



UNIVERSITY  
OF PITTSBURGH



Bar. fm.  
EX7101  
S7  
V. 2

LIBRARIES











THE  
**SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS,**

FOR THE YEAR

**1829.**

---

**VOL. II.**

---

**BOSTON :**  
PUBLISHED BY PEIRCE AND WILLIAMS,  
20, CORNHILL.

.....





# INDEX.

<i>Atav</i> meaning of,	514	Nature and Extent of	185
<i>Atavies</i> meaning of,	429	application of,	237
American Unitarian Association,	457	closing remarks,	298
Ames Hon. Fisher, religious character of,	455	Introduction,	1
Ancient Ecclesiastical Proceedings,	176	Iraueus on the Epistle to the Hebrews,	16
Arianism in Boston,	163	Jay's Exercises for the Closet, extracts from,	676
Athenagoras,	25	Justin Martyr,	24
Atonement, views of the Primitive Christians respecting,	455	King Chancellor, views of respecting the church,	453
Baxter Richard,	243	Laws and Decisions relative to the Churches of Massachusetts examined,	123
Bellamy, Doctor, character of as a preacher,	235	Lexicons of Schleusner and Wahl, critical remarks on,	444
Bible, perfection of,	239	Lowell Dr., Notes from,	63 176
Brainard, recollections of,	140	Luther, conversion of,	516
Caius,	31	Manuscripts and Versions of the New Testament,	54
Character of the first Ministers of New England,	516	Morgan,	642
Chauncey Dr., account of,	127	Nettleton Rev. Asahel, Letter of,	112
Chillingworth, account of,	127	Notices,	120 236 223 463 687
Extract from,	517	Orthodox, meaning of the term,	582
Christian Examiner corrected,	116 278	Parkman Rev. Francis, letter of,	223
Remarks on an article in,	451	Parochial Lawsuits,	622
Christian Church, the Primitive,	453	On the use of Personal Pronouns,	645
Clement of Rome,	20	Polycarp,	23
Clement of Alexandria,	27	Progress in Sin,	574
Chubb, account of,	612	Pulpit Eloquence,	488
Churches are legal corporations,	381	Rammohan Roy,	270
Constitution secures the rights of the Churches,	378	Religious Anniversaries,	344
Conversation at an Inn,	518	Religious Controversy vindicated,	2 199 321
Cooke's Rev. Parsons, Reply to the Christian Examiner,	120	Review of Milton's Christian Doctrine, remarks on,	532
Dangerous Combinations,	352	Revival in Boston,	123
Darracott's Farewell,	629	Rules for a Profitable Sabbath,	572
Davenport James,	125	Ryland Dr., original letter of,	342
Dedham Case,	175 323	Sabbath, important institution,	145
Dr. Dwight's Travels,	250	views of Unitarians respecting,	577
System of Divinity,	251	Sabbath Mails, evils of,	157
Emmons Dr., extract from a Charge by,	572	Salter's Hall controversy,	587
Envy between Christians,	345	Schemes for explaining away the Atonement, &c. examined,	525
Epistle to the Hebrews, objections to it considered,	16 47	Sermons, how to provide,	234
Internal Evidence of its Pauline origin,	82	Stock Dr., conversion of,	117
Examination at Andover,	577	Stuart Professor, on future punishment,	405
Experiment tried, &c.	669	Tatian,	26
Freeman Dr.,	291	Theophilus of Antioch,	26
Future Punishment, views of the early Christians respecting,	196	Tindal Matthew,	642
Gobar,	37	Poland John,	642
Half-way Covenant, origin of,	68	Unitarians, evidence of their concealment,	5 224 229 294
Harvard College, how it became Unitarian,	469 430	deny the inspiration of the Evangelists,	119
Heathen, character and prospects of,	431	reject Matt. xxviii. 19.	120
Hermas,	20	reject the New Testament as a revelation,	543 556
Hermias,	26	reject the Sabbath as a Divine institution,	575
Hicksites,	64	Unitarian management,	220
Hollis Thomas,	581	ministrations, effects of in England,	669
a Calvinist,	473	Association, American,	457
Hollis Professor, views of on the Inspiration of the Apostles,	344	Unitarianism, Letters on the Introduction and Progress of in New England,	65 121 177 239 469
circumstances of his election,	172	Watts Dr., a believer in the Divinity of Christ,	234
Holy Spirit, on the work of,	595	Whiston William, account of,	637
Ignatius,	22	Whitefield in Boston,	123
Inspiration of the Scriptures—Old Testament,	9	Zuingle Ulric,	305
New Testament,	70		

## INDEX OF REVIEWS.

Review of Professor Stuart's Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews,	15	80	Notice of Paley's Natural Theology,	282
Mr. Hawes' Lectures, addressed to Young Men,		47	Memoirs of Mrs. Huntington,	283
Mr. Linsley's Lectures to the Middle Aged,		105	Ratio Disciplinae,	284
Report on Sabbath Mails,		142	Mr. Sprague's Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Storrs,	285
Pamphlets against Controversy,		198	Mr. Walker's Sermon on Balance of Character,	287
Memoir of Rev. Legh Richmond,		213	Mr. Whitman's Lecture on Popular Superstitions,	288
Dr. Dwight's Sermons,	248	308	The Imitation of Christ,	404
Professor Stuart's Hebrew Grammar and Chrestomathy,		260	Mr. Stone's Sermons on War, Letters of Maria Jane Jewsbury,	404
Mr. Stowe's Translation of Jahm's History of the Hebrew Commonwealth,		319	Simple Memorials of an Irish Family,	404
Erskine on the Freeness of the Gospel,		359	Dr. Griffin's Park-street Lectures,	460
Publications on the Rights of the Churches,		370	An Account of Memorials on Sabbath Mails,	461
Letters to Dr. Channing on the Existence and Agency of Fallen Spirits.		491	President Allen's Address on the Death of Dr. Smith,	462
Mr. Montgomery's Poem on the Omnipresence of the Deity.		502	Mr. Potter's Sermon on Missions,	462
a Review of Professor Stuart's Commentary in the Christian Examiner,		538	Dr. Lowell's Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Sibley,	463
Pamphlets on the parochial Controversy at Cambridge		559	Mr. Arnold's Discourse on the Subjects of Baptism,	463
Dr. Payson's Sermons,		604	Mr. Whitman's Discourse before the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company,	464
Remains of Rev. Carlos Wilcox,		648	Dr. Beecher's Sermon at the Installation of Dr. Tyler,	519
Mr. Dabney's Annotations on the New Testament,		658	Mr. Ashmead's Sermon,	522
			Dr. Sharp's Missionary Sermon,	522
			Tract on Universal Salvation,	523
			Mr. Goodrich's Outlines of Ecclesiastical History,	524
			Dr. Dana's Sermon at the Installation of Dr. Brown,	577
			Mr. Sprague's Farewell Sermon,	578
			Mr. Rood's Ordination Sermon,	579
			Mr. Fairchild's Sermon on Essential Doctrines,	580
			Mr. Winslow's Lectures on the Trinity,	530
			Henry's Exposition of the Old and New Testament,	631
			Works of Rev. H. Scougal,	633
			Mr. Wilks' Christian Essays,	634
			Mr. Wilson's Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity,	635
			Memoir of Mrs. Ewing, by her husband,	636
			Bishop Heber's Sermons in India,	683
			Mr. Mann's Epitome of the Evidences of Christianity,	684
			Conversations on the Bible. By Erodore,	684
			Mr. Green's Discourse at Plymouth,	685
			Dr. Church's Sermon before the Massachusetts Pastoral Association,	685
			Dr. Park's Sermon before the Norfolk Education Society,	685

## INDEX OF CRITICAL NOTICES.

Notice of Memoirs of Dr. Doddridge,	56
the Visitor,	57
Mr. Pierpont's Sermon on the Resurrection of Christ,	58
Judge Story's Centennial Discourse,	59
Introduction to the Analytical Reader,	62
Mr. Cogswell's Family Assistant,	166
Recollections of a beloved Sister,	168
The Persecuted Family,	169
Mr. Harris's Questions,	170
Mr. Holbrook's Easy Lessons in Geometry,	170
The Bible Class Book,	170
Dr. Holmes' Anniversary Sermons,	171
Dr. Porter's Sermon on the Presumption of Skeptical Men,	173
the Final Tendency of Religious Disputes. By Old Experience,	174
Sabbath Recreations,	280
Mr. Freeman on Baptism,	281
Harbinger of Peace,	281
Cambridge and Saybrook Platforms,	282

THE

# SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. II.

JANUARY, 1829.

NO. 1.

---

---

INTRODUCTION.

THE design of this work, the reasons for undertaking it, and the principles on which it was proposed to be conducted, were fully explained in the Introduction to the first volume. Whether it has hitherto been conducted according to these principles, and in such manner as to meet the reasonable expectations of friends, our readers have the means of judging for themselves.

The work obviously was commenced under great disadvantages. The year had opened before it was seriously contemplated, and more than a month had elapsed, before it was announced. That a subscription commenced at this late period should have succeeded, as ours has done, is certainly a very encouraging fact, evincing that the reasons for the undertaking are duly appreciated, and that a work like ours is felt to be needed.

Respecting the contents and general character of the last volume, it is hardly to be expected that all who agree with us in doctrine should form precisely the same judgement. Some may have thought our articles too long, and the subjects of them too little diversified; while others have considered them too controversial, and not sufficiently pacific and practical in their tendency.

In regard to suggestions such as these, we can only assure our readers, that we have endeavored to do what, with our means of judging, seemed to be right. We have proceeded, from number to number, with a conscientious regard to what we believed our duty, and under a solemn, and often an almost overwhelming sense of responsibility, as to the impression we might make on the public mind.

It should be considered, too, that our work is not designed to be filled up with short scraps, and anecdotes, and items of intelligence, with a view to gratify a great diversity of tastes, and afford amusement for a leisure hour. It is intended rather for discussion; and for the discussion of *important*, and sometimes of difficult, and disputed subjects. It is intended to communicate, as occasion may demand, extended and labored articles, which will require the reader to think, to study, and discriminate, in order to understand them, and feel interested in them. And those of our readers who

are unwilling to think, and consequently are uninterested in communications of this nature, (though to such, above all others, mental effort is necessary) may as well give up their subscriptions, and proceed no farther with us.

On the subject of religious controversy, to which some portion of our work has been devoted, we can little more than repeat the remarks which were made at the commencement of the last volume. If controversy is in itself an evil, it cannot be doubted that it is often a necessary evil. The inspired prophets had frequent controversy with false prophets. Our Saviour was often in controversy with scribes, Pharisees, and priests. The apostles also had much controversy with Jews, and Pagans, and heretical brethren. And the faithful in all ages have been obliged to contend with the opposers of truth, and the enemies of their Lord. So long as 'there must be heresies,' there must be controversy, to expose and refute sophistry; to prevent the inexperienced and unwary from being turned out of the way; and to rescue, if possible, deluded souls. Our readers will bear us witness that we have not manifested a disposition to dispute on trivial matters, or on points of mere circumstantial difference. We have contended, when contending at all, for the great and fundamental principles of the Gospel—for those truths which respect the object of our worship, the foundation of our hope, and the terms of our final acceptance and salvation—for everything, in short, which is dear to us as Christians. If decision and engagedness can be justified on any subjects, they surely can be on subjects such as these.

We indulge the hope that the present volume may be less controversial than the last; but even of this we cannot be sure, as it must depend materially on the course pursued by others, and on circumstances over which we have no direct control. If the Unitarian controversy is to be continued in this region, we have to request of our opponents at least one thing,—which is, that they furnish us in future with less occasion for the charge of *misrepresentation*, than they have done in times past. If they wish to convince us of our alleged errors, they must learn to state these errors fairly. They must state and refute them as we actually hold them.

One particular, in which we are continually misrepresented, is that we are charged with certain modifications of Orthodoxy, as they may be held now in other portions of our country, and as they were held by Calvinists generally, in the former part of the last century. It would be some apology for Unitarians, if they were ignorant of the different views which we entertain on the subjects here referred to. But the truth is, they are not ignorant, unless they are ignorant of their own books.

At the time when the Theological Seminary at Andover was instituted, and for several years afterwards, the differences between

“Calvinists” and “Hopkinsians,” or “Andoverians,” as they were sometimes called, constituted a favorite topic of discussion with the self-styled liberal party. These differences were enlarged upon, and magnified, in hope, as it should seem, of making them a ground of radical and permanent separation among the Orthodox, and of weakening the friends of essential truth by division.\* But failing in this, the subject of these differences has been for several years dropped, and a directly opposite course has been pursued. It has been and is very strenuously insisted on, that there is no perceptible difference of sentiment between the Orthodox of New England now, and Calvinists a hundred years ago; and that, willing or unwilling, we shall be held responsible for all that persons calling themselves Calvinists, of any age, or of any country, have thought proper to hold and to teach.

Now this is manifestly unfair and unjust, especially as we have made repeated explanations, and have always endeavored to be as explicit as possible. Why should we not be as explicit as possible? There is no part of our religious system which we have any interest or inclination to conceal. We are willing, and we earnestly wish, that those who differ from us should possess our views on the whole subject of religion, as fully as we possess them ourselves.

In our first article, we gave an exposition of our faith, which has been called, not inappropriately, the “creed of the Spirit of the Pilgrims.”† As that exposition expresses positively what in several particulars we do believe, it may serve to prevent misapprehension, or to make misapprehension the more inexcusable, if we here express negatively, in a few particulars, what we do not believe.

We do not believe that the persons of the Trinity are in all respects distinct, and independent beings; for this would preclude unity in any sense: nor do we believe they are one, in the same sense that they are three; for this would imply a contradiction.

We do not believe that Jesus is in his human nature God, or in his divine nature man. In respect to his human nature, he is doubtless inferior, and in his official character he is subordinate, to the Father. Hence the passages so often urged to prove his inferiority to the Father are not at all inconsistent with our system, but support it.

We do not believe that God has made a part of mankind on purpose to damn them; or that he compels them to sin; or that he mocks them with offers of pardon on conditions which they have no power to comply with; or that he punishes them eternally for not performing impossibilities.

While we believe the doctrine of election, as stated and explained in the New Testament, we do not believe the elect will be

\* See *Anthology* for Nov. 1808, p. 602. Review of Ely's *Contrast* in the *General Repository*, vol. iv. p. 321, and *Christian Disciple*, vol. ii. pp. 166, 236, and 323.

† *Unitarian Advocate*, vol. i. p. 193.

saved, if they persist in transgression; or that the nonelect will be damned, if they confess and forsake their sins. We hold this doctrine in perfect consistency with the sincere offer of life to all, and with the salvation of those, and those only, who freely accept it.

We do not believe that the posterity of Adam are personally chargeable with eating the forbidden fruit; or that their constitution is so depraved as to leave them no natural ability to love and serve God, or as to render it improper for him to require obedience.

In making atonement for men, we do not believe that Christ endured the same amount of suffering which their sins deserve; or that he so cancelled their debt to justice that nothing is due on their behalf; or that the sufficiency of the atonement is so limited, that all may not be saved, on the ground of it, who comply with the offers of salvation.

We do not believe that the sinner in the moment of conversion is mechanically and involuntarily wrought over into another kind of being; but that he then begins, under the special influence of the Holy Spirit, and with the free and full consent of his heart, to love, serve, and enjoy God.

We hold the doctrine of justification by faith, as not dispensing with the necessity of an obedient life, but the rather enforcing it.

We hold the perseverance of saints, not as securing their salvation without respect to their future characters, but as implying that, through the grace of God, they will persevere in the voluntary exercise and practice of holiness to the end of their lives.

And we hold the doctrine of eternal punishment as implying, not that God is vengeful, or malicious, or delights in the sufferings of his creatures, but that he is a righteous Sovereign, who, in governing the intelligent universe, must maintain the honors of his law, by inflicting its just penalty on those who obstinately transgress it.

This enumeration of particulars might be greatly extended, but we deem it unnecessary. After the explanations made here, and in other parts of our work, if any will persist in misapprehending and misrepresenting our views, the public must judge whether the blame attaches to them, or to us.

Our Orthodox brethren have complained, and we think with good reason, of a want of explicitness on the part of Unitarians, ever since this controversy commenced. For some cause or other, they have manifested a disposition to keep back, and conceal their sentiments. They have shown a reluctance to come out frankly and openly, and make the world acquainted with their views. In many instances, they have employed words and phrases similar to those in popular use, but employed them in a disguised and peculiar sense. And their sentiments have come to be known, so far as they are known, only in consequence of incidental disclosures, or as they have been drawn out by the force of discussion.



We make these assertions with full deliberation, and with undoubting confidence of their truth. Much evidence of the truth of them has been exhibited in our previous pages.\* And we have much and various evidence of a similar kind in reserve, to be exhibited as occasion shall require. Indeed, it astonishes us, that the truth of what is here alleged should ever have been denied.

The spread of Unitarianism in this country *commenced* in concealment. The English Unitarian tracts were privately circulated, and because they could not be *purchased* for the public and social libraries, they were (no doubt with a show of much charity) gratuitously bestowed.†

Unitarianism gained footing in the University by concealment. When the present Professor of Divinity was a candidate for his office, "the right to *examine* him was denied." His "particular religious principles, though often asked for, *were not disclosed.*" He "was particularly asked by one of the honorable members of the Senate, whether he was a believer in that important doctrine, the *Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ*;" but "the reply conveyed no precise or satisfactory answer on that point." An attempt was made, however, by his friends, to pass the matter off in the public papers, as though he *was* a believer in the Divinity of Christ. His opposers were contemptuously represented as raising a needless alarm, and saying, 'Beware! he is an Arminian! He is an Arian!' as though such a charge was too ridiculous to need refutation.‡

In pursuance of the same plan of concealment, an opposition was excited about this time, against the examination of candidates for the Gospel ministry. Says a writer in the Panoplist for April, 1806, "The examination of candidates, previous to ordination, has *of late* been, not only neglected, but *violently opposed*; not only treated as a matter of indifference, but *decried*, as a *destructive evil.*" It was foreseen, as it must have been, that if Unitarian candidates were to be examined, in the usual way, and according to all previous usage in New England,§ the secret of their principles would inevitably come out.

In 1810, the Anthology reviewers, embodying the leading Unitarians of their time, deemed themselves grossly slandered by the Panoplist, in being denominated Unitarians. "Among other flowers of rhetoric," say they, "we are charged with UNITARIANISM, misrepresentation, dishonesty, resemblance to the hypocritical Scribes and Pharisees, and enmity to everything which con-

\* Vol. i. pp. 325—327.

† History of American Unitarianism, p. 22. ‡ Morse's "True Reasons," &c. pp. 19-22.

§ Speaking of the early settlers of this country, Dr. Trumbull observes, "The elders and churches were *exceedingly strict*, with respect to those whom they ordained; examining them, not only in the three learned languages, and doctrinal points of theology, with respect to cases of conscience, and their ability to defend Christianity and its doctrines against Infidels and gainsayers, but with respect to *their own EXPERIMENTAL and HEART RELIGION.*"

stitutes the peculiar glory of our forefathers." In the same article, they speak of Dr. Porter, of Roxbury, as being slandered in a similar way. "On what authority they (the editors of the *Panoplist*) imply that Dr. Porter is a *Socinian*, in *any sense*, we know not." "With regard to the numerous charges of latitudinarianism, *Unitarianism*, &c., Dr. Porter may reply, in the eloquent language of Bishop Watson," &c.\*

At the ordination of a gentleman from Cambridge, not many months ago, it devolved on an aged Unitarian clergyman to give the charge. In doing this, he took occasion to congratulate his young brother on the favorableness of existing circumstances compared with those of former years. 'The time has been,' said he, 'when our peculiar sentiments were so unpopular that it was hazardous to teach them. The minds of men were not prepared to receive them. We were obliged to *conceal them from public view*, or disclose them in *ambiguous language*.' We pretend not to give the precise words of the venerable speaker, but in regard to the sense generally we cannot be mistaken. Hundreds will bear us witness that we have reported it with accuracy.

This is in accordance with the ordination services of which Dr. Worcester speaks, "in which the preacher (a Unitarian,) very distinctly, and with considerable amplification, held forth, that though in some places it might be well, and contribute to the faith and virtue of a people, for a minister *openly and plainly to declare his sentiments*, yet in other places *it would not be prudent or proper*."†

But a "little time has elapsed," says a writer in the *Christian Examiner*, "since an objection to the chief doctrines of Orthodoxy *could not be whispered SAFELY*." "I can remember the time, and I am not old, when, though Boston was full of Unitarian sentiment and feeling, there was *no open profession of it*. *A dead silence was maintained in the pulpit on doctrinal subjects; a silence which was not disturbed by the press*."‡

The quotations here given, and the facts adverted to, will satisfy every unprejudiced mind of the truth of the allegations previously made, and of the existence of the evil of which we complain. Unitarians have not been fearless and explicit in the avowal of their peculiar sentiments. It has been their policy to conceal themselves, to operate in the dark, to creep in, and spread their sentiments unawares.—Nor are they sufficiently explicit now. The writer in the *Christian Examiner* already quoted, complains of the "timidity" of his ministerial brethren, that they 'keep to one style of preaching, and one round of subjects, and neither excite, nor are excited, to inquiry, decision, and exertion.' The discussions and disclosures of a twenty years' controversy have brought

\* See Anthology for Oct. 1810.

† First Letter to Dr. Channing, p. 17. ‡ Vol. iii. pp. 113, 114.

them out on several points ; but over others of equal importance there is still thrown a covering of disguise. For instance ; expressions are frequently dropped, which shew that Unitarians regard the *Bible*, as not altogether to be depended on, in questions of a religious nature. "The sacred documents of our faith" are represented "as prepared for *temporary use*, and filled with subjects of local interest or *popular accommodation*." "The scheme of preparation which led the way to Christianity" (meaning the Old Testament) is "mixed with the *doubtfulness of old traditions*, and with *systems of SUPERANNATED ERRORS*." "The words of Christ were reported *from memory* by the Evangelists, and NOT ALWAYS WITH PERFECT ACCURACY." "The reasoning of St. Paul *will not always bear a philosophical scrutiny*."\* Yet these writers talk of believing the inspiration of the Scriptures, and regard themselves as greatly misrepresented, and grossly slandered, if they are charged with any approaches to infidelity.

It is well understood that most Unitarians, especially those recently educated, are *humanitarians*. They deny the preexistence of Christ, and regard him as no more than a highly gifted and Divinely inspired prophet, a man. But how few there are, who openly and fearlessly avow their belief on this point. How many, who think to conceal it, under the cover of an ambiguous phraseology.

Unitarians are supposed to deny "the existence and agency of *fallen spirits*;" regarding the commonly received opinion as an 'oriental fiction,' and Satan as 'the personified principle of evil.' But what a studied silence has been observed in regard to this subject. Only one man, and he but in a single instance, is recollected to have published, under his own name, what is presumed to be the sentiment of the denomination generally. †

Again ; it is not doubted, as with all the facts before the public it cannot be, that a vast majority of Unitarians are Universalists. We presume there are not half a dozen Unitarian ministers in New England, who could be induced, on any consideration, to insist, in their pulpits, upon the doctrine of future, endless punishment. Yet their real sentiments on this point, though leaking out in a thousand ways, are not fearlessly and openly avowed. They are in many cases studiously concealed, through a fear of the consequences of declaring them. Says one Unitarian writer, "We think those Unitarians who believe in this doctrine (Universalism) have been much in fault *in keeping it out of view*, and *evading the charge of it*." ‡ "Many," says another, "who disbelieve the doctrine of eternal punishment, are *afraid*"—yes, reader,

\* Christian Examiner. vol. iii. p. 19., and vol. v. pp. 59, 69.

† Ware's Discourses p. 113. ‡ Review of a Letter to a Unitarian Clergyman &c. p. 21.

“AFRAID to avow their opinion, lest it should weaken the restraints of religion.”\*

While Unitarians pursue this clandestine course, they not unfrequently complain, in their turn, of misrepresentation. Their religious views, they say, are not fairly stated, and opinions are imputed to them with which they are not chargeable.—Now we have no wish to misrepresent our opponents, and no intention of doing it; and if they would avoid the evil of which they complain, let them, in future, be more explicit. Let them throw off the cloak which they have so long worn, and, like Unitarians in England and on the continent of Europe, let them no longer be afraid or ashamed to make a full disclosure of their sentiments.

We have endeavored uniformly to be as explicit as possible; and if in the opinion of any, we have not been sufficiently so, we promise to be. We have nothing to conceal, and we will conceal nothing. And if this controversy must be continued, we insist that our opponents should do the same. Tell us what you believe, and what you do not believe; make us fully acquainted with your views; and then if we misrepresent you, we will bear the blame. This obviously is the way, and the only way, in which the truth (on which side soever it may lie) can be made speedily to triumph, and in which, through its triumph, a mutual good understanding can be restored.

With a single consideration, addressed to our Orthodox brethren and friends, and directed also to our own consciences, we close these introductory remarks. In the purity of our daily example, and by uniform devotedness to the cause of Christ, let us endeavor to shew forth the truth, the power, and the excellence of those principles, which others so much undervalue and reproach, but which we profess to hold so dear. To adopt an admired stanza from our Christian psalmist,

“ So let our *lips* and *lips* express  
The holy Gospel we profess;  
So let our *works* and *virtues* shine,  
TO PROVE THE DOCTRINES ALL DIVINE.”

Or in the more authoritative language of the apostle Peter, “So is the will of God, that with WELL DOING—ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men.” “That whereas they speak evil of you as of evil doers, they may be ashamed, that falsely accuse your *good conversation in Christ.*”

In every view, it should be the leading object of this publication, and it shall be, to enforce the holy doctrines and duties of religion, and persuade all within its influence to believe, love, and obey the truth.—That our readers, with ourselves may imbibe and cherish the true spirit of the Gospel, be the devoted followers of Jesus Christ, and, having ‘fought a good fight and kept the faith,’ may be prepared to receive the crown of life, is the most earnest desire and prayer of the conductors of the Spirit of the Pilgrims.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

## INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES. NO. IV.

*Inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old Testament proved.*

What has been advanced in previous numbers has been intended to correct mistakes, to remove prejudice and the causes of prejudice, and to prepare the way for a profitable consideration of what the sacred oracles teach on the subject under discussion.

The diversity of opinions which shows itself among good men in relation to this subject is doubtless owing, in a considerable degree, to the neglect of those cautions which I have suggested, and to the influence of those prejudices and mistakes which I have endeavored to correct. If, when we apply ourselves to the examination of this subject, we assume that the writers of Scripture could not have been inspired, unless we know the particular manner in which their minds were affected by inspiration; or that they could have enjoyed no divine influence, except in the revelation of new truths; or if we assume that they could not have been inspired, if in writing the Scriptures they made use of their own faculties; or if they wrote in human language, and used the varieties of style common in other writings, or made quotations in any way except in the very words of the original writers, and for the very purpose originally intended; or if we assume that they could not have been inspired, if their writings contain things which appear in themselves to be of small consequence, or things which for a time are not understood; or if the *present copies* of their writings contain any real or apparent contradictions, or any instances of incorrectness:—if we admit all or any of these assumptions, and suffer them to influence our judgement, the certain consequence will be, that all which the Scriptures themselves say respecting the special divine guidance afforded to the writers will go for nothing, and we shall come in the end to a broad denial of the doctrine of inspiration. But as the brief attention we have given to the subject must have satisfied all that none of the circumstances above mentioned can furnish any argument against the common doctrine of inspiration; we shall be able, I trust, to give an unprejudiced attention to a farther discussion of the subject, and to judge impartially of the evidence arising from the testimony of the sacred writers.

The inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures will be first considered. The evidence I shall produce will be derived from the New Testament.

I shall, first, argue from *the passages which directly assert the fact of inspiration.*

One of these passages is, 2 Pet. i. 21: "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." The writer had just before spoken of the evidence which he and his fellow disciples had of the divine mission and glory of Christ, from what they saw of his majesty in the holy mount, and from the voice which they there heard from heaven, declaring him to be the Son of God. But clear as that evidence was, he represents the evidence arising from prophecy to be still clearer. "We have also," he says, "a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light shining in a dark place." And then, to recommend prophecy as a sure means of discovering the character of Christ, and to show that it may be safely relied upon, he adds: "For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Prophecy, in this place, has evidently a very extensive meaning, including all the representations of the Messiah contained in the Old Testament. Some learned commentators, under the influence of infidel principles, have denied that any real predictions of Christ can be found in the Old Testament. But if we have confidence in the knowledge and veracity of Christ and his apostles, we shall be satisfied that the Scriptures of the Old Testament contain many more predictions and other representations of Christ, than some Christians suppose. The text, in Luke xxiv. 27, clearly shows how Christ regarded this subject. "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, Jesus expounded to them in *all the Scriptures* the things concerning himself." There was then something of the nature of prophetic representation respecting the Messiah, in *Moses* and *all the prophets*, and in *all the Scriptures*. The 44th verse of the same chapter is of similar import: "And Jesus said unto them, these are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written concerning me, in *the law of Moses*, and in *the prophets*, and in *the Psalms*." Now it was of prophecy, understood in this extensive sense, that Peter said, "The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

We are not, however, to suppose that Peter, thus attributing inspiration to this particular part of the Scriptures, implies that other parts are not equally inspired. He attributed inspiration particularly to prophecy, because he then had occasion to speak of prophecy, and he wished to show in what estimation it was worthy to be held, and how perfectly it was suited to answer the end for which he exhorted Christians to use it. Whenever he had occasion to refer to other parts of the Scriptures, he showed the same respect for them, and represented them as being of equal authority with prophecy.



The other passage which *directly asserts the fact of divine inspiration*, is 2 Tim. iii. 16; "*All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.*" Here, as in 2 Pet. i. 21, the inspiration of the Scriptures is spoken of as an important practical subject. It is spoken of as connected with their being profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction, and their being able to make men wise unto salvation, and to furnish them thoroughly for every good work.

Our apostle says, "*All Scripture is divinely inspired,*" θεοπνευστος. Some writers think the passage should be rendered, *All inspired Scripture, or all Scripture being divinely inspired, is profitable for doctrine, &c.* The sense is not materially different. According to the common rendering, the inspiration of all Scripture is asserted; θεοπνευστος being the predicate. According to the other rendering, inspiration is presupposed; θεοπνευστος being the subject. But I submit it to those who are competent to judge, whether this last rendering, though adopted by some very respectable authors, is not liable to an insuperable objection, as θεοπνευστος and ωφελιμος are closely connected by the conjunction καὶ, and therefore must both be predicates, if either of them is. And one of them must evidently be a predicate, in order to make a complete sentence.

I here take for granted, what has often been satisfactorily proved, that when Paul speaks of all Scripture, he must be understood to mean all the writings which were held sacred by the Jews at that time; and that those writings were the same as constitute the Old Testament now in common use. We have proof then, from the plain, direct affirmation of the apostle, that *all the Old Testament Scriptures are divinely inspired.*

The former of the two passages quoted, casts light upon the latter. Paul asserts that all Scripture is *divinely inspired*. If any one wishes to know what is meant by being *divinely inspired*, he will find an explanation in the words of Peter. To say that the Scriptures are *divinely inspired*, is the same as to say, that those who wrote them, *wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*

In both of these texts it is evidently implied, that there is an essential difference between the Holy Scriptures and all other writings, as to their *origin, or the manner in which they were first produced.* Other writings come by the will of man; they originate in voluntary human efforts. Human genius and labor are sufficient to produce them. The effects produced are to be referred to man in the exercise of his natural powers, as the sole cause. But this is not the case with the Scriptures. It is not sufficient to say, the writers were honest and intelligent men, and wrote what they knew or believed to be true. This may be said of many other writings. But who would think it proper to affirm, that those other writings came not by the will of man, or that they were given by

inspiration of God? Who would put this high distinction upon them, that the authors wrote *as they were impelled by the Holy Ghost*? It must then be very manifest, that he who undertakes to account for the Old Testament Scriptures by alleging, that the writers had a sound understanding, and the best means of information; that they were men of unimpeachable integrity; that they were diligent in their labors, and watchful against mistakes; and that they wrote on subjects on which they had a competent knowledge;—he who undertakes to account for the Scriptures by alleging these things, and stops here, leaving out the grand fact, that the sacred penmen *wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*, and that *their writings were divinely inspired*, entirely sets aside the meaning of what both Paul and Peter assert, and overlooks the high and sacred characteristic, by which they distinguish the Scriptures from all other writings.

But there are other representations in the New Testament, which confirm the argument above stated.

To every intelligent reader of the New Testament, it must have occurred, as a remarkable fact, that the Scriptures of the Old Testament are frequently called *the word of God*. In this designation of these Scriptures, Christ and his apostles agree with the prophets. Now in what sense did the writers of the New Testament use the phrase, *the word of God*, when they applied it to designate their Scriptures? They evidently used it to distinguish the Scriptures from the traditions of men, and from all writings of human origin, and to signify that God had invested these books with divine authority. And if we take into view the representation before mentioned, we shall naturally conclude that when the apostles called the Scriptures *the word of God*, they had reference to their *inspiration*. These sacred books are not denominated the *word of God*, because they contain instruction respecting God and divine things, nor because the instruction they contain is *true*. For if any writings not inspired, either treatises on the attributes of God, or on the duties of man, or histories of the events of divine providence, should be *perfectly free from error*; they would not, on that account, be the *word of God*. Is every truth which a man speaks, the word of *God*? It is much more reasonable to suppose that, when the apostles called the Scriptures the word of God, they had their eye upon their *divine original*, and meant to imply, that they were written under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit, and so were stamped with divine authority.

Let me just remark here, that although different parts of Scripture were given in different ways, so far as human agency was concerned, we cannot allow any difference in regard to the *reality of inspiration*. Those parts which contain direct communications from God relating to future events, or relating to any doctrines before unknown, are nowhere distinguished, in respect of divine in-

piration or divine authority, from those parts which relate to things before known. No one who carefully examines the subject can doubt the truth of this remark.

The next argument I shall use to prove the inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures is, *that Christ and his apostles treat them as possessing an authority entirely different from that of any other writings.*

The books, called the *Scriptures*, were constantly appealed to by the authors of the New Testament, as having supreme authority on all questions of doctrine and duty. Neither Christ nor the apostles ever speak of any book or any sentence of the Old Testament, in a manner which implies, that they regarded it as a human production. They constantly represent it in such a light as to show, that disobedience to any part of it is disobedience to God, and that contempt of any part of it is contempt of the divine authority.

It will be proper here to give a few examples of the manner in which Christ and the apostles refer to particular parts of the Old Testament. The reader will see that, to whatever part they have occasion to refer, they treat it as possessing the same divine authority.

Matt. xix. 4—6. In answer to the question of the Pharisees, on the subject of divorce, Christ appealed to the particular account which Moses gave of the creation, as of decisive authority. "Have ye not read, (i. e. in the Scriptures, Gen. ii.) that he who made them in the beginning, made them male and female, and said, for this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and cleave to his wife?" Rom. iv. 3. Paul here shows that he regarded what was said of Abraham, (Gen. xv. 6.,) as of decisive authority. "For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." He referred to this passage as conclusive evidence of his doctrine. In verse 6th, he refers in the same manner to what David said, Psalm xxxii. 1; "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven." Again, verse 17th, he refers to what is said of Abraham in Genesis; "*As it is written*, I have made thee a father of many nations." In John x. 34, 35, we see what stress was laid on a particular expression in the Old Testament. "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, *I said* ye are gods? If he called them gods, to whom the word of God came, and *the Scripture cannot be broken*," &c., implying, that the particular declaration quoted from Psalm lxxxii, though it might seem to be of no special consequence, was yet of divine authority, and could not be invalidated. In 1 Cor. xv. 27, is another example of the stress which is laid on a particular text. The quotation is from Psalm viii. "He hath put all things under his

feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him," &c. The apostle understood the passage as relating to Christ, and reasons from it as having an authority which could belong to no human production. The author of the epistle to the Hebrews attaches the same importance to other expressions found in the same Psalm.

Examples of this kind might be multiplied; but the design of this discussion does not admit of it. It is obvious that whenever Christ or the apostles had occasion to refer to any passage, whether longer or shorter, in any part of the Old Testament, they refer to it as being the word of God, and as possessing divine authority. Sometimes they refer in general terms to the Scriptures, taken together, and represent them all as divine. At other times, they represent particular texts in the same light. They never intimate that there is any exception.

Now the Lord Jesus possessed a fulness of divine knowledge, and came on purpose to guard men against error, and to teach them all necessary truth; he commissioned and qualified his apostles to execute the same office. Both he and they had constant occasion to speak of the Old Testament Scriptures, and to show how they regarded them, and how they would have others regard them. But they never, in a single instance, taught or said the least thing which implied that there was any book or any text contained in the Scriptures, which was not the word of God, and which had not divine authority. And they never said anything which implied that one part was the word of God in a lower sense, or that it had less authority than other parts. They never gave the least intimation which was calculated to make any such impression on the minds of Christians. They never gave any caution to Christians, or even to Jews, against attributing too high an authority, or attaching too much importance, to the Holy Scriptures. They were so far from this, that it was evidently a great object with them to produce among men a higher reverence for all, and every part, of the sacred volume, and to excite them more diligently to search it, and more entirely to confide in it, as containing divine truth unmixed with error. Now this manner of treating the Scriptures agrees perfectly with the position, that they are *divinely inspired*; that holy men of God spake and wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. But it is totally contrary to the supposition, that the writing of the Scriptures is to be accounted for by means of human genius and labor, or in any way which supersedes the supernatural agency of God. For it is perfectly plain that no book, which is produced by man, in the exercise of his natural powers merely, can be entitled to that kind of respect and reverence, which Christ and his apostles manifested for the sacred Scriptures, or to that unqualified confidence which they require Christians to repose in them. For any merely hu-

man author to claim such reverence and confidence would justly be deemed arrogant and impious.

To the view of this subject which has now been exhibited, what Christian can refuse his cordial assent? It seems impossible for us to express a settled and a full conviction of any truth more clearly or forcibly, than Christ and his apostles expressed their conviction of the divine origin of the sacred writings. They made it evident, as we have seen, that this was their judgement of the Scriptures generally, or as a whole. And whenever they had occasion for it, they showed that this was their judgement of particular books, and particular expressions. They well knew what reverence the generality of the Jews, and especially the better part of them, felt for their sacred books. But instead of intimating that any Jews, even those who were the most subject to superstition, were in danger of carrying their reverence for the Scriptures to an extreme, and instead of doing anything to guard their minds against it, they labored in various ways to excite them to cherish a still higher reverence for the Word of God, and to render it a more constant and sincere obedience. Let me just add, that if Christ and his apostles have not taught us satisfactorily that they regarded the Scriptures as given by divine inspiration, and as clothed with divine authority, we must despair of ever knowing the mind of any writer or teacher in relation to such a subject. If Christ and the apostles were free from artifice, we certainly know what their views were on this subject; and we know that they regarded the Scriptures in the manner which has been described. And when I find some authors, who are distinguished for learning and genius, and who withal profess great respect for Christianity, who yet regard the Old Testament very much as they regard any other ancient writing, and account for its production in the same way as they account for the production of any other book; I am constrained to think that they have not yet learned the first lesson in the school of Christ.

PASTOR.

---

## REVIEWS.

A COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. In two volumes. *By Moses Stuart, Associate Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theol. Seminary at Andover:* Published by Mark Newman. Codman Press—Flagg & Gould. pp. 677.

(Continued from page 616, vol. i.)

We have in a preceding number of our magazine shown, that the epistle to the Hebrews belongs to the apostolic age; that before the close of the first century, it was received as authoritative

Scripture by the churches of Rome and Corinth, was quoted as such by Justin Martyr about the middle of the second century, at, or about which time it was embraced in the Syriac and Italic, that is, the Oriental and Western versions. We have also presented a very brief view of the positive *external* evidence on which we rest the claim of Paul to the authorship of this epistle. We have shown that the most competent judges, during the first four centuries of the Christian era, at Rome, Cesarea, and Alexandria, believed this epistle to have proceeded from Paul. Jerome, Eusebius, Origen, Clement of Alexandria, and Pantaenus, in ascribing this epistle to Paul, express, not only their individual opinions, but the belief of the great body of the early Christian fathers, the belief of the church in general.

It is proper, before we proceed to a consideration of the *internal* evidence of its Pauline origin, to consider the nature and amount of the external evidence adduced *against* it. The first witness to be examined is Irenæus. He is supposed to have been a native of Asia Minor, though the time and place of his birth, and the time of his death, are all involved in obscurity. Dr. Lardner says, "we have good reason to believe that he was a disciple of Polycarp, that he was presbyter in the church of Lyons under Pothinus, whose martyrdom occurred, A. D. 177, and that he succeeded Pothinus to the bishopric of that church." Irenæus himself informs us that, when young, he was a hearer of Polycarp. It is plain from this account, given by Irenæus, and preserved by Eusebius, that Polycarp was very old and Irenæus quite young, at the time when the latter was a hearer of the former. We will extract a part of this highly interesting account. Irenæus says in his epistle to Florinus :

"I saw you when I was yet a boy, in lower Asia, living splendidly in the imperial palace," so Grabe and Erasmus render it, "and striving to recommend yourself to the emperor ; for I better recollect things that then occurred, than those of recent date ; as what we learn in childhood (or early life) becomes incorporated and grows with ourselves. I can point out the very place where the blessed Polycarp sat and taught ; his going out and coming in ; the addresses he delivered to the people ; how he related the familiar intercourse he had with John and others who had seen the Lord."\* &c.

Dupin, in his *Bibliotheca Patrum*, places the death of Irenæus in A. D. 202, or 203. It is generally conceded that he flourished during the latter part of the second century. It will be seen by this, that he flourished after Clement of Rome, and Justin Martyr, but was cotemporary with Pantaenus, and Clement of Alexandria. How early he left Asia Minor does not appear, nor is there any proof that he was otherwise acquainted with Polycarp, than as having listened to his instructions, which made a deep and salutary impression on his youthful mind. Professor Stuart thinks it not

\* Eusebius, E. H. l. v. c. 20. The copy before us is that of Valesius with a Latin translation. 1672.



improbable that he visited Rome in company with Polycarp. We are not aware of any evidence to countenance this supposition. The letter of Irenæus to Florinus gives it no support. However this may be, we are assured that at the period of his life when his judgement was most mature, and his opinions, deliberately formed and expressed, most worthy of confidence, he resided at Lyons, in Gaul. He was thus at a great distance from the Oriental, Egyptian, and Grecian churches, and, with the facilities of intercourse then existing, could have had but partial, distant, and interrupted communications with his cotemporaries, whose names have just been mentioned, if indeed he knew of their existence. It is very difficult for us at this day to conceive of the precise situation of those early fathers. We are apt to associate those together in space, neighborhood, and intimacies of affection, who only coexisted in time. A moment's thought, however, will suffice to break up this very natural connexion of associated ideas.

The works of Irenæus, as they have reached us, afford no evidence that he had heard so much as the names of Pantaenus or Clement of Alexandria. He has nowhere quoted or referred to them, while he has distinctly mentioned the epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, and quoted from the writings of Justin Martyr. He has also quoted Polycarp, Papias, probably Ignatius, though without naming him, and perhaps Hermas, though we think this more doubtful. He has incidentally alluded to various other early Christian writers, whom Eusebius could not make out. He was also intimate with the heathen writers, as is evident by his quotations from Menander, Antiphanes, (a comic poet, whose works are not now extant,) Pindar, Sophocles, Plato, and Hesiod, and from Homer repeatedly. It is plain from this, that Irenæus was an extensive reader, and that he deserved the character given him by Tertullian, who says that "Irenæus, omnium doctrinarum curiosissimus explorator," i. e. Irenæus was a most inquisitive investigator of all doctrines.

We add, moreover, in regard to Irenæus, that he was not only an intelligent, but a pious, and for the most part judicious writer. He sometimes dreams, but is generally wakelul. His great work, having for its title, "The Confutation and Subversion of that which is falsely called Knowledge," consisting of five books, and written originally in Greek, has reached our times; most of it, however, in a literal though barbarous Latin translation. In this work he opposes the tenets of the Gnosticks, and particularly of the Valentinians. He makes frequent quotations from the Old Testament, and the New, often specifying the names of the writers. He is justly accounted a valuable witness to the genuineness of the writings which compose our N. T. canon. Much which he wrote has perished. In his writings which have reached us he has nowhere attempted to make out a canon of sacred writings,

nor has he anywhere pretended to quote from all the Scriptures, received either by the Jews or the Christians. Omitting the quotations by Irenæus from the O. T. as irrelevant, it has been asserted, and is generally admitted, that he has not made any quotations from the epistle to the Hebrews, the epistles of James, of Jude, the second of Peter, the third of John, or the epistle to Philemon. Are all these epistles, therefore, to be rejected as spurious and uncanonical? We answer, No; not if there be other and appropriate evidence, on which they have been received into the canon, and acknowledged as of apostolical authority.

Did Irenæus himself reject these epistles? This is the question we propose for the consideration of those who have recently brought forward the fact, that he did not quote the epistle to the Hebrews, as evidence that he rejected it. Is the want of positive evidence that he received this epistle tantamount to a rejection? If so, the same deficiency of evidence will tear out from the sacred volume the epistle to Philemon; and when one part of the *Homologoumena*\* may be thus wrested from us, what part will the tender mercies of criticism permit us to retain? If the epistle to the Hebrews must be rejected as uncanonical and un-Pauline, because it is not quoted in the works of Irenæus yet extant, though quoted as canonical more frequently than any other book of the New Testament, by Clement of Rome, writing as the official organ of that church to the Corinthian church; though appealed to, as canonical, by Justin Martyr, who has quoted but very sparingly from the New Testament, the gospels excepted; though adopted into the eastern and western versions of the second century; though acknowledged as Pauline by Pantaenus and Clement of Alexandria, the cotemporaries of Irenæus, who give not their individual opinions merely, but the tradition of the Oriental churches, to which this epistle was sent, and of the immediate successors of the apostles; then, we desire to know, on what ground we are to receive, and Unitarians yet receive, the epistles of James, of Jude, the second of Peter, and third of John, as of canonical and apostolical authority? In these remarks we confine ourselves to what is generally asserted relative to the works of Irenæus yet extant, without taking into view the assertions of Eusebius or Gobar, which, however, we shall shortly examine. If it be a fact that Irenæus has not quoted the epistles to Philemon, to the Hebrews, of James, the third of John, the second of Peter, nor that of Jude, the argument from this omission, if of validity against one, must be of va-

\* In the age of Eusebius, the sacred canon was considered as composed of two classes of books, the *Homologoumena*, or books universally received; and *Antilegomena*, or books generally received, though doubted or denied by some. The latter class consists of the epistle to the Hebrews, of James, of Jude, second Peter, and second and third of John, and the Revelation. On some future occasion we hope to show the reasons of this division, and point out the extreme caution of the early Christians in admitting books as of divine authority.

lidity against the whole ; and if the epistle to the Hebrews must be expunged from the sacred canon, on such ground, it will not go into solitary exile, but have for its attendants a universally acknowledged epistle of Paul, and the unquestionable epistles of James, John, Peter, and Jude. We would ask our readers, especially those Unitarians who may favor us with the perusal of our pages, and who entertain a feeling of reverence for the Word of God, solemnly to pause, and weigh well an argument, so dubious in its nature, and so perilous in its consequences. If these six epistles may be thus wrenched from that sacred volume, in which they have, for so many centuries, cast a pure and heavenly light upon this darkened, sin-blighted world, we are solicitous to know by what process of reasoning we are to retain the remnant of that light, thus shorn of its beams.

We are well aware of the answer which will be given, that "the epistle to Philemon was not quoted by Irenæus on account of its brevity ;" and, without any frank reply being made touching the epistles of James and Peter, John and Jude, we shall also be told, that "the epistle to the Hebrews is the only epistle asserted to be uncanonical." But we are testing the claims of an argument, which, if valid in its individual application, cannot lose its validity by extension to a parallel case. We desire our readers to bear this in mind.

We are, however, by no means certain that the writer who, on behalf of the more enlightened American rational inquirers, (as they deem themselves) has pronounced the epistle to the Hebrews uncanonical and unintelligible, is not prepared to follow out his principles, and acquiesce in the conclusion above deduced, which he perfectly well knows is the legitimate result of his principles and his logic. The application of his principle of reasoning to the epistle to Philemon is the only instance to which he could with any show of propriety take exception. With what propriety this exception could be taken, we shall endeavor to show before we close. *In words*, the reviewer of Professor Stuart's introductory volume allows the epistle to Philemon to have been written by Paul; *in argument*, he denies it. The rest of the above named epistles, with some others, we see no slight indications in his Review are retained with a shade of belief which it requires but another effort of the same mind to dissipate forever.

We feel ourselves warranted by the soundest principles of critical investigation, and the clearest rules of evidence, to assert that the omission on the part of Irenæus, to quote the epistle to the Hebrews, is no valid evidence against its antiquity, canonical credit, or apostolical origin. This omission, considered simply in and by itself, is nothing—nothing for, nothing against this epistle. We shall not stop to argue the point with direct reference to its antiquity, as this is universally conceded. There is scarcely a ground for

more doubt relative to the other points involved in our position. Let us test the truth of this by analogous applications; and as the question is exceedingly important, we must be pardoned for extending our remarks to an unusual particularity of detail. We have, for our individual satisfaction, examined the Christian writers of the first two centuries, whose works are yet extant, with reference to the quotations made by them from the New Testament, the formulas, and frequency of those quotations, &c.

We begin with the epistle of Barnabas. Pearson, Dupin, Cave, Archbishop Wake and others, think it genuine; that is, the production of the person whose name it bears. Cotelierius, Basnage, Jones, and many more recent writers and critics think otherwise. It is allowed to be of great antiquity. It has no inscription, not being directed to any particular church, but was early thought to have been directed to the Hebrews. Lardner does not find a quotation in this epistle from the New Testament, in which the book or writer is named. There are some passages apparently quoted from Matthew's gospel, and many passages closely resembling others in the epistles to the Galatians, to the Hebrews, and other epistles of Paul. But it is uncertain whether they were designed as quotations, or are only natural resemblances in the opinions and expressions of, perhaps, a cotemporary Christian writer.

Hermas, to whom the Pastor is attributed, was, according to Jerome, the same mentioned by Paul in the epistle to the Romans. But this is denied by many, doubted by more, while it is admitted also by very respectable critics. Lardner thinks the Pastor genuine, and written about the time of Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, i. e. A. D. 94—100. In it are no express citations, either from the Old Testament or the New; yet there are frequent allusions and references, which indicate that the writer was acquainted with the books now collected in the New Testament. Lardner concludes his examination of Hermas thus: "The allusions, which I have here produced from Hermas, relate to these several books of the New Testament: the gospels of Matthew, Luke, and John, [possibly Mark, though doubtful,] the Acts, the epistles to the Romans, 1 & 2 Cor., Gal., Eph., Philipp., Coloss., 1 Thess., 2 Tim., Hebrews, epistle of James, [very frequent, as Semler admits,] 1 & 2 Peter, epistles of John, Jude, and the book of Revelation." These allusions are in some cases more, and in others, less distinct. But in no instance is a book distinctly quoted, or a writer named.

We come now to Clement of Rome, whose first epistle to the Corinthians has already, in our preceding number, been particularly noticed. This is by far the best authenticated and most valuable relic of the first century of the Christian era. The most intelligent and judicious critics admit its genuineness. That it is the

same which Eusebius and Irenæus had, there can be no doubt; no more than there can be whether the orations against Cataline, or that for the poet Archias, were the productions of Cicero, and the same which existed seventeen centuries ago. We have already adduced the testimony of Eusebius relative to the epistle of Clement. It may interest our readers, while it will be found to strengthen our argument, to exhibit, in full, the opinion of Irenæus with reference to the same epistle. Speaking of the apostolical traditions, preserved in the church at Rome, Irenæus says :

“The blessed apostles, founding and building up this church, committed the episcopacy (or oversight) of it to Linus. Of this Linus, Paul in his epistle to Timothy makes mention: Anacletus succeeded Linus; after him, in the third place from the apostles, Clement received the episcopacy, who had also seen the apostles and conferred with them, and had the preaching of the apostles sounding [in his ears,] and their tradition before his eyes. *Nor was he alone; for as yet there were many remaining who were taught by the apostles.* During the time of Clement, a dissention of no slight kind arising among the brethren at Corinth, the church in Rome sent a most appropriate (or weighty) epistle to the Corinthians, urging them to peace and re-establishing their faith, and that tradition which they had recently received from the apostles, announcing that there was one omnipotent God, the maker of heaven and earth, the creator of man, who brought a deluge, and called Abraham, who led a people from the land of Egypt, who spake to Moses, who gave the law and sent the prophets, who prepared a fire for the devil and his angels. That He is held by the churches to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, those who are disposed can learn from this writing, (i. e. the epistle of Clement) and can thus learn the apostolic tradition of this church, since this epistle is much older than those who falsely assert and teach that there is another god above Him who is the creator of the world, and the maker of those things which exist.”\*

It is foreign to our purpose to comment on this passage farther than to remind the reader that, according to Irenæus, the epistle of Clement was written by a companion of the apostles, in the name and on behalf of a church, many members of which had been taught by the apostles, to another Christian church, which had been founded by Paul, and to which he had directed two epistles, and in which church there must have been many who had been converted under his preaching.

The epistle of Clement, is then an invaluable document, expressing the opinions of the Roman and Corinthian Christians at the close of the first century, at the latest. What books of the New Testament are quoted in this epistle, and in what way are these books quoted? Clement wrote this official epistle, as we have already seen, to appease dissensions. In doing this he says, “Take into your hands the epistle of the blessed Paul the apostle,” and then quotes from the first epistle to the Corinthians. This is the only quotation of any book of the New Testament by the name of its author; and yet his epistle abounds, or rather may be said to be made up with passages quoted from the Old Testament and the New. Writing to those Corinthians to whom Paul had written, it was very natural for him to name that apostle, for whom

\* Opera Irenæi. l. iii. c. 3. Oxford edition. By Grabe.

both he and they cherished an affectionate remembrance. With this exception, he quotes from the Scriptures as perfectly well known and received by the Romans and Corinthians, without ever appearing to think for a moment that it was necessary he should name the writer. In this way he repeatedly quotes the gospels, except John's, the epistles to the Romans, 1 & 2 Cor. Gal., Col., Eph., Philipp., 1 & 2 Tim., Titus, Hebrews, epistle of James, and 1 Peter. Perhaps he also quotes the Acts, and first epistle to the Thessalonians, and there are passages closely resembling 2 Peter and Jude. It deserves to be repeated, that the epistle to the Hebrews is quoted in precisely the same way as the other books of the New Testament, and *more frequently than any of them*. It should also be stated, that Clement has nowhere, so far as we can learn, *quoted any apocryphal book*. His epistle was, to all appearance, designedly composed of *scriptural extracts*. At all events, this is a very marked characteristic of it. If the epistle to the Hebrews was not received by Clement as the production of "the blessed Paul," and if, *of course*, he could not have received it as canonical, it certainly is strange, that the bishop of Rome, writing in the name of his Christian flock to the companions, disciples, and immediate successors of Paul, should appeal to an apocryphal, mystical, unintelligible book, more frequently than to any other part of the New Testament; should appeal to it in exactly the same way as to the other acknowledged writings of apostolic origin. It requires *rational* credulity to believe, or *rational* ingenuity to solve, this mystery. The great importance of this witness has engrossed a larger space than it will be necessary to allow for any other of the apostolical fathers.

Ignatius comes next in order. He was bishop of Antioch at the close of the first, and the beginning of the second century. There are fifteen epistles extant, which have been ascribed to this father. Of these, eight are unquestionably spurious, the forgeries of a later age. Of the other seven, there are two classes, the larger and the smaller, the former of which are greatly interpolated and otherwise adulterated. The smaller epistles have met with reception among many learned men, who, however, admit that they too are in some instances corrupted. On the other hand, many learned men deny their genuineness, and reject them as spurious. Among these are the Magdeburg Centuriators, a very learned corps, Calvin, Ernesti, Roesler, Semler, and many others. Their genuineness is very doubtful, and, of consequence, their authority is very small. In the seven smaller epistles, ascribed to Ignatius, we find only one book of the New Testament expressly named, which is the epistle to the Ephesians. Ignatius, writing to these same Ephesians, makes mention of an epistle by Paul, evidently referring to the epistle which he had addressed to them. This is the solitary instance in which Ignatius names the author of any book

in the New Testament. Besides this, however, there are plain allusions to the gospels of Matthew and John; and other allusions to the epistles to the Romans, 1 & 2 Cor., Gal., Eph., Philipp., Col., 1 Thess., 2 Tim., Titus, *perhaps to Philemon*, to the Hebrews, 1 Pet., 1 & 3 John. He also uses terms, indicating a collection of the gospels, of the epistles of the apostles, and of the books of the New Testament in general.

We come now to Polycarp. He was bishop of Smyrna and a disciple of John.\* He lived to a very advanced age. He suffered martyrdom, but in what year is questionable; Bishop Pearson fixes it as early as A. D. 148, and Archbishop Usher, as late as 169. There is extant one epistle of Polycarp, to the Philippians, written, probably, about A. D. 108—110. This epistle has been questioned by some, (what work of antiquity, scriptural or classical, has not been?) but is admitted to be genuine by the most discriminating and judicious critics. It is the earliest production of the fathers, with which Storr commences his rigid demonstration of the genuineness of the New Testament.† Polycarp, writing to the Philippians, expressly states that Paul wrote to them. He also quotes 1 Cor. vi. 2., adding: "As Paul teaches." Polycarp thus affords distinct evidence for the genuineness of these two epistles. We have this epistle only in Wake's, and in Cave's translation, the latter of whom points out quotations from the gospels of Matthew and Luke, the Acts, Romans, Eph., 1 Tim., 1 Pet., and 1 & 2 John. Lardner finds undoubted references, also, to 2 Cor., Gal., 1 & 2 Thess., 2 Tim., and a probable reference to the epistle to the Hebrews, which may be seen in Stuart, vol. i. p. 88, and which, as the Professor cautiously observes, "looks very much like a quotation." We have no doubt that a passage like this in Polycarp, which bore so peculiar and striking a resemblance to a passage in the epistle to the Romans, would be admitted on all hands as an indisputable reference. It must be kept in mind, that these quotations, with the exception of the epistle to the Philippians and the 1 Corinthians, are made without naming the book or the writer; made just as we make them now, presupposing the knowledge and reception of the books quoted both on the part of the writer and the reader. In the epistle of Polycarp, the books of the New Testament are also spoken of as "Sacred Scriptures," and "the oracles of the Lord." Polycarp has not quoted the gos-

\* Irenæus speaks of Polycarp thus: "Polycarp, who was not only taught by the apostles, and conversed with many of those who had seen our Lord, but was also appointed bishop, by the apostles, over the church of Smyrna in Asia; and whom we also saw in our early years, [in prima nostra ætate] (for he remained long, and to a good old age, and at last departed this life in a glorious martyrdom) taught those things, also, which he learnt from the apostles, and which he committed to the church, and which alone are true." Op. l. i. c. 3. The natural inference from this passage is against the opinion, thought probable by Professor Stuart, that Irenæus went to Rome in company with Polycarp.

† Storr seems to have committed an oversight in omitting the epistle of Clement, which affords distinct proof of the genuineness of the first epistle to the Corinthians.

pels by Mark and John, nor the epistle of James, nor the epistle to Philemon, nor the book of Revelation, not to mention some other portions of the New Testament.

We ask here, with reference to the position above laid down, viz. that omission by Irenæus, to quote the epistle to the Hebrews, is no valid evidence against its canonical authority and apostolical origin, whether Polycarp allowed no other gospels to be canonical, but those of Matthew and Luke? Did he *know* of no others? Did the disciple of John never hear of the gospel by John? Did the bishop of Smyrna never hear of an epistle "to the angel of the church of Smyrna?"\* Did that early martyr never hear of the promise "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life?" But where is the evidence that he did, from his epistle?

Papias was bishop of Hierapolis about A. D. 112. He is said to have been a companion of Polycarp, and one of John's hearers. This is asserted on the authority of Irenæus, and is highly probable. We have only a few fragments of his writings, which are preserved in Eusebius. Papias testifies that Mark, the disciple of Peter, and Matthew, recorded the actions and declarations of our Lord. Eusebius informs us that Papias also made quotations from the first epistle of Peter, and first of John. We will only ask whether Papias rejected the epistles of Paul, the gospel of Luke and John, &c. &c.?

We have now noticed all the writers, generally designated as apostolical fathers. We proceed to notice their successors, who flourished during the second century.

Justin, surnamed the Martyr, was born, according to Fabricius, about A. D. 90. His martyrdom, which occurred at Rome, is variously fixed by the learned, from A. D. 163 to 168. If we mistake not, only one book of the New Testament is specifically ascribed to its author by Justin. In his Dialogue with Trypho, he says, "A certain man by the name of John, in the Revelation, which was given him, predicted, &c." Justin frequently quotes what he calls the Memorabilia of the apostles. It has afforded matter for much discussion among the critics what is to be understood by this term. Hug supposes that it embraced the canonical gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke; and Paulus contends that it was a harmony of our four gospels. In his Apology, addressed to Antoninus Pius, Justin quotes from these gospels, as publicly known and read in the Christian churches. He also quotes from the Acts, epistles to the Rom., 1 Cor., Gal., Eph., Philip., Col., 2 Thess., Hebrews, and 2 Peter. Of these quotations, those from the Acts, and the epistle to the Romans and the Hebrews, are most numerous, distinct and certain. We think it doubtful whether, in his two Apologies and his Dialogue, there is a quotation

\* It has been thought by many, that Polycarp was himself this very "angel of the church" addressed in the Revelation.



from the gospel of John, 2 Cor., 1 Thess., Philemon, 1 Peter, 1, 2, and 3 of John, James, or Jude. Did he reject all or either of these? We have not appealed to any of the writings ascribed to Justin, except those, the genuineness of which is well established. Methodius very justly remarks concerning him, "that he was not far removed from the apostles, either in time or virtue." His works that have survived the ravages of time show that he was deeply imbued with the spirit of him who "counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus, his Lord." His Apologies and his Dialogue with Trypho were addressed to the enemies of Christianity. In the latter, he appeals to the Old Testament freely and fully. We much misjudge, if Justin had not been taught in the school of Paul, and especially by the epistle to the Hebrews, how to make use of the Old Testament for the establishing of a better covenant, founded on better promises. If the acute mind which produced *Horæ Paulinæ* had been applied to this Dialogue of Trypho, and the epistle to the Hebrews, coincidences so remote, undesigned, unsuspected, and yet so striking, would, we doubt not, have been presented, that incredulity itself could no longer doubt whether the epistle to the Hebrews was canonical scripture in the estimation of Justin. Justin wrote a work against Marcion, in which he must of necessity have appealed to the writings of Paul; also another work on the Government of God, in which, Eusebius informs us, he made quotations from the Scriptures and from Heathen writers.

Had the works of Justin which have perished, reached us, who can doubt but we might have alleged him as a witness for the genuineness of some other book besides the Revelation? As the case now stands, however, we cannot. Ye who, except a *rational* believer, will have the hardihood to assert or insinuate that he did not receive the other books of the New Testament?

The next writer of the second century, whose well authenticated writings have reached us, is Athenagoras, an Athenian philosopher, who was converted to Christianity about A. D. 155. He wrote an Apology for Christianity, addressed to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus, about A. D. 178. In this Apology, he has not specifically quoted any book of the New Testament; yet there are passages in it extracted from the gospel of Matthew and John, particularly from the sermon on the Mount. He has also, in his treatise on the Resurrection of the Dead, quoted from both epistles to the Corinthians, introducing his quotation with an "According to the Apostle." That an Athenian philosopher, addressing his countrymen on the resurrection of the dead, should quote from the apostle who had treated on this subject in an epistle to their fathers a century before, is just what might have been expected. But this is the only instance in which

he has let fall a hint, by which to judge who was the writer of the passages quoted, though he has quoted not only from the evangelists just mentioned, but from the epistles to the Romans, and the Galatians, and perhaps from the Acts, 1 Tim., James, 2 Peter, and the Revelation. Did he reject the gospel of Mark and Luke, the epistle to the Thessalonians, Colossians. &c. ?

Tatian was an Assyrian by birth ; was deeply versed in the Grecian philosophy, as it was called ; was a scholar of Justin Martyr ; became a convert to Christianity ; and about A. D. 172, published an Oration against the Greeks, in which, among other things, he labors to establish this proposition, " that none of those things, in which the Greeks so much gloried, had been invented by them, but all of them by those, whom they accounted Barbarians." In this oration or address, there is no passage distinctly quoted from the Bible ; at least we notice none. There are, however, a few probable references to the gospels, and perhaps, to some of the epistles. Tatian composed, as we learn from other sources, a diatesseron, or harmony of the four gospels.

The next writer we mention is Theophilus, bishop of Antioch. He wrote three books " against the calumniators of the Christian religion," which he addressed to Autolycus, a Pagan objector to Christianity, but apparently a friend of Theophilus. He says in his book that he " also once disbelieved the resurrection ; but that, on attentively examining the " sacred Scriptures," (by which term he probably meant the Old Testament) especially the predictions of the prophets, who had by the Spirit of God foretold things just as they afterwards came to pass, and had also predicted the order and succession of events yet to occur, he no longer doubted, but had faith in God." Theophilus ascribes the gospel of John to that apostle ; he also quotes the gospel of Matthew, and the epistles to the Romans, 1 and 2 Cor., Eph., Philip., Col., 1 Tim. and Titus. Was he ignorant of, or did he reject, the gospels by Mark and Luke, the epistles to the Thessalonians, &c. ?

A work has reached us, entitled " The Derision of the *without* Philosophers," i. e. of the Pagan philosophers, written, as its title indicates, by " Hermias, a Christian philosopher." Of this author, or of the precise time at which he lived and wrote, little is known. Dupin, Cave and Lardner place him at the close of the second century. The work itself is its best voucher for its great antiquity. It contains strong internal evidence, that it was written during the struggle between Paganism and Christianity. Hermias (who must not be confounded with Hermas) introduces his " Derision" by a quotation from the first epistle to the Corinthians thus, " The blessed apostle Paul says, the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." Besides this, there is no other quotation from, or reference to, any book of either Testament. Did the Christian philosopher

Hermias receive no other book, as of canonical authority, or apostolical origin, except the first epistle to the Corinthians?\*

We have now examined all the writers of the second century, whose works are extant, except Clement of Alexandria and Irenæus; and these we have reserved for special examination. It may be well to stop and see what direct evidence is afforded by these, and "the apostolical fathers," for the apostolical origin of the books of the New Testament. Clement of Rome, in his epistle to the Corinthians, ascribes the first epistle to the Corinthians to Paul. Ignatius, in his epistle to the Ephesians, makes mention of an epistle written to them by Paul. Polycarp, writing to the Philippians, states that Paul had also written to them. He also attributes the first epistle to the Corinthians to this apostle. Papias testifies that "Mark and Matthew recorded the actions and declarations of our Lord." Justin Martyr ascribes "the Revelation to a certain man by the name of John." We should have stated before, that it may be inferentially deduced from Justin, that the gospel of Mark belongs to the apostle Peter; and that the gospel of Luke was written by a disciple of an apostle, who, according to all collateral evidence, could have been no other than Paul. This is, however, inference, and not direct testimony. Athenagoras attributes both epistles to the Corinthians to "an apostle." Hermias quotes from the first epistle to the Corinthians as written by "the blessed apostle Paul."

The amount, then, of this testimony is, that the gospels of Matthew and John are the genuine productions of the apostles whose names they bear; that the two epistles to the Corinthians, together with that to the Ephesians and that to the Philippians, were written by Paul; that the gospel of Mark was written by that disciple, and if we allow the inference from Justin, was authorized by Peter, as that of Luke was also by Paul; and that the Revelation belongs to a certain man by the name of John. These are all the books of the New Testament, for the genuineness† of which we can adduce *direct* testimony from any writer preceding Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria. Is there a Unitarian in the United States, professing to receive the sacred Scriptures as "the sufficient and *only* rule of faith and practice," disposed openly to reject the rest of the New Testament, as not being genuine? We doubt whether there be one sufficiently *liberalized* for this. But if direct specific evidence be required, not only that the fathers of the first and second centuries received the epistle to the He-

\* This little treatise of Hermias deserves an English dress. It is a fine specimen of satire; perhaps the word *banter* more nearly expresses it. At some future time we may offer it to our readers, with extracts from Justin, Athenagoras, and Theophilus.

† It should be kept in mind that by the *genuineness* of a book, we mean that it was really the production of the person to whom it is ascribed. This fact may be shown in other ways than by the *direct* testimony of the fathers of the two first centuries. But to discuss this point would lead us too far from the object now in view.

brews as canonical, but also as Pauline, in order to our receiving it as canonical, then by parity of reasoning, direct specific evidence must be required, that those fathers received the epistles to the Thessalonians, to Timothy and to *Philemon* as Pauline, in order to our receiving them as canonical; and we hereby call upon those, who reject the epistle to the Hebrews, to *produce such evidence*.

In order to apply what has been said to the position laid down, we must add, that in remarks already made, and in those now to be offered, we assume the principle, that if it were required that Irenæus should, in his works yet extant, have quoted every book written either by Paul, or any other apostle, in order to our receiving it as a production of that apostle, or as canonical, then the same requisition must be made of Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, &c. viz. that in their works yet extant, they must have quoted every book written by Paul, or any other apostle, in order to our receiving it as his production, or as canonical. Irenæus can claim no preeminence above Clement of Alexandria, nor he above Clement of Rome. The principle will run itself into this; that every writer of the first two centuries must have quoted every book of the New Testament as apostolical, or as canonical, in order to our receiving them as such, yea, more, that with whatever ruin the destroying hand of time may have laid itself upon their writings, such quotations must be found in their fragments yet extant, or we must renounce the books not quoted, as not sacred Scripture. We feel that the distinct statement of such a position is its surest and shortest refutation.

Let us apply this principle to some of the indisputably genuine productions of the primitive Christian church. Clement of Rome has confessedly omitted to quote the gospel of John, the Acts of the apostles, 2 Thessalonians, *Philemon*, the book of Revelation, &c. Who is ready to give them up, on account of this omission? Polycarp has omitted to quote the gospels of Mark and John, 1 Cor., Titus, *Philemon*, 2 Peter, Revelation, &c. Are these no longer Scripture? In Justin Martyr, whose genuine writings yet extant are not much less voluminous than those of Irenæus, we find no quotations from 2 Corinthians, 1 Thess., 1 and 2 Timothy, *Philemon*, 1 Peter, &c. Are these universally received books of the apostle Paul to be universally rejected? Where does Athenagoras quote the gospels of Mark and Luke, the Acts, Col., Eph., *Philemon*, &c. &c.? In which book of Theophilus does he quote 1 & 2 Thess., 2 Timothy, *Philemon*, &c. &c.? And is it *rational* to conclude that the scriptural canon of Hermias consisted of the first epistle to the Corinthians only?

If the principle, the absurdity of which we have endeavored to expose, were to be admitted, not a solitary book of the New Testament would remain, a light to enlighten the nations. But if it be no objection to a book of the New Testament, that it is not

quoted by Athenagoras, while it is quoted by Justin Martyr as Scripture, it certainly can be no objection to another book of the same Testament that it is not quoted by Irenæus, while it is quoted by Clement of Alexandria, as Pauline, and by Clement of Rome as authoritative Scripture, and quoted by the latter more frequently than any other part of the New Testament. We repeat our position, and we submit it to our readers whether we have not proved, that omission on the part of Irenæus to quote the epistle to the Hebrews is no evidence against its canonical authority or apostolical origin.

But we have not done with this subject. Notwithstanding the *argument* from this omission by Irenæus is nothing against our epistle, there will still exist a *feeling*, that it was to have been expected of this writer, considering his acknowledged frequent quotations from the New Testament, that he should have quoted the epistle to the Hebrews. Let us examine, then, whether any circumstances existed in the situation of Irenæus, which will serve to explain this asserted omission. His great work which has reached us was, as we have already observed, composed in opposition to the Gnosticks, whom he was desirous of reclaiming to the Orthodox faith. But these Gnosticks rejected the epistle to the Hebrews.\* Irenæus, desirous that his arguments should take effect upon the minds of his opponents, would very naturally and properly select those which appeared both appropriate to himself, and most forcible to them. He would argue, as all other judicious writers would do, from those principles and those Scriptures which were acknowledged by himself and his adversaries, as established and authoritative. Is it uncommon for an Orthodox defender of the faith to omit arguments from passages accounted by his opponents *interpolations*, although he may himself only doubt their authority, or even admit their genuineness? The principle involved in this practice of all judicious and skilful rhetoricians, is the principle applicable to the case before us. We do not assert this with reference to Irenæus, at random, without examination, and merely to avoid an *appearance* of difficulty. We assert confidently, that Irenæus drew his main arguments and adduced his chief quotations from those books admitted by his opponents to be apostolical and authoritative, while of the books denied or disputed by them, he has made but very sparing use. In proof of this assertion, we refer our readers to the collection of passages cited or alluded to by his father, according to Grabe. They are as follows: The gospel of Matthew is cited in 290 places; of Mark, in 28; of Luke, in 197; of John, in 119; Acts, 64; Romans, 90; 1 Cor. 107; 2 Cor., 18; Gal., 30; Eph., 34; Philipp., 11; Col., 20; 1 Thess., 2; 2 Thess., 10; 1 Tim., 5; 2 Tim., 4; Titus, 3;

\* See Storr, El. Bib. Theol. vol. i. p. 111.

Heb., 5; James, 4; 1 Pet., 11; 2 Pet., 2; 1 John, 3; 2 John, 2; Jude, 1; Revelation, 31. We give them as the learned editor has collected and arranged them. It will be seen that the epistle to Philemon and the third of John are not quoted, nor in any way referred to. The epistle to the Hebrews, of James, Jude, and 2 Peter, if cited at all, are not cited by the names of their writers.

We see then, according to Grabe's enumeration, that the four gospels, the epistle to the Romans, and the first epistle to the Corinthians, were the books on which Irenæus mainly relied, for the establishment of truth and the refutation of error.\* To these he appeals with greatest frequency, while such epistles as those to Timothy and Titus are scarce noticed. He quotes every chapter, and we had almost said every verse of the gospel of Matthew. Were that gospel lost, we could nearly recompose it, by the abundant quotations from it found in his writings; while from the first epistle to the Thessalonians, only two verses are found in the work of Irenæus. It is very evident from this, that some other principle must have operated on the mind of this writer in regard to his quotations, than the comparative length of the different books of the New Testament. The fact already stated, that the Gnosticks, whom Irenæus was opposing, rejected the epistle to the Hebrews, is a perfectly satisfactory explanation of his omission to quote much or frequently from that epistle, or of his omitting to quote it altogether, even though no additional reason could be assigned.

But an additional reason has been assigned by Hug, Storr and Stuart, which, in order to explain and rightly understand the omission of Irenæus, must be considered in this connexion. This reason grew out of the Montanistic controversy; and in order to shew the nature and force of it, a short account of that controversy must be given. Montanism took its rise about the middle of the second century in Phrygia, a country of Asia Minor, whence it spread, in a short time, not only to Rome, but also to Gaul and Carthage.† These churches, widely spread as they were, were kept actively employed by the Montanists, who in vindication of their tenet, that those guilty of grievous transgressions, should be *irrevocably cut off from the church*, relied especially on Hebrews vi. 4, 5, and x. 28, 31, as we learn from Tertullian, Jerome and others. Hence the ministers of the Latin churches, who were strongly opposed to this tenet, and who found it difficult to interpret these passages in accordance with their views, made cautious and sparing use of this epistle. In this way the epistle to the Hebrews came to be but little regarded.

\* In regard to the authority attributed to the gospels by the heretics, opposed by Irenæus, see Op. Iren. l. 3. c. 11, p. 220, and the notes by Grabe. It was the principle of Irenæus to argue with his opponents from admitted premises. He refutes Marcion by his own copy of the gospel of Luke, and Valentinus by the gospel of John.

† See Storr, El. Bib. Theol. vol. i. p. 49. Note.

Shortly after the death of Irenæus, as we learn from Eusebius, Caius, a presbyter, probably of Rome, and a zealous opponent of the Montanists, in his account of Pauline books, makes mention of only thirteen epistles, not noticing that to the Hebrews. He flourished, as is most probable, about A. D. 210. His writings have perished. All we know of him is contained in the following extract from Eusebius.

“ There hath come to us a dialogue of Caius, a most eloquent man, held at Rome under Zephyrinus, with Proclus, a patron of the Phrygian, i. e. Montanist, heresy ; in which, reproving the rashness and audacity of his opponents in forging new writings, he makes mention of only thirteen epistles of the holy apostle, not numbering that to the Hebrews with the others ; and even to the present time some of the Romans do not reckon it to be Paul's.”\*

These new writings or Scriptures censured by Caius, were the prophecies, which the enthusiastic Montanists feigned to have delivered by inspiration ; Montanus having declared himself to be the Paraclete, i. e. the Comforter promised by Christ to his disciples. Jerome states that Caius denied the epistle to the Hebrews to be Paul's ; but Eusebius simply says, that he *omitted* it in his account of the Pauline books. The precise estimate in which this epistle was held, even by Caius, would seem somewhat uncertain, though the inference of Jerome that he did not receive it as the production of Paul, is perhaps warranted by the declaration of Eusebius. From the time of Caius to that of Jerome and Augustine, this appears to have been the predominant opinion of the western churches, though many dissented from it. Indeed, we should judge, from the manner in which Eusebius speaks, that the majority of the Romans in his time received the epistle as a production of Paul. His words are, “ And even to the present time some of the Romans do not reckon it to be Paul's.” The construction implies that “ the *some* of the Romans” were the minority, the exception to the general rule. We have thus a valuable witness for the state of opinion in the Roman church, in the intermediate time between Caius and Augustine. But we admit that many in the Roman church did reject this epistle as the production of Paul, and according to both Augustine and Jerome, these many, at times, constituted a majority. Such being the state of things, the Montanists themselves, in their subsequent appeals to this book, adduced it only so far as it was acknowledged by their opponents ; namely, as a production of Clement, or Barnabas. An example of this we have in Tertullian, who ascribes the epistle to Barnabas, and regards it as having a sort of semi-canonical authority.† See on this point the extracts from Tertullian in Stuart, vol. i. p. 128, and the comments by the Professor.

\* See Stuart vol. i. p. 114, 122, Eus. E. II. l. 6. c. 20.

† Tertullian was born at Carthage in Western Africa, was educated a heathen, was converted to Christianity, we knew not in what year, and was presbyter at Carthage at the close of the second and the beginning of the third century, where his writings were composed and published. He died about A. D. 220.

Shortly after the age of Caius and Tertullian, flourished Novatus, a presbyter of Rome, who embraced and defended the tenet of the Montanists above mentioned. It is not certain that Novatus received this epistle as a production of Paul; it is still less certain that he rejected it. See Stuart, vol. i. p. 125. The probability is that Novatus did receive it, as it is an admitted historical fact, that it was received by the Novatians, his followers, and quoted by them for the same purpose that it had been by the Montanists, within thirty years after his death. It seems highly probable that, from the time of Novatus to the time of Augustus, there was a gradual advance in the western churches in the reception of the epistle to the Hebrews, as a production of Paul, though there may have been, and probably was, an occasional alternation, depending on local circumstances, and theological prejudices and preferences.

We have thus traced, in a very succinct manner, the state of opinion in the Latin churches, from the middle of the second, to the close of the fourth century, in order to present a connected view of the subject before us. It appears, then, that many among the Latin or western churches were led, even in the time of Irenæus, by the pressure of circumstances, to deny the authority of the epistle to the Hebrews. They were led to deny its Pauline origin. This could not be admitted without settling, in their view, the question in dispute between them and the Montanists and Novatians, and settling it against themselves. In such circumstances, it requires no very profound views of human nature to see what course they would be inclined to take. Their theological opinions they *would not* give up. Certain passages in the epistle to the Hebrews they could not interpret consistently with those opinions. Either they must renounce their opinions, or deny the authority of this epistle. The former they would not do, the latter then they must do. But in order to deny the authority of this epistle with any appearance of consistency, they must deny its Pauline origin. This, considering that the epistle was anonymous, and sent to the distant Christians of the East, and that the canon of Scripture was yet unsettled, and the copies of the different books of the New Testament comparatively few, from the difficulty of transcribing, and the inability to print them, they were enabled to do with some show of reason. By thus involving the origin of the epistle in doubt and uncertainty, they attempted, like some later critics, to evade its authority. During all this while, the Greeks were calm spectators of the contest; and while they opposed the Montanists, they evaded the argument from Hebrews vi., by their interpretations. Not a single Greek writer from Greece, or Asia Minor, or Palestine, or Egypt, has been produced, who did not receive this epistle as from the pen of Paul; while the Latins, from about the middle of the second, to the close of the fourth century,



were divided in opinion, and after this were in agreement with the Greek and Oriental churches. *Omnes Græci recipiunt et nonnulli Latinorum*, said one abundantly able to investigate, and assuredly desirous of knowing and stating the truth.

It is a fact that deserves special attention, in order to a correct understanding of this subject, that those in the Latin church, who denied the Pauline origin of this epistle, were constrained to proceed wholly on the ground of internal evidence, having no ecclesiastical tradition, no authority of earlier churches, to which they could appeal. Hence Jerome, Augustine, and others, the most inquisitive and intelligent investigators in the Roman churches, could not adopt the opinion of many in those churches; for they were convinced that it was erroneous, by the testimony of the ancients. The judgement of these men, formed by extensive examination and historical testimony, was subsequently the occasion of restoring unanimity between the Latins and the Greeks, the latter of whom had never swerved from the opinion that Paul was the author of the epistle to the Hebrews.\*

Let us now apply these remarks to the case in hand. Irenæus, at the close of the second century, was closely connected with the western churches, over one of which he presided. In these churches there early commenced a warm dispute with the Montanists, in the progress of which many, driven by a theological difficulty, resulting from their mode of interpreting one or two passages in our epistle, were led to call in question its authority. Those opposed to the Montanists, would not cite a book that appeared to support the favorite tenet of their adversaries, while the Montanists themselves were compelled to appeal to it, only so far as it was allowed to be of weight.

Such, then, was the state of feeling, relative to our epistle, among the western churches, toward the close of the second century. Is it a matter of wonder that Irenæus, composing his great work against the Gnosticks, (who rejected this epistle) at this precise time, should have omitted to quote it? If we recollect the situation of Irenæus, the prejudices of many of the western presbyters with whom he was connected, and of all his opponents, and the object he had in view, it seems to us that this omission is just what might have been most rationally anticipated. If, as there is some reason for supposing, Irenæus rather favored the Montanistic views, and of course, the authority of the book supporting those views, still, as a skillful logician, writing on a subject totally distinct from this, he might be expected to draw his main and most important arguments from other Scriptures, in confronting those who rejected

\* It appears from Eusebius that there were a few in the East *in his time* who doubted or denied the Pauline origin of this epistle. But their main and, as it appears, *only* reliance was on the rejection of the epistle by the Romans: They had no authority, testimony, or credence in the Oriental churches. Nor does it appear that they were authors, or persons of influence or intelligence.

the epistle to the Hebrews. And that which appears thus reasonable in theory, is, in fact, matter of history. Irenæus, in his confutation of Gnosticism, does place his chief reliance on passages taken from the gospels, and the indubitable epistles of Paul, especially that to the Romans, and the first to the Corinthians. The two epistles of Paul to Timothy, and that to Titus, and the epistle to the Hebrews, all of which the Gnosticks rejected, are but very sparingly quoted. Let the reader combine this reason with that we have detailed above, that many in the Catholic churches of the West denied or doubted the authority of the epistle to the Hebrews, and we think he will not sympathize very deeply with some learned men among us, who affect to wonder at the omission of Irenæus to quote this epistle, and even convert the asserted silence of this good father into positive evidence against its Pauline origin.

It has been proposed by sceptics as an objection to the evangelists, that one or more of them omit facts recorded by others. John has omitted miracles recorded by Matthew, Mark, and Luke; therefore these miracles did not take place, or at least, John did not believe them, or know of them. We beg leave to propose an argument of equal weight. Irenæus forbears to quote the epistle to the Hebrews; Clement of Alexandria frequently quotes it as Paul's; Pantaenus ascribes it to that apostle; Justin Martyr appeals to it as Scripture; Clement of Rome quotes from it more abundantly than from any other book of the New Testament; therefore Irenæus did not receive it as Paul's, and not receiving it as his, it can have no claim to be considered canonical. We leave out of view the Versions in this latter argument, which would place the absurdity in a still stronger light. If men claiming to be *rational* will not be candid, they must not complain if we hold up their logical absurdities to the light of truth, and the reprehension of intelligence and piety. If the Deists are not candid, in producing such an objection against John, and the religion of Christ, omitting to state the essential fact, that John wrote his gospel as a supplement to the other evangelists; we ask if Unitarian objectors are not equally deficient in candor, in omitting to state that Irenæus wrote his work to refute and reclaim a class of heretics, who would have attached no authority to a quotation from the epistle to the Hebrews?

We think we have shown in the preceding pages that this alleged omission of Irenæus to quote the epistle to the Hebrews is no *argument* against its antiquity, or canonical, or apostolical authority. We have also endeavored to show, that no *presumption* even can be deduced from this omission. By a fair examination of the circumstances of Irenæus, the omission appears to be precisely what might have been rationally anticipated from an intelligent and judicious man. To expect that he should draw his argu-

ments from an epistle rejected by his opponents, or quote it frequently, or in any other way than occasionally and incidentally, is itself the unreasonable expectation. Indeed, if he wholly omit it, this is just what is done at the present day, and what has always been done, by those who are desirous of convincing and reclaiming their opponents. We hope, then, we have dissipated every feeling which may have existed, that this assumed omission is an apparent objection.

Feelings, however, which have not been reasoned up, are with difficulty reasoned down. If there be a fragment of feeling yet existent against our epistle, from the asserted omission of Irenæus to quote it, perhaps even this may be removed by other considerations yet in reserve. We proceed then to inquire, whether Irenæus has really omitted to quote from, or allude to, our epistle? We have already mentioned that he does not quote from it, specifically naming the book or the writer. We have, however, seen that Grabe, a most distinguished scholar, in his edition of Irenæus, points out *five* quotations from, or allusions to, this epistle. We look upon Grabe, in this case, as a perfectly impartial witness. We presume he had no eye or thought upon the question now agitated. He put down these quotations as they struck him. Any one who will examine the passages for himself will, we think, admit that the allusions are very natural, and might have been taken from this epistle, as well as from any other portion of the sacred Scriptures. Indeed, some of them could have been taken *only* from the epistle to the Hebrews. We will adduce but one instance, and leave our readers to judge of it for themselves. We give the passage in its connexion, as it will, we doubt not, be interesting on other accounts, besides that for which it is primarily adduced.

“ He alone is God, who made all things. He only is omnipotent, the only Father (of the universe) who created and made all things, whether they be visible or invisible, sensible or insensate, celestial or terrestrial, BY THE WORD OF HIS POWER, and adapted and disposed all things by his wisdom, and comprehending all things, is alone comprehended by none. He is the fabricator, the founder, the inventor, the maker, the Lord of all. Neither besides him, nor above him, is there another; neither a mother, as some feign; nor another god, as Marcion pretends; nor a pleroma of thirty æons, which is a vain pretence; neither a Bythus, nor a Proarche; neither heavens, nor a virginal light, nor an ineffable æon; nor, in short, any of those things which are madly dreamt of by these and all other heretics. But there is one only God, the creator, who is above all principality, and power, and dominion, and might. He is that Father, that God, that founder, that maker, that fabricator, who made all things by himself, that is, by his Word, and his Wisdom, heaven, and earth, and sea, and all things therein. He is just and good. He it is who formed man, who planted paradise, who created the world, who brought a deluge, who saved Noah; he is the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, the God of the living, whom the law announced, whom prophets predicted, whom Christ revealed, whom the apostles preached, whom the church believes. This Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is revealed and manifested to all to whom he is revealed, by his Word, who is his Son: for those know him, to whom the Son reveals him.

But the Son, always coexisting with the Father, formerly and ever from the beginning, has revealed the Father to angels and to archangels, to principalities and to powers, and to all to whom God wills to reveal himself.\*

At the present day, whenever the expression "by the word of his power" is introduced, it is understood to be a quotation from the epistle to the Hebrews. Grabe so understood it in the above passage. The passage is before our readers who will judge of it for themselves. We will only add that it is introduced just as we might have expected it would be, *incidentally*; thus shewing that the writer was familiar with our epistle, and if he abstained from distinctly quoting it, he did so for other reasons than because he rejected it. Much the same might be said of the other passages referred to by Grabe.

That our epistle was known to Irenæus, Eusebius informs us, from whom we learn that "Irenæus wrote a book of various disputations, in which he mentions the epistle to the Hebrews, and the book called the Wisdom of Solomon, quoting some expressions from them." The work here mentioned by Eusebius, as having been written by Irenæus, has perished. Eusebius does not say whether Irenæus quoted this epistle as Scripture or not. The fact

\* We had intended to have introduced the Latin, but a reference to the passage will be sufficient. It may be found, l. 3. c. 55. We cannot stop to comment on it at length. By the terms, *Bythus* and *Proarche*, the Valentianians meant an original æon or first principle of things. Epiphanius long ago, rightly observed, that their *Bythus* was the chaos of Hesiod, and, we may add, of his imitator, Ovid. In Irenæus, and also in Epiphanius, the names and the order of the thirty æons may be seen. As a specimen of learned exegesis, we subjoin the *reasons* these early *rational* opposers of the Gospel advanced in defence of this number. In the first place, our Lord lived thirty years before he entered on his ministry, or performed a miracle. In the second place, the parable of the vineyard supports this number. Some of the laborers worked one hour, others three, others six, others nine, and others eleven, which united make thirty. These thirty were by the Valentianians apportioned out into three classes, an Ogdoad, a Decad, and a Duodecad. Whether these absurdities, or the following, be the greater, we will not decide. The Rationalists of Germany, in whose steps American Rationalists are fast treading, "deny that Jesus actually expired on the cross; he only fainted, was taken down apparently dead, and was resuscitated by the care and efforts of some skilful Essenes;" they also assert that "he then spent about six weeks among his tried adherents in close concealment; but it becoming impossible for him to remain undiscovered in or near Jerusalem, he took a favorable opportunity of going, with a select body of his disciples, to a retired summit of Mount Olivet; that he there gave them his last instructions; that at this moment a thunder cloud rolled along the mountain, and cut him off from the sight of his companions; that, taking advantage of this circumstance, he descended into the opposite valley; that he lived for some years afterwards in the deepest seclusion, shewing himself only on very few occasions, and to very select persons, particularly to Saul, whom he accosted near Damascus, and prevailed upon to become a leader of the sect, which wanted a man of his character and talents; and that, in fine, where, how, and when this distinguished reformer and philanthropist ended his days, no historical document whatever has come to us, and probably care was taken that none should exist." These and other absurdities still more monstrous have been propounded as rational, rational *par excellence*, by men, who still call themselves Christian divines, and doctors in divinity. We do not say that any American is yet prepared for such divinity. But indications exist, too distinct and too numerous to be overlooked or forgotten, which point with perilous certainty to the same downward road. The waves of popular theological opinion, raised by the tempest and hurricane of liberal, *rational* discussion, already threaten to break from the channels, and overflow the barriers, within which some more serious minded Unitarians are vainly striving to confine them. They will yet rise and roar, and carry ruin; how far and how wide Heaven only knows. But there is One whose *powerful word* shall be heard and regarded, "Hitherto shalt thou come and no farther, and here shall thy proud waves be stayed."

that he quoted it is all that he asserts. We have, however, intimations from Irenæus himself that he was not only acquainted with this epistle, but considered it Scripture. If its only claim to be considered Scripture results from its having been written by Paul, as recent American objectors aver, then we have intimations from Irenæus that he considered it the production of that apostle. So much for the direct negative evidence afforded by this father, against the Pauline origin of our epistle.

We have yet to notice the assertion of Gobar, (a writer of the middle ages) which we have on the authority of Photius, that Irenæus rejected the epistle to the Hebrews. We have this naked assertion of Gobar without the grounds on which he made it. We are left to infer the truth from the probabilities of the case. We know the character, intelligence, object, and impartiality of Eusebius. He first made out a regular canon, or rather enumerated the several books received into the canon, of the New Testament Scriptures. He is scrupulously careful to inform us in what estimate these several books were held in different districts, by different churches, and by individuals of prominent character and controlling influence. With respect to the epistle to the Hebrews, he appears to have made more minute inquiries, and to have reported with greater accuracy the different opinions held and expressed, than with reference to any other book of the New Testament, the Revelation, perhaps, excepted. He made it a special object, while collecting materials for his ecclesiastical history, to notice the manner in which preceding writers had quoted or spoken of the several portions of the New Testament, especially the Antilegomena. Of these, the epistle to the Hebrews and the Revelation are the most important.\* They of course arrested his particular attention. Irenæus was among the most voluminous and trustworthy of preceding writers. Eusebius held him in deservedly high respect. He devotes a whole chapter of considerable length to giving an account of the manner in which Irenæus had quoted books of the New Testament. But in this chapter, there is not a word of Irenæus quoted respecting the epistle to the Hebrews. Yet Eusebius is scrupulously exact in informing us of the estimate in which this epistle was held, and of the manner in which it had been quoted, by Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Pantaenus, and Clement of Rome, on the one hand, and by Caius on the other. Had Irenæus, in any of his writings known to Eusebius, attributed this epistle to Paul, would not that historian have mentioned the fact, and have classed Irenæus with Pantaenus? Had Irenæus excluded this epistle from the number of Pauline books, would not Eusebius have mentioned this fact, and classed Irenæus with Caius?

\* It deserves to be stated that Eusebius, at times, places these among the Homologoumena, and at others, among the Antilegomena. They were received so generally, and with so little doubt, that he sometimes classed them with the universally received books.

We should answer these questions unhesitatingly in the affirmative, were it not that Eusebius, in the chapter of his work above referred to, makes mention of but part of the books most certainly quoted by Irenæus. He notices only the evangelists, the Revelation of John, first epistle of John, and first of Peter, as having been quoted by that father, whereas we have already seen that in his works yet extant, Irenæus makes abundant quotations from the Acts, and most of the epistles of Paul. But in the chapter of which we are speaking, Eusebius does not particularize a solitary epistle of Paul, as quoted by Irenæus. This consideration deserves to be stated, in order to a candid and correct appreciation of the subject before us. Were we playing the part of a special pleader, we should blink out of sight this fact. It ought to have been stated by Professor Stuart, but we presume it did not occur to him or we would have done it; as he is not a writer to present only one side of an argument, and mistake even that.

After all, considering that Eusebius takes another occasion to inform us that Irenæus did quote from the epistle to the Hebrews in a work not now extant, we cannot but look upon it as probable that had Irenæus distinctly received or rejected that epistle, as a production of Paul, Eusebius would have so stated the fact.

Jerome affirms that "all the Greek writers had received this epistle as Paul's." Was Irenæus a Greek writer in the estimation of Jerome? Perhaps Jerome only meant all the writers in the Greek or Oriental churches. If so, his assertion will not affect Irenæus. But if he intended all the writers in the Greek language, as his words indicate, his testimony will much more than balance that of Gobar. We must also add that the silence of Jerome, with reference to the rejection of the epistle to the Hebrews by Irenæus, is deserving of consideration. He has faithfully recorded the opinions of the cotemporaries of Irenæus; but no hint has escaped him, or Augustine, or any of the fathers of the first five centuries after Christ, that Irenæus rejected this epistle. Jerome distinctly testifies, not only that "this epistle was received as a production of Paul by the Oriental churches, but also *by all preceding writers in the Greek language.*" We acknowledge that testimony so distinct, and derived from an author so intelligent as Jerome, goes far towards invalidating our conclusion from the silence of Eusebius upon the question, whether or not Irenæus received this epistle as from the great apostle of the Gentiles. Perhaps Jerome may have inferred that Irenæus received the epistle to the Hebrews as Paul's, from the fact that he quoted it as Scripture, without noticing the book or the writer from which he made his quotation. And we are by no means certain that he did not, either in the book alluded to by Eusebius, or in some other book seen by Jerome, but unknown to Eusebius, quote it as Pauline. We allow that this is a supposition. We do not assert it as fact or evi-

dence. But any one acquainted with the literary condition of those times, will see a propriety in the supposition, which those, who borrow their ideas from the present state of the republic of letters, will be hardly able to estimate. Eusebius, though an inquisitive scholar and extensive reader, resided at Cesarea. Books did not then pass from Lyons to Palestine, as now a days from London to Boston. Eusebius was evidently unacquainted with some books which have reached us. It may have been, then, that Jerome, connected as he was with the western church, may have had evidence with reference to Irenæus unknown to Eusebius, and which warranted his positive assertion, in its full extent, that all writers in the Greek language received the epistle to the Hebrews as written by Paul. We have at least as good ground for this conclusion, as those have for theirs, who first assume that Irenæus has not quoted this epistle, and then infer that he must have rejected it.

We will now present, in few words, what we suppose is the fact with reference to Irenæus. We think it not improbable, considering his situation and connexions, that he may have entertained doubts relative to the apostolic origin of this epistle, though there is no *evidence* that he did. If, however, (as we think was the fact, but cannot positively assert it,) Irenæus looked favorably upon the Montanistic views, his theological opinions or prejudices would have induced him also to look favorably upon our epistle. In this dubious unsettled state of mind himself, and surrounded by others of different views, nothing could be more natural than for him to refrain from expressing any positive opinion, (which, indeed, he probably did not entertain,) upon this disputed question, which would be seized on by one party with avidity, and looked upon by the other with regret. His remote situation, his probable ignorance of the state of opinion in the Alexandrine, Grecian, and Oriental churches, relative to this epistle; his ignorance of the Syriac language, into which it had already been translated; his probable ignorance of the existence of the Syriac version; the difficulty of holding intercourse with unknown persons in remote places; the small number of copies of the sacred books at that time existing; the want of the press, by which copies are now multiplied to any extent; the fact, that the canon of Scripture was not yet, nor for a considerable period afterwards, fixed; that no general council of the churches had been convened, by which this important topic had been settled, or even discussed; all this, together with what has been already said, respecting the Gnosticks, and the Montanistic controversy, must be taken into consideration, in order rightly to apprehend the situation of Irenæus, or correctly to appreciate the fact, that he refrains from distinctly ascribing this epistle to Paul, or from quoting it otherwise than occasionally and incidentally.

The assertion of Gobar, opposed as it is to the state of the case, as appears from the works of Irenæus, from the testimony of Eusebius and Jerome, and from the omission, on the part of all the writers of the first five centuries of the Christian era, to notice it is rejection by Irenæus of the epistle to the Hebrews, we cannot think of any weight. We are ignorant of the character and object of Gobar; we know not with what ability he examined, or with what accuracy he reported facts; we know that it has been common for modern and more enlightened critics to draw more uncritical conclusions than Gobar would have done, if he inferred negative evidence from the want of distinct positive evidence; laying all this together, we abide by the fact, as it appears from both Irenæus and Eusebius, that he did not distinctly attribute this epistle to Paul, nor did he deny it to be his, and dismiss the assertion of Gobar as unworthy of confidence.\*

We cannot, with Professor Stuart, call this "hypothetical reasoning." To us it is reasoning founded on ascertained facts, and balanced probabilities. It is not often we see occasion to dissent from Professor Stuart, or to demur at his conclusions. In the present instance, however, we think Storr and Cramer have the advantage of him. We must also add, in critical justice, that we deem that portion of his first volume, in which he examines the negative evidence against our epistle, the least complete of his whole work. We do not mean that he has omitted any of that evidence; on the contrary, we think he has attributed to it more weight than it can justly claim. This is an instance of critical generosity, we apprehend, from present appearances, not likely soon to be reciprocated. If we may judge of the disposition of *liberal* critics, with reference to this point, from the Review or Notice of Prof. Stuart's first volume in the *Christian Examiner*, we should suppose they had taken for their motto, "Keep all you've got, and get all you can." At least we did think, till we read this Review, that something might, by a constrained and urgent possibility, be suggested in defence of the apostolical and canonical authority of the epistle to the Hebrews. If, however, this reviewer is to be trusted, our impression is wholly erroneous. The point is so clear; the evidence so convincing, so overwhelming; the case is made

\* Dr. Lardner was not only an intelligent, but, in a great degree, a candid writer. His opinion, with reference to Irenæus, is essentially that of ours. Had the circumstances in the situation of Irenæus, adduced by Ernesti and Hug, and to which we have adverted above, been fully before the mind of Lardner, we doubt not that he would have agreed with us in every, the minutest particular. We quote his conclusion for the special benefit of those to whom the name of Lardner is as a charm, and an oracle; and to afford an opportunity of comparison, not to say contrast, with the conclusion of the *Christian Examiner*. "Upon the whole, then, Irenæus affords proof that the epistle to the Hebrews was in being in his time; but he was not fully satisfied it was Paul's; and having some doubts about that matter, he was cautious in making much use of it as a book of Scripture." Lardner does not seem to have sufficiently considered that the Valentinians and Gnosticks generally rejected this epistle, and that, of course, whether Irenæus received or rejected it, "he would be cautious in making much use of it."



out with such undoubted and indubitable certainty, that it is superfluous even to hint at arguments in support of the inspiration or authority of this epistle. It is no longer a question of fact, but a mathematical certainty. The doctrine of chances has fairly distanced and dissipated all the probabilities of historical testimony.

This first distinct outbreaking of American skeptical criticism has at once overshadowed and eclipsed all the efforts of that distrustful intelligence and ingenuity, not over scrupulous, which have for more than half a century darkened and deceived, while professing to enlighten, the eastern continent. The parhelion, the mock sun, with which the magical Semler and Eckermann so long deluded European eyes, disappearing in the East, has now risen, a prodigy and a portent, in the West, to startle for a moment by its novelty, and then to vanish in its own illusive emptiness. The American atmosphere, we do believe, is too clear, and American eyes too keen and too piercing, to be long deluded by the ignis fatuus of skeptical exhalations. This semblance of light, this "glare of false science," we do hope, is here too well known,

"To lead to bewilder, or dazzle to blind"

We do trust in the good providence of God, that, while Germany itself is awakening and returning to the doctrines and principles of the Reformation, New England will not be found emulous of the character of apostate Germany.

Before we close this view of the negative external evidence against the epistle to the Hebrews, it may be well to present a summary of the arguments, by which the American rejecters of this epistle support their conclusion. This will be done with most fairness in their own language.

"The three writers, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, are those on whom we principally rely for the earliest direct evidence, concerning the reception and authority of the books of the New Testament among Christians. In regard to the gospels, the Acts, the thirteen epistles of Paul, the first of Peter, and the first of John, their evidence is joined by that of preceding, cotemporary, and subsequent writers, till the proof becomes decisive, that those books were universally received by catholic Christians during the first two centuries, as the works of the authors to whom they are ascribed. This is the main external evidence on which we rest for their genuineness. They had accompanied the religion as it spread itself over the world, had been received with it, and were acknowledged by the great body of Christians as its authentic records. When we attend to the full force of this argument, we shall find that the proof of the genuineness of the more important books of the New Testament, differs not only in degree, but in kind, from the proof of the genuineness of any other writings. It is the testimony of a whole widely spread community, to their belief, that certain works of the highest interest to them were the productions of the individuals to whom they are ascribed, it being understood that these works would be of comparatively little, or even of no value, if they were not the productions of those individuals. It is the proof which the early fathers afford of the general reception of certain books as sacred books, throughout the Christian community, which is the point to be regarded in our investigations respecting the genuineness of those books. Where this proof is wanting, the individual opinions of the fathers are comparatively of little value. In common with other ancient writers, they were liable to mistakes concerning

the authors and history of books, to a degree, which, with our incomparably greater facilities for obtaining information on all subjects, it is difficult for us to estimate justly. Accordingly they fell into many errors.

Proceeding upon these principles, we find that the evidence is wanting, which is required to prove, or to render it probable, that St. Paul was the author of the epistle to the Hebrews. It clearly was not generally received as his work, during the last half of the second century. It had not been handed down as such to the cotemporaries of Irenæus and Tertullian; and we have nothing in favor of the supposition that it was written by St. Paul, except the opinion of Clement of Alexandria, a writer particularly incautious on subjects of this sort, and who, in consequence, has repeatedly fallen into mistakes respecting the authors of different works.

But this deficiency of evidence not only leaves us without satisfactory ground for believing the epistle to be the composition of St. Paul; it assumes the character of a strong objection to this hypothesis. It is highly improbable, that an epistle really written by St. Paul, so elaborate, and so pregnant, as its admirers have believed, with the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, should not have been universally received as his work. No satisfactory answer can be given to the question, why, if written by him, it did not obtain equal reception with his other epistles. If it were not his work, we can easily explain how it came to be considered so; as those by whom it was valued would be ready to ascribe it, even upon slight grounds, to an individual so distinguished. If it were his work, we do not perceive that any probable account can be given of its not being generally received as such.

No show of subsequent evidence, if such existed, could in any degree supply the deficiency which has been pointed out. The value of passages in the later fathers, respecting the genuineness of the books of the New Testament, great as it sometimes is, consists solely in the light which they throw upon the state of opinion concerning those books during the first two centuries. At a subsequent time, no facts could be known or rendered probable, by testimony, which were not known during that period. But as regards the epistle to the Hebrews, in proceeding to the later fathers, we only find confirmation of the conclusion to which we have arrived." *Christian Examiner*, vol. iv. p. 499.

Our limits will not allow us to examine this passage in detail. In view of the facts already suggested, and of some others yet to be offered, we shall leave our readers to form their own judgement of its accuracy and fairness.

We shall at once test the main principle involved in the passage. We assume that it contains a fair statement of the mode of reasoning required to prove the genuineness of any book contained in the New Testament, and proceed to apply the principle to one of the "more important books of the New Testament," to one of the "thirteen epistles of Paul," viz. the epistle to Philemon. This epistle was not quoted by Irenæus, nor Tertullian, nor Clement of Alexandria, nor Hermias, nor Tatian, nor Theophilus, nor Athenagoras, nor Justin Martyr, nor Polycarp, nor Papias, nor Clement of Rome. We say nothing of the omission to quote this epistle by Barnabas and Hermas. According to Lardner, there is a possible quotation in Ignatius, though without naming the book or the writer. But the value of a quotation somewhat uncertain, in an epistle rejected by the ablest critics, and, at best, of but doubtful authority, we leave for our liberal critics to estimate. In Tertullian is a passage which has been thought to refer to this epistle, though it is not named, nor is any quotation made from it. The epistle to Philemon is the only epistle, now received and attributed to

Paul, which is not frequently quoted, either as sacred Scripture, or as the production of that apostle, by some of the writers named in the preceding list. This epistle is never so quoted "by any of the catholic Christians during the first two centuries," whose works have reached us. "It is the proof," says the Examiner, "which the early fathers afford of the *general* reception of certain books, throughout the Christian community, which is the point to be regarded in our investigations respecting the genuineness of those books. Where *this* proof is wanting, the individual opinions of the fathers are comparatively of little value." Still stronger then must the objection be, when none of "the early fathers," when no "individual opinions of the fathers" can be adduced in favor of the genuineness of an epistle.

"Proceeding upon these principles, we find, that the evidence is wanting, which is required to prove, or to render probable, that St. Paul was the author of the epistle to" Philemon. We have no evidence that it was received as his work, during the first or the last half of the second century, nor is there any evidence that it had been handed down as such, to the cotemporaries of Irenæus, Tertullian, or Clement of Alexandria. "No show of subsequent evidence, if such existed, could in any degree supply the deficiency which has been pointed out.\* The value of passages in the later fathers, respecting the genuineness of the books of the New Testament, great as it sometimes is, consists solely in the light which they throw upon the state of opinion concerning those books during the first two centuries. At a subsequent period, no facts could be known or rendered probable by testimony, which were not known during that period." "But this deficiency of evidence not only leaves us without satisfactory ground for believing the epistle to be the composition of St. Paul; it assumes the character of a strong objection to this hypothesis. It is highly improbable that an epistle really written by St. Paul," exhibiting such refinement of feeling and courteousness of character, as Buckminster and other scholars have discovered in this epistle, "should not have been received as his work. No satisfactory answer can be given to the question, why, if written by him, it did not obtain equal reception with his other epistles.† If it were not his work, we can easily explain how it came to be considered so; as those by whom it was valued, would be ready to ascribe it, even upon slight grounds, to an individual so distinguished. If it were his work, we do not perceive that any probable account can be given of its not being generally received as such."

\* "It is not improbable that before the close of the third century," the epistle to Philemon "was translated into the Syriac."

† Each of the other epistles of St. Paul is specifically quoted and ascribed to him by one or more of the fourteen writers above named. If the epistle to Philemon was received by the early church as Paul's, the probability that it would have been so quoted by some one of those writers, is to be found, (to adopt the Unitarian style of deciding such questions,) by multiplying the several numbers, from one to fourteen into each other. The result is 87,178,291,200 to 1, against Paul as the writer of the epistle to Philemon.

This being the state of the case, the evidence being wholly wanting, which proves the genuineness of the other epistles of Paul, we are constrained, reasoning on the Unitarian hypothesis, to reject the epistle to Philemon. Assuming the truth of the positions and assertions quoted from the *Christian Examiner*, and applying them to an epistle acknowledged and received, *universally* and *most justly* as a production of Paul, we find ourselves necessitated to reject that epistle. And we now respectfully ask those, who reject the epistle to the Hebrews, and yet receive the epistle to Philemon as a production of Paul, to state to us and the public the arguments which satisfy them, and ought to satisfy us, that Paul wrote this latter epistle. We wish to know, what cotemporary writers of Irenæus and Clement of Alexandria, and especially, what *preceding* writers received it as Paul's.\* Our Unitarian critics will remember, that they have, by their own statement of the question, limited their class of witnesses to the "catholic Christians of the two first centuries." They cannot complain that we hold them to the witnesses of their own selection, especially as the "thirteen epistles of Paul were universally received by those catholic Christians," if we are to trust their statement. We now call for the evidence of such reception of the epistle to Philemon.

It appears by the extracts from the *Examiner*, that "we have nothing in favor of the supposition that the epistle to the Hebrews was written by St. Paul, except the opinion of Clement of Alexandria, a writer particularly incautious, on subjects of this sort, and who, in consequence, has repeatedly fallen into mistakes respecting the authors of different works." Before we give up the little which the parsimonious retentiveness of skeptical criticism allows us, let us examine with some care this "particularly incautious writer." "Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman and uncondemned?" Let us at least hear what Clement can say in self justification. In the first book of his *Stromata*, he gives the reasons which induced him to write. He very justly observes, that if Theopompus and Timæus were at liberty to compose their Heathen fables, nonsense, and blasphemy, there could be no objection, but rather great propriety, for Christians to leave behind them writings that might profit posterity. He adds, "it is esteemed praiseworthy to leave good children to those that come after us. But children are sons of the body; books the offspring of the mind."† A few pages farther on, he says,

"I do not compose these pieces for the purposes of ostentation, but to lay them up for old age, a remedy against forgetfulness; a sort of shadow and image

\* If Caius of Rome is adduced in evidence, that he received thirteen epistles of Paul, we wish to know if that to Philemon is specifically named among them? Did not Caius receive one of the epistles of Paul now lost? Might he not have received that to the Laodiceans, rejected as spurious by Jerome? In short, what is the evidence that Caius received thirteen epistles of Paul? *Is Eusebius to be trusted?*

† The edition of Clement to which we have access is that of Morell, Paris, 1629. p. 274, et seq.

of those lively and animated words which I was accounted worthy to hear ; and of those worthy men, who deserve to be kept in remembrance. Of these, one was of Greece, an Ionic ; others of Magna Grecia ; one of Syria ; another of Egypt ; some of them from the East ; one of them an Assyrian ; another a Hebrew of noble decent ; when I fell upon him last, [Pantaenus] who was first in power, [intellectual power.] I remained in Egypt, scenting out those things which lay concealed. As the Sicilian bee creeping the flowers of prophetic and apostolic meadows, he begets a sincere and incorrupt knowledge in the minds of his hearers. These have preserved the true tradition of the blessed doctrine directly from Peter, and James, and John, and Paul, having received it as a son from a father, (though there are few sons like such fathers.) God having thus directed that those apostolic seeds should be deposited and preserved for us."

It will be recollected that Clement travelled through Italy, Greece, Syria, Palestine and Egypt in quest of information, at a period when there were many surviving, who were either acquainted with the apostles themselves, or their immediate successors. Of these he describes a few, through whose hands God had directed that the apostolic seeds should be transmitted to him and his cotemporaries, and through them to all coming ages. We will now lay before our readers an enumeration of the quotations from the New Testament by Clement, as they are collected by Morrell. The gospel of Matthew is quoted in 109 places ; Mark, 9 ; Luke, 23 ; John, 38 ; Acts, 8 ; Romans, 39 ; 1 Cor. 64 ; 2 Cor. 14 ; Gal., 13 ; Eph., 16 ; Philipp., 11 ; Col., 9 ; 1 Thess. 4 ; 2 Thess., 1 ; 1 Tim., 11 ; 2 Tim., 5 ; Titus, 2 ; Heb., 11 ; 1 Pet., 8 ; 1 John, 6 ; Rev., 2. It will be seen that he does not quote Philemon, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, James nor Jude. This "particularly incautious writer" has in one instance, according to Lardner, ascribed words to Peter which belonged to Paul. *But he has in no case whatever, ascribed a book, now contained in our New-Testament, to any other writer than that individual to whom the church in his age, and in all subsequent ages, has ascribed it.* It is possible that among three hundred writers quoted by him, he may have sometimes erred, either with reference to their works, or the title of their works,\* or the credit due to them. But that he has erred more frequently than Tertullian, who has also quoted upwards of two hundred works and authorities, we beg leave to question, till we see the evidence. General assertions, roundly made, may satisfy those who reason in generals, as Prof. Stuart well observes ; but before we assent to conclusions that would sweep away all historical testimony, we must be pardoned if we call for facts. But the only proper question here is, has Clement erred with reference to the authors of the New Testament Scriptures? About Pagan authors he might take little care, as he probably felt little interest. But he who had travelled wherever churches had been established, in order to learn the "true tradition

\* How easily such mistakes are made is well known. Lardner is a most careful and cautious writer. Yet, if we remember correctly, he quotes Tatian's work as "An Oration against the *Gentiles*," whereas it is an address to or against the *Greeks*. If Lardner made such a mistake, surely Clement may deserve some mercy.

of the blessed doctrine directly from Peter, and James, and John, and Paul," and who carefully committed to writing what he had thus received, both for his individual benefit, and the benefit of Christians of subsequent ages, is not thus lightly to be discarded, as an incompetent and discreditable witness. On the contrary, if we know anything of the law of evidence, and the nature of testimony, we do not see that a more credible, competent and trustworthy witness could be produced. In a work of his, now lost, we learn from Eusebius that he distinctly ascribes the epistle to the Hebrews to Paul. We were not aware, when we wrote our last number, that in works yet extant he has done the same. We think it an oversight in Prof. Stuart to rely only on the testimony of Eusebius in this instance, when the original witness is at hand, who testifies to the same effect. It will be seen by the enumeration before given from Morell, that he has quoted this epistle in eleven places. We notice, in a hasty perusal with reference to this point, some passages which are omitted by Morell, as also some from other books, especially an important one with reference to the Apocalypse. A few of these passages will show the estimate put upon our epistle, by this "particularly incautious writer." "But faith, which the Greeks calumniate, esteeming it useless and barbarous, is a voluntary anticipation, is the assent of piety, is the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen, according to the opinion of the divine apostle. By it also the ancients received a good report; for without faith it is impossible to please God."\* "For Paul also in his epistle, does not condemn true philosophy, &c.," and a few lines farther on, Clement adds, "wherefore, also, writing to the Hebrews, who were disposed to turn from faith to the law, he says, have you again need that I teach you what be the first elements of the oracles of God, &c.? In like manner he also addressed the Colossians, who were Grecian converts," and then Clement quotes the epistle to the Colossians.† Clement of Alexandria, then, was particularly cautious, both in his writings yet extant, and in others which have perished, to inform us what was the opinion of the Oriental and Egyptian churches, the opinion of the immediate successors of Peter and Paul, relative to this epistle. No doubt seems ever to have passed across the mind of Clement relative to this point. It was as he viewed it, without doubt, and without question, the production of Paul. Whether such distinct testimony, by so inquisitive, careful and competent a witness, is to be counterbalanced and nullified by the, at most, silence, and by the possibly coincident testimony of Irenæus, we submit it to our readers. We must pronounce the only negative testimony against our epistle, which is deserving of consideration, a NULLITY.

\* Op. Cl. A. p. 362.

† P. 645.

The great importance of the question under discussion is the only excuse we can or need offer our readers, for the length to which we have extended our remarks.

(To be continued.)

LECTURES ADDRESSED TO THE YOUNG MEN OF HARTFORD AND NEW HAVEN, and published at their request. By Joel Hawes, Pastor of the First Church in Hartford. Hartford, Oliver D. Cook & Co. 1828.

Many volumes of sermons, rich in thought and replete with instruction, have fallen under our notice; but we do not recollect having met with one containing discourses addressed to *young men*. It is indeed true, that the Gospel addresses itself to all—the young, as well as the old; and the truths, which constitute the burden of the preacher's message, are alike important to every class of human society. Still the sacred writers have not overlooked the fact, that different classes require, in certain respects, different kinds of instruction. Hence we find the apostle *charging* one who was to become a religious teacher, to adapt his instructions to the age and condition of those whom he addressed. "The aged man"—"the aged woman"—"the young woman"—"young men likewise"—and "servants," were designated as distinct classes of persons, who were to receive appropriate instruction in "the things which became sound doctrine."

While it is admitted, that general truths must be preached, and the consideration urged that all are alike concerned in them, it is obvious that the temptations, trials, dangers, duties, and relations of different classes of society, demand variety in a pastor's ministrations. The success of these ministrations depends not a little on their being *apposite* to the age and peculiar circumstances of the persons addressed. It is the characteristic of the "workmen that needeth not to be ashamed," that in prosecuting his sacred work, he "rightly divides the word of truth;" i. e., as Doddridge says, distributes with prudence, as well as fidelity, to each his proper share. How far such a method has been pursued, we take it not upon ourselves to ascertain. We must, however, express our conviction that in too many instances, the instructions of the pulpit have not had a sufficient degree of regard to the diversity of age and character found in almost every congregation. Probably no class has had more reason to complain of having been neglected than the young men—a class, than which no one is more exposed to the danger of a moral shipwreck. In his visits from house to house, the pastor may meet the fathers, and mothers, and sisters; but the young men, where are they? Does he usually find them in the domestic group? We hesitate not to say, No. They are in the

field, or the workshop, or in the counting room, or gone on excursions of sport and pleasure. The only place where they can be met by the pastor is the sanctuary, or where a special service is appointed for them. And generally, they will not be likely to be very much moved or affected by anything short of direct personal address. In such address, however, they will manifest a deep interest. We have seen this important class of hearers giving a fixed, serious, unbroken attention to a lecture designed specially for them, though apparently listless at other times. We have seen them meet with promptness and alacrity the proposal of the minister, who offers to address them particularly in a course of religious instruction.

"Youth," says the British critic, "has an *intellectual* bias against religion, because it would humble the arrogance of the understanding; and a *moral* bias against it, because it would check the self-indulgence of the passions." Having seen this remark verified, particularly in the case of young men, and having often deplored the consequences resulting from the fact, we were prepared to welcome the little volume of lectures now before us. Mr. Hawes has, in this attempt, contributed a most valuable addition to the stock of means adapted to the moral improvement and elevation of the character of the rising generation. The value of his book, like every other, is not to be estimated by its size, but by its richness of thought, the variety of illustration, and the breathings of piety developed in its contents. It supplies in a good degree, a desideratum which we have felt to be great, and is a fortunate, propitious advance towards meeting the claims which young men have on the teachers of religion; claims which will appear just, urgent, and important, if we consider, as our author has done, "the claims of society on young men," and the influence they will soon have in society, as the heads of families, as citizens, as rulers.

The political and moral power with which young men are shortly to be invested, renders it a subject of immense importance to society, what shall be the shape of their future course, and the features of their moral and religious character. Here a reason may be found, why they should receive *special* attention from those who, as under shepherds, are required to feed and protect the lambs of the flock. The stream of time, which bears away in swift succession generation after generation, will soon remove the present acting members of society from this transitory scene. The question occurs, "Who are to rise up and fill their places? To whom are to be committed the invaluable interests of this community? Who are to sustain its responsibilities, and discharge its duties?" The answer is anticipated:—It is the *young men*. "They are soon to occupy the houses, and own the property, and fill the offices, and possess the power, and direct the influence, that are now in other hands." Here are considerations which manifest



the wisdom and importance of Paul's direction in his charge to Titus :—" Young men, likewise, exhort to be sober-minded."

The fact has been often noticed, that there exists in the churches a great disproportion between the male and female professors. In revivals of religion, likewise, it is generally true, that a large proportion of conversions is found among females. Why are the daughters of Zion so much more numerous than her sons? Why are there so many more young women than young men among the followers of the Lamb? The difference has often been ascribed to the fact, that the former class possess a higher moral susceptibility, a more delicate fibre of soul, than is possessed by the latter. Perhaps this may furnish a partial solution of the question. But we are not satisfied that this is the sole or principal cause of the difference noticed. Another cause exists, the influence of which is often underrated: Females come more readily and more frequently within the sphere of religious influence, and share more largely in pastoral instruction. Witness the general appearance of Sabbath schools and Bible classes. Do not females constitute the great majority in these nurseries of the church?

In consequence of the habits, avocations, and intercourse of young men, it is somewhat difficult to bring them under pastoral inspection and influence, unless their interest is excited by special and appropriate efforts. They are likewise exposed to such foreign influences, as are calculated to dissipate religious impressions when made on their minds. And, withal, they are more or less prone to scepticism and unbelief. These circumstances tend to discourage the attempt to bring them under the moral influence of those means, which, in respect to the other sex, are so successfully employed. They are consequently neglected, at least in many instances, till age and experience shall have corrected their fickleness and temerity. But while the husbandman sleeps, the enemy sows tares, and improves the season to instil into the minds of young men moral and intellectual poison. The notorious conspirator against the liberties of Rome was not more assiduous in his attempts to corrupt the young men of the city, than he might thus bring them into his plans, than the enemy of truth and righteousness now is to prepossess the minds of youth in favor of a false religion, and shield them against the piety of the Gospel, and all the healthful influences of evangelical truth.

Moral difficulties generally look most appalling when viewed at a distance. They yield when met with unblenching firmness; they wither and vanish in the glance of that eye which the Christian soldier fastens on them. No difficulties should discourage the effort to bring persons of every class and age under the transforming influence of religious instruction. In respect to young men who are considered as standing far away from such influence, we have known facts which seem to warrant the success of well

conducted measures to bring them within the limits of pastoral ministrations. We have witnessed a revival of religion, in which the number of conversions among the young men fell not much below the number among the other sex. But it was where special attention had been devoted to the religious instruction of the former class, instruction adapted to their peculiar circumstances.

But we are not going to deliver a lecture on this subject, though its interest has been greatly increased, in our view, by a perusal of the volume before us—a volume which we hope is destined to be a kind of “pioneer,” leading the way for other like productions. Does the strength and safety of a community depend on “the virtue and intelligence of its youth, especially its young men?” Are they “the flower of a country, the rising hope of the church, and society?” The author of the Lectures to this class of persons is entitled then to the thanks of the Christian community for his acceptable labor; and so will others be, who shall bring their talents, and learning, and piety to bear directly upon the same noble object.

Perhaps we owe an apology for detaining our readers so long from the work itself; though from its great popularity and extensive circulation, we may presume that most of them will have seen it before meeting with this article. The Lectures are five, on the following subjects, viz. *Claims of society on young men; Dangers of young men; Importance of established principles; Formation and importance of Character; Religion the chief concern.*

The leading topics are few and well selected; the subordinate divisions are simple, and to the point. The general style of execution evinces the workings of a mind well acquainted with the subject in hand, and a benevolence of spirit, calculated to appeal with effect to the youthful heart. There is throughout a manly, business-like exhibition of truth and counsel, well adapted, we should judge, to the taste, and conscience, and various circumstances of an enterprising young audience. The language is perspicuous, pithy, chaste, and natural; the thoughts flow right on, and strike with all their point the mind of the reader.

The following selections from the work, made almost at random, will be read with pleasure, and show something of the manner and spirit of the Lectures.

In the first Lecture, which furnishes a concise and glowing exhibition of the claims which society has on young men; or rather a strong delineation of the character which it is expected they will form, and a view of the motives for the attainment of such a character, we find the following paragraph:

“No young man can hope to rise in society, or act worthily his part in life, without a fair, moral character. The basis of such a character is virtuous principle; or a deep, fixed sense of moral obligation, sustained and invigorated by the fear and love of God. The man who possesses such a character can be trusted. Integrity, truth, benevolence, justice, are not with him words without

meaning; he knows and he feels their sacred import, and aims, in the whole tenor of his life, to exemplify the virtues they express. Such a man has decision of character;—he knows what is right, and is firm in doing it. Such a man has independence of character;—he thinks and acts for himself, and is not to be made a tool of to serve the purposes of party. Such a man has consistency of character;—he pursues a straight forward course, and what he is to-day, you are sure of finding him to-morrow. Such a man has true worth of character;—and his life is a blessing to himself, to his family, and to the world."

Among the qualities of character which Mr. H. enumerates and warmly recommends, he includes *public spirit*; a spirit which the signs of the present day imperiously demand in every one who would be regarded as a friend to human society. On this topic he remarks:

"Cherish that noble, that disinterested, that rare patriotism, which will make you prefer the public interest to your own;—your country's prosperity and glory to your own honor and emolument. It is in this spirit alone, that you can prove yourselves the worthy descendants of the pilgrims, or preserve those precious institutions and privileges, which you inherit from their labors and prayers. No one trait in their character was more marked than their public spirit. They labored, not for themselves, but for mankind: not for time, but for eternity. It was this that led them to forsake their own green fields for these then inhospitable shores. It was this that induced them to lay broad and deep the foundation of those civil, literary and religious institutions, which are the glory and defence of our land. While, then, you have the honor of descending from those illustrious men, distinguished alike for their love of country, and their love of God, aspire to tread in their steps and imitate their virtues,—living not for yourselves, but for society; not for the present moment, but for all time and for eternity."

The second Lecture contains a graphic description of the *dangers* to which young men are exposed, a topic on which much should be said. The perils, through which they have to make their way to the theatre of active life, are appalling. Vice vegetates luxuriantly in the clime of secular prosperity. Commerce, with its foreign treasures of wealth, introduces a fearful surplusage of foreign corruption. The resorts of dissipating indulgence, and time-wasting amusement, hold out, from a thousand directions, allurements to their bewitching sorcery. The seminaries of false principles are increasing, and every young man must come in contact with their influence. He can scarcely go out or come in without meeting danger in some form or other. "The mystery of iniquity doth already work," and work everywhere, with bold and busy hand, to subvert the foundations of virtue and the faith of the saints. We rejoice, therefore, to hear from one quarter the watchman raising his voice, and pouring into the ear of young men the note of alarm.

The dangers specified by Mr. H. are such as arise from *the beginning of evil*; the want of *firmness and independence* of character; the influence of *bad company*; an *excessive worldliness*, and *secticism and unbelief*. The means of guarding against these dangers are briefly adverted to. "An high standard, an elevated aim;

this is the safeguard of character and the mainspring of excellence." It is added :

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. This is the command of God ; and were I to comprise all my directions to you in one, it should be this. Nothing furnishes so sure a protection against the allurements of the world ; nothing tends so much to invigorate private virtue, and diffuse, around, a healthful, public sentiment, as a serious observance of the Lord's day. No young man, who habitually keeps this day, is in much danger of having his principles undermined, or his morals corrupted. There is something in the very act of ceasing from worldly occupations on this holy day, and repairing with the people of God, to worship him in the sanctuary, which wonderfully tends to form and strengthen all good habits, and to adorn the character with the charms of a fair and lovely virtue."

In discussing *the great importance of established principles of action*, as illustrated by the noble example of Daniel, our author has labored, we think fortunately, to expose "the false and injurious principles of action." Among these he notices *the principle of honor ; the love of pleasure ; the love of money ; the love of human applause ; that management*, which is "a vile compound of sagacity and deceit, of duplicity and meanness ; and *regarding it as right to do whatever is sanctioned by common usage and public sentiment*. The grand principle of action, which he proposes, is *an unbending regard to rectitude and duty*. The application of this principle is urged by the consideration, that it is required by the command of God, that it is of invariable and universal application, that it is very easy, that it secures respect, and that it is the surest way to promote one's temporal interests.

"The principle of rectitude is of *very easy*, as well as of *invariable and universal application*. It is always easy to know what is right ; but often very difficult to know what is for our present interest or popularity. The man who acts from false principles is often thrown into great straits. He knows not what course to pursue, nor how to avoid the difficulties that are ever thickening around him. His way is dark and crooked, and full of snares and pits. He lives in a state of constant suspicion and fear. A dreadful sound is in his ears ; he trembles at the rustling of a leaf, and is compelled to have recourse to various dishonest arts and shifts to avoid detection and punishment.

"On the contrary, the man whose ruling principle is duty, is rarely at a loss to know how he ought to act. He has before him a path, plain, direct, open. He is never perplexed with anxious, corroding calculations of interest and popularity. These he leaves to the disposal of Providence, solicitous only to approve himself to his conscience and his God, not doubting but that in the end he shall find his reward."

The Lecture on *the formation and importance of character*, founded on the well known maxim of the wise man, "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches," &c. contains a series of observations, founded on a thorough knowledge of human life, and which are worthy the careful and repeated perusal of every young man. The love of character cannot be too highly cherished. It is something essentially different from a sordid, exclusive self-love. As another has said, "it is the ennobling quality of the soul. It is the love of character animating the bosom of her sons, on which America must depend in those approach-

ing crises, that may try men's souls." Mr. H. states, in the remarks which follow, what he means by a good character.

"That good name, which is to be chosen rather than great riches, does not depend on the variable, shifting breath of popular opinion. It is based on permanent excellence, and is as immutable, as virtue and truth. It consists in a fair, unsullied reputation,—a reputation, formed under the influence of virtuous principles, and awarded to us, not by the ignorant and the vicious, but by the intelligent and the good, on account of our good qualities and good conduct. In such a name, we look, first of all, for *integrity*, or an unbending regard to rectitude; we look for *independence*, or an habitual determination to be governed by an enlightened conviction of truth and duty; for *benevolence* also, or a spirit of kindness and good will towards men; and though last, not least, for *pity towards God*, or an affectionate, reverent regard for the will and the glory of the great Jehovah. These are the essential properties of a good character,—the living, breathing lineaments of that good name which in the text is commended to your high regard and careful cultivation."

Among the means of forming a good character, Mr. H. very justly states, that the most efficient, is a *deep and practical sense of responsibility to God*. An abiding impression of an ever present God, by whom actions are weighed, when duly cherished, fails not to act on character with "an influence of constant and mighty energy." On this particular, the following observations are much to the point.

"Indeed, my friends, true religion, the love and the fear of God implanted in the mind, is the most powerfully transforming cause that can be brought to act on the character of man. The truths it unfolds, the motives it urges, the interests it involves, the prospects it opens, the hopes it inspires, and the fears it awakens, are fitted to influence, in the most powerful manner, all the feelings and faculties of the mind,—to fill the soul with the noblest views and the purest sentiments; to direct all its energies, desires and purposes, to their proper use and end. When once seated in the bosom, it raises the thoughts and hopes to God and heaven; it opens the eye on the grandeur and bliss of eternity; it imparts new light and vigor to the mind; throws around the character and ways, the protection of established principles and habits; and secures to its possessor a safe passage through all the temptations of this corrupted and corrupting world, to the abodes of eternal purity and blessedness. The man of true religion stands on firm and elevated ground; his heart is fixed, trusting in the Lord; and he feels within him the workings of a principle, which, like the hand of God, will not let him go; but amidst all the assaults of the world, keeps him in the path of virtue, of happiness, and heaven."

In concluding his illustration of the *importance* of a good character, the author makes the following eloquent and solemn appeal to his young hearers.

"Do you now ask for other motives? I have one more to offer. *On the character you are now forming hangs your own eternal destiny*. Those dispositions and habits, which you now acquire, you will be likely to retain through life, and carry with you into another world. "They are the dying dress of the soul,—the vestments in which it must come forth to meet the sentence of an impartial judge." If filthy, they will be filthy still,—if holy, they will be holy still. Yes, my friends, the character you are now forming is that, probably, in which you will appear before the judgement seat of God; and by which your condition for eternity is to be decided. O then, be careful that you acquire a character of meetness for the society of just men made perfect in heaven; and not for the society of lost spirits in the world of wo."

The last Lecture in the series urges *religion as the chief concern*. Our limits admit not of more extracts, or remarks. We cannot,

however, forbear very earnestly to recommend this volume to the perusal of every young man in the country. We should rejoice to see it *stereotyped*, and distributed by thousands. The writer, while lecturing on points which have a secular aspect, does not lose sight of "the chief concern" Piety pervades the whole work. It will be read with good effect; and we doubt not that many a young man, reclaimed by this little volume, will one day rise up and bless the author, as the means of his being restored from the wandering way of sin to his Father's house in heaven.

---

## SELECTIONS.

### MANUSCRIPTS AND ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

In all critical inquiries relative to the New Testament, reference is necessarily made to the different manuscripts and ancient versions. As inquiries and references of this sort are becoming more and more frequent, we have thought we could not do our readers a better service, than by laying before them the following epitome. It is taken from the appendix to Dr. Smith's "Scripture Testimony" &c., and is, we presume, substantially correct.

#### I. *The principal Manuscripts of the Greek Testament.*

1. The *Alexandrian*, presented to King Charles I. in 1628, by the excellent sufferer and martyr, Cyrillus Lucaris, Patriarch of Constantinople; and placed by George II. in the British Museum. It contains, mutilations excepted, the whole New Testament and the Septuagint Version of the Old. It is attributed to the fourth century, but some place it as low as the sixth. The New Testament was published with *fac simile* types, by Dr. Woide, in 1786.

2. The *Vatican*, No. 1209, in the library of the papal palace of the Vatican at Rome: containing, excepting the mutilations, the whole of the Old and New Testament. The earliest date assigned is the third century, and the latest the fifth or sixth.

3. The *Ephrem*, in the King's library at Paris; originally containing the whole Old and New Testament, but greatly mutilated and defaced. At least of the seventh century, but probably much older.

4. The *Cambridge*, or *Beza's*; brought in 1562 from a monastery at Lyons, in the civil wars of France, and after near twenty years presented by Theodore Beza to the University of Cambridge. It contains the four Gospels and the Acts, with a Latin version on the opposite page. "It may be as ancient," says Bishop Marsh, "as the sixth, the fifth, or even the fourth century." It was published by Dr. Kipling, under the direction of the University, most beautifully printed with *fac simile* types in 1793.

5. The *Codex Rescriptus*, discovered in the library of the Univer-

sity of Dublin, and published with *fac simile* engravings, in 1801. It contains the Gospel of Matthew, but not free from mutilations. The learned discoverer and editor, Dr. Barrett, adjudges it to the sixth century.

6. The *Clermont*, in the King's library at Paris; containing the Epistles of Paul. Only two leaves and a part have been lost. The Epistle to the Hebrews is in a less ancient hand. Probably of the seventh century.

7. The *Augiensis*, in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge; containing the Epistles of Paul, except that the beginning of the Epistle to the Romans, and the whole of that to the Hebrews, are wanting. Attributed to the ninth or tenth century.

8. The *Stephani octavus*, No. 62, in the King's library at Paris; containing the four Gospels, with some mutilations. Of the eighth or ninth century.

9. The *Coislinianus*, No. 202-2; existing thirty years ago in the Benedictine library at St. Germain. It contains only fragments of the Pauline epistles, and is of the sixth or seventh century.

Besides these, there are about 460 manuscripts known to exist, and scattered in the different public libraries of Europe. They are of various ages, from the ninth to the fifteenth century. Some were originally copies of the whole, or nearly the whole, Greek Testament, but more usually they are portions, such as the Gospels, the Epistles of Paul, &c.

## II. *The Ancient Versions.*

### 1. *The Syriac.*

(1) The Peshito, that is, *right* or *correct*. It certainly existed in the fourth century, and may not improbably be ascribed to the third or even the second.\* It is pure in diction, very accurate and faithful, and of great utility in criticism and interpretation.

(2) The Philoxenian; made by Polycarp, under the patronage of Philoxenus, bishop of Hierapolis, in 508. It is literal to servility; but the translator was not well acquainted with Greek.

(3) The Jerusalem Syriac, in the Chaldaic dialect; existing in manuscript in the Vatican library, written at Antioch in 1030.

2. *The Coptic.* (1) The Memphitic, published by Wilkins, Oxford, 1716. There is reason to believe that its antiquity is very great, probably reaching to the third century. It is said to express the text of the best and most ancient Greek manuscripts. (2) The Sahidic, existing only in manuscript, except a part of the Gospel of John, which was published at Rome, 1789. Woide thinks it may be even of the second century.

3. *The Ethiopic*; ascribed to the fourth century. It has never been duly collated, and copies are said to be almost incredibly scarce in Abyssinia.

4. *The Armenian*; made by Miesrob about 410, said to be faithful, and often called the Queen of Versions. But the copies made

\* Most respectable critics ascribe to this version an earlier date. Michaelis says, "the close of the first, or beginning of the second century."

since the middle of the thirteenth century, are supposed to have been interpolated from the Vulgate.

5. The *Arabic*. Several versions exist, of the whole, or of parts of the New Testament; but all of them are supposed to be later than the seventh century, and are not of high authority.

6. The *Persic*; made from the Syriac, and containing only the Gospels. Other versions exist, but none of them are of much value in criticism.

7. The *Latin*. (1) Versions before the time of Jerome. These were various, and going back to a very high antiquity. It is probable that the different books, or small collections of them, were translated by different persons. Among these one called the Old Italic is said to have been most distinguished; but our information is obscure. (2) The Vulgate; not a new version, but a selection, revision, and careful correction, by Jerome, A. D. 384. It possessed great merit as a very close translation and generally following the best and oldest Greek copies: but it was not generally received till the eighth century. It has also been considerably altered since, by revisions and the intermixing of the former Latin versions.

8. The *Gothic*, or ancient German; by Ulphilas, bishop of the Gothic tribes in Wallachia, about the middle of the fourth century, and said to be a very excellent version. The Gospels only were known to be extant, till, in 1818, the Abbate Angelo Maio discovered manuscripts containing the thirteen Epistles of Paul, in the Ambrosian library at Milan. The publication of this much desired part of this venerable version is eagerly expected by the lovers of sacred literature.

9. The *Slavonic*, or ancient Russian; by Methodius and Cyril, in the ninth century.

10. The *Anglo-Saxon*, made probably in the eighth century. The Gospels only, and some fragments besides, have been published. It is said to exhibit chiefly the readings of the Old Italic.

11. In 1817, a manuscript of a version of the whole Old and New Testament in the *Georgian* language was discovered in the Georgian monastery at Mount Athos. It is said to be the actual autograph of the translator, Euphemius, who lived in the eighth century.

---

#### NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Memoirs of the Life, Character, and Writings of the late Rev. Philip Doddridge, D. D.* By JOB ORTON. Boston: Peirce & Williams. 1828. pp. 310.

We prefer these Memoirs of Doddridge by Orton to those by Kippis, not because they are written with more ability or taste, or make us better acquainted with the literary character and labors of the learned and distinguished divine of whom they treat; but because they exhibit him more fully and distinctly in his private intercourse, meditations, and devotions, when divested of all disguise and restraint, and standing before us in his real character. In the Me-



moirs by Orton, Doddridge is made as often as possible, and indeed usually, to speak for himself. We have his letters, his diary, and his own personal account of his trials, labors, and religious exercises; and in this way we become intimately acquainted with the means and motives by which one of the most eminent and useful religious characters of modern times was formed. We seem to go with him to his closet, his study, his family, to his parochial labors, his pulpit, and his theological school; and we feel honored in the opportunity of sympathizing with one, whom we find at all times, and in all places, to be the same devoted, consistent, and laborious Christian.

Dr. Doddridge, though catholic in his temper, was a firm and decided friend and advocate of evangelical truth.

“He saw and lamented the sad deviation of many ministers from what he thought important truths of the Gospel; insisting upon them much less than they should have done; or in such a manner as if they were making concessions to an adversary, rather than opening their hearts to their hearers upon a favorite subject. He saw persons refining upon a plain Gospel, until it was almost evaporated and lost; and therefore he was the most strenuous in the support of its vital truths.” p. 228.

After the commencement of his last sickness, but previous to any apprehensions of danger,

“His correspondents and friends at home, plainly observed his great improvement in spirituality and a heavenly temper, the nearer he approached to his dissolution. He seemed to be got above the world; his affections were more strongly than ever set upon heaven, and he was daily breathing after immortality.

In some letters to his friends, about this time, he thus expresseth himself: “I bless God, earth is less and less to me: and I shall be very glad to have done with it once for all, as soon as it shall please my Master to give me leave. Yet for him I would live and labor; and I hope, if such were his will, suffer too.” —“I thank God, that I do indeed feel my affection for this vanishing world dying and vanishing every day. I have long since *weighed it in the balances, and found it wanting*; and my heart and hopes are above. Fain would I attain more lively views of glory. Fain would I feel more powerful attractions towards that world, where you and I, through grace, shall soon be; and in the meantime would be exerting myself more and more to people that blessed, but neglected, region.” —“I am now intent upon having something done among the dissenters, in a more public manner, for propagating the Gospel abroad, which lies near my heart. I wish to live to see this design brought into execution, at least into some forwardness; and then I should die the more cheerfully. Should God spare my life, many opportunities of doing good in this respect may arise: but *to depart and be with Christ is far, far, infinitely better*. I desire the prayers of my friends in my present circumstances. I remember them in my poor way: but alas! what with my infirmities, and what with the hurries to which I am here [in London] peculiarly obnoxious, and the many affairs and interruptions which are pressing upon me, my praying time is sadly contracted. *O that I had wings like a dove!* You know whither they would carry me.” pp. 276, 277.

As this excellent volume has long been out of print, or to speak more properly, out of market, the publishers have performed a valuable service in bringing it forward at the present time. We trust their labors will be well rewarded.

2. *The Visitor; a Christmas and New Year's Token.* Edited by B. FIELD, A. M. Boston: Peirce & Williams. 1829. pp. 144.

If this little annual does not equal some of its competitors in size, and in the elegance of its engravings, it much more than equals

some of them, in the variety and excellence of its matter, and in the correctness of its religious bearing and influence. The Christian parent may *safely* put it into the hands of his children, as a token of affection at the commencement of the year.

3. *The Object of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. A Sermon preached in the Congregational church in Federal Street, Boston, Jan. 6, 1828.* By JOHN PIERPONT. Boston: Bowles & Dearborn. pp. 16.

The object of this discourse is to shew, that "the resurrection of the body of Jesus is not to be regarded as either an evidence or an emblem of the resurrection of the body, in the case of any other person;" but that "the immediate object" of Christ's resurrection was, like that of his miracles, "to prove the divinity of his mission;" and the ultimate object, the same as that "of Christianity itself—the salvation of men from sin, and from the ruin that sin brings in its train."

Mr. P. professes to *doubt* whether there will be any resurrection of the body.

"It will *probably* be found," says he, "that, although the apostle Paul sometimes—in his reasoning with his countrymen, many of whom believed the doctrine of the resurrection of the body that had been laid in the grave—uses language that might lead us to suppose that he believed it also, yet, at other times, as when he distinctly declares that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," he uses language incompatible with the idea of the resurrection of the body; and, consequently, we must understand that the resurrection which he preached, had no concern with the flesh and blood that compose the body while we live. And it will probably be found that our Lord himself, although, in speaking either to the Pharisees, who held to the resurrection of the body, —a doctrine which was taught by Zoroaster to the Chaldeans, and had been brought from Chaldea by the Jews, on their return from their captivity—or to the Sadducees, who denied that doctrine, he sometimes appears to accommodate his language to the previously existing opinions of the age,—never, yet, taught the resurrection of the *body* as a doctrine of his own; but that, on the contrary, when speaking, as he often spoke, of the resurrection of the *dead*, he meant the survivorship of the spirit." pp. 7, 8.

In regard to the question whether Paul taught the resurrection of the body, the following passages will, we doubt not, be sufficient to satisfy our readers: "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and *the dead in Christ shall rise first.*" "We look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, *who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body.*" "But some man will say, How are the dead raised up?" &c. 1 Cor. xv. 35—38, and 42—44, and 50—57.

Our Saviour, it is admitted, *seems* to teach the resurrection of the dead; or "he appears to *accommodate* his language to the previously existing opinions of the age," whether these opinions were true or false; "yet, he never taught the resurrection of the body as a doctrine of *his own.*" But in what sense did our Saviour not teach "the resurrection of the body as a doctrine of his own?" He did not indeed teach it as a doctrine of his own invention; or as a doctrine which had never been taught before; but did he not teach it as a

solemn and important religious truth? "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." John v. 28, 29. "I am the resurrection and the life." "I will raise him up at the last day."

Mr. P. is very positive, whether the doctrine of a future resurrection be true or not, that there is no manner of connexion between this doctrine, and the fact of Christ's resurrection.

"The object or end of his resurrection from the dead was *not* that it might be regarded, in all ages, either as an emblem or an evidence of the bodily resurrection at a future day, either of all mankind, or of all, or yet of any part of his disciples."

Now the following passages seem to us to teach directly the opposite of what is here affirmed. They evidently point out, as clearly as words can, a very intimate connexion between the resurrection of Christ, and that of his people. "He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. viii. 11. "God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by his own power." 1 Cor. vi. 14. "He which raised up the Lord Jesus, shall raise up us also by Jesus, and shall present us with you." 2 Cor. iv. 14. "If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." 1 Thess. iv. 14. "If Christ be preached, that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" "But every man in his own order: Christ the first fruits; afterward they that are Christ's at his coming." See 1 Cor. xv. 12—23.

Dr. Priestley, and some other Unitarians, have considered the doctrine of the resurrection of the body as the grand distinguishing feature of Christianity. But Mr Pierpont, as we here see, is almost, if not altogether, prepared to renounce even this.

4. *A Discourse pronounced at the request of the Essex Historical Society, Sept. 18, 1828, in Commemoration of the first Settlement of Salem, in the State of Massachusetts.* By JOSEPH STORY. Boston: Hilliard, Gray, Little, & Wilkins. pp. 90.

Two remarkable circumstances respecting this performance are, its great *length* for a single discourse, containing matter sufficient for a small volume, and its almost unvarying *excellence*. After an introduction of twelve or thirteen pages, rather desultory but not inappropriate, the author announces his plan in the following words:

"My object is to furnish you with a brief sketch of the origin of the colony; of the motives, which led to the enterprise; of the characters of the men, who conducted it; of the principles, upon which it was established; and of the grand results, which it has hitherto developed. I shall also adventure upon some topics, where the conduct of our ancestors has been severely put to question; and without attempting to disguise their mistakes, I trust that something may be said to rescue their memories from unmerited reproaches." p. 15.

In the filling up of such a plan, it hardly needs be said that Judge Story is eloquent. He is almost uniformly so; and it has quite sur-

prised us, to see a discourse of the length of this carried out with such spirit and elevation, page after page, even to the last. There is here and there a word, indeed, which does not fall pleasantly on our ear, and in two or three instances a sentiment is dropped, to the truth of which we could not subscribe. The whole too we should think rather diffuse. But in a performance of so high a character, and which we have perused with so much pleasure, we have no heart to particularize inferior blemishes. We can go hand in hand with the author, in his account "of the origin of the" Massachusetts "colony, of the motives which led to the enterprise, of the characters of the men who conducted it, of the principles upon which it was established, and of the grand results which it has hitherto developed." It is true, as he says, New England "owes her existence to the love of religion—*exclusively* to the love of religion." It is true, as he says,

"The men, who landed here, were no ordinary men; the motive for their emigration was no ordinary motive; and the glory of their achievement has few parallels in the history of the world. Their perseverance in the midst of hardships, their firmness in the midst of dangers, their patience in the midst of sufferings, their courage in the midst of disasters, their unconquerable spirit, their unbending adherence to their principles, their steady resistance of all encroachments, surprise us even more than the wisdom of their plans, and the success of their operations." p. 21.

"Of them it may be said with as much truth, as of any men that have ever lived, that they acted up to their principles, and followed them out with an unflinching firmness. They displayed at all times a downright honesty of heart and purpose. In simplicity of life, in godly sincerity, in temperance, in humility, and in patience as well as in zeal, they seemed to belong to the apostolic age. Their wisdom, while it looked on this world, reached far beyond it in its aim and objects. They valued earthly pursuits no farther than they were consistent with religion. Amidst the temptations of human grandeur they stood unmoved, unshaken, unseduced. Their scruples of conscience, if they sometimes betrayed them into difficulty, never betrayed them into voluntary sin. They possessed a moral courage, which looked present dangers in the face, as though they were distant or doubtful, seeking no escape, and indulging no terror. When in defence of their faith, of what they deemed pure and undefiled religion, we see them resign their property, their preferments, their friends, and their homes; when we see them submitting to banishment, and ignominy, and even to death; when we see them in foreign lands, on inhospitable shores, in the midst of sickness and famine, in desolation and disaster, still true to themselves, still confident in God's providence, still submissive to his chastisements, still thankful for his blessings, still ready to exclaim in the language of Scripture—'We are troubled on every side, yet not distressed; we are perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed;' when we see such things, where is the man, whose soul does not melt within him at the sight? Where shall examples be sought or found more full to point out what Christianity is, and what it ought to accomplish?" pp. 39, 40.

"It was Christianity, which cast over their character its warm and glorious light, and gave it an everlasting freshness. It was their faith in God, which shed such beauty over their lives, and clothed this mortal with the form of immortality. In comparison with these, the distinctions of this world, however high or various they may be, are but evanescent points, a drop to the ocean, an instant to eternity, a ray of light to the innumerable fires which blaze on unconsumed in the skies. This is not the poor estimate of man, the being of a day; it is the voice of that Revelation, which has spoken to our hopes and fears with an authority, which rebukes, while it convinces, our reason." p. 44.

We agree with Judge Story in admitting that our pilgrim fathers, with all their excellence, did not fully understand, and of course did

not always exemplify, that spirit of religious freedom, that regard to the opinions and consciences of others, which became them. And we agree with him in the apology he offers, that this was the fault, rather of the times, than of the men.

“There was not at that time in all Christendom a single spot, however remote, in which the freedom of religious opinion was supported by prince or people. Throughout all Europe, if we except Holland, the practice of burning heretics still prevailed, not only in Catholic but in Protestant countries. And even in Holland, banishment was not an uncommon punishment for those, who obstinately persisted in heresies of doctrine.\* What is it, then, that is required of our forefathers? That they should have possessed a wisdom and liberality far superior to their own age;—that they should have acted upon truths as clear and settled, of which faint glimmerings only, or at least a brief and dubious twilight, had then shot up in unsteady streams to direct their course;—that learned as they were, and wide as were their researches, and painful as was their diligence, they should have outstripped all others in the race, and surmounted the prejudices and prescriptions of twelve centuries. It would be dealing out a hard measure of justice to require perfect conformity under all circumstances to our own sense of duty. It would be dealing out still harder measure to press upon one poor persecuted sect, the sins of all Christendom; to make them alone responsible for opinions, which had become sacred by their antiquity, as well as their supposed coincidence with Scripture. Uniformity of faith and intolerance of error had been so long the favorite dogmas of all schools of theology and government, that they had ceased to be examined. They were deemed texts for the preacher, and not inquiries for the critic.” pp. 47, 48.

We agree also with Judge Story in all he has said on the value of religious freedom: and, whatever opinion he may entertain of us, can assure him of our intention to be the last to violate this freedom. “If there is any right, sacred beyond all others, because it imports everlasting consequences, it is the right to worship God according to the dictates of our own consciences.” Whatever opinion on religious subjects will not bear the test of unembarrassed investigation, of free inquiry, with our whole heart we say, *let it be abandoned*. We concur fully with our author in his unqualified admiration of the civil institutions of our fathers, and of their distinguished liberality in the cause of science and of public instruction. He discusses with candor and discretion the principles on which they held intercourse with the natives, and obtained a title to their lands; apologizes for their conduct in relation to supposed instances of witchcraft; adverts to the history of the Revolutionary struggle; and concludes with pertinent and seasonable admonitions in regard to national dangers and prospects.

After apologizing for the intolerent spirit of our fathers, by attributing it to the ignorance and error of the times, our author very justly adds, “Let us do, not what they did, but what with our lights and advantages they would have done, must have done, from the love of country, and the love of truth.” A similar remark has been made by Unitarians, in regard to the religious *sentiments* of our fathers. It is not denied, as it cannot be, that with all their excellence, and with all their praise, they were strictly *orthodox*. They believed in the doctrines of the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, of election, of entire human depravity, of regeneration, of the perseve-

\* Hume's Hist. vol. vi. 57, 163; and vol. vii. 20, 41, 515.

rance of saints, and of the future and endless punishment of the wicked. But it is said by Unitarians, in reply to this, 'It becomes us to embrace as truth, not what our fathers did, but what, with our lights and advantages, they would have embraced. And we believe, as we believe we live, that if they had been born two hundred years later, they would have been found amongst *our* warmest and most effective coadjutors.' (See Un. Tracts, No. 9, p. 8.) Now we admit the justness of a remark like this, in connexion with the intolerance which our fathers sometimes manifested; but deny it in relation to their religious sentiments: For the cases are, in every material point, unlike. The excuse for the intolerant spirit of our fathers is, that religious liberty was not then understood. "Uniformity of faith and intolerance of error had been so long the favorite dogmas of all schools of theology and government, that they had ceased to be examined. They were deemed texts for the preacher, and not inquiries for the critic." But religious doctrines were then understood. Unitarianism was understood; and because it was understood, it was rejected and detested. "Will God grant," said they, quoting the somewhat rude ejaculation of another, and applying it with special reference to Harvard college,—"Will God, the greatest and best of Beings, grant, that this seminary may be so tenacious of truth, that hereafter it may be easier to find a wolf in England, or a toad in Ireland, than either a Socinian or an Arminian in Cambridge."\* It cannot be denied, and should not be forgotten, that the religious sentiments of our honored fathers constituted the very *elements* of their character. It was these which made them what they were, and impelled them to accomplish that, in which we, their successors and descendants, glory. With other views of religious truth, or rather, with that indifference to truth, and that piousness of conscience, which are now inculcated as the perfection of Christian charity and liberality, they never had left their native homes, or braved the dangers of the deep, or seen the rocks and hills of New England, or given us occasion to remember and speak of them as the fathers of a great and happy people.

5. *The Introduction to the Analytical Reader, consisting of easy and interesting Lessons in Reading, &c. &c.* By SAMUEL PUTNAM. Salem: Whipple & Lawrence. 1828. pp. 144.

This will be found a very interesting book to young children, whether at school or at home. Specimens of words similar in sound, but of different orthography and meaning from those which occur in the lessons, as also the pronunciation of difficult words, are given in the margin. The whole is adapted to the capacities and tastes of those for whom it is designed; and while they will be induced to read from the force of mere interest, valuable instruction will be received, and favorable moral impressions will be left upon their minds.

\* "Felix Deus optimus, maximus, tenacem adeo veritatis hanc academiam, ut deinceps in Anglia lupum, in Hibernia bufonem, invenire facilis sit, quam aut Socinianum, aut Arminianum in Cantabrigia." Dr. Arrowsmith, quoted by Mather, Book iv.

The great Dr. Owen, the cotemporary, the companion, the particular friend of some of the first settlers of New England, wrote as ably on many points of the Unitarian controversy as any that have succeeded him.

THE

# SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. II.

FEBRUARY, 1829.

NO. 2.

---

---

## COMMUNICATIONS.

LETTERS ON THE INTRODUCTION AND PROGRESS OF UNITA-  
RIANISM IN NEW ENGLAND. NO. I.

Dear Sir,

Your favor of — was duly received, and your request, so kindly communicated, has been considered with much anxious attention. You express your astonishment at the great change of religious opinion and feeling which has taken place in some parts of New England, especially in and around the metropolis, within the last century, and wish me to inform you what has occasioned it, or how this revolution is to be accounted for. You are sensible, I suppose, that your request imposes on me no ordinary task; and yet, considering the source from which it comes, and my great obligations to him who urges it, I regard it as one which I am not at liberty to refuse. I only claim your candor and indulgence, while I endeavor to reply in the best manner I am able.

The change in the religious aspect of this portion of our country, which has taken place in the course of the last century, is indeed great. The first settlers of Massachusetts were strictly Orthodox in their religious character and views. They were Calvinists, in the sense in which this term was understood two hundred years ago. Here, they planted their churches, and established their University, and intended and hoped to promote and perpetuate their system of religion. And their religious system did continue and prevail, in tolerable purity, for a long course of years. But, alas, how changed now! How different the present religious aspect of things, from what the Pilgrims intended and hoped! In many of the churches, which were planted by their labors, and watered by their tears, the truths which they loved, and for love of which they had suffered the loss of all things, are no longer taught. So far from it, they are opposed and vilified. Indeed, the very existence of the church is called in question, and its property and rights are taken away. And the University which they consecrated to Christ and his church, has been for years a principal means of corrupting the church, and

of divesting the divine Saviour of his deserved honors. The change is indeed great, and greatly to be deplored; and you wish to be informed how it has been introduced. 'What has occasioned it? What has prepared the way for it? What have been the steps of its progress? In what way can it be rationally accounted for?'

You are mistaken, my dear Sir, if you suppose I can answer you in few words, or can refer you to any single, prominent event which has been the occasion of all this mischief. The change has been, not sudden, but gradual. It has been long in preparation and in progress. It has been accomplished, in some of its stages, by slow and scarcely perceptible degrees. A variety of causes has contributed to produce it; and an answer to your questions, such as the case requires, and as you are entitled to receive, must necessarily run back to remote events, and involve no inconsiderable portion of the religious history of New England.

I shall, first, go into a consideration of the more remote causes, which operated to deface the religious system of our fathers, and prepare the way for the introduction of Unitarianism; and next describe the manner in which the heresy entered here, and by which it has spread itself in the midst of us.

The circumstances of those who commenced the settlement of New England were, in many respects, peculiar. Having fled from the persecutions and corruptions of their native land, and come to this distant wilderness from purely religious considerations, they felt entitled to enjoy their retreat, without intrusion or disturbance from the enemies of their faith. They felt entitled to attempt here the erection of a *Christian Commonwealth*, constituted after what they considered the divine will and pattern. Accordingly, the church was, with them, the *primary* institution; while the civil power was regarded as a sort of appendage to the church, to be exerted chiefly for its protection and benefit. With this view, it was provided, from the first, that none should enjoy the right of *suffrage*, who were not members of some regularly established church.\*

The peculiar circumstances of our fathers enable us to account for this enactment, though not fully to justify it. Their intentions were certainly pure, but the path of duty was as certainly mistaken; and from their mistake in this particular, a train of unhappy consequences followed.

The enactment of which I am speaking operated to the detriment of religion and the injury of the churches, in two different ways. In the first place, it held out a sort of premium for hypocrisy. It brought numbers into the church, who had no true love for it, and who entered it only for the sake of its accompanying civil privileges. They entered it from selfish and mercenary

\* See Colony Laws, p. 117.



motives. Thus the churches were early corrupted; not, indeed, in essential doctrines, but by the leaven of unsanctified members, who had no spirituality, and whose hearts were averse to the holy truths, and precepts, and discipline of the Gospel. A root of evil was thus planted in the church, which would be sure to spring up in one direction or another, and spread abroad its disastrous shade, and scatter around its bitter fruit.

On the other hand, many, who either would not apply for admission to the churches, or having applied were refused, became the determined enemies of the existing ecclesiastical establishment, and exerted all their influence to injure and overthrow it. They complained loudly and incessantly of the disabilities under which they labored, and, as early as 1646, petitioned, not only the courts of the colonies, but the British parliament, praying, as they say, in behalf of "thousands," that they might enjoy, with others, the rights and the privileges of freemen.

The enactment of our fathers, which has here been considered, and which tended so directly to corrupt the churches, and to excite opposition against them, was repealed in 1662, soon after the accession of Charles II. to the throne of England. But before the termination of this dispute, another difficulty arose, partly from the same source, and partly from the operation of other causes. In the frequent discussions respecting church order and government, the religion of the heart was too much neglected, and the special influences of the Holy Spirit were withdrawn; so that many of the children of the first settlers of the country, who had been baptised in their infancy, and who their pious parents had hoped would be early regenerated, and become members and pillars in the churches they had established, were found unwilling and unprepared to make a public profession of their faith. They were mostly persons of sober life, but gave no decisive evidence of real piety. Of course, they could not conscientiously ask for admission to the churches, nor if they had asked it, could they have been received. Consequently, they were not only deprived of the rights of freemen, but (what was inexpressibly more painful to their pious parents) their children were not baptised, and were likely to grow up without so much as a nominal connexion with the church of Christ. In this painful emergency, what was to be done? Was it right or safe to innovate on the established order of the churches, and admit persons to communion, without a credible profession of piety? Or was it safe to shut their posterity out of the church; deprive them of the privilege of Christian ordinances; and so run the hazard of the cherished vine which, with so many tears and so great sacrifices, they had planted in the wilderness, being wasted, if not destroyed? These trying questions were first started in Connecticut; and we can hardly conceive of the feeling and interest with which they soon forced themselves upon

the attention of the colonies. They were discussed and decided at a meeting of ministers in Boston, in 1657. They were also decided in a general synod, in 1662. In these decisions, which were substantially the same, the difficulty was rather evaded than removed. It was not determined that those who gave no credible evidence of piety should be admitted to the communion of the church; nor was it determined that they could have no manner of connexion with the church, and consequently that their children must remain unbaptised. A middle course was suggested and adopted; viz. "that it is the duty of those who are baptised in infancy, when grown up unto years of discretion, though not yet fit for the Lord's supper, to *own the covenant* made on their behalf by their parents, by entering therein in their own persons. And it is the duty of the church to call upon them for the performance thereof. And if, being called upon, they shall refuse the performance of this great duty, or otherwise continue scandalous, they are liable to be censured for the same by the church. And in case they understand the grounds of religion, and are not scandalous, and solemnly own the covenant in their own persons, wherein they give up both themselves and their children unto the Lord, and desire baptism for them, we see not sufficient cause to deny baptism unto their children."\*

Such was the origin of infant baptism on the ground of what has been denominated the *half way covenant*. And here we have another instance of mistake, on the part of our honored and pious ancestors. Instead of laboring more abundantly for the conversion of their children, and looking to God with redoubled earnestness and faith for his Spirit and blessing; an expedient was devised, and much learned labor was bestowed to give it currency, tending rather to secularize the church, while it quieted the consciences of those who were living in acknowledged impenitence, living without hope and without God in the world.

The measure here considered, though sanctioned by a synod, and recommended by the general court, was long agitated, before it was adopted. Indeed, I do not think it ever was universally adopted. Some of the most eminent ministers, as Mr. Davenport, President Chauncey, Dr. Increase Mather, &c. opposed it from the first; and the churches, in general, were more averse to it than their pastors. The practice of 'owning the covenant,' so called, was not introduced in Connecticut before the year 1696, though previous to this, it prevailed to a very considerable extent in Massachusetts.

The result of this measure was precisely what might have been anticipated. Most persons of sober life, when they came to have families, 'owned the covenant,' and presented their children for

\* Mather, Book v.

baptism. But the number of *church members in full communion* was small, and was continually diminishing. The church therefore was still in danger. Baptism was administered to great multitudes, while the Lord's supper, the other special ordinance of the Gospel, was falling into comparative neglect.—In this trying and difficult posture of affairs, *another* innovation was attempted, which, indeed, had been agitated long before. It was alleged that the sacrament of the supper is among the appointed means of regeneration; that it is the duty of unconverted persons, regarding themselves as such, to come to this ordinance; and consequently that a profession of piety should not be required of those who offer themselves for communion in the church. This doctrine was strenuously advocated by Rev. Solomon Stoddard, a distinguished minister of Northampton, who was settled about the year 1670, and who died in 1729. “Mr. Stoddard's principle,” says the biographer of Edwards, “at first made a great noise in the country, and he was opposed, as introducing something contrary to the principles and practice of almost all the churches in New England; and the matter was publicly controverted between him and Dr. Increase Mathew of Boston. However, through Mr. Stoddard's great influence over the people at Northampton, it was introduced there; and by degrees it spread very much among ministers and people in that county, and in other parts of New-England.”\*

The operation of the views here considered was to increase the number of communicants, but to depress still more the vital energies of the church. It was well said by the great Dr. Owen, that “the letting go this principle, that particular churches ought to consist of *regenerate persons*, brought in the great apostacy of the Christian church.” I have no doubt that “the letting go this” radical “principle” in New England, in connexion with the causes previously mentioned, tended directly and eminently to prepare the way for “the great apostacy” here, for the origin of which we are now inquiring, and which we have so much reason to deplore. The churches came to consist very considerably, in many places, of unconverted persons; and not unfrequently of those who regarded themselves as unconverted, and who came to the Lord's table as a means of regeneration.

And when the door was once opened for persons without piety to enter the church, there was no let or hindrance to their entering the ministry. And between the years 1680 and 1740–50, it may be feared that many of this description did enter the ministry. They were grave men, in speculation Orthodox, or *moderately* so; and performed their customary ministerial duties with much regularity; but their preaching lacked point, and earnestness, and application; their devotional services lacked warmth

and unction; their labors were not blessed of the Holy Spirit; their people slumbered; the tone of religious feeling and sentiment was sinking; and true godliness seemed fast retiring from the land.

It deserves also to be considered, in this connexion, whether the manner in which, for more than a century, divine institutions were supported in New England, had not a tendency to hasten that deep and melancholy declension of which we are here speaking. No doubt, many advantages resulted from the regular and uniform system of taxation for the support of the Gospel, which was then in force; but the thought has often occurred, whether the existing state of things did not assume too much the appearance and the character of a religious establishment, and whether its tendency was not to induce security and slumber on the part of ministers and churches, and a reliance on the civil arm, rather than on the Lord of Hosts.

At the period of which I now speak, there were occasionally seasons of special awakening; but these were few, and insulated, and 'far between.' A depravation of morals was much complained of, and frequent attempts were made, in synods and otherwise, to promote reformation; but the means adopted did not reach the seat of the disease, which continued to rage with increased violence. So alarming had this declension become, in the days of Cotton Mather, as to lead him to declare, 'that in forty years more, should it continue to make progress as it had done, convulsions would ensue, in which churches would be gathered out of churches;'—a prediction afterwards most strikingly verified.

It would be easy to pursue the train of thought here suggested, but you must allow me to pause for the present. We have already discovered a fearful declension in New England, and have considered some of the causes which evidently led to it. A farther attention to the subject will show how this declension operated to prepare the way for the introduction and progress of Unitarianism.

In the meantime, believe me yours, &c.

INVESTIGATOR.



INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES. NO. V.

*Inspiration of the New Testament.*

From the previous investigation we have been brought to this conclusion, namely; that *any attempt to account for the existence of the Old Testament Scriptures, by the diligence and fidelity of*

the writers in the use of their own talents, and the means of information within their reach, without the preternatural influence of the Holy Spirit, is altogether unsatisfactory, and falls far short of the representations which Christ and the apostles make, as to the origin of the Sacred Writings. Or, to express the same conclusion in another form: *They who wrote the Scriptures of the Old Testament were under the infallible guidance of the Spirit, and so wrote neither more, nor less, nor otherwise, than God saw to be best.* I will only add, that so far as the mind of the prophets and pious Jews on this subject is made known, it corresponds with the representations of Christ and the apostles.

As we are now to enter on the consideration of the New Testament, it may be proper to remark, that as the Gospel dispensation is one of much higher perfection, and as it communicated more extensive miraculous endowments in a general view, than the former dispensation; it would be but reasonable to presume, that the writers of the sacred Books under this dispensation would have, at least, equal divine assistance with the writers of the Old Testament Scriptures. Indeed, it would seem no more than consistent, that they should have *superior* assistance.

But without relying on this presumptive argument, I shall proceed to examine the New Testament Scriptures themselves.

Our present inquiry is,—*What light do the Books of the New Testament reflect upon their own inspiration?*

I here assume, as in the former discussion, that the writers of the New Testament are entitled to full credit, and so that their testimony, whatever it may be, is to be received, as conclusive evidence, on this, as well as on any other subject.

The first thing I shall notice is, that *Christ, who had all power in heaven and earth, commissioned his apostles to act in his stead, as teachers of the Christian religion, and confirmed their authority by miracles.* By empowering them to work miracles, Christ invested them with divine authority, and gave his seal to the truth of their instructions. Their writings and their oral instructions were attested in the same way. For their miraculous works confirmed all the claims they made to be regarded as *divinely authorized teachers.*

Jesus said to his disciples, “As my father hath sent me, even so send I you.” The Father sent Christ to be an infallible witness to the truth. Christ sent his apostles with a commission of the same nature. They were appointed to carry on the work which he had begun, and to give all necessary instruction in regard to the Christian religion. But how could such a commission have answered the end proposed, had not those, who received it, been so assisted by the divine Spirit, as to qualify them for their work, and to render them *unerring teachers?* Had they not been furnished with ability to teach the way of God *infallibly and perfectly,*

how could they have supplied to the church the place of him who was the great Prophet, the faithful and true witness?

Secondly. *Christ expressly promised to give his apostles the Holy Spirit to assist them in their work.*

This promise is contained in various passages, particularly the following: "I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, (or assistant,) that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth." "When the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into *all the truth*. He shall take of mine and show it unto you." "He shall teach you *all things*, and bring all things to your remembrance whatsoever I have said unto you." "When they shall deliver you up, take no thought what or how ye shall speak; for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you." Storr and Flatt say, that the words in the last verse, *For it is not ye that speak &c.*, seem to relate to all the instructions of the apostles, and to contain the ground of the particular promise in the preceding verse. "The idea seems to be this: The instructions which ye, my apostles, in general give, are derived not so much from yourselves, as from the Holy Spirit. Hence when ye are called on to defend your doctrines, ye need feel no anxiety, but may confidently rely on the Holy Spirit to vindicate his own doctrines by suggesting to you the very words of your defence." Bib. Theol. b. i. sec. 9. illus. 14.

Now if the promises of Christ above cited, were fulfilled; then the apostles were favored with the constant and unerring guidance of the Spirit; and so must have had a complete knowledge of the truths of the Gospel, and all necessary assistance in making them known to others. If the Spirit abode with them *continually*; then, whether employed in preaching or writing, they must have been infallibly guided. What they *wrote* was to be the means of accomplishing a far more extensive good, than what they *preached*. So that if the Spirit of God deserted them when they were engaged in *writing*, he deserted them when his help was most needed, and when the want of it was likely to be most extensively injurious to the interests of religion. The effect of an error in their preaching might have been comparatively limited. But an error in their writings, which were intended for general use, would have spread a disastrous influence beyond any limits, either of time or place. If we take the promises of Christ, above quoted, in their obvious sense, we must believe that the apostles, as well as prophets, *were constantly moved by the Holy Spirit* in the execution of their work, and that all the Scriptures of the New Testament as well as of the Old, were *divinely inspired*.

The following remarks of Dr. Calamy, in his sermons on Inspiration, I quote with pleasure, as corresponding exactly with the views already expressed.

“If the writings of the New Testament were not given by inspiration of God, our Lord was not true to his apostles; he did not answer the promise he made them as to the assistance of the Holy Spirit. If this promise of our Saviour did not refer to assistance in *writing* as well as speaking, it reached to but half their work, and left them to themselves as to the other half; which, if the concern of all succeeding ages be regarded, is the most considerable of the two. If the promise did extend to their writings, then they were under *infallible conduct*. For it is not to be supposed that such assistance as that promised for the benefit of all after ages, should leave them exposed to mistakes in their writings. The substance of the promise was, *assistance in the whole of their apostleship by the presence of his Spirit.*”

Christian writers generally agree in these views of the subject. Knapp says: “If the apostles had inspiration in discourses which were merely oral, and therefore of very temporary and limited advantage; how much more in their *writings*, which were intended to exert a more lasting and extended influence.”

Thirdly; there are many passages in the New Testament which show, that *the writers considered themselves to be under the infallible guidance of the Spirit, and their instructions to be clothed with divine authority.*

It ought to be carefully kept in mind, that after the character of the apostles, as divinely authorised teachers of the Christian religion, was probably made known by miraculous works, and was generally understood and acknowledged by the churches; it was quite unnecessary for them frequently and formally to assert their claims to that character. It is not, therefore, to be considered as any thing strange or unaccountable, that what the apostles wrote on this subject, though sometimes direct and explicit, was for the most part *incidental*. Nor should this circumstance diminish, in our view, the evidence arising from their remarks.

Gal. i. 11, 12; “I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me, *is not after man*: For I neither received it of man, nor was I taught it, but by revelation of Jesus Christ.”

1 Cor. ii. 10, 12, 13; “But God hath revealed them to us” (i. e. the truths pertaining to the kingdom of heaven,) “*by his Spirit*. Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things which are freely given us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but in the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth.” This last text puts the apostles upon the same footing with the prophets. *The prophesy came not by the will of man; and the apostles spake not in the words which man’s wisdom taught. The prophets spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; and the apostles spake in the words which the Holy Ghost taught.* This text affords as much evidence of the

inspiration of the apostles, as other passages do of the inspiration of the prophets.

2 Cor. ii. 17; "We speak *as of God*;" *ως εκ θεου .... λαλουμεν.* This indicates, as Storr and Flatt understand it, that *God* is the *author* of what is spoken.

1 Cor. xiv. 37; "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things which I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord." Here then the apostle claims, that the precepts which he writes should be received as coming from God, and as clothed with divine authority; and clearly intimates that no one, who does not thus receive them, could be a true prophet, or spiritual.

The apostle says to believers at Thessalonica respecting the Gospel which he preached; "Ye received it, not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, *the word of God.*" 1 Thess. ii. 13. In the same epistle, iv. 8, he says respecting those who treated the instructions of the apostles with contempt; "He that despiseth, despiseth not man, but *God*, who hath also given unto us his Holy Spirit." What they spake was *the word of God*, and was to be treated as such, because he had given them his Holy Spirit. Their high authority rested on their being endued with special divine influence.

The apostle John asserts the same high claims, both for himself, and for his fellow apostles. 1 John, iv. 6; "We are of God. He that knoweth God, heareth us. He that is not of God, heareth not us. Hereby we know the Spirit of truth, and the spirit of error."

The following texts plainly imply, that the apostles hold the same rank with the prophets, and that their writings are entitled to the same respect as the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Ephes. ii. 20. Here Paul represents Christians, as "built on the foundation of the *apostles* and *prophets*,"—giving to apostolic instructions the same authority as to the writings of the prophets. 1 Pet. iii. 15, 16. Peter here speaks of the epistles of Paul, as standing upon a footing with *the other Scriptures*, i. e. the Scriptures of the Old Testament. The beginning of the same chapter is of a similar import. "I write unto you, that ye may be mindful of *the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets, and of the commandments of us, the apostles of the Lord and Saviour*;" thus representing the writings of the apostles as having the same authority with those of the prophets.

Other citations might be made; but these are sufficient. Now can it be supposed, that honest and humble men would have spoken thus of themselves, and represented their writings in such a light, had they not known themselves to be under special divine guidance? Their manner of speaking on this subject is strikingly peculiar. They require that the highest regard should be paid to



them as teachers, and unlimited confidence placed in their instructions. They never speak of any doctrine or duty, as though they apprehended themselves to be liable to error; although in other cases they were sufficiently prompt to disclaim what did not belong to them. Whenever the principles of Christianity are concerned, they speak as men who have received a divine commission, and who act under an infallible divine guidance. They make a cordial reception of their instructions, and submission to their authority, essential to Christian piety. They claim the right of determining every question on the subject of religion, and they interdict and anathematize all doctrines different from theirs. Now how can it be supposed that men, who had a very humble opinion of themselves, and a supreme regard to the honor of God and the cause of truth, would speak in this manner of themselves, and of their instructions, unless they believed themselves to be under a supernatural guidance, and their doctrines in all respects according to the will of God? Their manner of writing, and the high claims they made, can be justified only on the principle, that they had been commissioned by Christ to teach in his name; that their character as his ambassadors had been confirmed by miracles; that he had promised them the continual influence of the Holy Spirit, and had faithfully fulfilled his promise in the special aid afforded them. If any one should say, it might have been without sufficient grounds that the apostles believed themselves to be thus commissioned and assisted; he would invalidate their testimony as to all other facts, and so undermine the Christian religion.

Should any one here allege that, if the writers of the New Testament were really inspired, they would have asserted their inspiration more frequently, and in more direct and positive terms; this would be my reply. If the apostles were themselves assured of their divine commission and inspiration, and had established their claims to it by clear public evidence, an evidence of the highest kind; it must have been unreasonable to expect, that they would constantly affirm what had been so satisfactorily proved, and that in every discourse they delivered, and in every epistle they wrote, they would repeat that they had a divine commission, and were infallibly guided by the divine Spirit. Such reiteration would be wholly unnecessary, and unbecoming the character of ambassadors from the court of heaven. Indeed, nothing like this could be expected of an ambassador from an earthly court. The apostles write like men who know that they have a well authenticated public character; that they are clothed with power from on high, and that this is understood and generally acknowledged by those Christians to whom they write. Accordingly, when they speak of their high commission, and the special divine assistance afforded them, they do not represent it as a new doctrine which it was ne-

cessary for them to publish and to prove. They speak of it sometimes for the purpose of contrasting themselves with false teachers ; but most frequently, for the sake of producing a deeper impression of the paramount importance of the doctrines and precepts which they inculcated. The circumstance, therefore, that they so seldom and so informally affirm their inspiration, instead of being inconsistent with it, is rather an argument in its favor.

As the evangelists Mark and Luke were not apostles, it must be acknowledged that the arguments which prove the inspiration of the other books of the New Testament, do not directly prove the inspiration of their gospels. For the purpose of aiding Christians in relieving their own minds of any difficulties which may arise from this circumstance, I offer the following brief remarks.

In the first place, I remark, *that the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit were not confined to the apostles.* Other individuals, who were favored with miraculous endowments, are mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. And in the first epistle to the Corinthians, the apostle Paul speaks of many Christians who had supernatural gifts, and who were required to exercise them all for the edification of the church. It was *a miraculous dispensation* ; and at the commencement of that new era in the church, such a dispensation was adapted to confirm the faith of believers, and to prove to the world the divine authority of the Christian religion. Now the remarkable fact, that the supernatural gifts of the Spirit were conferred on so many, besides the apostles, shows it to be very probable that they were conferred on Mark and Luke. And the circumstance that these servants of Christ were so distinguished for their usefulness, and were chosen as the particular companions of the apostles, is a good reason for supposing that they were partakers of that divine influence which was afforded so extensively, and in such large measures, at that period of the church.

Secondly ; there was a tradition among the early Christians, that these two gospels were written under the special direction of the apostles. Tertullian says, "The gospel which Mark published may be affirmed to be Peter's, whose interpreter Mark was." He also says, that "Luke's history is usually ascribed to Paul ;" meaning probably that it rested on Paul's authority. The declaration of the Fathers that Paul and Peter approved and sanctioned the gospels of Mark and Luke, is not, however, to be understood to imply that these two evangelists were not themselves inspired. For Eusebius makes a similar declaration respecting the gospel of Matthew. He says that *Paul and Peter approved the gospel of Matthew, and confirmed the truth of it, as well as the gospels of Mark and of Luke.* And what can be more natural than to suppose that, whenever it was necessary, one inspired writer would give his testimony to the writings of another ? In this way Peter, though indirectly, confirms the authority of the

epistles of Paul. 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. On supposition that an inspired book came into the hands of any Christians who were ignorant of its divine original; surely, an apostle, who knew the circumstances of the case, must have been ready to give the necessary information respecting that book, and openly to declare, that it was divinely inspired, and was to be received as part of God's word.

Finally. It is a fact which cannot be questioned, that the gospels of Matthew and Luke were received as *canonical* by the primitive Christians. As those evangelists were cotemporary with the apostles, and were instructed by them; the judgement of the apostles respecting their writings was undoubtedly known. Primitive Christians must have been careful to inquire into the divine authority of any writings which they received, as part of the sacred canon. And they evidently had far better means of getting the necessary information, and of forming a correct judgement, than it is possible for us to have at this distant period. On the whole, as those early Christians, who first received the gospels of Mark and Luke, could have no motives to receive them, without good evidence of their inspiration; and as, in all probability, they did what they did under the eye of the apostles, and certainly in the apostolic age, and so must have been corrected, had they judged wrong; we have reason to be satisfied with their decisions, and to place the gospels of Mark and Luke on the same footing with other inspired writings.

There may be other arguments which deserve serious attention; but I deem it unnecessary to notice them here. I will, therefore, only add, that it makes little or no difference as to our faith, whether the spirit of inspiration resided in Mark and Luke, who wrote the gospels ascribed to them, or in Peter and Paul, who either employed them as amanuenses, or inspected and approved what they wrote.

Various objections have been urged against the inspiration of the apostles, as above exhibited. I shall attempt a particular answer to one of them, and that the most plausible, arising from several passages in Paul's epistle to the Corinthians, in which he may, at first view, appear to disclaim divine inspiration, and to speak only in his own name, and by his own authority. The passages referred to are the following. 1 Cor. vi. 10, 12, 25, 40; "And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord; let not the wife depart from her husband." "But to the rest speak I, not the Lord: If any brother hath a wife that believeth not, and she be pleased to dwell with him, let him not put her away." "Now concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord. Yet I give my judgement as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful." "But she is happier if she so abide, after my judgement: and I think I have the Spirit of the Lord."

2 Cor. viii. 8, 10; "I speak not by commandment, but by occasion of the forwardness of others, and to prove the sincerity of your love." "And herein I give my advice, for this is expedient for you." xi. 17; "That which I speak, I speak not after the Lord, but as it were, foolishly, in this confidence of my boasting."

On these texts I make the following remarks.

First. Should we admit that Paul, in these instances, intended to disclaim inspiration; we might give the answer others have given; that is, that the apostle's scrupulous care to inform us that, in a few particular cases, he wrote what he did without divine inspiration, affords satisfactory evidence, that in all other cases, he was inspired, and that he meant we should believe him to be so. But,

Secondly; I see no sufficient reason to conclude that, in any of the places referred to, the apostle meant to disclaim divine inspiration. The texts quoted admit of a satisfactory explanation without supposing this. For might not the Spirit guide the apostle in giving such *advice*, and in suggesting such prudential considerations, as the peculiar circumstances of Christians required? There are many cases in which it is proper and necessary that God's people should be cast upon their own discretion;—cases where there can be no universal, unbending rules, to which every one shall be obliged to conform; but where each man's duty must be determined by his peculiar dispositions and circumstances. And yet, in these very cases, it may be important that something should be said to him in the way of *advice*, something to assist him in the right exercise of his own discretion. And why may not an apostle judge it proper, in such cases, to give some particular instruction? And why may not the divine Spirit be supposed so to guide him, that he will be sure to give right instruction,—will be sure to suggest such advice or caution as shall be suitable to the occasion, and worthy of the most serious regard? Now this, as it seems to me, is just what the apostle did, in the passages under consideration. Cases arose, on which the Lord Jesus had given no express precepts or directions, but on which it was important that something should be said to Christians in the way of instruction or counsel. Paul, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, undertook to do this. When the Lord Jesus, during his personal ministry, had given any particular direction relative to the subject, he refers to that as decisive, and calls it *the commandment of the Lord*. "Unto the married command I, yet not I, but the Lord: Let not the wife depart from her husband." This was a matter which Christ had expressly decided: so that what the apostle here said was *the commandment of the Lord*. But as to the case of a Christian who had a heathen partner, Christ had given no particular instruction, but had left it among other things to be regulated by his apostles, who were to speak in his name.

So our apostle says : " But to the rest speak *I*, not the Lord." " Concerning virgins *I* have no commandment of the Lord ; yet *I* give *my* judgement." " She is happier if she so abide, after *my* judgement." " Herein *I* give *my* advice." But it is to be observed that even here, where the apostle has no express commandment of Christ to repeat, and only gives his own judgement or advice,—even here he tells us, that he enjoys special divine assistance. He says, " *I* give my judgement, as one that hath obtained mercy of the Lord to be faithful ;" that is, as one whom God, in the exercise of his mercy, has made faithful in discharging the apostolic office. Again : " She is happier if she so abide, after my judgement ; and I think I have the Spirit of the Lord." There is no reason to suppose that the word *δοκεω*, *I think*, is intended to indicate any doubt in the apostle's mind. It may express his *full persuasion*. He probably used this language in the way of modesty and delicacy, when speaking of himself. Similar modes of speech frequently occur, when no doubt or uncertainty is meant to be expressed, but the contrary. Is it not clear, then, that in giving his judgement, in the cases referred to, the apostle considered himself as having the Spirit of the Lord, and as being thus qualified for the right performance of every part of his office, as an authorised teacher of the Christian religion ?

The passages, 2 Cor. viii. 8, " *I* speak not by commandment ;" *κατ' επιταγην*, according to, or from, any express command of Christ ; and v. 10, " Herein *I* give my advice," are to be explained on the same principles with the passages just considered. The distinction intended, as every one must perceive, was not between what was *inspired* and what was *not inspired* ; but between *what Christ himself expressly commands*, and what he left to be regulated by the *counsels of one of his apostles*.

But the text, 2 Cor. xi. 17, is to be explained differently. " That which *I* speak, *I* speak not after the Lord ;" *κατα κυριον*, according to the Lord ; i. e. according to his example. The apostle was embarrassed and oppressed with the necessity which was laid upon him to speak in his own commendation ; and while doing it, charged himself with acting *foolishly, and not according to the example of Christ*. He probably meant, either that there was something in what he said which was *apparently* contrary to the unostentatious, humble character of Christ ; or something which, in *ordinary* circumstances, would be *actually* contrary ; though in the singular circumstances in which he was placed, he felt himself justified.

As to the objection which some have made against the inspiration of the apostles from the instances of impropriety which appear in their private conduct, I think it necessary at present only to say, that their inspiration is to be understood to imply, not that they were secured against all deviations from duty, and

made perfectly holy, in their *private capacity*; but *that they were divinely guided and assisted in discharging the apostolic office*. It is very conceivable, that, while the apostles were but imperfectly sanctified, and were liable to sin, as *private men*; they might be under infallible divine guidance in their *public capacity, as apostles*. We are taught by the Scripture, that men wholly destitute of goodness, such as Balaam and Caiaphas, were sometimes the subjects of divine inspiration, and were led by it to declare things which they would not have declared of themselves. (See John xi. 49—52.) And if men without any holiness, could be divinely inspired; surely the imperfection of holiness which appeared in Paul and Peter, can never be thought inconsistent with their inspiration.

PASTOR.

---

## REVIEWS.

A COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. In two volumes. *By Moses Stuart, Associate Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theol. Seminary at Andover*: Published by Mark Newman. Codman Press—Flagg & Gould. pp. 677.

(Concluded from p. 47, vol. ii.)

We have, in two preceding numbers, exhibited the age and the canonical authority of the epistle to the Hebrews. We have also shewn that the Oriental church, to which this epistle was sent, not only embraced it in their canon with the other epistles of Paul, but early, distinctly, and constantly attributed it to that apostle. We have examined the doubts, which were thrown upon this point in the western church toward the close of the second century, and onward to the fourth, and shewn, as we think, clearly, that they resulted from difficulties of a theological, and not of an historical or critical nature. We have also shewn that the external objections, which have recently been produced in this vicinity as conclusive evidence against the Pauline origin of this epistle, afford still stronger evidence against another undoubted, indisputable, universally acknowledged epistle of Paul, viz. the epistle to Philemon. An argument, which thus proves too much, which tends to an entire subversion of the New Testament, may well be said to prove nothing.

We forbore, in our last number, to apply the principle, advanced by a reviewer in the *Christian Examiner*, to either of the catholic epistles, because we were apprehensive that he would not feel himself under obligation to defend any portion of the Antilegomena. We chose therefore to meet his objections more directly, and show at once their entire futility, or irrelevance. As yet, Unitarians profess to receive all the New Testament, as the inspired word of God, as the sufficient and authoritative rule of faith

and practice, except the epistle to the Hebrews. We might then, with perfect fairness, have applied the reviewer's principles to the epistles of James, and Jude, second Peter, &c. We need not inform him, nor professed biblical critics among Unitarians, that these epistles have less external evidence of their genuineness, than the epistle to the Hebrews. The mind of Eusebius evidently wavered between the two classes of sacred books, in doubt with which this epistle should be ranked. When we consider the Arian tendencies of the historian, and the controversies which then agitated the churches from Constantinople to Alexandria, we cannot doubt that Eusebius attributed to this epistle only the authority, it could most certainly claim. Athanasius appeals to it, at the same period, as beyond all question Pauline. In his canon, it would have ranked in the Homologoumena, in which Eusebius also at times is constrained to class it.

But how is it with the catholic epistles just named? We have high Unitarian authority for asserting, that "The epistle of Jude has as little evidence, either external or internal, in its favor, as any book of the New Testament."\* Do American Unitarians, who reject one epistle, receive another as a part of the word of God, which English Unitarians assert has "as little evidence in its favor as any book of the New Testament"? *Rational* criticism on the continent of Europe has *imagined* that Jude copied part of his epistle from the writings of Zoroaster. Whether this opinion is deemed *rational* by *liberal* inquirers in America, we are not informed; but we are forcibly reminded by it of a remark in Campbell, which we cannot withhold. "A man's mind" says he, "may, by gross errors, and inveterate prejudices, be so alienated from the simplicity of truth, that the silliest paradoxes or wildest extravagances in opinion shall have a better chance of gaining his assent, than truths almost self-evident."† Notwithstanding the epistle of Jude, according to the editors of the Improved Version, has so small a portion of evidence in its favor, another Unitarian writer of still higher authority tells us, "it may not be amiss to observe here, that we have found this epistle (i. e. of Jude) oftener quoted by writers, who lived before the time of Eusebius, than the epistle of St. James."‡ Hence, according to the reasoning of the passage quoted in our last from the Christian Examiner, the epistle of James must have still less evidence in its favor than that of Jude, and both of them have less, than that of the epistle to the Hebrews. But the latter epistle surrenders to the Unitarian attack without resistance; *a fortiori*, the epistles of Jude and James will also yield in a similar manner. If there be any force in logic, or coherence in system, the editors of the Improved Version, and

\* See Improved Version, Am. ed. p. 569. † Campbell's Four Gospels, vol. iv. p. 447.

‡ Lardner, vol. vi. p. 614.

their American coadjutors, must reject the epistles of James and Jude. That they are prepared for this, with reference to the latter, we have no doubt. Let us hear their opinion of the former. "This excellent epistle is one of those, the genuineness of which was disputed in the primitive church. But it is not unworthy of the apostle to whom it is generally ascribed."\* This excellent epistle, being not unworthy "of the Lord's brother," is not, it would seem, to be rejected. Why not? It does not apparently thwart their theology. Their criticism therefore will raise no objections. But if Lardner and the Christian Examiner are to be trusted, (and to the former we yield our assent,) the epistle of James has less evidence in its favor than the epistle of Jude. But, according to the Improved Version, the epistle of Jude has as little evidence in its favor as any book of the New Testament. American Unitarians reject the epistle to the Hebrews as totally destitute of the evidence necessary to establish its genuineness or canonical authority. They must then, if they agree with the Improved Version, (as they no doubt do) reject the epistle of Jude, which has as little evidence in its favor as that to the Hebrews; and still more certainly must they reject the epistle of James, which, according to the testimony of Lardner, and the logic of the Examiner, has less evidence of its genuineness from the writers preceding Eusebius, than the epistle of Jude. Here then we hold. Liberal criticism, if it will speak out, and speak consistently, must reject the epistle of James as not genuine. Though "not unworthy of the apostle to whom it is generally ascribed," it certainly is not his, and, not being his, it can have no claim to be considered canonical. Will Unitarians still retain this "excellent epistle," as a part of God's word? Probably they will. If, then, in one case, they theologically receive an epistle which they critically reject, we need not be surprised that in another case, their theology should urge them to reject an epistle, which sound criticism would compel them to receive. But we must quit this part of the subject.

We come now to consider the *internal evidence* of the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews. Here we can add nothing to the original and unanswerable arguments of Professor Stuart; neither can we abridge them. They are of such a nature, requiring an enumeration and comparison of so many particulars, that it is not in our power to transfer them to our pages. We can only mention the general heads of argument pursued by the Professor, referring to his work for elucidation, and, as we think, entire satisfaction, with reference to them all.

In the first place, he derives evidence for the Pauline origin of our epistle from *circumstances mentioned or adverted to in it*. This species of evidence, it is well known, derives strength from its

\* Note, Improved Version, p. 539.



indirectness. The name of an author is easily forged, whether it be prefixed or appended to his work. But the casual mention of circumstances, which without design, and circuitously, identify the writer, has ever been regarded by critical inquirers as proof of the most satisfactory nature. All the circumstances mentioned in the epistle to the Hebrews exactly coincide with the condition of Paul, near the close of his confinement at Rome. Can the same be said of any other individual to whom ignorance or fancy, or system, or prejudice, has ascribed it?

In the second place, the Professor deduces evidence that the epistle is Paul's, *from a similarity of sentiment, and also from the form, method, style, and diction of the composition.* It is in this part of his introductory volume that we think he has risen in his strength, and snapped the cords with which the Philistines would have bound him. We know nothing equal to it. We recollect nothing like it. A writer in the London Evangelical Magazine has already anticipated our remark by saying, "This comparison exhibits one of the most laborious and accurate collations, which it has ever fallen to our lot to peruse." Our critical readers will examine the work for themselves. To others, we will only say, that all the prominent, and discriminating peculiarities which distinguish Paul, characterize the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews. This, we are aware, is assertion and not evidence; but for the latter we must refer to the volumes before us. Professor Stuart concludes this part of his argument thus;

"I cannot find any higher intensity of mind; any more exalted conceptions of the true nature of Christianity, as a *spiritual* religion; any higher views of God, and Christ, or of the Christian's privileges and his obligations to believe in, love and obey the Saviour; any more noble excitements to pursue the Christian course, unawed by the threats and unallured by the temptations of the world; or any so awful representations of the fearful consequences of unbelief, and of defection from Christianity. The man, who wrote this epistle, has no marks of a plagiarist, or of an imitator, about him. Nothing can be more free, and original than his thoughts, reasonings, and mode of expressing them. It is most evident that they flow directly, and warm from the heart. They are thoughts that breathe, and words that burn! Where, in all the ancient world, did ever a plagiarist, or an imitator write in this manner? A man who could form such conceptions in his mind, who could reason, and exhort in such an impressive manner; has he any need of imitating—even Paul himself? No; it may be said of him, (what Paul on another occasion said of himself in comparison with his brethren,) that he was not a whit behind the very chiefest of the apostles."

In the same connexion, the Professor shews the extreme difficulty of passing for genuine a supposititious work. In a few instances, this has been done, but the deception has soon been detected. The efforts and success of Chatterton are well known.

\* The epistle to the Hebrews was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. If it be contended that the writer imitated Paul, how many of his epistles had he seen, from which to frame his imitation? Or if he were a hearer of Paul, will it be allowed that he has correctly reported the doctrines of Paul? How contradictory is skepticism! The writer could not have been Paul; he is so unlike him! He must have imitated Paul; he is so like him!!

For a short time, the most sharp-sighted critics were deceived. But ultimately the deception was made apparent. Who ever successfully imitated Johnson? Many have attempted. All have failed.

"Just so it was in the primitive age of the church. The Christian world was filled with gospels and epistles, ascribed to Paul, and Peter, and other apostles and disciples. Yet no one of these succeeded in gaining any considerable credit among the churches; and what little was ever gained by any of them, proved to be temporary, and of very small influence. This was not owing to want of exertion; for strenuous efforts were made by writers to imitate the apostolic manner of writing, so as to gain credit for their supposititious pieces. But all of them failed. Indeed, nothing can be more egregious, or striking, than the failure. A comparison of any of the *apocryphal* writings of the New Testament, with the *genuine* writings of the same, shows a difference, heaven-wide, between them, which the most undistinguishing intellect can hardly fail to perceive.

"If then the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews was an imitator of the apostle Paul, he has succeeded in such a way as no other writer of those times, or any succeeding ones, ever did. He has produced a composition, the sentiments of which, in their shade, and coloring, and proportion, (so far as his *subjects* are common with those of the acknowledged epistles of Paul,) are altogether Pauline. Nay, he has preserved not only the order of writing which Paul adopts, but his mode of reasoning, his phraseology, and even his choice of peculiar words, or words used in a sense peculiar to the apostle. The imitation goes so far, it extends to so many particulars, important and unimportant, that, if our epistle was not written by Paul, it must have been an imitation of him which was the effect of settled design, and was accomplished only by the most strenuous effort."

The probability of this we shall leave for others to determine.

"Who then did write this epistle, if Paul did not? And what is to be gained by endeavoring to show the *possibility* that some other person wrote it, when so many circumstances unite in favor of the general voice of the primitive ages, that this apostle was the author? That the church, during the first century after the apostolic age, ascribed it to some one of the apostles, is clear from the fact that it was inserted among the canonical books of the churches in the East and in the West; that it was comprised in the *Peshito*; in the old Latin version; and was certainly admitted by the Alexandrine and Palestine churches. Now what other apostle did write it, if Paul did not? Surely neither John, nor Peter, nor James, nor Jude. The difference of style is too striking, between their letters and this, to admit of such a supposition. But what other apostle except Paul, was ever distinguished in the ancient church as a writer? None; and the conclusion, therefore, seems to be altogether a probable one, that he was the writer. Why should all the circumstances which speak for him, be construed as relating to some unknown writer? Are the sentiments unworthy of him? Are they opposed to what he has inculcated? Do they differ from what he has taught? Neither; why then not admit the *probability* that he was the author? Nay, why not admit that the probability is as great as the nature of the case, (the epistle being anonymous,) could be expected to afford? My own conviction, (if I may be permitted to express it,) is as clear in respect to this point, as from its nature I could expect it to be. I began the examination of the subject unbiassed, if I was ever unbiassed in the examination of any question; and the evidence before me, has led me to such a result."

Were we not aware that some other principle than strength of argument operates in this question, and operates with mighty force, we should anticipate that the variety, clearness, and urgency of proof adduced by Prof. Stuart would lead every examining mind to a similar result. It requires, however, but a very superficial observation of men, and of their principles of action and belief, to

perceive, that in a contest between the heart and the head, the former will come off victorious; that when a favorite system is in one scale, and arguments in the other, the latter will soon "kick the beam;" that to a prejudiced, like a jealous, mind, "trifles light as air will afford confirmation strong as (yes, stronger than) proof of Holy Writ."

Not content with stating the arguments which afford incontrovertible evidence of the genuineness of the epistle to the Hebrews, Professor Stuart has gone into an extended examination of all the objections, real or feigned, by which the credulous ingenuity of skeptical criticism has labored to disprove the Pauline origin of this epistle. Here, if we mistake not, the pillars of Dagon's temple give way, and the lords of the Philistines, instead of anticipated sport, are buried in its ruins. Or to speak without a figure, Professor Stuart has, in this part of his work, not only examined and removed all objections, accumulated by Bertholdt, Schulz, and their fellow laborers on both sides of the Atlantic; but he has shewn, that the principle of reasoning, adopted and confidently trusted in by them, applied to an epistle indisputably Paul's, to wit, the first epistle to the Corinthians, will prove that it could not have been written by Paul, and must be a forgery. This part of his work is, we believe, entirely original; and the Professor characterises it, we doubt not most justly, an "appalling labor." All thorough biblical critics will thank the Professor for the iron diligence and scrupulous accuracy with which this investigation has been prosecuted; and it will require something more than the cautious silence or gratuitous assertions of any Examiner to remove the facts exhibited by the Professor from "that great rectifier of wandering critics—a Greek concordance."

In view, then, of the whole subject,—of the futility of the objections raised against the Pauline origin of this epistle—that if allowed to be valid, they would disprove the genuineness of epistles acknowledged by all to have been written by Paul, and thus subvert the whole sacred canon; in view of the fact, that the doubts which existed in the Roman church are all easily explicable, and that even there, the most intelligent and competent witnesses ascribed it to Paul; in view of the fact, that the most thorough examination of the epistle, such as that instituted by Prof. Stuart, shews it to have proceeded from the same pen which wrote the other thirteen epistles of Paul; and in view of this most important fact, that the Grecian, Egyptian and Oriental churches, those to whom the epistle was sent, and who were most competent to form an opinion, early, uniformly, and unaminously ascribed it to that apostle, we are constrained to record our conclusion, in the language of Eusebius, expressed fifteen centuries ago, and which cannot be thought the language of a favorably prejudiced witness, "*Fourteen epistles are clearly and CERTAINLY Paul's.*"

We have extended our remarks altogether beyond our original intention. But the nature and importance of the subject discussed will, we think, justify, as well as explain, the course we have taken. While others, whose amiable characters, literary acquisitions, and official connexions give them great influence, are laboring to subvert the authority of the epistle to the Hebrews, and, as we solemnly believe, every other portion of God's most holy word, we have felt it an imperious duty to lay before the public an antidote to the poison, so adroitly prepared, and so skillfully administered. The question is one of *vital* importance. Let us beware, lest we give to the mere word of man an authority which belongs only to the word of God; and let us tremble lest we be found fighting against the truth of God, and the God of truth. With the whole subject thus before our readers, they must, on their own responsibility, "choose the good, and refuse the evil." We have endeavored to present it in what we conceive its true colors. We have not wished to give a distorted view of the evidence on which we rest our belief in the divine authority of the epistle to the Hebrews, neither have we wished to conceal or shrink from any objection. Whether we have been successful in our efforts to remove the latter, we must leave our readers to determine; but with reference to the former we can say with a clear and an unalterable conviction, that if this epistle was received as canonical by the companions, disciples, and immediate successors of the apostles before the close of the first century; if it was embraced in the canon, adopted in the East, and the West, before the close of the second century; and if, in addition to this, the voice of antiquity has handed it down, as from the apostle Paul—all which is clear as noonday—we may rest with entire confidence, in its sacred, apostolical authority, unshaken by the united attacks of Grottingen, and Cambridge.

Thus far, our remarks have been embraced under one general head, offered as a reason why we rejoice at the appearance of these volumes, viz. that they will convince intelligent and candid minds, that the most extensive examination, and the severest scrutiny, at once authorize the received canon, and establish the evangelical interpretation of the sacred writings. With reference to the latter part of this proposition, we have only room for a quotation from the second volume.

"I am aware that much has been said, by recent commentators, on arguing *κατ' ἀναλογία*, or in a way of *accommodation*, in our epistle; and that all the comparisons made in it, between things and persons, under the law and under the Gospel, have been ranked with this class of reasoning or argument. For those, who do not acknowledge the divine origin of the Jewish religion, nor that any of its rites, sacrifices, or persons were symbolical of anything belonging to Christianity, such a mode of explanation may be necessary. But for those who believe, with the writer of our epistle, that the Jewish religion was of God, and that the ancient Scriptures have revealed a Messiah, very little, if any, of arguing merely in the way of accommodation, in our epistle, needs to be ad-

mitted. Does not the 110th Psalm call Christ a *high priest*? And did not the Jews of Paul's day admit, (as well as Paul himself,) that this Psalm had respect to the Messiah? Undoubtedly they did. Where then is the *accommodation* of the writer to the mere prejudices of those whom he addressed, when it is evident that both he and they entertained an opinion in common, with regard to the exegesis of the 110th Psalm? Of course, both admitted that Christ was to be a high priest. But how? Why? Not of the ordinary kind; for he did not descend from Aaron. Not to make expiation which should merely pertain to external purification; but to make an expiation which should purge "the conscience from dead works," and which should procure the pardon of sin with God, and "bring in everlasting redemption for his people."

It is not, then, merely to satisfy the Jew that he need relinquish nothing of his regard for the excellence and importance of the office of high priest by embracing Christianity, and that he has exchanged a less splendid office of priest under Judaism, for a more splendid one under Christianity, that Paul dwells so long on the virtues and dignity of Christ's office as high priest. No doubt he had this object in his eye, as I have already stated, when he entered upon the consideration of this topic. But why does he dwell on it so much longer, than he does on the comparison of Christ with Moses? Not because the Jews exalted the high priest, above Moses; for this surely they did not. It was because Christ, in the office of high priest, performed that peculiar duty, which of all others made him what he was, the SAVIOUR of *sinners*, the REDEEMER of *lost men*: because, as *priest*, he offered an *expiatory sacrifice*, which takes away the sins of the world, and makes him the propitiation for their offences. I am entirely unable to explain the copiousness of our epistle on this point, if this be not the reason of it. And if this be admitted, then there is reason enough, why the apostle should dwell so long upon it.

"I know of no part of the Scriptures, which explains the nature and object of the Jewish ritual, in a manner so spiritual, so satisfactory, so clear, so worthy of God, and so profitably to us, as chaps. v. to x. of the epistle to the Hebrews. As a key to the Old Testament, these chapters deserve the most attentive and thorough study of all who wish to understand the Bible. As a statement and vindication of the great work of Christ, and the atonement which he made by his blood for sin, they stand in the very first rank of all the scriptural writings. As adapted to the wants and condition of those whom the apostle addressed, they are a consummate specimen of skilful argument, and of powerful persuasion and remonstrance."

It is grateful to reflect, at the moment when skepticism is, for the first time among us, openly casting off the authority of this valuable portion of God's word, that the established canon and Orthodox interpretation of the sacred volume, rest on an immovable basis, which appears deeper and broader as its foundations are more thoroughly examined.

A second reason why we are happy to receive these volumes is, that *they will convince the friends of vital religion in all parts of our country, that evangelical sentiments have no more strenuous or intelligent advocates than exist near the tombs of the Pilgrims.*

Whether from conviction, or policy, or both, we will not say, but from some motive the fact has been, that repeated efforts have been made in this vicinity to spread abroad the impression, that the Andover Professors, and especially Professor Stuart, were fast approaching Unitarianism. But, poor men! they did not know it. We have some doubts whether the Letters to Dr. Channing, and this Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, have been received as very promising first fruits of critical investigations and Unitarian tendencies. We have heard less of late

than in former years of this gradual Orthodox approximation to Unitarian sentiments. Still the impression has been made abroad; and the fact, that the Orthodox of New England, while they retain all the fundamental doctrines of the Reformation, have renounced some exceptionable philosophical explanations, and have varied their phraseology and, as they believe, simplified, and rendered more perspicuous the statement of those doctrines, has tended to deepen this impression in some parts of our country. The present volumes will help to remove whatever of such erroneous impressions may yet remain. On some points of minor importance (and such we conceive that discussed in the second Excursus,) differences of opinion may yet exist among those, who in great fundamental doctrines, are agreed. Perhaps the next generation will be nearer in agreement even here than the present, though we cannot but feel that under whatever advantages others may be placed, they too, as well as we, will see but in part, and know but in part. It is only when purified from the pollutions of sin, the clogs of mortality cast from us, and admitted to behold, admire, and adore the unveiled glories of the Godhead, that we shall know even as we are known. Meanwhile we are happy in the belief that the modesty and unassuming spirit exhibited in the present volumes, connected as they are with the various learning, the laborious research and discriminating acumen, indicated on every page, will have a tendency to bring into friendly contact even conflicting opinions. What we have just said suggests another general reason why we rejoice in the appearance of these volumes.

It is because *they present a finished specimen of exegetical criticism, by which we may hope future interpreters of the sacred volume will be assisted and guided.*

The design of this Commentary will be best perceived from the language of Professor Stuart himself.

“It will be understood that the work is designed for students in theology, and for those who engage in a truly critical study of the Scriptures. With commentaries designed for the edification of Christian readers at large, I believe the English world is better supplied than any other part of Christendom. Henry, Patrick, Guise, Orton, Doddridge, Brown, Clark, Scott, and others, have published works of this nature. It is not my design to occupy the ground, which they have already occupied. The reader of my work must not expect sermonizing commentary, but an attempt at philological and critical interpretation. *Cuique suum.* I bless God for raising up such commentators as those just mentioned, for Christians at large; but the professed interpreters of his word need other aid, and that very different from what their works afford, in order to attain a fundamentally critical knowledge of the original Scriptures.”

The expectations thus raised, these volumes will not disappoint. Works of this stamp are notoriously few in the English language, and generally of an inferior and unsatisfactory character. Campbell's Four Gospels is among the best, and is certainly a work of much value; but after all, its greatest merit, as we conceive, lies

in its prefaces and preliminary dissertations. These contain much valuable information, and a judicious discussion of many important principles. Campbell possessed a fine natural tact for criticism, as is apparent in many of his notes; but his biblical, philological, and critical apparatus, and, of course, his attainments, were incomplete, and much inferior to those now possessed by writers of far less gifted minds. In his translation, we think he was least successful. His principles are generally sound, but his practice does not always correspond. He does not seem to have felt, however he may have reflected, that *alteration* is not synonymous with *amendment*. Where the received version is definite, perspicuous and correct, we would by no means depart from it in a new translation. Why then should Campbell substitute, "Happy the clean in heart, for they shall see God," for that beautiful passage, as it stands in our common version? We do not perceive that anything is gained by the change; we feel that much is lost.

However little respect we may entertain for the theological opinions of Wakefield, and however little confidence we may repose in his translation, wherever those opinions are concerned, we must still say, that we respect his translation, because he respected the common translation. We will also add, that a critical and judicious scholar may derive advantage from the labors of Wakefield. His acquaintance with the Syriac, Coptic, Æthiopic, Arabic, and Persian languages, was not without benefit to his Version. But whoever will compare his translation of the epistle to the Hebrews, and the notes appended to it, with the translation and notes by Professor Stuart, will find sufficient reason to believe that Wakefield "saw not yet all things." Macknight in his translation of the epistles essayed a more difficult task than Campbell, and succeeded less happily. His mind was both less discriminating and less capacious, than that of his predecessor. Still the effort was meritorious and not without benefit. Their works are the only ones we now recall, in general circulation, designed by the writers for the higher purposes of critical philology.

It will be perceived by these remarks, that there is a mighty gap in English theological literature; a gap, which we know no one so well qualified to fill, as the writer, whose volumes are before us. From what we had known of Prof. Stuart's critical attainments and exegetical ability, our expectations in regard to this work were high. They have not been disappointed. The translation, considered simply as such, hits our *beau idéal* of what a translation should be exactly. It is designed to be a *fac simile*, not indeed of the words, but of the sense, of the original.

Professor Stuart is neither a metaphrast nor a paraphrast, neither an Arias Montanus, nor a Castalio. *Medium tenere beati*. Neither has he been ambitious of departing from the common translation, wherever that expresses the meaning of the original Greek

as accurately, (and this it generally does) as any other language would express it. There is an air of venerableness and sanctity about the common version, which we regret to have dissipated, and would never renounce, except for that of which it is but the shadow, *truth*. Professor Stuart seems to have been actuated by similar views. The version in common use is the basis of his translation, of which, were we to judge merely by the words it employs, we should call it a revision, rather than a new translation. This, in our view, instead of diminishing, augments its value. We think the Professor judicious also in adhering to the Saxon idiom of our language. We can with difficulty forgive the great English lexicographer the injuries he inflicted on our mother tongue, by his classical prejudices. But while the Bible, in the garb of "good old English undefiled," cheers and instructs the mass of British and American readers, in town and country, in hall and hovel, it will continue to regulate not only the sentiments and the manners, but the *language* also, of those who early acquire a familiarity with its contents, and a reverence for its costume. To preserve an equipoise between classical and Saxon English, we will throw Johnson's Dictionary into one scale, and the Bible into the other. We are glad that the version by Professor Stuart, will not diminish the weight in the scale we should be happy to see preponderate.

Though these volumes are nominally confined to a Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, including an introduction and translation, their value is by no means thus limited. In Ernesti and Morus, from the same hand, we have the abstract principles, the skeleton of Interpretation; here we have those principles illustrated and applied; we have a living, animated exemplification of their meaning; and practice is ever and everywhere more powerful than precept. These volumes will do more for the science of Interpretation, as such, than the able Manual of Hermeneuticks just mentioned. We are glad to have such a work put into our hands, in the language in which "our infantile caprices were soothed," in a good old homely English dress. We feel more at our ease, and more certain that we apprehend the meaning of the writer, than when reading in the language of modern Germany or ancient Rome. We may be told by scholars that the Latin of the Rosenmüllers, Titmann, Kuinoel, &c., is easy. This may be so. But English is *easier*, and more certainly intelligible. Nor can we refrain from adding, that Storr's Latin, and Noesselt's also, is often to us well nigh, and sometimes altogether unintelligible. This may only show our ignorance; but as we are seeking for a critical knowledge of the Scriptures, which neither we nor the great body of biblical interpreters can obtain "in an unknown tongue," we rejoice in the opening prospect that we shall soon have the op-



portunity of obtaining it, in a language with which we are familiar and at home.

We cannot stop to examine any portion of the volumes before us as verbal critics. But we will mention, in general, one trait of them with which we have been particularly struck. We refer to the light they throw upon the idiom of the New Testament; we might also add, upon the nature, force, and exact intent of the Greek particles. Whoever has studied the Greek language critically must have felt, that these are fugitives, fleet of foot, and difficult of apprehension. They are the nerves, the feelers, the *antennae* of language, which sometimes convey its living principle, and at other times are apparently lifeless and useless, deriding the laborious ingenuity that would detect their office. We think Professor Stuart has been more successful in apprehending these vagrants, than any scriptural commentator with whom we are acquainted. He has fastened them to their seats, while he has taken their reluctant and evanescent likenesses. All future philological miniature painters will do well to make this Commentary "a study." The collateral benefits which will spring from this work, we confidently anticipate will be many and great; we trust they will soon be realized, and be permanent in duration.

Another source of felicitation at the appearance of these volumes is, *they will show the British public that something can be done for the advancement of theology in a free government, without a church establishment or church revenues.*

Paley had too much good sense, and too much skill as a logician, to rest the claims of the English Establishment on the High Church principle of an exclusive, divine and divinely transmitted right. We go much further, and altogether deny the expediency of such an establishment. We cannot here argue the subject at length, or even state the general principles from which we deduce our conclusion. Nor is there any necessity for such a discussion in our pages. But we would thank any intelligent Englishman to point out to us the benefits which have accrued to the public from the theological labors of the recent Metropolitan of all England, or from the present incumbents of Canterbury and York. Why, we desire to know, should these elevated dignitaries rise thus high, rather from intrinsic levity, than inherent strength; rather from their political connexions, than from their attainments in ethics and theology? We have heard that the Minister, in the appointment of an Archbishop, selects an individual, whose qualifications are powerful family connexions, and moderate personal abilities; one who, while he may help forward the wheels of government, will cheerfully permit others to regulate their course. If we mistake not, the present Archbishop of Dublin (Magee) was chosen by regal rather than ministerial influence. This appointment does honor to the King. Those most strenuously opposed to

him in theological opinions must admit his talents and learning, and respect his general character. We cannot speak of *his* predecessors; but it is a fact worth noticing, that of nearly forty archbishops of York, since the Reformation, not one, either before or after his "enthronement," did aught for the advancement of theological science, though a few of them were apparently active ministers, as well as devoted servants, of the Lord Jesus Christ. Cardinal Wolsey is the only individual among them who has a name, and this, while it awakens remembrances,

"Sad, high, and working, full of state and woe,"

suggests nothing to diminish our regret, that the Protestant Episcopal church still continues, as it was three centuries ago, the menial and slave of the state. It is doubtful whether the book, known by the name of 'The whole Duty of Man,' was not written by one of this number. This, if we mistake not, is the amount of theological contributions, now accessible to the public, by his Grace of York, from Henry the Eighth to George the Fourth inclusive. We suppose his revenues during this period cannot have been less than twenty millions of dollars; a sum quite sufficient for the questionable production of a book of not very questionable character. It will be seen that each Archbishop, on an average, has drawn from the people five hundred thousand dollars, for which we shall seek in vain any adequate return. We must not, however, involve the whole episcopal bench in indiscriminate censure. Canterbury presents some names that would have rendered a Professorship illustrious, or a curacy beloved. Still we regret to state a fact, which is unhappily too true, that from the days of Bishop Lowth, the whole English church have done almost nothing for the advancement of a critical acquaintance with the Scriptures. We do not detract from the merit of the learned but intolerant Bishop of Peterborough, nor of the miscellaneous Horne; neither do we forget the names or the efforts of Newcome, Horsley, Blaney, and Wintle, when we make this assertion. Whoever is acquainted with the present condition of critical inquiries and theological opinion among first rate scholars in Germany, England and the United States, will at once admit, that none of the names just recited, except that of Lowth, and perhaps that of Marsh, and possibly that of Newcome, have had, or deserved to have, much influence.

It is indeed a subject of curious reflection, to notice the origin and extension of biblical criticism. The English divines seem to have been satisfied with *commencing* investigations, leaving it to continental inquirers to pursue and complete them. Mill and Kennicott, in default of successors in England, bequeathed their treasures to Kuster, Bengel, Wetstein, Matthai, Alter, Birch, Griesbach, De Rossi, and others of less note. Woide and Kipling performed an acceptable service with meritorious fidelity and competent

ability. But neither they nor Bowyer will take a prominent place among the philologists, biblical critics, or scientific interpreters, who have sprung up in clusters, during the last half century, in the father-land of the Reformation. Let any one examine the work of Professor Stuart under review, or "The Scripture Testimony to the Messiah," by John Pye Smith, and he will see, at a glance, that both these writers have derived their principal assistances, not from British, but from continental sources. Were Dr. Smith a bishop, and not an unpretending Dissenter, his book would not have remained on the hands of his publisher, scarcely saleable at half price. This fact is trumpet-tongued, in proclaiming the degradation of critical science in Great Britain. We are reminded by association of the opinion which Waller, the poet, early gave of *Paradise Lost*. "The old blind schoolmaster, John Milton, hath published a tedious poem on the Fall of Man; if its length be not considered a merit, it has no other." How many "stalled prehends" of the present moment entertain a similar opinion of Dr. Smith's unequalled work, we know not; but we cannot help raising a monitory voice, feeble though it be from the distance, drowned though it be by the roar of an interposing Atlantic, warning those, who are glorying in the fame of the Waltons, and Hammonds, and Lightfoots of other ages, to beware, lest while they are vainly striving to give importance and value to a theological work of Milton, that deserves only to be forgotten, they pronounce not their own condemnation, in slighting the most finished effort of the most highly cultivated theological mind, that now enlightens and adorns Great Britain.

The "Prellections on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews" had probably a greater effect in Germany, in producing a zest for the literary study of the Scriptures, than any other single work published the last century. In England, Bishop Lowth was the first and the last of his own school. No translation has appeared in England, since that of *Isaiah* by Lowth, which can sustain a reputable comparison with that of the book of *Job*, by Mr. Noyes. With some slight exceptions, this latter is very much what we could wish it to be.

It is worthy of note, that, in respect to other studies, remarks like those just made relative to biblical efforts, would hold equally true. It was for Europe to present her Eulers, and Bernouillis, and Paris her La Place, to develope whatever of principles in *Mathematicks*, and to occupy whatever of space in the science of *Astronomy*, Newton had left vacant. We regret not to add, that England has had few names enulous of the note of Collins, Tindal, &c., while unfortunately the continent has been flooded with such aspirants after fame, who with unblushing effrontery, have retailed those objections as new, which have long since been exploded, as untruths or absurdities.

In the absence of first rate biblical scholars in the Church of England (and such we do not consider Bloomfield, Burgess and Sumner, while the rest of the bishops are *turba sine nomine*,) blessed as she is with such venerable universities, with her Bodleian and royal libraries, and with her scientific and classical scholars; we are happy that New England is not thus destitute. We are happy, also in passing, to render a tribute of merited respect to that unrivalled genius, and self-created prodigy, Professor Lee. His influence has been already great, in disturbing "the peaceful slumbers of the venerable university," which has honored itself in honoring him. Professor Lee, has as yet done more for the cause of Bibles, than for the biblical cause; has done more, we mean, to translate the text, and superintend the printing, than to illustrate the meaning of the sacred Scriptures.

The volumes of Professor Stuart will claim a place for the writer, unless we greatly err, by the side of the Bentleys and Porsons—yes, above them, in some most important respects; we mean in actual value, and general permanent interest. If, to prove the Letters of Phalaris a forgery were important, and called forth all the acquisitions and energies of Bentley's well-stored mind; if to settle the text and illustrate the meaning of a few Tragedies of Euripides, or of a solitary verse in the New Testament, called into exercise all the talents and attainments of the far-famed Porson; surely, to settle the disputed questions concerning the epistle to the Hebrews, and to illustrate its full meaning, is, in itself, a task neither less difficult nor less important, and we are bold to say has been executed in a manner, not less satisfactory to well read, impartial scholars, not less reputable for the author, and far more beneficial to mankind. We hazard the prediction, that when this work is known in Germany, (and known ere this it probably is,) the decision of the most competent judges in that land of scholars will place it in the very front rank of the critical productions of this or of any age. Were the Professor a young man, and liable to assume airs by applause, we should be more guarded in our statements for his individual sake. We trust he realizes that it is a small thing, *a very small thing*, to receive the approbation of him, whose breath is in his nostrils, and who perishes before the moth; that there is a higher tribunal than that of earthly criticism, at which he must answer for the talents he has received, the opportunities he has enjoyed, the influence he has exerted, and the motives by which he has been actuated.

But we believe it to be our duty thus publicly to express our full convictions, when circumstances call for it, and no injury is to be apprehended. We deem it our bounden duty, as guardians of Sacred Literature, faithfully to notice the signs of the times; and it is specially grateful in the commencement of our efforts to build the old waste places, and to raise up the foundations of former gen-

erations, to notice a work having so auspicious a bearing on the interests and the progress of truth. Other works may be more immediately popular, but *this is a contribution to the permanent theological treasures of the English language*. Scholars alone may be able at first to appreciate its merit, or even relish its elaborate discussions; but its ultimate influence will be felt in the pulpit, the Bible class, and the Sabbath school, and thus through all classes of the community. It is thus with the fundamental works in other sciences. Truths which cost Newton days and months of continued thought to prove, are now received as first principles in the mechanic's lecture room, if not condensed into an apothegm for young remembrance in the infant school.

We rejoice for the honor of New England, free in all its institutions, without a church establishment, tythes or revenue, that such a work has come forth from the Andover Seminary within twenty years from its establishment; a work destined to be the "Principia" of philological theology, not only in the land of the Pilgrims, but wherever their language shall be read. The old world can expect no Syriac, Coptic, or Gothic versions to be found, no Alexandrine, Vatican, or Beza manuscripts to be collated in the new; but if, while they send us the *text*, we send them back the *meaning*, they will, we doubt not, think our obligations fully discharged. We trust the Professor will proceed as he has begun, and discharge American obligations so successfully that European critics will feel the debt to be on their side, and task themselves to throw it back. In this amicable contest, we are sure of the emulous sympathies of all the friends of revealed truth beyond the waters. This will afford another exemplification of what the venerable Burder, with reference to American and British missionary efforts, termed the Holy War.

Before the appearance of Professor Stuart's second volume in Boston, the first had been republished in London. The estimate there put upon it is the same as our own. We have already in a preceding number noticed the opinion of Dr. Smith, who in our judgement is the scholar of the day most competent rightly to appreciate its value. We believe Dr. Smith's opinion had reference to the whole work. The Elements of Interpretation before referred to, has been republished some time since in England, and adopted as a text book at a Dissenting theological school near London. The System of Theology by Dr. Dwight has already passed through some twelve or fourteen British editions, one of which issued from the press at Halifax, N. S. The Doctor, though dead, we are credibly informed, yet speaketh from many a British pulpit, into which he might personally have found some difficulty of admittance, while living. If the English clergy will not write their own sermons, but "by hook or by crook" appropriate to themselves the labors of others, we have no regrets that the theologian

of Yale, rather than the novelist of Edinburgh, should supply the demand. But if, while Dr. Dwight is teaching from the English pulpit and in the parlor, Professor Stuart is instructing in their theological schools, each in his respective department without an equal or a rival from ten thousand beneficed clergymen, we think "the church, as by law established," had better look about for the necessity of its alliance with the state. Some other reasons must be discovered than even the ingenious Paley could present, or this alliance will ere long begin to be thought unnecessary, unnatural, unholy, and therefore intolerable.

On the subject of church establishments, we believe that many of the most intelligent and the best clergyman, both of South and North Britain, have yet an important lesson to learn. We speak not from books, nor hearsay rumor, but from intercourse free and unrestrained with individuals of name and character. We were struck with the fact, that in a conversation on this subject, with Dr. Chalmers, he appealed to the necessities of our Western States, as laid open by Mills, in evidence that something besides voluntary effort was required to meet the present and anticipate the future wants of a growing population. We mention this fact in this connexion, not to enter into any explanations which are here perfectly well understood, but to present an additional motive to the friends of domestic missions, to persevere in their efforts to send out messengers of glad tidings, whose voice "shall reach every log hut beyond the Mountains." We are, in these States, trying an experiment, which is not only to convince the enemies, but many of the warmest and most enlightened friends, of religion, that the kingdom of Christ is indeed not of this world; that his Gospel is most salutary and most influential in its agencies, unaided and unimpeded by legislative enactments, and municipal regulations. If, in our hands, the experiment fail, where, when, how, can it succeed? If the light that is in us prove darkness, how great will be that darkness! how destructive to human effort! how blighting to human hope! how terribly disastrous to the temporal freedom and eternal happiness of our race! We are called upon, then, by the most urgent motives which can influence us, not only as patriots, but as philanthropists, as lovers of our country and friends of humanity, as lovers of Christ and of those for whom Christ died, of those that now live and of those who shall come up to take their places in all future time, to strain every nerve, to tax ourselves to the utmost, not merely in a pecuniary, but in a civil, social, moral, intellectual, religious sense, to send out the light of God's word which beams upon us in its purity, to others within our borders, who are in perilous danger of perishing for lack of vision. Having fallen upon this most important practical subject, we could not say less; our limits forbid us to say more.

An additional reason for the happiness we experience at receiving these volumes is, *they have already compelled the opponents of inspiration to take new and open ground against the sacred Scriptures.*

It is matter of deep regret that any among us should cast off the authority of any portion of God's most holy word. It is painful to reflect in what professed school of the prophets this infidel development has been made. The aggrieved spirits of Winthrop and Cotton pass before us, clothed in habiliments of woe. The shade of Harvard accepts no monument from the hands of those, who would wrest from the word of God a rich portion of its sacred truth, that they may tear the crown from the head of his Lord, before whom he bows in purity and in glory. Did we not know that it is the province of that God, who hideth himself, who doeth wonders, whose ways are past finding out, to bring good out of evil, to cause the light to shine out of darkness, we should feel, at this defection from the principles of our Puritan fathers, not merely an oppressive sadness of heart, but a questioning of Providence, that would border hard on unbelief. As it is, we hear a voice saying, "Be still, and know that I am God;" and we bow with humble reverence to the will of him in whose hands are the hearts of men, and against whom the devices of men, secret or open, shall not prosper.

Much as we regret the dereliction of Cambridge, we are glad it is at last brought to light. If we must have enemies, we greatly prefer that they take an open and avowed stand against us, rather than that they pass themselves off for professed friends, with traitorous intentions. We rejoice to identify ourselves and our hopes with the word of God. The volumes of Prof. Stuart show that we are no enemies to sacred criticism in its legitimate exercise, no enemies to truly rational investigation and liberal inquiry. But, if the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do? And who so effectually destroy the certain foundation of human hope, as those who pronounce the written record of eternal truth an enigma, and send us back for light and instruction from the revelations of those who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, to the mute elements of inanimate unconscious matter? No sooner was the first volume of Professor Stuart's work published, which placed on an immovable basis the canonicalness and apostolical origin of the epistle to the Hebrews, than the American reformers, who, if we are to trust their professions, are emulous of perfecting the work commenced by Luther and Calvin, come out with the discovery that this epistle is a cheat, a deception, having no claim, nor shadow of a claim, to a place in the sacred volume. This has been known to these intrepid reformers, these fearless searchers after truth, for years. The public, however, were not sufficiently enlightened

\* See Christian Examiner, vol. v. pp. 19, 20.

(*darkened?*) to receive it. The early Oriental, Egyptian, Grecian, and Roman churches, Clemens Romanus, Justin Martyr, Pantaenus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Jerome, Augustine, &c. &c. were all in egregious error, not merely in ascribing this epistle to Paul, but *in allowing it to be canonical*. To evade this conclusion, their characters must be blasted, or their testimony misrepresented. The forgery, which imposed upon the companion of Paul, "whose name was written in the book of life," upon the bosom friends, and immediate successors of James and Peter, and upon the most intelligent and inquisitive minds of the primitive church, separated from each other widely in space and in many articles of belief and practice,—this forgery is so evident, that in a liberal Review of Prof. Stuart's first volume, it was not deemed necessary to notice an argument in its favor, or to throw out a hint that anything could be said in its defence.

Unitarianism makes great pretensions to an enlarged liberality of mind, to freedom from prejudice and openness to conviction, to candor, to willingness to hear, not only both sides, but *all* sides. The claims put in by the Orthodox for these praiseworthy qualities, appropriated to themselves by Unitarians, no doubt often appear to their opponents exaggerated, if not entirely unfounded. Professions, our readers must be well aware, whether made by the Liberal or the Evangelical party, are of little value, unless they correspond with practice. Let us apply this touchstone to the case before us. Should we not have a right to expect that in a Unitarian Review, designed for, and circulating among, Unitarians principally, many of whom will not be able, if they are disposed, to read Professor Stuart's Introduction, the opportunity would be taken, not to mistake one side of a question of great importance, but to state both sides fairly and impartially, leaving it for rational Christians to adopt that conclusion, for which the evidence preponderates in their own minds, with the whole subject before them? Should we not also expect that the Professor of Sacred Literature at Andover, if he would weigh evidence in equal scales and with an impartial hand, would not merely bring forward arguments for the side of a question espoused by himself and his associates, but would fairly and manfully meet whatever could be opposed to his position. In which case anticipation would, and in which case it would not, correspond with fact, it is not necessary for us to state. We cannot forbear, however, urging those of our intelligent readers, who may be in doubt relative to the character and the claims of the systems which now divide this community, to institute an inquiry, relative to the mode of argument pursued in the Theological Schools at Andover and Cambridge, which have resulted, at the former in the reception, and at the latter in rejection, of the epistle to the Hebrews.



Perhaps, now the second volume of Professor Stuart's work is published, the reviewer, who took occasion from the title of the first volume to present the argument against Paul as the author of the epistle, may find an opportunity to complete his labor, and throw further light upon the great question of Revelation. We must, however, be permitted to suggest the propriety of a reviewer at least reading the work he professes to review. The writer alluded to does not pretend to have read the work, the title of which heads his articles in the *Christian Examiner*. The Orthodox, however little they anticipate that their argument will weigh with determined Unitarians, do yet expect, and think they have a right to demand, that their arguments, offered in behalf of what has been considered an inspired portion of God's word for seventeen hundred years, will be at least fully stated, and candidly considered, by those who claim to be in an especial sense the enlightened theologians of our country and of the age. We do not ask them to adopt our conclusions without satisfactory evidence of their truth. But we do ask those, on whom the brighter light of Unitarianism has beamed so effulgently, to show that the evidence we have adduced is unsatisfactory. The reviewer in the *Christian Examiner* does not deign to notice the arguments of Professor Stuart, and apparently had not read them. We think this view the most charitable we can take of his conduct; for had he read the volumes before us, he could have placed no confidence in an argument, which he must have felt to be nothing; and he would not have fallen into some very palpable errors, which resulted from his following Lardner rather than Stuart. We will give an example of what we mean. He quotes an epistle of Jerome, and refers to it in his note, as though he had consulted the original. It is, according to him, *ad Evangelium*. If he had looked into Stuart, or Jerome himself, he would have seen the mistake, and quoted it correctly, *ad Evagrium*. But, relying on Lardner, who had so quoted Jerome, he fell into this blunder. The mistake is slight and unimportant, we allow. Neither do we mean to question the learning or talents of the writer. But ingenuity is not ingenuousness; neither is a plausible defence of system a candid search for truth. Porson, in his *Letters to Travis*, says (we quote from memory) "a labored defence of one side of a question is barely tolerable in an hired advocate." The mistake of the reviewer above pointed out may, perhaps, awake a feeling of sympathy with that particularly incautious writer, Clement of Alexandria." See *Chris. Exam.* vol. iv. p. 506. *Lardner's Works*, vol. v. p. 50. Svo. 1788. *Opera Hieronymi*, tom. I. p. 1060. Paris ed. 1609.

It surely cannot be necessary for us to show the importance of the question at issue in this discussion. Is there a God? Has he made us? Has he revealed to us his will? Where is it? What is it? In what volume is it contained? Of what books is it composed? Of all the

questions which can arrest an intelligent, immortal mind, these, surely, are among the first and the most important. What matters it, whether Homer was one or twenty bards? Whether Troy was ever besieged or existed, or Hector ever slain? What matters it, whether Ossian was a bard, or the fiction of a bard? What interest turns on the question, who wrote the Letters of Junius? These, and questions like these, have interested the world of cultivated mind from year to year, and from age to age—with what profit? But is it thus, when the question stands, Is this the Word of God, or not? that word, by which our characters are to be tested, our hearts to be judged, and our final everlasting destiny to be decided—or only the imposition of man, assuming a place in the word of God? To these questions there can be but one answer among the readers of our pages. To all those who are desirous of knowing, whether the epistle to the Hebrews is part of a communication made by the God of heaven for the instruction and the guidance of man, or not, (and who can be indifferent to such a question?) we recommend the attentive perusal and comparison of the introductory volume by Professor Stuart, and the Review of it in the *Christian Examiner*.

We are happy to meet an able coadjutor in the *North American*. The reviewer in that work finds something, besides the opinion of “a particularly incautious writer,” in favor of the Pauline origin of the epistle to the Hebrews.

For ourselves, we are glad the time has come, when Unitarians are willing, in their most respectable and authoritative publication, openly to disclaim a part of the Bible, which they have heretofore *pretended* to receive. Had they, eighteen months since, been charged by the Orthodox with rejecting the epistle to the Hebrews, esteeming it a mass of mystical nonsense, doubtless some of the *uninitiated* would have come forward in the *Examiner* or *Register*, and accused the Orthodox of slandering the best men among us. Occasion would have been taken to tell us of Lardner, and how credibly and indubitably he had established this epistle. But we now have it under the “sign manual” of the most learned American Unitarian, that this epistle is a mystical jargon, totally unlike Paul, altogether incomprehensible to the great mass of readers, and wholly unworthy of the place it has occupied for seventeen centuries. Such is the effluence of “new light” which has burst on the astonished vision of those who were before groping along by the twilight which Jones, and Lardner, and Stuart, were feebly emitting. We rather suspect that the suddenness and dazzling splendor of this light combined, have taken from some Unitarians of ordinary nerves the sense of sight altogether. For we have waited a full year, and not one appears to have seen through or suspected the delusion; or, at least, no one has dared to express a doubt, or propose a question, to the master.

When Apollo has uttered his oracle, the *dii minores* may well keep silence. 'Who can come after the king?'

But as *we* do not take the "verba" of this, or of any other "magistri," for truth, we have adventured to call in question his positions, to meet assertion by evidence, and gratuitous assumption with historical fact. We trust there are some, even among Unitarians, who will weigh arguments, though offered by the Orthodox, with candor, and, as Campbell very happily has it, "sacrifice only to truth." If the arguments offered by Professor Stuart, and those we have endeavored to suggest, can be fairly met, and satisfactorily refuted, we say, Let it be done. But we trust we shall not be accounted either ignorant or bigoted, if we cannot renounce a portion of God's word, which we hold dearer than our lives, merely because a man of learning shows that

"E'en though vanquished, he can argue still."

We have entered into the discussions, presented in our preceding numbers, from a distinct perception of the truth and importance of the motto, *obsta principiis*, "resist the first encroachments." If this breach is made in the walls of our sacred citadel, we must either surrender at discretion, or sword in hand the assailing foe will press onward, carrying all before him, and giving no quarter. Full well our enemies know this; hence the fire of their artillery, and the concentrated accumulation of all their forces, upon this one point. But the gates of hell shall not prevail against that city, which is built upon a rock, having towers from which the forces and the stratagems of its assailants are all discried, having bulwarks which frown indignant defiance on the proud efforts of its puay foes. The angels of the Lord,—yea, the Lord of Hosts himself, keepeth the city; therefore they do not watch in vain who keep it.

We mean to be understood by our figurative illustration, (drawn out, perhaps, too far,) that those who reject the epistle to the Hebrews will not long retain any other portion of the sacred Scriptures, as divinely inspired. We have seen, for years, indications of no questionable kind, that the legitimate and inevitable result of Unitarianism in this vicinity must be a total denial of the inspiration and authority of the sacred writings. No intelligent Unitarian who understands his system, and who is acquainted with the history of *liberal* opinions since the Reformation, can doubt this. Those but partially informed, who are yet in leading strings, may doubt or deny it. Their more advanced brethren must humor their remaining prejudices, and must feed them with milk, as they are able to bear it. But there are those among the young, of ardent, adventurous mind, who have been educated aloof from the prejudices of moderate Calvinism, semi-Arianism, and Arianism, who will not be content with the fixtures and landmarks of the

olden time, but who will stake out their own ground, and enclose their own domain. An intelligent investigating Unitarian have fixed opinions! Sooner arrest the whirlwind, or chain up the lightning? The word is, *onward*. Paul, and Peter, and John, lived in the infancy of the human mind. Astronomy, and Chemistry, and Geology, had never expanded their provincial, sectarian spirits. There are sublime and glorious truths bursting from the harmonies of the spheres, to which their ears never listened. Who would compare the religion of Paul on Mar's Hill with that of Corinna in the capitol! How feeble the breathings of piety from the gospel and the epistles of John, compared with those of Aken-side, in his Pleasures of the Imagination! The last two sermons of Dr. Channing, intelligibly interpreted, amount to but a fraction less than this. In the Review of Storr's System of Theology in the Christian Examiner, the same ambiguous reception and doubtful commendation of the Scriptures were apparent. In the notice of Professor Stuart's work, a step has been taken, *not now to be retraced*, that narrows the vacant space between Unitarianism here, and Rationalism in Europe, to a hand's breadth. Some there are, who have heretofore ranked high in the Unitarian calendar, who, for good reasons, no doubt, have felt constrained to deny "the name and the party." Would that this may prove a favorable symptom of returning health; an indication that the waters have reached their farthest ebb, and are beginning to return. This is our wish, though we can hardly say it is our expectation.

Yet we cannot forbear asking those who have long looked upon the epistle to the Hebrews as a portion of inspired truth, who have preached from it, and expounded it as such, for twenty, thirty, forty years, if they are willing to go off the stage, and render up their account to their Master, without solemnly warning those who are soon to take their places, to beware how they reject, as an unintelligible forgery, what their fathers have clung to, as an anchor to the soul? We ask the more serious-minded Unitarian clergymen, who are either in middle age, or in the declining vale of life, if they are willing that their children, and their children's children, should reject the light which beams upon their path from the volume of God's only Son, and wander in the dreariness of universal skepticism? If you answer, No; then *Obsta Principiis*.

We will mention but one additional reason why we are pleased at the appearance of these volumes. *We receive them as a pledge of others yet in reserve.*

We earnestly hope the Professor will pursue the work he has so happily commenced, of independent translation and critical commentary. Heretofore, translators have looked too much upon the effect of their labors upon their system and party. A translator should be neither a Trinitarian nor a Unitarian, neither a Calvinist

nor an Arminian. These distinctions should all be merged in that of the patient, industrious, intelligent, candid philologist. In view of these remarks, considering the Professor's theological connexions and station, some may, perhaps, be disposed to question whether he possesses those traits of intellectual character which are indispensable for an accurate and faithful translator. But those who know his character, and his range of studies, or who have attentively examined the work before us, will allow that his claims to such qualities are at least equal to those of any other English translator of the sacred text. To expect of any one who attempts to give a new version of any part of God's word, that he should altogether disentangle himself from system, and allow no fixed opinion, no intellectual or moral bias to influence his language, is to expect what a very general experience, and what the nature of the human mind, pronounce next to impossible.

We do not say that we detect anything of this sort in the volumes before us. We thought we did in one or two instances, but have been convinced, on a more patient and extensive examination, that we were mistaken. We will not say but others may detect faults of this kind; if so, we doubt not the Professor will cheerfully revise and alter whatever may thus be shown to be erroneous. We are convinced that errors of this kind, if they exist, must be very few and very slight, or they would, ere this, have been pointed out, by the eagle-eyed opponents of the epistle to the Hebrews and of the doctrine of atonement by the blood, and salvation by the merit, of the Lord Jesus Christ. Their only resort is to deny the authority of the book. Whether the Unitarians of New England are all sufficiently *bigoted to system* to reject this epistle, because it establishes a faith directly the reverse of theirs, remains to be seen. If they are not, the opportunity is now fairly offered them to come forward and explain this epistle consistently with their views, and expose the incorrectness of the translation; or yield their assent to the truths it establishes. The occasion is important, the call imperative. If they decline the task, will some one inform the public why it is not undertaken?

It will be seen by the whole course of our remarks, that we look upon the present state of the discussion between Unitarians and the Orthodox as having nearly reached its final issue, viz. *are the Scriptures the authoritative rule of our faith and practice?* All other questions are subordinate to this. Once admit the sacred Scriptures to contain the true word and authoritative will of God, to be interpreted according to the usual rules of interpreting human language, and Unitarianism is at an end. It never has stood, and it never can stand, before this tribunal. It degenerates into Neology, (another name for Theism) or returns to Orthodoxy. Semler or Storr, Eichhorn or Knapp, Wegscheider or Tholuck, are severally the representatives of liberal or of evangelical senti-

ments, followed out to their appropriate results. American Unitarians, who stand blindfolded on this perilous precipice, may charge us with a want of candor in thus fathering upon them the Rationalism of Wegscheider. We are greatly mistaken, however, if the foundation on which they stand is not already crumbling beneath them. The last foothold is giving way. Happy will it be, if in the whirling dizziness of their descent, they be not drawn irrecoverably and forever within the vortex of a blank infidelity, or an unintelligible pantheism, or a dreary, cheerless, heartless, hopeless atheism.

We speak thus, we trust, not in bitterness, nor in the heat of discussion, nor to subserve any interests of party merely; but to express our sober, solemn convictions. We do hope there are some, among even the younger class of Unitarians, who will think seriously and *pray devoutly*, before they conclude to follow their leaders in rejecting a portion of divine truth which has for centuries enlightened the minds and purified the hearts of millions, who now bow before the throne of God and the Lamb in the highest heavens. Would you join that happy throng? Beware how you depart from the path they pursued in their ascent to glory. One false step may, *this false step will*, lead you to ruin. Believing this, we are thus urgent in expressing our serious and most deliberate convictions.

We have unintentionally digressed; but the infinite importance of the subject would justify a still wider digression. We repeat our wishes, and we will add our hopes, that Professor Stuart will go on as he has begun. We believe he is familiar with the adage, *Nil actum, &c.* We trust he will forget what he has done, and remember only what yet remains to be accomplished. If he will present us with the epistle to the Romans, we do not say in a style superior, but only equal to this; if we are not fully satisfied, we will be grateful. We cannot promise that when that work is performed, we will make no other exactions. The epistles to the Corinthians, the Ephesians, Philippians, Galatians; of James, Peter, John, &c. &c., will still remain. Nor do we by any means think that the labors either of Lowth or Campbell have removed the necessity of a new translation of Isaiah and the Gospels.

We have, however, seen the manuscript translation and analysis of the epistle to the Romans, and know something of the research and care and thought already expended upon it—enough to convince us, that a more desirable work is not soon to be expected than this translation, with the accompanying commentary by Professor Stuart. Biblical scholars throughout the United States, and in Great Britain also, will unite with us in the expression of earnest wishes, that the epistle to the Romans may follow that to the Hebrews as soon as possible. The introduction would be a slight labor, the translation and analysis are made, and we presume a

large proportion of the commentary is either written, or so completely in the Professor's mind, that it might easily be written out. We hope nothing will prevent its early appearance.

In the meantime, we cannot forbear adding, that the translator will feel encouraged and incited to new efforts, from the fact, that the present volumes hang not heavily on the hands of his publisher. It would be a disgrace to our national literature, and such an index of the condition of theological science among us, as we are unwilling to contemplate, if this work is not soon disposed of, handsomely compensating the labor and expense bestowed upon it. To all investigating theologians, we consider these volumes a *sine qua non*: to others, especially to scholars, they are greatly desirable. Whatever explains the charter of our eternal hopes, cannot but be valuable. In these volumes, more light is thrown upon the sacred page, than is to be found in the same compass in the English language. Surely, then, they will be found in the library of every one, who puts in a claim to theological scholarship, throughout our land.

We perceive by a note from Professor Stuart, that the Greek Commentary of Theophylact, together with a glossary and Latin translation, is prepared for the press, and only waits for patronage in order to be published. We hope this hint to our men of wealth and intelligence will not be lost. Patrons of learning like those of the old world, are yet to spring up in the new. The present occasion calls for them. Will it not create them? Who shall be the Mecenas of our republic?

In conclusion, we will only add, that the surviving founders and patrons of the Theological Seminary at Andover, and its numerous friends, have renewed occasion for thankfulness to Almighty God, for the great and various blessings it has already bestowed upon our country, the church, and the world. Let not its future prosperity and continued usefulness be forgotten in the prayers of those who love Zion, who prefer Jerusalem above their chief joy.



LECTURES ON THE RELATIONS AND DUTIES OF THE MIDDLE AGED. *By Joel Hurrey Linsley, Pastor of the South Church in Hartford.* Hartford: D. F. Robinson & Co. 1828. pp. 180.

This little volume is issued from the press in about the same style and manner as a similar volume by Mr. Hawes of the same place, entitled "Lectures to Young Men," a Review of which was published in our last number. Indeed, it is not improbable that the latter work suggested the idea of the former; nor if it did, is

the former the worse ; neither is it a bad omen for the ministers of religion thus to provoke one another to love and good works. The volume contains five Lectures. There is also an Appendix, containing extracts from another Lecture, which, as we are informed by an advertisement prefixed to the volume, "is suppressed, from a conviction, that the copiousness and increasing importance of some of the topics which it embraces, demand a more extended discussion." In introducing our readers to an acquaintance with these Lectures, we shall present an outline of them, in their order, including some specimens of the author's manner, with accompanying and concluding remarks. The author uses a text as the foundation of each Lecture, though with rather more latitude than is usual in common sermons.

In the first Lecture, we are presented with "a general view of the relations and responsibilities of the middle aged." By middle aged, he means "all those who, having passed the period of minority, and begun to act a part for themselves in the world, still continue in the active discharge of their various callings and duties." In this number he includes "all, generally, between the ages of twenty-five and sixty." In illustrating the subject of this Lecture, Mr. L. brings into view "the peculiar station held by the middle aged," and "the important influence which they must necessarily exert." Having spoken of the young as not yet arrived to the active duties of life, and of the aged as retired from them, Mr. L. observes:

"Our appeal is to those, in whose hands, and under whose control, are all the weighty concerns and mightiest moral influences of society ; who are bearing the ark of our civil and religious freedom ; and who are now deciding what shall be the moral and social condition of our children and descendants through successive generations." pp. 10, 11.

To show the importance of the station and influence of the middle aged, Mr. L. speaks of them, as those from whom we are to choose our legislators, magistrates, and ministers of justice ; as those who control public sentiment, through the press and the pulpit ; and as those who, as parents, guardians, masters, employers, or patrons, preside over the destinies of the opening and rising generation. These topics he illustrates by sensible and serious remarks, bringing us, at length, to a solemn and impressive conclusion—a conclusion to which we wish every middle aged person to be brought again and again, till he feels the weight of his responsibilities as he has never felt them, and devotes himself afresh to his divine Master, and his work.

The second and third Lectures are both on the important subject of Education. In the second, Mr. L. treats of "*physical education*," or the *training of the body*. If we understand him, he



confines his views principally to the nursery, which we think is confining them in quite too narrow limits. We do not doubt the existence of the evil of which he complains, and we believe that parents, and mothers especially, ought to inform themselves, and take good heed, that the food, clothing, and exercise of their little ones, be such as to promote the greatest bodily vigor. But we believe, also, that physical education, particularly in females, and those preparing for sedentary life, ought to be extended up to the time when the constitution comes to its perfection in full growth.

From physical education, Mr. L. passes to "education in the more popular sense;" the object of which, according to him, (and we agree with him) is, not merely the *cultivation* of the human powers, but the cultivation of them, "*with a view to some specific and useful result.*"

"To promote the true excellence of the individual—to render him alike a blessing to himself and to the community—to train him to just and enlarged views of his relations and responsibilities as an accountable being; and to accustom him to aspire by the faithful discharge of all his duties, private, social, and religious, after real honor and enjoyment in the life that now is, and immortal blessedness in that which is to come—these, as you have already been reminded, are the true ends of education: and these ends ought to be kept constantly in view, in the education of *all*, whatever rank they may occupy, or whatever stations they may be destined to fill." pp. 38, 39.

Mr. L. enters a complaint in this Lecture against the low estimation in which education is held by the middling class of society. We quote a few of his remarks.

"I say then, brethren, there has been utterly a fault among parents. It has been a common error among them to take defective views of the future relations and obligations of their children; and by mistaking or lowering the true end of education, to undervalue its importance. They have too little regarded the dignity and happiness of their children, as intellectual and thinking beings; and far too little their general influence and usefulness in society. Ought not every parent to desire, and aim, to make his children, when they come forward into the world, extensively respected in the community? Ought he not to do all in his power to give weight to their influence, as well as to render this influence of the most salutary kind? And will not that young man come forward into life with the best prospects, and other things being equal, exert the best influence, whose intellectual and moral powers have been the most cultivated; whose mind has been stored with general knowledge; and who, from his earliest years, has been taught to live, not merely for himself, but under an enlarged view of his various relations, to prepare himself to act a noble and useful part in the world? Surely there is no room for doubt or debate upon this point." pp. 44, 45.

The plan of education, recommended by Mr. L., we highly approve. While it is by no means to "encroach upon the time necessary to acquire a competent share of knowledge and skill in the particular branch of business designed to be pursued;" it yet provides, that those concerned should feel interested to make the most of what time they have; keep education constantly in view; and seize every opportunity that offers for improvement. This done, and our author justly concludes, all is done. We agree with him

in the opinion that education should be begun early, as early, indeed, as the mind begins to open; and that it should be prosecuted more and more as the mind continues to open. In this manner we are to follow the developement of the powers, till they come to maturity, and the mind is stored with knowledge, settled in good habits, and fitted for usefulness and enjoyment.

The third Lecture is on the subject of "moral culture." The particular object of the author, is to point out "some of the *more prominent causes of failure* in the great business of moral education. These, as he presents them, are, want of early attention to the subject; want of system; want of consistency; want of early correction of wrong tempers and habits; influence of bad companions; and not establishing the character on the proper Scriptural basis. Under each of these heads, the author has valuable remarks, illustrative of the general subject. Under that of want of consistency, are the following:

"Of what value are the cold lectures of such parents on the worth of the soul, and the superiority of moral to pecuniary considerations? and what influence will they have in forming the views and the decisions of the child, when weighed against this daily practical comment wholly of a different character, and speaking a totally opposite language?.....How often do we hear parents use language not unlike this. 'I am going to place my child with such a person, in this, or in that situation. I do not altogether like the place. His employer is not a man of principle; and I fear he will not have correct sentiments instilled into his mind; that he will not always hear the most decorous language, or have exhibited before him the fairest examples of virtue; but the situation is a very advantageous one. My child's master is skilled in his art, and is a thorough man of business; and more than all, he makes him the fairest offers, and will probably be the means of setting him up in the world.' The situation is therefore chosen, and the child, at a highly susceptible age, is consigned over to the most pernicious moral influences, with perhaps a solemn charge not to suffer his mind to be affected by them. This is not fancy, but melancholy fact. Conduct strongly resembling this, is not unfrequently exhibited; and however consistent it may be with kindness of heart, the wisdom it evinces resembles nothing so much as that of a parent who should precipitate his child into the crater of a volcano,—charging him at the same time to guard himself against the assaults of the fiery waves that rolled below." pp. 78, 80.

The fourth Lecture is on "the relations and duties of masters." It is a very interesting discussion, and the more so, from the novelty of the subject. The master's relation, as here exhibited, is certainly a very responsible and important one. The numbers usually under a master; his influence over them, and their relation to life and business; the difficulties in the way of a master's faithful discharge of duty, arising from bad education in some youth, and from restlessness, and the desire of change, in all, at a certain age: and the greater evils, in too many masters themselves, of want of interest in education and morality, want of government, and neglect to provide for the right improvement of those under their care:—these, and things of this sort, either glanced at, or distinctly brought to view by our author, must, we think, make his fourth Lecture one of the most useful in the volume, especially to

those for whom it was particularly designed. We greatly misjudge, if many a master, who may have intended to be conscientious and faithful, do not find, on reading this Lecture, that he has hitherto failed—very much failed in the discharge of his duty.

Proceeding with the same topic, Mr. L. suggests “such principles and limits on the subject of reform, as may be useful to all those who seek to know that they may *do* their duty.” His hints are, that the master’s relation be rendered “more *paternal* ;” that apprentices “be regularly bound *as such* ;” that spirituous liquors be excluded from the shop, and other places of labor ; that no journeymen be employed who “frequent taverns, groceries, victualling cellars, or other similar establishments ;” that masters, not only keep the Sabbath themselves, and attend in their proper places on the public worship of God, but cause all under them, and in their employ, to do the same ; and that “leisure hours” be devoted faithfully to improvement, and that young men be not allowed to spend them, as too many do, in dissipation and vice. Add to these things, our author suggests “the propriety of adopting some plan to render the money, from time to time given to apprentices, the instrument of good, rather than as it now is, the means of a decidedly bad influence ;” and he would never, as a general thing, have money given, except for “*known and specific objects*.” He recommends, moreover, the plan suggested by Dr. Franklin, of having “a faithful apprentices’ fund.” Finally, he would have all masters come up, at once, to “the duty of making every reasonable effort to improve the minds, to enlarge the views, and elevate the aims of the youth under their care.”

In the conclusion of this Lecture, Mr. L. addresses the young in terms of glowing interest, to which we wish every apprentice and clerk in our country might lend a listening ear, and a prayerful heart :

“In all that I have said, I have had in view your intellectual and moral improvement, the elevation of your character, your augmented usefulness, and highest happiness. Both experience and observation have taught me the dangers of youth. I know them to be many and great. I tremble—instinctively tremble, when I look back to that yawning gulf, upon the borders of which, I once heedlessly traced my steps, and down whose awful abyss I have lived to see some of those who were once my companions, make the last—the *fatal plunge*. To young men, during the period of their minority, no mercy can be greater than that of being rescued from their own inexperience, self-confidence, and presumption, and guided and restrained by the counsels of matured wisdom ; and that youth is to be pitied, not envied, who through the unfaithfulness of a parent, a guardian, or master, is left to choose his own course, and walk in his own ways. It is under the influence of these views, that I have been urging upon masters their responsibility, and pressing the importance of fidelity. Yet after all, it must be obvious, that whatever may be their efforts in your behalf, these efforts will prove unavailing, in regard to all those who cannot be made to respect themselves, or be persuaded to make personal exertions for their own improvement.” pp. 133, 134.

The subject of Mr. L’s. fifth and last Lecture is *religion*. He assigns reasons why religion is to be regarded as the “supreme

good." The reasons are, because it is the only effectual remedy for the mortal disorders of our nature; because the tenure by which its blessings are held, is secure and unfailing: because it supplies numerous incentives and aids to fidelity in duty; and because it is the only means of securing immortal blessings in the life to come.—Under these several heads, the author expatiates on the general subject with good effect; and though, in the other Lectures, he appears to hold the pen of a ready writer, he is peculiarly at home in this. As a specimen of his manner, we give the following, on the efficacy of religion.

"Do you doubt the power of religion to achieve such triumphs and win such trophies? Why should you doubt? What is religion but the spirit of Christ? What is it but heaven begun in the soul—the commencement of a process by which the inner man is to be progressively remoulded, and the divine moral image which was obliterated by the fall, ultimately restored in all its pristine beauty and glory? Be a Christian, and to the full extent in which you are truly such, you shall be like Christ; you shall find the divine energy of a holy temper exerting a sensible remedial agency over the degenerate principles of a ruined nature. It will check the intemperance of appetite; it will quench the fires of unhallowed passion; hush the tumult of earthly desires, the ever longing aspirations after sublunary good; and diffuse a holy rest, a calm and heaven-born peace, through all the immortal powers of your soul. For this exalted and glorious end, God devised and revealed the religion of the Gospel. It was primarily for man's moral renovation and recovery to holiness. Its sufficiency for this end follows of course; and thousands of witnesses, both in heaven and upon earth, have tried and have testified its power, both to purify and to save. He that *believeth*, hath *the witness in himself*." pp. 143, 144.

Such is an outline of the five Lectures of our author. In regard to the Appendix we have only to say, that the subjects spoken of in the extracts from the unpublished discourse are important, and well worthy of "extended discussion." We hope the author may be encouraged to prepare what he has in mind, and give it to the public.

As to the estimation in which we hold the volume before us, we can freely say, that we think it a *valuable little work*. The writer appears at his ease throughout. There is no laboring after what he cannot reach. All he wishes is at his command, and he goes directly along with his labor. Nor is he a workman who needs to be ashamed. His work, in general, is well done. There is not indeed any special polish, and no great display of taste; but though plain, the whole is neat and chaste, and what is of more consequence, it is all serious and practical. The author writes, evidently, not to make a book, but to do good, to serve God, and to benefit his generation.

But having said all this, and said it most sincerely too, we still think our author has some defects. Though apparently methodical, at least in some parts, there is in others a seeming want of method; at least there is a want of concentration and point. Mr. L. is not a redundant writer in relation to words. But we have felt the need of something more definite in relation to thought, and especially

*drift* of thought, running through the work. There is thought enough, good, serious, powerful thought; but it is too much diffused abroad, and not sufficiently concentrated. There is no focus. We are not brought into port. We have come over a rich landscape, but the scenery has been so various, and our way so casual, that we scarcely know whence we have come, or where we are: nor does any very definite impression in regard to objects remain.

We are always pleased to see an author shew himself superior to the chill and stiffness of mere formality. We certainly would not have him "the slave of words." But we would have him really and *appropriately* methodical; and, where the nature of the subject admits of it, we would have him rise upon us as he advances, till finally he commands us at his pleasure. A distinguished clergyman, now living, once said of the late Dr. Payson, that the impression made on his mind, on hearing him preach, suggested the idea of a ship, which, starting on her voyage with a light breeze, advanced under a gradual increase of sail, till, having accomplished her prosperous course, she entered majestically the port of her destination. Now an idea, like this, would not probably be suggested by these Lectures. As we have said, we are not brought into port. And had Mr. L. arranged the matter of his several discourses in such order as to be more easily taken up and remembered, and so as to produce one grand impression in each, he would doubtless have rendered his volume more interesting and profitable.

In point of force, strength, and urgency of appeal, too, we think Mr. L. might have laid himself out more, to great advantage. His good sense and seriousness would certainly have warranted it. We would not intimate that he is particularly deficient in this respect; but the boiler, we *presume*, would not have burst, had he put on more steam; and since, in this age of excitement, men will travel by steam, for despatch, rather than by coach, he should have contrived to draw after him as many as possible.

In taking leave of our author, we can truly say that we have been highly gratified with his Lectures. Their spirit is good, and though we have spoken of slight defects, we think well of the volume, as a whole. It certainly is a seasonable and important work, and we cheerfully recommend it to the perusal of that large and interesting portion of society for which it was specially designed.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## LETTER OF MR. NETTLETON.

The following letter of our honored and beloved Mr. Nettleton was addressed to a clergyman in Connecticut in 1822, and has been kindly forwarded to us for publication. We think it exceedingly important in two particulars: first, as a testimony to the *permanent* value and good influence of revivals of religion. Speaking of "revivals which took place ten or fifteen years" previous to the date of his letter, Mr. N. says, "Take the whole number who professed religion, as the fruit of these revivals, and take the same number who professed religion when there was no general revival, and *I do think that the former have outshined the latter.*" "I think they have exhibited *more of the Christian temper*, and a *better example*, than the same number who have professed religion when there was no revival."

But secondly; the letter which follows is of great importance, as a caution to individuals who are accustomed to even a moderate use of ardent spirits, not to place much reliance on their supposed religious affections; and a caution to churches not to be deceived by such persons. In this view, indeed, we can hardly express our sense of the value of the testimony now before us. We would suggest to our clerical patrons the propriety of reading it, either from their pulpits, or in church meeting, or in the conference room, as they may think it most advisable, that all concerned (and all are more or less concerned) may hear, and be instructed, and fear to offend.

My Dear Brother,

I hear frequently from many places where God has of late poured out his Spirit and revived his work. My friends residing in these places, far and near, either visit me or write to me, and tell me all their joys and their sorrows. For a number of years, I have kept a list of the names of those who have hopefully experienced religion, and made a public profession of it, in these revivals. When far from them, in my retired moments, I have often read over their names, and pondered on them, and on the scenes they have awakened, with emotions too big for utterance. I have watched them with anxious solicitude, and have made particular inquiry about the spiritual welfare of each one, as opportunity presented. My heart has often been *refreshed*, when some Timothy has *brought me good tidings of the faith and charity of these young converts*. No tidings have been more "*refreshing*." I have often had occasion to adopt the language of Paul, on this very subject; "*What thanks can we render to God again, for all the joy wherewith we joy for your sakes before our God.*"

During the leisure occasioned by my late illness, I have been looking over the regions where God has revived his work for the two years past. The thousands who have professed Christ in this time, in general, appear to run well. Hitherto, I think they have exhibited more of the Christian temper, and a better example, than the same number who have professed religion when there was no revival. With hundreds of these I conversed, when anxious for their souls, and afterwards when rejoicing in hope. Some of them I have followed through life, and down to the grave. *If genuine religion is not found in revivals, I have no evidence that it exists in our world.* Some few, indeed, have dishonored their profession, have opened afresh the wounds of the Saviour, and caused the hearts of his friends to bleed. Bunyan says, "If at any time I heard of such instances of apostacy among those who have hopefully been benefited by my ministry, I feel worse than if I had followed one of my own natural children to the grave." I have lost near and dear relatives, but the

tidings of which Bunyan speaks have sometimes struck me with a deeper sadness. Of the few who have finally apostatised, you may wish to know the cause. I have made particular inquiry, and find that the declension of some has commenced with an undue conformity to the world; but the sin of *intemperance* has caused more trouble, and done more dishonor to the cause of Christ, than any other crime that can be named. Though some have confessed, and doubtless repented of other crimes; yet few if any excommunications have hitherto taken place, for any crime except intemperance. I have heard from S—— county, that of the hundreds who professed religion there two years ago, a few only have been called to a public confession, and these have been restored. I have heard of but one excommunication. He was an acquaintance of mine, a man about thirty-five years of age, in the town of M——. He had been a little inclined to intemperance. He was anxious with others; his conversion was considered interesting; and at the time he professed religion, it was thought that his habit was broken. But before I left that place, he ventured to drink a little. On a public occasion, he became boisterous, and charged one man with lying, and that led on to an angry dispute, in which all present considered him the aggressor. This was soon noised through the place. It gave a general shock to all the young converts. I well remember the effect. Each one began to tremble, lest he too should be left to wound the cause which was to him dearer than life. I shall not forget what tenderness of conscience the young converts manifested. Each one seemed to tremble most of all for himself. The next morning Mr. H—— became sober, and now he felt exceedingly chagrined on remembering what he had said and done. He told me, that his first thought in the morning was, that he had dishonored religion, and he could not bear to be seen. He was almost tempted to leave his family and friends, and abscond. He however confessed his fault, and appeared penitent. But, sad to relate, he drank again; and, as I have been informed, is now cut off, and utterly abandoned.

A Mr. T——, in the town of B—— was under conviction, hopefully experienced religion, and made a public profession with about sixty others. He appeared well, with the exception of this circumstance, that previous to his convictions, he had been a little inclined to intemperance. In the judgement of charity he had reformed, and become a new man. He forsook his wicked companions, prayed in his family, and appeared to be much engaged in religion, and continued for a number of months to adorn his profession. But he began by slow and cautious steps (as he thought) to *sip a little*, only for his health. Though not drunk, he became foolish, and this led on to other things, until he dishonored the cause of religion. He made a public confession of his fault, and for a while appeared penitent. But he drank again, and this led to other unchristian conduct, which demanded Christian satisfaction. His brethren began, a few days since, their endeavors to reclaim him. But he removed in the night, with all his family, and has left the State to avoid another confession. We consider him a ruined man.

In the town of K——, a promising young man hopefully experienced religion, during the recent powerful revival there, and made a public profession, on the same day with one hundred and six others. I believe he was never considered at all inclined to intemperance. He left K—— and labored in company with others, who made a free use of ardent spirits. He soon contracted a taste for it; and we have heard of the public disgrace which he has brought on the cause of religion. With taunting voice, the enemies have been heard to cry around him, 'There is one of Mr. K——'s converts.' Brother K—— went after him to a neighboring place, and the young man has just made a public confession of his fault, and appears penitent. I find that all are flattering themselves that he will never offend again. I should think and rejoice with them, if I had not so often been disappointed. Of the whole number who professed religion in that revival, this, I think, is the only instance of an offence demanding a public confession.

When I look back on revivals which took place ten or fifteen years ago, I have been agreeably surprised to find so many of the subjects of them, continuing to adorn their profession. Take the whole number who professed religion as the fruit of these revivals, and take the same number who professed religion when there was no general revival, and I do think that the former have outshined the latter. I have not made a particular estimate, but from what I have

seen, I do believe that the number of excommunications from the latter is more than double, in proportion to the former. And I find, all along, that more excommunications have taken place in consequence of intemperance, than for any other crime.

A Mr. H——, a member of Brother T——'s church, was thought to have experienced religion in L——, in the days of your predecessor. He was a promising, active young man; much beloved and highly esteemed by Christians, and never suspected of intemperance, until about a year since. The disclosure of this fact not only grieved Christians, but surprised and astonished every body. Though he was not suspected of intemperance, it was afterwards ascertained that he had been in the habit of drinking a little in private. This is one method of covering sin. Whoever does it, is privately working out the ruin of his soul. But Mr. H—— made a public confession, appeared penitent, and all rejoiced in his reformation. This, I said, was about a year ago. When I was last in N——, he called at Brother T——'s on an evening visit. It was evident he had been drinking. The next day Brother T—— warned him in the most solemn manner, but all to no purpose. He was past fear, and past shame, and all have given him up as lost. He had accomplished his ruin by drinking in private, before his friends had any chance to prevent it. I could name a number of individuals, in different towns in this State, whose case is similar to his.

Now, my brother, what shall be done? I do not ask what shall be done to reclaim those who have so grievously offended. For these, nothing ordinarily can be done. Their case is hopeless. My inquiry is, what shall be done to prevent the future disgrace of the cause of Christ? As for those who have confessed their fault, and have been restored to fellowship, they must remain where they are, until the next offence cuts them off. But a public confession for intemperance, I think, is about nothing, and ought to go for nothing. *The only evidence of repentance in such case is, a continued course of entire abstinence from ardent spirits of every kind.*

As for those who think they have experienced a change, if their habits are bordering on intemperance, we ought to be cautious how we admit them to a public profession. If they have been in the habit of drinking freely, though not to intoxication, however clear in other respects, this circumstance alone renders the evidence of their conversion very doubtful. From what I have seen, I do believe that no class of persons are more likely to be deceived with false hopes, than the intemperate. If, while under conviction, a person allows himself to sip a little, or raises his sinking spirits in the least; he is sure to grieve away the Spirit of God.

During the revival at S——, two years ago, I witnessed an instance which, if you please, I will relate. Mr. A—— was one of the most respectable men in that village, about thirty years of age, who kept a large boarding-house. His wife was under deep conviction, and soon was rejoicing in hope, and prayed with and for her husband. This was the means of his conviction; though at the time it was not known. Report said that he was confined to his bed, and dangerously ill. Hints were privately circulating that he was anxious for his soul, and was ashamed to have it known. It was late in the evening, when Brother G—— went to his house, and found him in a bedroom, in a remote corner, in the greatest agony. "What is the matter," said Brother G——. "O, I am sick; I am in such distress!" "But your pulse is regular,—where is your pain?" He made no reply, but with violence smote upon his breast. He was asked, "Is it there?" "It is," he replied. The next evening I called, and found him still in the same distress. His convictions appeared to be deep. But when I returned, I suggested to Brother G—— a suspicion of the smell of ardent spirits. I then related a number of anecdotes of false conversions, connected with this suspicious scent. "Mr. A. is a very moral man," said he, "and far from suspicion on that point." But for fear, he sent me back to give him a solemn caution. I returned, and with much delicacy warned him not to taste, lest—— He seemed startled at my suggestion, and assured me that he was far from the habit. I requested his wife to watch him, and learned from her, that through his distress his strength had greatly failed, and that he had taken a *very little only*, to prevent his sinking entirely. I returned and observed to Brother G——, that I feared Mr. A—— was a ruined man. His concern continued for a few days, when he became exceedingly



joyful. His conversion was considered wonderful. But my joy was checked; I could not forget the smell of ardent spirits. I called and found him much elated with joy. But when I cautioned him, he seemed surprised, and somewhat offended, and observed, "I think I have been distressed enough to experience religion." "Ah," said I, "now I doubt more than ever whether your heart has ever been changed? Do you think there is any merit in the distress of an awakened sinner? Suppose you had been to hell, and endured the torments of the damned; what then? It is not distress, but love to God, and a change of heart, which alone can fit the sinner for heaven." After a little conversation, his heart rose in such opposition, that he relinquished his hope; his distress returned in a moment; and he cried out, "*What shall I do?*" His heart was evidently unrenewed, and still quarrelling with the justice of God. From some expressions, I caught a glimpse of his heart, and that, if he should ever experience religion, it was his secret purpose never to make a public profession of it. He was evidently unhumbléd—*like a bullock unaccustomed to the yoke*. I put into his hands Edwards, on the Justice of God in the damnation of sinners. Shortly, he again found relief. He wished to profess religion with others, but prudence led us to wait; and the result was, that in progress of time he became a sot. I know not now of a more hopeless being on earth. He does no business; has drunk himself out of his property, and almost out of his reason; and as Brother G— says, he has become a brute.

I could fill sheets with the relation of facts of a similar character, all which lead to the conclusion, that persons of intemperate habits, though deeply convicted, are far more likely to rest in a false hope than others. However distressed a person of this character may have been, or however joyful in hope, I think we may set it down as a probable sign of a false conversion, if he allows himself to *taste a single drop*. If he does not give evidence that he intends to abstain wholly and forever, I feel decided that he ought not to profess religion. If he cannot be willing to do this, he can have no sufficient evidence of his own repentance or conversion, and his hope is a spider's web. Brother T— preached an excellent sermon, not long since, from these words; "Cleanse thou me from secret faults; keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins." In the class of presumptuous sinners, he placed the person of intemperate habits. "The person who has drunk to excess, and has been warned, cannot venture to drink again, at all, without sinning presumptuously. He sins deliberately, and with his eyes open. *Let him remember that he drinks damnation.*" I felt the justice of this last sentence. It was attended with a thrill of horror. I am satisfied that he who cannot break off entirely, and at once, can never do it. And without it, we can have no evidence of his piety. Every time he tastes, he is putting fire to tinder and powder. If he really thinks that he can drink a little, and yet not become a drunkard; his danger is so much the greater. This confidence evinces his consummate ignorance of his own heart. This confidence, if not destroyed, will damn him. "*He that trusteth his own heart is a fool.*"

I wish that all the young converts, who profess religion, would make it a point of conscience not to taste of ardent spirits. This is the way in which many have dishonored the cause of Christ on public occasions. In this way thousands have become drunkards. I scarcely expect that any drunkard will be reformed, by any measures that can be adopted. The only successful method of preventing this kind of disgrace to religion in future, is to begin with the temperate. Though the plague cannot be cured, it may be shunned. Had all young converts seen what I have, they would need no other motives to induce them to adopt the resolution to abandon the use of ardent spirits forever. Could I learn that all the young converts in your parish had jointly adopted this resolution, it would be to themselves, to you, and to me, a most delightful evidence of the sincerity of the Christian profession, as well as of genuine conversion. "*Dear beloved, I beseech you, as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul.*"

Yours, as ever,

ASAHEL NETTLETON.

## CHRISTIAN EXAMINER CORRECTED.

In the last two numbers of the *Christian Examiner*, under the head of "Intelligence," are published extracts of letters from different counties in Mass. professing to exhibit the present state and prospects of Unitarianism. A correspondent in Worcester has communicated the following letter, for the purpose of correcting some part of the statement relative to that town. If gentlemen in other sections of the Commonwealth would give attention to this subject, and furnish us the means of correcting any wrong impressions which the accounts in the *Examiner* may have made, their communications will be gratefully received.

To the Editor of the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*.—Sir,

Allow me through your periodical to correct an erroneous representation.

In the *Christian Examiner* for July and August last, an account is given of the progress and prospects of Unitarianism in several counties in this Commonwealth, among which is Worcester county. Who wrote the account relative to this county I do not know; nor can I vouch for the correctness or incorrectness of it in relation to all the towns referred to, if indeed I understand the writer's initial references. But of the town of Worcester, although, as appears from his communication, he is from that town, or a resident there, I feel constrained to say that his account is incorrect. He says:

"Our own parish has grown since the last year. Several respectable families have been added. Our meeting is far better filled than it was a year ago. We have commenced a new house; for it is impossible to procure seats for all who would worship with us. We have added nearly twenty to our church, and although there has been an excitement among the Orthodox, we have lost none."

Such is this writer's account of the state of things in Worcester; on which I beg leave to make the following remarks.

He says, "We have lost none." Now this is not true; and for proof that it is not, I may appeal to the pastors and clerks of the several evangelical churches. Their records will show the names of twelve or fifteen, who, having attended meeting heretofore with Unitarians, have come off from them, under a full conviction that Unitarianism is not true religion. In some cases the heads, and in others the children or inmates of "respectable families," have left the Unitarian meeting, after staying there till seriousness, the fear of God, and the love of Christ, would allow them to stay no longer. It may not be that any have left since last May, whose names would be recognized on the parish clerk's book; though such have left since the revival (which this writer calls, "excitement of the Orthodox") commenced, a period evidently included in the general view presented in the account under consideration. Several families may have been added, in the meantime, to the Unitarians, for anything that I know; but so there have been to each of the other societies in town. The town is increasing in population, and all the societies have had accessions; nor is there the least occasion for the insinuation of this writer, that the "several families added" to the Unitarian society have been added by withdrawing from the other societies. Every one knows, that, when there are different societies in the same town, there are not wanting reasons, no way touching essential points in religious belief and practice, sufficient to cause removals from one to the other; and if there have been one or two removals from the three evangelical societies in two or three years, every one who believes in the opposition of the unrenewed heart to the truth of God will know how to account for it. As for removals from change of sentiments, there has not been, so far as I am informed, a single instance.

The writer says, "Our meeting is far better filled, than it was a year ago." This I do not doubt, nor will any one acquainted with the state of things in Worcester. A young man is generally more interesting to a people than an old one, however much the old one may have laid them under obligations by his services. But is the Unitarian meeting better filled at the expense of the Orthodox, so that the latter are proportionably diminished? This evidently

is the impression which a stranger would receive, on reading the article in the Examiner. But this is incorrect.

I proceed to another erroneous representation. The writer says, "We have commenced a new house; for it is impossible to procure seats for all who would worship with us."—The impression from this is, that the old meeting-house is not large enough—it is filled to overflowing, so that the congregation are obliged to retire, and provide other accommodations. You may be surprised to learn that nothing of this is true. The old house, I am confident, was never full on the Sabbath. When Mr. Hill, (Dr. Bancroft's colleague) was ordained, it was not so full as a great many houses for evangelical worship are on ordinary occasions; though numbers were present from the other societies, as well as from the neighboring towns. The new house therefore is not going forward, because the old one is not sufficiently large to hold all that have hitherto wished to meet with Unitarians.

There is another part of the statement which deserves to be noticed. The writer says, "We have added nearly twenty to our church." On reading this I was forcibly reminded of the late ordination of Mr Hill. I was present on that occasion, and truly it was amusing, though painfully so, to mark the confusion into which the different members of the council (especially the scribe) were thrown, in dragging in the word, *church*. The fact is, there was no recognition whatever of a *church* in the doings of the people calling Mr. Hill; while yet the council, conscious, as it would seem, that there ought to be a church somewhere, were constantly stumbling upon the word *church*, through all the services.

I would always speak respectfully of whatever any of my fellow men regard as sacred; but really it seems little short of ridiculous to talk of a *church* in relation to that people, who, when he whom they have chosen to be their minister is about to be ordained, recognize no such thing. According to the Unitarian construction, pray what is a church? Or rather, holding, as they do, that all who attend public worship, and are so disposed, are qualified, without any *special* preparation, to come to the communion table, and partake of the Saviour's body and blood, why do they speak of church at all? Why especially, does this writer, who is probably a member of the body he describes, having disowned the church on so important an occasion as the ordination of his minister,—why does he here retain the uncourteous, not to say invidious distinction, implied in this then unworthy and insignificant term, church?—"She must be *consistent*," says Cælebs in search of a wife; "She must be consistent, or I should offend against the shade of my mother."

I am, Sir, yours, &c.

VERAX.

---

#### CONVERSION OF DR. STOCK.

The following extract of a letter from Dr. J. E. Stock, of Bristol (England,) once a resident for several years in this country, exhibits the manner in which his mind was led to a renunciation of Unitarian errors, and to a reception of the truth as it is in Jesus. His letter bears date Nov. 6, 1816, and was addressed to his former Unitarian minister.

My Dear Sir,

I scarcely know in what terms to begin this letter, or how to communicate to you the object of it. Yet I am anxious to be the first to convey to you the intelligence, because I am unwilling that it should reach you, unattended by those expressions of personal regard and respect by which I could wish that it should be accompanied.

In the month of July last, my professional attendance was required for the Rev. John Vernon, the Baptist minister of Downend, who was then on a visit to a friend in Bristol. I found him very ill; so much so, that his other medical attendant and myself have since judged it necessary that he should suspend all his public labors. After attending him here for two or three days, he removed

to Downend, where I have since continued to see him about once a week. He felt it a duty to endeavor to lead me to reconsider my religious opinions; and at length, with much delicacy and timidity, led to the subject. I felt fully confident of their truth, and did not, on my part, shun the investigation. For some weeks, his efforts did not produce the smallest effect; and it required all the affectionate patience of his character to induce me to look upon the arguments on his side, as even worth examining. This spirit of levity, however, was at length subdued and restrained by the affectionate earnestness of his manner. Now and then he produced a passage of Scripture which puzzled me exceedingly; but, as I was always distrustful, I scarcely ever allowed any weight to it, till after I had coolly examined it at home. I began, however, to consider whether it was not possible that his observations might contain some truth; and, of course, was led to examine them with more care and impartiality. Doubts, now and then, at rare intervals, would force themselves upon my mind. Such, however, was my hostility to the sentiments to which these doubts pointed, that I resisted every suspicion of this kind. I treated it as a mere delusion of the imagination. I felt ashamed even to have yielded to such suggestions for a moment. My doubts, however, returned upon me, with tenfold force. I read—I was perplexed. Often, very often, I wished I had not begun the inquiry. I prayed for illumination; but I found my mind daily becoming more and more unsettled.

Such continued to be the state of my mind, during the latter end of September, and the whole of October. Towards the end of the latter month, the evidence for the doctrines which I had hitherto strenuously opposed, seemed progressively to increase. But it was not till this very week, that conviction came, and that my mind unhesitatingly and thankfully accepted the doctrines of the *Supreme Divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, of Atouement or Reconciliation by his precious blood, and of the Divinity and Personality of the Holy Spirit.*

A change so awful, so unexpected, I may add so improbable, which, four months ago only, I should myself have said was impossible, has deeply and solemnly impressed my mind. That I must encounter much ridicule in consequence of this change, I fully expect. I am sure that I well deserve it; for no person would have burst out more loudly against such an alteration in the views of another, than myself. Nor should I omit to add, that my excellent friend, Mr. Vernon, while I was communicating to him the conviction that I had received, and my expectation of being ridiculed for such a change, observed to me, that I certainly must expect it, but he hoped that I was prepared to forgive it. I trust that I shall be enabled to do so. Upon reviewing this last sentence, my dear Sir, I feel myself bound to say, that, in stating this, I hope not to be understood as anticipating anything of the sort from you, or from your venerable colleague. No! however you may pity my delusion, I feel assured that you will do justice to my motives.

My dear Sir, I have extended this letter to a much greater length than I had any expectation of doing, when I began it. I began with alluding to my regard and respect for you. Will it be deemed inconsistent with either, if I venture to conclude it with a most affectionate wish and prayer—that you and yours, and all who are near and dear to you, may receive every earthly blessing, and may be brought to the knowledge of the truth! I feel it to be my duty to conclude thus, and I shall stand excused. And, O! how much is that wish enkindled, when I recollect the seriousness and solemnity of your manner in prayer, and your impressiveness in preaching! How do I wish that endowments of such value were consecrated to those views which I have received! But I feel myself getting upon tender ground. It is difficult to word such a wish, without appearing arrogant, or impertinent, or presumptuous; and yet nothing is further from my heart than either of these feelings.

Yours, my dear Sir,

J. E. Stock.

## VIEWS OF UNITARIANS ON THE INSPIRATION OF THE EVANGELISTS.

We extract the following from the *Christian Pioneer*, a periodical published in Scotland, and highly esteemed by Unitarians in this country. The article from which we quote is "On the Canon of Scripture." The writer proposes, "in the first instance, to ascertain what parts of the Bible are more pre-eminently important, and unquestionably inspired." He next "inquires what parts of it are of a mixed and *doubtful* character," "in regard to positive inspiration." "And, in the third place, whether there are not some parts, which are *manifestly and merely human compositions, and resting upon human authorities.*" The discussion commences "with the inspiration of Christ," who, the writer admits was inspired "on *all topics of religion,*" not indeed as to "the very words," but "the general spirit and meaning of his doctrine." "A distinction" is then made "between the inspiration of Christ," and "the alleged inspiration of the Evangelists."

The Evangelists were only the historians of an inspired person, and of a divine revelation made by him; *they were not*, in their capacity of historians, *inspired themselves.* When, therefore, we say that the Gospels are inspired books of the highest order and authority, we say so, because the subject matter of them consists chiefly of the words and actions of Jesus—the Anointed—or Inspired.

When the Evangelists relate anything else, we are to receive what they say, not as matter of inspiration, but of history, and attach that consequence only to it which its nature and evidence require. The idea of the Evangelists being *inspired writers*, is quite inconsistent with what Luke says of "his treatise," the verity of which he grounds expressly upon his access to the best sources of information, through the ordinary medium of the testimony and concurrent report of eye and ear witness. He was not an Apostle, nor is he known to us as having possessed any supernatural gifts.

It was the same with Mark, who, according to an ancient tradition in the Church, was a personal attendant on Peter, and wrote his Gospel as a memorandum of what that Apostle was in the habit of teaching: in which respect, his authority as a writer, is *just equivalent to that of a short-hand writer or reporter of modern times.*

Matthew, indeed, was an Apostle; but whatever might be the *official* authority of the Apostleship in other matters, of which we shall afterwards speak, the credit more especially due to him, as a historian of our Lord's life and doctrine, arises solely from his having been a personal attendant on him; what he heard and saw, that he testified—and *inspiration*, regarding such a matter, was equally unnecessary for *his* information, or for *our* belief of his testimony.

Besides, let any man read the Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke under this view, and he will be unable to discern any marked superiority or difference in the narratives of the Apostle, and of the Physician. They relate some different incidents, and so far extend our information and confirm our belief, because they exhibit a unity of character and doctrine in the subject of their memoirs; but it cannot be alleged that Matthew's Gospel is, by virtue of any apostolical inspiration, preferable, upon the whole, to Luke's. That is to say, in other words, *inspiration has nothing to do with the composition of his history.*

With regard to John, as he wrote at a much later period, and has given us chiefly a number of discourses and conversations of his Master, we may have no doubt that he enjoyed the benefit of that inspiration, which was expressly promised to the Apostles;—that at a due and proper time, "the Spirit would bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had taught them:"—but this was only restoring to his memory, what was formerly in it, and enabling him, at a distance of sixty years, to write down the discourses and conversations of Jesus, with the same accuracy as if he had made notes of them at the time of their delivery. The character of his testimony was still the same as that of the earlier historians; it rested on what he had heard, and seen.

## UNITARIANS REJECT MATT. XXVIII. 19.

The same number of "the Christian Pioneer," from which the remarks on our last page were taken, contains an article on the subject of "Baptism in the name of the Trinity." Having assigned his reasons for rejecting the declaration in 1 John, v. 7, the writer adds,

"There is another text which we consider a *forgery*. It is Matt. xxviii, 19. 'Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them, [in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:] teaching them' &c. The sense is complete, without the words included in brackets, and there is no want of connexion, if they be omitted. In no other place in all the Old and New Testament is there a direction to baptize in the name of the Father, or the Holy Ghost, nor any allusion to baptism in his name, unless John the Baptist's ceremony can be considered so.

Now, we admit our *strict disbelief that ever Jesus Christ gave any such directions as to the mode of baptism*, contained in the words which we have enclosed in brackets, and *our firm conviction that it is one of those pious frauds* which were resorted to in the early ages of the church, for the purpose of bolstering up the heathen doctrine of a plurality of persons in the Godhead."

---

MR. COOKE'S REPLY TO A LETTER IN THE CHRISTIAN  
EXAMINER.

All we shall at present say of this performance is, that we wish it may have a thorough circulation. We wish that persons of every sect, and name, and party, in Massachusetts may be induced to read it. The subject discussed is certainly one of great importance, affecting the vital interests both of religion and the State.

The last number of the Christian Examiner contains the following pithy sentence :

"Should the dominant sect in the church ever dare to assume in effect, no matter under what pretences, the least particle of influence or authority in the State, merely on account of their supposed Orthodoxy, the blood of our fathers, notwithstanding their many inconsistencies, will cry to us from the ground for resistance—resistance unto death; and we shall prove recreant to the name and race, if it cries in vain."

Our neighbor Editor, as the public will here see, is already wrought up to the spirit of martyrdom. He is prepared for "RESISTANCE UNTO DEATH"! if the Orthodox, in any way, or under any pretence, "*dare to assume the least particle of influence, or authority, in the State, merely on account of their supposed Orthodoxy.*"—The readers of Mr Cooke's pamphlet will judge for themselves, whether Unitarians have not dared to assume something more than the least particle of influence or authority in the State, merely on account of their Unitarianism.

---

NOTICE.

We have received a second Letter, longer than the first, from Dr. Lowell, for which we hope to find a place in our next number.

THE

# SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

VOL. II.

MARCH, 1829.

NO. 3.

---

## COMMUNICATIONS.

LETTERS ON THE INTRODUCTION AND PROGRESS OF UNITARIANISM  
IN NEW ENGLAND. NO. II.

DEAR SIR,

IN my last I referred to several transactions connected with the early history of New England, the tendency of which was to bring the churches, at the close of the first century, into a state of deep and melancholy declension. This declension was greatly deplored by many of the aged and more experienced ministers. "Oh!" said they, "the many deadly symptoms, symptoms of death that are upon our religion! How is religion dying in the churches! And how are the churches themselves languishing and dying together with religion!" "O, New England, New England, look to it that the glory be not removed from thee! Tremble; for it is going; it is gradually departing! How has the gold become dim, and the most fine gold changed! O, that my head were waters, and mine eyes a fountain of tears!"\*

The declension thus bewailed by the Mathers, and others, consisted, as I have said, in the churches becoming corrupted, by the admission of unworthy members, and by the ministry of teachers who, in many instances, gave no decisive evidence of piety. This, at least, was the judgement of Whitefield respecting the churches and their pastors, at the time when he first visited New England. "I fear," says he in his journal, "that many rest in a head knowledge—are close pharisees—and have only a name to live. It must needs be so, when the power of godliness is dwindled away, and the *form* only of religion has become fashionable amongst a people." And again; "Many that preach, I fear, do not experimentally know Christ; though I cannot see much worldly advantage to tempt them to take upon them the sacred function."†

\* See Prince's Christian History, vol. i. pp. 66—99.

† See Journal at New England, pp. 70—96.

The clergy of New England, at the period of which I am speaking, were reputedly Orthodox. Doubtless the most of them were, in speculation, and to a certain extent, really so. Yet there was evidently a full preparation of heart for the spread of Arminian and Pelagian errors, and much anxiety was felt and expressed, lest these errors should come in and prevail. President Edwards writes, in 1734; "About this time began the great noise that was in this part of the country about Arminianism, which seemed to appear with a very threatening aspect upon the interests of religion. The friends of vital piety trembled for fear of the issue."\* It has also been said, in a late Review of "the revival under Whitefield," "The ministers of Boston seem to have been alarmed at the inroads which Arminianism and Arianism had already begun to make in this vicinity."† It is doubtful, however, whether previous to 1740, there was much avowed Arminianism in the country; certainly there was no such thing as avowed Arianism. Dr. Chauncy of Boston, who was as near being an Arminian as any man of his time, in 1743 denies the charge of it, and professes to approve "the confession of faith agreed on by the churches of New England, and by the Assembly of divines at Westminster."‡

I have here gone a little into detail, for the purpose of shewing you the precise state of the churches, at the period of which I am speaking. The clergy were, for the most part, grave men, reputedly, speculatively, moderately Orthodox, and regularly maintained the forms of religion; but who, in some instances, had well nigh lost the spirit of religion, and in others, it may be feared, had never felt it. The churches, also, to which they ministered, were in a cold and formal state, consisting to a considerable extent of those who had not experienced, and who perhaps did not pretend to have experienced the saving power of religion on their hearts.§ Arminianism was frequently talked of, with complacency by some, and with dread by others; but as yet there was no general and open dissent from the religious principles of the fathers of New England.

It was in this state of things, that the great and powerful revivals of religion, which occurred towards the middle of the last century, commenced. There had been instances of revival before, in different parts of the country, but they were becoming unfrequent, and were comparatively unknown. But in 1734, a new era began

\* Works, vol. iii. p. 13.

† Christian Examiner, vol. iv. p. 480.

‡ Seasonable Thoughts, &c. pp. 398, 417.

§ The effect of Mr. Stoddard's principle, that the Lord's supper is a means of regeneration, and that persons regarding themselves as unregenerate should be encouraged to partake of it, was well illustrated in an occurrence recorded by Mr. Prince. "At the time of the great earthquake," in 1727, "people were generally frightened, and many were awakened to such a sense of their duty, as to offer themselves to our communion. Very few came to me then under deep convictions of their unconverted and lost condition, or with the inquiry, What shall we do to be saved;" but rather "to signify that they had such a sense of their duty to come to the Lord's table, that they dare not stay away any longer." Chris. Hist. vol. ii. p. 381.



to open. This work of God commenced in Northampton, under the searching and powerful ministry of Mr. Edwards. Here it continued and prevailed, "till there was scarcely a person in the town, either old or young, that was left unconcerned about the things of the eternal world." In the spring of the next year, it extended into the neighboring region, and nearly all the towns in old Hampshire county were visited and revived. It also prevailed in different parts of Connecticut, and in New Jersey.

In 1738, the celebrated Mr. Whitefield first visited the country. He commenced his labors in the southern provinces, and did not visit New England, until the autumn of 1740. During his first visit, his labors in Boston, and in other places, were followed by a very unusual and general attention to religion. "Multitudes were greatly affected, and many awakened, with his lively ministry. Great numbers in Boston," says Mr. Prince, "were so happily concerned about their souls, as we had never seen anything like it before." In the winter following, Mr. Gilbert Tennent came into New England, where his labors also were abundant, and were greatly blessed. The revival in Boston exceeded anything ever before witnessed in this part of the country. "The very face of the town seemed to be changed," so as to occasion "great surprise" to the strangers who visited it. From Boston the work spread in every direction over the settled portions of New England. In the *Christian History*, mention is made of nearly fifty towns in the several provinces, on which the Spirit of God was specially poured out, nearly at the same time. The work also prevailed in most of the middle and southern provinces, and was powerful and general at some places in England, and in many parts of Scotland.\*

I might here pause, and detail to you many of these interesting revival scenes; but as this is not absolutely necessary to my present purpose, I must forbear. If from the point at which we have now arrived, we turn back and contemplate the state of the churches at the time when this great revival commenced, we shall see that, in all probability, it must have encountered violent opposition. It must have encountered opposition, not only from the profane scoffer and infidel, but from multitudes in the churches, and from not a few of the ministers. For in these revival scenes, religion was presented in a new and glowing aspect. It was exhibited, not as mere form, but as feeling and substance—not as matter of cold speculation, affecting the head only, but as reaching, stirring, warming, renewing all the affections of the soul. Many, therefore,

\* The *Christian History* gives an account of revivals in between forty and fifty places in Scotland—a good comment on the declaration so often made, that revivals of religion were never known in Britain.—It may not be improper to observe here, that the *Christian History*, to which I have repeatedly referred, was a weekly paper, commenced March 5, 1743, and continued two years. It was edited and published by Mr. Thomas Prince, Jr., son of the Rev. Mr. Prince, of the Old South church, Boston. Its pages were chiefly occupied with accounts of revivals of religion. This was probably the first religious newspaper ever published. It was commenced at the suggestion of Mr. Edwards of Northampton.

in the churches, and in the ministry, felt themselves reprov'd and condemn'd by these new exhibitions of religion. They saw and felt, that if this was religion, they had none of it. They had themselves experienced no such thing. They knew nothing about such glowing heart religion as this. They were constrained, therefore, either to renounce their hope, and take the humbling attitude of inquirers and learners, or to condemn and oppose the revival, as mere frenzy and delusion. Some, to be sure, both ministers and professors, were induced to take the former course;\* but many were left, as might be expected, to take the latter. They condemn'd the revival, condemn'd the fruits of it, and condemn'd the measures which were taken to promote it, refusing to have any participation in these measures. They closed their houses of worship against Whitefield and Tennent, and the other revival preachers, and regarded and spoke of the whole work, either as a tumult of the passions, or as the delusion of an evil spirit.

Though I consider this ancient revival of religion as a glorious display of Divine power and mercy, I am far from pretending that there were no mistakes made, and no errors adopted, on the part of those who were instrumental in promoting it. Doubtless there were mistakes and errors, not only at the conclusion of the work, but in its progress, which ought to have been candidly pointed out and corrected. But while I admit this, I have no hesitation in expressing my belief, that had the work been carried on without a single mistake, entirely according to the pleasure of God, and the suggestions of the Holy Spirit, taking place in the manner and under the circumstances which have been mentioned, it would have been opposed. It must have been, unless from the first it had subdued the causes of opposition; unless it had been so powerful and general as to have opened all the blinded eyes, and melted the proud hearts, and bow'd the stubborn wills, and removed the deep rooted prejudices, which withstood its progress.

To prevent misapprehension, I would further say, that I am far from representing all, who stood aloof from the revival of 1740, and declined promoting it, as unconverted persons. It cannot, I think, be doubted, that, owing to the influence of family connexions and attachments, or of an undue regard for established cus-

\* As an instance of a clergyman who was brought, in this revival, to a knowledge of the truth, I may mention the excellent Mr. Porter of the North parish in Bridgewater, father of the present Dr. Porter of Roxbury. Speaking of Mr. Whitefield, he says, "I shall always mention him with respect and honor, whatever others may think or say of him, from the benefit which one of the meanest and most unworthy of Christ's ministers hopes he received by his holy and fervent ministrations while at Boston. *Be sure, I knew nothing rightly of my sin and danger, of my need of a Saviour, or of the way of salvation by him, neither was I established in the doctrines of grace (though a preacher and one who endeavored to instruct others in the way,) till I heard that man of God. And if the Lord had permitted me to take the oversight of a flock, as I had a call to do, an Uhad given my answer; the blind would have led the blind, and so it is likely both would have fallen into the ditch.* But he did not. 'Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me bless his holy name; for what he did for me through the instrumentality of that man!' See Chris. Hist. vol. i. pp. 397, 398.

toms and forms, or of false reports, or of indiscretions on the part of those who were engaged in the revival, some, who on the whole were true friends to Christ and his cause, were induced to regard this work with suspicion and hesitation. The number of those to whom this exception applies was not, however, large; and to me it is evident that the many, who originally and steadily opposed this revival, did it not only from mistaken views, but with improper motives. Certainly their opposition was, at the first, unreasonable—it was virulent—it was unrelenting. It displayed a much greater lack of charity than it condemned, and was conducted often in a use of the most unworthy means.

The effect of this opposition on the friends and promoters of the revival was in various instances unhappy. Instead of making them more humble and watchful, more suspicious of themselves, and more prayerfully dependant on the Lord; it wounded the pride of some, enkindled their resentment, induced them to retaliate censure for censure, and railing for railing, and put them upon the adoption of new and exceptionable measures to carry on the work. In this way, their wily opponents gained a prodigious advantage over them, and they pushed it to the utmost of their power. Still more, therefore, were some of the professed friends of the revival exasperated, and the sound of contention waxed louder and louder.

In this state of things, it was impossible for persons of tried wisdom, and humble, devoted piety to speak, so as to make themselves heard and regarded. The excellent Mr. Edwards published his "Thoughts on the Revival of Religion in New England," a work which cannot be too highly esteemed, and which was productive of immediate good, both in this country and in Scotland; but to accomplish all that he intended and hoped, it was too late. Confusion and contention extensively prevailed, and the Holy Spirit was already in a great measure grieved away.

Of some of the principal actors near the close of the revival, we cannot speak but with decided disapprobation. The chief of these was a Mr. James Davenport, great grandson of the excellent Mr. John Davenport, first minister of New Haven. Associated with him were several others, who had been trained under one David Ferris, a noted fanatic in Yale college, in 1730.\* In the great excitement of which we are speaking, these men were stirred up to unwonted zeal, and by their impulses, visions, and revelations—by their confidence, their censures, and their new and imposing measures, they succeeded for a time in deluding many. In the summer of 1742, Mr. Davenport came to Boston, and in opposition to the expressed wishes of the ministers, commenced his opera-

\* "Ferris left college before he took his degree, professing himself a Quaker." He afterwards became, it is said, "a Quaker preacher." Chauncy's *Seasonable Thoughts*, &c. p. 213.

tions there ; soon after which a quarrel commenced, and the revival in Boston ceased.

Mr. Davenport lived to make a full and public recantation of his errors,\* but not to do away the evils of which his conduct, and that of his associates, were the direct occasion : for some of these evils have continued, and are discernible, to the present hour.

Looking back on the season of revival which has been described, at the distance now of almost a century, we come to the same general conclusion with the judicious Edwards, who lived at the time, and in the midst of it. It was undoubtedly a great and glorious work of God's Holy Spirit, commenced in the midst of deep declension, and prevailing for a season with much power, and with the best effects ; but, through the unreasonable opposition of unholy men, and the delusions of Satan,† and the errors of those who were thinking to promote it, becoming at length corrupted and defaced, and liable in many points to objection and censure.

One immediate result of this great excitement through New England, was a division among the ministers and churches in respect to religious sentiment and feeling. Those on one part were greatly elevated in their views of Divine truth, and of experimental religion. They obtained clearer ideas of the precious doctrines of grace ; felt more of their redeeming power ; proclaimed them with much greater plainness, earnestness, and force ; and lived in nearer conformity to their sanctifying influence. In this view, the revival of which I have spoken was an inestimable blessing to this country. It rekindled the holy fire, when it was well nigh extinguished, and gave a tone and spirit to the prevailing religion of New England, which it has never lost. Indeed, most that is at present desirable in the religious aspect of things among us may be directly traced to the influence of men who were trained and instructed in the revival of 1740.

But to those on the other part, who discountenanced and opposed the revival, and by this means failed of its beneficial results, its consequences were directly the opposite. Numbers of this class soon settled down into avowed Arminianism, or into a strange and criminal indifference in regard to religious doctrine. If men would but attend upon external observances with a cold formality, and frown upon everything which had the appearance of engagedness and zeal, and think well of their neighbors who were as life-

\* Mr. Davenport's recantation was published in the *Chris. Hist.* Vol. ii. p. 237.

† Of all the forms of delusion which the father of lies has ever assumed, perhaps none is so dangerous as that of a revival preacher. When he attacks the church under the mask of Popery, or Infidelity, or a latitudinarian Christianity, he may be met by reason and the word of God, and be driven back. But when he transforms himself into an angel of light, and by his mock revivals and false conversions, by impulses and trances, unmeaning extacies and nervous agitations, undertakes to beguile unstable souls, the difficulty of resisting him is vastly increased, while the work of destruction is not less extensive or sure. He now identifies his delusions with the sacred cause of religion, and pretends to move only by the suggestions of an infallible Spirit ; so that, while he who yields is led captive by him at his will, he who opposes is denounced as fighting against God.

less as themselves ; it was of little consequence what they believed or rejected. They might be Calvinists, or Arminians, or almost anything, without forfeiting their places, or materially affecting their reputation.

Of those who took the course here spoken of, the celebrated Dr. Chauncy, long pastor of the first church in Boston, may be mentioned as an instance. He was unfriendly to the revival from the first, and in 1743 published his work, entitled "Seasonable Thoughts on the state of religion in New England," for the purpose of exposing and suppressing it. Perhaps no individual did so much to transform and deface the religious character of Boston and the surrounding region, as this man. His intellectual powers were of an high order, his learning various and extensive, his publications numerous, his social qualities interesting, his station commanding, and his life long. He died in 1787. At the close of the revival, he professed himself a Calvinist ; but he lived to become, not only an Arminian, but a strenuous advocate for Universal Salvation. There were not many, perhaps, who followed him in all his speculations ; for there were not many of his cotemporaries who possessed an equal share of mental vigor and boldness. But the opposers of the revival in general soon became Arminians ; or if not, their Calvinism was little, if at all better. It was cold and speculative, without heart or point, and made to exert no favorable influence. The abuses of the late revival excited and confirmed their prejudices against everything of the like nature. They discouraged warmth and engagedness in religion, as ' things of a bad tendency,' and were afraid of nothing so much as what they denominated ' enthusiasm.' Innovations in points of doctrine were considered as of small importance. If people attended public worship, and paid their taxes, and made no pretensions to unusual seriousness, but sneered and scoffed at those who did ; they might expect to be regarded as very good men.

Perhaps you will think this statement too highly colored, though I am satisfied that it cannot be far from the truth. For the prejudices of many aged people, ministers and others, against ' new lights,' and sudden conversions, and everything which assumes the appearance of engagedness in religion, are within the memory of many now living. And the bitter fruits of these prejudices are discernible all around us. We behold them, full grown, and maturely ripened, in the Unitarian speculations and practices of the present day.

It should be mentioned here, as a circumstance which hastened the decline of religion among the opposers of the revival, that the promoters and the subjects of it in many instances withdrew, and separated from them. Some removed to other places, some attached themselves to other denominations, and in some cases parishes were divided, and ' churches were gathered out of

churches.' The result of these separations was, that not a few of the original churches were deprived of most of their engaged and devoted members, and the spirit of the world was left to operate without mixture or control.

It was shown in my last, that the deep declension, preceding the revival of 1740, was attributable to several *mistakes* which occurred in the early history of this country. I have endeavored to show, in the remarks here made, that it was owing to this declension, that the revival, when it began, was so strenuously opposed; that this opposition occasioned bitter contention and real abuses, which abuses, in their turn, gave to the opposition increased advantage and success; that, by this means, the work was soon brought to a melancholy stand, and the Holy Spirit was grieved away;—and, while many were savingly benefitted, and a degree of life and spirit was imparted to the prevailing religion of New England which it has never lost, and we trust never will, many, on the other hand, were hardened, imbibed prejudices against all serious religion, adopted a lower standard of theology, became strangely indifferent in respect to doctrines, feared nothing so much as warm and devoted piety, and fell into precisely that state which is most favorable to the introduction and growth of Unitarian errors.

Having pursued the discussion to this point, you will readily excuse me for the present. You shall hear from me again by the earliest opportunity.

INVESTIGATOR.



#### EXAMINATION OF SOME LAWS AND JUDICIAL DECISIONS IN RELATION TO THE CHURCHES OF MASSACHUSETTS.

The following discussion of the 'rights of churches,' is from the pen of a highly respectable lawyer, now living in this State. It has been examined and approved by several gentlemen of the bar. We rejoice that our brethren of the legal profession are at length awaking to this important subject. To them it properly belongs. Especially do we rejoice in the fact here asserted, that the judicial decision of which *we* have so loudly complained, "*has never been well received, or acquiesced in, by the bar, or by intelligent lawyers of the Commonwealth.*"

It has of late become fashionable to eulogise the virtues, and the civil and religious institutions of the pilgrim fathers of New England. We congratulate ourselves that we are their descendants, and that we inherit the blessings which have resulted from their wisdom, benevolence, and goodness. It is, however, to be feared, that there are those among us, who "expect to take the lead," and claim precedence by merit, who, while they applaud virtue and good institutions in the *abstract*, countervail their influence in *practice*, and use their high official standing to mar and

change those very "bulwarks of our religion," which they applaud our ancestors for erecting and maintaining.

The happy condition of our republic, after the lapse of two centuries, is a clear demonstration of the utility of our public institutions. But with the best lights of history, and the best results of experience before our eyes, we fear that transmutation and a new order of things are coming upon us to our ruin, which some even *do not perceive*, or if they do perceive it, are willing to venture all to promote a favorite system. If any object, 'You are assailing the best pillars of our ancient institutions,' they answer, 'You mistake the character of these institutions; we are supporting them.' Others more ingenuously say, 'The times have changed, and we must change with them.' It is of the highest importance, that this subject should be understood. The great object of the migration of our ancestors to this country was, to ESTABLISH AND ENLARGE THE TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST; to protect and foster it; to preserve its purity, and bring into action its spiritual energies. There is no ground of pretence that they wished to bestow upon it temporal power.

But with our ancestors, the church was not an outlaw. Good men were always protected in the enjoyment of their religious privileges, and the church was protected in its order, discipline, and worship, and in the enjoyment of those *civil rights*, which were deemed essentially necessary to its prosperity. The rights we refer to, are the right to receive and appropriate the bounties of its pious friends, and the right to elect its own officers—its pastor. In the enjoyment of these rights, religion prospered in former times, and the churches of New England became a praise in the earth. We are pleased with this praise; and in our turn we applaud the wisdom and virtues of our ancestors. But do we in heart approve of those institutions, to which our churches have owed so much of their prosperity? Here, we fear, many, alas too many, smile on them as puritanical; and while they will not say they were of no use, still think that in these days, the enlightened men of the world must have their way.

In affording pecuniary aid to the church, in order that its institutions, its ordinances, and its poor may be supported, Christians are wont to express their benevolent affections, and their supreme regard for the cause and kingdom of their Lord. Hence, if the arm of the law so hedge up the church, that none of these things can be done for her, the efforts of Christian benevolence are strangled in the cradle; and not only do our religious affections and religious institutions suffer loss, but our civil institutions, in their turn, feel the palsy react upon them. If we mistake not, this Commonwealth is now in this downward course; and that charity, which was usual in the days of the apostles, and has been usual in every age of the church, without being interrupted even under

the persecutions of pagan Rome, is now diverted from the object for which it was bestowed, and cold discouragement is cast upon all future charities of the kind.

That in this age of boasted liberality, of peculiar Christian effort, of enlightened intelligence, and, let us add, in this free Commonwealth, the church should not be allowed to receive, use, control, and appropriate the bounties and charities of its pious friends, which accompany their prayers for her prosperity, we confess has not a little alarmed and astonished us. With the hope that, whatever violence may have been suffered, whatever breach may have been made, whatever injury may have been inflicted, there is yet among us a redeeming spirit, which may recover and restore our Commonwealth from its diseased condition in these respects, we propose to make some inquiry and remarks in relation to the laws and judicial decisions affecting the rights of the churches.

How far the institutions of religion may be advantageously connected with those of civil society, is a question which has been long and often discussed, and which does not yet seem to be fully and satisfactorily decided. But the diversity of circumstances in which the church has at different periods been placed, since the introduction of Christianity, has made some things in relation to this question very evident. When religion walks in her golden slippers, sustained by the power, and enriched by the bounty of the civil arm, she has a great multitude, a mixed multitude of professed friends; but it is soon apparent that many of these are friends by profession only, and that their influence tends to contaminate, rather than to strengthen. On the contrary, though it has been said that persecution is a purifying wind, separating the wheat from the chaff, and that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church; still, a state of persecution ought to be regarded as a state of affliction, and every justifiable means ought to be used to shelter and protect religion from it. The followers of Christ are to expect the persecution of the men of the world, as individuals. "The oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely," the reproach of singularity, of weakness, and of fanaticism,—all these, and much more, are to be counted as the costs of a religious course of life. But the protection of equal laws and distributive justice in a free Commonwealth, impartiality in judicial decisions, and the usual redress of injuries, individuals and churches have a right to expect; and if they do not realize them, they have a right to complain, and to be heard. They have a right also, and it is their duty, by all fair and constitutional methods, to endeavor to bring about a better state of things.

It is generally known that the call, settlement, and ordination of Mr. Lamson in the first parish in Dedham took place without the consent of the church in that parish; and that, after his ordination, the church no longer associated in worship with the majority of the



parish in the house where they had been accustomed to assemble, but erected another house near by, and settled a pastor, according to the order of the Gospel. At the time of the settlement of Mr. Lamson, the church were possessed of property which had been given them by pious and charitably disposed Christians, the income of which had for sometime been sufficient, or nearly so, for the support of their pastor. This property had been under the control and management of the deacons, who, by the order of the Gospel, as well as by the law of the land, have the charge of all the property of the church; and the title of the church to this property was supposed to be as safe, as the title of any corporate body whatever to their corporate property. But some few members of the church, who continued to worship with the parish in the old meeting house, claimed to be the *whole church*; and coming voluntarily together, without notice to any of those who worshipped in the new meeting house, and who were a majority of the church, passed a vote of removal against the deacons, who were with the majority, chose two new deacons, and made claim, through them, to all the property belonging to the church. This claim was sanctioned by the judges of the Supreme Court, and final judgement entered at the October term for Norfolk county, 1820. A particular list of the donations to the church, and of the property claimed, a statement of the facts on which the claim was made, and the reasons of the court for their opinion and decision, may be found in the report of the case; Mass. Reports, vol. xvi. p. 488. Eliphalet Baker and another, vs. Samuel Fales.

This strange and unexpected decision, which has shocked the plain sense of good men wherever it has been known, has never been well received, or acquiesced in, by the bar, or by intelligent lawyers of the Commonwealth. The doctrine by which this decision is attempted to be supported, appears to us not less novel, strange, and untenable, than the decision itself; and we regard both doctrine and decision in the light of mere assumption, or what is quite as offensive, of *judicial legislation*.

It was in this case gravely held by all the judges, that when property is bestowed upon a church, "for the use and accommodation of a teaching church officer," or without specially designating the use to be made of it, the parish within which the church is gathered, are the *cestui que trusts*; that is, the property is virtually given to the parish, and the church, by their deacons, are the servants of the parish, to dispose of it for the support of public worship in such house, and under such minister, as the parish may see fit to provide: that, if the church should themselves provide a house and a minister in the place, neither they nor their deacons have any further control over the property; and the parish may, in such case, cause a church to be gathered within the walls of their own house, who shall, by their deacons, seize upon the prop-

erty, and support their minister. It was also in this case solemnly decided, that a parish may legally settle a minister, although the church dissent, and are opposed to it. In order to support these positions, other principles and views equally novel, and equally opposed to the vital interests of the church, were advanced. Thus it is said of the churches, p. 505, that, "As churches, there is not appertaining to them any civil rights or privileges," and "that a church cannot subsist without some religious community to which it is attached." Again, p. 520; "Churches, as such, have no power but of divine worship, church order and discipline." And again; "If a church may subsist independent of a congregation, or religious society, it is certain it has no legal qualities." p. 503.

In order that the whole case may be fairly before the public, I now propose to set down so much of the law and its history on this subject, as shall enable every plain, candid man to decide it for himself. I would however observe, that until the late decisions affecting the rights of the churches, I do not find any just cause for complaint, in respect to their situation in this Commonwealth. The relation between them and the religious societies and civil institutions has been peculiar, and more or less intimate, according as the state of society has varied and changed. It may, perhaps, be fairly inferred, from the history of our laws, institutions, and manners, that every attempt to confer temporal power and authority upon the churches, has failed to promote their best interests; but that in all instances, in which the civil arm has mildly held over them the protecting shield of the law, securing to them the common rights of social bodies, and to individual Christians liberty of conscience, the prosperity of the churches, and the prevalence of true piety, have been promoted.

As early as the year 1641, the protection of the churches became a subject of legislation among the colonists. By a law of that year, the people of God were specially authorized "to gather themselves into a church estate, provided they could do it in a Christian way, with the observance of the rules of Christ, revealed in his word." By the same law, every church was protected in the free exercise of the ordinances of the Gospel, in the election and ordination of its officers, in the admission and discipline of its members, and in all the usual transactions of congregational churches. By a law of 1668, in order to secure the churches in a free and unbiassed election of their officers, it was ordered and declared that, "by the church is meant such as are in full communion only;" and all others are prohibited from voting at their elections.\* By a law of 1692, it is declared that "the churches shall at all times hereafter use, exercise, and enjoy all their privileges and freedoms respecting divine worship, church

\* Colony Laws, pp. 100—104.

order and discipline, and shall be encouraged in the peaceable and regular profession and practice thereof." Under these laws, and until the year 1693, all the ministers were called and settled by the churches. But in that year, a law was passed, which agrees with all subsequent usage in the Orthodox churches and societies of the Commonwealth. "Each respective gathered church, in any town or place, that at any time shall be in want of a minister, shall have power, according to the directions in the word of God, to choose its own minister; and the major part of such inhabitants as do there usually attend the public worship of God, and are by law qualified for voting in town affairs, concurring with the church's act, and the person thus elected and approved accepting thereof, and settling with them, shall be their minister."\*

From the time of the apostles, it had been usual for the churches, through their deacons, to receive donations of money and other things, for the relief of the poor, for the maintenance of their pastors and teachers, and for the support of the Lord's table. This most important part of Christian practice had not been interrupted, even in the worst days of the persecutions under Nero and Domitian. When, after the dark ages, Christian churches began to be regarded as regularly organized bodies, associated for the best of purposes, they were authorized in our mother country to possess property, of a permanent value, and a certain income, for pious uses. It seems the liberality of the pious soon discovered this method of doing good in New England. Considerable grants and donations having been made to the churches under such circumstances as to shew clearly the design of the donors, that the property granted should go in succession, and be held by the respective churches forever; a law was passed, for the purpose of carrying into effect these benevolent designs. In the year 1754, it was enacted,

"That the deacons of all the several Protestant churches, not being Episcopal churches, and the church wardens of the several Episcopal churches, are, and shall be deemed so far bodies corporate, as to take in succession all grants and donations, whether real or personal, made either to their several churches, the poor of their churches, or to them and their successors, and to sue and defend in all actions touching the same; and whenever the ministers, elders, or vestry shall, in such original grants or donations, have been joined with such deacons or church, as donees or grantees in succession, in such case, such officers and their successors, together with the deacons or church wardens, shall be deemed the corporation for such purposes as aforesaid; and the minister or ministers of the several Protestant churches, of whatever denomination, are and shall be deemed capable of taking in succession any parsonage land or lands granted to the minister and his successors, or to the use of the ministers, and of suing and defending all actions touching the same; saving that nothing in this act shall be construed to make void any final judgement of any court of common law, or judge of probate; saving also, that no alienations of any lands, belonging to churches, hereafter made by the deacons without the consent of the church, or a committee of the church for that purpose appointed, or by church wardens without the consent of the vestry, shall be sufficient to pass the same;

\* *Province Laws*, p. 255.

and that no alienation hereafter made, by ministers, of lands by them held in succession, shall be valid any longer than during such alienors continuing ministers, unless such ministers be ministers of particular towns, districts, or precincts, and make such alienation with the consent of such towns, districts, or precincts, or unless such ministers so aliening be ministers of Episcopal churches, and the same be done with the consent of the vestry; and the several churches within this province, not being Episcopal churches, are hereby empowered to choose a committee, to call the deacons or other church officers to account, and if need be, to commence and prosecute any suits touching the same, and also to advise and assist such deacons in the administration of the affairs as aforesaid.\*

In the year 1785, this law was re-enacted, in the same words above quoted. We have quoted the whole section, that every man in his own conscience may judge what is right.

Here, we desire that it may be carefully noticed in regard to this law, 1. The deacons of the churches are made bodies corporate, for the purpose of receiving and holding in succession forever all grants and donations made to the churches or to their poor. 2. The churches, by their committee, are authorized to call their deacons to an account respecting their management of these donations. 3. They are authorized to commence and prosecute any suits, if need be, touching the same. 4. They are also authorized to assist the deacons in their charge of these donations. 5. In regard to donations to the churches, and the management of them, we do not find the least notice whatsoever of any concern the parish may have with them.

From the several laws which have been quoted and referred to, we believe the proposition fully supported, that the deacons are the trustees of such donations of property as may be given to the churches, to hold the same for the use of the members thereof, who, for the time being, may be in full communion. But this proposition, which we believed so plain as to need no argumentation or comment to aid or support it, is encountered and overthrown by the judges of the Supreme Judicial Court, in the case of *Baker and Fales*, which we have before referred to. According to this case, parishes are made to take the place of churches, and churches are made to have no civil rights whatever, unless they place themselves under the wing and protection of parishes. The consequence of this doctrine is, that the churches must be outlaws, and individual Christians must experience persecution. For religious privileges, being more important than civil rights, and coming often in competition with them, as they certainly will, (and have indeed already,) good men will always prefer liberty of conscience, to the mammon of unrighteousness; the churches will secede from the parishes; and the pious donations of the charitable will be turned over to the support of ministers who may soon be not only heterodox, but deistical, and lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God.

\* *Province Laws*, p. 506.

This whole case ought to be laid before the public in its true colors. We have thought the eminent counsel for the church owed it to themselves, as well as to the churches, to publish their argument, by which this novel system of things was resisted, before it came upon us; especially, as in the report of the case, this argument is entirely omitted. We have had no communication with them, but consider the reporter censurable for the omission. He is the servant of the people, and being very amply compensated, we have a right to expect from him a full account of every important case. We have a right to know, not only the reasons upon which the court place their decisions, but the argument of the counsel opposed to them. If it had appeared in this case, as it ought to have done, we might have been saved from the trouble of any additional examination.\*

Here we might stop, and appeal to the good people of Massachusetts to administer a remedy and relief, either by the enactment of laws, or changing the administration of justice. For we cannot believe, that, when this state of things shall be fully known, the good sense and good feelings which prevail among us will long suffer it to continue. Literally, the churches are "speckled birds" among us; now something, now nothing. They are like so many cyphers in arithmetic, which count well at the right, but nothing at the left. If they will worship in such a meeting house, and under such a minister, as the parish shall provide for them, they are numerically something: if they choose to provide a minister and meeting house for themselves, on the opposite side of the way, they are numerically nothing. We do not believe our fellow citizens are prepared to acknowledge this new logic to be genuine: for *law* it is not. It is a kind of chop-logic, by which the whole binding force of the statute is done away. If this generation, and all generations to come, do not perceive this decision to be an anomaly in the law, and a perversion of logic, it must be attributed to that blind prejudice, under the influence of which the learned and the mighty of this world have not unfrequently ranged themselves in opposition to the true church of Christ.

But we propose to examine some of the positions by which this decision is fortified. The court say, p. 494, the counsel for the church "contended that the property given to the church belonged to them as an ecclesiastical body, without any connexion with the parish; and to the use of the church, without any trust in favor of the parish." If so, they contended for what plainly appears to be

\*The office of reporter, blended as it now seems to be with the court itself, has lost the affections of the most intelligent portion of the community. Instead of operating as a check to the court, by a faithful record of the cases; it has become, by the omission of a great proportion of the cases altogether, and of the argument of counsel so frequently, rather a protector of court blunders and improvident decisions: so that it has now become questionable with the best lawyers, whether the law establishing this office answers any beneficial purpose; and whether our jurisprudence would not be better promoted, by leaving this business to be done by individuals upon their own responsibility.

the sound exposition of the statute; and we find no satisfactory reason given for deciding contrary to this position of the counsel for the church. The parish were not mentioned in the donations; they are not mentioned in the law. The first step in the argument of the court is, that "the donations were given for the support of public worship." Well, was not that worship to be directed by the church? But what is the inference? "Therefore the parish must be the *cestui que trust*." see p. 496. Why? "Because the effect was to relieve them from the expense they would otherwise have been obliged to bear, or forego all the benefits of a Christian ministry." p. 499. If this reasoning be correct, the legal estates of Cambridge university, of Williams and Amherst colleges, and of all our incorporated academies, is in the resident pupils and students who receive the immediate benefit of them. But how does it follow, if the donations do not go to the parish, that the parish must "be at the expense of supporting a minister, or forego the benefits of the Christian ministry." Cannot the people of the parish attend meeting with the church? "Aye, but they must have a minister of their own choice." Well, they then must be at the expense of maintaining him, and not lay violent hands upon the pious bounty of good men, who did not trust it in their hands, and who, if alive, would not attend upon his ministry.

The next position is, "The church is not a body politic, and cannot hold in succession." "Nor were they *cestui que trusts*, for there were no trustees but themselves." p. 405. '*No trustees but themselves*'! But according to the court, see p. 467, "the statute of 1754, constitutes the deacons of the churches the *trustees*." Let these two sentences be reconciled, if they can be. '*Cannot take in succession*'! What was the object of the statute of 1754? Are not the deacons, by that statute, a perpetual corporation, to hold in succession for the church those bounties which are expressly given them? '*Not a body politic*'! We hope not to be put down by a hard name. A town, a parish, a school district, are not, strictly speaking, bodies politic. They are, in the language of courts, *qua corporations*; that is, corporations in some respects, though not in others. See Mass. Rep. vol. xiii. p. 193. Fourth school district in Rumford vs. Wood. By the court, "school districts may be considered, under our institutions, as *qua corporations*, with limited powers, co-extensive with the duties imposed upon them by statute or usage, but restrained from the general use of the authority which belongs to those metaphysical persons, by the common law. The same may be said of all the numerous corporations created by the Legislature, enjoying the power expressly bestowed, and possessing by necessary implication the authority which is requisite to execute the purposes of their creation." A church, by the statute, consists of "those who are in full communion." The court admit that this was a description

of the voters sufficiently definite, p. 516. No doubt it is a definition by which the members may be always ascertained. By the statute, the deacons are accountable to the church, for the right appropriation of their donations : the church may also bring actions against the deacons, if need be. Why, then, are not the church sufficiently qualified to be *cestui que trusts* of these donations? Is it not trifling with names, and with reason too, to say that a church is not a body politic?

But say the court, "there is distinction between a church, in an ecclesiastical point of view, and a church, in relation to civil rights," p. 503. This appears to us a solecism, and must, we think, be an insolvable enigma to all who read the case. The statute of 1641 prescribes the mode of gathering a church. The statute of 1668 declares who shall constitute the church, for the purpose of electing ministers. The statute of 1754, re-enacted in 1786, makes the deacons of the church a body corporate to receive donations, and holds them accountable to the church therefor, to use and appropriate the same, according to the form of the gift. Have we any other kind of churches recognized by the law of this Commonwealth? We know of no other. Is this, then, a church in an "ecclesiastical point of view," or a church "in relation to civil rights"? Undoubtedly *both*. It is a church gathered in manner prescribed by law, and "with the observance of the rules of Christ in his word." A church, *ecclesia*, *ex vi termini*, is an ecclesiastical body; and if it has any civil rights, it is a church in "relation to those rights."

But the court say, p. 505, "A church cannot subsist without some religious community to which it is attached." This assertion we consider *entirely gratuitous*. We do not believe there is a colorable ground for it. There never was a law in this Commonwealth which required such a connexion, as essential to the enjoyment of the civil rights secured by the statute of 1754, nor does the notion of such a connexion consist with the statutes of 1641 and 1668, nor with the rules of the Platform.

But say the court, "if this were not so, a church might remove to any other place, even without the Commonwealth, and carry their donations with them." Well; and so might the corporation of Harvard university run away, and carry all the immense property in their hands with them: the inhabitants of a town might remove, *en masse*, and take with them any property in their hands. The Society for Propogating the Gospel may pocket the charitable donations bestowed upon them, and run away. A poll parish may remove, and carry with them the donations of property bestowed on them: so may the trustees of the funds of our parishes. There seems to be a great apprehension that the churches will run away. Good men, it is believed, are not without apprehensions that such may be the state of things among, us, if these judicial opinions are

followed up, that the church must go away ; but with very little, certainly, to carry with them. But is not this a mere bugbear, to frighten us out of the important rights secured by the statute ? If the laws have not sufficiently secured pious donors against a possible abuse of power by those to whom the donations are given, then let wiser laws be made. But let the law-making power do this, and not the judicial courts. How readily is it admitted that parishes will not abuse their donations ! But what are the lessons of experience ? Is it not well known to all descriptions of persons, that this parish in Dedham have diverted the donations in question from the original design of the pious and Orthodox benefactors ? And have not other parishes done the same ? And does not every body know that the Corporation of Harvard university have done the same, in relation to the Professorship of Divinity, to the outrage of all principle, justice, or gratitude ?

But the case does not stop here. Something more must be said to justify the removal of the deacons by the minority of the church, without notice to the majority ; and the choice of new deacons by the same minority, without notice to the majority, and without a pretence of accusation. Accordingly it is said, p. 503, “ The secession of a whole church from the parish would be an extinction of the church ; and it is competent for the members of the parish to institute a new church, or to engraft one upon the old stock, if any should remain.” We are quite certain there is nothing in the reasoning which follows, which has any tendency to prove this proposition. But let it be examined. It was intended to apply to the facts in the case. By the word *secession* then, is meant the retiring of the church by their own vote and act, from the old meeting house, and their worshipping in the new meeting house on the other side of the way. The court say, p. 504, “ Though many instances have occurred of the removal of church members from one church or place of worship to another, and no doubt a removal of the majority of the members has sometimes occurred, we do not hear of any church ceasing to exist, while there remained members enough left to do church service.” But what has this to do with the case ? [It is the whole argument.] Is there no difference between *secession*, as defined by the case itself, and the casual removal of members by dismission and recommendation ? Beyond all question, church members may remove from one place to another, as individuals, and still leave the church behind them. But when a church, in regular meeting, takes up the subject of seceding from a parish, or leaving a particular place of worship ; deliberates respecting it ; votes to withdraw ; and in a body does withdraw ; we insist upon it, that the church, by their secession, have not become extinct. They still live, and are entitled to live, in the enjoyment of all their powers and rights. The abandoned parish may indeed institute a new church, but this will be a *new*



one, possessing its own rights and privileges, but not inheriting those of the church which has retired.

We believe the instance at Dedham was the first in Massachusetts, in which the usage, the Platform, and the law were all disregarded; and in sanctioning this proceeding by our highest judicial tribunal, we regard the churches as cast without the protection of the law, and their members as brought into a state of legal persecution. By the law of 1641, every church was to be protected in the free exercise of the ordinances of the Gospel, in the election and ordination of its officers, in the admission and discipline of its members, and in all the usual transactions of congregational churches. But in sanctioning the unprecedented proceedings at Dedham, we depose the officers of the church, without accusation, without a crime, without notice, and without the consent of the church; we set at naught the discipline of the church, and set up a kind of civil church by *construction* and *assumption*, which is contrary to the order of the Gospel; and while we take from the true church every right and privilege in civil society, we clothe this *mongrel, barbarous* church with rights and privileges unknown to the law, and unknown to the Gospel.

We intended to have pursued this case still farther, and to have examined it more minutely. We intended to have discussed the nature of those civil rights which are thus attached to these cameleon-colored churches, and to have inquired whether they are of that unalienable, indefeasable, independent character, which alone are worthy of mention in a free commonwealth.

We designed to have gone with some particularity into our own ecclesiastical history, and to have shewn, as we certainly can, that there is no color for saying, with the case before us, that the churches and parishes in Massachusetts were formerly identified; and this remark being thrice repeated in the Report, we have deferred an inquiry into its truth with the more reluctance. We intended to have examined the case in Sandwich,\* which is adduced in the Report as an authority, and to have shewn that it was a case

\* The case here referred to is not that of "Burr vs. Sandwich," but that of "the deacons of the first church in Sandwich vs. Tilden."—The pretence of a judicial decision to warrant the decision of the Dedham case, is, in our opinion, an abuse of language. The case above alluded to is placed in a note to the principal one, p. 503. The date of the case is not mentioned, which in our view is a culpable omission. We have ascertained that it was decided during the pendency of the case of Paker and Fales, and on the trial of that case was not relied on as an authority. It ought not have been so relied on: *for it was a case which was never tried.* So much attention was paid to it, that the facts were agreed, and eminent counsel was engaged to argue the case for the defendant; but it became impossible for the counsel to be present, and the defendant was defaulted. The friends of Mr. Lamson attended at the court, expecting the trial, and expressed great satisfaction in discovering what was called 'the *learning* of the court.' The judges intimated that probably the defendant would not have been benefited by his counsel, if he had been present; for having previously been furnished with the papers, they could not but have formed some opinion in respect to the merits of the case. But in our view, it is a perversion of good practice, to quote that case as a judicial decision; a case of *default*—a case *not argued*—a case contemporaneously pending—a case upon which, if any opinion was given, it was given gratuitously, and extra-judicially.

of *no* authority. And especially, we intended to show, that the right of the churches to prevent the settlement of a heterodox minister over them, was a right coeval with our existence as a community, and never was intended to have been done away by the constitution.

But enough has been said to shew the condition in which the Orthodox churches of this Commonwealth are now placed; and that they are placed in this condition by a species of unwarranted *judicial construction*, by which the sound and wholesome provisions of the statute of 1754, "*are torn to very tatters.*" We ought to talk no more of *liberty*, until this foul stain on our jurisprudence is wiped away.

---

RECOLLECTIONS OF BRAINERD.

The name of Brainerd will be held in sacred remembrance by those who love Zion, in every age and in every place. The perusal of his life, to the hundredth time, will not be unprofitable. For however often read, the warm effusions of piety and devotion which flowed from his pen, will still excite to circumspection and diligence, to humility, thankfulness and praise.

His experience was deep, and in some respects peculiar. From common indifference, he was brought to uncommon pharisaical self-righteousness and outward attention to religion. From this state, after humiliating proof of the deceit and wickedness of his heart, he was at length brought to a peaceful embrace of Christ, in the offers of salvation, and to enjoy an habitual and remarkable nearness to God. In this state he lived; in this he labored; in this he died. 'Blessed and happy saint! May I follow thee, as thou followedst Christ; and ultimately may my rest be glorious, as thine is, through the grace of our Redeemer, and the renewing and sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit.'

In the light of that pure law, by which is the knowledge of sin, Brainerd had seen and was convinced of the entire depravity of his heart, regarding himself as naturally opposed to God and his government. In this state he was convinced, after many and earnest efforts to save himself, that this was impossible; and that faith alone in Jesus Christ could avail to save him. Out of this state of darkness, he was at length brought into "marvellous light." Unspeakable glory seemed to open to his view; and now, if he could have been saved by his own duties, his soul had no desire for it, and he wondered that the whole world did not see and comply with the free offers of salvation through the righteousness of Christ.

Brainerd was an uncommon example of self-mortification and self-denial. Witness his confession of his faults at college, and

(though of bright promise had he sought distinction) his cheerful withdrawal of himself and devotion to the cause of Christ among the poor Indians at Kaunaameek, and afterwards at the Forks of the Delaware, and on the Susquehanna.

As might be expected of one who withheld not himself, Brainerd was liberal of his property, to promote the happiness of his fellow men. Though far from affluent, he gave, in fifteen months of rather more than ordinary prosperity, *a hundred pounds* to charitable purposes, and blessed God for having made him the steward of his bounty.

Brainerd was a man of uncommon inward struggles, trials and consolations. His spiritual life was no ordinary life. He was not content with no more than ordinary attainments in piety. We find him struggling against everything which he discovered within himself that was not pure, and humble, and holy, and active. He made no compromise with sloth and carnal indulgence. Whatever was wayward in affection, or weak in faith, or wanting in zeal, he was for correcting without delay. If from any cause God hid his face, his soul was in distress; nor, till the sun of righteousness shone forth again, could he give himself rest or quiet. He was for dwelling near in the presence of God, and living habitually upon the fulness of the Redeemer. "Nothing," says he, "so refreshes my soul, as when I can go to God, yea, to God *my exceeding joy*. When he is so, sensibly to my soul, O how unspeakably delightful is this! O, that I could forever live to God!"

He was also a man of wrestling prayer, and of prevailing supplication; and therefore God was with him, and wrought gloriously by him. Whether in the house or by the way, among his friends or in his study, he was in prayer. Preaching at a certain place, he was barren in the morning, and enjoyed "scarcely any warmth." But at noon he withdrew, and "got alone among the bushes." There he "cried to God, being in great anguish, that he could not address souls with more compassion and tender affection." In the afternoon he preached in demonstration of the Spirit and with power. "The Spirit of God was there, and the effects were apparent, tears running down many cheeks."—Sometimes he even forgot his food, through his interest in devotion and secret prayer.

Instead of terrors, in the nearest views of death, Brainerd rather exulted and triumphed. "O," said he, "the glorious time is now coming! I have longed to serve God perfectly: Now God will gratify those desires. I long for the time. I am very willing to part with all. O, why is Christ so long in coming? Why tarry the wheels of his chariot?"

How many ministers are there now of this apostolical character? Let the clerical readers of the Spirit of the Pilgrims be admonished of what they ought to be, by the example of David Brainerd. They may have read his life repeatedly, but let them read it again, and if like me, they will not read in vain.

## REVIEWS.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO WHOM WAS REFERRED THE SEVERAL PETITIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF MAILS ON THE SABBATH, *presented to the Senate of the United States, Jan. 16, 1829, by the Hon. Mr. Johnson of Kentucky, Chairman.*

By the title and design of our work ; by the memory of those who fled from Holland to Plymouth, because in that land of merchandise they could not enjoy a quiet Sabbath, or accustom their children to keep it holy ; by all the blessings, civil and religious, which exist in close alliance with that day, which have been our birthright, and are the just inheritance of the future generations of our children ; and by all our obligations, as patriots to our country, and as Christians to our God, we consider ourselves called upon to animadvert upon the facts, principles and reasonings contained in this Report.

We cherish an ardent attachment to the principles of our republican institutions, and believe that, in alliance with the Gospel, they are destined to emancipate the world ; and, without permitting ourselves to participate in the collisions incident to popular elections, we hold ourselves bound, and declare ourselves disposed, to render to the constituted authorities of our nation, from time to time, our prayers, and our cheerful co-operation, in all things which are lawful and right. It is the happiness of our nation, that so extensively the people read and think for themselves ; and the glory of our government, that it is so accessible to the people, and feels with such ease, superceding the necessity of revolution, the slightest movement of the public will. The press, which in Europe is struggling on to liberty amid bristling bayonets, is with us free ; and those accommodations to public sentiment, which there can be secured only by innovation upon ancient usages, are obtained here with all the safety which appertains to public discussion, and a judicious and peaceful legislation. The people have only to ascertain what will be for their good, and they are blessed with a government whose honor and happiness it is to bestow it.

It is both admitted, and by us maintained, that animadversions upon public men and measures, legislative or judicial, should be conducted with candor and respect. But the maxim that no wrong can be done by men in authority, belongs to the monarchy from which our fathers fled, and not to the republic which they instituted. In our animadversions, therefore, upon the Report of this Committee, we both exercise a right, and perform a duty, which belongs to us as citizens and as Christians.

We enter upon this duty without delay, because the principles of

the Report are fraught with too much evil, and the reasonings which recommend them are too specious and coincident with popular inclination, to permit the bane to circulate long without the antidote; it being much easier to prevent the introduction of poison into the body politic, than to expel it when it shall once have obtained a brisk circulation. We are the more constrained to speak, because in our view, the Sabbath is the mainspring of our republican institutions, every one of which, without its moral power, will most assuredly run down; and because, if the tide of profanation, set in motion by governmental example, continues to roll on for fourteen years to come, as it has done for the fourteen which are past, it may be impossible to preserve to the nation the moral blessings of that day. If, with twelve millions of people, the breaking forth, which at first was but a drop, and then a pure stream, has become a flood, sweeping all mounds and landmarks before it, what power shall stay it, when urged on, as in the course of the present century it will be, by a population of thirty, sixty, or even eighty millions. We are sure that the people of this nation would not, by any public act, abolish the Sabbath; and we are equally confident that to all purposes of national morality it will be done, unless a more efficient public sentiment can be arrayed in favor of its preservation. To our apprehension, the question now before Congress and the nation is, *Abolish, or not abolish, the Christian Sabbath.* Of such a decision we dare not, in time or in eternity, meet the result, without having done all which heaven has enabled us to do, to produce a correct decision. Between the cradle and the grave of liberty we take our stand; and to the nation, and to heaven, we here pledge ourselves, never to abandon our post, or to keep silence, till the Sabbath, the palladium of our hopes, is rescued, or the grave has closed upon our country's glory. And these, we have cause to know, are the views and feelings which have waked up the nation, and called forth the united, spontaneous burst of importunity which has flowed in upon Congress.

The question, however, is not to be settled by mere feeling; much less by the *argumentum ad invidiam*, on either side. It is manifest that the people, as yet, do not thoroughly understand the subject, and when they do, we have great confidence that, under God, they will decide right. Before we proceed, therefore, to a particular consideration of the Report, we shall endeavor to afford to our readers the means of forming a correct judgement, in respect to the real and indispensable efficacy of the Sabbath to the maintenance of our civil and religious institutions.

It has been said often by the advocates of a liberal exposition of the fourth command, that 'the Sabbath was made for man.' This is true, but in a sense directly the opposite of that which is intended. The Sabbath was *made* (i. e. it was *instituted and set*

apart by heaven) for the spiritual use and benefit of man. To be made for *man*, denotes its universal necessity and universal and perpetual obligation: for the term *man* is generic, and includes the race, of all ages and nations. The declaration 'the Sabbath was made for man,' implies also that it was bestowed as a blessing, and not imposed as a penance—a mitigation, and not an augmentation of the curse, 'In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return to the earth.' The six days were made for man as really as the seventh; but they are appropriated to labor, while the seventh is given as a season in which to suspend his toils and cares, and furnishes to the laboring classes of the world almost their only opportunity for intellectual and moral cultivation. Thus, it is said, at the close of creation, that God blessed and *sanctified* the Sabbath. But to sanctify times, places, and things, is, according to scriptural usage, to set them apart from a secular to a religious use; as the sons of Levi were sanctified to the priesthood, and the tabernacle and temple to the worship of God, and all their utensils to religious uses.

The necessity of some respite from the ordinary vocations of life the Report admits to be the "voice of universal nature;" and the wisdom and benevolence of consecrating a seventh part of time to this rest, appear in its experimental adaptation to the physical, intellectual and moral necessities of man. Experience has ascertained that the frames of men and animals are incapable of uninterrupted action. Beside the repose of the night, a periodical rest of the Sabbath is demanded. Those who labor through the summer, without intermission, accomplish less, with much greater exhaustion, than those who observe the Sabbath. Extended journies are performed with more expedition, and less fatigue, by man and beast, with, than without, the rest of the Sabbath. It was ascertained in France, by experiment, that the labor of nine days, instead of six, increased the exhaustion of man, and diminished the aggregate amount of labor. The reason is obvious. No device of man can make a pound weigh more than a pound, or limited strength endure but a limited degree of action; and he who made the frame of man prepared it to sustain action six days in the week, and no more.

It is manifest, that the mind has its limits of vigorous and healthful application to study, or to business, and that all taxation beyond the exigencies of six days reacts, in nervous prostration, mental aberration, or mortality. God has set the bounds to muscular and mental effort which they cannot pass; and though man, impatient of constraint, has rushed upon them, and sought to pass, like the waves dashing upon the iron-bound shore, he alone has been broken, while the ordinances of heaven have 'maintained their place'.

It is chiefly, however, in a moral respect that the Sabbath was

made for man. For all experience has shown that cessation from labor, without religious and moral instruction, results in dissipation and excess, more injurious to mind and body, than unintermitted toil. The Sabbath, as a mere holiday, has always exerted a most terrific demoralizing influence; and there is no alternative for man, but to keep it holy, or waste away by the toil or the dissipation of its violation.

That man is a free agent, to be governed by law, and not by force, is a matter of universal consciousness. That the moral law contained in the decalogue is the rule of duty, and would, if obeyed, constitute perfect society, is admitted by Christians. The entire influence of this law depends however on its being known, explained, and pressed earnestly and often upon the attention of men. It is the design of the Sabbath to give omnipresence and energy to the moral law, by convening, one day in seven, the population of the world to hear the expositions of its precepts and sanctions. It is not to be denied, also, that man is a sinner, and must be reclaimed and pardoned, to fit him for heaven; and the Sabbath is given to him as a day of rest, in which he may attend to such instructions as God has provided to make him wise unto salvation. But the influence of both law and Gospel to benefit man for time or for eternity is impaired, just in proportion as the Sabbath is diverted from sacred, and is devoted to secular uses. To establish this position, nothing is necessary, but a concise consideration of the state of human society in respect to each command of the decalogue, where the Sabbath does not give presence and influence to the law of God and the precepts of the Gospel. We will name the commands in order, and illustrate, by an appeal to facts, the state of society in respect to each, where the Sabbath does not impart its energy to the moral law.

"*Thou shalt have no other gods before me.*" But unblessed by the Sabbath, there is not a spot on earth, where the understanding is enlightened by just conceptions of the character of God, or his worship maintained, or the hearts and lives of men purified by the Gospel. Everywhere, as the Sabbath has disappeared, has darkness covered the earth, and gross darkness the people; and though we exult in our liberties and superior illumination, in one century, without the Sabbath, would our sun go down, and all our civil and religious institutions perish.

"*Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image.*" But where has the Sabbath departed, and idolatry not entered? The reluctance of man to retain God in his knowledge is notorious. It is only by the evidence of miracles, and the energy imparted by the Sabbath to divine institutions, that the name and worship of God have been maintained upon the earth. The Jews, previous to their captivity at Babylon, were strangely addicted to the worship of idols; but after their return, when the synagogue wor-

ship was established, the Sabbath more strictly observed, and the law of God read and explained every recurring seventh day, they never relapsed into idolatry more.

The Sabbath is the wall of partition between Christian and heathen lands;—the sun which enlightens the one, while all without is the region of the shadow of death. The enemies of revelation revile the Sabbath, as a day subservient to superstition and the clergy; but let them turn their backs on its hated light, and go where its glimmerings do not reach, and everywhere they will witness the ignorance of the multitude, and the uncontrolled despotism of an idol priesthood. Idolatry has retreated before the hated light of holy time, and now lies in ambush, waiting to return, whenever it shall be extinguished. The enemies of revelation and the Sabbath are in fact the pioneers of idolatry, with all its abominable superstitions and impurities.

“*Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.*” The entire influence of the divine government depends on the reverence and love for God which prevail among his subjects. Wherever respect for God declines—wherever his name, attributes, word, and worship, are treated with irreverence and levity, there the obedience of the heart has no place, and atheism itself could scarcely be more licentious in its results. Profaneness is ever associated in some form, and more commonly in many forms, with immorality; so that universally, the more profaneness abounds, the more dissolute is the community in which it prevails. But among what classes of the community does the profanation of the name of God most abound? Never among those, as a class, who are reverential and strict in their observance of the Sabbath, but among those, almost exclusively, who lightly esteem and violate that holy day.

“*Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.*” But what is the treatment of parents by their children, where no Sabbath preserves natural affection, corroborates parental by divine authority, invigorates conscience, and forms a public sentiment which renders filial ingratitude disreputable? In lands nominally Christian, children who are farthest removed from the influence of the Sabbath, are most frequently irreligious, self-willed, ‘heady, highminded, disobedient to parents, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful;’ while often, by their abusive conduct, they destroy domestic peace, and by their vices and crimes bring themselves and the grey hairs of their parents with sorrow to the grave. In pagan lands, the insubordination of children to parents is notorious, and the affections and comforts of the family state, as they are enjoyed in Christian lands, are scarcely known. It is a common event for children, when their parents have become old, and can be of no further use to them, to carry them forth as a nuisance, and lay them down under the canopy of heaven, by the



river, or the way side, to die the lingering, intolerable death of starvation.

“*Thou shalt not kill.*” But where the Sabbath does not give presence and energy to the moral law, how cheap and insecure is the life of man? Duelling, as a general fact, prevails among Sabbath breakers. It is doubtful whether an individual can be found, of the multitude who have fought, who was accustomed to pay a strict regard to holy time. And where do those assaults most abound, which indicate the absence of principle, and the predominance of intemperance, and rage, and brutal force? Precisely where the Sabbath is least revered, and the tavern has supplanted the sanctuary of God. Where, with horrid frequency, and more horrid impunity, do those assassinations multiply, which hold life in jeopardy? It is where the Sabbath, if known at all, exists in name only, as a day of superstitious forms, and is, in fact, a holiday, more destructive to morals than the other six. In many such places, the work of assassination has become a profession. For a small sum, a desperado can be hired to take away life, and can find a sanctuary from justice in the church; and, for a small portion of his gain, can be absolved from guilt by the ghostly priesthood.

There is a city in our own land, in which, a few years since, an appalling number of assassinations took place in six months, and every one of them with entire impunity. But there was no Sabbath there, which gave presence and influence to the government of God, or tone to public sentiment, or energy to the civil law. And whoever reads the account of assassinations and murders which are fast becoming a part of our weekly intelligence, and observes the geographical location of these deeds of blood, will perceive that they abound chiefly in the twilight of religious knowledge, and where the Sabbath sheds upon the population but a faint and glimmering light. In most unevangelized nations, infanticide is common, and often prevails to such an extent that one half the children born are destroyed, and not unfrequently by the hand of her who bore them. In nearly all heathen nations human sacrifices been offered, and in many are offered still; and in all, the life of man is set at naught with an inhumanity unparalleled even in the worst parts of nominal Christendom. In India, every year, multitudes of widows burn on the funeral pile with their dead husbands. It is said, indeed, to be done voluntarily; but it is a compulsory choice—the disgrace and persecution for a refusal being more dreadful than death. In Rome, thousands were sometimes murdered in a month, in the shows of the gladiators, merely for the public amusement. But no Sabbath had brought to their ears the divine prohibition, ‘*Thou shalt not kill.*’ Until the light of the Sabbath arose on that dark empire, a vast proportion of the population were slaves, over whom the master held the power of life

and death, and whom, in passion or caprice, he often killed and cast into fish ponds, to fatten the fish of his table.

Buchanan, in his *Christian Researches*, writes thus :

“ Buddruck, May 30, 1806. We know that we are approaching Juggernaut, (and yet we are more than fifty miles from it) by the human bones which we have seen for some days strewed by the way. Near the pilgrim’s caravansera, there are more than a hundred skulls. The dogs, jackalls and vultures seem to live here on human prey. The vultures exhibit a shocking tameness. This Buddruck is a horrid place. Wherever I turn my eyes, I meet death in some shape or other.”

“ Juggernaut, June 14. I have seen Juggernaut. The scene at Buddruck is but the vestibule. No record of ancient or modern history, can give an adequate idea of this valley of death. The idol of Juggernaut has been considered as the Moloch of the present age, and he is justly so named ; for the sacrifices offered up to him by self-devotement are not less criminal, perhaps not less numerous, than those recorded of the Moloch of Canaan.” “ I beheld another distressing scene this morning. A poor woman lying dead, or nearly dead, and her two children by her, looking at the dogs and vultures which were near. The people passed without noticing the children. I asked them where was their home? They said, ‘ they had no home but where their mother was.’ O, there is no pity at Juggernaut, no mercy, no tenderness of heart in Moloch’s kingdom ;”—and he might have said, *because there is no Sabbath there.*

When the Sabbath was abolished in France, the Mighty God, whose being they had denied, and whose worship they abolished, stood aloof, and gave them up ; and a scene of proscription, and assassination, and desolation ensued, unparalleled in the annals of the civilized world. In the city of Paris, there were in 1803, eight hundred and seven suicides and murders. Among the criminals executed, there were seven fathers who had poisoned their children, ten husbands who had murdered their wives, six wives who had poisoned their husbands, and fifteen children who had destroyed their parents.

“ *Thou shalt not commit adultery.*” But in many nations lying without the pale of Christendom, promiscuous concubinage has prevailed to the annihilation of domestic purity, and all the sweet charities of the family state. At the Sandwich Islands, licentiousness and disease were fast exterminating the wretched population, until the Sabbath and the glad tidings of the Gospel came to their aid. The impurities of heathenism cannot be named—cannot be even conceived. Buchanan, who witnessed the walls and gates of the temple of Juggernaut “ covered with indecent emblems in massive and durable sculpture,” and listened to the obscene stanzas which the priest said “ are the delight of the god,” beheld the “ lascivious

gesture," and "indecent action," and heard from the multitude "the sensual yell of delight," as they urged the car along, says, "I was appalled at the magnitude and horror of the spectacle, and felt a consciousness of doing wrong in witnessing it, and was about to withdraw; but a scene of a different kind was now to be presented. The characteristics of Moloch's worship are lust and blood. We have seen the former; now comes the blood." "This, thought I, is the worship of the Bramins of Hindostan, in its sublimest degree! What then shall we think of their private manners and their moral principles: for it is equally true of India, as of Europe, if you would know the state of the people, you must look at the state of the temple."

Why should we allude here to the temple of Venus, and the similar abominations which pertained to her worship; or to the chastity of nations, a part of whose religion consisted in the most shameless obscenities? *There was no Sabbath there.*

"*Thou shalt not steal.*" But it is notorious that the unevangelized population of the world, with little exception, is addicted to theft. By the laws of some of the ancient heathen nations, stealing was encouraged, if not expressly enjoined. And among modern heathens, as missionaries and other travellers have constantly witnessed, this vice almost universally prevails. And from what class of society in Christian nations, does the anti-social conspiracy of swindlers, thieves and robbers usually proceed? Beyond question, they are those whom in childhood no parental instruction and example taught to remember the Sabbath day—the vagrants of our cities and land, to whom the returning Sabbath brought leisure and opportunity to perfect themselves, by practice, in all manner of wickedness.

"*Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.*" But in Hindostan, Sir William Jones, who adorned alike religion, literature, and the bench, declares, that he "never knew a Hindoo, whose testimony under oath could be fully relied on." "They will swear falsely," says Mr. Ward," in the most shocking manner, so that a judge never knows when he may safely believe a Hindoo witness. Some of the courts of justice are infested by a set of men who, for a paltry sum, are willing to make oath to any fact, however false."

The facility with which forged papers and false testimony can be obtained in most Catholic countries, is well known to commercial men. And in our own land, as we recede from the sanctuary and the Sabbath to those classes of society, whose inclination or employment carry them beyond its illumination and blessed attraction, we shall find the sanctity of an oath to decline, and life and property, as protected by law, to be more and more insecure.

"*Thou shalt not covet.*" "The Hindoos," says Mr. Ward, "are excessively addicted to covetousness, especially in the great

towns, where they have been corrupted by commerce." And where, except in Christian lands, do *governments* exist, which are not rapacious? The rapacity of the Turkish government has well nigh depopulated some of the fairest portions of the earth, once the most populous, where no crime is more dangerous to life than that of being rich. And where will you look for confirmation of the inspired declaration, that 'the world lusteth to envy,' and for mobs and insurrections, laying rapacious hands on the property of the rich, but among those whom the Sabbath has not visited, and whose only restraint is the coercion of law? Men of wealth, who are hasting to be rich by Sabbath day earnings, should understand that their wealth is floating on a popular sea whose waves the laws cannot chain, when the Sabbath has ceased to legislate in the name of heaven—that a volcano is beneath them, whose explosion man cannot prevent or withstand, when the fear of the Lord has ceased, which is the beginning of wisdom. If our men of wealth desire the scenes of revolutionary France to be acted over, let them obliterate the Sabbath, and propagate infidelity, and 'from the vasty deep,' call up the demons of blood—and they will come.

Volumes of facts, under each of these particulars, might easily be accumulated. We have selected a few only as specimens, but enough to show, that the moral law, without the Sabbath, is as imbecile to restrain and bless mankind, as would be the constitution and statutes of our government, without an administration.

From the moral efficacy of the Sabbath, as illustrated by facts, we are authorized to infer the universality and perpetuity of its obligations. It is one of the ten commands, which epitomize the whole duty of man to God, and to his neighbor;—the practical expression, in worship and relative duties, of that love which is called 'the fulfilling of the law.' It was 'made' or instituted for man 'in the beginning.' It might just as well be pretended that the world was not created, as that the Sabbath was not instituted, till the time of Moses. And it is no more an appendage of Judaism, than is the worship of God, or the love of our neighbor. It is, in its nature, (the particular day only in the seven excepted) a moral and not a positive institution. It results from the nature of God that he should be worshipped; and from the nature of man, that he should one day in seven enjoy rest, and pay to God his adoration, and be instructed in his duty. There is in the constitution of the human mind and body, and in the nature of God's moral government, as real, as universal, and as permanent a necessity for the Sabbath, as there is for marriage, obedience to parents, or for truth and moral honesty. Nay, the fourth command is more important than either of the nine, as it is that alone which secures to the government of God an effectual administration.

The change of the day from the seventh to the first, (of which we cannot now speak) no more abolishes the obligation to keep

holy a seventh part of time, than it changes the nature of God or man. To God worship is still due, and man needs instruction and rest one day in seven. All the reasons, therefore, which ever existed for the institution of the Sabbath, exist still, and will forever exist, while the character of God, and the capacity and character of man remain.

Were it admitted, as some Christians do admit, that the obligation to keep the Sabbath is not derived from the fourth command, but from its manifest and acknowledged utility, still, it must be agreed, that the Sabbath is, as a matter of *duty*, to be set apart from secular to religious purposes; for unquestioned utility indicates the will of heaven, and creates moral obligation. The known use of the Sabbath, and the mischiefs of its profanation, afford evidence of the divine will, which every man would be bound in conscience to regard, though no express institution appeared upon the record. God has not defined, by express precept, the kind of garments we shall wear summer and winter; but it would be suicide to expose the body in the habiliments of summer, to the storms of winter. And it is no more credible that an institution so powerful and salutary in the moral world as the Sabbath, rose up by chance, or at human bidding, than that the sun itself sprung into existence, and continues its course, in obedience to human volition.

It is equally manifest in what manner the Sabbath must be sanctified, to answer, in human society, the benevolent end of its institution. It must be so kept, that the physical rest which universal nature demands may be enjoyed; that the worship which is due to God may be rendered by all, and the instruction which all need, to make them good citizens in time, and fellow citizens of the saints in heaven, may be obtained. All plans, individual or national, which interfere with the universal rest and moral instruction of the Sabbath, except as cases of real necessity shall indicate, do, in proportion to the extent of the violation, contravene the wisdom and goodness of God in bestowing the Sabbath upon man. There are many, who eulogize the Sabbath, and would deprecate its universal violation, who seem to think it may well be kept by proxy—the few for the many. But the community at large may as well eat by proxy, the few for the many, as to obtain rest, or intellectual and moral culture by proxy. The Sabbath exerts its benign power on those only who keep it; and in proportion to the extent of its violation, are men robbed of the rest which God has given them, and deprived of all the good influences of his moral government.

Violations of the moral law are proper subjects of legislative prohibition and punishment, whether they invade directly, or only indirectly, the rights of man. The blasphemer may not himself be a thief; but his blasphemy, so far as it produces its legitimate

effect, breaks down the moral government of God, emancipates men from his fear, and lets them loose, urged on by furious passion, to prey upon society. The drunkard may not be himself dishonest; but by the neglect of relative duty, and the contagion of his bad example, he sows far and wide around him the seeds of irreligion and dishonesty. The adulterer may, in his commercial intercourse, be a man of his word, and in the duelling world a man of honor; but he scatters in the community firebrands, arrows and death, and sets on fire the course of nature, as if it were set on fire of hell. The Sabbath breaker may not be in all respects an immoral man; but by his example, and by his influence when he employs others to violate the Sabbath, he prostrates, as far as his influence extends, the moral government of God, and lets men loose to war upon their own souls, and upon one another, and upon the State, as depravity, unrestrained by the fear of God, and stimulated by temptation, may urge them on. Is it proper then to punish the incendiary; and shall he escape who made him such, and laid the train to which he only applies the spark? Shall the sword of justice sleep, while the dagger is brandished, and the poison is preparing, and smite only when the work of desolation is done? Shall the enemy be met only when he has planted his foot on the soil of freedom, and no opposition be made to his landing?

All Christian nations have considered it lawful to protect the Sabbath from secular violation, as the means of self-preservation and civil prosperity. Most or all of the American colonies did this from the beginning; we believe all the thirteen States enacted laws prohibiting the appropriation of the Sabbath to secular concerns; and nearly every State which is a member of the social compact now, has done the same. It is not without astonishment, therefore, that we behold the principle advanced, that government has no right to make the moral law the rule of legislation, because it would imply a legislative exposition of its precepts, and settle theological disputes. This we believe is a new maxim, wholly original, never conceived or uttered before in a Christian legislature; a position which can be sustained only upon the supposition that there is no God, or no national accountability to God. Is it true, that the government of a Christian people, under all the immense responsibilities of legislation, must move on blindfold to the light from heaven? Why then do Congress prescribe oaths, from the chief magistrate, to the lowest office in the custom house, or post office department? And how many disputed questions do they thus settle by legislation,—deciding against the atheist, that there is a God; against the fatalist, that man is a free agent and accountable; against the deist, that the soul is immortal; while they settle the much contested question of future punishment—‘so help me God’ being understood to mean, ‘may God deal with me in the world to come, as my testimony shall be true or false.’ The punishment for piracy or murder,

expounds the sixth command, and decides the agitated question, that the taking of life for national security is lawful, which more persons disbelieve than there are Jews and Sabbatharians in the land. The appointment of chaplains in Congress, seems to be a legislative decision against the Jew, that Jesus is the Messiah, and the Christian religion true. And why do Congress adjourn over the Sabbath, and why are all the courts, and heads of department, and custom houses, and navy yards closed? Ought not all these to be opened, to avoid such a seeming exposition of the fourth command, such a trampling on the conscience of the Jew, and such a sanctioning of "the principle of all the religious persecutions, with which almost every page of modern history is stained?"

What if the national government, instead of practising economy by the violation of the fourth command, had authorized the violation of the seventh, by licencing, as they do in Europe, houses of pollution; and national shame and conscience had poured in these petitions, that the nation might be released from such infamy and crime? The honorable Committee, in reply, would need to change scarce a letter of their Report. 'We are aware,' they might say, 'that a variety of sentiment exists in this nation on the subject of the seventh command, and the obligations of chastity. The petitioners seem to take it for granted, that the practice complained of is a violation of the law of God. But a large and respectable class of men (and women also) believe the Bible to be a cunningly devised fable, and the seventh command, in particular, to be an invasion of inherent rights, and a war against nature—the result of that artificial and arbitrary state of society which kings and priests have introduced, and which it is the prerogative of reason and philosophy to oppose, till the happy time shall come, when coercive monopolies shall cease, and every man and woman, being fully persuaded in their own minds, will act according to their persuasion.

'With these different views about the seventh command, the Committee are of opinion, that Congress cannot interfere. Should Congress repeal the law, it would imply a legislative decision that the Bible is the word of God—a legislative decision of a theological dispute—an encroachment on natural liberty—an attempt to coerce chastity by national law; all which transcends, obviously, the powers of the government.'

From the views here taken on this subject, we cannot but hope it will seem plain to many, whose minds have been unsettled and perplexed by the Report, that the transportation of the mail and the opening of the post offices on the Sabbath cannot be regarded as a matter of national necessity. To become such, it must be as urgent as the necessity which authorizes individuals to do secular work on the Sabbath. But this, in the case of individuals, must be only occasional, and never systematic and habitual. And it must be, where the great laws of self-preservation, which it is

the object of the Sabbath to sustain, would be subverted. But no such necessity to transport the mail, and open the post offices, presses on the nation, as would constitute a justifiable necessity in the case of individuals,—like that of preparing food, attending the sick, pursuing voyages on the deep, or self-defence in time of war. And as the necessity is not such as would justify individuals, even in the occasional violation of the Sabbath; much less can it justify the government in extending its stated and habitual violation through the land. Necessity, in the scriptural sense, is not even pretended. All which is claimed is, that the running of the mail is a great convenience, and a great saving in time and money. But may individuals violate the Sabbath stately for convenience, time and money? How then can Congress do it? Can the people invest their government with authority to do that which is unlawful for themselves to do?

This plea of national necessity is answered also by the consideration, that the post office in London is closed on the Sabbath, and no mail is permitted to leave the city on that day;—by the fact that, during the early part of our national existence, including a period of unparalleled commercial activity and national prosperity, the post offices of this land were closed, and the mails did not run on the Lord's day;—and from the fact that we enjoy now, by the improvement of roads, and the facilities of steam, a more rapid communication of intelligence in five days, than fifteen years ago could have been accomplished in seven. No necessity, therefore, presses us now, which did not press the nation twenty years ago, without the apprehension of creating a necessity for violating the Sabbath; and every year, the same causes are rendering the plea more and more fallacious and inexcusable. Besides, not half the nation are benefited now by the Sabbath mails. Probably three quarters of the people do not receive their intelligence oftener than twice and thrice in the week. How are these defended against expresses, and commercial speculations? Or is it only for the accommodation of the great cities, that the nation must surrender, to such a fearful extent, the moral energies of the Sabbath? But that even this is not necessary, is apparent from the facts, that many merchants of the first respectability and most extensive business, will not receive their communications on the Sabbath; and that a large portion of the respectable mercantile community in our cities, have petitioned Congress to close the post offices, and discontinue the running of the mail,—while few, and comparatively feeble, have been the notes of remonstrance.

We are aware it has been said, that if the government should cease to transport the mail, private expresses would be hastened through the land, and that a greater encroachment would be made upon the Sabbath, than is now made; so that even if it is a sin to



keep up commercial business on the Sabbath, it is much cheaper, on the whole, to have the government sin for the people, than to have the people sin for themselves. But by the same authority we have been told, and we believe it, that it is not the business of the national government to sustain by positive legislation, either the religion or the morals of the nation. It is wholly a political institution. If other men will sin if the government do not sin for them, that is not the fault of the government, and does not expose the people to punishment on their account; and before the government undertake to economize in wickedness for the people, we think the constitution ought to be revised, and an article inserted giving this power. Until this is done, all we ask of Congress is not to impede our efforts to maintain the sanctity of the Sabbath; and by the laws of the states, and Sabbath schools, and such other efforts as the honorable gentleman kindly recommends to us, we will endeavor to persuade, not coerce, our countrymen into a unanimous opinion that it is best, for time and for eternity, to remember the Sabbath day, and keep it holy.

We cannot but admire the admirable dexterity with which the honorable gentleman touches and demolishes, as with magic wand, all his own formidable objections to granting the petitions. 'It cannot be done! Impossible! Jew and Gentile would justly revolt at the odious impartiality. Should there be only half a thousand Jews, we must violate the Sabbath of twelve millions of Christians, to evince our consistency and impartiality.'—How ceasing to violate the Christian Sabbath should alleviate the conscience of the Jew, whose Sabbath will be violated at any rate, we cannot perceive; but so it must be, until the petitioners are disposed of; and then, having escaped from these rocks and quicksands to a smooth and open sea, lo! all at once, there is not the least difficulty in stopping the mail on the first day of the week, if it be only expedient. If a few dollars can be saved to the nation by stopping the mail, why then it can be done; for 'it is the opinion of the Committee that the subject should be regarded simply as a question of expediency, irrespective of its religious bearings. Jew and Christian out of the question, we can grant your petitions without the least difficulty, if it is best.' Be it so, then. The petitioners have not asked that Congress will be induced to stop the mail on the Sabbath for every one of the reasons they have urged; nor would the granting of the petitions imply this. Does the decision of a case in favor of counsel on one side imply the legitimacy of all his arguments? If the honorable gentleman had read the petitions extensively, he would have seen, that they rest their argument as much on the inexpediency, as on the immorality, of encroaching upon the Sabbath, by the transportation of the mails. Indeed, if the transportation of the mail is not a work of necessity, the evidence of its inexpediency is irresistible. Those best acquainted

with muscular strength, admit that, whatever seeming gain may be the result of unintermitted toil, it is more than balanced by the waning powers, and shortened date of animal activity; and the general law of animal mechanism will, with infallible certainty, cut short the date and the results of human exertion. So far then as national prosperity depends on muscular and mental vigor, six days will produce a greater income than seven; with cheering rest, and higher health, and better spirits, and social enjoyment, and religious privileges, and peace of conscience, and hopes of heaven. But were the earnings of the Sabbath clear gain, it is too soon to exult, until the sickness and premature mortality occasioned by incessant toil are estimated—the quarrels and law suits, the intemperance, and improvidence, and idleness, the neglect of moral culture in the family, and the peculation and wasteful prodigality which attend the latter end of national dissoluteness. How certainly will all these sacrilegious earnings be swallowed up, and with them double their amount of honest gains, in the vortex of dissipation, which the violation of the Sabbath will not fail to create; for nothing is so improvident and wasteful as vice. Besides, if the transportation of the mail is not lawful, as a work of necessity, it is criminal, and a great national sin; and whoever contended with his Maker and prospered? Does he not hold at his disposal all the sources of national prosperity, and all the engines of national chastisement? At what instant he speaks, pestilence and war, blast and mildew, may invade us; the wisdom of the wise may perish; infatuation fall on our counsels; and the flames of a furious civil war burst out in the nation. Until we are independent of God, it is madness to trample on his institutions.

But we are told that no great encroachment is made on the Sabbath, and no great evil inflicted, by the transportation of the mail. This is the opinion of the honorable Committee, unsupported by any competent testimony, and in opposition to the express testimony of the thousands of all classes in society, of all religious denominations, and from all parts of the land, who express their deep sense of the *great* evil which is done to the cause of religion and morality, by the transportation of the mail, and the opening of the post offices. Nor are facts in the case wanting which justify their belief. There are twenty-six thousand men employed on the Sabbath, in superintending the transportation and opening of the mail; many of whom are subjected to the entire loss, and many more to the partial loss, of the privileges of public worship. Those who travel in the mail stages, and those detained from worship for their accommodation, constitute an equal number, who are deprived of the rest and benign influences of the Sabbath. And probably three times the same number of children and servants are in this way denied the instruction and government which their parents and masters are bound to give them on the Sabbath,

and abandoned to their own way, under the powerful influence of a bad example. And is all this a trifle? But to this must be added the innumerable multitude of minds, tossed by restless anxieties, and unblessed by the influence of religious instruction, in consequence of the tide of worldly care and business which the mail of every Sabbath throws upon them. And to conscience we appeal, whether to these entire classes the mail does not counteract and destroy nearly the whole moral influence of the Sabbath day. When political intelligence or letters on business are expected or received, how many thousands absent themselves from the house of God wholly; or with what vacant, vexed, and wandering minds, do they attend? Does not the seed fall among thorns, and the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, and the lust of other things, spring up and choke the word? Can the Sabbath exert its benign influence on those, for time or for eternity, through whose minds and hearts the Sabbath mail pours along, without intermission, the turbid stream of worldly care, and on whom it imposes, in some form, and to a great extent, the tax of secular labor? How can the Sabbath be kept, when the entire secular business of the nation is pressed every Sabbath upon the attention of those who are concerned in it? Most of these persons, too, are parents and masters, whose children and servants are again unblessed with that moral supervision which God has provided for them, and left to grow up in darkness, or to borrow light from other altars than their own. Is this wide spread diversion of mind and heart, and this neglect of religious and domestic duties, a small evil?

But as yet we have not named the influence of Sabbath mails and post offices, which is most comprehensively disastrous. We mean the high countenance and sanction, which the example of the government affords, to an entire national sequestration of the Sabbath. Until the mails stretched out their long lines of travel through the nation, public sentiment and law, in many parts of the land, kept back the immoralities of impatient worldliness. But this single practice of running the mail, and opening the post offices on the Sabbath, has been like the letting out of waters,—first the drop—next the stream—and then the yawning breach—till all mounds and landmarks have nearly disappeared before the universal inundation. The laws of the States relative to the Sabbath have become a dead letter, and public sentiment, paralyzed by familiarity, and faint-hearted, has not been heard amid the foam and roar of the surrounding flood; until the precipice at length to which we are rushing is beheld, and a panic of fear has flashed through the land, while all instinctively lay hold on the Sabbath as the anchor of their hopes. And yet the Committee tell them, while the cataract roars, and cord after cord of the cable is cut, that no harm is done—that it is good economy, and that Congress, for conscience sake, and the love of liberty and convenience, cannot stop!

In our more particular animadversions on the Report, we regret that truth and equity should require us to say, that the petitioners are misapprehended, and, though we trust unintentionally, yet really and grossly misrepresented. Both the language and the argument of the Report imply, that the petitioners have requested Congress to legislate over the citizens of the nation, to prohibit the violation and enforce the observance of the Sabbath, by the penalties of law. And the reply is, 'it would interfere with the rights of the Jew; oblige Congress to turn expositors of the ten commandments, and settle by legislation a theological controversy; would be like the Jewish theocracy, to enforce religious observances; introduce religious coercion in our civil institutions; innovate upon the religious rights of the citizens; incorporate the observance of a holy day in our land; and we might as well provide edifices and support the ministry;—that there is no way to avoid these evils, but to regard Congress as a civil institution, wholly destitute of religious authority; and that our constitution regards no other power than that of persuasion for enforcing religious observances.'

By all this variety of phraseology and argument, are the petitioners held up to odium before the nation, as having petitioned Congress to compel the people of the United States, by law, to observe the first day of the week. Those who approve of the Report, understand it thus, and seek to turn upon the petitioners the odium of such a request. But have the petitioners made any such request? NEVER. We challenge the honorable gentleman who presented the Report to produce a single petition from the multitude, which asks that Congress will by law compel the people of the United States to observe the first day of the week as the Sabbath, or to observe any day. We admit, and the petitioners well knew, that Congress have no power to do this, not because it would imply an exposition of the moral law, or the settlement of a religious controversy; but the Sabbath, with many other subjects of legislation, is reserved to the States, as independent republics; while to Congress is confided such matters of general policy, domestic and foreign, as result from the relations of the States to one another and to the government, and from our national character and relations. Congress have no more authority to prohibit and punish theft and adultery, than Sabbath breaking; no more authority to protect the life, reputation and property of the citizens of the United States, except it be on the high seas, than to protect the Sabbath; no more right to build court houses and jails, and appoint courts and sheriffs for the different counties, than to build temples and support ministers. On all these subjects, involving expositions of the divine law, it is the province of the States to legislate; and on all these subjects the States have legislated from their colonial infancy to this day, without dreaming of any of the horrible consequences portrayed in the Report, and without encroach-

ment on the conscience either of Sabbatarian or Jew, who have been permitted to be fully persuaded in their own minds, and rest on which day of the seven they pleased. Will it then be demanded, what have the petitioners prayed for? Self-respect and public justice required the Committee to have ascertained this, before with such needless haste and injurious misrepresentation they made their Report. The petitioners ask that Congress will cause its own agents of the post office department, over whom it possesses the entire power of legislation, to pay the same respect to the Sabbath, which Congress itself, by its adjournment, pays to it, and which the national courts, and other heads of departments, and the custom houses of the nation, pay to it; and they request Congress to do this by legislation, because they have by legislation required and sanctioned the anomaly of disregard to the Sabbath in the post office department.

The Committee are mistaken in saying that Congress have never legislated on this subject. From an early date, the mail has run on the Sabbath on some routes; and repeatedly have Congress, when petitioned on the subject, refused to give directions to the Post Master General to the contrary. And in 1825, a law was enacted, requiring every post master in the land to deliver letters and packages on every day of the week, at all seasonable hours. The refusal to direct the Post Master General to discontinue the transportation of mails on the Sabbath, and this law compelling all the post offices of the nation to be open on the Sabbath, is a legislative confirmation of the practice. So the Post Master General justly considers the subject. "The result of these applications," he says, "has given a sanction to the policy of the department, which I have considered as controlling any discretion the Post Master General might be inclined to exercise on the subject. He cannot act on the moral principle, unless he extend it to every mail in the nation. This would involve a responsibility which no individual can exercise with impunity, and would be in opposition to the implied sanction of the national legislature."

The petitioners ask that Congress will cease to enforce, by law, what they (the petitioners) deem a violation of the Sabbath; that they will give to the Post Master General a legislative sanction for the *discontinuance* of the Sabbath mails, as unequivocal as that by which they have foreclosed his discretion, and made it his duty to continue them. They ask Congress, by its public agents, to respect the Sabbath in the Post Office department, as it is respected in all other departments of the government. And they are gravely told that Congress cannot expound the ten commands, cannot settle theological disputes, cannot invade the conscience of the Jew, cannot introduce religious observances into our institutions, cannot coerce the observance of the Sabbath, cannot preclude the discretion of the people to think for themselves, cannot sanction a

principle of persecution which has stained almost every page of history ; and they might have added with just as much relevancy, and with as little insult to the petitioners, cannot sustain a crusade to rescue the holy sepulchre from infidels, or make a pilgrimage to Mecca in honor of Mahomet, or send an embassy to explore the concavity of the North Pole.

Nor is misrepresentation the full measure of retribution with which the petitioners are visited. It is insinuated that they are a combination to change the government from a civil to a religious institution. To make such an attempt would be treason, and the punishment of treason is death. But what have the petitioners done ? Have they met in midnight conclave, or in tumultuous assemblies, or assailed the government with the language of authority or menace ? What unlawful word have they spoken ? What unlawful act have they done ? Have not religious persons the same right as others to petition Congress ? And when they have done so, are they to be denounced before the nation as a treasonable combination to change the government—as taking the first step, and entering the opening wedge of revolution ? And yet the conspirators are many of them such men that, if they are false, where shall we look for integrity ; or if they are deceived, for talent and wisdom ? They approach the government, not for personal emolument, but as patriots and Christians, to express their high sense of the moral energy and necessity of the Sabbath for the perpetuity of our republican institutions, and respectfully to request that the government will not, by legislation, impair those energies. And by implication they are charged with crimes which, were they real, would subject them to the halter !

There has been no combination, and is none, but what is produced by the concurrent feeling of grief and alarm among wise and good men, at beholding the influence of the Sabbath impaired, by a conspicuous and all pervading governmental sanction. And no means have been resorted to, but such as the Constitution guarantees, the nature of the case demands, and all men adopt on other subjects to bring out an expression of public sentiment.

The Report denies to Christians the exercise of their civil rights. The right of petitioning is guaranteed to all citizens alike. But the object of petitioning is, by a statement of facts and arguments, and the exhibition of public sentiment, to *influence* the government ; and this the Report implies all persons may do, but religious persons. Should they, alarmed by any supposed encroachment upon the religious or moral interests of the community, venture to petition, they must be rejected,—for the prevention of a religious despotism, and the preservation of religious liberty ! Alas ! where is religious liberty now, if Christians may not petition Congress !

We admit that Christians, as such, ought not to attempt to in-

fluence the administration in things merely secular, beyond the unobtrusive influence of their silent suffrage; and ought not to become political partisans, heated and agitated by all the little and great disputes which must ever attend popular governments; and ought never to attempt, or be permitted, to make the government a religious instead of a civil institution. But it is not a civil, but a moral effect for which the petitioners ask, and one in their view indispensable to the perpetuity of our republican institutions. Nor do they request Congress to do anything by positive legislation to support or even to protect the Sabbath. To the laws of the States, and to moral influence and public sentiment they look for this. It is their desire to 'recommend religion by deeds of benevolence, by Christian meekness, by lives of temperance and holiness, by combining their efforts to instruct the ignorant, to relieve the widow and the orphan, and to promulgate to the world the Gospel of their Saviour;' and they only request that Congress will not obstruct them in their work, by impairing the moral energy of the Sabbath, on which, under God, all their success depends;—and they are told about religious combinations to effect a political object, and the danger of a religious despotism!

Is the maxim settled, then, that the government can do nothing injurious to the interests of republicanism and virtue, or that if they do, religious persons must exert no influence to prevent the evil? Should infidelity begin to turn the influence of the government against religion, might not the injured petition? Should Congress war upon national morality by building distilleries all over the land, might not the friends of Religion, beholding their demoralizing influence, petition Congress to discontinue them? Would this be an unlawful attempt to influence government by a religious combination? To whom does it more properly appertain than to the religious community, to watch over the interests of morality, and to send into the halls of legislation the voice of respectful, affectionate, but earnest expostulation?

The Report perverts and misapplies historical facts, in respect to religious usurpations upon the institutions of civil government. The Report reasons as if the facts were, that religious people have been accustomed to seek and to gain an insidious ascendancy over governments; whereas the facts are, that governments, to augment and perpetuate their power, have usurped the rights of the people. Priests have indeed been the instruments, but they have been hirelings, appointed and supported by the government, and not by the people. There is no instance in the annals of the world, in which ministers, chosen and supported by their people, or churches, in the full and intelligent enjoyment of religious liberty, ever attempted to usurp an ecclesiastical dominion, and introduce a religious despotism. The facts assumed to excite so much odium, and bring so much jealousy upon the religious community of this nation, are

facts that never happened. The truth is, that Christianity, in its doctrines and institutions, is theoretically, experimentally, and practically, republican in its tendency. Despotie governments know this, and have therefore never permitted Christianity to go out among their people in all her simplicity, loveliness, and power. They have corrupted her doctrines, bribed her priesthood, and encumbered her movements by state garments which they have compelled her to wear; while the history of the church presents a continued effort of good men to throw off these encumbrances, and of government to keep religion in chains. And if we may trust infidel or Christian historians, a great proportion of the civil and religious liberty of the world has resulted from the efforts of the pious to obtain religious liberty. None were more determined advocates of religious liberty, than the Fathers of this land, who broke from the religious establishments of Europe, and by whom, in their colonial state, all the elements of our civil and religious institutions were formed. It was their spirit which burst out in the Revolution, achieved our independence, and breathed itself into our State and national governments. None, in that tremendous conflict of an infant republic with a giant nation, were more influential in rousing the zeal, and sustaining the courage of the people, or made greater sacrifices, than the ministers and their pious hearers. Nor to the present hour has the flame abated. The ministers and churches of this nation do not desire, but would most solemnly deprecate, a union of church and State. Religion does not obliterate intellect, nor blot out memory, nor subvert the judgement, nor inspire ambitious and sinister designs. There is reason, and philosophy, and talent, and learning, and patriotism, and political wisdom, and integrity, among the religious portion of the community. Nor have they done anything to forfeit the confidence, or to justify an attempt to fasten upon them the suspicion, of their fellow citizens. They know, as well as any can teach them, that the alliance of church and State, corrupts religion, and tends to despotism, and have no more desire than others to bequeath degradation and bondage to their posterity. They feel that it is the glory of our nation, that it is not cursed, as other nations have been, with the union of church and State, and the perplexed legislation about forms of worship, and the establishment of creeds; and so far are they from desiring a national religion in any one denomination, or by the amalgamation of all, that no class of the community would regard such an attempt with more abhorrence, or meet it with a more determined resistance.

Why, then, are the sins of Popery visited upon Protestants, and the sins of despotie governments and national religions visited on the Christians of a republic who abhor them, and who were the providential instruments by which God prepared deliverance, and established at length the fair fabric of our civil and religious



institutions—at once the admiration and the hope of the world? And why do the honorable Committee forget that the last horrible despotism which arose on the ruins of civil and religious liberty, was reared by atheists, who obliterated the Sabbath, and denied accountability, and with the sweet words of liberty and equality on their tongues, waded in blood?

The Report, were it sanctioned by the government, would be an act of real and severe persecution. No device of persecuting governments has been more common to inflame popular resentment, prevent sympathy, and justify cruelty, than to multiply upon good men false accusations and odious epithets, for the conscientious performance of their duty. Jeremiah, for his faithful reproofs was charged with treason and cast into prison; and Jesus was charged with aspiring to the throne of Cæsar. Nero set Rome on fire, and then threw upon Christians the odium of the execrable deed; dressing them up in the skins of wild beasts, and letting out dogs to bark at and devour them. In the pagan and papal persecutions, the most horrible designs and odious crimes were charged upon Christians. Vice and irreligion have always chosen to wrap themselves in the habiliments of virtue, and to throw their own unseemly garments on the victims of their hate. In this nation, the cry of 'church and State' has, by certain writers, been rung through all the changes of the octave. But the names and lives of the authors being known, have rendered their efforts harmless. But let these dark and unfounded suspicions, arising from the lakes and fens of infidelity, be embodied and propagated by the government, and a new era opens upon us. This would be indeed the first step, and we trust the last too, of a most injurious governmental persecution;—"the entering wedge of a scheme to make this government" a religious despotism, "instead of a social and political institution." For of what avail would be a legal equality on paper, and the sweet sounds of liberty playing about our ears, if ambitious and irreligious and worldly men, may set at naught the Sabbath, which all men admit to be indispensable to the perpetuity of republican institutions; and religious men, if they express their fears, and pour out their sorrows, supplications and arguments in the ears of the government, must be repelled with the charge of treasonable combination. It was said of Nabal, that 'he was such a son of Belial, that a man might not speak unto him;' and really, it would seem as if some gentlemen imagined that their feet were already upon the necks of the pious, and governmental influence their own by prescription, and that all attempts to persuade a Christian government not to do wrong, were an unhallowed interference with the rights of a wicked man's conscience. If atheists had petitioned for the preservation of the Sabbath, on account of its good republican tendencies, *they* might have been

treated with decorum ; but for the religious community to petition, *that alters the case.*

Again we ask, of what avail are liberty and equality on paper, and in name, provided such a perversion of public sentiment should be sanctioned by the government itself, as makes the exercise of those rights by Christians a crime, which are so liberally enjoyed by all other classes of the community? This would be a despotism more injurious than unequal rights by constitution : for these, modified by a generous public sentiment, might become a dead letter ; but a perverted public sentiment, which gives to one class of citizens rights, the exercise of which is treasonable combination in another, is a despotism which never sleeps, and is never obsolete,—a despotism whose iron rod would be felt, not around the throne merely, but wherever there is an atheist, or a scoffer, or a profligate, to cry ‘ priestcraft,’ and an irreligious multitude to echo the cry, and browbeat the pious. Let the people of this nation look to this, and remember, that religious liberty may be destroyed, under the specious pretext of defending it.

The Report concludes by saying, that “ the petitioners do not complain of any infringement on their own rights.” But they do : it is their whole and only complaint, that their rights are invaded. They complain that the government should make them partakers in its sins, and in the judgements which, for national sins, God is accustomed to visit both upon the government and the people. They complain that their efforts to train up their children and the rising generation, should be impeded, counteracted, and often defeated, by the floods of irreligion and immorality, which are let out upon them by those increasing violations of the Sabbath, to which the authority and the example of the government is accessory. They complain that their own life, and character, and property, should be rendered more and more insecure by such a fearful perversion of that day, which alone gives energy to the moral government of God, forms a correct public sentiment, and gives efficacy to those civil laws which protect their rights. They complain that conscientious men should be obliged to violate their consciences, or be excluded from employment in one department of the government, thus throwing the entire business of that department, into the hands of men of a lax conscience. They hold that our republican institutions are their birthright, and that neither the citizens, nor the government, may take it from them, by impairing the influence of the Sabbath, on which its perpetuity depends. They are employed, as they have been exhorted to be, in undergirding the ship by moral bonds, not at all aspiring to guide the helm ; and they complain that while they are doing this, the high officers on board should give orders to pull out the caulking, and bore holes in the bottom. They have no desire to go to the bottom, and the government have no right to sink them.

Since most of the preceding was in type, we have been cheered by the Report of the honorable Mr. McKean, chairman of the Committee on post offices and post roads, between which and our own sentiments, we are gratified to perceive so many points of coincidence. It is a lucid, candid, able document. It treats the petitioners with the decorum which every republican government owes to its citizens, who approach it respectfully to petition, and vindicates them from the unfounded aspersions so illiberally cast upon them by the Committee of the Senate. It commences by saying,

“The memorials on this subject, on account of the numerous sources from which they have been received, the number and respectability of the signatures, as well as the intrinsic importance of the question involved, require from the Committee and the Legislature, the most deliberate and respectful consideration. It is believed that the history of legislation in this country affords no instance in which a stronger expression has been made, if regard be had to numbers, the wealth, or the intelligence of the petitioners.”

The Report thus proceeds ;

“The Committee entertain no doubt that the numerous petitioners for the discontinuance of the Sabbath mail, and the delivery of letters from the post offices, have generally acted from pure motives, and with a reference to what they consider the best interest of the country.

“They do not ask Congress to impose certain duties on any portion of citizens, which may interfere with their religious opinions, but to relieve from the performance of such duties.

“The transportation of the mail is a great governmental operation, and the petitioners believe it should be suspended on the Sabbath, and the post offices closed, out of respect to the day, as well as the business of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the government. They did not, probably, consider that greater difficulty could arise in designating the first day of the week as the Christian Sabbath, for this purpose, than had been incurred in the instances referred to. It is not considered by the Committee, that the petitioners ask the introduction of any new principle into our laws, but the extension of one which has already been recognized. In the policy of the measure desired, the Committee believe the petitioners are mistaken, but they do not consider the attempt made by them, as tending to form the justly odious combination of church and State.”

The Report also in conclusion “earnestly recommends the repeal of so much of the eleventh section of the post office law, of March, 1825, as requires post masters to deliver letters, newspapers, &c., on the Sabbath.”

Though on some points, their Report is adverse to the petitioners, yet, wherever the Committee differ from them, they treat them respectfully, giving facts and arguments, instead of insidious insinuation and unmerited rebuke.

The arguments for continuing the transportation of the mail, are derived wholly from considerations of expediency ;—the convenience and gain of uninterrupted and rapid intelligence, and its necessity to protect the citizens from the evils of speculation. That some convenience and immediate gain may be the result of the constant movement of the mail, and that there may be some evils incident to its discontinuance on the Sabbath, may be ad-

mitted. But so also would there be some immediate gain, should Congress, and the courts, and heads of departments, and custom houses, transact business on the Sabbath; and there are some evils incident to this general suspension of secular business in all the departments of the government. The merchant also, and the manufacturer, and the mechanic, and farmer, might be able to turn the Sabbath to some immediate good account, and to avoid some evils which attend its observance. But the question is, will these temporary gains balance the permanent loss which will result from a general relaxation of morals, produced by the rapid disappearance of the Sabbath from our land?

The subject is now fairly before the nation, and it is the most important one on which a free people were ever called to decide. It is, whether the Sabbath, as to all national influence, shall be blotted out, or maintained; for its name, as a holiday, will be of no avail, when its moral energies shall have ceased.

This is no time for petulance and invective. We are now pre-eminently free and happy, and with absolute certainty, our republican institutions may be made perpetual, by the moral energies of the Sabbath, and not without. But no coercive legislation can preserve it. Unless the nation will awake, and by a spontaneous public sentiment arise for the preservation of the Sabbath, it is gone. For the temptations of the seaboard, and steamboats, and canals, are immense; far and wide do they put in motion the streams of business; and as our millions multiply, and the power of habit, and the tide of business shall increase, we may as well attempt to stop the rolling of the ocean, or the currents of our mighty rivers. Now we may perpetuate our republic, upon condition that we will observe the Sabbath; and the world, and heaven, and hell, are looking on to witness our decision.

---

#### NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

*The Assistant to Family Religion, in six parts.* By WILLIAM COGSWELL, A. M. Pastor of the South church in Dedham. Second Edition. Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1828. pp 404.

This work commences very appropriately with "a Dissertation on Family Religion;" in which the duty in question is explained, its importance urged, and excuses and objections answered. Next follows "a system of natural and revealed religion, in the form of question and answer, accompanied with Scripture proofs." This is much the largest, and we think the most valuable part of the work. The great truths of religion are clearly and concisely stated and properly arranged, so that their mutual connexion and dependence

may be seen ; and what is of more consequence, they are solidly supported at every step by quotations from the unerring word of God. Heads of families, will here learn to *connect* their thoughts on the subject of religion, and to reduce their principles to a system ; and when they are themselves sufficiently learned in this way, it will be easy for them to teach their children. We should be glad to see this part of the work published, with slight alterations, in a volume by itself, for the benefit of the higher classes in Sabbath schools, and for the use of societies, such as exist in some parts of our country, and might with profit be more generally established, where young people are associated for the purpose of theological instruction and improvement.

The third part consists of " a series of resolutions, and of questions for self-examination." The truths inculcated in the preceding division are here closely and faithfully applied, and religion is shown to be, not mere speculation, however correct, but a concern of the heart, a concern pending between the soul and God. The resolutions are such as every reader ought to form and fulfil ; and the inquiries are such as every wise and watchful believer will be disposed often to press upon his conscience.

The fourth part, consisting of forms of prayer suitable for families—and the fifth and sixth, consisting of " select psalms, hymns, and tunes, adapted to family devotion," are judiciously executed, and well fitted to answer the end for which they were designed. The prayers we think uncommonly scriptural and excellent. The practice of reading prayers in families is not indeed, in ordinary cases, to be commended. " Extemporary prayer," says Mr. Scott, " is far better for domestic worship, than any forms can be, both as admitting of adaptation to the varying circumstances of families, and the cases of friends and relatives to be remembered in our prayers, and also as giving scope to more enlargement in intercession, according to occurring events, for all sorts and conditions of men. Still, forms of prayer may not be without their use, in suggesting suitable expressions to those who lead in the devotions of the family, and in furnishing them with an interesting *variety* of expression. In this latter view, suitable forms of prayer, so far from producing formality, may serve to prevent it. The changes of providence also, as will be readily conceived, may often throw families into circumstances, in which social prayer would not, perhaps could not, be decently offered, without the assistance of a form ; and, in the language of Mr. Jay, " Surely the greatest zealot for free prayer would recommend forms, in preference to neglect."

This second edition of the work before us is presented to the public with the best recommendations, and, in our judgement, it well deserves them. We scarcely know of a volume which, on the whole, is better calculated to be useful. We hope it may have a continued and general circulation, and that it may be a means, through the accompanying blessing of God, of reviving, improving, and perpetuating family religion.

2. *Recollections of a Beloved Sister, interspersed with Reflections, addressed to her own Children.* By the author of *Little Sophy*. Boston: Munroe & Francis, and Charles S. Francis, New York. pp. 155.

This book has an advantage over many of a similar class, in being, as it purports to be, and as we presume it is, 'no fiction.' The writer is the daughter of an Episcopal clergyman in England, and the wife of a clergyman. At the decease of 'a beloved sister'—one (if full credit be given to the effusions of bleeding affection) of no ordinary excellence of character, these recollections and reflections were committed to writing; not, as the author assures us, with the remotest view to their publication, but merely to furnish to her own little children the means of an acquaintance with their departed aunt, and as they could no more enjoy her society and counsels, to give them the benefit of her example. The book contains so many crudities and inconsistencies, that we dare not recommend it for general circulation; and yet it has not a few excellent remarks, particularly on the subject of religion. The lesson which the writer seems most effectually to have learned, and consequently shows herself best fitted to teach, is the utter insufficiency of mere natural good qualities, to satisfy the high demands of the Gospel, and prepare the soul for a happy meeting with its Judge. Addressing her children on this subject, she says,

"You will meet with very many wise, and even amiable people, who will quietly, and perhaps imperceptibly, lead you away from the God of your salvation, either by telling you that so much strictness is quite unnecessary, or by assuring you that it is enthusiasm, or Methodism, or Calvinism, or some new name of reproach, which, by the time you are grown up, may perhaps be used to stigmatize the people of God. When I was a child, I remember they were called Methodists, and I considered it a part of my duty, as a sound member of the established church, to hate them. As I grew up, this idea strengthened, and became a most inveterate and bitter prejudice. There was nothing I more dreaded than being thought too religious, and, to avoid this terrible imputation, I was careful not to observe any strictness in my religious duties. To neglect the service of God was in my eyes a small matter, so that I escaped the imputation of being "righteous over much," or of being classed among the people whom I thought it my duty to despise and oppose as far as my power or influence went. Yet, at this very time, I was esteemed very amiable; indeed, I have never, I think, stood so high as I did then in the estimation of the world.... All this while, I was as far *off from* God as an untutored heathen; nay, farther; for a heathen cannot lie under the guilt of rejecting the light which has never been presented to him; but I was born in a land where the Gospel was preached, and yet I did, as thousands do: I "would not come to the light that I might have life."

"I declare, that up to a certain period, the idea of religion as anything more than an observance of outward forms, had never crossed my mind. I was, however, perfectly at ease. No doubts, no fears disturbed me. "The strong man armed kept his goods in peace." If I ever thought of a Saviour at all, it was, as of one who had suffered the penalty of Adam's transgression, and had thereby opened the gates of heaven to all but the gross sinner, and the notorious profligate, who openly avows his sin and unbelief. I was quite satisfied with myself; quite sure that, when the time of death came, I had nothing to do but resign myself to the blow, and enter upon the reward which a life of so much merit well deserved.

"I knew many, whose characters were so very amiable, so full of all kindly feeling, that it seemed as if I could not do better than make their example the light of my path. I shall never forget the pain and difficulty that I had in believing that one of my highest specimens of moral excellence was yet far from

the kingdom of heaven. Yet I could not fail to be convinced of it on farther consideration. When I heard her appoint parties for the Sabbath-day, and complain that it was "a long, dull day;" and then looked into my Bible, I could not but see that this was not giving God what he demands—the heart. Her heart was given to the world, and even on that day when we are commanded not to "do our own pleasure," nor even to "think our own thoughts," she could not so far detach herself from its attractions, as to serve God without crying with his ungrateful people of the old time, "Behold it is a weariness." She must be classed among those persons who seek their happiness in this life, and of whom our blessed Lord has said, "Verily they have their reward." They have it in the esteem and affection which their good qualities excite among their companions; but I believe it will be found that such characters are often more difficult to be brought to the humbling doctrines of the cross than any other. They are so hedged about with their own virtues, and the approbation which they excite, that they are very hard to be persuaded to rely on any merits but their own. Yet "other foundations can no man lay than that which is laid."

3. *The Persecuted Family; A Narrative of the Sufferings of the Presbyterians in the Reign of Charles II.* By ROBERT POLLOK, A. M. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. New York: J. Leavitt, 1829. pp. 150.

This affecting story acquires additional interest from the name and fame of its lamented author. We learn from the accompanying Memoir, that Mr. Pollok is the writer of two other fugitive pieces which have been published in this country; viz. "Helen of the Glen," and "Ralph Gemmell," both tales of the imagination, though founded on facts, and intended for the instruction and amusement of the young. In judging of these, candor requires that we regard them as the productions, not of a long cultivated and solidly matured mind, but of a youth yet in his preparatory course of study, who fell by the relentless hand of disease, when only in his twenty-eighth year.

Mr. Pollok's "Course of Time," considering the age and advantages of its author, is indeed an extraordinary work. We mean not to say that it has no imperfections, for imperfections it certainly has; but that, in many points of view, it has *great merit*, and will doubtless be read with interest and profit, especially in the religious world, so long as the 'course of time' shall endure.

"The Persecuted Family" is designed to convey some idea of the sufferings of the Presbyterians in the West of Scotland, after the passing of the act of uniformity in the reign of Charles II. The author does not pretend that 'the different parts of his narrative ever took place, in the very same relation in which he has given them;' but assures us that they "are all severally true," and entitled to credence. The story of "the persecuted family," who, like the saints of old, "wandered in deserts and mountains, in dens and caves of the earth, being destitute, afflicted, tormented," and who were pursued by their relentless enemies even unto death, is touching, *affecting*, in the highest degree—perhaps too much so for the benefit of youthful readers. Yet it contains many noble sentiments, calculated to inspire a love of civil and religious liberty, and an abhorrence of persecution; to promote fortitude and patience under severe afflictions; and to establish the soul in the principles of our most holy faith.

4. *Questions on Christian Experience and Character.* By SAMUEL HARRIS, Minister of the Gospel. Haverhill: A. W. Thayer, 1828, pp. 24.

The author of this little manual rightly judges, that "the heart is not only desperately wicked, but *deceitful above all things*. There is great reason to fear that many, who hope they are Christians and in the way to heaven, are as ignorant of vital godliness, as a blind man is of light and colors; and that much passes for true religion, which has nothing of the nature of that holiness without which no man shall see the Lord." Under impressions like these, the work before us was prepared, and is designed, to be a guide and help to *self-examination*. It contains eighty-four judiciously written "questions on Christian experience and character," each followed by appropriate passages of Scripture, presenting religion as a personal concern, and bringing it home to the conscience and the heart. These Questions the reader is exhorted most seriously to ponder, and to determine for himself, as in the presence of the heart-searching God, whether he can answer them in the affirmative. With the author, we would devoutly say, "May the blessing of God accompany this effort to promote the spiritual good of precious souls. May it be a means of detecting the hope of the hypocrite, and of strengthening and confirming that of the people of God."

5. *Easy Lessons in Geometry, intended for Infant and Primary Schools, but useful in Academies, Lyceums, and Families.* By JOSIAH HOLBROOK. Boston: Peirce and Williams, 1829. pp. 36.

The design of this little work is fully and properly expressed in its title. The important science of Geometry, which has been assigned usually to an advanced stage in popular education, and by most who go to school, has been wholly neglected, is here brought down to the level of the humblest capacity, its definitions and elementary principles being so arranged and explained, that they may be easily understood even by children. By the help of this little treatise, with the accompanying diagrams and solids, those who have the care of children, whether in the school or the family circle, will find it easy and delightful to instruct their charge in the rudiments of a very useful branch of knowledge. Unless we are greatly deceived, the labor of Mr. H., in thus simplifying and presenting the elements of Geometry, will be duly appreciated, and generously rewarded.

6. *The Bible Class Book, designed for Bible Classes, Sabbath Schools, and Families. Prepared for the Mass. Sabbath School Union.* By N. W. FISKE, and J. ABBOTT, Professors in Amherst College. Boston: T. R. Marvin, 1829. pp. 35.

This book differs from all others which we have seen, intended for the same general purpose, in its systematic arrangement of the subjects introduced into the work, so that it forms an epitome, though a very brief one, of the whole Scripture history. It has been a defect in the common method of Sabbath School instruction, that the recitations and explanations of different portions of Scripture have had reference to them rather as detached and isolated



passages, than as parts of an interesting history, of a complete and divine system of religion. We are much mistaken, if this little work does not enlarge the views, and facilitate the labors, both of teachers and scholars, in the delightful task of studying and explaining the word of God; and we may add, shall be *disappointed*, if the encouragement given to it, and the success attending its use, do not procure us the pleasure of seeing, either from its respected authors, or from some other source, a more extended and comprehensive work on the same general plan.

The execution of the plan adopted in this work, is, so far as we have examined it, unexceptionable. A brief analysis of Scripture history is comprised in eighteen topics, each embracing one or more subdivisions. For example:—Under the general topic of the Deluge, are included the reason for it, time and manner, and the preservation of Noah from the general destruction. Under the general topic of the death of Christ, we find noticed, his arrest, his trial, and his crucifixion. Besides the references to those passages of Scripture by which each subject is explained, there are hints to teachers, explanations of many texts referred to, and moral and religious reflections which are intelligible to all classes of scholars, while they will be found to be not without important benefit to the most experienced and best qualified teachers.

On the whole, we regard this little book, not only as a *good book*, but as indicating progress in the science of Sabbath school instruction; and consequently, as deserving honorable notice among those means by which the children and youth of our land are trained up “*a generation to serve the Lord.*” And we can cheerfully recommend it as adapted to the purposes for which it is designed, “for the use of the various classes in Sabbath schools; for adult Bible classes; for common schools, where it is thought proper to have an occasional Scripture exercise, and for the family circle.” Especially would we recommend it, as a help to the higher classes in Sabbath schools, and to those, generally, whose age and understanding are so far advanced, that they require, and can appreciate, a systematic, connected, and enlarged course of biblical instruction.

7. *Two Sermons preached at Cambridge, January 25th 1829, the thirty-seventh Anniversary of the Author's Installation.* By ABIEL HOLMES, D. D. Pastor of the first church in Cambridge. Cambridge: E. W. Metcalf. pp. 31.

On several accounts, these are very interesting Sermons. The subjects discussed are of great importance, and they are treated with simplicity, perspicuity, and force. The occasion on which they were delivered was deeply interesting both to minister and people—“the thirty-seventh anniversary of the author's installation.” But above all, the peculiar and trying circumstances in which the venerable author is at present placed, give interest and prominence to the discourses before us. These circumstances are pertinently alluded to in the Sermons, and a note is prefixed in reply to the request for their publication, which will enable the reader to understand the allusions. We design not here to go into particulars respecting the late proceedings of the first parish in Cambridge, a majority of which is composed of Unitarians) or to descant on the

manner in which they have thought proper to treat their worthy and venerable minister. Our readers may anticipate an article on this subject, when the work of innovation and encroachment is ended, and the time for inserting it has fully come. Suffice it to say at present, that systematic and persevering attempts have been made by members of said parish, to compel their minister, contrary to his judgement and his conscience, to exchange with Unitarian ministers; to decline all exchanges with the Orthodox; to discontinue his lectures during the week; and to substitute a collection of Unitarian hymns for the Psalmody in common use;—all which attempts he has hitherto repelled, and for repelling which he is now threatened with a dismissal from office.

Referring to these encroachments on his ministerial liberty and rights, Dr. H. concludes his discourses in the following manner:

“Allow me to ask you, my hearers, would you request me to preach to you what I do not myself believe? Would you request me to ask others to preach to you, in my place, what is opposed to my religious principles; what, of course, would tend to counteract and subvert my own ministry, to make this “house of prayer” a place of disputation, and to lead you into doubts and perplexities, to skepticism and infidelity, to schism and confusion, or to what were no less fatal, an indifference to all religion? When the Lord saith to me, “Thou shalt speak my words unto them whether they will hear or forbear,” will you ask me to speak to you such words as would be acceptable to you, whether I am convinced, or not, that they are according to the words of God? It might then be justly said, “Ye know not what ye ask.” You would virtually ask me, instead of “holding faith and good conscience,” to make shipwreck of both. You would ask me to be alike unfaithful to you and to myself; and we might well fear, that, I having thus preached, and you thus heard, we should both be “drowned in destruction and perdition.”

“Some may still insist, that a minister should remember the injunction of the apostle, “Let us follow after the things which make for peace.” Assuredly he ought; but he may not forget what is immediately subjoined—“and things wherewith one may edify another.” I acknowledge that the precept of the Gospel, “If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men,” is alike binding upon us, the ministers of Christ, as upon you who pertain to our charge. But, whether it were possible for a minister to live peaceably with those, who would constrain him to bring into the pulpit doctrines which he does not believe to be scriptural, or to invite others to stand there and deliver them in his place; with those, who, in disregard of his pastoral responsibility, and of his right of private judgement and conscience, would have him do what he cannot do honestly, and what, if done, would, in his judgement, be of baneful tendency and influence, with respect both to the peace of the society, and to the welfare of the church committed to his care; whether it were possible to live peaceably with all men, were such things asked or expected of him, judge ye.

“That such things have been asked of *your* pastor, is well known to you, my dearly beloved, of this church and congregation; and I may seem to be pleading my own cause, while I am only endeavoring to have it rightly understood. A fuller view of the subject will be given in its proper place. In the mean time, “let your moderation be known to all men; the Lord is at hand.” On my part, while I, this day, renew my ordination vows, let me assure you, that “I have no greater joy, than to see you walking in truth; that my heart’s desire and prayer to God for you, is, that you may be saved; that I will very gladly spend and be spent for you, though the more abundantly I love you, the less I be loved;” and that through the cloud, which now darkens our prospect, I look, with delightful anticipation, to the glory of that coming day, when the church of Christ will “look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible, as an army with banners.” I look still beyond. While the shadows of the evening of my life are stretched out, I look joyfully through the valley of the shadow of death, to the world of celestial light and glory, where, I hope in God, many of your fathers who are now sleeping in the dust,

many of your relations and friends whom I have attended to the grave, and many of you who now compose my pastoral charge, will be my "joy and crown of rejoicing, in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming."

From this long extract, our readers will judge for themselves of the character of these Sermons, and will agree with us, we doubt not, in regarding them as of more than ordinary excellence, and as well deserving the attention of the public.

8. *The Presumption of Sceptical and Careless Contemners of Religion. A Sermon preached in the Meeting house of the South Parish, Andover, on the last Sabbath in November, 1828.* By EBENEZER PORTER, D. D. President of the Theol. Sem. Andover. Andover: M. Newman, 1829. pp. 14.

In an "advertisement" prefixed to this discourse, the author informs us that it was written and first delivered "in a distant part of the country, and was designedly adapted to a class of hearers, who were accustomed to parry all the solemn appeals of religion, by alleging, not their certainty that it is false, but their doubts of its truth." To arrest the attention of such hearers, we think the Sermon admirably calculated. The author first takes the ground that "an eternal state of rewards and punishments" is "possible;" as it cannot be disproved from "the perfection of God," nor from "the constitution of the human mind," nor from "the stated operations of providence," nor from "the best feelings of men," nor from "the dictates of sound reason," nor from "any other source of argument." And then on the ground of this *possibility*, he "maintains the charge of daring and blind presumption, against those who treat the Gospel with indifference." He "arraigns careless men at the threshold of their own system, and shows that, on principles which they do and must admit, they are beside themselves, in neglecting for a moment the great salvation."

"What," he asks, "shall we say of those, who treat religion with indifference, on account of occasional scruples concerning its truth? What shall we say of those, who balance probabilities, on this subject, according to what they may happen to hear, for or against religion, or according to the numbers of those who embrace or reject it? We may say, they disregard the plainest principles of common prudence. In any concern of temporal magnitude, they would act more wisely. Perhaps there is some passage in the Bible, which they have never seen explained, to their satisfaction. Perhaps some preacher has advanced a sentiment, which they do not comprehend, or do not believe. Perhaps some professor of religion has acted unworthily. What then! What if a thousand things of this sort could be alleged? Is Christianity therefore untrue, or unimportant? What if the majority of the world have neglected this religion? What if its professors and its ministers, have been imperfect? What if scolding tongues and scolding pens have made light of it? In all this, is there anything like demonstration of its falsehood? Yet, here immortal beings stand; stand, doubting, tritling, slumbering over this great subject; stand, perhaps, searching for objections, on the last trembling verge of a dread hereafter;—while, according to the conviction of their own understandings, and the confession of their own lips, *all is at stake for eternity!*"

"What would you say of him, who should build his house on the sandy brink of a river, which had been overflowed, for fifty successive years? Suppose he is not *certain* that it will be overflowed again;—yet his house would be safer in another place.—What would you say of him, who should lie down to sleep, on the margin of the sea, where the tide has risen, every day, for centuries? Suppose he is not *certain* that it will rise there again; yet he would be safer to sleep in another place. Noah, being warned of God, built an ark, to the saving

of his house. Surely he had good reason to believe God; but what if there had been no flood? Would not the condition of Noah and his family have been as good as that of other men? Lot, being told by an angel that Sodom would be destroyed, fled from the city. Surely he had good reason to believe that an angel had spoken the truth; but what if there had been no storm of fire? Would he not have been as safe as his neighbors? Joseph, apprized of a seven years' famine, laid up vast stores of corn. What if there had been no famine? Would he not have fared as well as they who had no store? The Christian, warned of the wrath to come, has fled to the Saviour, and made the Judge his friend. He has acted wisely. Revelation decides that he has acted wisely. Reason decides that he has acted wisely. Eternity will decide that he has acted wisely; and that he could not have acted otherwise without madness. Beware, then, ye who stigmatize his faith, as blind credulity, beware, lest that come upon you which was spoken by the prophets; "Behold ye despisers, and wonder, and perish."

9. *The Final Tendency of the Religious Disputes of the present day impartially considered.* By OLD EXPERIENCE. Boston, 1829. pp. 29.

"Old Experience," we suspect, is not so "old," after all, as not to come within the apostle's signification of "a novice;" nor has he grown so wise by "experience," as to avoid inconsistencies and blunders. He comes out in a violent controversy against controversy; and is so disinterestedly benevolent, that, rather than others should contend, he chooses to contend himself. In the course of his performance, he sometimes affects learning, and sometimes ignorance; sometimes seems to know almost everything, and sometimes scarcely anything at all. His expressions are often insufferably low, and while he puts on the appearance of lightness and humor, he cannot conceal that his pen is dipped in gall. The burden of his book is, that 'religious controversy is an evil in itself, and produces nothing but evil. It has never done any good, and never can.' We will believe all this, when "Old Experience," has satisfied us that Jesus Christ did no good, by his discussions with the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Priests; that Paul did no good, by his frequent controversies with Jews and Pagans; that the Reformers did no good by their long and eventful controversy with the court of Rome; that the Puritans did no good, by their controversy with the hierarchy of England; and that missionaries now are doing no good, by their controversies with idolaters, Mahometans, Jews, and nominal Christians. The fact is, as Robert Hall well expresses it, "Truth has *usually* been elicited by controversy." Wherever the Christian religion has spread, it has been propagated more or less by controversy. And there will be, *must* be, a continuance of controversy, by which term we understand *earnest religious discussion*, until the Gospel is preached to every creature, and the religion of Christ becomes universal. Idolaters, Mahometans, Jews, Papists, infidels, and errorists of every description, must be *convinced* of their errors, before they can be expected to forsake them, and embrace the truth as it is in Jesus.

We have no means of determining, from the title of the book before us, by whom it was written, printed, or published. We know it is advertised, sold, purchased, and patronised, chiefly, if not exclusively, by Unitarians. And yet we cannot see why *they* should wish to circulate it; as the writer of it does not treat them, more

than others, with respect, or even decency. "The Unitarians," says he, in a style which we think will not soon be imitated, "the Unitarians repeatedly have been driven yelping from the field, with their tails between their hind legs; and so have the Orthodox." p. 7.

Our Unitarian neighbors, who, as the public know, have contended earnestly for several of the last years, are becoming, of late, much opposed to controversy. Scarcely a paper or pamphlet issues from their quarter, which does not touch upon the subject, sighing and lamenting over the evils of controversy. We know very well there are evils incident to controversy; and this, among others: *Persons sometimes get into difficulties, and are driven into corners, from which they know not how to escape.* Whether or not some of our Unitarian polemics feel any evils of this sort, and whether these have operated to wean them from controversy, the public will judge.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### THE DEDHAM CASE.

We invite the particular attention of our readers to the following extracts of a letter, recently received, from a distinguished and experienced Jurist in a neighboring State. They exhibit his views of a famous decision of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, relative to the rights of the churches; and show how this decision is likely to be regarded by intelligent and impartial gentlemen, both of the bar and the bench, in other States.

"The Dedham case, so called, was a bold stroke. It astonished me. I first saw it merely touched in a Boston newspaper of the day; and in a letter to one of the judges, my friend, if I know a friend, and one with whom no friendship is broken, I asked whether the statement of the decision, as given in the newspaper, could be correct, observing that I hoped not, for if correct, it seemed to me "a declaration of war against evangelical churches." I wondered to hear so very little said, by way of protest, against it. I could not suppose that religious sentiment was "dead or asleep."

After speaking of the published Result of an Ecclesiastical Council at Groton, in which the decision in question is largely discussed, and having expressed his satisfaction with that discussion, the writer proceeds.

"If I were to find a truth, which might have been better edged and pointed, it would be the concession made in the Dedham case, that "there may undoubtedly be donations to a church" to which "the parish would have no claim," such as furniture for the communion table, &c., in which case it is certain that *no person but the church* could have a claim. This concession, which the court had not the courage and the conscience to controvert, cuts up by the roots the whole principle assumed; viz. that the church "could not hold as a corporation." This assumption, to my understanding, ever appeared to be the whole foundation of the decision; the rest of the case, (being thirty-four pages of Report,) seems to be foreign remarks and declamation, tending not to discuss the subject, but to confound or evade it; and even this assumption seems, by the above concession, to be wholly abandoned.

"The judges are great men; as such I consider and esteem them. But we have wrong notions of great men. Mere greatness does not imply that men, because great, are more free than others from an arithmetical proportion of errors; but great men are great in all their parts, as an elephant is greater than a sheep. They have great thoughts, great views, great premises, great conclusions; their demonstrations are great demonstrations; their errors are great errors; and *that is the difference.* The character of Judge Parsons is

proverbially that of the great Judge; and never did I know a Judge, whose blunders were greater blunders.

"I know something of the immense load which hung upon the Court who decided the Dedham case;—Boston feeling—Cambridge feeling—the expectations of men in power—and above all their own total settled inclination, *the stronger for being sincere*—all were a trial of the Court, severe and conflicting. While I observe this, I do not forget that I have my feelings, and that others have their feelings of the opposite tendency; and there I leave the Ded'm case."

---

#### ANCIENT ECCLESIASTICAL PROCEEDINGS.

From documents lately furnished us by a friend, we gather the following facts, illustrative of the ancient ecclesiastical order of things in Massachusetts.

In 1671, a Mr. Charles Nicolet was employed to assist the Rev. John Higginson, pastor of the church in Salem, in the work of the ministry. After about two years, Mr. Nicolet received an invitation from the town to become, in connexion with Mr. Higginson, their settled and permanent religious teacher. In this invitation, the church refused to concur. A majority of the town therefore concluded to separate from the church, and "voted a piece of land," on which to erect a house of worship. In consequence of this, Mr. Higginson addressed a letter to the Court, "protesting against the people's proceedings, and saying, amongst other things, that *such a practice as calling a minister by the people, without a prior vote or call by the church, had never been known in New England.*" In the mean time, before the Court could take cognizance of the affair, the supporters of Mr. Nicolet made an attempt to gather a church among themselves; but this was opposed by the church in Salem, and by several of the neighboring churches, and the measure failed. In June, 1675, a Court's Committee, consisting of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and eight others, visited Salem, examined into the whole proceeding, and in their Report say, "We declare the course and way that hath been attended in the calling and settling of Mr. Nicolet, as a preacher, by a *promiscuous vote of the town, is very irregular, and expressly contrary to the known, wholesome laws of this jurisdiction, and of dangerous tendency and influence as to the state and order of the churches here established.*" The Committee proceed to recommend a discontinuance of separate meetings, and that the whole church and congregation meet together as before. Soon after this, "Mr. Nicolet, finding there was likely to be little peace, preached a farewell sermon, and left the town."

---

#### THIRD NOTE FROM DR. LOWELL.

As our apology for not publishing the *second* letter from Dr. Lowell, promised in our last, we now present our readers with a *third*, which may be expected to close the correspondence.

To the Editor of the Spirit of the Pilgrims,  
Dear Sir,

Instead of the Note which I sent for insertion last month, I wish you to have the goodness to state, that as there was not room for my note in the last number of your work, I avail myself of the opportunity to withdraw it, as it might lead to a prolonged discussion in which I have no disposition to engage.

Respectfully yours,

February 6, 1829.

CHARLES LOWELL.

THE

# SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

VOL. II.

APRIL, 1829.

NO. 4.

---

## COMMUNICATIONS.

LETTERS ON THE INTRODUCTION AND PROGRESS OF UNITARIANISM  
IN NEW ENGLAND. NO. III.

DEAR SIR,

IN speaking of events which prepared the way for the spread of Unitarianism in New England, I have already come down to the close of the great revival of 1740. The effect of that general and powerful work of Divine grace was to try the hearts of ministers and professing Christians, draw out their feelings on one side or the other, and bring their true characters to light. There were many who rejoiced exceedingly in the displays of God's power and mercy which were then made. They had been waiting and praying for a revival of religion; and when it came, they could welcome it with gladness, and engage in promoting it with all their hearts. But with many others, it was not so. They regarded the work from the first with suspicion, and this suspicion soon became a determined hostility. They opposed the revival to the utmost of their power, endeavoring to hinder its progress and cover it with reproach, and were exceedingly prejudiced against everything of the like nature. The error of these persons first discovered itself in their feelings—their *hearts*; for as yet there was no open dissent, in point of doctrine, from the creed of their fathers. But from the heart, the disease soon extended itself to the head. There was a full preparation of heart for the spread of Arminian and Pelagian errors, and these errors came in like a flood.

The prevalence of them was hastened by the importation and dispersion of heretical books. The writings of Whitby, Taylor, Clarke, Emlyn, and others of the same character, were brought over from England, and by many were received and circulated with much pleasure. It was in opposition to Whitby, that President Edwards published his treatise on "the Freedom of the Will;" and in opposition to Taylor, that he wrote his work "on Original Sin." A distinguished clergyman in Connecticut,\* speaking, in

\* Rev. Noah Porter of Fairfield.

1759, of the various errors which prevailed in England, adds, "These corruptions in doctrine have crossed the Atlantic, and too many in our churches, and even among our ministers, have fallen in with them. Books containing them have been imported; and the demand for them has been so great, as to encourage new impressions of some of them. Others have been written on the same principles in this country; and even the doctrine of the sacred and adorable Trinity has been publicly treated in such a manner, as all who believe that doctrine must judge, not only heretical, but highly blasphemous." President Edwards, in the preface to his work "on Original Sin," written in 1757, mentions "the great corruption of doctrine in New England in consequence of Dr. Taylor's writings, which had been published about fifteen years before."\*

Another cause, which operated on most of the ministers and churches during nearly all the latter half of the last century, tending to detract from their spirituality and depress the standard of religion and morals, is to be found in the *political struggles and conflicts* which almost continually prevailed. The struggle with the French, which terminated in the surrender of Nova-Scotia, the Canadas, and some part of the West Indies, continued, with little cessation, from 1744 to 1762. And in 1765, only three years afterwards, the stamp act was passed, which again roused New England. The war of the revolution followed, and continued till 1783. During these times of high political excitement, interest, and peril, all other concerns seemed to be merged in those of the nation. And perhaps no class of citizens were more deeply interested than the clergy. By their prayers, their sermons, their conversation, influence and example, they endeavored to the utmost to sustain the courage of the citizens, and secure the deliverance of their bleeding country. This course of procedure was regarded at the time as necessary, and in many points of view it was highly commendable; and yet it could not but have withdrawn the minds of the clergy, and, through them, of their people, from the great concerns of religion and the soul. In such a state of things, the tone of religious sentiment and feeling must necessarily be relaxed, and the cause of Christ would be neglected. Aged enlightened Christians, when speaking on this subject, uniformly refer to the war of the revolution as that which operated, preeminently, to corrupt the morals, and deface the religious character of New England. It had this effect in various other ways, besides that which has been already mentioned. It introduced a multitude of vicious and unprincipled foreigners into the country in the capacity of officers and soldiers, either as allies or

\* Dr. Taylor, not long before his death, 'pathetically lamented the revolution in some of the Dissenting churches in England, which his writings had contributed not a little to accomplish.' See his "Scripture Account of Prayer;" 1761. pp. 47-49.



enemies to trample on the institutions, and corrupt the principles and habits, and of the unoffending citizens. It withdrew a large proportion of the young men of the country from their customary pursuits to a military course of life, and familiarized them to all the temptations of the field and the camp. It operated also to break down the Sabbath. Before the war of which I am speaking, which, says Dr. Morse, "introduced into New England a flood of corruptions and errors, the Sabbath was observed with great strictness. No unnecessary travelling, no secular business, no visiting, no diversions, were permitted on that sacred day." But in the course of the war, people became accustomed, not only to see the Sabbath violated, but in many instances to violate it themselves. In this way, they lost, irrecoverably, their feelings of regard for it, feelings, in the absence of which laws are of very little consequence. Add to all these considerations, that the very spirit of war is a ferocious spirit—a spirit directly opposed to the benevolence and gentleness of the Gospel. "Wars and fightings" not only come, as the Apostle assures us, of the lusts of men, they tend to nurture pride, revenge, and hate, and all the baser passions of our nature.

Looking at the subject in this light, and revolving it in its various moral bearings, it cannot be thought strange, however much it may be lamented, that the war of the revolution, which brought us independence, and such a profusion of political blessings, should have proved deeply injurious to the spiritual interests of New England. There were many, to be sure, who engaged in this war under a sense of religious obligation, and who, through the whole of it, maintained their integrity. But with many others, the result was different. Their minds were drawn away from the great concern of life; their moral sense was blunted; their respect for the law, the truth, and the institutions of God was diminished; while, under the pretence of superior knowledge, greater enlargement of mind, a freedom from prejudice, and a spirit of catholicism, they were led to regard all religious systems as of about equal value, and to prefer that, of course, which would impose the fewest restraints.

And with respect to those whose minds were in this state, the course of events *subsequent* to the war was directly calculated to draw them further away from God. In the joy of victory and independence, and in the full tide of commercial prosperity and increasing wealth, the world engaged their affections more and more; its riches, honors and pleasures attracted their pursuit; while the bounteous Giver of all—his word, his truth, his institutions and laws, were forgotten and despised. The holy principles of the Pilgrims were regarded as but the infant dress of the new republic, too tight and contracted for their free descendants; and in the pride of their hearts, many were ready to say of the religious system of their

fathers, their strictness and purity, 'It is time to put away childish things.'

The causes of spiritual declension, hitherto mentioned, it will be seen are of a *general* nature. They operated alike on the whole community. They tended evidently and powerfully to prepare the way for the spread of error and false religion; but not in any one *particular section* of the country, more than in others. 'Why then,' you will still inquire, 'did the Unitarian heresy make its first appearance, and its most formidable onset, in Massachusetts, and in the region of Boston? The same mistakes were made by our fathers, previous to the revival of 1740, in other parts of New England, as in Boston. The abuses of the revival, and the opposition to it, were even greater in some parts of Connecticut, than in Boston. The wars too, with the French, and with the parent country, were common evils; and the commercial prosperity which succeeded to the war of the revolution was of common influence. All these things tended, doubtless, to break down religious principle, and prepare the way for the growth and prevalence of Unitarian errors; but what reasons can be assigned for the particular *locality* of these errors?'—I state this inquiry, as one which will naturally arise in your mind, and to which I propose, in what follows, to direct your attention. In doing this, it will be necessary to turn back for awhile, and consider again the bearing of events which took place near the middle of the last century.

It is true, that the opposition to the revival of 1740 was more violent in some parts of Connecticut, than it was in Massachusetts, and in the region of Boston: For in Connecticut it arose to the most disgraceful persecution. It arose to such a height, that it produced a reaction, defeated itself, occasioned the disgrace and overthrow of its abettors, and brought the friends of the revival again into favor. The opposition to the revival in Connecticut proceeded to the enacting of laws, for the purpose of suppressing it, and to the arrest, prosecution, imprisonment and transportation of some who promoted it. Some of the best ministers in the colony were openly insulted, deprived of their salaries, subjected to heavy pecuniary charges and bonds, and even carried by public authority out of the jurisdiction. Laymen, too, were deprived of their civil offices, and those who were accustomed to exhort in religious meetings were cast into prison. Such was the *liberality* of an anti-revival, Arminian governor and legislature. Nor was the work of persecution confined to the civil powers. Some of the revival ministers were deprived of their seats in the Associations, suspended from all associational communion, and even dismissed from their charges, for no other crime than that of laboring to promote the work of God. Members of the churches also, were in some instances excommunicated, for hearing Mr. Whitefield

and others preach; and the friends of the revival, in general, were harrassed and perplexed by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, in every way possible.\*

But these violent proceedings, as might have been expected, at length wrought the disgrace and overthrow of those who promoted them. The good sense of the people of Connecticut was shocked, and after a few years of oppression and trial, the persecutions ceased. The friends of the revival were restored to their rights, and received to more favor than they had lost; while their late opposers were regarded "as haters of God, opposers to his truth, and the persecutors of his servants."

The opposition to the revival in Massachusetts was conducted in a very different manner. Dr. Chauncy and his coadjutors had more cunning, if not more principle,† than to attempt suppressing it by statutes and penalties. In place of these, the good work was here assailed by sneers, reproaches, malicious insinuations, and slanderous reports. The abuses of it were much insisted on and exaggerated, and the friends of it were treated in a manner which had all the effect of palpable persecution, without its odium. Warm, active, devoted piety was rendered disgraceful; and strong prejudices were excited and confirmed against everything which bore the appearance of a revival. By these more artful methods, the opposers of evangelical religion succeeded, in some parts of Massachusetts, in running it down; while the result of their violence in Connecticut was to bring it back to favor and influence, and bring themselves only into disgrace. Here, then, we have *one reason* why the errors, for the origin of which we are inquiring, made their appearance in Massachusetts, and in the region of Boston, rather than in some other portions of New England.

We have another reason for this, in the fact, that the Calvinism of Boston, during the time of the revival, and afterwards, was not of the most unexceptionable kind. The half-way covenant was in full operation; and the views of Mr. Stoddard, relative to the prerequisites for membership and communion in the churches, were embraced, even by the best ministers. Mr. Prince represents Mr. Tennent as excessively "strict, in cautioning people against running into churches, taking the sacred covenant, and receiving the Lord's Supper, *until they had saving grace*." It seems

\* That this account is not exaggerated, our readers may satisfy themselves, by consulting Dr. Trumbull's History of Conn. vol. ii. chap. 3. Dr. Pomroy of Hebron, besides pecuniary charges and being laid under bonds, was deprived of his salary for seven years. The late Pres. Finley, of New Jersey College, "was once or twice carried out of the colony, as a vagrant." Messrs. Humphreys of Derby, Leavenworth of Waterbury, and Todd of Northbury, were suspended from all associational communion, for assisting in the ordination of a Calvinist minister, contrary to the views of their anti-revival brethren. Rev. Timothy Allen of West Haven, afterwards minister for many years of Chesterfield in Mass. was dismissed from his people by an Arminian Consociation "with this illustrious triumph, that they had blown out one new light, and intended to blow them all out."

† I should not have so much as hinted a lack of *principle* on the part of Dr. Chauncy, were it not that he refers to the persecutions in Conn., without censure certainly, if not with approbation. See "Seasonable Thoughts," &c. p. 41.

to me," he adds, "that where there is a thirst for Christ and his spiritual benefits, that thirst is raised by the Spirit of Christ; and in raising such a thirst, he shows his readiness to satiate it, and invites, requires, and gives sufficient grounds, for coming to these pipes of living waters," i. e. the sacraments.

In the summer of 1747, the excellent David Brainerd spent several weeks in Boston, with a view to the recovery of his health. While here, as appears from his journal, he had occasion to bear testimony against prevailing errors; and particularly this, "that the essence of saving faith lies in believing that Christ died for *me in particular*, and that this is the first act of faith, in a true believer's closing with Christ." It is known that this mistaken idea of faith, which almost necessarily results in Antinomianism and which Mr. Brainerd well says, "has nothing in it above nature, nor indeed above the power of the devils," prevailed very much, for a time, in Boston. It was in opposition to this representation of faith, that Dr. Bellamy published his "Letters and Dialogues on Theron and Aspasio," in 1759; and his work on "The Glory of the Gospel," in 1762.

President Edwards, in his farewell sermon at Northampton, in 1750, speaks thus of "Arminianism, and doctrines of like tendency." "The progress they have made in the land, within these seven years, seems to have been vastly greater than at any time in the like space before. And if these principles should greatly prevail in this town, as they *very lately have done in another large town I could name, formerly greatly noted for religion*," meaning Boston, "they will threaten the spiritual and eternal ruin of this people."

In 1765, Dr. Hopkins, afterwards of Newport, was concerned in a controversy with Dr. Mayhew of Boston, respecting "the doings of the unregenerate." It is to be supposed, therefore, that the views of Dr. Mayhew, relative to this subject, were widely different from those which prevail among the Orthodox at the present day.—From the facts here presented, it appears that the Calvinism of Boston, which, even during the revival, was not of the most unexceptionable kind, in a few years afterwards became essentially corrupted; and thus a foundation was laid for that fearful defection from the truth, which has since been witnessed.

Another reason for the prevalence of religious error in Boston, arose from its particular exposure, more especially before the revolution, to a corrupting *foreign* influence. It was at that time more exposed to such an influence, not only than any other place in New England, but than any other in the country. And it is indubitable, that the beginnings of most of the corruptions at present existing among us, whether of doctrine or practice, have been imported. The writings of Whitby and Taylor scattered the seeds of Arminianism in New England. The works of Hervey and

Marshall inculcated those views of faith, which Brainerd and Belamy so strenuously opposed. The works of Clarke and Emlyn led some to doubt and deviate on the subject of the Trinity. While in more recent times, the works of Priestley, Lindsey, Belsham, and others, have instructed and confirmed many in their Unitarian speculations.

More than half a century ago, there were a few, both among the clergy and laity, in Boston and the surrounding region, who secretly entertained erroneous views on the subject of the Trinity. In 1768, Dr. Hopkins published a sermon from Heb. iii. 1, entitled, "The importance and necessity of Christians considering Jesus Christ in the extent of his high and glorious character." It was preached in Boston, and "was composed," says the author, "with a design to preach it there, under a conviction that *the doctrine of the Divinity of Christ was much neglected, if not disbelieved, by a number of the ministers in Boston.*" I have no positive evidence that Dr. Chauncy, or his colleague and successor, Dr. Clark, or Dr. West, denied the doctrine of the Trinity; though, considering their views on other subjects, it is hardly to be doubted that they did. In a letter from the late President Adams to Dr. Morse, dated May 15, 1815, the writer observes, "Sixty-five years ago, my own minister, Rev. Lemuel Bryant; Dr. Jonathan Mayhew of the West Church in Boston; Rev. Mr. Shute of Hingham;\* Rev. John Brown of Cohasset; and perhaps equal to all, if not above all, Rev. Mr. Gay of Hingham, were Unitarians. Among the laity, how many could I name, lawyers, physicians, tradesman, and farmers. I could fill a sheet, but at present will name only one, Richard Cranch, a man who has studied divinity and Jewish and Christian antiquities, more than any clergyman now existing in New England!!! More than fifty-six years ago, I read Dr. Samuel Clarke, Emlyn," &c.

Dr. Howard, the successor of Dr. Mayhew, and immediate predecessor of the present Dr. Lowell, was an avowed Unitarian. He is said to be "the first clergyman who publicly defended Unitarian sentiments in New England."† Of the last generation of Boston ministers, Mr. Everett of the New South (or Summer Street) church, and Dr. Lathrop, successor of the excellent Dr. Pemberton, and predecessor of Mr. Ware, were probably, though very secretly,

\* Dr. Ware of Cambridge was for some time colleague with Mr. Shute. They jointly published a Catechism, for the instruction of the young. This contains no avowal of Unitarian sentiments. Close concealment was then the order of the day.

† Chris. Register for April 22d, 1826. We admire the frankness and honesty of Dr. Howard, as much as we disapprove the concealment of Unitarians who preceded him, and of many who have followed him. Why should those, who walk in the fancied splendor of Unitarian light, forever keep their candle under a bushel? Why not rise above mere temporal considerations, and make the world acquainted with all their views? Such was the state of feeling in Boston at the time of Dr. Howard's settlement, that for years he was not admitted to the Boston Association of Congregational ministers.

Unitarians.\*—In addition to these, there were numbers of their cotemporaries among the laity, who speculated with them on the subject of the Trinity. I think President Adams mistaken, in supposing he could fill a sheet with names; but doubtless there were several—and some who, like himself, were considered as persons of distinction.

It was necessary for the early Unitarian ministers of Boston and the vicinity, in order to retain their places, and promote their views, to proceed with the utmost caution. In general, they never preached their peculiar sentiments, and endeavored, as far as possible, to conceal them from public view. The better to accomplish this, the original practice in New England of strictly examining candidates for the Gospel ministry, began many years ago to be opposed, and in some instances to be laid partially aside. The biographer of President Edwards, speaking on this subject, says, “He (Edwards) thought it of importance that ministers should be *very critical* in examining candidates for the ministry, with respect to their *principles*, as well as their religious disposition and morals. And on this account, he in some places met with considerable difficulty and *opposition*.” A difficulty of this sort occurred at the ordination of the Mr. Everett already mentioned, in consequence of which a part of the ordaining council withdrew. Confessions of faith, too, began at this time to be opposed, and not unfrequently were disused. The object of all this was to prevent discussion and disclosure, and cover up the secretly spreading error.

But to keep the subject entirely concealed, for any considerable time, was manifestly impossible. In personal intercourse and conversation, if by no other means, it must at length come out; and to meet disclosures of this sort, there must be provision. But in making this provision, the ancient doctrines of the New England churches must not be openly attacked; for this would shock the minds of the people, and endanger, if not defeat, the whole design. A safer way would be to inculcate an almost total *indifference* in regard to religious doctrine. The impression must be made, that ‘if we differ from you at all, it is only in some slight, speculative points, about which diversity of opinion is worthy of no consideration. The outward character is all with which we are concerned.

For *modes of faith*, let graceless zealots fight;  
He can't be wrong, whose *life* is in the right.

The quiet of parishes must in no case be disturbed; and he is the best minister who so manages as to live in the greatest peace.’

An impression of this sort began to be made in the easterly part of Massachusetts, before the war of the revolution; and after the war, it became more general and confirmed. The consequence was, that the Orthodox ministers were kept back from

\* The Unitarians here and previously named should not be confounded with those of the present age. They were high Arians, and doubtless believed in something which they called an atonement for sin.

withdrawing from their heretical brethren, or taking any decisive measures to defeat their plans. The customary ministerial intercourse and exchanges were continued, and the impression was made, all around, that one system of doctrine was as good as another, and that every man was entitled to embrace that which best suited his convenience and his inclinations.\*

It should be observed here, in addition to all other considerations, that the special influences of the Holy Spirit were almost entirely withdrawn. What discourses were preached of a character to awaken and impress the minds of people, were neutralized by others of a different character, and the wise and the foolish slumbered together. There was no revival of religion in Boston, at least in the Congregational churches, from 1743, till we come down almost to our own times. No wonder, then, that iniquity abounded, and the love of many waxed cold. No wonder that the lamp of spiritual life was well nigh extinguished, and that innovations and errors had come in like a flood. Considering all that has been here said, it is much more lamentable than strange, that Unitarian errors have made their appearance in this country, and that they have gained their principal footing in Boston, and the surrounding region.

Asking pardon for intruding on you so long a communication—much longer than was intended, when I commenced, I must, for the present, bid you adieu.

INVESTIGATOR.

---

INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES. NO. VI.

*What views are we to entertain respecting the nature and extent of divine inspiration?*

The best means of forming a right judgement respecting the nature and extent of inspiration, may be found in the Scriptures themselves. The subject, generally, presents itself to my mind thus: If the Scriptures contain truth unmixed with error; the *divine influence* must have secured the writers against all liability to error, and enabled them to teach *pure divine truth*. If the Scrip-

\* Dr. Mather, in his "Prognostications upon the future state of New England," says, "there was a town called Amyclæ, which was ruined by *silence*. The rulers, because there had been some false alarms, forbade all people, under pain of death, to speak of any enemies approaching them. So, when the enemies came indeed, no man durst speak of it, and the town was lost.—*Corruptions will grow*," says he, "upon this land, and they will gain BY SILENCE. It will be so *invidious* to speak of them, that no man will dare to do it, and the fate of Amyclæ will come upon the land."—How far this "prognostication" has been fulfilled, the reader need not be informed.

tures really and infallibly express the mind of God on the subjects treated, and so are justly entitled to be called *the word of God*; and if this *infallible utterance of the mind of God* is beyond what the writers were capable of from the mere exercise of their own rational powers; then they must have had supernatural assistance;—must have thought and written under the direction of an intelligence above what is human. And this is only saying, that the work accomplished must have proceeded from an agency sufficient to accomplish it. And if we can be satisfied what the work accomplished is, we shall be easily satisfied as to the agency to which it is to be ultimately ascribed.

There are many, who recognize no higher agency in the production of the Scriptures, than that of man. But if we regard the sacred volume, as sustaining the character which the writers themselves attribute to it, we shall at once recognize in its production an intelligence and influence truly divine. The exercise of this divine influence upon the sacred writers is what we mean by *inspiration*.

I shall not stop to reason with those, who question either the power of God to afford men the supernatural guidance and aid here supposed, or the importance of such aid to enable them to give the necessary instruction on the subject of religion; nor with those who are insensible, how utterly dark, and wretched, and hopeless must have been the state of the world, had not a book been written under the direction of an omniscient mind. We must surely entertain very low conceptions of what the human mind would have been likely to accomplish *without a divine revelation*, when we find that, even in the *enjoyment* of such a revelation, it is so difficult to avoid the most erroneous and hurtful opinions, and to obtain any clear apprehensions of divine truth.

To all Christians, the doctrine of divine inspiration must appear exceedingly desirable and important. A full persuasion that those writings, on which they depend for all saving knowledge, had a divine original, must be full of comfort. “If the Apostles did not enjoy that higher divine influence, called inspiration, we might,” says Dr. Knapp, “be easily disturbed by the doubt, whether they rightly understood and taught this and the other doctrine of the Christian religion; whether, for example, their faithful attachment to Christ, their love to his person, and high reverence for his character, did not betray them unintentionally and unconsciously into mistaken and exaggerated views concerning his person, his divinity, and his glory in his state of exaltation. It would be easy in this way, if no inspiration of the Bible were admitted, to render doubtful the most important doctrines of Christianity. This is what has been done, especially in modern times, by those who deny inspiration.”

The definition which the excellent author, just quoted, gives of inspiration, is perhaps as correct as any which has been given. He



says, "It may be best defined, according to the representation of the Scriptures themselves, as an *extraordinary divine agency upon teachers while giving instruction, whether oral or written, by which they were taught what and how they should write or speak.*" We may express the same thing, substantially, in another form, and say, that *in writing the Scriptures, the sacred penmen were perfectly under divine guidance; or, they wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*

Various distinctions have been made in regard to the kinds and degrees of inspiration afforded to the sacred writers. But it ought to be remembered, that the sacred writers themselves nowhere make any such distinction. They declare that *all Scripture is divinely inspired.* This implies that the writers of Scripture were constantly under the guidance of the Spirit. It seems therefore more agreeable to the views which the Scripture itself expresses, and more favorable to its influence, to say, that *the sacred writers were so guided by the divine Spirit, that, in every part of their work, they were rendered infallible, and wrote just what God willed they should write; so that the sacred volume entirely answers to the mind of God, and has nothing, either as to matter or form, which he did not see to be suited to the great object of a divine revelation.*

In some cases we may find it convenient to speak of the influence, which God exercised over inspired men, as a *divine superintendency*; in other cases, as a *divine suggestion*. By a *divine superintendency*, we may designate such a divine control over the sacred writers, as effectually preserved them from error, and enabled them to write that, and that only, which corresponded with the will of God, and which can justly be considered as *the word of God*. And by a *divine suggestion*, we may properly enough set forth that divine influence, which makes known what was before unknown, or causes one to recollect what would otherwise escape his recollection. But, in general, I see no necessity for such a distinction, and no special advantages likely to result from it. I therefore prefer a definition, which has nothing to do with the particular *manner* of divine operation in this work, and which represents inspiration, simply, as a *supernatural guidance or assistance of the Spirit afforded to the sacred writers, that divine guidance or assistance having been such, as entirely to guard them against error, and to lead them to write just what God saw to be suited to accomplish the ends of revelation.* If God would have them make a record, for future use, of what was at the time generally known, he influenced them to *make* such a record. If he would have them predict future events, or teach doctrines or precepts never taught before; he influenced them to do this. And universally; whatever God would have them write, he prompted them to undertake it, and assisted them in accomplishing it;—in every case granting them just such assistance, as the end he had in view required.

Some have supposed, that the influence, which inspired men had, related *exclusively to the thoughts or conceptions of their own minds*. But this supposition seems to me not accordant with what the inspired writers themselves advance on the subject. Far be it from me to attempt an explanation of the specific mode of the divine agency in the work of inspiration. But as the writers of Scripture nowhere limit the divine influence which they enjoyed, to the thoughts or conceptions of their own minds; neither would I do it. And as there are some texts which, according to any fair interpretation, clearly imply that the divine guidance afforded to inspired men, had, in some important sense, a respect to their language; how can I entertain any further doubt? And I find myself still more satisfied by considering the cases, in which the Apostles and other Christians were miraculously assisted to speak with *other tongues*; because, in all these cases, the agency of the Spirit related directly to the language they used. The very fact asserted necessarily implies this. For to say, that the divine Spirit assisted them to speak in a foreign language which they had not learned, and yet that the divine assistance afforded them had no respect to *language*, would be a contradiction. The remarkable instance of divine agency, now referred to, should at least prevent us from asserting in unqualified terms, that divine inspiration in the Apostles could have had no respect to their language.

The general doctrine of inspiration, understood in any important sense, seems clearly to imply, that the divine influence which the Prophets and Apostles enjoyed, must have pertained, in some way, to the manner in which they communicated divine truth. For can we suppose that God moved his servants to write a particular doctrine or fact, and yet did not influence them to write it in a suitable manner?—that, after prompting them to communicate something of consequence, he so abandoned them, that they were liable, as every man without divine assistance is, to fall into mistakes, or to make the communication in a manner less proper in itself, and less agreeable to the mind of God, than some other?

One argument which has been urged against the supposition that divine inspiration had any respect to language, is, that *the language employed by the inspired writers exhibits no marks of a divine interference, but is perfectly conformed to the genius and taste of the writers*.

The fact here alleged is admitted. But how does it support the opinion of those who allege it? Is it not evident, that God may exercise a perfect superintendency over inspired writers as to the language they shall use, and yet that each one of them shall write in his own style, and in all respects according to his own taste? May not God give such aid to his servants; that, while using their own style, they will certainly be secured against all mistakes, and exhibit the truth with perfect propriety? It cannot admit of a question,

that Isaiah, and Paul, and John might be under the entire direction of the Holy Spirit, even as to language, and at the same time, that each one of them might write in his own manner; and that the peculiar manner of each might be adapted to answer an important end; and that the variety of style, thus introduced into the sacred volume, might be suited to excite a livelier interest in the minds of men, and to secure to them a far greater amount of good, than could ever have been derived from any one mode of writing? The great variety existing among men as to their natural talents, and their peculiar manner of thinking and writing may, in this way, be turned to account in the work of revelation, as well as in the concerns of common life. Now is it not clearly a matter of fact, that God has made use of this variety, and given the Holy Spirit to men, differing widely from each other in regard to natural endowments, and knowledge, and style, and employed them, with all their various gifts, as agents in writing the holy Scriptures? And what color of reason can we have to suppose, that the language which they used was less under the divine direction on account of this variety, than if it had been perfectly uniform throughout?

To prove that divine inspiration had no respect to the language of the sacred writers, it is further alleged, that even *the same doctrine is taught, and the same event described in a different manner by different writers.*

This fact I also admit. But how does it prove that inspiration had no respect to language? Is not the variety alleged a manifest advantage, as to the impression which is likely to be made upon the minds of men? Is not testimony, which is substantially the same, always considered as entitled to higher credit, when it is given by different witnesses in different language, and in a different order? And is it not perfectly reasonable to suppose, that, in making a revelation, God would have respect to the common principles of human nature and human society, and would exert his influence and control over inspired men in such a manner, that, by exhibiting the same doctrines and facts in different ways, they should make a more salutary impression, and should more effectually compass the great ends of a revelation?

All I have to advance on this part of the subject may be summed up in these obvious positions. First; The variety of manner apparent among different inspired writers, even when treating of the same subjects, is far better suited to promote the object of divine revelation, than a perfect uniformity. And, secondly, it is agreeable to our worthiest conceptions of God and his administration, that he should make use of the best means for the accomplishment of his designs; and of course, that he should impart the gift of inspiration to men of different tastes and habits as to language, and should lead them, while writing the Scriptures, to exhibit all the variety of

manner naturally arising from the diversified character of their minds.

But there is another argument, perhaps the most plausible of all, against supposing that inspiration had any respect to language ; which is, *that the supposition of any divine influence in this respect is wholly unnecessary ; that the sacred writers, having the requisite information in regard to the subjects on which they were to write, might, so far as language is concerned, be left entirely to their own judgement and fidelity.*

But this view of the subject is not satisfactory. For whatever may be said as to the judgement and fidelity of those who wrote the Scriptures, there is one important circumstance which cannot be accounted for, without supposing them to have enjoyed a guidance above that of their own minds ; namely, that *they were infallibly preserved from every mistake or impropriety in the manner of writing.* If we should admit that the divine superintendence and guidance afforded to the inspired writers had no relation at all to the manner in which they exhibited either doctrines or facts ; how easily might we be disturbed with doubts, in regard to the propriety of some of their representations ? We should most certainly consider them as liable to all the inadvertencies and mistakes, to which uninspired men are commonly liable ; and we should think ourselves perfectly justified in undertaking to charge them with real errors and faults as to style, and to show how their language might have been improved ; and, in short, to treat their writings just as we treat the writings of Shakspeare and Addison. “ Here,” we might say, “ Paul was unfortunate in the choice of words ; and here his language does not express the ideas which he must have intended to convey. Here the style of John was inadvertent ; and here it was faulty ; and here it would have been more agreeable to the nature of the subject, and would have more accurately expressed the truth, had it been altered thus.” If the language of the sacred writers did not in any way come under the inspection of the Holy Spirit, and if they were left, just as other writers are, to their own unaided faculties in regard to everything which pertained to the manner of writing ; then, evidently, we might use the same freedom in animadverting upon their style, as upon the style of any other writers. But who could treat the volume of inspiration in this manner, without impiety and profaneness ? And rather than make any approach to this, who would not choose to go to an excess, if there could be an excess, in reverence for the word of God ?

On this subject, far be it from me to indulge a curiosity, which would pry into things not intended for human intelligence. And far be it from me to expend zeal in supporting opinions not warranted by the word of God. But this one point I think it specially important to maintain ; namely, *that the sacred writers had such direction of the Holy Spirit, that they were secured against all lia-*

bility to error, and enabled to write just what God pleased ; so that what they wrote is, in truth, the word of God, and can never be subject to any charge of mistake, either as to matter or form. Whether this perfect correctness and propriety as to language resulted from the divine guidance *directly*, or *indirectly*, is a question of no particular consequence. If the Spirit of God directs the minds of inspired men, and gives them just conceptions relative to the subjects on which they are to write ; and if he constitutes and maintains a connexion, true and invariable, between their conceptions, and the language they employ to express them ; the language must, in this way, be as infallible, and as worthy of God, as though it were dictated *directly* by the Holy Spirit. But to assert that the sacred writers used such language as they chose, or such as was natural to them, without any special divine superintendence, and that, in respect to style, they are to be regarded in the same light, and equally liable to mistakes, as other writers, is plainly contrary to the representations which they themselves make, and is suited to diminish our confidence in the word of God. For how could we have entire confidence in the representations of Scripture, if, after God had instructed the minds of the sacred writers in the truth to be communicated, he gave them up to all the inadvertencies and errors, to which human nature in general is exposed, and took no effectual care that their manner of writing should be according to his will ?

But besides what has been said, I have a strong objection to *the principle* which is involved in the reasoning now under consideration. For if we may properly deny that the divine guidance afforded to the sacred writers had any respect to their language, on the pretence, that they were able to write without it, and so that the divine guidance was *unnecessary* ; we might, on the same pretence, deny that the divine guidance had any respect to the greater part of the *subjects* on which they wrote. We might ask ; what necessity could there be for divine inspiration in writing the historical or didactic parts of Scripture ? Could not Moses write a history of events which took place under his own eye, and in which he himself was particularly concerned, without supernatural aid ? And could he not, without supernatural aid, make a record of what he received from tradition ? Could not Joshua and subsequent prophets write a history of what took place in their respective generations, without being moved by the Holy Ghost ? So of a great part of the Psalms and Proverbs. Let any man carefully attend to these writings, and then say, whether, on the common principles of reasoning, and independently of the testimony of inspired writers, he could prove the necessity of supernatural assistance. We may indeed prove the necessity of such assistance in regard to things which are manifestly beyond the reach of uninspired men. But in regard to a majority of things contained in the Bible, how could we prove

that they were written by those who were divinely inspired, except by the declaration of the writers themselves? The same as to the case in hand. I admit that, independently of what we learn from the inspired writers themselves, we could not prove the *necessity* of supernatural divine aid in regard to the *language* they employed, and could not prove that they generally had any such aid. But if this is expressly taught, or fairly implied in their own declarations; then there are no presumptions, and no reasonings, which we can admit to be conclusive against it, and, to be consistent Christians, *we must believe it simply on the authority of God's word.*

Let us then briefly examine the subject, as it is presented in the Holy Scriptures, and see whether we find sufficient reason to deny that inspiration had any relation whatever to language.

The first thing I notice is, that *the Apostles were the subjects of such a divine inspiration as enabled them to speak with other tongues.* Here, as I have already remarked, *inspiration related directly to language.*

Secondly; It is the opinion of most writers, that, in some instances, inspired men had not in their own minds a clear understanding of the things which they spake or wrote. One instance of this commonly referred to, is the case of Daniel, who heard and repeated what the Angel said, though he did not understand it. Dan. xii. 7--9. This has also been thought to be in some measure the case with the prophets referred to, 1 Peter i. 10--12. And is there not reason to think this may have been the case with many of the prophetic representations contained in the Psalms, and many of the symbolic rites of the Mosaic institute? Various matters are found in the Old Testament, which evidently were not intended so much for the benefit of the writers, or their contemporaries, as for the benefit of future ages. And this might have been a sufficient reason why they should be left without a clear understanding of the things which they wrote. In such cases, if the opinion above stated is correct, inspired men were led to make use of expressions, the meaning of which they did not fully understand. And according to this view, it would seem that the teaching of the Spirit which they enjoyed, must have related rather to the *words*, than to the *sense.*

Those who deny that the divine influence afforded to the sacred writers had any respect to language, can find no support in the texts which most directly relate to the subject of inspiration. And it is surely in such texts, if anywhere, that we should suppose they would find support.

The passage, 1 Pet. i. 21, is a remarkable one. It asserts that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." There is surely nothing here, which limits the divine influence to the thoughts or conceptions of their minds: They were moved by the Holy Ghost to *speak* or *write.* 2 Tim. iii. 16. "All Scrip-

ture is divinely inspired." Does this text afford any proof that the divine influence granted to the inspired peunen, was confined to their inward conceptions, and had no respect whatever to the manner in which they expressed their conceptions? What is *Scripture*? Is it divine truth *conceived in the mind*, or divine truth *written*.

In Heb. i. 1. it is said that "God *spake* to the fathers by the prophets." Does this afford any proof, that the divine guidance which the prophets enjoyed, related *exclusively* to the conceptions of their own minds, and had no respect to the manner in which they communicated those conceptions? Must we not rather think the meaning to be, that God influenced the prophets to *utter*, or *make known* important truths? And how could they do this, except by the use of proper words?

I have argued in favor of the inspiration of the Apostles, from their commission. They were sent by Christ *to teach the truths of religion in his stead*. It was an arduous work, and in the execution of it they needed and enjoyed much divine assistance. But forming right conceptions of Christianity in their own minds, was not the great work assigned to the Apostles. And if the divine assistance reached only to this, it reached only to that which concerned them as *private men*, and which they might have possessed, though they had never been commissioned to teach others. As *Apostles*, they were to preach the Gospel to all who could be brought to hear it, and to make a record of divine truth for the benefit of future ages. Now is it at all reasonable to suppose, that the divine assistance afforded them had no respect to their main business, and that, in the momentous and difficult work of *communicating* the truths of religion, either orally, or by writing, they were left to themselves, and so exposed to all the errors and inadvertencies of uninspired men?

But our reasoning does not stop here. For that divine assistance, which we might reasonably suppose would have been granted to the Apostles in the work of *teaching* divine truth, is the very thing which Christ promised them, in the texts before cited. I shall refer only to Matt. x. 19, 20, "When they shall deliver you up, take no thought *how* or *what* ye shall speak; for it shall be given you in the same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you." This promise, as Knapp understands it, implies, that "divine assistance should extend not only to *what* they should say, but to the *manner* in which they should say it." It is not, however, to be understood as implying, that the Apostles were not rational and voluntary agents in the discharge of their office. But it implies that, in consequence of the influence of the Spirit to be exercised over them, they should say what God would have them to say, without any liability to mistake, either as to matter or manner.

From the above cited promise, taken in connexion with the instances of its accomplishment which are recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, it becomes evident, that *God may exert his highest influence upon his servants, so as completely to guide them in thought and in utterance, in regard to subjects which lie within the province of their natural faculties.* For in those speeches of the Apostles which are left on record, we find that most of the things which they declared, were things which, for aught that appears, they might have known, and might have expressed to others, in the natural exercise of their own faculties. This principle being admitted, and kept steadily in view, will relieve us of many difficulties in regard to the doctrine of inspiration.

The passage, 1 Cor. ii. 12, 13, already cited as proof of the inspiration of the Apostles, is very far from favoring the opinion that inspiration had no respect whatever to their language, or that it related *exclusively* to their thoughts. "Which things we speak, *not in the words* which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." The Apostle avoided the style and the manner of teaching, which prevailed among the wise men of Greece, and made use of a style, which corresponded with the nature of his subject, and the end he had in view. And this, he tells us, he did, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. His language, or manner of teaching, was the thing to which the divine influence imparted to him, particularly referred. Storr and Platt give the following interpretation of this text: "Paul," they say, "asserts that the doctrines of Christianity were revealed to him by the Almighty agency of God himself; and finally, that the inspiration of the divine Spirit extended even to his *words*, and to all his *exhibitions* of revealed truths." They add, that "Paul clearly distinguishes between the doctrine itself, and the manner in which it is communicated."

I quote the following passages from the same learned and judicious authors, as a farther illustration of the views which have been exhibited in this discussion.

"The Apostles doubtless thought for themselves; that is, exercised their natural faculties, and communicated their own thoughts, both in their oral and written instructions. Still, their instructions are to be considered rather the instructions of God, than of the Apostles: for the substance or matter of them was, for the most part, communicated to them, if not at the moment when they were speaking or writing, yet previously, either by Christ during his abode with them on earth, or by the Spirit of God. Moreover, this perpetual coadjutor exercised a *constant superintendence over all their communications, both oral and written*; and where anything had escaped their memory, recalled it; and where there was ignorance or error in their views, afforded them the necessary instruction; thus preventing the omission of anything which the



Spirit of God would have them communicate, and guarding them effectually against imperfect or erroneous exhibitions of those truths which they had received from the Lord.”—“As the Apostles were to be infallible teachers, and their instructions to be received as coming from God,—to ensure *perfect accuracy in their communications*, the superintending influence of the Spirit might be necessary, even when they were communicating doctrines which had been revealed to them at a former period, or which they had learned in some other way.”—“By the Spirit of God, their inseparable assistant, the Apostles were preserved from *adulterating* the revelations which they received from God. The Spirit, for example, prevented them from using *expressions* suggested by the additions which their reasonings might make to the revelations they received from God. He excited in them a suspicion of all such ideas as originated from themselves, and thus led them to select other *expressions*, which, while they accorded with their own ideas, and habits of expression, harmonized perfectly with the truth, and with the purposes of the divine Spirit. In this way it may be seen that, while the Spirit of God prevented any false propositions or expressions from escaping them, opportunity was afforded, even in the communication of truths immediately inspired, for each Apostle to manifest that peculiarity of thought and expression, by which he was distinguished from others.”

If, after all, it should be thought by any who examine this subject, to be an objection to the views I have expressed, that there is no appearance of anything *superhuman*, or *preternatural*, in the *language* of Scripture; I would ask, what appearance of this there could be, on the supposition that the divine Spirit superintended, or even prompted, the language employed. The language, in order to answer the end, must still be human. The modes of speech, the figures, and everything relating to the style, must be conformed to common usage. They must be so, even if God himself should make a communication *directly*, by uttering a voice from heaven. Such a direct communication he actually made in the testimony he gave to Christ at his baptism. And he made a direct communication in another form, when he wrote the ten commandments on tables of stone. And yet, in both of these, the language was in all respects according to common usage. Why then should it not be so, where he makes a communication through human agency? Why should we suppose he would depart from the common modes of speech? And admitting that the common modes of speech are used, why should we suppose that God would set aside the natural powers of the writers, and would make thoughts and words for them, without any use of their minds, or their organs of speech? Far be it from us to entertain so strange and senseless an imagination.

## VIEWS OF THE EARLY CHRISTIANS RESPECTING FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

In the reign of Antoninus Pius, about A. D. 139, the Christians were accused of holding pernicious opinions, and of practising the most hateful vices; and, on this account, a violent persecution was raised against them. In these distressed circumstances, Justin Martyr addressed his celebrated Apology to the Roman emperor, in which he proposed to give a fair and complete view of the faith and practice of his fellow Christians, in order to show that neither their opinions nor their conduct rendered them deserving of the evils which they suffered. No man could be better qualified for this task, than Justin. He was born and educated in Palestine, he had spent many years among the Christians of Asia Minor, and, at the time of writing his Apology, he was a resident at Rome. No man, therefore, could have a better opportunity of knowing what the Christians really believed; and the high degree of mental cultivation, the intellectual vigor and glowing eloquence which his writings everywhere exhibit, afford sufficient proof that no one was better able to express what he knew.

This Apology, then, may justly be considered as the most perfect exhibition of the views of the early Christians, with which antiquity can furnish us. I shall here give a few passages which relate to the doctrine of future punishment. I shall endeavor to make my translations as literal as possible, in order to avoid all suspicion of misrepresenting my author.

In the eighth section of the Apology, addressing the emperor, Justin says: "Wherefore, indeed, to tell in few words what we expect, what we have been taught by Christ, and what we teach, it is this. As Plato said that Minos and Rhadamanthus would punish the wicked who went to them; so we say that the same thing will be done, but that they will be punished by Christ, and in their bodies as well as their souls, and with an eternal punishment (*αιωνιαν κολασιν*); but not for a period of a thousand years only, as he (Plato) supposed. If, indeed, any one will say to us, that this is incredible and impossible, it is at least a harmless error (*ἡ δε πλανη εστιν αλλου προς ελερον*), as long as we are not convicted of any actual crime."

This extract furnishes two important remarks: 1. It shows that the adjective *αιωνιος* really means *endless* in its largest sense; for the phrase *αιωνιαν κολασιν*, *eternal punishment*, is here purposely opposed to the *περιοδον*, the *limited punishment*, which Plato supposed the wicked would suffer in a future state.

2. This extract shows that *eternal punishment* is peculiarly the doctrine of Christianity, and that *limited punishment* is a doctrine

of heathen philosophy ; for this is expressly stated by Justin, who was a Platonist before his conversion to Christianity : and it is further evident from the apologetic sentence with which the extract closes, that Justin was sensible that the notion of endless misery would seem harsh and strange to the philosophic emperor, however willing he might be to admit the idea of limited punishment.

*Section XII.* “Of all men, we are your best helpers and allies, in preserving peace, who teach that it is impossible for any wicked, or avaricious, or treacherous, or virtuous man to be concealed from God ; and that each one will go to eternal punishment or salvation, according to the merit of his deeds. For if all men knew these things, no one would choose wickedness for a short time, knowing that he must go to eternal condemnation by fire ; but he would by all means govern and adorn himself with virtue, that he might obtain the rewards from God, and escape the punishments.”

*Section XVIII.* “Look to the end of each one of the former emperors, that they have died the death common to all men : and if that state be void of sense, it is gain to all the wicked. But since the senses remain to all who have lived, and eternal punishment is reserved, do not neglect to be persuaded of these things, and to believe that they are true.”

*Section XIX.* “But Gehenna is the place where they are to be punished, who live wickedly, and do not believe that those things will come to pass, which God has declared by Christ.”

The Christians of Justin’s time, then, believed that *Hell* is a place, and *unbelief* a crime.

*Section XXI.* “We have been taught, that they only will obtain eternal life, who live piously and virtuously, near to God ; and we believe that they who live wickedly, and do not repent, will be punished in eternal fire.”

*Section XXVIII.* “Among us, indeed, the chief of the evil spirits is called serpent, and satan, and devil ; as you can learn by examining our Scriptures. Christ has declared that he shall be sent, together with his host, and the men who follow him, into the fire, to be punished forever,” (*απεραν τον αιωνα through a boundless age.*)

*Section XLV.* “If, indeed, you will attend to these words as enemies, you can do nothing more than kill us, as we have said ; which will do us no hurt, but will bring on you, and on all who indulge in hatred unjustly, and do not repent, eternal punishment by fire.”

*Section LII.* Speaking of the second coming of Christ, as predicted by the prophets, Justin says : “He will raise the bodies of all men who have lived ; and the bodies of the good he will clothe with incorruption ; but the bodies of the wicked, he will send, (endued) with eternal feeling, into the eternal fire, with the evil spirits.”

All these allusions to future punishment (and several others might be added) are contained in one short composition of about 35 common octavo pages; and everywhere it is mentioned as a doctrine of universal belief, and not a hint is given that it had ever been disputed or doubted by any who bore the Christian name. It should be recollected, also, that this is a composition expressly designed to give a full view of the faith of Christians, at a time when they were suffering from persecution; and given by one who was himself personally acquainted with all the most considerable Christian societies and teachers of the age, and who had every opportunity of knowing their real sentiments. If there had ever been, to that time, any Christians who disbelieved the doctrine of endless punishment, would not Justin have known it? And, knowing it, would he not have alluded to it? especially, when he was sensible that the severity of the sentiment might excite prejudices in the mind of the emperor, before whom he was pleading the Christian cause; prejudices which he attempts to soften by alleging that the tenet was a harmless one, while those who held it remained free from crime? Could not a man of Justin's penetration have seen, that the emperor's favor might have been much more effectually secured, by asserting that this was not an article of universal belief, if such an assertion could have been made with truth? Justin and his contemporaries had never heard of the doctrine of Universal Salvation; for Justin and his contemporaries had been instructed in Christianity by the Apostles, and their immediate successors.

---

## REVIEWS.

A PLEA AGAINST RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY, *delivered on Sunday, Feb. 8, 1829.* By N. L. Frothingham, Minister of the first church in Boston. pp. 16.

THE FINAL TENDENCY OF THE RELIGIOUS DISPUTES OF THE PRESENT DAY, *impartially considered.* By Old Experience. *There came a viper out of the heat,* Acts, xxviii. 3. Boston, 1829.

SERMON ON SECTARIANISM. By Rev. Orville Dewey, of New Bedford, Mass. "For while one saith I am Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal?" 1 Corinthians, iii. 3. *Published in the Liberal Preacher, March, 1829.\**

Many are the evils of controversy; and could truth be maintained without being earnestly contended for, we would gladly lay

\* We place the titles of these several publications at the head of our article, not that we have entered into an extended review of them, but because we have occasionally al-

aside our swords and our shields, and set ourselves quietly down by the side of those, who, at their ease, and out of the danger of combat, are content to let others carry on the warfare, or to leave truth to take care of itself as well as it can.

We assure such comfortable gentlemen, that we love our ease no less than they ; but hope we do not arrogate too much to ourselves in saying, we love truth a little more ; we love peace much, but liberty far better ; and if we would shun strife, much more would we eschew error. In the words of the Christian Examiner, " In the purer and nobler views of God and his religion we believe it our happiness to possess, we have received a treasure which we are afraid to hoard,"—" we feel it our bounden duty, by the best means we can compass, to introduce these views to other minds, and to recommend them to other hearts ;" and being, for once, of the same belief with that work, we feel that " it would be idle to attempt the propagation of truth, without endeavoring at the same time to eradicate error." Both cannot long flourish together.

We have, therefore, lifted up our banner on high, and on it is written—" Contend earnestly for the faith ;" and there it shall float till it is beaten down, or the strong holds of error are carried, and there is no longer cause of war. But it will never be beaten down. Though we may be weak, the Lord of battle is mighty ; and though we must soon be laid in the ground, He will raise up to himself other soldiers, faithful to His and his Son's cause, and clad in the whole armor of God. Christ has predicted that the battles shall be many, and hard fought ; and without, through a mere love of contention, doing what in us lies to see that his prophecy fail not, we may at least take it to ourselves, as some justification of our resolve, when such an outcry and warfare against controversy have all of a sudden broken out.

luded to them, and also from a desire that the public may be duly impressed by the simultaneous movement which has been made against controversy ; and that, undoubtedly, *without any previous concert*, or from *any other motive than a love of peace*. If any one questions this motive, he has only to read these publications, and feel the spirit of peace and love that breathes gently through them, to learn how well fitted they are to put an end to all strife.

It was observed in our last, that " Unitarians are becoming of late much opposed to controversy." This feeling continues to exhibit itself more and more. The Christian Examiner, after thundering for several years in war, when it shall have completed the volume for 1828, (if it ever does) we are informed, is to cease ; or to be transformed into something of a more pacific character. And the Christian Register promises, in future, to " exclude bitter and personal controversy from its columns," and begins already to compliment Professor Stuart, and " the gentlemen at Andover," and to " hail them as fellow laborers."

With all our respect for the talents of Mr. Frothingham, we can find nothing in his *Plea against Religious Controversy* making it particularly worthy of publication.

As for *Old Experience*, whom we noticed in our last number, if in the many and strange transformations our religious associations are undergoing, it should ever come round that our places of public worship should be open for the enacting of Dramas, as were those of Europe in early times, he will, then, be more in place, and appear to considerably greater advantage within the precincts of the church, than he does at present.

Every one has heard of gall and wormwood. If any are curious to ascertain how strong a bitter may be obtained from these articles, we beg leave to recommend an extract, prepared by the Rev. Orville Dewey, of New Bedford, Mass., and to be had of the Rev. T. R. Sullivan, at the office of the Liberal Preacher, Keene, N. H.

Whence is it that the clangor of arms in the ranks opposed to us has all at once died away? Was not their harness sword proof? Or did the flashes from the stricken breastplate of those who fought in the dark discover them a little too distinctly? Why is it that those who, but awhile ago, were all invective and scorn, now salute us with, "Brothers, peace!" Are the *hearts* of men thus changed in a twinkling? This would be *conviction* and *conversion* with a witness; aye, something well worthy the attention even of the English Traveller, and fitted to accompany his Letters on Revivals. Surely, nothing more sudden or extraordinary has fallen under his observation; and if for getting it up and carrying it on, means have been "adopted which would scarcely be thought creditable or correct in any other case;" if "there are plans, and combinations," and "secret plottings;" if the doctrine is applied to such a course, that "the exigency justifies it;" we are acquainted with no man more likely to be familiar with these facts, or, if we may depend upon his own account of himself, better fitted to "philosophize a little" upon them, or to expose them to those of the "misguided people" of New England, who are so simple as not yet to have "learnt the morality of washing their faces."

With all our charity, we cannot avoid the misgiving, "that there is contrivance in these things"—clumsy contrivance enough, we acknowledge. But self-complacency is apt to underrate discernment in others; and there is a class in our community of whom it may, perhaps, be said, "This overweening self-complacency is one of the worst traits in their religion." As the English Traveller was, for a time, a favorite with this class, and as he possessed in a remarkable degree this trait of character, and that disposition to look down upon us—for which all English travellers are proverbial—we fear that the Rev. Orville Dewey, and others, have been deluded by him into a very false estimate of yankee sagacity, or else, when they "set all their energies and devices at work, to save a sinking reputation, or a failing parish," they would have gone about it more "deliberately and coolly," and not have rested quite so much upon the notion that the people were so purblind as to see "nothing of the unworthy designs or motives." It is credibly reported by Olaus Magnus, the good Bishop of Upsal, of those who wrought witchery in the north, that, "by a perfect act of casting mists before men's eyes, [*they*] could represent themselves and others in diverse shapes, and with false apparitions hide their true faces; and not only champions, but women and young maids were wont from their ay to borrow wan vizards, and counterfeit pale faces: and, again, laying these airy vapors aside that shadowed them, they would discuss these dark clouds before their faces with bright day." These were truly wonderful powers; but we know not why, whether the magic skill is partially lost, or our people are

too cautious and keen sighted, yet so it is—it has not gone well with witchery, since the hanging days of our fathers.

We cannot compliment with the matter before us, and must be allowed to express our thorough conviction as to the cause of this sudden change in the conduct of those who had so long worked counter to us, with equal zeal, diligence and asperity. It is the point of Ithuriel's spear that Error dreads; it cannot endure that touch of celestial temper.

————— up he starts  
Discovered and surprised.

It was well seen that our opponents could not much longer go on with the controversy, and their "Body of Divinity" not be fairly stripped of its manifold wrappings, and the shrunken corpse be exposed to the multitude in its cold and lifeless nakedness—that in the struggle, the unseemly garments which they had been so long throwing over true faith, to make it the abhorrence and derision of the people, would be torn away, and the warm and healthful figure be left standing free in all its living vigor and proportions. Again, it was seen that we were "putting them up;" that it could no longer be called bush fighting and ambuscade, but a fair field and open day; and that this was being a little "too much in the sun."

It is not that we take pleasure in bearing hard upon the systematic conduct of any set of men; but common honesty demands it of us, and the very works of our opponents give warrant to our assertion—they have not dealt openly with their followers. They have led them along in the woods, through a glimmering, uncertain twilight; they have never told them fairly what they did believe—perhaps this would be requiring too much of them—they have never let them know what they did not believe. Many may answer, that they are not settled in these things; and we are aware that some are living in the daily and blessed expectation of having less and less for the trial of their faith. Yet we cannot see why the leaders should object to letting the people know how far they have already gone, merely because they have not reached their journey's end, and know too little of the way to conjecture when they shall. Would that their followers might have their eyes opened; then might they behold some of these new apostles of reason standing on the verge of the shore of time, and looking far out—on what?—a restless sea of doubt; and others, bolder in their pride, on a strip of sand beyond, which wave after wave is washing loose beneath their feet.

Of these, some are they who pull down and build not up; who pick flaws in God's Gospel, and too dull to perceive a mystery in their own being, question mystery in his Word, and deny most of revelation that goes beyond what was too plain to need being re-

vealed. Others there are, helpers in this drudgery, but with minds too alive to rest here. Something they must have to pore upon, and a somewhere for a gorgeous dwelling place. They leave the flock that followeth him who leadeth it by the still waters, and get them up into the mountains, that they may behold all things; and there they build their altars, and thence the incense goeth up to their unknown God—their *Anima Mundi*, their *Universal Soul*. The stars in the heavens are God; Orion, whose bands he looseth, and the Pleiades, whose sweet influences he bindeth. To their Deity they give a new name, a name which no man understandeth, and “the *Divine Idea*” is he called. And they say, one to another, “Ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee;—and ask from the one side of heaven unto the other, whether there hath been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it?”

But what answers the only God, from heaven? “Take ye therefore good heed—lest thou lift up thine eyes unto the heavens, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them, and serve them, which the Lord thy God hath divided unto all nations under the whole heaven.”—And what answers the heart afflicted with its sins? It cries, in its desertion, with the prophet of sorrows, “I beheld the heavens, and they had no light, and all the birds of the heavens were fled, and the heavens above be black.” I have seen the worshippers, and “they are gone from mountain to hill; they have forgotten their resting place.” Far off have I heard their voices, and that word which man comprehendeth not—*Infinitude*. Yes, sceptical as to God’s Word, and like all such sceptics, credulous of other things, there are no whimsies of the speculatist’s brains too absurd to be wrought by them into a system, and be dubbed philosophy. Air, earth and sea are ransacked for food, a substitute for the simple bread of life, and the muddy dregs from old heathen stores are quaffed, rather than the clear waters from the fount set open by Christ.

It may, perhaps, be asked, why charge upon us all the incongruous and wild dreams of Germany? We answer, we can see the signs. Many minds are infected more, much more, than they are, perhaps, aware of. Minds at all poetical can never be content with doubting this, that, and the other portion of God’s Word, and taking the life out of half they leave behind; such minds must have something to excite and fill them; it is for your minds of the middle order to be ever at the work of undoing, and be content with that.

Mystery is written on the hearts of all men; and he who refuses to look for the true key to its meanings in the *Book of God*, will presumptuously seek for it in the workings of his imagination blending vaguely with the material world. And there is something



beautifully winning in the blending of our thoughts and feelings with this outward nature; for God formed this not for our vulgar uses only, but to harmonize with our sentiments and passions. Thus, pleasing sensations are awakened, and we look up to the stars, and call them "the poetry of heaven," and we feel as if a being we poetically called God, was shining through their mingling lights—we become poetical, and believe ourselves religious. But this never did, and it never will lead the sinner forth out of the ruins of a fallen world up to the one true God. There is but one way; Christ has told us so. Turn thee, vain man, and look upon him that was "lifted up," and be healed. We never can be healed without it. We may look day and night upon nature, and yet live strangers to that which is truly the heart,—indeed, grow more and more strangers to it; for we cheat ourselves even by these pleasurable, these elevated sensations. We deceive ourselves in our views of God, casting out of the universe all but one of his infinite and balanced moral attributes, and setting up that One, and making it our God; bowing ourselves down, not before our Creator, but before the *creature of a creature*. Until man will take humbly and unqualifiedly the revealed word of God for his great and only sure teacher, he never will know that God aright. He may not fall into the gross idolatry of those who bow down before stocks and stones; yet, etherealize it as he may, his worship, after all, will be but a more refined idolatry.

This is not the place for us to go into a subject so important, and one becoming daily more and more so. Of all false systems, it is the most delusive, and the one most likely to allure cultivated and refined minds.

These false views are beginning to spread amongst us. Our sentimental preachers are growing more and more sentimental; the young ladies hurry home from church all in raptures—"O, it was so beautiful, so *Wordsworthian*! How delightful it is to be so good, so refined, so elevated!"—Paul, Paul, didst thou preach thus to fallen, sinful man? "I am determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." Alas, what would be one's scorn at this trifling, did it not move him to pity and sadness.

This same spirit is beginning to show itself in another way, and we are soon to have a sweet mingling of polite literature and polite theology; not simply a literature purified by true religion; but a palatable mixture to take the place somewhat of the old religion of the Bible, which is getting to be too harsh for these refined days. It is curious to see how everything of this kind is caught at. Awhile ago, there was the admired Mr. McCauley, who had been gathering after the reapers of Germany. Having made up his shocks, he hurries home with them, sets up his tubs, stills and worms, and the gentlemen swallow down, and the ladies smell and sip, till the

heads of half Britain and America are turning round. Now, could any man of common discernment help seeing, whether Mr. McCauley saw it or not, into what flat infidelity he was so pleasantly leading his admirers,—an infidelity not worthy the name of Deism, and much like the doctrine of the Universals of the Nominalists, that “prototype of the Pantheistic theory,”—a doctrine which “went as near to some of the worst theories of scepticism, as argument, *contriving also to be ostensibly decorous, could publicly advance.*” —How these words bring some things of this day into our minds!

What, in this state of things, is to be done? Here are your men of flesh and blood, with pick and crow, at work upon the foundations of Christ's church; and there are your etherials blowing bubbles in the newly risen light, and bidding us admire their hues; or building castles in the air, and trying to persuade plain men that they are good, substantial edifices, fit for shelter, and magnificent withal. The Bible is getting to be a little homely and old fashioned, and the Apostles somewhat too rustic for this period of high culture. We know that Christianity has by some been complimented upon its being able to keep along with the advance of mind, and Paul been approvingly spoken of for his vigour of thought and laudable degree of freedom from many of the errors and prejudices of his times. The inspiration of the Bible, denied wholly, or in part, leaves that book no longer the Word of God; there is no more a revealed authority for man to go to; and he must henceforth walk by the surer light of his own reason. For who would take the Bible for his guide, who looks upon it as does the author of the article styled “The Beginning and Perfection of Christianity?”\* We would not speak too confidently; for we are not sure but that, through his much looseness, and might it not seem uncharitable, we should add, purposed ambiguity of expression—we may sometimes misapprehend him.

“The scheme of preparation which led the way to Christianity, is, for the most part, but dimly discerned, and unsatisfactory, even in what is plainly to be perceived; mixed with the doubtfulness of old traditions, and with systems of superannuated errors.” “They,” the Apostles, “were faithful, and therein chiefly lay their praise. But not in their day was the clear glory displayed, which Jesus saw in the visions of his inspired mind, beaming full on the nations. Something of the imperfections of the times yet mingled with it, and intercepted its shining. We reach the end of the historical records of our religion; and we see it at that point, and leave it there, somewhat as they leave Paul, its high minded champion;—preaching indeed worthily, ‘the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concerned the Lord Jesus Christ,’—but in a hired house, and more than half a captive.”—“These extravagant-

\* See the article in *Christian Examiner*, Nos. 1, 2, vol. 111., understood, we believe, to be written by the author of the *Plea against Religious Controversy*.

cies of credulity are owing to the false estimate which is so general of the nature and uses of the holy scriptures; as if they were really written by the hand of the Almighty, and the essence of religion were left to be extracted from them alone and forever." "For what source of scepticism has sent out its troubled streams so widely, as the idea that revelation is the very same thing with the documents that tell us of it, and has its safety utterly dependant on the works that from time to time have been thrown up about it; that it lives in each part of a long series and accumulation of recorded opinion and testimony, and is answerable, with its life, at every point of the complicated whole." "They," the Scriptures, "contain, too, the treasures of various wisdom, which are to be estimated according to their respective values; according as they are in harmony with that supreme and original law of reason and the soul, 'which is not so much a written as an inbred law; which we have not learned, received, read, but from nature herself apprehended, drawn up, drank in; to which we were not educated, but constituted; not trained, but destined.'"<sup>\*</sup> Cicero against the Bible!—However remarkable these detached passages may appear, if we have not, through his ambiguity of phrase, sadly misunderstood the author, they are not more extraordinary than is the general tenor of the article. Yes, and another, calling himself a minister of Christ, has said of the Bible, "I believe it as much inspired as Herodotus', or any other well written history." The Saviour, with an interjected phrase of reverence, has been held forth to young men, along with the father of our country, and Henry IV. of France, as an admirable example of "balance of character." We ourselves have heard from the pulpit, when a prophecy of difficult solution was alluded to, the opinion confidently advanced, that there were, no doubt, contradictions in that portion of Scripture, but that our Saviour probably told us all he knew upon the subject; thus making him a wretched fanatic, or a still more wretched impostor. The author of the "Beginning and Perfection of Christianity," would, we presume, have thrown this upon the historian, and not have laid it upon "the *gifted* mind of our Lord."

These things come from men active in the cause of their sect, and some of them prominent characters in it.

Things being thus, and the divinity of the Saviour, the personality of the Holy Spirit, the Atonement, the doctrine of Grace, the alienation of man from his Maker, the eternity of future punishment, and the entire, and by some, even the partial, inspiration of the Scriptures, being denied,—are we to join in with the cry, and say, 'True, in all these things we differ; but why contend about theories of no practical importance, when there is so much of beautiful morality in the Book, about which we are all agreed?' The

<sup>\*</sup> Cicero.

word *doctrine* has a mighty charm in it. But let us not be deluded by words. The doctrines of the Bible are statements of facts, having a tremendous bearing upon the moral nature of man, and his views in relation to his own character, his eternal state, the character of God and his government as connected with his creations of countless, eternal spirits, the holy and the fallen. It is something worse than idle to attempt to belittle these differences, by likening them to the hair-splitting metaphysics of the most Subtile Doctor, Duns Scotus, and your Irrefragable, your Seraphic, and your Angelical Doctors, and that long tribe of super-subtile disputants. Truth must lie somewhere, and truth worth contending for; and if it lies not in our views, or their opposites, where does it lie? Looking upon man as a fallen creature, blinded by sin, and prone to error, and believing as we do, that "the seed and generative principle of the new creature is truth," wo be to us, if we cease from opposing, with all our might, everything that opposes truth, till its light shall shine from one end of the world even unto the other. This sudden opposition to controversy we must regard as of ill omen. We are of the same mind with Lord Bacon, and think it "weak divinity to account controversies an ill sign in the church. In ignorance and implied belief, it is easy to agree, as colors agree in the dark. If any country decline into Atheism, then controversies wax dainty; *because men do not think religion worth the falling out for.*"

Notwithstanding the outcry against controversy, we might, perhaps, go on with it, and leave the question of its utility to be settled by our opponents; for we cannot find, after all their complaints, that they are quite agreed upon it. The Rev. Orville Dewey thinks "it is undoubtedly useful." But at the same time he is in great horror, if social beings, who happen to agree in sentiment and faith, unite in support of their belief. He has no objection to fighting, but chooses to fight as did the countryman in our old war, who, taking his gun, and standing apart from his friends, was doing as much execution upon the enemy as any one in the ranks; when being asked, why he was firing away there all alone, answered, "he was fighting upon his own hook." The Rev. gentleman seems unrivalled in his fear of dependence, and his love of independence, and is truly another Daniel Boone, in his own way. And he is right, if any sense can be made out of his drum and trumpet rhetoric, and it be a fact that "never has this heavenly visitant [Truth] that courts solitude and silence—never, alas, has it come into the crowd of men, but it has been degraded and dishonored." There are others who do not entirely object to controversy, provided it can be carried on, as a respectable old gentleman wished a border war managed—that is by each clan keeping on its own side of the line, and not troubling the other.

But to be serious; it is perfectly futile to attempt to make it

appear that truth has never been sustained or helped forward by controversy. And we would here observe, by the way, that one man never wrought singly any great change in favor of truth. One man may, from superior energy and talents, take the lead; but it is the spirit astir in society which first moves him, and by and with which he moves. Luther (notwithstanding Mr. Dewey's notion) no more brought about the Reformation without this exciting cause and helping sympathy, than a Pharaoh built a pyramid with his single and unaided arm.

To return: there is no truth, however sacred, none, however remotely or immediately useful, that has not from time to time stood in jeopardy, and that would not have been beaten down, and trampled into dust, had not its friends heard its call for help, and come out. Christ himself inveighed against those who added to the law, or explained it away. Who more vehement against false doctrines than the same Paul, from whose words one of the Rev. gentlemen has seen fit to write his "Plea against Religious Controversy." Christianity was at war, not with idolatry alone; it was against the false philosophy also of Greece, and its "unknown God," that Paul contended. Why, pray, was he so zealous for the truth? Why could not he have been quiet, and have looked down upon false philosophy and idol worship with the same contempt and silence that the proud ones of Greece looked down upon their national idolatry, and with the same forbearance as the philosophers of this day would fain have us to do upon what we believe from our very hearts to be a false system, and tending to systems yet more false? Why needed he be "turning the world upside down?"

Rome had within its dominion a good part of the various religious systems upon the then known globe. But these systems did not clash; all was as quiet as midnight. And if the Flamens did *not exchange temples*, they, and the gods too, dwelt quietly as brothers. But no sooner did Christianity come in, than what an uproar!

Apollo from his shrine  
Can no more divine,  
With hollow shriek the steep of Delphos leaving.

Peor and Baalim  
Forsake their temples dim,  
With that twice battered god of Palestine;  
And mooned Ashtaroth,  
Heav'n's queen and mother both,  
Now sits not girt with tapers' holy shine;

And sullen Moloch fled,  
Hath left in shadows dread  
His burning idol all of blackest hue.

Now, what, probably, said the cool philosophers of that day, on

hearing all this noise, and witnessing this mighty rout and ruin? Most likely, very much the same that men of such a cast are saying in these days about religious controversy; talking much about the good old quiet times before these men, calling themselves Christians, came in to make divisions in the community, and excite the violent passions. If answered, that these were, indeed, evils, and that in our infirm natures evil was continually mingling with the good, but that where a great good was the object, attendant evils must be borne with, and that truth, the highest good, was not to be attained without a struggle; they might then ask, with Pilate, 'what is truth,' and go away without waiting an answer. We allow that many evils wait upon all reformations; for reformation will always be met by hostility, and we know not what sort of opposition that must be where there is but one side. While watchful, therefore, of our own hearts, let us not shrink from our duty to others, remembering that all is working together for good.

Whatever selfish motives, or worldly and violent passions were mixed with the contest of the Reformation, that reformation certainly was brought about by controversy, and that a sufficiently warm one; and few, we believe, are prepared to deny that great good came of it. Had not Luther, and Calvin, and others lived, "Old Experience," might now have been counting his beads, and fumbling a death's head, instead of going at large, jeering those who love the truth ardently enough to bear, for truth's sake, the odious names of bigot, and zealot, and controvertist; and if controversy do not stop him, he may yet, for aught we can tell, be putting up his prayers to all the saints in the calendar, or, joining the Rev. Mr. Pierpont, be offering them for Mr. P's and his own departed friends. Controversy began and helped to establish the Protestant cause in Britain, though Henry VIII. was used as an instrument in it, by Him who often sees fit to make evil men the means of a good of which they little thought. And the same spirit that called out controversy when truth and civil liberty were in danger, found for truth and liberty an abiding place here. Controversy led to our national independence; and we look confidently forward to the time, when controversy shall rescue the churches of this Commonwealth from their thralldom, and shall restore to us, an excluded sect, all the rights of free citizens,—not the mere privilege of being governed, but of sharing, in common with all, in the administration of government.

And here we would put a question to the Rev. Gentleman who has filed his Plea against Religious Controversy. What, in this region, would have been the state of Orthodoxy, which we believe to be the truth, had it not been for controversy; and had not its champions come out, armed and ready for defence or attack, as occasion might demand? Why, a few years ago, it was nearly as feeble as a child; and now!—Let its opponents say what it is now.

No wonder that the nostrils which awhile since moved in scorn at Orthodoxy and the Orthodox, now turn up at controversy, as of ill odour.

‘But Truth is immortal,’ it is said. And so she is; still, she must feed on the true manna. ‘But Truth is invincible.’ And so she is; but she must have soldiers of stout heart and fearless aspect, to go whither she sends, and take ground and stand firm where she bids them stand. One would suppose, to hear the late complaints against controversy, that Truth had nothing to do but to walk leisurely abroad in this delightful world, and scent the flowers, and feel the fanning breezes, and be waited upon and adored of all. Alas, poor, naked, persecuted Truth!

If gentlemen would act up to their professed belief in this matter, in India they would look on without concern, and see the fair form of Truth thrust down before the massive wheels of Juggernaut, and hear bone after bone crushed, and grinding to powder beneath the enormous weight of that unclean thing of lust and blood, waiting to see her rise up forthwith out of the dust, and stand once more before the mad multitude, living and beautiful. We have read, and seen, and felt a little too much of human nature, to believe that truth is to be thus kept or won.

We would inquire of the author of the Plea, in which of those doctrines, esteemed by us essential, he agrees with us? If we have not been misinformed, there is not one of those which we have mentioned as being questioned or rejected by Unitarians, that he does not reject. If any conclusion can be drawn from the article in the Examiner, already referred to, there is every reason to believe report speaks truly of him; for we cannot see to what other result the principles there laid down can lead. And what he makes of “the gifted mind of our Lord,” who so frequently refers to the Old Testament, is more than we can conjecture, unless he resolves the whole into the convenient principle of *accommodation*.\*

It is from no particular fondness for catechising the gentleman, that we put the question; but when he comes out with a Plea against Religious Controversy, and would fain bring odium on those who may think it their duty to continue it, common fairness demands that he make those he appeals to acquainted with the points of difference between him and us. Does he believe that were these differences stated in full and plain English, the community would, with him, call them mere theories or technicalities, having no practical character nor uses? But he has so spoken of them. Is this just and open? We leave it for him to consider;

\* The writer of the *Plea* must have often been amused at the recollection of the well known attempt at defining the word *accommodate*, namely; that whereby “a man is, as they say, accommodated:—which is an excellent thing.” He who formed this definition was a wiser man than we had taken him for, or the times have given it a wonderful significance.

thinking too well of him to doubt, how, with all his leanings, he will decide.

Seeing our opponents have of a sudden become such condemners of controversy, we would remark generally, that would they but follow the course we have alluded to, and lay before the community, fairly and in plain terms, their whole system of negations, they would more speedily and effectually bring about the desired cessation of the contest, than by sending forth myriads of Pleas and discourses against it. We can think of nothing which would be so likely soon to leave us little to oppose, and allow us to go earlier to rest from our disagreeable, but now imperative, duties.

Lord Byron said, in substance, nothing but experience does a man any good ; no, nor does that even. His lordship, we believe, was more than half right, if we may judge by what we have seen of "Old Experience." Yet even the king's jester may now and then let fall something worth a wise man's picking up ; and there may be something in his fooleries out of which a moral may be drawn by the thoughtful. We may learn how "a lazy, unconcerned trifling, without a care which end goes forward, and with an utter indifferency whether to stir or sit still," will infect the heart and mind, even as to the great and everlasting truths of the Gospel, and leave to us "nothing serious in mortality," nothing earnest, nothing solemn, in eternity. The writer seems, as it were, to have bound up his jest-book with his bible, and to have set an example of trifling upon what is closely connected with that sacred volume, which is dangerous to the young, and which the sceptical and the careless will not be slow to turn to use.

If this harlequin, when he had made his way into the church, had contented himself with dusting our black coats with his wand, we would have taken it in perfect good nature, nor have envied him his gay, motley jacket ; but if we have a right to judge an author by his book, he is too much at heart a trifler to meddle with sacred things. We are not pharisaically strait, nor do we measure a man's sanctity by the length of his visage, and we take to ourselves, and allow to others, something for one's peculiar humor, where not bearing too directly on God's Word ; but there seems to be about this writer not a touch or shade of seriousness, even here.

That evil passions will come out of controversy, we have plainly enough seen. And, as "Old Experience's" motto reminds us, when the fire, which was kindled for a *benevolent* purpose, began to blaze, upon Paul's laying the sticks thereon, "*there came a viper out of the heat.*" But though the venomous reptile "fastened on his hand," "he shook off the beast into the fire, and felt no harm." So long as we can enlighten the benighted mind, or comfort the cheerless heart, by the blaze of truth, we shall continue, like Paul, to lay on the sticks ; and if it should still bring out the vipers,



we, too, trust to shake of the beasts into the fire, and feel no harm.\*

If we could possibly make room for a more particular notice of the Rev. Mr. Dewey's discourse, than we consider our mere allusions to be, we should hardly know how to proceed; for it is not quite clear to us, and we fancy it was not to him, what it is that he has been attacking with so much invective and wrath. Through a melancholy delusion of mind, Don Quixote fell violently afoul of the windmills. If the Rev. gentleman has been laboring under an infirmity of the head, alike delusive, we have to regret that he did not discover something, at least, of the Don's noble indignation, and generosity of heart.

There is the word *spite* in our language; but it implies so much which is despicable, that we never intend using it, if we can possibly come near our meaning by any other word, or by an ever so long periphrasis. Mr. D.'s attack upon the missionary cause, and upon the motives and feelings of its friends, is one of the greatest outrages upon truth and common decorum, that has chanced to fall to our lot to notice. With the most perfect sincerity, and with no unkind feeling—for the writer has made us sad rather than angry—we advise him to make himself somewhat acquainted with his subject before he writes again, and, what is far more important, to examine well his heart; and until his passions are brought under better control, to have the grace not to expose them thus unscrupulously to the public.

Though we cannot give up controversy while there are errors to be opposed, we shall endeavor to maintain a spirit of forbearance and meekness; and if within a very few years past, and almost up to the present moment, there has been anywhere in our community a class of persons who made scoff of us, and for whom no story could be too absurd to listen to, or too scandalous to retail, provided it would blast our characters and weaken our influence; if, on some public occasions, a spirit has discovered itself, which, had the state of society allowed, would have hunted us over mountains and into caves, we hope that in these days of our growing strength and prosperity, we shall have no disposition to retaliate, or to remember these things.

Now that a new mode is adopted of counteracting our efforts and checking their success, let us be under no concern; let us be ac-

\* One of the wickedest things in "Old Experience's" Pamphlet, is his insinuation that, in their addresses to people, Orthodox ministers are not sincere. "Only let us suppose," says he, "that young Mr. Beecher, who, in his address to the Young Men of Boston, has merely undertaken to explain the counsels of God from everlasting to everlasting, is not so sure as he pretends to be on these subjects, and has taught us ten times as much as he knows himself; the moment I become one of his followers, and have taught my faith to bow to his reason, I shall find some private letter from him, perhaps, sent to somebody in Ohio, confessing that he was only *humbugging* the people, and seeing how far absurd reasoning would go with credulous minds." Many have supposed there was an allusion in this sentence, to some letter actually written by Mr. Beecher. We are authorized to say, that no such letter, to which it can allude, has ever been written by him, and that the whole is a *sheer fabrication, a malicious scandal.*

tive, but calm; let us be ardent, but not angry; and these wiles against us will also fail, and the fowler be caught in his own snare. Let us be grateful for our success, but not vain of it, remembering the God who has bestowed it; let us rejoice in it, not so much for our own sakes, but the rather that it is in His cause.

Let us be up and doing; for our work is but just begun. Let us look around us and see what is man, and what the fallen world he dwells in. "The stately ruins are visible to every eye, that bear in their front (yet extant) this doleful inscription: *Here God once dwelt*. Enough appears of the admirable frame and structure of *the soul of man*, to show the Divine presence did sometime reside in it; more than enough of vicious deformity, to proclaim he is *now* retired and gone. The lamps are extinct, the altar overturned; the light and love are now vanished, which did the one shine with so heavenly brightness, the other burn with so pious fervour. The golden candlestick is displaced, and thrown away as an useless thing, to make room for the throne of the prince of darkness. The sacred incense, which sent rolling up in clouds its rich perfumes, are exchanged for a poisonous vapour; and here is, instead of a sweet savour, a stench. The comely order of this house is turned all into confusion; the beauties of holiness, into noisome impurities. The house of prayer to a den of thieves, and that of the worst and most horrid kind; for every lust is a thief, and every theft a sacrilege. Continual rapine and robbery are committed upon holy things. The noble powers which were designed and dedicated to divine contemplation and delight, are alienated to the service of the most despicable idols, and employed unto vilest intuitions and embraces; to behold and admire lying vanities, to indulge and cherish lust and wickedness. What have not the enemies *done wickedly in the sanctuary? How have they broken down the carved work thereof*, and that, too, *with axes and hammers!*"—"You come amidst all this confusion, as into the ruined palace of some great prince, in which you see here the fragments of a noble pillar, there the shattered pieces of some curious imagery; and all lying neglected and useless amongst heaps of dirt. He that invites you to take a view of the soul of man, gives you but such another prospect, and doth but say to you, Behold the desolation, all things rude and waste! So that, should there be any pretence to the Divine presence, it might be said, *If God be here, why is it thus?* The faded glory, the darkness, the disorder, the impurity, the decayed state in all respects of this Temple, too plainly show the great Inhabitant is gone."

Up, then, to the repairing of this Temple; and be not discouraged, although they of Samaria plot against you. The great Master-builder is calling us to the work; and let us not rest from our labors, till this house be more glorious than the former house, and the whole earth shall lift up its voice with a shout, crying, The Lord is in his holy Temple!

A MEMOIR OF THE REV. LEGH RICHMOND, A. M., *author of the Dairyman's Daughter, Young Cottager, &c.* By the Rev. T. S. Grimshawe, A. M. Abridged by the Rev. William Patton, A. M. New York: J. Leavitt—Boston: Crocker & Brewster, 1829. pp. 364.

We have rarely been more interested in a volume of biography, than in this. Legh Richmond, who had been chiefly known in this country as the author of certain popular tracts, was truly a great and good man—a lovely and consistent Christian; and the American editor and publishers deserve the thanks of this community for the present edition of his Memoir. We rise from the perusal of it with a deeper sense, indeed, of human unworthiness, but with enlarged views of the excellence, usefulness, happiness and honor, which the *grace of God* confers on all who truly possess it.

Legh Richmond was born in Liverpool, in 1772. His early education he received at home, under the care of his father, who was a physician; his collegiate, at the University of Cambridge. He was distinguished as an uncommonly agreeable young man, and a successful scholar. His father designed him for the law, but he chose the ministry; from other motives, however, than a true love to Christ, and the souls of men. It was not till he had been in the ministry more than two years, that he became truly pious. The circumstances which led to his conversion were as follows:

“About two years after he had entered on his curacies, one of his college friends was on the eve of taking holy orders, to whom a near relative had sent Mr. Wilberforce's “Practical Christianity.” This thoughtless candidate for the momentous charge of the Christian ministry, forwarded the book to Mr. Richmond, requesting him to give it a perusal, and to inform him what he must say respecting its contents. In compliance with this request, he began to read the book, and found himself so deeply interested in its contents, that the volume was not laid down before the perusal of it was completed. The night was spent in reading and reflecting upon the important truths contained in this valuable and impressive work. In the course of his employment, the soul of the reader was penetrated to its inmost recesses; and the effect produced by the book of God, in innumerable instances, was in this case accomplished by means of a human composition. From that period, his mind received a powerful impulse, and was no longer able to rest under its former impressions. A change was effected in his views of divine truth, as decided as it was influential.”

The character of his ministry was now changed, and a correspondent change took place in the effects of it. “God blessed it, and numerous converts attested its efficacy and power.”

Mr. R. was first settled in the Isle of Wight. After eight or nine years, he was removed to the Lock Hospital; and thence, after a few weeks, to Turvey, in Bedfordshire, where he spent the remainder of his days. “The text of his first sermon” at Turvey, “was taken from 1 Cor. ii. 2: ‘For I determined not to know

anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.' From these words he uniformly preached, on every returning anniversary of his incumbency, and continued to do so till the last year of his life." He died in the spring of 1827, in the 56th year of his age.

Besides his Tracts, and several occasional discourses, Mr. R. compiled a work, entitled "The Fathers of the English Church," in eight volumes 8vo., and contributed occasionally to "The Christian Observer." He was not a voluminous writer, but rather the man of action, the preacher, pastor, parent, friend. In these relations he was most conspicuous, and in these he shone with superior lustre. Whoever is social, active, engaged in doing good, and pleased to see others so, will find a treat in the Memoirs of Legh Richmond; nor if tasteful and literary, as well as pious, need he have any fear of being offended.

The Memoir in general is well written. The thread of the narrative is agreeably preserved, and the whole concluded with appropriate remarks by the editor. The most prominent thing in it is the character of Mr. R. as a preacher and public agent of benevolent institutions. It contains extracts from his correspondence, diary, and journal, with several letters from his relatives and friends, communicating important information respecting his life, character, labors, sickness, and death.

We offer a few extracts, with a view to excite interest, rather than satisfy it. For full satisfaction, our religious readers must be referred to the work itself, in perusing which, we cannot doubt they will experience much pleasure and profit.

The preaching of Mr. R., so far as it respected doctrines, is thus described by his biographer.

"In his addresses from the pulpit, he never failed to point out, distinctly and forcibly, *man's ruin by the fall—his condemnation under the law, and his moral inability to deliver himself by any power or strength of his own.—Free and full justification, through faith in the atoning blood and righteousness of the Redeemer—the nature of that faith, and its fruits and evidences,—the agency of the Holy Spirit, in the regeneration and sanctification of believers;—and the necessity of personal righteousness, or a conformity of heart and life to the word of God—not as the title to heaven, but as a meetness for its enjoyment.* These are fundamental doctrines, in which all true Christians, without distinction of sect or party, cordially unite. They have been the food of the church of God in all ages—the manna which has sustained her children in the many and diversified scenes of human trial and infirmity; they have been the song of their pilgrimage; their joy in tribulation; their light in darkness, and their guide to life and immortality."

In respect to style and manner,

"Mr. R. used to refer his friends, who conversed with him on the subject of preaching, to the advice of his college tutor: 'Don't use terms of science. The people have no abstract ideas—they cannot understand comparisons and allusions remote from all their habits. Take words of Saxon derivation, and not such as are derived from Latin and Greek. Talk of riches, not affluence—of trust, not confidence. Present the same idea in a varied form, and take care you understand the subject yourself. If you be intelligent, you will be intelligible.'"

During the frequent journeys of Mr. R. as an agent for charitable institutions, he addressed numerous letters to his friends, his people, and the different members of his family. The following excellent counsel is communicated in his letters to his daughters.

“With a heart full of affection, I sit down to express a few sentiments and intimations of my wishes, as connected with your conduct, in the course of any journey, or absence from home. I wish each of you to preserve a copy of it, my dear children, and often look at it; take it with you when from home, and keep it safe when at home.

“Independently of my anxious wishes for your secret, spiritual welfare, I have much to feel on my own account, in point of credit and character, as connected with your department, in every house and company into which I may introduce you. I have not a doubt of your general affectionate wish to speak and act right; but, inexperience, youth, thoughtlessness, and want of more acquaintance with the world carnal, and the world religious, may easily occasion inconsistencies and errors which might be injurious to your own, as well as to my comfort and credit. Accept, therefore, a father’s blessings and prayers, with a father’s chapter of admonitions and explanations.

“You are not unaware, that I avowedly belong to a class of Christian ministers, who profess, for Christ’s and their souls’ sakes, to be separate from the world—to maintain purer and more distinct views of the Scripture doctrine—and to be willing to spend and be spent in behalf of the truth, as it is in Jesus. I am, therefore, supposed, not only to maintain a consistent separation from the follies and vices of the world, its pomps and vanities, but to aim at so ruling and guiding my household, that my principles may shine forth in their conduct. Any want of correctness, consistency, faithfulness, and propriety in them, will always attach a mixture of censure, surprise, and concern, as it regards me. The friends of religion will grieve, and those who are otherwise will rejoice, if you could be drawn into compliances, and expressions of sentiment, at variance with your father’s; always, therefore, keep in remembrance, whether you are in company with decidedly religious and consistent Christians, or with those who are only partially so, or with those who are not so, (unhappily) at all,—that you have not only your own peace of conscience to maintain, but the estimation and honor of your parent also.

“Many temptations will occur, to induce you to yield and conform to habits and principles, the very reverse of those which you hear me supporting, both in the pulpit and the parlor. Be not ashamed of firmly, though modestly, in such cases, resisting them. State what mine and your principles are, and heed not the momentary unpleasantness of appearing singular, when conscience and duty require it. You may easily say, ‘My father does not approve of such and such things, neither can I.’ No person, whose estimation is worth having, will think the worse of you, for such instances of mild, but decisive firmness.”

“The half-religious are often more dangerous than those who are less so; because we are more on our guard in the latter case than the former. The great number of instances in which I have seen the young people of religious families deeply injured in their spirits and habits, by much visiting with persons of different views and customs from those of their own household, has made me, I confess, from pure motives of conscience and prudence, very averse to much of that sort of visiting in my own children’s case, which I know has been productive of bad consequences in others. And the difficulty of drawing the line has always appeared very great, with my numerous friends and acquaintance.”

“I will now add some remarks, placed under select heads, which may make them more conspicuous, and better remembered: and may God render them useful to you! Keep them constantly with you, and let them be always read over, at least, once a week.

“*Amusements.*—Plays, balls, public concerts, cards, private dances, &c. &c.

“Serious, consistent Christians must be against these things, because the dangerous spirit of the world and the flesh is in them all: they are the “pomps and vanities of this wicked world,” so solemnly renounced at baptism. To be conformed to these seductive and more than frivolous scenes, is to be conformed to

this world, or to be opposed to the character and precepts of Christ. They that see no harm in these things are spiritually blind; and they who will not hear admonition against them are spiritually deaf. Shun, my girls, the pleasures of sin, and seek those which are at God's right hand for evermore. You cannot love both."

"*Books.*—Characters are speedily discerned by their choice of books.—Novels in prose, I need not now forbid; ignorant as you are of their bad tendency by experience, you, I am persuaded, trust me on that head, and will never sacrifice time, affection, or attention to them. But beware of novels in *verse*. Poets are more dangerous than prose writers, when their principles are bad. Were Lord B—— no better poet than he is a man, he might have done little harm; but when a bad man is a good poet, and makes his good poetry the vehicle of his bad sentiments, he does mischief by wholesale. Do not be ashamed of having never read the fashionable poem of the day. A Christian has no time, and should have no inclination, for any reading that has no real tendency to improve the heart.

"*Dress.*—Aim at great neatness and simplicity. Shun finery and show.

Be not in haste to follow new fashions.

Remember, that with regard to dress, Christians ought to be decidedly plain-er, and less showy than the people of the world. I wish it to be said of the females of my house, 'With what evident and becoming simplicity are the daughters of Simplex\* attired.'

"*Behaviour in Company.*—Be cheerful, but not gigglers.

Be serious, but not dull.

Be communicative, but not forward.

Be kind, but not servile.

In every company, support your own and your father's principles by cautious consistency.

Beware of silly thoughtless speeches: although you may forget them, others will not.

Remember God's eye is in every place, and his ear in every company.

Beware of levity and familiarity with young men; a modest reserve, without affectation, is the only safe path—grace is needful here; ask for it; you know where."

"*Prayer.*—Strive to preserve a praying mind through the day; not only at the usual and stated periods, but everywhere, and at all times, and in all companies. This is your best preservative against error, weakness, and sin.

Always think yourselves in the midst of temptations; and never more so, than when most pleased with outward objects and intercourse.

Pray and watch; for if the spirit be willing, yet the flesh is deplorably weak.

"*Religion.*—Keep ever in mind, that, for your own sake and for my sake, you have a religious profession to sustain; and this both in serious and worldly company. Be firm and consistent in them both. Many eyes and ears are open, to observe what my children say and do, and will be, wherever we go. Pray to be preserved from errors, follies, and offences, which bring an evil name upon the ways of God. You may sometimes hear ridicule, prejudice, and censure assail the friends of true religion—it ever was, and will be so: "but blessed are they who are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Be not ashamed of Christ here, and he will not be ashamed of you hereafter.

"Attend, in the course of every day and hour, to the growth of your best and most ennobling principles of action. Much, very much time, which might be employed in an increasing meetness for the inheritance of the saints in light, is, I fear, lost. These things ought not so to be. Time is short, eternity is at hand. It is a hard thing to be saved at all; and every lost hour, every idle word, every neglected opportunity, makes it more hard. It is a strait gate and narrow way to heaven, and (comparatively) few there be that find it."

"*Estimate of Characters.*—Look first for grace. Do not disesteem good people on account of their foibles, or deficiencies in matters of little importance. Gold unpolished, is far more valuable than the brightest brass. Never form unfavorable opinions of religious people hastily,—'Charity hopeth all things.'

\* Mr. Richmond's signature in the 'Christian Guardian.'

Prize those families where you find constant family prayer; and suspect evil and danger, where it is avowedly unknown and unpractised. Always remember the astonishing difference between the true followers of Jesus, and the yet unconverted world, and prize them accordingly, whatever be their rank in society.

"Gentility and piety form a happy union; but poverty and piety are quite as acceptable in the eyes of God,—and so they ought to be in ours. Not only are the poor far more in actual number than the rich, but experience proves that the proportionate number of the truly serious among the poor is much greater than the corresponding proportion of numbers among the rich. Take 1000 poor and 100 rich; you will probably find ten of the latter serious: but 200 of the former shall be so at the same time."

"*Parents.*—Seek to make them happy in *you*.

"If you perceive that anything in your ways makes them otherwise, you ought to have no peace until you have corrected it: and if you find yourself indifferent or insensible to their will and wishes, depend upon it yours is a carnal, disobedient, ungrateful heart. If you *love* them, keep their commandments; otherwise love is a mere word in the mouth, or a notion in the fancy, but not a ruling principle in the heart. They know much of the world, you very little: trust them, therefore, when they differ from you and refuse compliance with your desires,—they watch over you for God, and are entitled to great deference and cheerful obedience. You may easily shorten the lives of affectionate and conscientious parents by misconduct, bad tempers, and alienation from their injunctions. Let not this sin be laid to your charge."

Mr. R. was passionately fond of music, and in the early part of his life had paid much attention to the subject. As Oratorios, Grand Concerts, &c. are becoming frequent among us, we take the liberty of acquainting our readers with his sentiments in regard to exhibitions of this nature.

"The approaching grand musical festival, to be held at Edinburgh, about the same week with that at Northampton, occasions almost daily discussion in every party where we are visiting; and there is but one feeling among all our Christian friends—that no serious and consistent Christian will go.

"I have never had but one opinion on the subject of these prostitutions of religion and music, at these theatrical, and, as I think, unwarrantable medleys. I deeply lament that any who, in other respects, so justly deserve the name of consistent Christians, should so little fathom the corruptions of their own hearts, and be so insensible to the dangerous tendency of public amusements which unite all the levity of the world with the professed sanctity of religious performances.

"I do consider the ordinary musical festivals, conducted as they are, amid a strange medley of wanton confusion and most impure mixtures, as highly delusive, fascinating, and dangerous to youth. I consider the Oratorio performances in churches, as a solemn mockery of God, and forbidden by the clear principles of the Gospel. The making the most sacred and solemn subjects which heaven ever revealed to man, even the Passion of Christ himself on the cross, a matter for the gay, critical, undevout recreation of individuals, who avowedly assemble for any purpose but that of worship; and who, if they did, could hardly pretend that it were very practicable in such company, and on such an occasion. I do from my heart believe to be highly offensive to God."

In writing to his children, he speaks thus beautifully of one of their number, who had died in infancy.

"But, whilst I am enumerating 'the olive branches which surround my table,' and 'the children whom God hath given me,' I suddenly feel as if I had erred in my calculations. Is there no link of connexion between the visible and invisible worlds? no right of appropriation by which an earthly parent may say, 'I have a child in heaven?' Yes; a sweet little cherub in the mansions above, seems to my imagination to be the very link which faith and love would

employ to animate all the energies of my best affections, when I look at my still living children, and contemplate their immortal condition.

“ One of you, my *deeren* children, is in glory,—a lamb, safely and eternally folded in the arms of his Redeemer. He is the first in my household that has gone to his rest. May he prove a pledge for many to follow him there, in God’s own time. In the meantime, cherish it in your frequent remembrance, as an argument for heavenly-mindedness, that one of you is already in heaven. I may not, indeed, now address myself to *him*; but I may speak of him to you: I may remind you of his epitaph, and of the Paradise to which he belongs. I may also thus preserve the sense of kindred alliance between the dead and the living of my family, and ardently pray for the perfect and eternal reunion of them all, through grace, in ‘ the house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.’ ”

In a letter to one of his sons, we have the following noble sentiments, on the necessity of *piety*, as a qualification for preaching the Gospel.

“ Earnestly as I should wish a son of mine to be a minister, yet I tremble at the idea of educating and devoting a son to the sacred profession, without a previous satisfactory evidence that his own soul was right with God. Without this, you and I should be guilty of a most awful sin in his sight. To any, and every other good profession, trade, or occupation, it may be lawful and expedient to fix, with some degree of determination, long before the entering on it; but the ministry is an exception. Even St. Paul himself trembles, ‘ lest, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away.’ I consider personal religion, accompanied and evidenced by personal conduct, to be indispensable in the individual, before either he, or another for him, fixes on the ministry for his profession. And I will not hesitate to say to *you*, that, honored and happy as I should feel in being permitted to see you a faithful preacher of righteousness, adorning the Gospel which you would proclaim to others;—yet, without this, I would rather a thousand times see you a mason, or in the humblest capacity in life. I know what the office is; and a penitent sense of my own deficiencies teaches me to be fearful, and to tremble for those of others: how much more so in the case of a child ?

“ The national church groans and bleeds, ‘ from the crown of its head to the sole of its feet,’ through the daily intrusion of unworthy men into its ministry. Patrons, parents, tutors, colleges, are annually pouring a torrent of incompetent youths into the church, and loading the nation with spiritual guilt. Hence, souls are neglected and ruined—bigotry and ignorance prevail—church pride triumphs over church godliness—and the establishment is despised, deserted, and wounded. Shall you and I deepen these wounds?—shall we add one more unit to the numbers of the unworthy and traitorous watchmen on the towers of our British Jerusalem? God forbid! But, to avoid so sad a departure from every principle of sacred order and conscience, *you* must become a humble, seriously-minded, consistent young disciple of Christ: a diligent student, an obedient son, a loving brother, a grateful worshipper, a simple-hearted Christian. And *I* must feel comfortably satisfied that you are so; or with what conscience, with what hope, with what satisfaction, with what peace of mind, can I consent to devote you to the most sacred, the most important, the most responsible of all offices within the compass of human existence ? ”

Mr. Richmond’s Tracts are certainly among the most popular, and perhaps quite the most so, of any now in circulation. “ The Dairyman’s Daughter ” has been “ translated into nearly all the continental languages. It has found its way to the palaces of kings, and to the hut of the American Indian.” In the English language, alone, nearly two millions of copies are supposed to have been circulated. To the lovers of these Tracts it will be a satisfaction to know, what is abundantly proved in the volume before us, that



they are literally 'no fiction,' but a plain and sober narrative of *facts*.

Mr. Richmond was a distinguished preacher, sound, ready, instructive, and deeply interesting. He was an ardent friend to religious charitable institutions, and in the latter part of his life was much employed on agencies to increase their funds. In these excursions, he uniformly drew large auditories, to the number, in some instances, of three or four thousands, who hung on his lips with intense delight, while by the force of his arguments, and the power of his appeals, their hearts were opened to give freely and liberally. From three to five hundred dollars was a common collection—in one instance it amounted to *fourteen hundred and sixty-nine dollars* !!

In all his labors abroad, Mr. R. seems never to have written his sermons, but to have made them on the spot, or as he passed from place to place. Prayer, meditation, and a general arrangement of topics, was all that he attempted. In this manner he prepared his sermons generally, whether abroad or at home. Perhaps there is occasion to regret, with his biographer, that he did not write more of them; but, however it may be in Old England, natural preaching from the mind and heart, without the formality and stiffness of full notes and literal reading, is not the sin of ministers in New England. That there is enough of a *sort* of extempore preaching in some parts of our country, is not doubted; but it deserves inquiry whether, among well educated ministers, the general strain of preaching, with us, is not too mechanical, too artificial, —and whether it is not, on this account, in frequent instances, dry, cold, speculative, and nearly useless.

It is a singular circumstance in regard to Mr. Richmond, "that his first attempt to preach *extempore*, in the very small church in Yaverland, in the Isle of Wight, was a total failure. He was so ashamed of it, that he declared he would not repeat the attempt; and it was only in consequence of the urgent solicitations of a friend, that he was induced to make a second trial." And yet he attained, at length, to such perfection in his mode of delivery, that, preaching once before the Duke of Kent, who had made him his chaplain, it was matter of dispute among his royal auditors, whether he had not committed to memory a finely written discourse, and recited it *memoriter*; nor would some of them be convinced to the contrary, till, having obtained the notes of the amiable preacher, the Duke exhibited the brief outline, which had been actually used. "He was once known to preach an hour and three quarters on so difficult a subject as the incidental evidences of Christianity," after the manner of Paley's "*Horæ Paulinæ*," applying the principle of the argument "to every book" in the Bible; and yet, says his biographer, "nothing remains of the sermon, except a few short heads of discourse."

In the character of Mr. Richmond, as exhibited in the work before us, we have an example of high and uniform Christian attainment of full, even, justly proportioned, and well balanced *piety*. Doubtless a piety such as this; which sanctifies the imagination, the intellect, the social affections, and all the powers and acquisitions of the man to Christ and his cause, should be desired, pursued and cultivated as the great end of life.

We trust the effect of the interesting volume which we now lay down, on all of a kindred spirit who peruse its pages, will be to admonish of remaining deficiencies, excite to greater diligence, and thus quicken them in the pursuit of glory, honor, and immortality.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENT.

### UNITARIAN MANAGEMENT.

It was intimated, in the introduction to our present volume, that we had in reserve, and were intending to publish, additional evidence of the endeavors of Unitarians in this region, several years since, to cover up and *conceal* their peculiar sentiments. We know not when we shall have a fairer opportunity, than now, to commence the fulfilment of our promise. It will be recollected, that American Unitarianism was first drawn from concealment, by the publication of private letters from Unitarians in this country to those of the same sentiment in England. These letters, with accompanying remarks, were introduced by Mr. Belsham into his *Memoirs of Mr. Lindsey*, from which they were extracts, and published in Boston, in 1815.—The documents which follow are of the same general description, and scarcely inferior in point of interest to those which were then published. They are worthy of attention, not only as proving the fact of concealment, but as disclosing the views and expectations of Unitarians on other subjects, at the time when they were written.

The following is an extract of a letter “from one of the ministers of the Philadelphia Unitarian Society” to friends in England, dated Philadelphia, Sept. 28, 1811, and published in the London “*Monthly Repository*,” vol. vii. pp. 56, 57.

“Having this summer made an excursion to Boston, perhaps a few particulars relative to the state of religious information there, may not be unacceptable. There is only one place of worship at Boston which is *avowedly* Unitarian, viz. King’s Chapel, originally an Episcopalian church, and still so in regard to the mode of worship, except that the service has been freed from everything relative to the Trinity, Atonement, &c. A new and improved liturgy was published a few months ago, which is now used instead of the former one. The ministers are Mr. Freeman, a most excellent man, and Mr. Cary, a young gentleman of superior talents, and great respectability.”

“For years after Mr. Freeman’s settlement, the other ministers, with few exceptions, regarded him with considerable shyness, on

account of his supposed heterodoxy, and because he had not had clerical ordination; but now, and for a considerable time past, these prejudices have given way; while the weight of his talents, and the great goodness of his heart, have rendered him the object of high and general esteem.\* Mr. Cary was not ordained in any other way than by Mr. Freeman laying his hand on his head, merely in the name of the congregation. No minister was called to assist.

Of late years, there has been a *remarkable change in the Congregational churches at Boston*. Of this description there are nine, eight of which are supplied by ministers, differing more or less on various topics, but all living in great harmony with each other, and with Messrs. Freeman and Cary, with whom they occasionally exchange pulpits, reading the King's Chapel service when they preach there, and on the other hand, Messrs. Freeman and Cary, when in a Congregational pulpit, conduct the prayers after the Congregational mode. In most of the Congregational churches, Belknap's collection is used. Mr. Buckminster uses Tate and Brady's, and a selection compiled by himself. Ere long, Belknap's book must be discarded; for *all the ministers alluded to are anti-Calvinistic and anti-Trinitarian*.

The ministers of Boston and its vicinity hold meetings at each other's houses, in rotation, once every fortnight, for the examination of candidates, and for friendly advice and social intercourse. At these meetings, you may see Unitarians, Arians, and Trinitarians indiscriminately—as also at the weekly Thursday morning lecture, which is preached by Orthodox and heterodox men alternately. I heard two of these, one by Mr. Cary, quite an Unitarian discourse; the other by a Mr. Codman, in the true style of an old Puritan. Dr. Osgood, whose sermon was animadverted on, in the Monthly Repository, (vol. v. p. 606) is a high Calvinist, of a warm and affectionate temper, and of great liberality and candor on theological subjects. His sympathies are with the anti-Calvinists, and if any of his own folks show anything like bigotry, Dr. O. is their (the anti-Calvinist's) champion. He is, therefore, a great favorite with the Boston ministers.

The Presbyterians of the Middle States, finding that so many of the Congregational churches had departed from the old faith, erected a fine new church at Boston, to promote *revivals*. It is supplied by one Dr. Griffin, who had been extremely popular in New Jersey; but he has *settled down at Boston*. The church is deeply in debt, half the pews are yet to let, and the good man himself, by not returning the civilities paid him by the other ministers, when he first came to Boston, is now neglected, not only by them, but by their hearers; and he has to stand his ground, and plead the cause of Orthodoxy, against *eight of the Congregationalists*, besides the King's Chapel ministers."

"While at Boston, I had every opportunity of seeing with mine own eyes." "It was my wish to have been only a hearer; but, although I declared myself a layman, yet a minister according to our constitution, i. e. as it respects our flock, I had to officiate twice."

\* A few days ago, Mr. Freeman had the degree of D. D. from Harvard University.

In the statements here made, there are some slight inaccuracies. In Sept. 1811, the date of the letter, there were *ten* Congregational churches in Boston, nine of which were supplied with ministers. Two of these ministers, Messrs. Griffin and Huntington, were not "anti-Calvinistic and anti-Trinitarian," neither did they "exchange pulpits" with the ministers at King's Chapel.—The "Thursday morning lecture" was preached, not "by Orthodox and heterodox men, alternately," but by the members of the Boston Association, in succession.—The account given of the Park Street church and its minister is too amusing to require correction or comment.

It will be observed, that "*all* the ministers," except the two above named, "are anti-Trinitarian;"—Dr. Griffin "has to stand his ground, and plead the cause of Orthodoxy, against" them all;—and yet "there is only one place of worship at Boston, which is *AVOWEDLY Unitarian*." Our readers will draw the inference for themselves.

The letter above given, we consider of small importance compared with one which is to follow. In order to bring this more important communication fairly before our readers, a preliminary statement will be necessary.—Some time previous to 1812, the Rev. John Grundy, of Manchester, (England) published a Sermon, delivered at the opening of a new Unitarian chapel in Liverpool. In the course of the sermon, he spoke of the sense in which he wished the word *Unitarian* to be received:

"Since we must have some discriminating appellation, would that we could unite in the use of one term, so defined as to include us all, the term *Unitarian*—Unitarian, in contradistinction from Trinitarian, and referring solely to the object of religious adoration. The term, thus defined, would include us all, whether believing the *pre-existence*, or the simple *humanity* of Jesus Christ."

To this paragraph, Mr. Grundy appended a Note, giving a very flattering account of the progress of Unitarianism in Boston, and the surrounding region. "The account" in the Note, he says, "was drawn up by a gentleman who had *recently* been in Boston, and thought himself *fully qualified* to give an account of Unitarianism in that place." The Note, so much of it as is necessary for our present purpose, is as follows:

"It may be interesting to the friends of Unitarianism to be informed, that the doctrines which they consider as consonant to the genuine principles of Christianity, have already made very considerable progress in the northern and eastern parts of the U. States. For several years, these doctrines have been spreading rapidly in the town of Boston; and at present, an open profession of them is made by the most popular and influential of the clergy there. Nor is this change by any means confined to the teachers of religion, inasmuch as a gentleman of much talent, and very high celebrity in America, in speaking on this subject to the writer of this article, said, that he did not think there were two persons in Boston, who believed in the doctrine of the Trinity. This assertion, *though it certainly cannot be intended to be literally understood*, may serve to show the great prevalence of Unitarianism; in further proof of which it may be well to mention, that a very large and expensive place of worship, which has been recently erected to enforce Cal-

vinistic doctrines, has completely failed, and it was expected would be sold to its opponents.\*

The office of President of Harvard College having lately become vacant, Dr. Kirkland, a professed Unitarian, was elected by a great majority of votes.—Until very recently, Unitarianism has been confined to the town of Boston; but at the last annual meeting of the Congregational clergy of the States of Massachusetts and Connecticut, it appeared that upwards of 100 ministers declared themselves converts to the new doctrine.†—Out of nine Congregational ministers in this town” (Boston) says another friend, “eight are either Arians or Humanitarians.” Nothing like Calvinism is to be heard.”

The sermon of Mr. Grundy, containing the foregoing account, was put into the hands of the Rev. Francis Parkman, now one of the Unitarian ministers of Boston, who was then in London. Mr. Parkman, thinking the account in the Note “very incorrect,” addressed the following letter to Mr. Grundy, which we publish entire, pointed and italicised as we find it in the Monthly Repository, vol. vii. pp. 199 and 264, and to which we request *the very particular attention of our readers.*

*London, February 20, 1812.*

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

Mr. ——— was kind enough to lend me a sermon, which you delivered a short time since, at the opening of a chapel in Liverpool. It contains towards the close, a note, respecting the supposed progress of Unitarianism in the northern and eastern parts of the United States, and particularly in Boston. As I am a native of that place, and excepting a short visit in this country, have constantly resided there, and from my acquaintance, as a student of divinity, with most of its ministers, and attendance upon their preaching, have had the best opportunity of knowing their sentiments, as well as the general state of religious opinions among us, I hope you will pardon, dear Sir, the liberty I am taking, of mentioning some mis-statements in your note. The account it gives of the general progress of Unitarianism in America, is certainly incorrect. I will first mention a few facts, for which I can answer, with respect to Boston, and I think you will see, that the gentleman, who gave you the information, on which you relied, in his zeal for Unitarianism, has imagined occasions for triumph, which do not exist.

We have, in Boston, twenty-one places for public worship. Of these, ten are Congregationalists. But there are also two *Episcopalian*, in which the service of the Church of England is read, with no other alterations, than those, which are adapted to the different state of the country. Of course, all the Trinitarian doxologies, the addresses of the Litany, &c. are used. One of the clergymen is an high churchman; and I believe I am correct in saying, that both are decided Trinitarians. There are also three *Baptist* churches, the ministers of which, and their leading hearers are Calvinists, and

\* The Park Street church, doubtless, is intended.

† The Massachusetts Convention must be intended, as the Congregational ministers of Mass. and Conn. never meet together in convention.

Calvinism is uniformly maintained. Besides these, there are two Methodist meetings. I will not undertake to say, whether they are Arminian, or Calvinistic; for I scarcely ever attended them, and indeed, I believe, the distinction, so common in this country, between the Wesleyan and the Whitefieldian Methodists is very little known in ours. At least, in common with the Baptists, they are decided Trinitarians, and both pray and preach, as if this were a doctrine absolutely essential to Christianity. This certainly is not consistent with your friend's very wide declaration, that "he did not think there were two persons in Boston, who believed in the 'Trinity.'" You see, that of our twenty-one churches, there are seven, at least, that are Calvinistic or Trinitarian. Indeed, you would hardly look for Unitarianism among our Methodists or Baptists.

But it is, I presume, to the Congregational churches, that your friend's account must chiefly refer. With the ministers of these, I am well acquainted. I have always heard their preaching, and as a student of divinity, I constantly attended for two or three years their monthly meetings, when they frequently converse upon their religious opinions. This "Association" is composed, not only of the ministers of Boston, but of several of the neighboring towns. Of these gentlemen, about twenty in number, there is only one, whom, from anything I ever heard him offer, either in private, or in his pulpit, I, or any body else, would have a right to call an Unitarian. Even this gentleman, when I was in Boston, did not preach Unitarianism systematically. I never heard him express such views of the person of Christ, and it was rather from inference, that I could say he held them. Many of his people are widely different from him; and, with the exception of two or three, or, at most *four or five heads of families*, I may safely say, that there is scarcely a parishioner in Boston, who would not be shocked at hearing his minister preach the peculiarities of Unitarianism.

There is one church in Boston which may perhaps be said to be founded on Unitarian principles. Dr. Freeman of King's Chapel, with his church, about thirty years ago, adopted an amended liturgy. But if you will admit what Mr. Belsham himself very fairly stated "that no man can justly be called by the name of a party, unless he *willingly*, and (if he be a minister) to a certain degree, *openly*, acknowledge himself of that party," Dr. Freeman can hardly be considered as an exception to the great majority of his brethren. For, though on other subjects he is as explicit and unreserved, as he is able and intelligent, I never heard him express an Unitarian sentiment; and I believe he carefully avoids it in the pulpit, because it might unnecessarily disturb some of his hearers.—There is now one more gentleman in Boston, who, with his intimate friends, may, perhaps, be considered a Unitarian; but he maintains the same cautious reserve; and from neither his sermons, his prayers, nor his private conversation, could I infer that he was a Unitarian.—Now even admitting, what I hardly think I have a right to do, that these three gentlemen are Unitarians, to what can all this prudent reserve be ascribed, but to their conviction that the preaching of Unitarian doctrines would be offensive to their hearers, and injurious to their

usefulness? In truth, the Congregational societies of Boston, as are most of those in the country, are composed of hearers of various opinions. Some of them are Calvinists, some of them Arminians; perhaps the greater part, without having minutely investigated, or having any very distinct views of the shades of difference among them, entertain a general liberality of sentiment. But, as I personally know, from instances, too, of those who attend the three gentlemen I have just mentioned, they regard the doctrines of Unitarianism as unscriptural, and inconsistent with the great object and spirit of Christianity.

Of our other seven Congregational ministers, two are very decided Calvinists. One of these is the minister of the new church you mention. I know not how this church flourishes at present, but it was opposed, not because it was founded upon Calvinism; for this would be altogether inconsistent with our love of religious freedom, but on account of the intolerant spirit some of its first patrons displayed. Our other five ministers, if I must use so many names, which I do not like, are very far from Unitarians. You say they are all Arians or Unitarians; as if these were very nearly the same. But I assure you they would contend for a very great distinction, and *holding, as I believe they do, high and exalted views of the person and mediation of Jesus Christ, resting on the merits of his atonement, his cross and passion, and zealous to pay the honor which they believe due to his name, they would, I think, be very unwilling to be confounded with the followers of Dr. Priestley.* Some of them, I know, are utterly opposed to the sentiments and spirit of Unitarianism.

You say that Dr. Kirkland is a professed Unitarian, and mention him, as if his election to the Presidency of Cambridge University, were a decisive proof of the prevalence of your sentiments among us. Dr. K. was formerly one of the ministers of Boston, and whatever his particular friends may think of his opinions, he never preached these sentiments. Nay, I may venture to say, that had Dr. Kirkland been an *acknowledged defender of Unitarianism*, he would not have been elected to that place. Unitarianism is too unpopular in the country, and his friends, who are at the same time the friends and governors of the University, with all the respect they most justly entertain for his exalted talents and character, and particularly for his candid and liberal mind, would, I believe, have deemed it necessary to sacrifice their private wishes, and consulted the interests of the University in electing a President, whose sentiments were more agreeable to the great body of the Massachusetts clergy, of which, *ex-officio*, he is generally considered the head, and to the sentiments of the community at large. Had a decided Unitarian been elected, I really believe that the number of the students would have been diminished.

I fear that I have already wearied you, but, my dear sir, you must permit me to say, that your account of the progress of Unitarianism in our northern and southern States, is altogether incorrect. In our own neighborhood, with the exception of those I have mentioned, and, perhaps, one clergyman about forty miles from Boston, I know

of no one whom you could call an Unitarian. In the western parts of Massachusetts, they are almost altogether Calvinists, or, as they term themselves, *Hopkinsian Calvinists*, who carry their system to great extremes, and are dissatisfied with everything that falls below their standard. This is a sect formed chiefly upon the system of the celebrated Dr. Edwards, and they are named from Dr. Hopkins, once a minister of Newport, who first published the system. They compose a numerous class of Christians in Rhode-Island, New-Hampshire, and Vermont, and are thought by many to be increasing.

As for Connecticut, nothing else but Calvinism, in a greater or less degree, can flourish there. You may see an example of this in a pamphlet, which Mr. —— was also kind enough to lend me, respecting the dismissal of an able, pious, and intelligent minister (Mr. Abbot) from his people, on account of some differences of opinion. The intolerant spirit that prevails in this, as well as in some other parts of New-England, is greatly lamented by very many serious, intelligent, and rational Christians among us, who are at the same time no less opposed to the other extremes of Unitarianism.

I really cannot imagine what your friend could mean by his Convention of Massachusetts and Connecticut ministers, in which, on a single day, *one hundred ministers declared themselves converts to the "new doctrine"!!!* As you candidly acknowledge the doctrine to be new, so, I am sure, must have been the Convention that adopted it. The ministers of Connecticut, as far as I know, never meet in convention with those of Massachusetts. They are members of a different State; the constitution of their churches very different;—that of Connecticut almost as rigidly *Presbyterian*, as the Kirk of Scotland, and that of Massachusetts, *Independent*. If ever such a Convention took place, it could have only been with the Calvinists of Connecticut, and their no less Calvinistic neighbors of the western parts of our State. But if such a body as this, who, before, would hardly acknowledge that man to be a Christian, who did not fully unite in all their articles of faith, could in *ONE DAY* become converts to Unitarianism, then surely the age of miracles has not ceased; a new day of Pentecost has been granted us, and the "new doctrine," after the establishment of Christianity for more than eighteen hundred years, has *by a sudden conversion*, at last made progress.\*

I might mention other parts of America, in which I think it will be found that your friend's account is very incorrect. In New-York, and especially in the city, where there are several distinguished ministers, there is a great attachment to Calvinism; and this, though

\*This convention of the Connecticut and Massachusetts clergy is so very improbable, that I think your friend must have referred to the annual Convention of Massachusetts Congregational ministers, which takes place in Boston the last week of every May. It is composed of ministers of very various and opposite sentiments. They are, however, united in the care and distribution of a common fund for the relief of poor widows of their deceased brethren, very much in the same manner, as the three different dissenting denominations in London. But when you consider that it is formed of men of such varieties of opinion, that many are Hopkinsians, and many are Calvinists, you will think that such a conversion to Unitarianism, as your friend and yourself seem so much to rejoice in, is quite as improbable as would be the same conversion among the united Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists in London.



I am not so well acquainted with particulars, is the general spirit of our more southern churches. Indeed, in the Carolinas, in Tennessee, in Georgia, Methodism very much prevails: and in the Presbyterian churches of any note, the ministers, as far as I know, are most decided Calvinists. In Philadelphia, where Dr. Priestley used to preach to a very few hearers, there is an Unitarian church. But this is really the only one that I know of; and in general I would say, that multitudes, who reject the doctrines of Calvinism, are equally opposed to those of Unitarianism.

But I really beg pardon, my dear Sir, for this very long letter. From a stranger, I feel that it needs apology. But I have only stated facts, without, as I hope, any coloring or exaggeration. To such, as a friend of truth, I think you cannot object. I only wished to show as I trust I have done, without offence, that in Boston, in New-England, and in America at large, we ARE NOT, and permit me to add, as long as we study the Scriptures, I believe we SHALL NOT, become converts to your "*new doctrine*."

I am, dear Sir, with respect, yours.

F. P."

We feel authorized to say that the writer of this very extraordinary letter, who subscribes himself "F. P.," is the Rev. Francis Parkman of Boston: since Mr. Parkman is referred to as the writer of it by Mr. Belsham, in his *Memoirs of Lindsey*; and since Mr. Grundy addressed his reply to Mr. Parkman, *by name*.

Before offering our own remarks on the letter of Mr. Parkman, it may be proper again to introduce the Philadelphia minister, and hear what he has to say respecting it.

"Mr. Grundy's correspondent," he says, "certainly went too far; for, with the exception of Dr. Freeman's church, no place of worship is *avowedly* Unitarian."—"The truth is, at Boston, there is considerable diversity of sentiment, yet great liberality and candor; the people are serious and inquiring: no wonder, then, if, in the same congregation, we find Unitarians and Trinitarians. In this state of things, particularly as *many worthy persons, advanced in years, retain a strong attachment to the tenets which prevailed in their early days*, it has not been deemed either expedient or proper, to preach in a controversial strain, or change the name of Congregationalist for that of Arian, &c. But although Dr. Freeman's church, as well as the Congregational churches, still retains its original name, and although there are some Trinitarians who stately attend there, it ought to be known, that King's Chapel at Boston is *as much a Unitarian place of worship, as Essex Street chapel in London*; and also, that Dr. Freeman and Mr. Cary, the officiating ministers, *have no reserve on that subject*." *Monthly Repository*, vol. vii. p. 649.

In remarking on the foregoing communications, especially the letter of Mr. Parkman, we shall not undertake to reconcile his testimony with that of some other Unitarians, who wrote at the same period. Speaking, for instance, of Dr. Freeman, Mr. Parkman says, "Though on other subjects he is as explicit and unreserved, as he is able and intelligent, *I never heard him express an Unitarian sentiment*; and I believe he *carefully avoids it in the pulpit, because it*

might unnecessarily disturb some of his hearers." But the Philadelphia minister says, "It ought to be known, that King's Chapel at Boston, is as much an Unitarian place of worship, as Essex Street Chapel, in London; and also that Dr. Freeman and Mr. Cary, the officiating ministers, have no reserve on that subject."

William Wells Esq. of Boston, in a letter to Mr. Belsham, dated March 21, 1812, and published in the Memoirs of Lindsey, says, "*Most of our Boston clergy and respectable laymen are Unitarian.*" "I may safely say, the general habit of thinking and speaking upon the question in Boston, is Unitarian." But how does this compare with the testimony of Mr. Parkman. Speaking of the members of the Boston Association, he says, "Of these gentlemen, about twenty in number, there is ONLY ONE, whom, from anything I ever heard him offer, either in private or in his pulpit, I, or any body else, would have a right to call an Unitarian." "With the exception of two or three, or, at most, four or five, heads of families, I may safely say, that there is scarcely a parishioner in Boston, who would not be shocked at hearing his minister preach the peculiarities of Unitarianism."—Again, Mr. Wells says, "With regard to the progress of Unitarianism, I have but little to say. Its tenets have spread very extensively in New England." But Mr. Parkman says, "With the exception of those [three] I have mentioned, and, perhaps, one clergyman about forty miles from Boston, I know of no one whom you could call an Unitarian."

Leaving Mr. Wells and Mr. Parkman, both Unitarians and men of intelligence, to settle these contradictions between themselves, we shall assume, in what we have to offer, that Mr. Parkman stated in his letter what he believed to be the truth. And, assuming this, we proceed to show, that there must have been a system of concealment, *studied concealment*, practised by the Unitarians of Boston, such as probably never before existed in any similar case. What, let it be inquired, was the *actual religious state* of Boston, at the date of Mr. Parkman's letter? We hazard nothing in saying, that Unitarianism was then at its height here. Its prospects never were brighter, nor its prevalence greater, than they were then. If any doubt this, let them look at the subject, and determine for themselves. In 1812, the Unitarian leaven had been *secretly* working in this city for a very considerable time. Dr. Freeman had been settled, and Trinitarian worship banished from his chapel almost thirty years. In 1789, Dr. Freeman writes to Mr. Lindsey of London, "There are now many churches in Boston, in which the worship is strictly Unitarian." Again he writes, in 1792, "*An abundant harvest has been produced in the vicinity of Boston.*" From 1804 to 1811, the Monthly Anthology was published in Boston, conducted by some of the first literary characters, clergymen and others, then in the place, the whole influence of which, so far as it related to religion at all, was exerted, not nominally, but undeniably, in support of Unitarianism. In 1809, an edition of "the Improved Version of the New Testament" was published in Boston, and circulated as widely as possible. In 1812, the General Repository was commenced at Cambridge, which, in zeal for Unitarianism, has never been surpassed by any periodical work in this country. Look also at the religious state of Boston, as exhibited in its more prominent citizens, in 1812. Among the clergy, were Holley, and Buckminster, and Thacher, and Channing, and Freeman, and Cary, to say nothing of Lathrop, Elliot, and Lowell;\* and among the laity, were the greater part of the leading Unitarians of the present

\* The first church in Boston was destitute in 1812. It buried one Unitarian minister in 1811, and settled another in 1813.

day. Indeed, we express the opinion of intelligent and experienced men, good judges, when we say, that Unitarianism was at *its height* in Boston, in 1812. To adopt the language of Mr. Wells, already quoted, "Most of our Boston clergy and respectable laymen are Unitarian." "The general habit of thinking and speaking upon this question in Boston, is Unitarian." Or, in the more recent language of a writer in the *Christian Examiner*, "Boston was" then "*full of Unitarian sentiment and feeling.*" Vol. iii. p. 114.

Such, then, was the actual religious state of Boston, in 1812. Let us now turn to Mr. Parkman, and see what opportunities he had enjoyed for becoming acquainted with this state of things. On this subject we can add nothing to what he has himself told us.

"I am a native of that place, and, excepting a short visit in this country, have constantly resided there; and from my acquaintance, as a student in divinity, with most of its ministers, and attendance upon their preaching, have had the *best opportunity of knowing their sentiments, as well as the general state of religious opinions.*"—"With the ministers of these" (the Congregational churches) "I am well acquainted. I have always heard their preaching, and, as a student of divinity, I constantly attended, for two or three years, their monthly meetings, when they frequently converse upon their religious opinions."

Keeping in mind the actual religious state of Boston at this time, and the opportunities of Mr. Parkman for becoming acquainted with it, as detailed by himself, let our readers now look back, and consider his testimony again. And assuming, as we do, that he meant to tell the truth, let them repress (if they can) their astonishment, at the gross and palpable ignorance in which this young man was kept,—and at the system of *concealment* which must have been practised, in order to keep him in this state. "Only *one*" minister of the Boston Association a Unitarian; and "I never heard him *express* such views of the person of Christ, and it was rather from *inference* that I could say he held them"! "With the exception of two or three, or, at most, four or five heads of families, *there is scarcely a parishioner in Boston who would not be shocked, at hearing his minister preach the peculiarities of Unitarianism!*" "I never heard him" (Dr. Freeman) "*express an Unitarian sentiment!*" The "hearers" in "the Congregational societies of Boston" "*regard the doctrines of Unitarianism as unscriptural, and inconsistent with the great object and spirit of Christianity!*"—Unitarians, with a view to free themselves from the charge here fastened upon them, may call in question the *veracity* of Mr. Parkman, if they please. We shall not do it. We assume that he spoke what he believed to be the truth; and if he did, how grossly was he deceived! With all his opportunities, how little did he know of the actual religious state of Boston and the surrounding region! And, to reiterate what we have already said and repeated—what a *close and studied concealment must have been practised*, thus to impose upon him, and no doubt others, and keep them in the dark on this most interesting subject!

But we learn the fact of *concealment*, in the letter of Mr. Parkman, from what he *knew*, as well as from what he did not know. Though he did not know there was much Unitarianism existing, either in city or country, he did know that what Unitarians there were, were in the habit of maintaining a "*cautious reserve.*" He did know that Dr. Freeman "*carefully avoids it* (Unitarianism)

rianism) in the pulpit, *because it might unnecessarily disturb some of his hearers.*" He did know another "gentleman in Boston who, with his *intimate friends*, may perhaps be considered a Unitarian; but he maintains the same *cautious reserve*; and from neither his *sermons*, his *prayers*, nor his PRIVATE CONVERSATION, could I infer that he was an Unitarian." And knowing these things, Mr. P. had sagacity enough to inquire, "To what can all this *prudent reserve* be ascribed, but to the conviction that the preaching of Unitarian doctrines would be *offensive to their hearers*, and injurious to their usefulness?" Mr. P. well knew, as appears from his letter, that "the Congregational societies of Boston are composed of hearers of various opinions;" that "some of them are Calvinists, some of them Arminians;" that "with the exception of four or five heads of families, *there is scarcely a parishioner who would not be shocked at hearing his minister preach the peculiarities of Unitarianism*;" and that for fear of shocking them, their ministers were constrained to "maintain a *cautious reserve*." The Philadelphia minister, too, had learned, during his visit to Boston, that "in the same congregation" there were Unitarians and Trinitarians; and that, "in this state of things, particularly as *many worthy persons, advanced in years, retain a strong attachment to the tenets which prevailed in their early days*, it has not been deemed either expedient or proper, to preach in a controversial strain, or to change the name of Congregationalist for that of Arian."

It further appears from the letter of Mr. Parkman, not only that he knew of the "cautious reserve" practised by Unitarians in Boston, but that he had himself adopted the same prudent course. No one can read his letter, without perceiving an effort to cover up and conceal from his friends in England, at least some portion of the truth. Respecting the two or three ministers in Boston whom he, on the whole, judges to be Unitarians, he would seem not to be positive, but affects to be in doubt. He dares not say expressly that Dr. Kirkland is a Unitarian, and yet it is evident from what he does say, that he believes he is. And as to the five ministers in Boston, who, though they are not Calvinists, "are very far from Unitarians," he is careful not to disclose, with definiteness, their religious views. Indeed, we are authorised to say, that Mr. Parkman left his friends abroad in *doubt*, as to his own standing and sentiments. One, in commenting on his letter, speaks of his "zeal for *Orthodoxy*"—as though he were a zealous Orthodox man. And Mr. Grundy, in replying to him, puts the question direct, "Am I mistaken in the opinion I have formed, that you, in the sense so often referred to, are yourself a Unitarian? I ask this question, because it appears to me so astonishing, that, if you are a Trinitarian, you should not have preached Trinitarianism any of the times you officiated in the chapel, where the sermon, which has caused your animadversions, was delivered." *Monthly Repos.* vol. vii. p. 501.

But perhaps the most important part of Mr. Parkman's letter remains yet to be noticed. It is his testimony respecting Dr. Kirkland, and Harvard University. We said, it will be recollected, in our introduction (vol. ii. p. 5.) "Unitarianism gained footing in Harvard University by concealment." We referred there to the appointment of the Professor of Divinity. We may now say, and are able to prove, that *the late President owed his appointment to concealment*. On this point, we can add nothing to the plain and explicit testimony of Mr. Parkman.

"Dr. Kirkland was formerly one of the ministers of Boston; and, *whatever his particular friends may think of his opinions*, he never preached these (Unitarian) sentiments. Nay, I may venture to say, that had Dr. Kirkland been an *acknowledged defender of Unitari-*

*anism* HE WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN ELECTED TO THAT PLACE. Unitarianism is *too unpopular* in the country." "Had a decided Unitarian been elected, *I really believe that the number of the students would have been diminished.*"

Here then, readers and fellow citizens of Massachusetts, you have the truth placed before you in the most unquestionable shape. You have it on the testimony of the Rev. Francis Parkman, now one of the Unitarian ministers of Boston in good repute, as to the manner in which you have been deceived and imposed upon, in regard to that institution which is, and ought to be, the College of the State. It is evident from this letter that, at the time of Dr. Kirkland's appointment, it was well understood among "his *particular friends*," that he was a Unitarian. Indeed, the fact that he was, is *now* on all hands admitted. But did he *openly* and *honestly* avow his opinions? No, says Mr. Parkman, "I may venture to say, that had Dr. Kirkland been an *acknowledged defender of Unitarianism*, HE WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN ELECTED TO THAT PLACE"!!

Now, fellow citizens, look at this thing for yourselves—and think of it—and make the best of it that you can.

In reply to the remarks here made on the letter of Mr. Parkman, it may perhaps be said, that he used the word Unitarian in a *restricted sense*—that he expressly distinguishes between "Arians and Unitarians," applying the latter term only to "the followers of Dr. Priestley."

But we ask, in the first place, could he *fairly* or *properly* use the term in this restricted sense? He was replying, let it be remembered, to Mr. Grundy, who, in his sermon, had expressly defined the sense in which he used the word Unitarian;—"Unitarian, in contradistinction from *Trinitarian*, and referring solely to the object of religious adoration." Remarking on a Note appended to this very sentence in the sermon of Mr. Grundy, with what propriety could he use the word in any other sense, than that in which Mr. G. had himself defined it? Under these circumstances, how could he use the word in any other sense, without evincing either the most palpable blindness himself, or a disposition to blind and deceive others?

But we ask, in the second place, does it appear from Mr. Parkman's letter, that he actually *uses* the word Unitarian in the restricted sense, confining it uniformly and solely to the followers of Priestley and Belsham? Let our readers examine his use of the word, and then judge for themselves. He says, "There is one church in Boston which may, perhaps, be said to be *founded on Unitarian principles*. Dr. Freeman of King's Chapel, with his church, about thirty years ago, adopted an amended liturgy," &c. But was Dr. Freeman's church "*founded on Unitarian principles*" in the restricted sense? And when his people adopted their first amended liturgy, did they adopt the Unitarianism of Priestley, Lindsey, and Belsham? "I endeavored," says Dr. Freeman in a letter to Mr. Lindsey, dated July 7, 1786, "*I endeavored*" to introduce your liturgy entire. But the people of the Chapel were not *ripe for such a change*. Perhaps, in some future day, when their minds become *more enlightened*, they may consent to a further alteration."

Again, Mr. Parkman admits, though with great caution, that there are three clergymen in Boston, who may be called Unitarians. But does he mean to say that there are three, in the restricted sense—three, who may be regarded as "the followers of Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham? If so, he is at issue with Dr. Channing, who says, in his letter to Mr. Thacher, "I very much doubt whether *one individual* can be found, who could conscientiously subscribe to Mr. Belsham's creed," &c.

But further; Mr. Parkman clearly intimates, that although Dr. Kirkland had "never preached Unitarian sentiments," he was known, among "his particular friends" to be a Unitarian. But does he mean to insinuate that Dr. Kirkland, at the time of his election to the Presidency of Harvard College, was a Unitarian in the restricted sense—a Materialist, a Universalist, a Humanitarian of the lowest grade, a "*follower of Dr. Priestley?*" We do not believe that Mr. P. will now say that such was his intention.

But there are expressions in the letter of Mr. Parkman which show, we think conclusively, that he used the word Unitarian in the *ordinary* sense of it, the sense defined by Mr. Grundy; and, consequently, that the pretence we are examining is without foundation. Speaking of the members of the Boston Association, he says, "There is only one whom, from anything I ever heard him offer either in private or in his pulpit, I, or *any body else*"—ANY BODY ELSE, be his definition of Unitarianism what it may—"would have a right to call a Unitarian."—Again; "With the exception of those (three) I, have mentioned, and perhaps one clergyman, about forty miles from Boston,\* I know of no one whom you"—*You, Mr. Grundy*, who have defined the sense in which you use the word Unitarian—"whom YOU COULD CALL A UNITARIAN."

We see not, therefore, how it can be pretended, and we presume it will not be, that in the letter here examined, the word Unitarian is employed throughout in an unusual and restricted sense.—But should such a pretence be set up, and should it even be *admitted*, it will make very little difference as to the value of Mr. Parkman's testimony. If it should remove, in some measure, the appearance of *ignorance* on his part, as to the actual religious state of Boston in 1812, it will present him, on this very account, as a more competent witness, and his testimony will be rather strengthened than otherwise—as to the "*cautious reserve*" maintained by ministers here, and the unworthy *reasons* of it—as to the *concealment* by means of which Dr. Kirkland obtained his office in Harvard College—and, indeed, as to all the more important points of the letter.

Whatever explanations may be attempted, therefore, we thank Mr. Parkman most heartily for his letter; assuring him that, however it may have been received in England at the time of its publication, it will not be read on this side of the water without deep interest, and we believe much profit.

We cannot conclude this discussion, though protracted already much beyond our intended limits, without offering a few thoughts for the consideration of the citizens of Boston, and more especially the *Unitarians* of Boston. We have here furnished you, fellow citizens and friends, with the means of seeing and knowing for yourselves in what manner your religious interests and concerns have, in years past, been managed. And we now ask most seriously, *What do you think of these things?* What think you of men, whom you have received to your bosoms, as faithful "ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God," who were bound to declare to you all his counsel, and keep nothing back—of such men maintaining, as Mr. Parkman expresses it, a "*cautious reserve*," so that 'neither from their *sermons*, their *prayers*, nor their *private conversation*,' their real sentiments could be discovered. What think you of such persons being known among their "particular friends" in *one* character, and passing themselves off before the public, and obtaining and holding important offices, in another? What think you of their withholding

\* This "one clergyman" is supposed to be Dr. Bancroft of Worcester, who, as we learn from his volume of sermons, is *not* a Unitarian, in the restricted sense.

from you, year after year, through a fear of displeasing you and losing your favor, what they secretly believed to be the truth of God? Are you willing to be treated in this way by your spiritual guides? Do you think it fair and generous treatment? Do you think it a suitable return for the respect, the confidence and the very liberal support, which you have given them?

In the letters here published, you hear of "many worthy persons *advanced in years*," who "retain a strong attachment to the tenets which prevailed in their early days," and to avoid displeasing whom the system of reserve and concealment was begun and continued. Now these "worthy persons advanced in years" were your fathers and mothers. They were those who early devoted you to God, who endeavored to train you up in his fear, and from whom, as your hearts testify, you received your best religious impressions. These venerable ancestors, many of whom have gone, we doubt not, to heaven, believed and loved *the truth as it is in Jesus*. And they left you under the care of teachers who, they were led to suppose, believed and loved the same precious truths as themselves. But it seems from letters here laid before you, that your pious fathers and mothers were deceived. They were imposed upon, in respect to their most important interests. They did not know that their ministers were Unitarians. How should they know it? A "cautious reserve" was kept up; and neither from the *sermons*, the *prayers*, nor the *private conversation* of those who instructed them, could their real sentiments be gathered. Your fathers would have been "shocked," as Mr. Parkman testifies, if they had heard "their ministers preach the peculiarities of Unitarianism;" and yet some of these ministers\* held these very peculiarities, and would not disclose them. We repeat then the question, Fellow citizens, how ought you to regard this treatment of your venerated fathers and mothers? What say you to the cruel imposition which was put upon them? Was it fair? Was it Christian? Was it what your ancestors had a right to expect? Would the apostle Paul, think you—nay, would any fair and honorable man—have consented to manage in such a way?—But this, you see, was the way in which Unitarianism planted itself in the midst of you. It came in by concealment. It "crept in unawares." We wonder not at all, considering the various devices which have been practised, that Evangelical religion has been, to a great extent, rooted out from these churches. The greater wonder is, and to the credit of the citizens of Boston it ought to be spoken, that there is so much the appearance of ancient order, and principle, and piety still remaining.

But you will say, perhaps, these are old affairs. The present Unitarian ministers, especially those who have been recently settled, are not responsible for the errors of those who preceded them. And we allow that they are not, any farther than they are consenting to them, and are in fact practising the same things. It was stated in the Introduction to our present volume, page 7, that Unitarian ministers now are not explicit. "The discussions and disclosures of a twenty years' controversy have brought them out, on several points: but over others of equal importance, there is still thrown a covering of disguise." If your ministers really believe that the Bible is not itself the word of God—and that Jesus Christ was no more than a human being—and that there is no devil—and no future endless punishment for the wicked;—if they actually believe thus, as the most of them unquestionably do; then why do they not now frankly tell you so? Why do they not preach out their sentiments, and dwell upon them, and disabuse those of their confiding hearers who are living, as they think, in supersti-

\* "Most of our Boston clergy are Unitarians."—*Mr. Wells' Letter*.

tion and error? Why are they *afraid*—as Dr. Bancroft assures us many are afraid\*—to preach what they believe, on any of the important subjects of religion?

Between Unitarian ministers and their hearers, it is not our province to interfere, except in the way of publishing facts, affording light, and urging motives. This is all the right that we have in the case, and all we desire to have. If, fellow citizens of Boston and the country, you are satisfied and pleased with the doctrines of Unitarianism, as constituting a religion in which you mean to live and to die,—then *hear these doctrines*. You must have your choice. But, we beseech you, hear them *all*. Insist upon it with your teachers that they shall be plain and full, and drop all disguise, and bring before you their whole system. The present is no time for “cautious reserves,” and temporizing concealments, “For there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, neither hid that shall not be known.”

#### HOW TO PROVIDE SERMONS.

We present the following extract to our clerical readers, not that we suppose they will need, or will be inclined, to avail themselves of the expedients it suggests, but merely as a matter of curiosity. It is taken from a volume of miscellaneous sermons, published by the Rev. Dr. Freeman, of Boston, in 1812. Having asserted that a minister “cannot compose two, or even *one* discourse every week, and continue the practice during life,” and consequently, if “two sermons are expected to be preached in the same pulpit, recourse must be had to some practicable means of supplying this demand”; he proceeds to suggest several ways, in which the needed supply may be furnished. One is, “to have two ministers in every church;” a second, “that of frequent interchanges;” and a third, that of repeating “old sermons.”

“Another means for supplying the demand for a variety of sermons, a means to which few preachers in this country have yet applied, is to transcribe them from printed discourses. This practice has been recommended by several eminent authors; but it is an objection to it, that ‘he who lives by theft is always poor.’”

“If the public sentiment and the customs of the country would permit a clergyman, in the first years of his ministerial life, before his sermons are old enough to be preached a second time, openly to read, on one part of the Lord’s day, from printed books, the sermons of the best English divines, it would both conduce to the edification of his hearers, and enable him to employ more time and pains in studying and perfecting his own compositions. But as this indulgence will probably not be granted to him at present, he must have recourse to other means of supplying the deficiencies of his own invention. To steal is criminal; but *it is not unlawful to borrow*. He may be allowed, therefore, to borrow the plan of his discourse from one author, the explanation of his text from another, and his proofs from a third, and to insert long quotations of eloquent or instructive passages.”

“Another way of obtaining sermons, is to translate them from the works of authors in a foreign or dead language.”

“It is a necessary caution to a preacher, whose sermons are either compilations or translations, that he should be careful to distinguish, by some mark which will be understood, between those parts which are borrowed, and those which are properly his own. For he knows

\* Sermons, page 392.



not what will be the fate of his manuscripts after his decease. His partial heirs may think proper, not to commit them to the flames, but to print them, to the injury of the public, or of his own reputation. It is by the want of this care, that the good name of an author, who on the whole is entitled to esteem, may be tarnished. For the sermons, which he may have put together without any view of obtaining fame by them, but entirely for the edification of the congregation of Christians, to whom they were delivered, have been injudiciously brought to light when the writer of them was no more; and after the public has applauded them for a while, a critic, more acute than benevolent, has at length announced to the world, that the praise which has been bestowed is misapplied, for that the pretended author is a plagiarist: in consequence of which the unfortunate compiler or imitator has lost the greatest part of the credit, which he had obtained by his genuine productions."

"It will perhaps appear from observations which have been made, that though it may be easy to write many sermons, yet that it is very difficult to produce a good, or an original sermon. From a just view of the imperfection of the human understanding the hearer will learn candor, and the preacher humility. If, in the course of his life, he has the happiness of being able to produce one original work, which illustrates an important doctrine of Christianity, or adds a new motive to the practice of the duties of religion, he has not lived in vain. But if this favor is denied him, as it probably will be, because it is bestowed on few, he should not murmur against Heaven: God will send light upon the earth, though not by him, yet by means of other men: he should be content, therefore, to walk in the paths which they mark out, to borrow the thoughts which they originate, and to *preach what they preach.*"



#### CHARACTER OF DR. BELLAMY, AS A PREACHER.

The following account of Dr. Bellamy, is from Rev. Dr. Trumbull's History of Connecticut.

"Dr. Bellamy was a large and well built man, of a commanding appearance; had a smooth, strong voice, and could fill the largest house without any unnatural elevation. He possessed a truly great mind, generally preached without notes, had some great point of doctrine commonly to establish, and would keep close to his point until he had sufficiently illustrated it; then, in his ingenious, close, and pungent manner, he would make the application. When he felt well, and was animated by a large and attentive audience, he would preach incomparably. Though he paid little attention to language, yet when he became warm and was filled with his subject, he would, from the native vigor of his soul, produce the most commanding strokes of eloquence, making his audience alive. There is nothing to be found in his writings, though a sound and great divine, equal to what was to be seen and heard in his preaching. His pulpit talents exceeded all his other gifts. It is difficult for any man, who never heard him, to form a just idea of the force and beauty of his preaching.

“While I was an undergraduate at New Haven, the Doctor preached a lecture for Mr. Bird. At the time appointed, there was a full house. The Doctor prayed and sang; then rose before a great assembly, apparently full of expectation, and read, Deut. xxvii. 26, “Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them: and all the people shall say, Amen.” The number and appearance of the people animated the preacher, and he instantly presented them with a view of the twelve tribes of Israel assembled on Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim, according to the divine appointment, and the audience were made to hear the Levites distinctly reading the curses, and all the thousands of Jacob repeating them, uttering aloud their approving Amen. Twelve times, says the Doctor, it goes, round, round all the camp of Israel, Cursed be the man who committeth this or the other iniquity. Nay, round it goes, through all the thousands of God’s chosen people, Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them: and all the people shall say, Amen. By universal consent, (the approving Amen of all the congregation of Israel,) he who did not yield a cheerful and universal obedience to the whole law, was cursed. From this striking and general view of the subject, the Doctor observed, that it was the ancient doctrine of the church, which God took great pains to teach them, that every sin deserved the eternal curse and damnation of God: or that the wages of every sin was death. Having, from a variety of views, established this leading point; that all parties might be treated fairly, he brought the objector on to the stage, to remonstrate against the doctrine he had advanced. When he had offered his objections, Gabriel was brought down to show him the futility of his objections, and the presumption and impiety of making them against the divine law and government. They were clearly answered, and the opponent was triumphantly swept from the stage. The argument gained strength and beauty through the whole progress. The deductions were solemn and important: The absolute need of an atonement, that sin might be pardoned, or one of the human race saved: the impossibility of justification by the deeds of the law: the immaculate holiness and justice of God in the damnation of sinners. They were stripped naked, and their only hope and safety appeared to be an immediate flight to the city of refuge. The truths of the Gospel were established, and God was glorified. No man was more thoroughly set for the defence of the Gospel.”

---

#### NOTICES.

It was observed in a Note, p.199 of this volume, that we had been informed that “the *Christian Examiner*, after completing the volume for 1823, was to cease; or to be transformed into something of a more pacific character.” Since the above was printed, the new work has made its appearance, with the title of “*Christian Examiner and General Review*,” (not *Theological Review*, as before;) “New Series, No. I.” Of the character of it, we are not yet prepared to speak.—The number of the old *Christian Examiner* for November and December, is not yet published.

Our patrons will be happy to learn that we have at present on hand a great number of original articles—some of them very valuable—which we are intending to publish as fast as our pages will admit. While our correspondents are entitled to our grateful acknowledgements, and are earnestly requested to continue their favors, they must not impute blame to us, if they do not always find their articles published as early as they anticipated.

The present number contains four pages more than our conditions specify. The number for January contained eight additional pages. Were our list of subscribers so enlarged as to cover the increased expense, we should be happy to increase permanently the size of our work.

THE

# SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. II.

MAY, 1829.

NO. 5.

---

---

## COMMUNICATIONS.

INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES. NO. VII.

*Application of the Doctrine to different parts of Scripture.—Perfection of the Bible.*

THAT *all Scripture is given by inspiration of God*, is a doctrine, indescribably precious to every Christian, and in the highest degree important to the interests of the world. And it is a doctrine which must be happy or dreadful in its consequences, to all who enjoy the light of revelation.

In order to guard against hurtful mistakes relative to this doctrine, and to give the contemplation of it the most salutary influence, it is important that we should well consider *the particular manner in which it is to be applied to different parts of Scripture*. This is one of the few remaining points to which I shall invite the reader's attention.

No one can be so absurd as to suppose that the speeches of uninspired men, recorded in Scripture as historical facts, were themselves originally dictated by the Holy Spirit. The object of the sacred volume requires, that it should record the speeches of wicked men, as well as of good men; and the speeches of good men who were not inspired, as well as of those who were inspired. For example, it was important that the Evangelists, in their history of the Saviour, should relate the cavils, reproaches, and false accusations, which his enemies uttered against him. But who ever imagined that his enemies were prompted to utter these by the Holy Spirit? The Evangelists have recorded the words which Peter used in denying his Lord. But who ever imagined that he was prompted to utter those rash and sinful words by the influence of the Spirit? When we say, *the Scriptures are divinely inspired*, our meaning is, that the divine Spirit guided the *writers*. Whether those persons whose words are recorded, were inspired or not, must, in every case, be determined by the records themselves. In some instances they evidently were inspired; in other in-

stances they were not. But whatever may have been the case with those whose words are recorded, our doctrine is, that *those who made the record were under infallible divine guidance*. If they undertook to record historical facts, they were enabled to do it with perfect historical truth, and to extend their record to just such a length, and to give it just such a form, as was suited to the design which God had in view. If they undertook to teach the doctrines of religion, or to announce divine commands, promises, or predictions; they were enabled to do it infallibly. And if they undertook to give instruction by parables, allegories, or symbolical representations; the Spirit of God enabled them to make use of such parables, allegories, or symbols, as were adapted to the end in view.

To make this matter as plain as possible, I shall refer to a few examples.

I begin with the book of Job. Though we have many reasons to believe, that the account which the writer gives of the conversation between Job and his three friends had substantial fact for its basis; yet it would be unreasonable to suppose, that a conversation actually took place in Hebrew poetry, just such as is here recorded. The case does not require anything like this. The object of the writer was not to relate simple historical facts, but to exhibit just views of the character and government of God, and to expose and correct the various misconceptions of men on that subject. Our doctrine is, that the divine Spirit so guided the writer, that the representations he made in this familiar poetic dialogue, are well adapted to give the instruction intended, as to the righteousness and majesty of God, the errors of men, and other related subjects. When therefore we read a particular passage, containing an expression of Job, or of his wife, or of one of his friends; we are not to infer from the circumstance of the writer's inspiration, that the particular expression referred to, was conformed to truth, or that the person who originally uttered it was divinely inspired, any more than we are to infer from the inspiration of the Evangelists, that the various charges which they declare to have been brought against Christ were conformed to truth. In every such case, our business is to discover what was the design of the writer, or the design of God, in what was written. The inspiration of a writer implies, that the instruction which he communicates is true. The author of the Book of Job wished to show, how a good man may be affected by long-continued afflictions; what mistakes he may make in judging of the divine administration; what impatience he may indulge; what a wrong construction others may put upon the conduct of God towards him; what gracious methods God may take to instruct and humble him; and how happy, in the end, is the effect of divine chastisements on the man who is upright in heart, and who enjoys divine teaching. The Holy Spirit prompt-

ed the writer to aim at these important ends, and, with a view to their accomplishment, to write a sacred poem, consisting chiefly of a dialogue between Job and his three friends, and of a solemn address to Job from the Creator and Sovereign of the world. The inspired writer was enabled to frame such a dialogue, and such an address from God, as should be agreeable to nature and truth, and convey with clearness and force, the most important knowledge respecting God and man. This is what I mean, when I say, the Book of Job was divinely inspired.

As another example, take the Proverbs of Solomon. God saw it to be necessary to the highest improvement of men, that they should have, for constant use, a collection of *maxims*, or *wise practical sayings*, resulting from observation and experience. This was one of the modes of instruction, which God judged to be important to our welfare. He therefore moved and assisted Solomon to write a book of Proverbs, the greater part of which were probably suggested by his own experience, though some of them were doubtless in common use before. But in whatever way he became furnished with these maxims of divine truth, he selected and wrote them under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

As to the Prophets, the nature of the subject shows, that the Spirit of God not only guided them in committing their predictions to writing, but in a supernatural way made them acquainted with those events to which their predictions related.

In short, whether the writer was a prophet, a historian, or a teacher in any other form, the divine Spirit assisted him to perform his work ;—that assistance always having been adapted to the nature and circumstances of what the writer was to execute.

Another point, to which I would invite the reader's attention is *the perfection of the Bible*. This clearly results from the doctrine of inspiration as above explained.

I speak not now of an *abstract*, or *absolute* perfection, but of a *relative* perfection which has relation to the ends of revelation. It would be impious to suppose that a book written by inspiration of God, is not perfectly adapted to the purposes for which it was designed. We may indeed frame an idea of a kind of perfection, which does not belong to the Bible. And we may in like manner, frame an idea of a kind of perfection which does not belong to what God has done in creation. We may imagine that it would be a perfection in the scheme of his works, if houses, and carriages, and clothing, and all the instruments which can be necessary or useful to man, and all the books fitted to promote his improvement, were produced, as the trees of the forest are, according to the laws of the natural world, and without any concurrence of human agency. But is it true, that it would be a real perfection in the natural world, if houses, and carriages, and clothing, and instruments, and books were all produced spontaneously from the earth, like the trees of

the forest? Who does not see that this would really be an *imperfection*, and that, on this supposition, the most important ends of creation in respect to man would fail of being accomplished? For what exercise or improvement of man's active powers, either corporeal or mental, would there be, if all that he desires, were formed ready for use without his agency?

The most common objection against the perfection of the Bible, is, *that so many difficulties and obscurities are found in it*. On this I shall particularly remark.

If the Bible had no difficulties or obscurities; if all were, at first view, perfectly plain and easy; what occasion would there be for diligent mental exertion? And what opportunity for improvement? This fancied perfection could not be made out completely, unless the Bible, throughout, were plain and easy to every human being, even to every child. Such a perfection as is here supposed, could it exist, would supersede all motive to improvement. But in reality, it is impossible. For how can it be, that subjects so vast, and so complex, should be perfectly plain and easy to those who have so little information, and who are in the very infancy of their being? This supposed perfection of the Bible would require, either that the subjects of which it treats should be lowered down infinitely, so as to meet the littleness of the mind of man, and the mind of a child; or that the mind should be infinitely enlarged and exalted, so as to be able at once to comprehend the vastness of these subjects.

When we look at the *natural world*, we find it to be one great object of the Creator, to furnish man with materials, from which he may, by his own exertions, form whatever will conduce to his convenience or comfort. And we know by experience, that the exertions we make to procure the necessaries and accommodations of life, not only conduce to the improvement of our faculties, but prove an unfailing source of enjoyment. It follows then, that so far as our improvement or enjoyment is concerned, it would greatly detract from the perfection of the creation, if everything we need or desire were thrown into our hands, without any forethought or labor of ours. And is not the same true in regard to *revelation*? It is certainly essential to our highest enjoyment in religion, that we should diligently exert the powers of our minds in the acquisition of religious knowledge. But what occasion or opportunity could there be for mental exertion, if everything in the Bible were, at first view, perfectly plain and obvious? That we should, on the whole, have the highest amount of enjoyment, it is, therefore, necessary that we should meet with *difficulties* and *obscurities*, and that these should in some way continue, through every stage of our progress in the acquisition of divine knowledge. For if difficulties and obscurities should cease, and there should be nothing left beyond the present grasp of our understandings; what motive could we have for any further efforts?

That the Bible is such a book as the foregoing remarks imply, we find to be a matter of fact. The man, who applies himself in earnest to understand its contents, meets with difficulties in abundance. And as he proceeds in acquiring knowledge, and in clearing away the difficulties which first arose, new difficulties occur, which he was before incapable of discovering. And every advance he makes, gives him ability to see what he could not see before, that is, various remaining difficulties, which are to be overcome by new exertion. Now I hold it to be no fault, but a real perfection of the Bible, that it thus calls us, in every stage of improvement, to encounter difficulties; to get a knowledge of what was before unknown, and so to keep up, to the last hour of life, that mental effort, which God has made essential to the end of our being. If the Bible were in all respects perfectly plain; if all the subjects it introduces were level to our understandings; it would have but little power to interest our feelings, and would be, in a great measure, dull and tasteless.

If we keep in mind that the Bible is not a book to be read indolently, or to be understood passively; but is intended for the instruction and moral discipline of God's people through every period of their life, and that, to answer the purpose fully, it must, through every period, excite their persevering diligence, and be a constant means of improving all their intellectual and moral powers; we shall be satisfied, that those very things, which have been complained of as defects in the word of God, are in fact essential to its perfection.

It is not meant to be implied in any of the foregoing remarks, that the inspired penmen *purposely* introduced difficulties and obscurities into their writings for the sake of exercising and improving our minds. Most of these difficulties and obscurities arise necessarily from the nature of the subjects to which they relate, and from human ignorance and weakness. These subjects being what they are, the Bible must contain things which are difficult and unsearchable, and which are, on that account, suited to rouse the mind of man to vigorous and persevering efforts.

That we may be completely satisfied on this subject, we must consider that the Bible is intended to be a subject of study, and a means of intellectual and moral culture to good men, through all ages. Had it been intended for one particular society of men, or for one period of time, a great difference would undoubtedly have been made in its structure. But God designed this holy book to be the study of all ages; and, accordingly, he has so formed it, that many things, which are obscure and unintelligible to men of one age, shall be perfectly clear to men in a succeeding age. A particular doctrine of the Bible may now be attended with an obscurity, which the superior advantages of a future period may clear away. The doctrine itself, according to the present sup-

position, is contained in the Bible. God has declared it. But owing to various causes, we do not fully understand it, and of course do not fully perceive its value. But others who shall come after us, will have better means of knowledge, or a better mode of thinking, and so will have a clear and comprehensive view of what is very imperfectly known to us. This may be true in respect to prophecies. A particular prediction may be so expressed, or it may relate to events of such a nature, that it cannot be well understood before the accomplishment shall explain it. And some ends of no small consequence may be answered by this very circumstance. Now, in any such case, whether a doctrine or prophecy is concerned, we are not to look upon the present obscurity attending it, as a mark of imperfection in the Bible. The passage, thus involved in obscurity, may be intended for the benefit of the church in some future age; just as some things which were but obscurely known to the people of God under the former dispensation, are made very plain to Christians, being intended chiefly for their benefit.

The points which I wish to be specially remembered, are these; that our finding, after all our efforts, that any part of Scripture is of difficult interpretation, or even unintelligible, is so far from proving the Bible to be imperfect, that it may directly result from its *perfection*; that the sacred volume could not, consistently with the nature of the subjects of which it treats, and with the ends which God designs it shall answer, be so formed, as to be entirely free from obscurity; and that the Holy Spirit may direct men to write, for the benefit of future times, that which may be quite unintelligible now, and which may be of but little use to us, except as a means of rendering us more modest and humble, and more desirous that a day of clearer light may come; and that many things may have been written, which are not applicable, and not intelligible to us, but which were intelligible, and of real use, at the time when they were written.

I have dilated somewhat on the difficulties and obscurities of the Bible, because they constitute the most plausible objection; and because they most frequently occur to the minds of men, as a proof of imperfection.

It would be easy to introduce many other particulars. But I shall refer to only one, and that in a few words.

If, then, any one should think it a proof of imperfection in the Bible, that it *does not exhibit the principles of religion in a regular, systematic form*; I would just ask him to consider how it is with the work of God in the material creation. The objects of the natural world are not exhibited in such regular order and systematic form, as to correspond with the natural sciences. But who supposes that this fact furnishes any argument against the infinite wisdom and goodness of the Creator, or against the plan of operation which he has adopted?

PASTOR.



## RICHARD BAXTER.

During the troubled times of the English Church, there arose many individuals of eminent piety, vast intellectual resources, and great moral courage. But in the galaxy, there were few brighter stars than Richard Baxter. Few men indeed, of any age, have exhibited a more holy and blameless life, or exerted upon the spiritual interests of the world a more efficient and salutary influence, than this oppressed and persecuted dissenter.

Baxter came upon the stage shortly after the first company of Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, that they might build in the wilderness a house for God. He was of a kindred spirit with that devoted band, and his whole heart, soul and body were enlisted for the support of the same cause to which they had sacrificed all they held dear on this side heaven.

As a scholar, Baxter must be ranked in the class of "self-made men." When a youth, his literary advantages were few; but he did not remain in ignorance. A strong thirst for knowledge, a vehement ardor in its pursuit, a resolution and perseverance which bent to nothing but the will of God, bore him successfully forward in a course of acquisition, until his intellectual resources became various, extensive and valuable.

In 1738, being 23 years of age, he was set apart to the sacred ministry. At his ordination, he subscribed to the bitterly disputed rites and canons of the authorized church, a step which he afterwards deeply lamented. For, when he became acquainted, on the one hand, with the self-denying and self-sacrificing piety of his Puritan neighbors, together with the reasons of their resistance, and on the other, with the bad spirit, weak arguments, and the exorbitant and oppressive claims of the prelates, he entirely changed his views, shifted his ground, and commenced supporting the cause of the non-conformists with the zeal of fresh conviction, and with all the vehemence of his sanguine spirit.

Upon the opening of the long Parliament, he was chosen vicar of Kidderminster. His labors in that place were eminently successful. When he went there, iniquity, open and unblushing, prevailed, and the religion of the heart was scarcely known. He labored faithfully, and his efforts were not in vain. A powerful work of grace soon commenced and spread, and the aspect of the whole town was changed. The day of the Lord was observed; riot and dissipation ceased; the tongue of blasphemy was silent; the voice of prayer and praise was heard in almost every house; and the still influence of the Spirit felt in nearly every heart. The truths which he preached, and which were instrumental in producing this wonderful reformation, were the essential doctrines of the evangelical system. "The great fundamental principles of

Christianity," says Calamy, "contained in the baptismal covenant, even a right knowledge and belief of, and subjection and love to, God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, were the things which he daily opened to them, and with the greatest importunity labored to imprint upon their minds." Indeed, Baxter was, in the best sense of the words, a *revival preacher*; and were he living now, he would be found among the warmest friends and the most efficient promoters of revivals of religion.

During the civil war, which commenced in 1641, Baxter withdrew to Coventry, and preached to the garrison and the inhabitants. He avowed his decided disapprobation of the measures which Cromwell adopted to accomplish his ascendancy; and even publicly reproved him, when in the height of his power, for his ambitious usurpation. He preached before the Parliament, the day before they voted the restoration of the king. Immediately on his return, Charles appointed Baxter one of his chaplains in ordinary, and he was once allowed to preach before the king and his court. He was one of the commissioners appointed to meet at Savoy, to settle the long disputed points of worship. During the whole conference, Baxter was earnest for accommodation. He was ready to meet his opponents on what was then called the middle ground of "primitive episcopacy." But the Bishops were unyielding, and the conference was dissolved, having accomplished nothing but a wider and more irreconcilable separation.

In the beginning of 1662, the famous, or rather the *infamous* act of Uniformity was passed, which silenced, on pain of imprisonment and of the most cruel deprivations, all who would not subscribe to the ultra episcopacy which then prevailed. By this act, about two thousand preaching ministers, holy, faithful, laborious men, were ejected from their respective fields of usefulness, torn from their affectionate and beloved flocks, and "at once buried alive in a common grave." Amongst these were such men as Owen, Bates, Baxter, Corbet, Woodbridge, Charnock, Fairfax, Poole, some of the richest minds, and the best spirits of England. From this time until his death, Baxter was often a sufferer. His faith and patience were sorely tried. But the gold shone the brighter for the furnace. His terrestrial sun passed behind a cloud, but the Sun of Righteousness beamed more clearly upon his spirit. The love of Christ constrained him, and he dared to obey God in defiance of men. He continued to preach and toil to promote the glory of God and the salvation of the perishing about him. For his self-denying efforts, he was thrice imprisoned. But he rejoiced in the midst of his trials, and well he might: For they were fast ripening his soul for the communion and the joys of heaven.\* In 1691 he was granted a peaceful

\* The account of Baxter's trial before the notorious Jeffreys has often reminded us of the trial of our Lord at the bar of Pilate. The resemblance would be more perfect, except that, in insolence and abuse, the English judge far exceeds the Roman governor.

release from sin and sorrow, and an abundant admission to that world, where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest.

On many accounts, Baxter was an extraordinary character. The visits of such spirits to these abodes of sin are few and infrequent. He was esteemed and admired, not only by his friends, but by many of those who differed from him in the then existing points of acrimonious dispute. Lords and Bishops have given him the meed of their praise. "His practical writings," says Barrow, "were never mended, and his controversial seldom confuted." "He was a man," says Granger, "famous for weakness of body and strength of mind; for having the strongest sense of religion himself, and exciting a sense of it in the thoughtless and profligate."

The spring of Baxter's energy and usefulness was a deep, vivid, operative piety. He was well acquainted "with the *inside of religion*." The Spirit of God had performed a thorough work in his heart, and under the continued teachings of the Heavenly Messenger, he became well qualified to guide others in the way of life. High in holy attainments, and faithful in the discharge of duty, he shed around him a strong and reproofing light upon an ignorant and profligate generation. The following sententious aspiration expressed the deep desires and established principles of his heart. "Let the eternal God be the portion of my soul; let heaven be my inheritance and hope; let Christ be my Head, and the promise my security; let faith be my wisdom, and love be my very heart and will, and patient, persevering obedience be my life; then I can spare the wisdom of the world, and all the trifles it seeks."

Baxter's piety received the nourishment of various and severe afflictions. Within his own breast he had many hard conflicts; storms of temptation, which at times well nigh swept away the foundation of his hope. In the early stages of his Christian course, he was much disturbed with the strength and occasional prevalence of sin, and consequently with agonizing doubts of his own sincerity. At a later period, his most distressing temptations were to question the truth of Scripture, and the reality of the life to come. So powerful were the onsets of the adversary, he says, that sometimes he hardly knew whether he was a Christian or an infidel. But his trust was in the Redeemer, and in his strength he came off a conqueror. His house was on the rock, and Satan could not undermine it, or shake it down.

Baxter lived, as every Christian ought to live, with the future world clearly and steadily in view. He looked to things unseen and eternal. He walked by faith. His best thoughts and affections were upon the life to come. The debilities of his body seemed to augment the energies of his spirit and the efficiency of

his piety ; for he ever prayed and felt and acted under the rousing impression, that death and eternity were very near him. Some of his most searching practical writings are the sentiments and urgencies of a soul deeply imbued with the love of Christ, and stationed at the very entrance of heaven.

Baxter possessed, in no ordinary degree, the spirit of a missionary. "He gave in one year a hundred pounds to buy Bibles for the poor." From his own account, we learn, that he intensely felt and prayed for the perishing heathen. "There is nothing in the world," he says, in his *Life and Times*, "that lieth so heavy upon my heart, as the thought of the miserable nations of the earth." Again, "I cannot be affected so much with the calamities of my own relations, or the land of my nativity, as with the case of the Heathen, Mahometan, and ignorant nations of the earth. No part of my prayers is so deeply serious, as that for the infidel and ungodly world, that God's name may be sanctified, and his kingdom come, and his will be done on earth as it is done in heaven." If Baxter had such thoughts and aspirations in the 17th century, how would he have prayed and pleaded and labored, had his lot been cast in a day like the present, when so much light is shed upon the moral condition of the world, and the facilities for its conversion are so much increased, and the efforts and sacrifices made for its welfare are so signally blessed of God.

Baxter is an example worthy of study and imitation, in seasons of high controversial excitement. His lot was cast in times of violence, oppression, and bitter contention, not about *the foundation*, the *corner-stone*, but the mere appendages of the Christian edifice. When he lived, a man was condemned and anathematized for the slightest singularity in the mode of his worship ; or as it has been rather strongly expressed, "his very brains were knocked out to kill a fly on his forehead." But in this conflict of bitter feelings, hard speeches, and unchristian actions, Baxter exhibited, with some exceptions, (which are to be attributed to the times, rather than to his disposition)—he exhibited the charity and meekness of the Gospel. Grace had thoroughly penetrated and calmed his nature ; and not unfrequently would he throw the oil of his own quiet spirit upon the turbulent elements about him, in hope of assuaging the violence of the storm. But he was determined in the course which he thought right. The truth of God he would maintain, at any sacrifice or hazard. The terrors of a dungeon and the allurements of a diocese were alike insufficient to draw him into any compromise with error in principle or practice.

Baxter is a bright example of faithfulness, as a preacher of the Gospel. He is a model worthy of particular regard at the present time, when with many, who are reputed to preach the truth, there is too manifest a disposition to paraphrase some of its plain, sententious epithets, round off its most cutting points, and soften

some of its unceasing asperities. Baxter did not so preach the Gospel. No matter whom he was addressing, kings or beggars, we hear the same direct, fearless disclosure of the counsel of God. The sermon delivered before the dissolute Charles II. is said to be a masterly specimen, not only of grand, impressive eloquence, but also of plain, pointed dealing with the consciences of his princely auditors. "Will you persuade us that the man is *wise*, that can climb a little higher than his neighbors, that he may have the greater fall? That is attended in his way to hell with greater pomp and state than others? That can sin more syllogistically and rhetorically than the vulgar, and more prudently and gravely run into damnation; and can learnedly defend his madness, and prove that he is safe at the brink of hell? Would you persuade us that he is wise, that contradicts the God and rule of wisdom, that parts with heaven for a few merry hours, and hath not wit to save his soul?" "Can you forget that death is ready to undress you, and tell you that your sport and mirth is done, and that now you have had all that the world can do for those that serve it and take it for their portion? How quickly can a fever, or the choice of an hundred messengers of death, bereave you of all that earth afforded you, and turn your sweetest pleasure into gall, and turn a lord into a lump of clay?" "Princes and nobles live not always. You are not the rulers of the *unmoveable kingdom*; but of a boat that is in an hasty stream, or a ship under sail, that shall speed both pilots and passengers to the shore. The inexorable leveller is ready at your backs to convince you by irresistible argument, that dust you are and to dust you shall return. Heaven should be as desirable and hell as terrible to you as to others; no man will fear you after death, much less will Christ be afraid to judge you."

The same style of plain, earnest dealing runs through all the practical writings of Baxter. Of these, however, it is scarcely necessary to speak. Their record is the hearts of thousands, some on earth, and many in heaven. "To allure our desires," says Bates, "he unveils the sanctuary above, and discovers the glory and joys of the blessed in the Divine presence, by a light so strong and lively, that all the glittering vanities of this world vanish in that comparison, and a sincere believer will despise them, as one of mature age does the toys and baubles of children. To excite our fear, he removes the screen, and makes the everlasting fire of hell so visible, and represents the tormenting passions of the damned in those dreadful colors, which, if duly considered, would check and control the unbridled, licentious appetites of the most sensual wretches.

"His Call to the Unconverted, how small in bulk, but how powerful in virtue? Truth speaks in it with that authority and efficacy, that it makes the reader to lay his hand upon his heart,

and find he has a soul and a conscience, though he lived before as if he had none." Let no individual who values his salvation, no Christian who would grow in grace, fail to be familiar with the descriptions, counsels, and warnings of the "Saint's Rest." Let the "Reformed Pastor" lie upon every minister's table, or be written in his heart. Let the vehement and searching pages of this godly man be more and more circulated and read, and it will not be in vain. God *has* blessed them, and he will bless them again, to the welfare of immortal souls; and the glorified spirit of their author will shine with still increasing lustre in the heavenly firmament.

DALETH.

---

## REVIEWS.

SERMONS by *Timothy Dwight, D. D. LL. D., late President of Yale College.* In two volumes. New Haven: Howe, Durrie and Peck. 1828.

We congratulate the friends of sound practical theology upon the publication of these Sermons; and are glad of the opportunity which they afford us, at once to express our estimation of the character, talents, industry and public usefulness of the distinguished author, and to enrich our miscellany, with extracts from his eloquent and instructive pages. Dr. Dwight was a great and good man. In saying this, we utter no common place eulogy. We merely speak the general sentiment of those who knew him best—merely reiterate the deliberate and recorded judgement of distinguished theological and literary tribunals, on both sides of the Atlantic. We call that a great mind, which in its original constitution is well balanced, vigorous, discursive and penetrating; which is capable of excelling in any department of science or literature, to which it may be directed; and which exults in the exercise and developement of its noble powers.

We do not mean to say that all these qualities are essential to intellectual greatness; for a man may be an eminent astronomer, metaphysician, orator, poet, jurist, or statesman, without the power of excelling at once in every branch of severe induction, or polite literature. Much less do we intend to say, that Dr. Dwight had no superior in intellectual endowment; or that he was equally successful in every branch of study to which, at different periods, he applied himself. Undoubtedly, he was more of a philosopher, than a poet—was more nearly related to Locke, than to Milton. And he certainly triumphed more gloriously in his defence of revelation, than in his 'Conquest of Canaan.' But if extraordinary

facility in acquiring knowledge—if a memory remarkably retentive of philosophic relations, analogies and general principles—if the power of grasping and analyzing a great and difficult question—if a vast fund of useful information on a great variety of subjects—if severe and successful mental discipline—if untiring energy of investigation, and a passionate love of truth—if strong native good sense, a discursive fancy, and a rich imagination—if a noble and transparent frankness of character, which despises everything like trick and artifice—if a dignified mien, commanding elocution and unrivalled powers of conversation—if almost unexampled success as a teacher and a disciplinarian, during the space of nearly fifty years; and above all, if exalted moral principle—if a glowing Christian philanthropy—if sublime and worthy conceptions of the divine character and government—if a long life spent in doing good, upon a scale commensurate with opportunities, and with a personal influence which but few men ever enjoy:—if these, and such as these, are the prominent features and attributes of intellectual and moral greatness, then, we repeat it, was Dr. Dwight truly a great man. We knew him long, and knew him well. It was our privilege to sit for years under his luminous and impressive ministry. His power, too, in the recitation room, we shall never forget; and though we loved and revered him as a father, and consequently may be supposed to feel a bias in his favor, we confidently appeal to his writings, to the good which he accomplished, and to thousands of living witnesses, scattered all over the land, for the general correctness of the preceding outline.

Dr. Dwight's works, (besides the *Conquest of Canaan*, a poem intitled *Greenfield Hill*, and many occasional sermons and periodical essays,) are comprised in *eleven* thick and closely printed octavo volumes: viz. *A System of Theology*, in *five* volumes; *Travels in New England and New York*, in *four* volumes; and the *Sermons* just published, in *two* volumes. When, and how, all these were written, by a man at the head of a great literary institution, "discharging the duties of *four offices*,"\* during nearly the whole term of his presidency, and suffering all the while under extreme weakness of sight, will not easily be conceived, by those who were unacquainted with the vigor of his mind, the versatility of his talents, and the methodical arrangement of his time. If such words as *cannot*, *impossible*, *insuperable*, and the like, were contained in Dr. Dwight's vocabulary, he seems never to have used them. Day dreams and brown study, were among the few things, with which he was entirely unacquainted. He was refreshed rather than fatigued, by mental effort. Under such perfect discipline had he brought his powerful and elastic mind, that he found no difficulty in carrying on two trains of thought at the same time. He

\* See Memoir of his Life, p. 26.

could dictate to his amanuensis, while engaged in conversation with his friends ; and could, with equal apparent ease, when occasion required, indite two letters at once on different subjects, faster than his thoughts could ordinarily be committed to paper. Since he never permitted his intellectual machinery to run down and stop, as is the case with most men, no time, of course, was lost in winding it up. While ordinary writers were trying to begin, he would finish the first half sheet ; and before they had fairly commenced a subject, he would be ready for some new discussion. Having accustomed himself, moreover, from a very early period, to a methodical arrangement of his thoughts, on every topic, however trifling, and to express them in select, and even elegant language, his sermons and other writings needed very little correction, to prepare them for the public eye. What will not such a mind and such habits accomplish ? And how deeply is it to be lamented, that so few men improve their talents with equal diligence and advantage. The human mind is capable of much great and useful exertion ; and that it ordinarily brings so little to pass, even with the advantages of a liberal course of study, is owing incomparably more to irresolution and want of method, than to the limited nature of its faculties.

Though, as we have already hinted, the friends of Dr. Dwight should not rest his fame upon the 'Conquest of Canaan,' it is, we believe, the least esteemed by those, who know little or nothing of its merits. Many a sentence of condemnation has it received, without the privilege of being heard ; and by men, too, as much inferior to the author in poetic talent, as in good taste and critical acumen.

Our design permits us merely to glance at the Travels of Dr. Dwight in New England and New York, which received an early and flattering notice, from one of the most distinguished Journals in Great Britain. Some would probably say, that these Travels should have been condensed by the author into one volume, or at most into two ; and there is certainly a particularity of detail, which must be tiresome to the general reader. But this minuteness, so far from being an objection to the work, is in our judgement one of its most valuable characteristics. Nothing is worth so much as facts, especially in the early history of so interesting a country as ours. To us, who live in the same age with the writer, and have constantly before our eyes the very objects, customs, manners and institutions which he describes, many of his delineations must, of course, be superfluous. But these travels will go down to posterity, and be received as an extremely valuable legacy, while mere general descriptions of men and things, at this early period of our national existence, will be read with comparative indifference. What would not the literati, and indeed all the more intelligent people of England, France, or Germany now give for four such



volumes of early annals and facts, as Dr. Dwight has bequeathed to an equally remote posterity?

But his great work is the *System of Divinity*, which, as Professor of Theology, he delivered to the students of Yale college, and which was published soon after his death. It would be foreign from our present design to attempt an extended analysis of this elaborate system; but we cannot do justice to the character of its author, or to our own feelings and estimate of its value, without offering to our readers a hasty outline. Preliminary to this, however, we deem it proper to notice the two opposite errors which extensively prevail, in regard to systematic theology.

With a very respectable class of intelligent and thinking Christians in our country, there is nothing like reducing the doctrines of the Bible to a regular and connected system. And in their view, everything which disclaims allegiance to such a system must be loose, declamatory and unsafe, if not positively erroneous. "Give us," say they, "not a medley of disconnected truths, doctrines and precepts, leaving the mind always bewildered and unsatisfied; but let them be ranged under their proper heads, that we may see their bearings and relations, and how they strengthen and elucidate each other. We want a creed which has a beginning, a middle, and an end—drawn out in distinct propositions, to which we may, in an orderly manner, refer all the important truths of revelation."

That we have ourselves no objection to systems of divinity, will more fully appear in the sequel; but the danger is, that through the mighty influence of sectarian biasses, they will be placed on a level with the inspired volume, if not virtually made paramount to its authority. Imperfection is stamped on every human performance. When a man sits down to the great work of preparing a complete system of divinity, he is extremely liable to be swayed by feelings, motives, and prejudices, of which he is little aware. Early impressions secretly cling to him. The sect to which he belongs, perhaps, urges him to the undertaking. Opinions first imbibed, he knows not when nor why, but long cherished as sacred, are now to be defended and set in the strongest possible light. Under these circumstances, what, but immediate inspiration, could secure a professed systematizer from erring in a greater or less degree? And when, after long and wasting toil, the work is completed, how natural is it for the author to regard himself as fully committed to defend it; and to feel all the solicitude of a parent for its reputation and success. Henceforth, the Bible must of course give its sanction to his scheme, because he is sure that his scheme is true.

We do not say, that all systematical writers are in equal danger of erring in their expositions, arguments and conclusions; but that the wisest and ablest of them are exposed to err, when they

least suspect any danger. And if this is true of pious and learned divines, in the very act of laborious investigation, it cannot be supposed that common Christians are less liable to be warped by an overweening attachment to systematic theology. That which purports to be a *complete system*, especially if written by some favorite champion of their party, must needs embrace all the important truths of revelation, and why should they give themselves the trouble to inquire any further? That the Bible should teach any great truth, not found in their standard, or that it should give a different bearing to the same truths which are contained in both, seems in the highest degree improbable. To be exactly right, is, in their estimation, to embrace all the articles of their faith; and sound theology is synonymous, not so much with an intimate knowledge of the Scriptures, as of the definitions, reasoning and technical phraseology of an admired polemic. Accordingly, when any of his doctrines or positions are assailed, and they are driven to the Bible for weapons of defence, the appeal is often made to that infallible standard, not so much as a *test*, as to find arguments and texts to support the system. This is no ideal representation. It is what takes place, more or less, every day and hour. Surely, it were infinitely better, never to have seen a system of divinity, than thus to receive even the highest human authority, as the ultimate rule of faith or practice.

But many, in their zeal against such writers as Calvin, and Edwards, and Bellamy, and Hopkins, and Dwight, go very far into the opposite extreme. Nothing in their view is so mischievous and alarming, as creeds, confessions, and systems of theology. The Bible, the Bible, they reiterate, is the only safe and allowable creed—not indeed as we have it, “in our own tongue wherein we were born;” but as corrected and improved by the help of new translations and expurgatory criticism. Such a version you may read; but you must not presume to decide positively, in regard to any doctrine which it seems to teach. And much less must you state any of its doctrines in the form of a system, or creed, however concise, or however manifestly coincident with the divine record. The moment you venture on this ground, numbers are horror struck at your temerity, and you must expect to be denounced as a presumptuous meddler with things too sacred for human touch. To tell *what* you believe, and *why* you believe, and above all, either to put your creed upon paper in your own language, or to give even a qualified assent to what any man has compiled in the form of a general system, is to renounce the authority of Christ, of the evangelists and apostles, and to set up human fallibility in its place.

All this, and much more to the same effect, is sounded through the land, and chiefly by the very men, too, who with all their reverence for the exact words of Scripture, are employing their utmost ingenuity to translate its life and soul away, leaving a mere “dead

letter," to teach 'no doctrines in particular;' to threaten nothing in earnest; and to require no obedience which the unsanctified heart cannot render, no meetness for heaven which it does not already possess.

Now the truth undoubtedly lies between the two extremes which we have mentioned; but much nearer to the first than the last. Systems of divinity are not entitled to all the reverence with which they are sometimes regarded by religious partizans; and far less are they such terrible and impious usurpers of the rights of conscience, as they have often been represented. Like other systems, they are highly convenient and beneficial, when ably drawn up, and when referred to, not as original authorities, but as helps to the students. The legitimate use of our standard theological writers is no more to supersede the study of the Bible, than the same use of a system of chemistry, or botany, or astronomy, or intellectual philosophy, is to excuse the student from investigating the laws and phenomena either of matter or mind. In religion, our ultimate appeal is to the *word* of God, just as in physical science it is to his *works*. To say nothing of the infinite *hazard* of relying implicitly upon the expositions of men, it is just as *unphilosophical*, as it would be to close the book of nature, and take it for granted that the system, or text book before us, contains all that is known, or ever can be found out, by the most diligent investigation. The man who attempts to reduce every revealed truth to what he conceives to be its appropriate place in his system, will be likely to meet with the same difficulties, as if he were to attempt a perfectly scientific classification of all the objects in nature. He can only approximate towards perfection in either case; and in both, this is found to be sufficient for all practical purposes.

But on the other hand, nothing can be more unreasonable than the indiscriminate censure which has been lavished upon creeds and systems. They are adapted to aid the biblical student, by bringing kindred doctrines together, and giving him a connected view of their harmonious relations, just as the student of nature is assisted by the classifications of Linneus, and other distinguished philosophical writers. If the former is liable to place too much reliance upon his favorite system, so is the latter. The mind may, in either case, be fettered, or misled, by fallible authority; but it is now quite too late to sustain the sentence of condemnation against a good thing, on the ground that it is liable to be abused. What book, we ask, has ever been subjected to more unwarrantable liberties than the Bible itself—by the mortal enemies too, of all theological systems—but their own? And yet, the value of the Bible is not at all depreciated, by its having been so often misused.

If the views which we have expressed in regard to the utility of able and judicious summaries of Christian doctrine, and of the injury which may result from the publication of crude and errone-

ous systems, be correct, then the work of preparing a system of theology is one of extreme responsibility, and requires a rare assemblage of high qualifications. Among these we may mention, a comprehensive, vigorous and perspicacious mind—an intimate knowledge of the Scriptures, and of the true principles of interpretation—deep and ardent piety, connected with the highest reverence for Divine authority, and a childlike docility, in “sitting at the feet of Jesus”—an extensive acquaintance with the opinions of the most distinguished commentators and theological writers, both ancient and modern—the constant exercise of genuine Christian liberality towards opposite religious sentiments—a holy indifference, alike to human censure and human applause—persevering, humble and fervent prayer to God for the illumination of his Spirit; and a settled determination to follow wherever the inspired penmen lead.

Such, in our judgement, are the requisite qualifications, for the great and difficult work, of preparing a system of divinity; and few men, we believe, have been more richly and variously endowed than was Dr. Dwight. His inquisitive and independent mind would never consent to wear the shackles of sectarian vassalage. The Bible, with him, was the only legitimate authority, and to this he always bowed with solemn reverence. He respected and loved good men, who differed from him in some of their religious opinions, as much, for aught that appeared, as if they had embraced every article of his particular creed; and this he thought perfectly consistent with “contending earnestly for the faith, once delivered to the saints.” Without discarding the “mint, annis and cummin,” as of no importance, Dr. Dwight looked chiefly at the “weightier matters of the law.” No favorite doctrine ever occupied the whole field of his vision, to the exclusion of others equally important; but he loved to contemplate them all together, in their extended bearings and harmonious proportions. He was not a man to examine one side of a question merely, nor to confine himself to one corner of the great field of Christian knowledge, nor to dogmatize where the best of men have differed, nor to plunge into depths which cannot be sounded, nor to affirm that there is no bottom because he could not reach it.

On the contrary, considering how sanguine he was in his natural temperament, and how much better entitled than most other men to speak *ex Cathedra*, the cautious and qualified terms in which he was wont to express his opinions, always struck us as one of the most remarkable traits of his character. Those who enjoyed the high privilege of being his pupils will never forget how often he cautioned them against an implicit reliance upon the strength of his arguments, or the correctness of his conclusions. He always left room for any one to differ from him, without the least fear of being counted either weak or incorrigible. “This, young gentleman, is *my* opinion,” was his usual closing remark; “but I wish you to

examine and think for yourselves." This trait, which characterized all his decisions in the recitation-room, is conspicuous in the most polemic of his systematical discourses. Reasons and deductions greatly abound; but for bold and unsupported theories and assertions, the reader will search in vain. While he was always in earnest, and honestly believed everything that he taught, he never lost sight of his own liability to err, nor expected that all intelligent Christians would think exactly as he did. In the warfare to which his sacred profession sometimes called him, he scorned to take any advantage of an adversary; and he discomfited the enemies of revelation, not by decoys, or ambuscades, but by the death-dealing visitation of a battery which needed no masking, because it was always more than sufficient to ensure the victory. The triumph which he gained, immediately after his accession to the presidency of Yale College, will long be remembered, not by the vanquished only, but by all who witnessed the unequal combat. It was then, that certain warm admirers of Hume and Voltaire, waxing bold by long sufferance, unwittingly encountered him. It was enough—for it was a total rout, and they met him not again.

In reading the works of some learned apologists for the Bible, the sincere Christian is disappointed and grieved to find, that while they mightily repel every attack upon the outworks, they have no common sympathies with the "sacramental host of God's elect" within the fortress. They manfully defend the towers of Zion, not that the holy seed may come and dwell safely within the walls, but that the walls themselves may stand, the empty monuments of their own prowess. They effectually guard the holy sepulchre against the approach of the scoffing infidel, but when the Christian draws near, he finds it empty—for "they have taken away his Lord, and he knows not where they have laid him." In a word, it is but too obvious, that some of the ablest advocates of the divine origin of the Scriptures have been strangers to their life-giving power; and it is hard to tell, whether the church has more reason to be thankful for their aid, than to mourn over their avowed hostility to the distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel.

But a very different champion did she find in Dr. Dwight, who was always ready, at a moment's warning, to step forth in her defence while he lived, and who at his death, bequeathed her his well furnished armor, and the trophies of his many victories. His system of divinity is more full and complete than any other with which we are acquainted. It begins with the being and perfections of God, and ends with the happiness and glory of heaven, after the general judgement. In the filling up of this great plan, Dr. Dwight arraigns the dark spirit of infidelity at the bar of reason and common sense; and leaves us in doubt, after trial, whether most to marvel at the puerility of the culprit's objections, or at the malignity of his efforts to subvert the foundations of

social order and of man's immortal hopes. As the author advances, he descants, with great clearness and ability, upon the unchangeable purposes, the incontrollable sovereignty, the wonderful works, and the all-wise providence of God—upon the existence, rank, attributes and employments of angels—the primitive and lapsed condition of man—his fall, and the way of his recovery through the atonement, righteousness and mediation of Christ—the gift of the Holy Spirit, and his divine work in convincing men of sin, renewing their hearts, and preparing them for heaven. He then places in a strong and convincing light, the nature and necessity of faith, repentance, justification and new obedience. As he advances, he gives a lucid and searching exposition of the ten commandments; insists with great earnestness on the importance of the means of grace; speaks with no common ability of the constitution, officers and special ordinances of the Christian church; anxiously follows both the righteous and the wicked to their dying beds, to the judgement bar, and thence to their eternal reward:—shuddering as he looks down into the bottomless abyss, and exulting as he looks upward to the “throne of God and the Lamb.”

How vast and solemn the range of such a system! How momentous all the leading subjects of discussion! Jehovah in his infinite majesty and dominion! Good and bad angels; man in his innocence and his shame; Jesus in his agony and his triumph; Sinai, Calvary, the last trump, a burning world, the great white throne, the descending Judge, the final sentence, hell with its undying horrors, and heaven with its eternal glories! This is a mere glance at Dr. Dwight's system; and no one, we are sure, can give it an attentive and candid perusal, without being struck with the extent and variety of his theological attainments, the originality and freshness of his conceptions, the force of his reasoning, and the benevolence of his heart.

It is hardly necessary to add, that in his religious views, Dr. Dwight was a Calvinist. By this we do not mean to say, that he adopted all the opinions of the great and much abused Genevan reformer;—for he certainly did not. But whoever will look into their respective systems, will find a substantial agreement on all the important points, which distinguish them from the school of Arminius. Dr. Dwight, however, called no man master. He went up to the fountain head, and drew water directly “from the wells of salvation.” All the doctrines which he ever taught, he found, or believed he found, in the Bible; and he taught them because he found them there, not because Calvin, or any other man had previously embraced them.

Voluminous as his system is, it bears evident marks, in some of its divisions, of laborious condensation. Many of the discourses chiefly consist, aside from the application, of concise and weighty propositions, each of which might have been drawn out into a long

paragraph : and though never obscure, we think parts of the system would have been more interesting, had the pruning knife been less freely employed. But though an occasional complaint of needlessly dry discussion may perhaps be sustained by an appeal to some of these discourses, there is one redeeming quality in them all, which will be dwelt upon with satisfaction by every serious mind. We allude to the practical application. It seems never to have occurred to the pious author, that because he was writing a system of didactic theology, his work was done as soon as he had established a principle, or proved a doctrine. So far from it, he evidently valued principles and doctrines, chiefly on account of their practical bearing upon the consciences of men, and the great duties of human life. Accordingly, at the close of every sermon, he deduced from the subject matter in hand those solemn truths and awakening motives, which he thought it was intended by the Holy Spirit to suggest. In this way, the attention of the thoughtless youth was often suddenly arrested, and conviction was fastened upon his mind, before he had time to harden his heart against it. Nor could the perverse caviller always escape. Led onward from step to step, by the dignified elocution and powerful reasoning of the preacher, he was surprised at length into conclusions which he would gladly have avoided, but from which he found it too late to break away. If there is a God, he is to be worshipped ; if he made us, he has a right to do what he will with his own ; if we are wholly depraved, we must be born again ; if Christ, a divine and Almighty Saviour, came down from heaven to die for us, then must the demerit of sin be dreadful indeed. Such are the inferences which abound in the system of which we are speaking, and which constitute an exceedingly valuable part of it. And it is no common praise to say, that the attentive Christian reader, as he passes on from theme to theme, will be reminded, at almost every step, of Paul's epistles to the churches, which commence with the discussion of great doctrinal principles, and end with the most earnest practical applications.

Our limits prohibit our offering the remarks which have occurred upon the several grand divisions of Dr. Dwight's system ; but we cannot take our final leave of it, without adverting to two of them. The first is that in which he treats of the divine and mediatorial character of Christ. Here the reader will find a degree of amplification which no other subject perhaps would justify. The discussion is continued through no less than *thirty* discourses ; and is spread over more than *four hundred and fifty* pages. To those who "make light of Christ," this part of the work cannot fail of being exceedingly tiresome. "What," they will be ready to ask, "is thy beloved more than another beloved?" For, alas! to them, "He has no form nor comeliness—no beauty, that they should desire him." But those who remember that he hath "a

name given him which is above every name," and whose hearts prompt them to sing, "Whom have we in heaven but thee, and there is none upon earth that we desire beside thee," will read these discourses with very different emotions: for how can they ever be weary of such a theme? They will bear it in mind, too, that the divinity and atonement of Christ lie at the foundation of that glorious superstructure, whose "head-stone shall be brought forth with shoutings, Grace, grace unto it." And when they recollect what mighty efforts are making to undermine this foundation, they will bless God for such large and impregnable munitions—for *impregnable* we are confident they will prove, whatever force may assail them. The main arguments for the supreme divinity of the Saviour are here set in a strong and convincing point of view, the most plausible objections are repelled, and we believe that very few professed theologians have thought and read so much on this great subject, that they can gain no additional light from these lucid pages.

On the nature, variety and efficacy of the means of grace, Dr. Dwight expatiates at great length, and with all his accustomed opulence of thought, reverence for the authority of Scripture, force of argument, and felicity of arrangement. Here we glance hastily at a single topic, because a sense of justice to so distinguished a champion of strictly evangelical principles does not permit us to pass it over in silence. It has often been said, and is still thought, we believe, by some who know little of Dr. Dwight, that he laid too much stress upon the efficacy of means, such as prayer and reading the Scriptures; or rather, that he was not sufficiently explicit and earnest, in urging upon sinners the duty of immediate repentance. He certainly *did* lay a mighty stress upon means, and for the best of all reasons, that the Bible does the same. He exhorted sinners, as well as saints, to pray, to read, to hear; and he never held out any encouragement to those who were living in the neglect of these duties: but, on the other hand, he encouraged no man "to lay the flattering unction to his soul," that praying and reading, however long continued, would save him; or that he could offer any acceptable sacrifice to God, while he withheld his heart from him. With the same breath that Dr. Dwight exhorted sinners to pray, he solemnly called on them to repent. The purport of all his teaching on this point, was, "If you finally turn your backs upon the divinely appointed means of grace, you will be lost; and if you continue to use them ever so long, with an unholy heart, still you will be lost. Prayer, religious meditation, reading the Scriptures, and sincere repentance, are duties equally and immediately binding upon all men." That these were his settled views no one, we think, can entertain a doubt, after reading the following extracts from his *hundred and thirty-seventh sermon*.



"It will here be said that Moses, in requiring this conduct of the sinful Israelites, (to circumcise their children, to offer sacrifices, &c.) neither commanded nor authorized them to continue sinners in performing it. This is unquestionably true. So far from allowing them to continue in sin, he required them to perform these various duties from supreme love to God. Equally true is this of the Christian Minister, in directing sinners to use the means of grace, or to perform any of the other duties of life. Instead of directing or allowing them to remain impenitent, he directs them to perform every duty with a virtuous disposition."

Again :

"God, as it appears to me, deals with mankind, and, if he deals with them at all according to the System of Providence which he has established, must deal with them, as rational beings. As they are all originally sinners; every thing addressed to them, either by God or man, must be addressed to sinners. He has commanded and exhorted sinners in his own person; and has required men also to teach, and exhort them in his name. In these commands and exhortations, two things are included: *the Act to be done*, and *the Disposition with which it is to be done*. The command or counsel sometimes includes both expressly; and sometimes but one. Such commands and counsels, as direct to the performance of *the act*, direct to *that act*, which, in the case stated, is proper to be done; and imply the disposition with which it should be done. Such, as direct *the disposition*, require that, and that only, which is virtuous. Those, which require the act, regulate both the heart, and the external conduct. Those, which require the disposition, regulate merely the affections of the heart.

"Commands of both these kinds, God has evidently given to men as rational beings merely; and often without discriminating at all their moral character. They are given to all men. The duties which these commands enjoin are numberless. They occur every day, and are as obligatory on the sinner as on the Christian. They bind with their whole force every man by whom they are known. Among these, are prayer, attending public worship, reading the Scriptures, and industry in our lawful business. God requires every man to perform these various duties of life as they occur. He does not leave him at liberty to defer the performance, until he has discovered whether he is the subject of Evangelical repentance. He requires the performance at the time: and if the individual refuse, God will not hold him guiltless. But, it will be asked, *Is not every action to be performed from supreme love to God?* An answer to this question has already been given. This disposition is implied in every action which God requires us to perform; and God will accept of no performance which does not flow from this source. To such a performance only, is an impenitent sinner directed, when he is directed to pray, to read the Scriptures, to worship God in the sanctuary, or to use any of the means of grace."

Other similar quotations we might add; but let these suffice. If Dr. Dwight thought it his duty, in combating the opposite opinion, (viz. that sinners should be exhorted to nothing but repentance,)—if, having this error chiefly in his eye, he felt himself bound, to lay more stress upon means, than we ourselves should ordinarily do, or than he would have done under different circumstances, he certainly never meant to substitute prayer, or reading the Bible, or anything else, for the duty of immediate submission to God.

(To be continued.)

A GRAMMAR OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE. *By Moses Stuart, Associate Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Institution at Andover.* Third Edition. Andover: Flagg and Gould. Codman Press. 1828. pp. 240.

A HEBREW CHRESTOMATHY, *designed as the first volume of a course of Hebrew study.* *By Moses Stuart, Associate Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Institution at Andover.* Andover: Flagg and Gould. 1829. pp. 244.

The Codman press at Andover has already become celebrated both in America and Europe; and should Professor Stuart, with his learned coadjutors, be spared to continue their labors, it will ere long go far to rival the most ancient and splendid of the typographical establishments of the other continent. The labors of Professor Stuart, already accomplished, entitle him to the gratitude of the American public, to a degree of which they are but just beginning to be sensible. We recollect no individual who has exerted so powerful an influence in any single department of learning, as this gentleman has, in advancing among us the science of Biblical interpretation and Hebrew Philology. Profound Biblical literature in this country may almost be said to have commenced with him; and the publication of the Hebrew Chrestomathy, with a third and much improved edition of his Grammar, will, we doubt not, cause an advancement in this branch of learning, unexampled for its rapidity and extent.

Before we proceed to a particular examination of the excellencies and defects in these works, we shall lay before our readers a sketch of the progress of sacred literature, under the auspices of Professor Stuart, at the Andover Institution. Mr. Stuart entered on the duties of his professorship in 1810. In about two years, notwithstanding his many cares—always heterogeneous and perplexing in a youthful seminary, but peculiarly great at that period—he had prepared in manuscript a Hebrew Grammar without the points, for the immediate use of his own pupils. For some time, those who possessed the energy to avail themselves of its assistance, were compelled to copy it from the author's written sheets. More than twenty copies, we believe, were taken—some by a young lady, who displayed a zeal in the pursuit of Hebrew, which would do honor to a grave professor, and who assisted the author in revising the proof-sheets when it was printed. In 1813 he published it, wholly at his own expense. No aid, we believe, was solicited: and if it had been, so little were other minds aroused to the importance of the object, that it could not, perhaps, have been obtained. At this period, our author coincided in opinion with those who advocate the study of the Hebrew without the vowel points; but the

progress of his studies soon led him to the conclusion that the vowel system is an important and almost indispensable assistance in obtaining a radical knowledge of the Hebrew language. After the publication of this grammar, he continued his researches, calling in the aid of those 'natural philologists' and biblical annotators, the Germans. In the pursuit of his German investigations, Professor Stuart was compelled to encounter not a little jealousy and suspicion on the part of many, who doubted what might be the result of his excursions to the country of heretical opinions. He, however, was not to be daunted or discouraged in the prosecution of studies, through which he labored steadily for the attainment of truth; nor was he, with such an object before him, to be driven from his advanced post of observation, by opposition even of a much fiercer nature than any he was obliged in reality to encounter. He persevered in his researches, until the publication of his letters to Dr. Channing, in 1819, a work to which no answer has yet been attempted save in the form of a hasty periodical review, completely put to flight the phantoms which had haunted the imaginations of his friends.

With the publication of the enormous volume of Gesenius, containing more than nine hundred pages, in 1817, commenced an important epoch in the science of Hebrew Grammar. With this noble assistance before him, Professor Stuart returned, with new ardor, to the task of preparing a work for the use of his own pupils, and of the students in this country; and, in 1821, published the first edition of his larger grammar. He took the general plan of Gesenius for his model, embodying the results of his own experience with the improvements of that distinguished writer. In his preface, the author says,

"He has spared no pains to render the work as complete as was in his power. He owes it to himself, however, to say, that, as he could not remit the usual duties of his office, and has had to struggle with imperfect health, he has not been able to make it so complete, in all respects, as he hopes to do at some future day, should Providence permit. He flatters himself still, that nothing very important will be found wanting, as the substance of Gesenius' great work is incorporated in it."

In connexion with this edition of the grammar, he published, with notes, a translation of the admirable dissertations of Jahn, and others, on the best method of studying the oriental languages.

In 1823, a new edition of the grammar being called for, its author applied himself with much assiduity and labor to its improvement. He says, in his preface,

"Every important part of the grammar has undergone an investigation *de novo*, independent of any preceding grammar; and the present edition contains results in some important respects, and in a multitude of minor ones, which are drawn from no other source than the author's own experience and investigation."

This revision, with the author's changes and improvements, cost him much more time and labor than were expended on the

original composition. In 1824, Mr. Gibbs published his translation of the *Manual Lexicon of Gesenius*, adapted to the grammar of Professor Stuart; a task which was undertaken at his suggestion. In 1828, our author prepared a third edition of his grammar, compressed within much narrower limits than either of the former.

"In order to execute this," says his preface, "nearly the whole of it has been written entirely over, and some of it three, four, and a small part even seven or eight times over. It would be of no use to state the reasons for such a labor, any farther than to say that want of due arrangement, or of explicitness, or of completeness in representation, whenever I discovered it, was deemed a sufficient reason for repeating my labor, until I became better satisfied. But, after all, I have not accomplished all I could desire. The ideal of a more complete grammar seems to be before my mind; but years of labor would be necessary to accomplish a plan such as I have mentally sketched out."

To the imperfections of the grammar, as it now stands, Professor Stuart appears more sensible than we think the public will be. We only wish him leisure and health to give substantial reality to that ideal of excellence which is still before his mind.

Simultaneously with the grammar, an abridgement of the *Hebrew Lexicon* was published by Professor Gibbs. This was followed, in the first month of the present year, by the publication of the *Hebrew Chrestomathy*.

Most of the volumes here noticed, have been issued from the Codman press. This name is given to the press, which in reality belongs to the printers, on account of a donation by Rev. Dr. Codman, of Dorchester, in May, 1821, of one thousand dollars, for the purpose of procuring a Hebrew font, or full set of new and elegant Hebrew types. Since that period, the Institution has procured fonts of the cognate dialects; and an importation has been lately received of the Coptic, Armenian, Rabbinic, Ethiopic, and Samaritan, which, with the former stock, make fonts of type for eleven oriental languages and dialects.

The term *Chrestomathy* is a new one in the English language, but one well adapted to express the signification for which Professor Stuart has used it. It is derived from the Greek, *χρηστική μὲθῃ*, simple or easy instruction. We believe the first *Chrestomathy* of any language, on the general plan which our author has adopted, was published, in 1784, at Leipsic, for the aid of students in Arabic, by William Frederic Hetzel, der Weltweisheits Doctor, and Professor in the University at Halle. Most languages now have their *Chrestomathies*; and it seems to us surprising, considering their great and obvious utility, that the Hebrew should have remained so long destitute of what will henceforward be deemed indispensable to its easy acquisition. Professor Stuart calls his *Chrestomathy* an experiment; "not claiming to have accomplished all which may be desirable, but aiming at least to break the way in which others may follow,

and do for the Hebrew that which has in some cases been so admirably accomplished for other ancient, and for the modern languages." This description agrees better with the unassuming character of the author, than with the real, intrinsic merits of the work.—The following statements and remarks in the preface, deserve to be particularly considered by the public :

"The expense of publishing books of criticism on the Hebrew language," says the Professor in the course of it, "is a thing that is yet but very imperfectly understood in our country. That the public may be enabled to make some proper estimate of it, and so to judge, on good grounds, whether the price of books like the present is put too high, it is proper to state, that the labor of correcting a printed sheet of Hebrew with the accents, is at least *twenty-five times as much* as that of correcting English, printed with a type of the like size ; and that the labor of the printer, in setting up and correcting such a sheet, is at least *six times as much* as that of executing a sheet in English. Then the labor of the original writing or composition, when so many Hebrew words are to be written as occur in the notes to this volume, is at least *four times as much* as that of composing a like quantity in mere English. Besides all this, no sheet is contained in the present volume, which has not, in the printing, gone through at least *five several corrections, or revisals*, besides the corrections of the printers. Let those who know how to estimate the severity of such labor judge, in view of these facts, whether the present book, and others of a similar character, can reasonably be asked for at a lower price than that at which they are actually sold."

The volume before us consists of extracts from the Hebrew Scriptures, with notes appended, to obviate the grammatical and exegetical difficulties, which lie so thick in the path of the learner. The selections of the author are well calculated, by their simplicity of construction, beauty of style and sentiment, and deep interest of subject, to beguile the tedium of the learner, while they lead him insensibly to a knowledge of the language. But the nature and purpose of the work will be best made known by another extract from the preface.

"My plan has been to take that which might serve to aid and instruct the beginner ; which is easy and yet inviting ; and in following this plan, I have of course omitted most of the awfully sublime parts of the Old Testament, nearly all of which are replete with exegetical and grammatical difficulties. I have extended the selection so far as may serve the purposes of an introduction to the regular exegetical study of the Hebrew. My views of the importance of accurate grammatical analysis, are sufficiently explained in the notes appended to this volume. In estimating the present work, I must beg the reader to remember, that my principal design is to aid the student in the grammatical study of the Hebrew. All else besides this is added for the sake of smoothing the way, and making it more attractive. No student of any understanding can long content himself with the mere study of words, forms, and syntactical constructions ; he must understand, in some good degree, the meaning of what he reads, in order to take any pleasure in it. Recognizing this principle of our nature, I have all along, from the very outset, added such brief exegetical remarks as may assist the beginner, and make his progress more agreeable to him. As the notes advance, they become, as is proper, more exegetical and less grammatical."

The notes in this volume are generally excellent. They are plain, yet profound ; and learned, without the parade of learning. The author tells us his opinion with a simplicity and conciseness truly refreshing to the mind which is burthened with the tedious

accumulations of Rosenmueller, and wearied, near to fainting, with the omnifarious speculations of some of the German annotators. It is a truth, on which he might have enlarged with much feeling, that "some of the investigations made at the close of various pieces in this selection have cost time and effort, which critical students, and probably such only, will know well how to estimate." He has sometimes given us, in a single paragraph, the fruit of hours, and perhaps days of wearisome study. "Many talk of the truth," says the venerable Hooker, "who never sounded the depths from whence it springeth." The most important principles in all science, when once discovered and unfolded, are the simplest in their mien; but they lie the deepest in the fountains of knowledge. In Biblical science, the plain truth is often so deeply concealed, under the glosses of schoolmen, the vagaries of infidel commentators, and the expositions of unwise but headstrong defenders of the faith, that it requires an iron diligence to clear a path through the accumulated rubbish.

The prevailing deficiency in these notes is, that, through a fear of tiring, by diffuseness, our author has incurred "the imputation of having written too briefly." The grammatical explanations seem to us too scanty in the annotations on the Psalms. In general, the notes may be sufficiently copious for theological students at the commencement of their course; but our author should have remembered, that his book will be read not merely by beginners; and that a greater freedom of annotation, while it would not have injured the work, as to its main purpose, nor diminished its interest to the minds of his own pupils, would have made it more interesting and useful to clergymen and practised theologians. We hope that in the future volumes, which he has encouraged us in his preface to expect, he will bear this in mind; and, while he is preparing materials for the instruction of those who enjoy his personal teachings, and those who are elsewhere commencing, under similar advantages, their studies preparatory to the ministry, he will have an eye also on the wants of those who have already entered the field of labor.

Our limits forbid us to go into so particular an examination of his exegetical remarks as we could wish. He has briefly refuted most of the objections urged by sceptics against the Mosaic account of the creation. The notes upon the six days of creation, upon the deluge, and upon the position of the garden of Eden, may also be mentioned as peculiarly excellent. On page 83, may be found a curious and interesting explanation of the Turkish phrase, 'Sublime Porte,' in much better accordance with oriental customs than the explanations commonly given. Professor Stuart is of opinion that the diversity of languages ought not to be traced back to their confusion at Babel. We

cannot yet see why the hypothesis, which traces that diversity to this event, is not perfectly satisfactory. The fact that it is the only one which agrees properly with the narration of the Scriptures, taken in its literal and plain meaning, is a circumstance which should go far, according to our author's principles of interpretation, to make us receive it as the truth.

Our author's comment on the history of Eve's temptation and fall, does not afford us the same pleasure which we have received from the perusal of most of his notes. He supposes the whole account of the Serpent and its conversation with Eve to be merely figurative of the suggestions of Satan, addressed, not to her senses from any visible shape, but presented by the invisible and spiritual tempter to her imagination. The conversation, therefore, was carried on solely in her own thoughts. The serpent, being the known emblem of sagacity in the east, was for that reason selected as an emblem of the insinuating artifices of the evil spirit. When asked, how this explanation can be consistent with the address of Jehovah to the serpent, and with the curses pronounced upon it in the presence of our first parents, he answers, that this is only a necessary method of keeping up the figurative style to the end of the story! We have neither time nor room to present all our objections to such an interpretation of this interesting and simple narration. We would only ask if the learned Professor has not, in this instance, departed from his own established principles of interpretation. An important one is, always to receive the literal explanation of a passage, unless there be something in the passage itself, in the context, or in the nature of the case, to make that interpretation evidently wrong. Professor Stuart would agree with us, that this part of Genesis is to be accounted, not poetry or fiction, but historical prose. But the figurative dress, which he makes it assume, is such as is never used, except in the enthusiasm of poetry, and that too, in its highest and boldest flights. Herder, himself a poet, and a distinguished critic on ancient oriental poetry, in his letters on the study of theology, rejects, with singular energy and beauty of composition, the metaphorical explanation of the passage. "I read it," he says, "and read it again; no tone of song strikes upon my ear; no more than in the whole history of the Israelites, or of their fathers. Yet in the songs of Lamech, in the songs of Moses, of David, of the prophets,—the discourse at once rises with such marked, such evident distinction, that no one, who has the least feeling for song or poetry, can mistake its thrilling, its elevated tones. Who hears these tones in the beginning of the Bible? Where does the song begin, where does it end? Where does the fable begin, where does it end? Is it not all poetry, all fictitious allegory,—paradise, the tree, the serpent, sin, Adam, Eve?"

When Professor Stuart can show us another passage of historical narration, which bears indisputably the dress of poetry in its

wildest garb, then perhaps we can agree in his acceptance of the chapter before us. At present, the laws of exegesis, which he has done so much to explain and defend, are an insuperable bar to that interpretation.

The only consideration, so far as we can judge, which has prevented Professor Stuart from adopting the literal interpretation of the passage before us, is, that it attributes to Satan a miraculous power. We see, however, no greater miracle here, than we find in the account of a legion of demons entering into a herd of swine, and compelling them to rush down violently into the sea and perish in the waters; and we believe our author prefers the literal interpretation of that history, to the labored, farfetched explanation of Farmer. Who can believe that it requires a greater degree of power, for Satan to enter into the body of a Serpent and exercise an influence upon it, than for a legion of his emissaries to enter into and "possess" a whole herd of swine?

If any person chooses to follow the explanation which Doederlein has given of the chapter in question, we are not very eager to disprove it, though for ourselves we should still prefer the one which is more strictly literal; but that which denies altogether the actual physical form or presence of a serpent puts every rule of interpretation at defiance, and cannot therefore be adopted. "*Salva fide et Salva ecclesia.*" Doederlein supposes that a real serpent ascended the tree, and ate of the forbidden fruit in the presence of Eve, and then, with inviting gestures, et *sibilo ore*, allured her, at length, to follow his example.

We question much whether it does not involve as great a miracle—at least, as great a difficulty—to suppose that Satan operated by suggestion on the mind of Eve, imperceptibly, artfully, and unsuspected by her, and yet without impairing her free agency, or diminishing her accountability in the slightest degree, as to suppose that he entered into the body of a serpent, and tempted her under this physical shape. The perplexity arising from the supposition of a miracle is not, by either method, completely avoided. The permission of the Supreme Being is in both cases equally necessary.

In the following note on the occurrence in the wilderness, when the Lord brought water from the rock for the murmuring children of Israel, our author supposes that the sin of Moses cannot be ascertained.

A very true and important sentiment; but a more apposite text

"From Psalm cvi. 33, and Deuteronomy, xxxii. 49, 52, it appears that Moses sinned on this occasion; but the nature of his offence is not particularly specified in either passage. In the Psalm it is said that 'he spake unadvisedly with his lips'; in Deut. that he did not 'sanctify the Lord in the midst of the children of Israel': but by Numbers, xx. 12, it appears that Moses and Aaron themselves indulged in a spirit of unbelief on this occasion. It was for this they were excluded from the promised land. Well may we conclude that an unbelieving spirit is offensive to God!"



might be found for its illustration, than that from which it is here deduced. To us it is evident, that the guilt of Moses and Aaron, on this remarkable occasion, consisted in exhibiting a spirit of angry pride and self-sufficiency—in appropriating to themselves the authority and the power which they ought reverently and humbly to have attributed to Jehovah. Instead of saying ‘Shall the Lord fetch you water,’ &c., the angry exclamation of Moses was, “Hear now ye rebels; must we fetch you water out of this rock?” He was, moreover, commanded by Jehovah only to “*speak unto the rock* ;” instead of which, after thus angrily addressing his brethren the Israelites, he seems to have proceeded, in his impatient indignation, to SMITE the rock twice,—and that without any visible reference to the Supreme Being. Thus expounded, the passage affords, like the history of Herod who was smitten by the angel, a monitory lesson of the heinousness of our guilt, when we ascribe to ourselves, and not unto the Lord, the glory due to his holy name; when we applaud ourselves for the talents, or the success, or the authority, which are but a brief loan to us from the Almighty, to be employed in his service and according to his will.

Of the execution of this volume we can hardly speak in too high terms. The Hebrew print is clear and definite, and almost entirely accurate, presenting a rich and beautiful page. We have discovered a few errors and omissions, to which we refer in the accompanying note, that they may not mislead the student, and that they may be corrected in another edition.\*

On page 185, we have the following amusing definition of a valley; “A *Wady*, as the Arabians call a ravine, WITH BANKS MORE OR LESS STEEP, AND EITHER NARROW, OR OF SOME CONSIDERABLE

\* Page 83, in the 19th line from the top, Hiphil is written when it should be Piel. Page 84 and 23d line from the top, Hiphil is inserted where it should be Hitpacl. Page 94, 5th line from the bottom, רָבִי signifying *to be high*, is incorrectly stated as derived

from, רָמָה which signifies *to shoot*; in the Piel conjugation *to deceive*. The word in reality comes from the verb רוּם. In the text, Page 44, No. 33, verse 7, we find the word

וְשִׁנְנֶתֶם. In the note on this word, page 134, it is written וְשִׁנְנֶתֶם in the

first case, with Qamets, it is the second person singular of the verb, with the suffix pronoun for the third person plural masculine, and signifies *and thou shalt inculcate them*. In the last case, with Seghol, it is the regular form of the verb in the second person plural, and signifies, *and ye shall inculcate*. It is correct in the text. This is an example of the manner in which a change in a single Masoretic point, will alter the form of a word, and sometimes the meaning of a whole sentence. In the last line but one, Page 133, the word מֵאֵד all the vowels of which are immutable, is placed under the sixth Declension;

contrary to the principle of classification in the grammar, which assigns all nouns, that have all their vowels immutable, to the first declension. הָאָרֶן verse 14, Page 16,

presents a difficult anomaly, being in the construct state, and yet having Qamets under Aleph, contrary to the regular form with a composite Sheva, which occurs several times on the same page. This anomaly should have been mentioned in the notes, and a satisfactory solution, if any exists, presented to the student.

In the notes on the history of Samson, whenever the name of that hero occurs, it is invariably written with a p, *Sampson*. This could hardly be an error of the printers, and we are at a loss to conceive how the superfluous letter should always have crept in, where it evidently has no business.

WIDTH." For its singular definiteness, this deserves to be placed alongside of Dr. Johnson's celebrated definition of *network*; "Anything reticulated or decussated at equal distances, with interstices between the intersections."

We have noticed, in Professor Stuart's English style, a recurrence of new words, both technical and common, so that he has often transgressed the grand principle—never to coin an epithet, when there is one already existing to express with energy the precise idea in the mind. In the *Chrestomathy* we observe the word *linguistic*, an awkward substitution for the usual term *philological*; and *Epexegetis*, to signify one text, or one part of a text or passage, explanatory of another. We mention these instances, because we think that a gentleman so eminently skillful in dead and foreign languages, should be watchful to preserve the purity of his own.

Our author has, with great propriety, added the accents to the Hebrew text of the present volume. The form of a word, and even the construction of a sentence, may sometimes depend upon them. They serve a purpose in the Hebrew language somewhat analogous to that of the particles and accents in the Greek; and Professor Stuart has been as successful in dissecting and explaining their operation in the one language, as he has in apprehending and chaining down the vagrants in the other.

By the publications before us, Professor Stuart has made Hebrew accessible, in the words of his preface, "to all classes of people who may wish to learn it. Private persons, for their own advantage and gratification, may study it. I venture to affirm, without the fear of being contradicted by those who have had experience, that the Hebrew is now more accessible than Latin or Greek, and may be learned in less than half the time which these languages cost." We have no doubt of the truth of these remarks. Much as the difficulties formerly attendant on this study were lightened by the first publication of his large Grammar, with the Lexicon translated by Mr. Gibbs, he has now increased, many fold, the ease and pleasure with which the language may be acquired. The same degree of knowledge, which, even but two years ago, it cost the student in Theology almost a twelvemonth to obtain, may now be secured, perhaps in a third part of that period. With these increased facilities, we trust the day is not distant, when the influence of Mr. Stuart's labors will be evident, even to the dullest apprehension, in the flourishing state of Hebrew literature in the United States—in the eagerness with which many will advance to its pursuit—and in the manner and degree in which it will be cultivated in our literary institutions. We anticipate the day, when the study of the Hebrew will form a part of the established course in all our colleges; when the perusal of those sacred models, so far superior in sublimity and beauty to the best of the heathen

writings,\* will accompany, if not supersede in part, the application which has been lavished on the remains of Grecian and Roman literature—a literature often noble and elevated, sublime and beautiful, yet oftener immoral, wordy, conceited and tame. The time, we think, will come, when the thrilling Songs of David will be the subject of translation and recitation, at least as often as the Odes of Horace, or the mythological fables of Ovid.

There is another respect in which we think the publications we have examined will exert a highly salutary influence. We have witnessed and lamented, in years past, the almost total neglect into which most theological students have suffered their Hebrew to fall, after the lapse of the year which is devoted chiefly to its pursuit. This has been owing, in a degree, to the slowness of their progress, with helps so far inferior to those of the present day, and to their not becoming firmly grounded in the knowledge of Hebrew, before they were obliged to leave it for other studies. This difficulty will now be removed. Before the end of the Hebrew year, the classes will have become so much imbued with the spirit of the language, and so intimately acquainted with its forms, that the daily perusal of a portion of the Hebrew Scriptures will afterwards be a delight, rather than a labor. Still there will remain to be guarded against, the natural indolence of the human mind, which forever disposes us to leave that to a future hour, of which there is no immediate and pressing need. We would earnestly recommend, therefore, to all who are commencing their course of theology, the diligent prosecution of this important branch of their studies; and the continued habit, even amidst other harassing duties and pursuits, of devoting to this one object some daily portion of their time. If they do not vigorously prosecute this department of sacred literature, who will? Let it be remembered, that among *them* must be sought the future supporters and teachers of Biblical learning.

More than four hundred and fifty students have already completed their course of study at the Theological Institution in Andover. Of these, many have gone to their eternal dwelling place, whose remains are deposited, not only in their native land, but in distant regions, where their lives had been spent in the service of their Saviour. Some sleep in the Holy Land; some in the fathomless ocean; some in the plains of India; some in

\* Excellent as is our English translation of the Scriptures, it is certain that it does not breathe the full spirit of the Hebrew poetry. Whoever wishes to experience its inexpressible pathos and beauty, its awful sublimity, its vivid and burning energy, must study it in its original and native garb. He would be well repaid, in the enlargement, the elevation and the increased vigor of intellect, (to say nothing of its influence upon his moral feelings) if it cost a much greater labor, than at present it requires. Milton's unequalled genius was moulded and elevated far more by his study of the Hebrew Scriptures, than by the poetry of Greece and Rome.

We have been informed that the senior class in Amherst College have lately, to a man, engaged in the study of the Hebrew.

the islands of the sea. Of those still living, many are missionaries or pastors in the United States; some are the messengers of glad tidings to the heathen; and some are connected with our literary or theological institutions; but most are necessarily prevented, by the pressure of active duties, or the want of early advantages, from any but the prayerful and practical study of the word of life. It belongs then to those who have not yet entered the vineyard of the Lord, and especially to those who are commencing their studies with the numerous facilities which are now afforded, to remember their responsibilities, and not disappoint the reasonable expectations of their Christian friends. If they become dead to the love of divine knowledge, and cold in this respect to the claims of the church, who then shall be found to stand in the breach, when the present promoters of sound Biblical learning shall be gathered to the graves of their fathers?

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### RAMMOHUN ROY.

Our readers need not be informed that this is the name of a distinguished Hindoo Bramhun, who is said to have renounced polytheism and idolatry, and to have embraced a species of Unitarianism. He is one with whom the Unitarians of Calcutta have been in close alliance, and in whose praise much has been said by Unitarians in Great Britain and America.

The object of these remarks will be answered, by exhibiting, first, the views of American Unitarians respecting Rammohun Roy; and, secondly, his true religious character, so far as we have the means of ascertaining it.

The views of Unitarians among us respecting this man, will be given, as nearly as possible, in their own words.

The Christian Disciple represents him, not only as "a Christian convert, but a Christian controversialist, fit to be compared with Europeans of the highest name, for learning, penetration, and judgement."\*

The Unitarian Miscellany speaks of his "conversion to Christianity," and affirms that he "became a Christian in spite of the missionaries." "With heathenism on the one hand, and Trinitarianism on the other, he rose from his studies a *Unitarian Christian*," and "has converted one missionary who was sent to convert him."†

\* Vol. v. p. 383.

† Vol. iv. pp. 166, 169, and v. p. 202. The missionary here spoken of is the Rev. William Adam, who was sent out by the English Baptist Missionary Society, and was originally connected with the Baptist Mission in the East. By the influence of Rammohun Roy, he was led to renounce his belief in the Trinity, and the doctrines of grace—was separated from the Baptist connexion—and has since been employed, for a time, as a Unitarian missionary at Calcutta. We shall have occasion to refer to his letters in the course of this discussion.

The Christian Examiner for September and October, 1826, has an article on this question, "Is Rammohun Roy a Christian? Or, in other words, is he a believer in the divine authority of our Lord?" This question the writer answers in the *affirmative*, and adds, that if any do not acquiesce in his decision, he "shall be very glad if they can bring better evidence that they are themselves believers in the divine authority of our Lord." In another number, Rammohun Roy is represented as "a Hindoo convert to Unitarian Christianity"—"the most remarkable individual in the literary world now living"—an "eminently gifted and good man."\* In a more recent number it is said, that the theological works of Rammohun Roy "would be honorable to any the most *thoroughly educated Christian Divine*."† The Editor of the Christian Examiner has also published a letter in the Christian Register, in which he says, "The Examiner has never, expressly or by implication, admitted for a moment that Rammohun Roy 'has no claim to be considered a Christian.' It has uniformly asserted the contrary."‡

In the Appendix to the third Annual Report of the American Unitarian Association, Rammohun Roy is spoken of as "the first native convert to Unitarian Christianity," and "the most distinguished native of Asia for genius and learning."||

The Christian Register for April 28, 1827, speaks of Rammohun Roy's "belief in, and attachment to, Christianity," and denominates him "a *great Christian philosopher*." In a later number, it is said, "From being a learner, he has become one of the *most profound and powerful expounders and teachers of our joyful revelation*." "He is in the *very first rank of Christian theologians*."§

Other similar quotations might be given, but these are sufficient for our present purpose. They must satisfy every reader as to the views entertained by American Unitarians respecting the religious character of Rammohun Roy. If any reliance can be placed upon the meaning of words, they regard him as not only a Christian, but an *eminent* Christian. He is "a *great Christian philosopher*"—"one of the *most profound and powerful expounders and teachers of our joyful revelation*." His works "would be honorable to any the *most thoroughly educated Christian Divine*." "He is in the *very first rank of Christian theologians*."

We shall endeavor now to exhibit the true religious character of Rammohun Roy, so far as the public have the means of knowing it.

Rammohun Roy was born in 1780, in the district of Bordouan, near Bengal. He received his education at Patna, and Calcutta, from Mohammedan and Bramhun masters. In 1805, he removed to Moorshedabad, one hundred miles north of Calcutta, where he published a work "against the idolatry of all religions." Not long after this, by the loss of his father and two brothers, he succeeded to a large estate. Since 1814, he has resided chiefly at Calcutta.

It cannot be doubted that Rammohun Roy is sincerely averse to many of the superstitious observances of his countrymen, and that he has written and published much to refute and discountenance Hindoo idolatry. He has en-

\* Vol. iii. p. 169. † Jan. and Feb. 1826. ‡ No. for Oct. 25, 1826. || p. 61.

§ No. for May 24, 1826. It has been stated, that the works of this "great Christian philosopher" are not only in high repute, but in common use, among the theological students at Cambridge. The public, we presume, would like to be informed as to the degree of importance and authority which is there attached to them.

deavored earnestly to put an end to the burning of widows, and to other cruel and murderous practices which prevail around him. On this account, he enjoys, and he deserves, the reputation of a philanthropist.

*Is he also a Christian?* Does he belong to the general community of Christians, and can he properly be called by their name? This is the question now to be decided; and, in approaching it, we may inquire,

1. Is he a *professing* Christian? Has he ever received Christian baptism, or the Lord's supper, or been admitted to communion in any society calling itself a Christian church? This, no one acquainted with circumstances will pretend.

2. We ask, then, in the second place, is Rammohun Roy a *nominal* Christian? Does he *assume* the Christian name, and call himself, uniformly and openly, a Christian man? This, again, is not pretended. The writer in the Christian Examiner, to whom I first referred, in answer to the question, whether Rammohun Roy is "not still known in India as a Bramhun," replies, that "HE IS." He still wears "his poita," "retains his Brahmunical rights, and observes the rules of caste." Vol. iii. p. 369.

Mr. Adam, in reply to the inquiries of Dr. Ware, observes, "Several natives of distinction and wealth," at the head of whom, doubtless, was Rammohun Roy, "openly assist me in my labors, *who would on no account permit themselves to be called Christians by their own countrymen.*"

When the Rev. Mr. Yates of Calcutta was in Boston, in the spring of 1827, he observed, in the hearing of several gentlemen, that the relatives of Rammohun Roy had repeatedly endeavored, by legal process, to obtain possession of his property, on the ground that he had renounced the religion of his fathers, and embraced Christianity; but that, in every instance, he had defeated them, and retained his property, by proving that *he was not a Christian.*

3. There can be but another inquiry relative to this subject, Is Rammohun Roy a *real* Christian? Professions and names out of the question, has he the *thing itself*? Is he in possession of the great reality? Or, putting the question in a shape to be determined without judging directly of the state of his heart, Does Rammohun Roy receive Christianity as of *supernatural* and Divine origin? Does he receive the Bible as a *supernatural* and *miraculously attested revelation* from God? He doubtless believes that there are many things good and true in "the precepts of Jesus;" and so did Lord Herbert of Chisbury, and Rosseau, and Bolingbroke.\* And he may say, in a qualified sense, of what he regards as good in the Bible, that it *came from God*, or was *inspired of God*. So every good thing may be said, in a sense, to have come from God. "Every good gift, and every perfect gift, is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights." "There is a spirit in man, and the *inspiration* of the Almighty giveth him understanding." But to repeat the question above stated, Does Rammohun Roy receive the Bible, or the New Testament, as a *supernatural* and *miraculously attested revelation* from the Supreme Being? We regret to be obliged to reply, that we have no sufficient evidence that he does, but much to the contrary.

He has long been a great admirer of the Vedas, the most ancient and sacred

\* "No religion," said Lord Bolingbroke, "ever appeared in the world, whose natural tendency was so much directed to promote the peace and happiness of mankind, as Christianity. No system can be more simple and plain than that of natural religion, as it stands in the Gospel." "The system of religion which Christ published, and his evangelists recorded, is a complete system to all the purposes of religion, natural and revealed." "The Gospel is, in all cases, one continued lesson of the strictest morality, justice, of benevolence, and of universal charity."

writings of the Hindoos. These discountenance, he says, the idolatry and superstitions of his countrymen, and inculcate "a pure theism," or deism. As they were almost entirely secluded from the common people, being written only in the Sanscrit, or sacred language of the country, Rammohun Roy commenced his public labors as a reformer, probably in 1816, by translating and circulating, at his own expense, different portions of these sacred writings. The Vedant, an ancient compilation from the Vedas or Vêds, and an attempt to resolve them into a system, he also translated and published in several languages. When his labors in this way were attacked and denounced by the advocates of idolatry, he published, in reply, what was entitled "a Defence of Hindoo Theism."

These various labors of Rammohun Roy in opposition to idolatry, and for the propagation of "Hindoo Theism," were not altogether without success. Several Hindoos of high *caste* soon joined him, and he formed around him an association of native Deists. "To conciliate the Europeans," says a French account of him, "he gave to his sect the appellation, *Unitarian*."\*

All who have attended particularly to the accounts published by Unitarians of their operations in the East, must have observed a distinction between what are called "Hindoo Unitarians," and "Christian Unitarians." Of the origin and character of the "Hindoo Unitarians," we may form some idea from the preceding quotation. "To conciliate the Europeans," Rammohun Roy gave to his Vedant, Deistical "sect, the appellation, *Unitarian*." A similar account of the "Hindoo Unitarians" is given by Mr. Adam, in a letter dated January, 1822. "Those," says he, "whom I denominate Theists, are the followers of the *Vedant system of philosophy*, and are, in fact, *Unitarian Hindoos*. This system has been of late revived in Bengal, *through the exertions of Rammohun Roy*, and those who have embraced it form a small but highly respectable portion of the Hindoo community."† In the letter of Mr. Adam, replying to the inquiries of Dr. Ware, we have the same account of the "Unitarian Hindoos." "They have derived their present views of religion," not from the Bible, but "from those portions of *the Ved*, which have been translated and published by Rammohun Roy."‡ It is highly important that this account of the "Hindoo Unitarians," and of the distinction between them and "Christian Unitarians," should be kept in mind. The religious public have not generally understood this subject. If the distinction here spoken of has been noticed at all, it has been thought merely to mark the difference between Europeans and natives. The "Christian Unitarians" have been regarded as Europeans, as indeed they are, we believe without an exception in Calcutta, while the "Hindoo Unitarians" have been regarded as *native converts to Unitarian Christianity*. But this, it will be seen, is a great mistake. "Hindoo Unitarians" are no other than Deists. "They have derived their present views of religion," not from the Bible, but "from those portions of *the Ved* which have been translated and published by Rammohun Roy," and which, as he has often boasted, inculcate "a pure Deism."

In 1821, Rammohun Roy and his associates commenced the publication of a periodical work, entitled "the Brahmucal Magazine." Its object was to defend "Hindoo Theism," or the religion of the Ved, in opposition to the religion inculcated by the missionaries. Several numbers of this Magazine were received and reviewed by Unitarians in this country.

\* Monthly Repository, vol. xv. p. 2.

† Christian Disciple, vol. v. p. 311.

‡ Correspondence, &c. p. 33.

In 1816, a correspondent of the Church Missionary Society addressed to some of its members a letter, a part of which was published in the *Missionary Register*, "representing him (Rammohun Roy) as a *self-confident Deist*."—In an extract published in the *Monthly Repository*, (Unitarian,) vol. xiii. p. 512, he is called "a *Hindoo Deist*."—In 1818, Col. Fitz-Clarence thus speaks of him: "He has openly declared that the Brahmunical religion," to which he adheres, "is, in its purity, a *pure Deism*."\*—"Should he become a *Unitarian Christian*," says the *Monthly Repository*, in 1819, "his influence may be incalculable." It seems he had not *then* become such.—In 1820, one of his particular friends (an Unitarian) speaks of him as what "we should call a *Freethinker*."†—The *Monthly Repository*, after reviewing his controversy with the Baptists, styles him "a Unitarian," but dares not "add the cognomen, *Christian*."‡—The late Bishop Heber, speaking of him in 1823, says, "He has been called, *though I fear without sufficient reason*, a Christian."§—When the Rev. Mr. Yates, of Calcutta, was in Boston, in 1827, he represented him as 'having no more faith in the Gospel than Mahomet had, and as not believing the Scriptures to be a revelation from God. He has frequently said to me,' says Mr. Y., 'that any man who believes in the *whole New Testament* must either be a *knave at heart*, or a *fool in his head* if he denies the doctrine of *atonement by Jesus Christ*.'§

Indeed, it has been often admitted by Unitarians in this country—with how much consistency we pretend not to say—that Rammohun Roy is not a Christian.—In the *North American Review*, vol. vi. p. 393, we have the following testimony: "Rammohun Roy is not a Christian, it is true; but the doctrine he inculcates differs very little from the Christian doctrine, respecting the nature and attributes of the Deity."—In the *Christian Examiner*, vol. i. p. 303, it is said, Rammohun Roy "has not avowed himself to be a *believer in the Divine mission of our Lord*."—Also in the volume for 1826, p. 363, referring to "the Precepts of Jesus," the *Christian Examiner* says, "It was not made certain, by this publication, that Rammohun Roy was a *believer in the Divine authority of our Lord*;" but merely "that he esteemed the precepts of Jesus," and wished to recommend them to his countrymen.—In the volume of the *Christian Register* for 1826, it is also said, "The question has been frequently asked, is he (Rammohun Roy) a Christian? Does he believe, and avow himself a believer in Christianity, as a Divine and *miraculously attested revelation from God*? Or does he only esteem Christ, as the teacher of the purest and sublimest morality the world has ever known? *Rammohun Roy, then, is NOT a CHRISTIAN, in the broad sense of the term, as far as we can learn*."

We shall make no attempt to reconcile these quotations with those which were given near the commencement of this article. How Rammohun Roy could be, not only a *Christian convert*, but a *Christian controversialist*, fit to be compared with Europeans of the *highest name*, in 1823, and never so much as have "avowed his belief in the Divine mission of our Lord," in 1824—or how it can be true of the *Christian Examiner*, that it "has *never*, expressly or by implication, admitted for a moment, that Rammohun Roy has no claim to be considered a Christian," when, in its first volume, it did say, Rammohun Roy "has not avowed himself to be a believer in the Divine mission of our

\* Journal of a Route across India, in the years 1817, '18.

† Month. Repos. vol. xvi. p. 523. ‡ Ibid. p. 465. § In Ch. Reg. for Sept. 29, 1827.

§ Christian Watchman, April, 1827.



Lord"—must be left for those who are more versed in uttering and resolving "dark sayings" than we can pretend to be, to determine. It will follow conclusively, from the declaration of the Editor of the Examiner, that a "belief in the Divine mission of our Lord" is not at all necessary, in order to constitute a "claim to be considered a Christian."

But not to insist on this: We have it on the best authority, that, in 1826, American Unitarians had no evidence, and could not learn, that Rammohun Roy was "a Christian, in the broad sense of the term," i. e. that he was "a believer in Christianity, as a Divine and miraculously attested revelation from God." And yet, in 1827, he is "a *great Christian philosopher!*" and, in 1828, he is "one of the most profound and powerful expounders and teachers of our joyful revelation"—"in the very first rank of Christian theologians"—whose works "would be honorable to any the most thoroughly educated Christian Divine"!! Where now, we would ask, is the *evidence* of this great and glorious change in the religious character of Rammohun Roy, between the years 1826, and 1827 and 1828? From being no Christian at all, in any proper sense of the term, he has come to be one of the greatest of Christians, and stands "in the very first rank of Christian theologians"! Here, surely, we have an instance of most sudden and surprising conversion and growth in grace! But where is the *evidence* of this alleged and most astonishing fact? Where is the evidence even of Rammohun Roy's *conversion*, between the years specified; or of his having experienced any change of religious character at all? We are sorry to say, that *there is no evidence of this sort in existence*. So far from it, the last accounts of Rammohun Roy that have been published in this country, represent him as sustaining the *same character* which he has held for fifteen or twenty years—a Vedant philosopher, a Hindoo Unitarian, or (to express the same thing by a more intelligible word) a DEIST. In one of the last published letters from Mr. Adam, he says, "Rammohun Roy has built a small, but very neat and handsome college, which he calls the *Vedant College*, in which a few youths are at present instructed, by a very eminent Pundit, in Sungserit literature, with a view to the propagation and defence of"—what? Christianity? No; but "of HINDOO UNITARIANISM"—*alias* DEISM. "With this institution he is also *willing* to connect instructions in European science and learning, and in *Christian* Unitarianism, provided the instructions are communicated in the Bengalee or Sungserit language."\* This college, the reader will remember, is a "*Vedant College*," not a *Christian* institution; and was built for "the propagation and defence of *Hindoo* Unitarianism," or Deism, not *Christianity* in any form. And yet we are told that its founder and proprietor is "one of the most profound and powerful expounders and teachers of our joyful revelation"—"a *great Christian philosopher*"—"in the very first rank of *Christian theologians*"!! To be sure, "he is *willing*"—surprising condescension for such an eminent Christian Divine—"he is *willing*" that "*Christian* Unitarianism" should be taught here, "*provided the instructions are communicated in the Bengalee or Sungserit language*." But there are no *Christian* Unitarians to be instructed, except Europeans, and these will hardly be at the trouble of acquiring the Bengalee or Sungserit language for the sake of learning their own religion in a "*Vedant college*."

At the first meeting of "the British Indian Unitarian Association," holden something more than a year ago, Rammohun Roy moved the following resolu-

\* Christian Examiner, vol. v. p. 176.

tion: "That this meeting invites all Unitarians, whether Christian or *Hindoo*"—whether Christians or Deists—"in every part of India, to form themselves into Associations auxiliary to the British Indian Unitarian Association, and to place themselves in communication with the Secretary of that Association." This resolution goes to illustrate, not only the character of Rammohun Roy, but the nature and character of the whole Unitarian establishment in the East. The British Indian Unitarian Association has taken the place of the former Calcutta Unitarian Committee, "assuming all the responsibilities of that Committee, and receiving their rights, titles, powers and properties." It is to this Association, therefore, that the monies which are contributed, in this country and in England for the advancement of Unitarianism in British India, are paid. And what is this British Indian Unitarian Association? Of whom is it composed? and of whom is it intended to be composed? The published account of the proceedings of the first meeting show what this Society is,\* and the resolution of Rammohun Roy proves what it is designed to be—a *union*, a *combination* of *Christian* and *Hindoo* Unitarians, i. e. of English Unitarians and *native Deists*. Such is the institution, and the public ought to know it, in aid of whose funds Unitarians in Boston and the vicinity have pledged themselves to pay 600 dollars a year for the next eight or ten years!!† Are all the contributors of this money fully acquainted with this state of things? Leading Unitarians, among the clergy and laity, cannot but be acquainted with it; but are there not many, whose purses have been opened, and are expected to be opened again, to make up the sum above specified, who do not know, and are not informed, that the Society in India which receives their money, is composed, in considerable part, of *avowed native Deists*;—that persons of this description attend its meetings, propose resolutions, and make speeches; and that these Vedant Deists, "in every part of India," are publicly invited to unite, in "auxiliary associations," and place themselves in communication with its Secretary?‡

We now return to Rammohun Roy, and with two additional quotations shall conclude what we have to offer, at present, relative to his religious character. The first is the testimony of a gentleman "of unimpeachable veracity, recently returned from India, who had an interview with" him a little more than a year ago, and has published the following account in the Philadelphia Church Register.

"My recollection is sufficiently distinct to enable me to say, that in the course of the conversation which I had with Ram Mohun Roy, he declared, as his settled conviction, that if the Old and New Testaments were separate, and certain objectionable parts of the latter stricken out, Christ Jesus would be preferable to Mahometanism; and upon a gentleman present remarking, that that gave it very small credit indeed, he repeated the observation, accompanied

\* Christian Examiner, vol. v. p. 268. † Ibid. vol. iv. p. 197.

‡ Recent accounts prove, that the influence of these Vedant philosophers in this Association is not confined to the proposing of resolutions, and making speeches. "Education will never be employed," by the Society of which they are members, "as a direct means of *proselytism to Christianity*. In any institution established by them for the promotion of education, *no one religion will be recommended more than another, to the attention and favor of the pupils*. To attempt to initiate the infant mind into the peculiarities of any religion would, they consider, be unwise, in any case; and in the case of *Hindoos* receiving education from the *benevolence of Christians*, it would be *cruel to the children, unjust, and, in most instances, deceptive to the parents, and inconsistent with the spirit and genius of the Christian religion*." Ch. Examiner, vol. v. p. 125. This is promoting Christianity among the heathen, with a witness! *Cruel to Hindoo children, and unjust to their parents, and inconsistent with the genius and spirit of the Christian religion, to endeavor to persuade them to renounce their idols, and become Christians!*

with the remark, that many of the actions ascribed to David and Abraham, were, to say the least, quite as objectionable as those of Mahomet; and even went so far to express his belief, that there was quite as good reason for believing in the divine origin of the absurd system of the "Prophet," as for that of our Saviour, either resting chiefly on the *ipse dixit* of its founder. His attachment to Christianity cannot be better illustrated than by the fact of his having put into the hands of an inquirer into the truths of the Gospel, a copy of Paine's Age of Reason: and so far from being in that disposition so requisite in a Christian, which would lead him to acknowledge Christ before men, he carefully abstains from everything which would jeopard his character as a Heathen; and is looked upon by his Heathen neighbors as an advocate of that pure system of Theism which is to be found in the "*Vedant*," one of their most ancient Books.\*\*

The following is from a Calcutta Paper of Aug. 23, 1828, and is, we believe, the latest intelligence which has been received in this country relating to the subjects of which it treats.

#### UNITARIANISM AND DEISM.

"Those who, like ourselves, are orthodox in the faith, and pray fervently for deliverance from all manner of heresy and schism, will not regret to hear that the attempts to propagate the doctrines of Unitarianism through a society, or committee, lately organized at this presidency, are not likely to prove successful. We understand the operations of this Society are at a stand-still from the want of zeal in its members, and the consequent hopelessness of the cause. It is added that some of the most distinguished native gentlemen who had joined its ranks, if they deserve not a higher reputation as its *founders*, have received "a new light," and from Unitarianism very naturally slid into pure Deism,† and erected a chapel or temple, or by whatever name it may be known, where the Veds have taken the place of the Scriptures. A friend, to whom we are generally indebted for information of what is going on in the religious world, tells us, that at this Chapel, which was opened only a few days ago, the service commences with the singing of a hymn, after which a prayer is offered up. Some doctrinal part of the Ved is then read; after which follows another hymn. Then comes the sermon from a text selected from the Veds; the officiating minister lecturing from a separate room, that the Veds may not be desecrated by being in the same apartment with the *profanum vulgus* of hearers. It is not without considerable regret that we understand, that a well known Hindoo gentleman (Rammohun Roy) is at the *head of this new sect*."

What will American Unitarians now say, in regard to the exhibition here given of the religious character of Rammohun Roy? Unless they have intelligence more recent, and altogether of a more decisive character, than any they have yet published, they cannot disprove the statements which have been made, or make it appear that he is, or ever has been, any other than a Vedant Deist, or, as they choose to phrase it, a Hindoo Unitarian.—They may, if they please, *retract* the misplaced and most extravagant encomiums which they have passed upon him. They may say that they have been mistaken, or deceived, and that in the eminence of Christian attainment to which, in their published accounts, they have exalted him, they have spoken unadvisedly. Or they may say *noth-*

\* The Editor of the Christian Examiner rejects this account, (see his letter published in the Register) as not entitled to the least credit. We happen to know the gentleman who furnished it, and have not a doubt that it is strictly true.

† These "native gentlemen" have not "slid from Unitarianism into pure Deism," however natural such a slide may be. So far from it, they have never yet slid out of Deism. They have never been more or better than Deists. In a letter now before us from an American merchant who has resided much in Calcutta, the writer says, "Of one point you may be *sure*; Rammohun Roy has *never*, in *any instance*, given Unitarians any just right to claim him as a Christian; and I predict that you will presently find him maintaining this ground himself, to prove his consistency;—and the impudence that has asserted the contrary will be made to appear."

ing at all on the subject—a manner in which they commonly think to get over difficulties from which they find it impossible to extricate themselves in any other way.

But they will bear in mind, that the public have read, and remember, their unmeasured praise of Rammohun Roy, as being not only a convert to Christianity, but one of the greatest Christian philosophers and teachers. They will recollect, too, that the public are beginning to understand the subject, and have the means of judging as well as themselves respecting the real character of this far famed Hindoo. And they must settle it in their own minds as to the opinion which this public will entertain of them, who extol a man to the skies, as a *first rate Christian*, who not only does not assume the Christian name, and makes no profession of Christianity, but who places the Bible and the Koran on the same footing as to *supernatural* inspiration, and prefers the Hindoo Vedas to both.

Before closing, we must be allowed to call the attention of our readers to a single topic more. It is but a few years, since Unitarians were loud and long in their complaints of the mode of conducting Missionary operations by the Orthodox, and of the consequent want of success attending these operations. 'Preaching Christ and him crucified is of little or no service among the heathen. You must teach them philosophy, and the arts, and moral precepts, and the religion of nature, before you attempt to make them acquainted with the doctrines of revelation.' With these views of the subject, Unitarians were at length led, in providence, to commence Missionary operations themselves. And with a Missionary such as they wished ready to their hand, and "the most distinguished native of Asia for genius and learning," more than half converted, and a score of Bramhuns in his train, waiting to follow wherever he should lead the way—with all these advantages, what have they accomplished? What? We wish they would tell us what. Rammohun Roy and his followers still adhere to the Vedas, and are no nearer being converted than they were at first; and Mr. Adam, as the last accounts inform us, has relinquished his Missionary labor, and devoted himself to a secular employment.\* We cannot say that we rejoice at this failure; neither can we say that we very much grieve at it. But we can say, in the sincerity of our hearts, that we hope the whole Unitarian denomination may learn wisdom from the things they have suffered. And we hope their next Missionary, instead of forming a coalition with native Deists, and shaping his instructions with a view to gratify them, will take the great primitive Missionary for his model, and *know nothing among his benighted hearers but Jesus Christ and him crucified.*

---

#### CHRISTIAN EXAMINER CORRECTED AGAIN.

To the Editor of the Spirit of the Pilgrims,—Sir,

In your number, for February, a correspondent corrects the Christian Examiner respecting its statement of the progress of Unitarianism in Worcester County. That publication needs correction, no less, in respect to its statement of the progress of Unitarianism in *Plymouth* County. I am specially concerned to correct its statement respecting *Warcham*.

\* Query. What is to become of the 600 dollars a year which is to be paid in future?

The writer of the account, after remarking that he is "not very intimately acquainted with the state of religion, in the neighboring towns," (which was tantamount to saying, Unitarianism has gained *little or no* footing in them,) proceeds to say,

"In W——, however, the Minister, who is Orthodox, is dismissed and gone, and as a society, they are evidently liberal. I preached there lately to a very respectable assembly, and a very attentive audience, although on the same day a meeting was held at a private house by the Orthodox. The Society, three to one, I was told, are advocates for liberal Christianity, and this town has always been under the yoke of the Orthodox."

Another Gentleman adds,

"A strong demonstration has been made in favor of liberal principles in W——, eighteen miles east of us. It appears that *half* the town is liberal, and the Calvinistic minister is dismissed."

Now the *fact*, Mr. Editor, in respect to *Wareham* is this. Within a few years, two gentlemen, the one said to be a Unitarian, and the other a Universalist, have come into the place, and are now at the head of large manufacturing establishments, having in their employ several hundred men. Through their influence, the Rev. Mr. Hemenway was, nearly a year ago, dismissed. Opposition to his *sentiments*, however, was not the *ostensible* reason for efforts made against him—and is believed not to have been the *real* one. He was, however, dismissed, to the great grief of the church, and a large proportion of the society. Consequent upon his dismission, the Rev. Dr. K. of Plymouth, and the Rev. Mr. D. of N. Bedford, the probable writers of the statements above quoted, gave the opposers and their adherents a Sabbath's preaching, while the larger proportion of those who had usually attended public worship, met at a private house.

Two Sabbaths of Unitarian preaching, it is supposed satisfied them; for they have had none of that description since, but have uniformly procured an Orthodox supply. The friends and the opposers of the Rev. Mr. Hemenway have recently become again united, and are now harmoniously engaged in the erection of a new and expensive house of worship, with a basement story, to be exclusively occupied by an Orthodox minister; the opposition having given their solemn pledge, (as a condition of reconciliation,) that they will never again infringe on the *rights of the Church*. So that the prospect is, that the town of Wareham, will still *continue* "under the yoke of the Orthodox."

Dr. Kendall closes his communication to the Examiner as follows:

"On the whole, I place no confidence in the reports of the Orthodox periodicals on the state of religion, or the progress and triumphs of Orthodoxy. They are not *true*; they are exaggerated, highly colored, and in many instances absolutely false. It is painful to read them, for they are not to be believed. We have only to regret that men, who would be thought to embrace and teach all that is true and good in Christianity, should pay so little regard to truth and goodness, in maintaining their cause."

Now Mr. Editor, what think you of this? Is it not *liberal—charitable—aye, and gentlemanly* too? Does it not sound *well*, coming from such a man as Dr. K., and especially after such a representation as he had just given of the progress of Unitarianism in a neighboring town? It is to be regretted, Sir, that the venerable Doctor, should, almost at the same breath, have been guilty of that, which he so severely reprobrates in the Orthodox?

With sentiments of respect, I am,

Yours, &c.

VERA, 2<sup>ND</sup>.

## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Sabbath Recreations; or Select Poetry of a Religious kind, chiefly from the works of modern poets, with Original Pieces never before published.* By Miss EMILY TAYLOR. *First American Edition, in which many pieces have been withdrawn from the English copy, and others substituted;* by JOHN PIERPONT. Boston: Bowles and Dearborn. 1829. pp. 278.

The nearest resemblance between this work and the English "Sabbath Recreations," of which it professes to be a "copy," will be found in its title\* and general plan. The volume contains one hundred and ninety-seven pieces of poetry, in compiling which Mr. P. has omitted, we believe, more than a hundred which are found in the English copy, and in place of them has added not far from eighty of his own selection. Our readers will perceive, therefore, that in point of materials, the two volumes cannot have any great similarity; and we hazard nothing in saying, that they differ as much in character, as they do in contents. The hymns omitted by Mr. P. are in general those which a truly spiritual mind would think the most devotional, and the most agreeable. And for the absence of these, those which are added, whatever may be their poetical merit, make, in a religious point of view, no adequate compensation. To occasional verbal alterations of English works published in this country, with a view the better to prepare them for circulation here, we see no valid objection. But to change, as in this case, to a great extent, the contents and character of a work, and still pass it off under the name of the original compiler (especially when to her own compilation "the fair compiler" did not think proper to prefix her name) we must consider, at least until further explanations are offered, as highly reprehensible.

It is not long since the public were admonished of the additions and subtractions which a little work entitled "Anna Ross" had undergone, and with which it was circulated as "an abridgement" of the original work. The "Sabbath Recreations" have experienced even a greater transformation than "Anna Ross," and if so many people are not imposed upon by them, it will be because they are not likely to be so widely circulated.

If Mr. P. is disposed to publish a volume of miscellaneous poetry, he certainly has a right to do so; but we have yet to learn with what right or propriety he has prefixed the name of Miss Taylor to a volume, to no part of which she has prefixed her own name—a volume which she has never sanctioned, and probably never will.

As to the character of the work before us, our principal objection to it is, its lack of true *Christian sentiment*. It does not correspond

\* A title which sounds very unpleasantly to us,—"*Sabbath Recreations.*" Recreation is defined to be, "relief after toil or pain; amusement in sorrow or distress." Just as though the Sabbath were a weariness; and we needed something to relieve the tedium of observing it. We are required to "call the Sabbath a *delight.*"

with the feelings, or satisfy the desires, of the penitent and broken heart. It has more to say of "the stars" than of the cross of Christ, and it contains not a hymn which the devout and humble believer would probably regard as a "song of *redeeming love*."

2. *The Import and Practical Use of Baptism.* By CHARLES FREEMAN, Pastor of the Congregational Church in Limerick, Me. Portland: Shirley and Hyde. 1829. pp. 115.

This work differs from most on the same subject, in that it contains nothing directly controversial. The writer assumes the existence of water baptism, as an ordinance of Christ, and endeavors to explain its "import and practical use." He offers some general reasons why infant baptism ought to be practised, and enlarges upon the nature and design of this application of the ordinance, and upon "the truths suggested by the baptism of children." In this part of the work, he undertakes to point out the relation of baptized children to the church, and urges the obligations resulting, on either hand, from this relation.—We recommend the volume before us to the attention of our readers, not because we suppose Pedobaptists will universally assent to all the positions of the author, but because the discussion is ingeniously and ably conducted, exhibiting, throughout, a Christian spirit, and throwing much light on a subject, from the investigation of which our brethren have too long and too readily excused themselves. There are perhaps no subjects, in the common views of which the superior light of the latter days may be expected to introduce greater changes than those discussed in this little volume. It is time that the attention of the church was directly called to them; that the mind of Christ in respect to them was fully elicited; and that the conduct of parents towards their baptized children was guided and governed by his perfect will.

3. *The Harbinger of Peace.* Vol. I.

We ought to have noticed this interesting periodical at an earlier period. It is published monthly, "on the account and at the risk of the American Peace Society," at one dollar the year, each number containing 24 duodecimo pages. The Secretary of the National Society and Editor of this work, is William Ladd Esq., a gentleman singularly qualified for the undertaking, and disinterestedly devoted to it, "receiving nothing for his time, trouble or expenses." As the *Friend of Peace*, long published by Dr. Noah Worcester, is discontinued, the *Harbinger of Peace* is now received and patronized by the members of the Massachusetts Peace Society.—The *object* of the American Society, to which Mr. Ladd has devoted himself, is certainly one of *great importance*. We wish him all possible success in his endeavors to promote it, and shall be glad to see his publications in the hands of our friends.

4. *The Cambridge and Saybrook Platforms of Church Discipline, with the Confession of faith of the New England Churches, adopted in 1680; and the Heads of Agreement assented to by the Presbyterians and Congregationalists in England, in 1690. Illustrated with Historical Prefaces and Notes.* Boston: T. R. Marvin. 1829. pp. 132.

We regard this edition of the New England Platforms, Confessions of Faith, &c. as a valuable offering to the public. Though in the lapse of time, and by "the gradual introduction of laws and usages," these ancient formulas have lost something of their authority, still, they are very often referred to in the proceedings of churches, "and as a monument of the Ecclesiastical order of our venerated fathers, they are exceedingly valuable." The text of this edition has been carefully collated with that of the most approved copies, and numerous errors which had crept into some former editions have been corrected.—The historical prefaces, especially that to the Cambridge Platform and Confession, give additional value to the work. The reader becomes somewhat acquainted with the venerable men who founded the churches of New England, with their circumstances and their customs, and is prepared to enter on the study of the Platform with understanding and interest. The work is well printed, and ought to circulate, especially among the leading members of our churches.

5. PALEY'S NATURAL THEOLOGY, *Illustrated by the plates, and by a selection from the notes of James Paxton, member of the royal College of Surgeons, London; with additional notes, original and selected, for this edition; and a vocabulary of Scientific terms.* Boston: Lincoln & Edmands. 1829. pp. 464.

To say anything in commendation of Paley's Natural Theology with a view to increase its reputation with the public, would be superfluous. It is one of the few books, which Christians of all denominations read with interest and pleasure, and which none can read without profit. The general argument goes to illustrate and establish the declaration of the Apostle, "The *invisible things* of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the *things that are made*, even his *eternal power and Godhead*," and in this way to impress upon erring mortals their obligations to adore and serve the universal Creator and Disposer. The work before us is one which deserves rather to be *studied*, than merely read—indeed, without diligent attention and study, neither the excellencies of it can be fully discovered, nor its advantages realized. It is therefore gratifying to find it introduced, as a text book, in several of the Colleges and literary institutions of our country.

The edition before us is superior to any we have seen—and, we believe, superior to any that has yet been published. It is illustrated with notes, original and selected, and, what is of much more importance, by nearly forty lithographic plates. These are almost as necessary to the successful prosecution of Paley's argument, as maps are to the study of geography. As an additional help, especially to the younger classes whose attention may be directed to this



interesting volume, we would suggest to the publishers the preparation of a list of questions, which might be issued in a pamphlet, or bound up with the work.

On the whole, we have seldom received a volume with more pleasure than this, or one which we can more cordially recommend to the public.

6. *Memoirs of the late Mrs. Susan Huntington, of Boston, Mass.* By BENJAMIN B. WISNER, Pastor of the Old South Church in Boston. Third edition. With an *Introductory Essay*, and an *Original Poem*, by JAMES MONTGOMERY. Boston: Crocker and Brewster. New-York: J. Leavitt. 1829. pp. 328.

We are glad to notice the demand for this interesting volume, not only in our own country, but in Great Britain. "Two editions, each of two thousand copies, have been published and sold in the United States;" while not less than five editions have been published in Scotland, and the work is now publishing again in Glasgow, as one of a 'series of select Christian authors.' Prefixed to the Glasgow editions already published are the 'Introductory Essay and Poem,' by Mr. Montgomery, which accompany the volume before us. This introductory essay will be found an agreeable and valuable addition to the work. The ingenious author represents those, whose good or evil actions are recorded in history, as a sort of "invisible beings among us, whose influences are perpetually acting upon our minds, directing our pursuits, and shaping our characters." Among the most lovely and attractive of these invisibles, he would rank the late Mrs. Huntington, who, when she 'went down into the darkness of the grave, left an unexpected light, like an undecaying sunset, behind her, in the comfort of which, not relatives and friends only, but strangers and foreigners, and many born in distant ages, will delight to walk.'

The following extracts from Mr. Montgomery exhibit his views of Mrs. H., and of the volume before us, to the justness of which we cheerfully record our assent.

"In Mrs. Huntington, we have an exemplification of Christian character in the female sex, rising into grace, expanding into beauty, and flourishing in usefulness, from infancy to youth, and from youth to womanhood; then, without reaching old age, translated to Paradise, "like a tree planted by the rivers of water," that brought forth its fruit in due season, and whose leaf also withered not; being cut down in its prime, and remembered only as the glory of the place where it grew. There were no extraordinary incidents in her brief existence; she was endowed with no splendid talents; but on account of these very deficiencies, (defects they were not,) something *more excellent, yet attainable by all*, having been found in her, she may be presented as a model to others passing through the same ordinary circumstances, whereby they may form themselves to meet every change, till the last; and in that last, be perfectly prepared for a state beyond the possibility of change forever."

"Mrs. Huntington's experience, here recorded in her genuine Letters, written for the eye of friendship only, and her Diaries, written for the eye of her own spirit, in which it might see, and from time to time, compare itself with itself, more perfectly than it could in the mirror of memory,—her experience, thus recorded, gives to the reader a peculiarly intimate and affecting knowledge of the most secret emotions of her individual heart; yet not to gratify impertinent, indelicate curiosity; for such is the nature of these discoveries, that

they can be interesting and intelligible to those alone, who have proved the same discouragements and revivals in following hard after the Lord, and serving him in the beauties of holiness. To such, the volume on which we are entering, will be a treasury of things new and old; the more valued, the more deeply it is searched, and the more attractive, in proportion as it is studied for purposes of edification."

"In these ingenuous and unsophisticated productions, there is little either of the warmth or coloring of imagination; no brilliancy of ornament; few descriptions of natural scenery: the narratives are brief; except the account of the last hours of her husband, but that indeed, penned under the inspiration of the subject, displays a power and pathos, rarely exhibited on other occasions. Her English is remarkably pure; the diction is flowing, and her compositions in general are distinguished by maturity of thought, and correctness of style, without extravagance in the one, or efflorescence in the other.

"The blossoms of her mind were like the delicate bloom of wheat, not the pageantry of flowers; they were the promise of precious seed, good for food, not the evanescent attractions of the butterfly and the bee."

7. *Ratio Disciplinæ, or the Constitution of the Congregational Churches.* Portland: Shirley and Hyde. 1829. pp. 324.

This is not, as many readers will infer from the title, a new edition of Mather's *Ratio Disciplinæ*, but a *new work* on the same general subject, by Professor Upham of Bowdoin College. By reference to the best treatises of the early Congregationalists in this country and in Europe, to the most respectable existing usages, and to the laws of the land, the author has endeavored to draw out and digest what may be regarded, at present, as "*the Constitution of the Congregational Churches.*" We agree with Mr. Upham, that a work of this nature has been *long and greatly* needed; and we sincerely thank him for the attention and labor which he has bestowed upon the subject. His work, if extensively circulated, (as we trust it will be, especially among the clergy,) can hardly fail of accomplishing *much* good.

It is divided into two Parts. Part first—the more interesting part—is subdivided in twenty-four Chapters, and these again, for convenient reference, into two hundred and twenty-four sections. The subjects of the chapters are the following: Origin of Churches; Congregational Churches; Gathering of Churches; Church Officers; Admission of Members; Choice and Call of a Pastor; Ordination of the Pastor; Ordination of Missionaries; Of Church Censures and Excommunication; Transference of Relationship; Pastoral Associations; Of Licensing to Preach; Removal of Ministers; Disciplining and Deposing of a Minister; Councils; Mutual Councils; Ex-parte Councils; Synods; Discipline of whole Churches; Baptism; Half-way Covenant; The Lord's Supper; Church Conferences; Worship and Religious Customs. Part second consists of a Confession of Faith, which is subdivided into thirty-two Chapters. Following these, is an Appendix, containing the "Congregational and Presbyterian Heads of Agreement;" the "Saybrook Articles;" an article on the "Legal Rights of Churches and Parishes;" and the "Constitution of the General Conference of Maine."—The article on the "Legal Rights of Churches and Parishes," is drawn up with great care and candor, and manifests a

thorough acquaintance with the subject. We present the following extracts, to show how entirely the views of the author coincide with those which have been expressed in this work.

"In the first place, it is to be observed, that churches are bodies corporate, although perhaps, in some parts of the country at least, existing without a formal act of incorporation by the legislature. Such an act is not necessary to their existence as corporations. Bodies may become corporate by mere prescription, and without an express act of incorporation, and they are often recognized as such by the supreme authority. Many towns have become corporations in this way.\* Churches, therefore, having become corporations, either by legislative enactment, or by common law, may maintain a perpetual succession; and possess certain rights, which they can legally defend in their united or corporate capacity. The members of a church are generally inhabitants of the parish; but membership in a parish is not absolutely essential to membership in the church, nor, on the other hand, does membership in a church necessarily imply membership in a parish."

"Agreeably to these views, churches may hold property for themselves, and independently of the parish, with which they are connected, such as baptismal fonts, furniture for the Lord's Supper, property designed for the assistance of the poor and suffering members, and also property designed for the support of a minister. As churches are to be considered corporations for these purposes in particular, among others, viz. to baptize, administer the Lord's Supper, assist the poor, and maintain the preaching of the Word, the objects, for which they exist as distinct and authorized bodies, would, in a great measure, fail, unless they were permitted to hold property of the kind, and for the ends above stated. (*See Mass. Rep. Baker et. al. vs. Fales.*)

"It would seem to follow, therefore, from what has been said, that the connexion, existing between the church and parish, is a mere matter of agreement. And hence, being distinct corporations, except so far as they reciprocally agree in an unity of interests and objects, they may separate from each other, whenever they please, although they have previously acted together for certain common purposes. And, therefore, it would seem to be reasonable and just, that a church, separating from its parish in a body, (that is to say, a majority of them separating by proceeding and voting in the usual way,) should hold the property, which had previously been in its possession, unless it appear to have been given to the church on the condition, or implied condition, of its remaining in a particular place, or sustaining a relation to a particular parish. But, generally, property cannot be supposed to have been given in this way, inasmuch as churches often find it necessary to separate from parishes, and since it is undoubtedly their duty so to do, whenever any important ecclesiastical rights, the acknowledgement of which was understood to be the basis of their union, are invaded."

"We pass from the consideration of the legal powers and rights of churches to those of parishes.—Parishes, as well as churches, are corporate bodies, being constituted such, either by statute or usage. The rights and powers of parishes are limited by the objects for which they are incorporated, and therefore are few. They may join with the church in electing and supporting a minister; they may erect and repair houses of public worship; they may hold parsonages and other property for the support of the ministry."

"The usage of Congregationalists, granting the church the privilege of taking the lead in the settlement of a minister, and giving to the parish merely the power of concurring or non-concurring, has been recognized in legal decisions.—The parish, when the ministerial office is vacant, from an ancient and respectable usage, wait until the church have made choice of a minister, and have requested the concurrence of the parish, and if the parish do not concur, the election of the church is a nullity; and if the parish do concur, then a contract of settlement is made wholly between the parish and minister, and is obligatory on them only.—*Mass. Reports, Burr vs. the Inhabitants of First Parish in Sandwich*, vol. ix. p. 277."

\* There are a number of enactments by the legislature of Massachusetts, which, either directly or indirectly, authorize or acknowledge the existence of churches as corporations.

8. *A Sermon preached January 14, 1829, at the Dedication of the new house for public worship, erected by the Evangelical Congregational Church and Society in Barre; and at the Ordination of the Rev. John Storrs as their Pastor.* By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, Pastor of the first Church in West Springfield. Hartford. 1829, pp. 32.

This is one of the best occasional Sermons that we have recently seen. From the ejaculation of the Psalmist, "O Lord, I beseech thee send now prosperity," the preacher is led to consider "*In what the prosperity of a church consists, and what are the means by which it is to be secured and maintained.*" The prosperity of a church, he says, "does not consist in the splendor of wealth, the dignity of power, or any mere worldly distinction;" but it necessarily supposes "the prevalence of an enlightened faith in the great truths of the Gospel," "an elevated and well directed state of religious feeling," "a high tone of religious action," and "a gradual increase of numbers." To secure this prosperity to a church, there must be "the establishment and support of the Christian ministry;" a "constant," "devout" and "self-applying attendance" upon this ministry; "an exemplary attention to the moral and religious interests of the young;" "the active circulation of religious intelligence;" "a proper degree of caution in the admission of members, together with due fidelity towards those who are members; and finally "a spirit of harmony," and "of fervent prayer."—Our readers will perceive from this outline, that the subject of the discourse is highly appropriate, and the plan judicious; and we can assure them that the *filling up*, both as it respects matter and manner, is quite equal to the plan, and worthy of the respected author. The following extract must serve as a specimen:

"Of the importance of ministerial character in its connexion with ministerial influence, suffer me to say, my brethren, that I fear most of us have but very inadequate conceptions. We have indeed no difficulty in perceiving that gross immorality in a minister inflicts a deep wound on the cause of religion; and we look upon that man, and justly enough too, who, holding the sacred office, yields himself up to brutish indulgences, as bearing upon his forehead the brand of a traitor. But I would ask whether there are not some things which we practically agree, at least in some measure to tolerate, whose influence is scarcely less to be deprecated than that of immorality? Let a minister, for instance, possess, in a high degree, a spirit of levity; let him show himself ready at all times to bear his part in jovial conversation, rarely appearing serious, unless it be in the pulpit or at a funeral, and what effect, think you, will this have upon his usefulness? That such a man cannot reasonably expect to accomplish any good *out of the pulpit*, I need not stop to show; but I venture to say that his prospects *in the pulpit* are scarcely more promising. What though he may preach the doctrines of the Gospel ever so distinctly, boldly, pungently, it will be impossible for those who are accustomed to witness the levity of his daily intercourse, to believe him in earnest. They will consider it as a mere official exhibition; and while they will not improbably smile at his inconsistency, they will nevertheless avail themselves of it, as a shield to protect their own consciences against the arrows of conviction. It would seem as if there were a sort of silent compromise between such a minister and the careless part of his audience, that they should tolerate his preaching, provided he would indulge them with his levity. If the case which I have supposed be extreme, and not often found in all its offensive features, it becomes us to inquire whether some approximation to it at least be not common; whether there are none of us who acquire with the

careless and worldly the reputation of being pleasant companions, at the fearful expense of completely neutralizing the influence of our public instructions, and even confirming them in their neglect of religion."

9. *Balance of Character: A Sermon.* By JAMES WALKER of Charlestown, Mass. Liberal Preacher, Vol. i. No. 11. pp. 8.

The theory advanced in this Sermon is, that no feeling or passion which men ever exercise is wrong in itself, or becomes wrong, except when indulged to excess.

"For wherein," says Mr. Walker, "consists the sin of an avaricious disposition? Not simply in having an attachment to property; for this, when kept within due bounds, is a perfectly natural and proper feeling; but in having an inordinate attachment to property, so that our other principles are no adequate check upon it, and of course, the balance of the character is destroyed. Again, wherein consists the sin of a revengeful temper? Not simply in feeling resentment at wrong; for this, when kept within due bounds, is also a perfectly natural and proper feeling; but in suffering this feeling of resentment to become inordinate, so that our other principles are no adequate check upon it, and the balance of the character is destroyed. *The vice does not consist in the feeling itself, but in its being permitted to become inordinate, so that our other principles are no check upon it.*"

Again; no exercise or feeling, which men ever put forth is good in itself, or continues good any longer than it is restrained within certain limits. "It was never intended, *it is not right*, that any one quality, even though it be a *good quality*, should be forced to develop itself disproportionately." Again, "the disproportionate development even of a *good quality*" "would be, not to secure, but to destroy a proper balance of character."

Indeed, in the judgement of Mr. W., the perfection of "virtue consists" in maintaining a proper balance of character. "Reformation in morals is nothing more, in most cases, than a restoration of this balance of character, after it has been lost by vicious indulgences." And "to secure a balance of character is the great object of all religious instruction and edification."

It obviously results from the views here stated, that one feeling or trait of human character is, in itself, as good as another. Hatred is as good as love; pride as good as humility, and selfishness as good as benevolence. Indeed, Mr. W. speaks expressly of the happy effects of "a well conducted selfishness." All human feelings are good in their place; and none are good, when exercised out of due proportion.

Mr. W. had not room, probably, in the eight pages of his Discourse, to attempt comparing his theory with the Bible; or time to search for proof-texts by which to support it. It might have taken a long time to find passages which speak of a commendable avarice, a right spirit of revenge, a holy pride, or a "well-conducted selfishness." Mr. W. mentions our Saviour, as a remarkable instance of a well balanced character. But it might be difficult to show, in respect to him, that he had selfishness enough to balance his benevolence; or enough of a spirit of revenge to balance his meekness; or love enough for this present world to balance the strength of his religious principles, or the ardor of his desires to do the will of his heavenly Father.

10. *A Lecture on Popular Superstitions.* By BERNARD WHITMAN. Boston: Bowles & Dearborn. 1829. pp. 66.

With those of our readers who have become acquainted with this book, it needs no refutation; and to those who have not, we can give some general idea of it in few words. With some things that are amusing and, among the more ignorant and superstitious classes may be useful, is mixed up much that, in our estimation, is not only irreligious, but grossly wicked. The author very properly reckons, as popular superstitions, "all pretended signs of good and evil fortune, all pretended influence of the moon and planets; all pretended tricks for obtaining a knowledge of future events; all pretended lucky and unlucky days; all pretended supernatural dreams and visions; all pretended witches and ghosts and apparitions;" and in the same class with these, he ranks the doctrines of a special providence, and the special operations of the Holy Ghost; the agency of fallen spirits; revivals of religion; the resurrection of the body; a change of heart; and religious experience—mingling all promiscuously together, as equally unfounded and ridiculous. "Religious excitements have existed among all denominations; but they have been produced by human exertions and concurring circumstances. Visions, ghosts and apparitions have been seen; but they existed only in the minds of the observers, and were caused by some mental or bodily operation." The most ridiculous stories are related respecting revivals of religion, and alleged instances of conversion, and no pains are spared to turn all such occurrences into derision and contempt.

Our feelings impel us to remind Mr. W. that there is a sin which "hath never forgiveness, neither in this world, neither in the world to come;" and that those are in great danger of committing this dreadful sin, who speak lightly or reproachfully of the special operations of the Holy Ghost.

We only add, as a specimen of our author's fairness, that this lecture was delivered, as we are informed, in two instances, before Lyceums, or Societies for mutual improvement, the Constitutions of which provide that "nothing of a *party bearing*, either political or *religious*, shall be introduced."

#### NOTICES.

The Christian Examiner for November and December, 1828, is at length published. The Reviews of Dr. Beecher's Letters, and of our Article on the Rights of the Churches, are concluded. They shall receive early and due attention.

On page 266 of this number, the bottom line became accidentally displaced after revision, and the mistake was not discovered until part of the impression had been worked off. Instead of being, as it should be, at the bottom immediately following an extract, it will be found, in some copies, immediately preceding the extract.

THE

# SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

VOL. II.

JUNE, 1829.

NO. 6.

---

## COMMUNICATIONS.

LETTERS ON THE INTRODUCTION AND PROGRESS OF UNITARIANISM  
IN NEW ENGLAND. NO. IV.

DEAR SIR,

It was shown, you will recollect, in my last, that as early as the close of the revolution, and perhaps earlier, a species of Unitarianism had gained footing in Boston, and the surrounding region. It was studiously concealed, indeed, and measures were taken to continue the concealment, at least till a disclosure could be safely made; but still it was here. The leaven was working in secret, and gradually diffusing itself among an unsuspecting and confiding people.—What I now purpose, is, to direct your attention to several events which went to expose the existing evil, and give it prominence in the view of the public.

The first was the settlement of Dr. Freeman, as Minister of King's Chapel, in Boston. King's Chapel was formerly the principal Episcopal church in the city, and the most considerable establishment of the kind perhaps in New England. It was here, before the revolution, that the Provincial Governors usually attended public worship. Dr. Freeman was employed as a reader in this church in 1782; and, whether a Unitarian or not, he continued for three years to use the liturgy of the church of England, and to engage and lead in Trinitarian worship.\* But in 1785, the minds of the people being in a measure prepared for it, he attempted a change; and with no small uneasiness and opposition from various quarters, and the loss of a number of his hearers, he succeeded at length in accomplishing his purpose. "The plan of Dr. Clarke's reformed liturgy was adopted," and the worship became such as a high Arian might consistently offer. Dr. Freeman allows in a letter to Mr. Lindsey, dated July 7, 1786, that his new liturgy was not such as he should himself prefer, but insists that it was all which the people could be persuaded to adopt. "I wish," says he, "that the work

\* This worship Dr. F. has since represented as "idolatry." See Letter to Mr. Lindsey in 1794.

was more worthy of your approbation. I can only say that I endeavored to make it so, by attempting to introduce your liturgy entire. But the people of the Chapel were not ripe for so great a change. Some defects and improprieties I was under the necessity of retaining, for the sake of inducing them to omit the most exceptionable parts of the old service, the Athanasian prayers. Perhaps in some future day, when their minds become more enlightened, they may consent to a further alteration."

A difficulty still remained, as Mr. Freeman had not received ordination, and it was doubtful whether Episcopal ordination could be obtained for him. As this however was a point "upon which some of his hearers laid much stress," it was determined to make the attempt; and accordingly application was made for ordination, first to bishop Seabury of Connecticut, and afterwards to Dr. Provoost, bishop of New York.

It is not easy to reconcile these repeated applications of Dr. Freeman to obtain Episcopal ordination, with that honesty and openness of character for which, in the estimation of many, he is distinguished. He must have known that the church necessarily required, in all candidates for ordination, a profession of attachment to its *doctrines, discipline and worship*; and he could hardly have presented and repeated his request, without making up his mind, in case it were granted, to comply with established rules. He must moreover have been acquainted with the ordination service of the church, and knew that, in receiving ordination, he must *seem*, at least, to approve of this service, and to unite in it. Still he knew that (Unitarian, Humanitarian, as he was) he could not make a show of uniting in this solemn service without the most manifest insincerity. And yet he did apply repeatedly for Episcopal ordination, and would have received it at the hands of the American bishops, if it could have been obtained. He confesses, in one of his letters, that he "should have acted wrong" in receiving ordination in this way; and says, "I shudder when I reflect to what moral danger I *exposed myself*, in soliciting ordination of the American bishops." But is there no sin, I ask, in seeking and attempting to do a wrong action, even though our design is defeated? And how much better is he who solicits the opportunity of acting insincerely in one of the most solemn transactions of life, and fails, than he whose purpose is accomplished?

On the whole, must we not conclude that, had Dr. Freeman fallen into some Congregational churches, instead of an Episcopal one, where he could have modified his worship without attracting public attention, and been ordained without examination, his Unitarianism would have been as closely concealed, as that of any of his cotemporary brethren. But the liturgy of the church of England stood directly in his way; and he was obliged, either to relinquish his proffered parish, or to avow his sentiments, alter his



prayer book, and endeavor to carry the parish with him. He preferred the latter course, and he succeeded in it. He failed of receiving ordination from the American bishops, and was ordained (if ordination it can be called) by the wardens of his church, Nov. 18, 1787. The senior warden "laid one hand upon him, and with the other delivered him the Bible, enjoining him to make that sacred book the rule of his faith and conduct."\*

Dr. Freeman has been instrumental in spreading Unitarianism, not so much by his own preaching or publications, as by circulating the writings of English authors. He early opened a correspondence with Mr. Lindsey of London, received copies of Lindsey's and Priestley's theological works, and procured for them all the attention and circulation in his power. A set of these works was presented to "the Library of Harvard College, for which, as a very valuable and acceptable present," Mr. L. "received the thanks of the President and Fellows." "Though," says Dr. Freeman to Mr. L. "it is a standing article of most of our *social* libraries, that nothing of a controversial nature should be purchased, yet any book which is presented is freely accepted. I have found means, therefore, of introducing into them some of the Unitarian tracts with which you have kindly furnished me. There are few persons who have not read them with avidity."

The cause of Unitarianism was considerably promoted in this country by the visit of a Mr. Hazlitt, an English Unitarian minister, in 1785. "I bless the day," says Dr. Freeman, "when that honest man first landed in this country." "Before Mr. Hazlitt came to Boston, the Trinitarian doxology was almost universally used. He prevailed upon several respectable ministers to omit it. Since his departure, the number of those who repeat only scriptural doxologies has greatly increased, so that there are now many churches in which the worship is strictly Unitarian."†

By personal efforts, and the circulation of books, two or three small Unitarian societies were established, in different parts of the country, previous to the year 1800; but they died almost as soon as they began to live. The doctrine, though secretly spreading, was unpopular; very few dared to preach it openly; and for many years—indeed until comparatively a recent date—the society at King's Chapel was the only avowed Unitarian congregation of note in New England.‡

The first American Unitarian *author* was the Rev. Hosea Ballou,

\* See Lindsey's *Vindiciae Priesteianæ*, p. 35.

† The labors of Mr. Hazlitt were not confined to Boston. He preached in different places, especially in Maine. A Thanksgiving Sermon, preached by him at Hallowell, Dec. 15, 1785, was published, and may be seen in the library of the Boston Athenæum.

‡ The Unitarian meeting house at Philadelphia, erected, I believe, in 1812, is said in the *London Monthly Repository* to be "the first attempt that was ever made in the United States to build a house for Unitarian worship." The means of erecting this were furnished, in part, from England. *Monthly Repos.* vol. vii. p. 58.

now minister of the second Universalist Society in Boston. He published his treatise on Atonement in 1803, which, it is said on good authority, was "the first American work in which the doctrine of Unitarianism was ever advanced and defended."\* Whether Mr. Ballou or Dr. Freeman is entitled to be considered the *father* of American Unitarianism—or whether they ought in equity to divide the honor between them—I pretend not to decide.

Et fors æquatis cepissent præmia rostris.

Dr. Freeman was probably the first nominal and open preacher of the doctrine, and Mr. Ballou was the first who inculcated and defended it from the press. These leaders in promoting American Unitarianism have labored in different connexions, and with various success. Dr. Freeman had the advantage in point of early education; and Mr. Ballou in native ingenuity and resources. The followers of Dr. Freeman have been the most select; those of Mr. Ballou the most numerous.

The next individual who avowed and inculcated Unitarian doctrine, both from the pulpit and the press, was the Rev. John Sherman, Pastor of the first church in Mansfield, Conn. This aspiring, visionary and changeable young man was led to renounce the doctrines of the Bible and the church, and to become a Materialist and Humanitarian, by reading the works of Priestley and Lindsey. He disclosed his change of sentiments to his people in 1804, and was dismissed by a mutual Council in Oct., 1805. The same year he published a work, entitled "One God in one person only, and Jesus Christ a distinct being from God;" which, in the language of the Anthology (vol. ii. p. 249) was "one of the *first* acts of direct hostility against the Orthodox, which has ever been committed on these Western shores." On leaving Mansfield, Mr. Sherman was settled for a few years in the western part of the state of New York. He afterwards relinquished the ministry—went into other employments—forfeited his moral and religious character—and not long since died.

The case of Mr. Sherman was followed, after a few years, by another of a similar character in Connecticut. In the beginning of 1810, the Rev. Abiel Abbot, Pastor of the first church in Coventry, was suspected by his people of denying the doctrine of the Trinity; and, on inquiry, their suspicions were confirmed. He was, in consequence, dismissed by the Consociation of Tolland county in April, 1811; and in June, of the same year was dismissed again by a Council of his own selection. This Council was "imported" from the Easterly part of Massachusetts, and consisted entirely of men belonging to what was then styled the *liberal* party. Their proceedings, in interfering with and censuring the ecclesiastical regulations of a sister state, and in affecting to overrule an authorized

\* See London Monthly Repository for March, 1827.

decision of Consociation, called forth a severe but merited rebuke from the General Association of Connecticut, at their meeting in June, 1812.—It does not appear that Mr. Abbot was a believer in the doctrine of the Trinity at the time of his ordination. Yet so ambiguous were his allusions to the subject, and so carefully did he keep his sentiments concealed, that it was not till he had been settled more than a dozen years, that any suspicions were entertained of his dissent from the common faith of the churches.\*

Nearly at the same time with the proceedings in Coventry, a more important developement of Unitarianism began to be made in another quarter. In 1810, Messrs. Noah and Thomas Worcester, brothers, and both settled ministers at that time in New Hampshire, commenced their publications against the doctrine of the Trinity. The principal of these publications was entitled “Bible News of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; in a series of Letters in four parts,” &c. The author supposes that “Christ is the Son of God in the *most strict and proper sense of the terms*,” “as truly as Isaac was the son of Abraham;” that “he is not a created,” but a “*derived*” Being; that “he is as truly the image of the invisible God, as Seth was the likeness of Adam;” that “he is a person of Divine dignity,” and was “constituted the *Creator of the world*;” that “he is the object of Divine honors;” “that he became the Son of man, by becoming the *soul* of a human body,” &c. &c. It is hard to determine respecting this strange theory, whether it is more properly Tritheism, or Semi-Arianism. In either case, it has no foundation in the Scriptures; and the man who adopts it, and who, after due reflection, can feel satisfied of its truth, ought not, surely, to complain of mysteries in the religious system of others. The discussion in support of it, however, was ingeniously conducted, and for a time the work made a very considerable impression. Many were led, in consequence of it, to review their grounds of belief in the doctrine of the Trinity; and the faith of several was shaken.

Up to this period (1810) Unitarianism was hardly admitted to have an existence in the Congregational Churches of Boston and the vicinity. “Many complaints were made, that the Boston clergy were ‘*slanderosly* reported’ to be Unitarians.” The opinion was inculcated “that they did not differ materially from their clerical brethren through the country;” and the fact that, when abroad, they frequently were not invited to preach, was attributed to the false charges of Unitarianism under which their reputation suffered. But the time had now come, when the existence and prevalence of the heresy in Boston could not be much longer concealed. The truth had been leaking out, in conversa-

\* Mr. Abbot was of the Council who dismissed Mr. Sherman, and, so far as appears, acted harmoniously with his brethren.

tion, in letters, and periodical works, for several years, and the traces of it were becoming continually more evident and palpable. The pulpit was indeed masked and silent. I do not now recollect a sermon from a Congregational minister in Boston or the surrounding region, which directly contravened the doctrine of the Trinity, previous to 1815. The opposition to Evangelical religion was carried on "for the most part in secret, and proselytes were made, rather by suppressing truth, than by explicitly proposing and defending error." But in the spring of 1815, the cloak of concealment was suddenly taken off, and so far as the *existence* of Unitarianism is concerned, a full and unequivocal disclosure was made. The temporizing policy of Unitarians in this country had long been disapproved by their brethren in England, who took effectual means, at last, to expose and correct it. Mr. Belsham, in his *Memoirs of Lindsey*, printed in London in 1812, devoted a whole chapter to publishing extracts of letters from this country, and giving an account of American Unitarianism. His work soon found its way across the water, and though studiously kept out of circulation for about two years, it fell, at length, into the hands of those who were disposed to make the proper use of it. The chapter on American Unitarianism was published in a pamphlet by itself, and a spirited review of it was given in the *Panoplist* for June, 1815. These measures introduced the controversy between Dr. Worcester and Dr. Channing, and constrained Unitarians to take a stand before the public, a thing which they manifestly were very unwilling to do, and from the consequences of doing which they have never recovered.

When the disclosure and discussions here referred to had passed over, and time had been given for those ministers and people who had already exchanged the religion of their fathers for Unitarianism, to avow their faith and take sides for themselves; it was found, as was expected, that a very considerable impression had been made. The number of Unitarian parishes in New England has been variously estimated. Exclusive of professed Universalists, it probably ranges between seventy-five and a hundred. A very large proportion of these are in Massachusetts, and in what may be termed the Easterly part of it.

You will be solicitous to know by what means this error was promoted, and made such progress, while as yet it was not professed, and while the very existence of it was often denied. This is indeed an interesting inquiry, and although the remarks in previous numbers may have furnished an answer to it, in part, it will be needful to consider it more particularly.

I have spoken already of the opposition which was made to creeds and confessions of faith; and to the examination of candidates for the Gospel ministry. This opposition was continued and increased, till these impediments in the way of propagating error

were, in many places, entirely removed. I have spoken also of the *indifference* to religious truth which, years ago, began to be inculcated. This has long been a favorite topic with persons inclined to promote Unitarianism. 'No matter what a man believes. Sincerity is all that we have a right to demand.' It was this which gave to Unitarians the appellation of the *liberal* party. They were those, who professed to care little or nothing about doctrines, and to think no better or worse of any one on account of his religious opinions; who were willing to tolerate the errors of others, provided others would consent to tolerate theirs; and who honored this blind indifference respecting truth and error, with the name of *charity*. I might present many striking examples of the feeling which prevailed formerly among Unitarians in relation to this point. The two following may be regarded as a specimen. The first is from a sermon, preached by the Rev. Samuel Cary on the day of his ordination, in 1809, as assistant minister with Dr. Freeman of Boston. Addressing his people, his future charge, he says, "You will expect from me no detail of my speculative opinions. They are really of **TOO LITTLE CONSEQUENCE** to be brought forward at a period so interesting as the present. You know that I am a Christian. I have preached to you, and shall continue to preach, Jesus Christ and his Gospel." p. 23. The religious sentiments of a Minister "*of too little consequence*" to his people, to be so much as *named* at his ordination! "I shall continue to preach Jesus Christ and his *Gospel*." What is this Gospel? Of what truths does it consist? But this is a point which must not be touched—a matter of *no importance*!!

The following is from a sermon by Rev. Dr. Porter of Roxbury, delivered before the Convention of Congregational Ministers in Massachusetts, in 1810. "What are we to think of the doctrines of original sin and total depravity; of imputation of sin and righteousness; of a trinity in unity; of the mere humanity, superangelical nature, or absolute deity of Christ; of particular and general redemption; of unconditional decrees, personal election and reprobation; of moral inability, and the total passiveness of man in regeneration; of the special and irresistible operation of the Holy Spirit; of perseverance, or the impossibility of the believer's total apostacy; and, to mention no more, the absolute eternity of the torments to which the wicked will be sentenced at the last day? My individual belief in respect to the truth or error of these points can be of but *little importance*, and my subject no way requires that it should be given. *Neque teneo, neque refello*." "I believe that an *innumerable company of Christians, who never heard of these articles*, have fallen asleep in Jesus; and that *innumerable of the same description* are following after." pp. 19, 20. "An *innumerable company of Christians*" then "have fallen asleep in Jesus," and "*innumerable of the same description* are following after," "who never heard," either of "the mere *humanity*, the *su-*

*perangelical nature*, or absolute *deity* of Christ"—"who never heard" of "*redemption*," whether general or particular! It would be interesting to know what views this twice "*innumerable company of Christians*" have entertained of Christ and redemption; or whether they have entertained any views at all. I am curious to know, too, where these "*innumerable companies*" of good Christians have lived, or are now living, and by what distinctive appellation they are called.

The indifference to religious doctrine of which I have here spoken was absolutely necessary to be inculcated, in order to the spread of Unitarianism. For had the churches retained the same love of truth, and the same abiding sense of its value, which were felt in the days of our pilgrim fathers, the error could scarcely have entered here; or if it had entered, it must have been immediately detected and suppressed. But when the impression is made all around that religious truth is of very little consequence; that one doctrine is as good and as safe as another; that sincerity is enough; then the door is thrown open to every absurd opinion, and the most dangerous errors may be propagated without let or hindrance.

The way being thus opened for the spread of Unitarianism, it was promoted by various means, as circumstances would allow. It was promoted extensively by conversation, and a cautious personal intercourse. The writings of English Unitarians were procured and industriously circulated. Many of these were republished in Boston—a work for which nobody would be held responsible, but in which many persons were more or less engaged.\* Periodical publications, too, were instituted, having the promotion of Unitarianism as a leading object. The *Anthology*, which was commenced in 1803, and continued till 1811, labored assiduously in this work, especially during the latter part of its course. Yet its conductors had the effrontery to declare, in their concluding address, "We have *never lent ourselves to the service of any party, political or theological.*" The *General Repository* commenced in 1812, and was more open and violent in its measures, than the *Anthology*. The *Christian Disciple* commenced in 1813, and though, at first, but moderately Unitarian, it accomplished something. The *Christian Monitor* also, which commenced in 1806, and consisted of a series of religious tracts published quarterly by the Society for promoting Christian knowledge, piety, and charity, became, before it closed, very decided, in its predilections for what was called the liberal theology.† These different periodical

\* In one year (1809) were published *Fellowes' Religion without Cant*, with a new title, and slight alterations; the *Improved Version of the New Testament*; *Belsham's Letters on the character and writings of Dr. Priestley*; and probably others of the like description.

† An instance of management on the part of the conductors of the *Christian Monitor* is worthy of being here recorded. The tract No. ix, is entitled "An earnest Exhortation to a holy life," and "a Letter to a young lady on preparation for Death," written by William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury. It was said to be published "with *little variation* from

works, though written, published and patronized by leading Unitarians and abounding with evidence of the prevalence of the error, were not allowed to be urged as proof against any particular individuals. And when referred to in this view, it was customary to pass them off, "as though they had been the productions of nobody, and nobody was responsible for them."

As Unitarianism advanced, the old collections of hymns, with the doxologies, were in many places laid aside, and others of a more liberal cast were substituted. Different collections, one for the first church in Boston, and another for the church in Brattle Street, were published in 1808. These were so modified, of course, as to leave "most of the capital doctrines of the Gospel entirely out of view." Yet when referred to in the *Panoplist*, as evidence that the Brattle Street church had departed from the faith, *the charge was repelled with apparent indignation*, and the Editor was referred to the former collection of hymns, which it was said were still in use, in which "he would find his '*capital doctrines*' remaining untouched in their proper places." *Pan.* vol. iv. p. 275.

A circumstance which tended greatly to promote the spread of Unitarianism in Boston and the surrounding region grew out of the rank and standing of some who early embraced it. These were, in several instances, men of respectability and influence in civil life, whose names were a sufficient shelter for the busy sectarian, and whose opinions the multitude were ready to receive almost without examination. It was taken for granted that what such men as Gov. Bowdoin, and Gen. Knox, and President Adams, and Chief Justice Parsons believed, must be right, and to call in question the correctness of their speculations, on the authority even of the Bible itself, would be little less than arrogance.

The manner in which Unitarianism gained the ascendancy in Harvard College will be considered in another communication. But having once gained the ascendancy there and in Boston, it will be evident to all, that the influence exerted upon the surrounding country must have been immense. The College was continually pouring forth its streams—its clergymen, its lawyers, its literary and professional men, its various publications; while the city was a centre of attraction and influence, not only to Massachusetts, but to all New England. Here, counsellors, senators, and representatives, from different parts of the Commonwealth, were accustomed to reside several weeks every year. Here, too, merchants, and men of property and leisure frequently visited, and re-

the original?" leaving the reader to suppose that there were only slight verbal alterations. But, on comparison, it was found, that nearly every sentence in the original tract, which treats of the Trinity, of the atonement, of the preexistence and incarnation of Christ, of the Divinity and personality of the Holy Spirit, of the existence of the devil, and of future eternal punishment, was either expunged, or was so mutilated as no longer to express the sentiment of the venerable author.

turned with an abundance of Boston fashions and notions on the subject of religion, as well as everything else.

Add to all this, that Unitarianism, as a system, is very agreeable to the natural, unhumbled heart—is specially adapted to the tastes and inclinations of the gay, thoughtless, and fashionable world, denying them no liberties or gratifications which come anywhere within the bounds of decency, while it quiets their consciences with the name and forms of religion, and allays the fear of death by promising happiness beyond the grave; and it will not be thought strange—with all this variety of adaptation, preparation and influence—that a considerable number of individuals and churches were secretly, and it may be almost imperceptibly corrupted.

The *concealment* practised by the early Unitarians of Massachusetts tended greatly to further their designs; but this must be the subject of a future letter.

Yours, &c.

INVESTIGATOR.



INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES. NO. VIII.

### *Closing Remarks.*

1. From the doctrine of inspiration, as exhibited in previous Numbers, it is evident that *our belief in the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel rests on the firmest basis.*

The common doctrines of natural philosophy are founded on facts, which the natural world exhibits, and which we learn through the medium of our senses. These doctrines we confidently believe; and we should think that any man, who refused to believe them, violated the principles of common sense, and was destitute of a sound understanding. But our faith in the peculiar doctrines of the Bible rests on a surer foundation, than any of the doctrines of natural science. Our acquaintance with the objects, which the natural world presents to view, is imperfect. Our senses and our mental faculties are all fallible. But God is perfectly acquainted with the subjects on which he has given us instruction; and he is liable to no mistake. The doctrines, therefore, which rest on the authority of God's word, are, to say the least, supported by as good evidence, and as worthy of our belief, as any of the principles of natural philosophy. And a man cannot dishonor his own understanding by rejecting these principles, more than by rejecting the peculiar doctrines of revelation.

It is also evident, that the doctrines of the Bible rest on a surer basis, than any of the facts which we admit on *the testimony of our fellow men.*



Who has any hesitation in believing that there were such men as Alexander, and Julius Cæsar, and that there is such a place as Rome. But we never saw those men, and perhaps have never been in that place. Our belief respecting them rests entirely on testimony. Now, however sure the testimony of men in such cases may be; the testimony of God is greater. There are indeed many who bear witness to the existence of Alexander, and Cæsar, and Rome. But the testimony of God has more weight, than that of ten thousand human witnesses. Whatever declaration we find in the Bible, we have better reason to believe, than we have to believe any facts which depend merely on human testimony, though it should be the testimony of the whole world. This must be admitted, unless we deny, either that the Bible is the word of God, or that he is possessed of infinite perfections. For if he has infinite perfections, then he has more knowledge, and more goodness, and more ability and inclination to speak the truth, than any created being, or all created beings united together; of course, it would be reasonable to suppose, that all the men on earth, and all the angels in heaven would lie, rather than God. So that any doctrine which rests on the word of God has a better support, than it would have, if, without any reference to the divine testimony, it should be affirmed to be true by all intelligent beings in the creation.

We see to what a comfortable conclusion our investigation has brought us, in regard to the foundation of our faith. If all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is, in truth, *his word*; then, whatever doctrine it exhibits respecting the divine character and administration, or respecting the state and prospects of man, has the firmest, best support. The peculiar doctrines of revelation have no other support. As they lie beyond the discovery of our natural reason, we must forever have remained ignorant of them, had they not been made known by the word of God. But as soon as *he* reveals them, we know them to be true.

2. *We are to regard the Bible as the source of religious knowledge, and the standard of our faith.*

As soon as we find out, in any case, what sense the word of God expresses, we have come to the end of our inquiries. Reasoning has nothing more to do, either in the way of proving or disproving. What remains for us is, to believe; and to believe just *what* is taught,—and exactly in the *manner* in which it is taught. In this way we give reason its proper exercise; that is, we bring it to sit as a learner at the feet of the heavenly teacher. As rational beings, we have in this case only one question; and that is, *what the God of truth says*. No man is at liberty to inquire, whether anything which God says is true. The simple fact *that God declares it*, is the highest possible evidence of its truth. When we proceed on this principle, our reason has its

proper use. It seeks that truth, and seeks it by suitable and effectual means.

The inspiration of the Bible, regarded as a practical doctrine, relieves us from misconception, doubt and perplexity respecting the most interesting of all subjects. I can illustrate my meaning best by examples. I begin with the following. We are exposed to doubt and misconception as to the manner in which the perfections of God will be developed hereafter in a moral government. What particular measures God will adopt in accomplishing the great ends of his benevolence and justice, it is impossible for us to determine by our own reason. And every attempt to determine it in this way, must involve us in error. Our own benevolence and justice are very imperfect, and cannot be considered as standards for these attributes as they exist in God. His benevolence and justice, under the guidance of his infinite intelligence, must be widely different from benevolence and justice so feeble as ours, and so exposed to be misguided by erring reason. We have therefore no means which we can rely upon for information on this subject, but *the word of God*. Here we are definitely taught, that God will display his benevolence and justice, and secure the ends of his moral administration, by *eternal retributions*; that he has appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness, and that he will bestow immortal happiness on the obedient, and inflict endless punishment on the disobedient. In this way, we obtain real knowledge of the manner in which God will unfold his benevolence and justice; knowledge which can be relied upon; knowledge founded on an infallible revelation. Our persuasion that such is the way in which divine benevolence and justice will operate has as sure a support in the word of God, as it would have, if we actually witnessed the accomplishment of that word in the endless happiness of the righteous, and the endless misery of the wicked. Thus we are freed from doubt and conjecture, and guarded against all the erroneous tendencies of uninstructed reason.

I shall give one more example. It would be impossible for us to discover, by our own reason, the peculiar manner in which the infinite God exists, as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; because there is nothing in created beings which could suggest it, or help us to explain it. But God, who knows himself, has taught us, that although there is only one Being possessed of eternal power and Godhead; there are yet three, Father, Son, and Spirit, to each of whom all divine attributes and acts belong. Now, if we regard the Bible as divinely inspired, and as infallibly true; we may free ourselves from all doubt and perplexity on this subject, and arrive at entire satisfaction. The fact that what God makes known to us differs from anything of which we are conscious in ourselves, or which we have observed in others, can be no objection to it. For we may well suppose that a Being, possessing a nature so infinitely

above ours, must in many respects be different from us ; so that when the Bible actually exhibits him as different, we have no occasion to feel any surprise. But aside from any reasonable presumption of ours, it is clear that, as soon as the inspired volume declares to us anything peculiar in the attributes of God, or in his mode of existence, we have a sufficient foundation for our faith. Nor should our faith waver in the least, because we may be unable to reconcile the doctrine revealed with some other things which we acknowledge to be true. That God has declared it, is perfect evidence of its truth. And they who refuse to believe any doctrine on the ground of this evidence, virtually deny that the Bible is the word of God, or else they deny that God is true ; and thus abandoning the true source of knowledge and the standard of faith, they are exposed to wander in darkness and perplexity without end.

Regarding the Bible as the source of knowledge, and the infallible standard of faith, is the sure way to put an end to controversy, and to bring Christians to a general agreement in regard to the principles of religion. For it is certain that those, whose faith agrees with the same standard, will be agreed among themselves. If men differ in respect to the doctrines of religion, it must be because some or all of them fail of conforming to the word of God.

That our faith may be conformed to the word of God, the following things are necessary. We must be fully persuaded of the divine inspiration and authority of the Bible, and then must apply in earnest to the study of it,—we, humble learners, and God our gracious Teacher.

In the prosecution of our inquiries after the truth, we must rid ourselves of all those dispositions, which darken the understanding, and bias the judgement ; and, by cherishing pure and holy affections, must prepare our minds readily to admit the light of divine truth.

Our study of the Scriptures must be well directed, and must be pursued with persevering diligence. We must understand what belongs to a correct interpretation of the Bible. Without such an understanding, our most diligent and pious efforts will, in a great measure, prove unsuccessful. We must, therefore, take pains, by the use of all the means in our power, to acquaint ourselves with the best principles and rules of interpretation, and by practice make those principles and rules familiar. In reference to the higher purposes of theological science and controversy, this is a great and arduous work, and requires talent, and learning, and long, intense study. But as to all the purposes of practical piety, it is a work perfectly within the reach of Christians in general, and only requires common sense, honesty, diligence, and prayer.

Now if all Christians, learned and unlearned, should pursue the study of God's word on right principles, and in a right manner, and

should come to understand its true meaning; and if they should conform their faith to this perfect standard; the certain consequence would be, a general agreement among Christians in regard to religious opinions. The prospect of such agreement among them must be in proportion to the intelligence, candor, piety and zeal, with which they apply themselves to the study of the Bible. It is not controversy, nor unsanctified learning, but *the diligent pious study of the Bible*, which is destined to put an end to division and strife in the Christian world.

3. *Those authors, who deny the inspiration of the Bible, are to be regarded as unsafe guides in respect to the principles of religion, and are to be read and studied with great caution.*

Let such authors be possessed of ever so much genius and learning; yet, in their representations of the essential doctrines of our religion, they are not worthy of our confidence. Should we think it safe that such men should be trusted to *preach* the gospel? And how can we think it any more safe that they should be trusted to explain Christianity by *writing*? Men of such views cannot be expected to feel any proper reverence for the word of God. The infallibility and divine authority of the Bible are both connected with its *inspiration*. They who deny the inspiration of the Bible will, of course, feel themselves at liberty, whenever they find occasion for it, to question the truth of the doctrines and the authority of the laws which it contains. As the prophets and apostles claim divine inspiration; those who do not admit that claim, must regard prophets and apostles as enthusiasts or impostors. It is a well known fact, that the denial of evangelical doctrines, and the denial of inspiration, go together. Priestley, for example, and others who agree with him, are obliged, in order to be consistent with themselves, to deny the inspiration of the apostles, and to charge them with ignorance and mistake. Such men will, in all probability, be biassed in their judgement as to the true sense of Scripture, and will be blind to the spiritual glory of the Christian religion. As they are unconvinced and unaffected by the evidence which proves the Bible to be divinely inspired; is it to be supposed, that they will rightly discern the nature of the heavenly truths which it contains? Will not those heavenly truths be foolishness to them? And can those, who are desirous of learning the mind of Christ, rely on such men as safe guides to the right understanding of God's holy word? We may indeed avail ourselves of all the important information which can be derived from those authors, who deny the divine origin of our sacred books. Whatever they contain that is valuable in respect to philology, or any branch of knowledge, we may properly convert to our use in defending and explaining Christianity. But can we rely on them as guides, or appeal to them as authorities, in respect to the holy doctrines of revelation? Suppose Saint Paul were here, and we should ask him, whether he would have us

learn the sense of his writings from infidel critics? What might we expect from him in reply, but the same caution that he gave to Christians in his day: "Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit." And what would *Jesus* say, if we should ask him, whether we may expect to learn the true, spiritual meaning of the Scriptures from those who are blinded by the god of this world, and are enemies to his cross! The advantages to be derived from their erudition, and from the acuteness of their philological investigations, are many and great. But in our inquiries after the peculiar truths of the Christian religion, we cannot look to them for aid. And who has ever resigned himself to their influence, or in any way leaned upon them, without essential injury?

How is it in other cases similar to this? Suppose that a man distinguished for genius and learning, entertains principles utterly subversive of civil law and government. Should we choose him as a teacher for those who are to be trained up to be legislators and judges? And suppose that a man of distinguished abilities is known to entertain principles pernicious to health and to life. Should we choose him as a teacher of the art of healing, and make his books, containing those pernicious principles, standards in the study and practice of medicine? How then can we look to men, whose religious principles are radically erroneous, for the assistance we need in discovering what are the true doctrines of revelation? Those who are set for the defence of the Gospel may consult, and when there is a prospect of obtaining knowledge which may subserve the cause of truth, *ought* to consult writers of the character above described. But whenever we consult them, we should exercise a watchful caution, and should be jealous over ourselves with a godly jealousy. We should bear in mind that those, whose writings we are perusing, are strangers to the truth as it is in *Jesus*, and enemies to the spirit of revelation, and that in everything, in which the essence of religion is concerned, they are to be suspected. And if those, who are preparing to be Christian preachers, do not remember this;—if while they are, from laudable motives, conversant with infidel or skeptical writers, they are heedless of the danger which attends them, and are not careful to shield their minds against the poisonous influence to which they are exposed, by faithful self-inspection, and constant, fervent prayer; they will certainly be led astray by the fascinations of genius and taste, and will suffer a moral injury, for which the most splendid acquisitions and honors they can obtain will prove but a miserable compensation.

4. *Those who disbelieve the doctrines, or who despise or neglect the precepts contained in the Bible, subject themselves to a heavy charge of presumption and impiety.*

To disbelieve the word of God is to impeach his veracity, or, as an Apostle expresses it, to *make him a liar*. Be it so, that some

things revealed in Scripture are contrary to the deductions of our natural reason. To deny or doubt their truth on this account, would be to set up our weak and erring reason above the infinite understanding of God. And what impious pride and folly would this be! The same may be said as to the *commands* of the Bible. They are the commands of *God*; and they have as high claims to our dutiful regard, and they bind us with as strong obligations, as if God now addressed them to us, individually, by a voice from heaven. The doctrine of divine inspiration is then a doctrine of tremendous import. It impresses upon the Bible a divine majesty and glory. It invests all its doctrines and precepts and promises with a high and holy authority. To the majesty and authority of such a book, containing the word of the eternal God, all our intellectual and moral powers should render the tribute of the profoundest reverence and submission. And surely God will not hold him guiltless, who either despises or neglects this gift of his mercy.

*In conclusion; how important is the work of explaining and inculcating the word of God, and disseminating it through the world.* There is no work on earth so momentous, so sacred, or so arduous. To publish to the world the doctrines and precepts of the Christian religion, would be a high and honorable employment for an angel. But God has seen fit to commit this high and honorable work, not to an angel, but to men. Those who undertake it may well feel it to be a work far above their power, and that they must entirely fail of success in their endeavors to execute it, unless they are aided by the grace of Christ. How honored and happy are they, who are called to this work, and who are striving to accomplish it. But their labors, already useful in a degree not easily estimated, would be far more useful, if they would abstract themselves from all other pursuits, and give themselves wholly to the business of teaching *the religion of the Bible*. In this way, their office would be associated still more closely with the glory of God, and the most precious interests of man. In this way, they would become, in the highest sense, benefactors to the world.

The work of preaching the Gospel has a natural and intimate connexion with the work of circulating the Scriptures. The labors of Christian ministers, and of Bible Societies, are directed to the same benevolent end. God has given the world a volume of divine truth. It is *his word*. And it contains instruction which it is infinitely important that every child of Adam should receive. There is no human design or enterprise, which enlightened Christian benevolence can place above that of giving the volume of inspiration to all men, and of teaching all men to understand it. Let Bible Societies, then, and Gospel ministers pursue their great object with united and growing and persevering zeal, till, through the mercy of heaven, all men shall hear and obey the Gospel, and the world be filled with the knowledge of the Lord.

## ULRIC ZUINGLE.

The history of the world, as exhibited in books, is little else than the history of eminent men. What is true of the world in general, is also true, in a good measure, of the visible church of Christ. Zuingle, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, and a few others of similar spirit, gave character to the Protestant church in the sixteenth century. Whenever we recur to the scenes of that eventful period, our minds imperceptibly fasten on these distinguished individuals, as the representatives of all that was then interesting and great. We love to dwell on their memories, to retrace the record of their lives, and to learn from our own sympathies with their thoughts and feelings, what it was to be a reformer in Christendom. It delights us, if we may gather up their reverend images, and, wiping off the accumulated dust, be able to discover here and there a characteristic feature.

Ulric Zuingle, the celebrated reformer of Switzerland, was born of worthy parents on the first of January, 1487, at Wildehausen, in the county of Toggenburg, a part of Switzerland lying south of the canton of St. Gal, and east of Zurich. He early discovered that precocity of genius which too often is but an omen of early decay. His active, sprightly, comprehensive mind made pastime of all the studies which usually task the powers of boyhood; and he passed from stage to stage in the progress of his education, with a rapidity that astonished his instructors. History however fails to give us the little incidents which first tried his energies, and curiosity inquires in vain for those developements which would exhibit the germ of his future character. We are obliged to make our acquaintance with him, as he appears in the business of public life, and to search out, as we can, the peculiarities of his mind, in the midst of complex and varying circumstances. Nothing more is known than that he soon became familiar with languages, music, poetry, and history; and afterwards, with vigorous resolution, mastered the subtilities of the prevalent philosophy. He then hastened from the technical jargon of the schools, to engage in what he felt to be the more congenial studies of Christian Theology; but his ingenuous mind was deeply agitated when he found within that sacred enclosure 'confusion worse confounded.' He gazed for awhile, first with astonishment, then with loathing, as one looks round on the disorders of a promiscuous crowd, and finally moved on in the way which his own good sense directed. At the age of 18, he was chosen the pastor of a little church at Glaris, where for several years he studied and explained the Scriptures, as he says, in humble dependence on the enlightening influences of the Holy Spirit. In the year 1516, he removed to a place called the Hermitage, famous for pilgrimages to the Virgin Mary, and began to

preach boldly the doctrines of the Gospel, in opposition to some of the tenets of the Catholic church. This happened just about one year before the gigantic Luther rose in his might to wrest from the Pope the wand of his usurped authority. A short time after, Zuingle was invited to the capital of Zurich, and there commenced a splendid career of usefulness, which was soon terminated by his death. He died in battle, on the eleventh of October, 1531, at the age of 44 years. Humanity is here obliged to pause and shed a tear over his untimely end, not more on account of the great loss sustained by the world, and the indignity done to his person, than the unkind aspersions which have since been thrown upon his character, by men who have not known, or who could not appreciate, his motives for engaging in such a contest. But he went not forth as a warrior. There were no arms in his hands. He only followed the people of his care, in conformity with the imperious custom of his country, to give them his counsel and to pray for them in the hour of their danger.

To Zuingle belongs the honor of being the first efficient reformer. Wickliffe, it is true, had preceded him, and has since been called 'the morning star of the reformation;' but his light was extinguished before the slumbering nations began to awake. The name of Luther was yet unheard in the cantons of Switzerland. But Zuingle had seen, that the principles of Christianity were widely different from those imposing errors which then degraded the understandings, and debased the hearts of men. With the spirit of a Christian, and the wisdom of an enlightened politician, he prepared to disenthral his countrymen and the world. His plan was deep; his purpose might be slow in its progress, but he knew it must be sure in its accomplishment. He aimed at nothing less than the establishment of a thorough system of evangelical truth. To this he devoted all his resources of extensive learning and energetic thought. He advanced moderately and cautiously but firmly in his work; and had it not been for the abusive sale of indulgencies, which now roused the indignation and nerved the arm of a fiercer champion against the church of Rome, that huge fabric might not have suffered as it did from a single and dreadful shock, but its very foundations would have been undermined. For it was while Zuingle was working the entire destruction of the papacy, that Luther gave it an impatient blow, which was felt through Christendom, and drew upon him the attention of the world. The comparatively small reputation which the former has gained, may be regarded as a remarkable instance of the singular but well known fact, that men are prone to judge of the importance of an enterprise by the event of it, and to estimate the character of individuals by their ultimate success. Zuingle wanted only the opportunity of Luther, to be as successful and as conspicuous as he. Luther stood forth with a daring front in the centre of Europe; Zuingle was shut up within the recesses of the Alps.



There are also several points of contrast in the character of these illustrious and nearly contemporary reformers, which account, in part, for the relative importance they hold in the estimation of mankind. Zuingle's faculties had symmetry and completeness; Luther possessed a certain directness and peculiarity of mind. The greatness of the one is partly lost in its exact proportions; that of the other is magnified by its bold and irregular prominence. Zuingle, though vigorous and decided, was self-possessed and considerate. He waited for a comprehensive view of his subject, and kept a steady eye, in everything he did, upon its probable effects. Luther was enthusiastic and reckless of consequences. A single object engrossed his soul. He saw things intuitively, felt indignant that others did not see as he did, and was astonished if any presumed to see more. No sooner had he detected an error or abuse, than he set the whole in commotion to beat it down. His was the policy that excites admiration, Zuingle's that which the judicious will always approve.

In his intellectual and moral endowments, Zuingle was eminently qualified to act his peculiar part in Switzerland. His mind partook strongly of the characteristics of his countrymen; it was active, vigorous, perspicacious, and free. With a capacious memory and a lively imagination, he possessed a soundness of judgment that never failed, and a maturity of thought that was seldom distrusted. His attainments were not the growth of superficial reading; he did not play on the insect wing of ephemeral poetry; his faculties were disciplined by severe study, and chastened in the school of thorough classical learning. He was one of the most eminent scholars of the age. In his biblical criticisms, plain common sense and an extensive acquaintance with the forms of speech are his most shining qualities. He appears to singular advantage in contrast with that host of literal, allegorical, and metaphysical expositors, who have 'darkened counsel by words without knowledge.' As a theologian, he was comprehensive and clear, acknowledging no other guide than Scripture and the plainest dictates of reason. He never perverted any doctrines in order to adapt them to a theory, and every part of his simple system received light, strength, and beauty from the whole. His preaching was in harmony with his character—bold, instructive, and pungent. He portrayed vice in its naked deformity, and thundered against it with a vehemence of expression, that made the guilty tremble. But withal there was a frankness and generosity of manner, which made them feel, that while he scorned the vice he loved the man.

Zuingle was, in the best sense of the term, a *liberal* man. There were principles in his heart, with which bigotry could not coalesce, and into whose society it was not permitted to enter. Even in the unhappy controversy which he held with Luther concerning the nature of the eucharist, he discovered a spirit of indulgence towards his opponent, while at the same time he main-

tained, with unconquerable pertinacity, what he believed to be true. And if, in relation to the Anabaptists of Zurich, he ever seemed to encourage intolerance, it was only on the same principle, by which our pilgrim fathers once persecuted the Quakers of New-England—because they were at that time too wild and frenzied to be endured in civilized society. He was alternately courted and suspected, cherished and abused, by men of different sentiments and opposite interests. But he was independent; neither friend nor foe could make him swerve from his purpose; he could not be shut up to narrow exclusiveness, nor thrown open to a weak surrender of his faith. He was full of courtesy and generosity, yet dignified and firm; like a noble elm that gracefully yields its flowing boughs to every breeze, but remains unmoved at its base amid storms and whirlwinds.

No man ever possessed more fully the confidence of his fellow citizens than Zuingli. He was the object of their admiration and their warm affection. He was their guide and their dependence; they boasted of his worth, and gave to his word the authority of a law. Senates eagerly sought his advice, passed resolutions, and decided on treaties, agreeably to his counsel. He lived to see the system of popish imposition legally abolished in his own canton, and other cantons fast imitating the example. In truth, he emancipated his country, and gave to it the simplest form of that system of faith which Calvin afterwards matured, and which the exiled puritans of England transferred from the school of Geneva to the land of our home. Zuingli therefore is nearly allied to us; we can almost hail him in our churches as our sire. Gratitude for his services, as well as respect for his character, demand for him a place in our tenderest recollections. Let his self-confidence and arrogance be overlooked, while his magnanimity prepossesses the heart. We have only to regret that history has done no more justice to the merits of the man, who, like his own Switzerland, is little known and little talked of by the world, but admired by every acquaintance for simplicity and grandeur.

s.

---

## REVIEWS.

SERMONS by Timothy Dwight, D. D. LL. D., late President of Yale College. In two volumes. New Haven: Howe, Durie and Peck. 1828.

(Continued from p. 259.)

We come now to the two volumes announced at the head of this article, the *latest*, though we hope they will not be the *last*, of his printed discourses. Here are *sixty-one* sermons, all of them on highly interesting topics, and executed in a style and manner

worthy of the reputation of their gifted author. We have spoken of Dr. Dwight's system of divinity, as his *great* work; but a more leisurely perusal of these volumes, leaves us in doubt which is entitled to the highest rank. Each, if not absolutely preeminent in its appropriate sphere, will, we venture to predict, be placed on the same shelf with the ablest productions of the kind. They have their distinctive features, to be sure, and they ought to have. The one contains more of divine philosophy, and the other of sacred rhetoric. *That*, perhaps, has more bone and muscle; but *this* surpasses it in the heart and soul of pulpit eloquence. When we turn to the system, if fancy is there, she sits by with folded wings, and imagination is held in check by a strong hand, to give scope for severe theological discussion: but when we come back to these more practical and popular discourses, we find the reins relaxed. Logical filiations are less extended and less abounding; feeling has more sway; the heart is more directly aimed at; and far more room is given for vivid pictures, and strong appeals both to the hopes and fears of the reader.

But after all, the great lineaments of talent, and feeling, and piety, are everywhere the same. There is the same originality, independence, richness and vigor of thought; the same love of arrangement; the same earnestness and copiousness of diction; the same glow of benevolence; and the same lofty conceptions of God, of the Gospel of Christ, of the worth of the soul, and of eternity.

When we say, as we would be understood distinctly to say, that, in our judgement, the sermons before us will not suffer in comparison with some which have enjoyed the greatest popularity, we do not mean to intimate, that they possess, in the highest degree, every requisite of this species of composition—nor that they are equally adapted to all occasions, and to every class of readers. Davies has more tropical fervor, and perhaps more genuine pathos, but not near so much depth and solidity. Bellamy sometimes makes the law thunder louder in the sinner's ear; and Edwards gives a nearer and more vivid reality to the deathless worm, and the unquenchable fire; but neither of those great preachers was master of so correct, or so captivating a style. For the conference room, in the commencement and progress of a revival, these discourses of Dr. Dwight will not compare with Burder's Village sermons, nor with many others which we could name. They are too long—too long, we mean, for the occasion. They are also, paradoxical as it may appear, too full of thought; and the style is too elevated. In short, they belong to a higher class of compositions, and will fill a very important space which ordinary sermons are not permitted to occupy. Such is the wisdom of God, in the diversity of gifts which he bestows upon his ministers, for the edification of the church.

Duly to estimate the value of these discourses, we must bear in mind that they were written, not for a common, but for a literary audience,—with a view to be preached in the college Chapel at New Haven. Required by the statutes of the Seminary to appear in panoply every sabbath morning, Dr. Dwight would hardly be expected or desired to lay it wholly aside in the afternoon: but if he did not ordinarily put it off with the occasion, he was seldom or never incumbered with it. As in the theological chair, we always found the able logician and divine, so in every other department of the sacred office, we meet with the same earnest, faithful and warm-hearted pastor.

To offer anything like a fair abstract, or even the frame-work of more than sixty sermons, occupying nearly *eleven hundred* closely printed pages, would be impossible within our limits. A richer table of contents we have rarely met with; but instead of copying it out, we shall quote a few paragraphs from the work, just to awaken a desire to possess the whole, and close with such remarks of our own, as can be crowded into the narrow space which will be left us.

The first two hundred pages are devoted chiefly to the necessity of a special revelation, such as the Bible contains, to make mankind acquainted with all those great truths on which their eternal well being depends. And here, we know not which to admire most, the strong grasp of the author upon a great and difficult subject—the cogency, variety and freshness of his arguments—his familiar acquaintance with the writings and opinions of heathen philosophers—or his masterly exposure of their absurdities and contradictions. We quote a single passage from the close of the *tenth sermon*, entitled *Life and immortality brought to light by the Gospel*.

“Thou art a sinner. Thy own conscience has a thousand times declared this tremendous truth. Should God summon thee to account for thy sins hereafter, what wilt thou answer? From his eye, where wilt thou hide? From his hand, how wilt thou escape? With what agonies wilt thou then wish that thou hadst acknowledged, believed and obeyed, his Word? With what sighs will thy bosom heave, with what throes will thy heart wring, for an interest in that divine Redeemer, whom in this world thou hast only *crucified afresh by thy unbelief!* Dost thou not see that thou art sacrificing thyself on the altar of Infidelity, and murdering thy soul as a victim to sinful pleasure?”

“What then is thy hope? Annihilation. But how dost thou know that God will annihilate thee? Stung by thy guilt, thou hast made thyself willing or persuaded thyself that thou art willing, to see the living light of the mind go out in eternal darkness. But will He, who kindled it, suffer it to expire? Shouldst thou continue to exist after death, how terrible a state of existence will eternity prove to thee!”

“Accompany me to yonder cemetery. Whose graves do I see? In *this* thy father is interred: in *that*, sleep the remains of thy mother. They were Christians. They loved God; they trusted in the Redeemer; they practised holiness; and, from this melancholy world, they ascended to heaven. In that delightful world, amid all its glories, they wait impatiently for the arrival of thee, their beloved child, to complete their joys. But they wait in vain. Thy path is only downward. Thou hast destined thyself to the regions of annihila-

tion. Nay, thou wouldst pluck them from the foot of the eternal throne; extinguish their immortal life; strip them of angelic happiness; and hurl them down to the same dark and desolate abyss. Miserable man!"

"Open thine eyes, if they are not finally closed in moral darkness, and see before thee the melancholy regions of woe, where the groan of anguish resounds, and the stream of tears flows without intermission, and without end; and where death and despair stretch their iron sceptre, forever, over the dreary solitude! Dost thou tremble at the prospect? Look behind thee, and behold Goodness and Mercy, twin-born of heaven, and arrayed in robes of uncreated light, stand anxiously watching thy course, and beckoning thee back to life; while, at their side, Hope, with her lucid finger, points the path to immortality, and exclaims, with a smile of transport, 'Glory to God in the Highest; peace on earth; and good-will towards men!'" vol. ii. pp. 178, 179.

Of the same general character are the two celebrated sermons, *On the Nature and Danger of Infidel Philosophy*, preached to the candidates for the Baccalaureate, in 1797, and soon after republished in England. These, we think, are the most elaborate and, upon the whole, the most finished and powerful of Dr. Dwight's discourses. Such a synopsis of infidel opinions as they contain had never been given, we believe, by any writer; and if Hobbs, and Tyndal, and Herbert, and Shaftesbury, and Hume, have ever been summoned to answer for their unhallowed assaults upon the Christian system, by an abler indictment, we know not where to find it. Roused to a holy jealousy for the Lord of Hosts, Dr. Dwight comes down upon these vaunting Philistines, like some indignant spirit from a higher sphere; and they quail and tremble under his rebukes. Awful is the majesty of truth! If the author of these two discourses had never done anything else for his country and the church, he would have been entitled to the gratitude of the age in which he lived. We offer as a specimen the following extract. That it is eloquent—powerful, no one will deny; and that, when delivered, it sent a thrill to every corner of the house, many living witnesses can testify.

"It is by no means my intention, or my wish, to flatter you with hopes of unmingled happiness on this side of the grave. This world has ever been, and still is, a vale of tears. Want, pain, sorrow, disease, and death, are constant tenants of this unhappy soil, and frequent inmates of every human dwelling. To aid the sufferer, to sustain, and to vanquish, these unfriendly visitors, Christianity furnishes the peace, the patience, and the fortitude of virtue, the consciousness of forgiven sin and infinite complacency, and the supporting hope of endless and overgrowing sanctity, happiness, and glory. In every throbbing bosom she sings, 'This light affliction, which is but for a moment, is not worthy to be compared with the glory, that shall be revealed hereafter.' The song is the song of Angels; the voice is the voice of God.

"All these alleviations are, at a stroke, swept away by the besom of Philosophy. Like a rude, unfeeling nurse, she approaches the bed of pain and sickness, and tells the groaning sufferer, that he is indeed miserable; and that he may quietly resolve to bear his calamities, for they are irremediable and hopeless. To the despairing victims of want, infamy, and oppression, she extends her hand, empty of comfort, and passes by on the other side. The Parent, overwhelmed with woe for the loss of his only son, she coolly informs, that his tears and his sighs are useless, for his favorite has ceased from the light of the living, and vanished forever. To the failing eye of the poor, desponding and expiring wretch, she holds out her dark lantern, and, as the only consolation which she can give, shows him the sullen region of annihilation, destined to receive and wrap him in eternal and oblivious night.

“You, with the rest of men, must suffer woe. Poverty may betide, shame may arrest, pain may agonize, sorrow may sink, disease may waste, and death will befall you. In all these evils, you will seek for consolation, support, and hope. From Philosophy you will find none. On that solemn day, which is fast approaching, when you will be extended upon the bed of death, when the physician has bidden you adieu, and your friends are watching for the parting gasp, your souls will cling to existence, will pant for relief, and will search the Universe for a glimmering of hope. Should Philosophy have been your bosom companion, and the arm on which you have finally rested, you will then know what it is to have renounced religion, to look back on a life of sin with agony, and forward to a world of suspense with horror. Christianity, sighing her last farewell, and dropping her parting tear, will retire in silence and sorrow, and will mourn with deep compassion, that, forlorn and dreadful as was your lot, you would not suffer her to allay your misery, and with the lamp of hope light you through your melancholy path into the world of future being.

“Religion, on the contrary, feels, and proves, a regard for the sorrows of man, infinitely more tender, soothing, and supporting. Like the fabled power of enchantment, she changes the thorny couch into a bed of down, closes with a touch the wounds of the soul, and converts a wilderness of woe into the borders of Paradise. Whenever you are forced to drink the cup of bitterness, Mercy, at her call, will stand by your side, and mingle sweetness with the draught; while with a voice of mildness and consolation she will whisper to you, that the portion, though unpleasant, is necessary and balsamic; that you have diseases to be removed, and morbid principles to be exterminated; and that the unpalatable administration will assuredly establish in you health immortal. The same sweetener of life will accompany you to the end, and, seating herself by your dying bed, will draw aside the curtains of eternity, will bid you lift your closing eyes on the end of sorrow, pain, and care, and in the opened gates of peace and glory will point to you, in full view, the friends of Christ, waiting to hail your arrival.” vol. ii. pp. 375-7.

It can hardly be necessary for us to say, that Dr. Dwight took a deep interest in those revivals of religion which commenced in Connecticut, near the close of the last century, and in which his beloved College so richly shared, during his presidency. We quote, however, the following paragraphs, for the special edification of some, who are wont to receive it as *prima facie* evidence of a man's being weak, or fanatical, that he is an ardent friend of revivals.

“There are, my brethren, there are in this land, men, who oppose, decry, and ridicule, Revivals of Religion. Few, perhaps none, of these persons profess to direct their hostility against Religion. A Revival of Religion is, in their view, or at least in their declarations, false phraseology; and not descriptive of the fact to which it is ordinarily applied. Enthusiasm and Fanaticism are the names, under which their opposition is carried on, and by the aid of which they appear to think it justifiable. Let me ask these persons; Are you sure that this opinion is just? Have you any satisfactory evidence, that, in your designs, Enthusiasm, only, is aimed at; and that you intend no hostility against Religion itself! Should this be the fact; have you ascertained that that, against which you contend, is, in the given case, not Religion, but Enthusiasm? He, who *may be found fighting against God*, ought, certainly, to be well assured, that a conflict, upon which he is about to enter, is not of this tremendous nature. Where there is a visible concern for the interests of the soul; where men are heard to ask, *what they shall do to be saved*; there is, certainly, the appearance of Religion: and, where there is the appearance, there may be the reality. Suppose then, that amid much Enthusiasm, and many delusions, there should be some real piety; that among multitudes who, in what is called a Revival of Religion, are anxious about their salvation, a single man should become a genuine convert, and actually embrace the offers of eternal life. This, certainly, is supposing the least; and less, probably, than the truth, in any case of this

nature. Would not the salvation of this individual more than balance all the evils, which you apprehend from the enthusiasm in question? This single man will escape from more evils, as may be shown with mathematical certainty, if the Scriptures are the Word of God, than have been suffered by the whole human race since the world began; and will enjoy more happiness than has fallen to the lot of all the generations of men on this side of the grave. Would not the arrival even of this one man in the regions of immortality be a source of everlasting joy to the Church of the First-Born? Who, unless animated with the spirit of a fiend, can fail to welcome the conversion, from which such glorious consequences will spring, with the most ardent feelings of gratulation?

“Suppose your opposition should be successful. Suppose your arguments, your ridicule, or your influence, should discourage even one awakened, anxious man from pursuing the salvation of his soul. With what emotions will he regard you on his dying bed! With what feelings will he remember you amid the endless sufferings of perdition! What appearance must you make to the eye, what character must you sustain in the heart, of the religious parent, who beholds you laboring to destroy, who sees that you have finally destroyed, his beloved child; have cut off his hopes of life, and shut him out of heaven. Angels, if sorrow could find an entrance into their unspotted minds, would weep over this terrible catastrophe, and sackcloth shroud the world of immortal glory.” vol. i. pp. 239, 240.

In unison with these solemn appeals, is the whole of sermon *twenty-sixth*, of the second volume, from the text, “*The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved,*” which is supposed to have been instrumental in producing four or five extensive revivals. Gladly would we ring every warning of this discourse in the ears of perishing millions, till they should listen, and pause, and turn, and “flee from the wrath to come.” We can find room only for the “*prospects*” of a dying sinner.

“Before him, robed in all his terrors, stands Death, the messenger of God, now come to summon him away. To what, to whom is he summoned? To that final Judgement, into which *every work* of his hands will be speedily brought, *with every secret thing*: to that Judge, from whose sentence there is no appeal, from whose eye there is no concealment, from whose hand there is no escape. Through the last agonies, lies his gloomy, dreadful passage into the unseen world; his path to the bar of God. What a passage! What an interview! He, a hardened, rebellious, impious, ungrateful wretch; who has wasted all the means of salvation, prostituted his talents, squandered his time, despised his Maker, “crucified afresh the Lord of glory, and done despite unto the Spirit of Grace;” now comes before that glorious and offended God, who knows all the sins which he has committed. He is here, without an excuse to plead, without a cloak to cover his guilt. What would he now give for an interest in that Atonement which he slighted, rejected, and ridiculed, in the present world; in that Intercession, on which, while here, he never employed a thought; and in that Salvation, for which perhaps he never uttered a prayer! The smiles of redeeming, forgiving, and sanctifying love are now changed into the frowns of an angry, and irreconcilable Judge. The voice of mercy sounds no more; and the hope of pardon has vanished on this side of the grave.

“To the Judgement succeeds the boundless vast of *Eternity*. Live, he must: die, he cannot. But where, how, with whom, is he to live? The world of darkness, sorrow, and despair, is his final habitation. Sin, endless and increasing sin, is his dreadful character; and sinners like himself are his miserable and eternal companions. Alone, in the midst of millions, surrounded by enemies only, without a friend, without a comfort, without a hope; he lifts up his eyes, and in deep despair takes a melancholy survey of the immense regions around him, but finds nothing to alleviate his woe, nothing to support his drooping mind, nothing to lessen the pangs of a broken heart.

“In a far distant region, he sees a faint glimmering of that ‘Sun of Righteousness,’ which shall never more shine upon him. A feeble, dying sound of the

praise, the everlasting songs of 'the general assembly and church of the first-born,' trembles on his ear, and in an agonizing manner reminds him of the blessings in which he also might have shared, and which he voluntarily cast away. In dim and distant vision those heavens are seen, where multitudes of his former friends and companions dwell; friends and companions, who in this world loved God, believed in the Redeemer, and by a patient continuance in well doing, sought for glory, honor, and immortality. Among them, perhaps, his own fond parents; who, with a thousand sighs, and prayers, and tears, commended him, while they tabernacled here below, to the mercy of God and to the love of their own Divine Redeemer. His children also, and the wife of his bosom gone before him, have perhaps fondly waited at the gates of glory in the ardent expectation, the cheering hope, of seeing him once so beloved, reunited to their number, and a partaker in their everlasting joy. But they have waited in vain.

"The curtain now is drawn; and the amazing vast is unbosomed to his view. Nature, long decayed, sinks under the united pressure of sickness, sorrow, and despair. His eyes grow dim; his ears deaf; his heart forgets to beat; and his spirit, lingering, terrified, amazed, clings to life, and struggles to keep possession of its earthly tenement. But, hurried by an unseen Almighty hand, it is irresistibly launched into the unseen abyss. Alone and friendless, it ascends to God; to see all its sins *set in order before its eyes*. With a gloomy and dreadful account of life spent only in sin, without a single act of piety, or voluntary kindness to men, with no faith in Christ, and no sorrow for iniquity; it is cast out as wholly wicked and unprofitable, into the land of darkness and the shadow of death; there to wind its melancholy journey through regions of sorrow and despair, ages without end; and to take up forever the gloomy and distressing lamentation in the text, 'The harvest is past, the summer is ended; but I am not saved.' vol. ii. pp. 415—17.

Not to have trembled under such preaching as this, would have indicated a degree of insensibility, to which we believe that God in his wrath does not often abandon the youthful hearer.

The last twelve discourses of the first volume, including the two already mentioned on the nature and danger of infidel philosophy, were delivered to as many successive classes, at the end of their collegiate course. To say that they were listened to with great interest, would be common praise. They are of that class of occasional sermons, which will bear to be *read* as well as *heard*; nay, which will richly reward a frequent perusal. They embody the results of long experience—the accumulated practical wisdom of no common mind. As specimens of classical taste and pulpit eloquence they are unequal, and several of them, perhaps, are in these respects surpassed by some other valedictory addresses. But in compass and richness of thought; in minuteness of observation; in comprehension and philosophic views of human nature, and of mere earthly glory; in lofty moral principle; in earnest and pious exhortation; and in overflowing paternal yearnings; we know not where to find anything superior to these baccalaureate discourses. We regret that we have no room for extracts; and that we are compelled to pass over, in silence, so much more that is excellent, in order to find room for the remarks which we intended to make, upon the talents and character of Dr. Dwight as a religious and literary teacher; upon the influence which he exerted while living; and the enduring good which will result from his instruction, example and writings.



In selecting his topics, and preparing his discourses, Dr. Dwight never "drew a bow at a venture." He had an aim, and he never lost sight of it. So accustomed was he to invention, and to the arrangement of his thoughts under their proper heads, that to have written a sermon after the manner of some preachers, without any proper beginning, middle, or end, would have been impossible. Discussion was his life and breath. Order was the first law of his mind, which, as it advanced from step to step, would always create for itself a solid substratum. It had an instinctive fondness for hard labor; but it would not work at all, except by rule. Every sermon must have a skeleton, to be "clothed with flesh and skin, and the articulations and processes must be sufficiently prominent for the muscles and tendons. This is observable in all his discourses, whether doctrinal or practical. They are "fenced with bones and sinews;" and the effect depends, not so much upon a single feature, as upon the compactness and goodly proportions of the whole frame. Dr. Dwight, like every other distinguished preacher, made his own plans. The deep and broad current of his thoughts could never flow in common channels. Whenever a passage was to be cut through the solid rock, he chose to hew it out for himself; and he would as soon have gone to England for the materials of his "table talk," as to Simeon, or any one else, for *helps*!

In his manner of delivery, Dr. Dwight was graceful, dignified, solemn and animated. In his voice were united fullness, strength, flexibility and melody. His articulation was remarkably distinct, though at times considerably rapid; and it was always forcible. In whatever great and crowded house he was called to speak, he filled it with perfect ease, never failing to reach the remotest of the audience. We have seldom known a speaker, who could, especially on great occasions, hold an enlightened assembly in more fixed attention. The volume of his elocution, though always full, and clear, and strong, was, for the most part, quite uniform. But there were times, under special excitement, when it burst forth like a torrent; and then, if it did not hurry you down the cataract, it inevitably swept you away from your moorings. That he was not acting a part, but pouring out the treasures of his own understanding and feelings, was manifest on all occasions; but when warmed by some favorite and inspiring subject, his whole soul was in his eye; and his logic itself was all on fire.

But much as Dr. Dwight excelled and was admired in the pulpit, he appeared with still greater advantage in another sphere. The remark will no doubt be thought extravagant, if not invidious, by some of our readers, but it is our sober judgement, that no other man in this country ever possessed so many rare qualifications, physical, intellectual, and moral, for the presidency of a great literary institution; and all these combined with so much

knowledge and experience. With the happiest talent for winning confidence and communicating instruction, teaching was his great business and his delight for almost fifty years ; and during the last half of this period, we do not believe that any distinguished instructor, who knew him, ever considered it a disparagement to be placed below him. Having been so long conversant with youthful intellect, in its strength and its weakness ; in its loftiest aspirations, and its deepest dwelling places ; and having made himself master of all the avenues by which it can be approached, he was seldom at a loss for expedients, even in the most discouraging cases. If a student had any talent, any capacity for improvement, Dr. Dwight was sure to find where it lay, and to make the most of it. His maxim was, that nothing is impossible to application and perseverance ; and cheered by his smiles, many a youth was nurtured up to respectability and usefulness, who would have come out a mere cypher from under the hand of an ordinary instructor. He was constantly exhorting his pupils to set their mark high, to think, to reason, to be thorough in every study, to fix their thoughts upon great and worthy objects, and to attempt great things for their country, for the church, and the world. There was nothing which he more heartily pitied and despised, than one who was content that his soul should revolve forever in an acorn shell ; and no man ever knew better than he did how to make such an one feel his contemptibleness.

Always cheerful and animated himself, his example contributed powerfully to spread the same sunshine, even over minds predisposed to despondency. At all times accessible, courteous, and sensible, he entered at once into the feelings of such as applied to him for advice, made their interests his own, and, we believe, seldom failed to gain their confidence, and win their hearts. Viewed as an instructor and guide of young men, perhaps no two traits were more remarkable in the character of Dr. Dwight, than his assiduity and disinterestedness. If he delighted in anything, it was in doing good to those under his charge, and fitting them for usefulness. He cared not how much he labored, nor how much thought and time it cost him, if the great objects of their being, and of their education, could be promoted. His pupils felt, when they had occasion to consult him, that he could not have taken a deeper interest in the welfare of his own children, than he manifested in theirs ; and this, we believe, was literally true. For he had so long delighted in doing good, for its own sake, as well as from principle and habit, that he seemed incapable, to a degree which we have hardly ever known, of taking his own personal convenience or interests into the account.

But though winning and instructive everywhere, it was in the class room that his powers of communication were drawn out in their greatest strength and variety. It was there that he poured

out the stores of his knowledge and experience on every subject that came before him. It was there that metaphysical acumen, a lofty imagination, keen logical discussion, and profound elocution, were blended often in unwonted harmony. It was there that Dr. Dwight, like a presiding genius, encouraged the timid, checked the temerity of the froward and presuming, enlightened the understanding, and warmed the heart. In short, it was there that he astonished, delighted and animated those who had the privilege of hearing him, almost at pleasure.

As a disciplinarian, he was perhaps equally unrivalled. When he took charge of the college, "all the foundations were out of course;" but his energy and wisdom soon brought them to their places. He knew how to touch the secret springs of motion and action, so as to make the great body of the students respect themselves; and this being done, they were brought to respect the laws and government of the institution, almost as a matter of course. In the most hopeless cases of refractoriness, his forbearance was carried to the extreme point of safety; but there was something portentous in this very forbearance, which the subject of it could not fail to perceive, and to fear.

In his government of the college, Dr. Dwight was truly parental. He loved his pupils, and "on his tongue was the law of kindness." When they erred, he treated them as in error, and not as in deliberate transgression. His intercourse with them was that of benignity and confidence. He wished them to forget that there were any laws, other than those by which gentlemen and Christians voluntarily govern themselves. In this manner he commonly succeeded, and established an influence far preferable to that of pains and penalties. When a student refused to be won by means like these, which sometimes happened, and private admonition was called for, it was given with so much kindness, mingled with firmness, that it commonly had the desired effect. If, however, it failed, no man better knew how to administer threatening and terror than Dr. Dwight. No man could more easily make the transgressor tremble, or make him more heartily despise himself, by showing him what he was, and what he might be. Long will the friends of Yale College have reason to bless God, for raising up and placing over it such a man, at the very time when his peculiar talents and almost unbounded popularity were so imperiously required.

Dr. Dwight would have appeared to advantage in almost any station to which he could have been called. He would have been distinguished at the bar, or on the bench; his eloquence would have been impressive in the halls of legislation; he would have presided with dignity in the deliberative assembly; he would have been respected and listened to in the cabinet; he would have done honor to his country, as her representative at a foreign court; and

he was early solicited to receive the suffrages of his fellow citizens, and aspire to civil and political distinction. But God had raised him up for different services; and whatever reputation he might have earned at Washington, or St. Cloud, we believe he could nowhere have done so much for his country and his kind, as in the place which he actually filled. It was chiefly through his influence and that of his pupils, that many of the churches were brought back from the *half way practice*, with all its laxness in doctrine and discipline, to the foundation on which the American church was first established by our pilgrim fathers. We do not say, that this great reformation, involving, as we believe it did, the salvation of thousands, would not have been effected without him, for God could have raised up a mightier champion for the truth; or he could have accomplished his purpose by much feebler instrumentality; but what we think ourselves fully justified in repeating, is, that Dr. Dwight was honored, above all his contemporaries, in the influence which he directly or remotely exerted, for the recovery of the *half way* churches around him, and others in different parts of the land, from their backslidings. This, which of itself would have been richly worth any man's living for, was but one among the many important services, which he personally rendered to the cause of truth and righteousness.

But great as was the good which he did while living, it bore no proportion to what we believe his surviving influence and his writings are destined to accomplish. Such a man, especially when intrusted extensively with the education of youth, for all the high offices and learned professions of the country, will impress much of his own character upon the next generation. Dr. Dwight could not, indeed, impart his great and various intellectual powers to his pupils. But he could, and did, breathe into many of them, the spirit of patriotism, philanthropy, and moral enterprise which glowed in his own bosom. He could, and did, mould the characters of a large proportion of every class, we will not say into his own image, but into habits of thought and action, specially adapted to the age in which they were to live. How many hundreds, who are now acting their parts with ability and usefulness on the great theatre of human life, rose up under his plastic hand, and will entail blessings upon a remote posterity. Not far from fifteen hundred, we believe, of the liberally educated men of our country enjoyed, at one time or another, the advantages of his instructions, example, experience, and advice. And when it is considered how many of these are burning and shining lights in the church—are found in our courts of justice—in the halls of science and legislation, and in various other departments of literary, political and moral influence, throughout a mighty empire, even now in its early youth; who will undertake to estimate the final aggregate of that influence upon coming generations? To have been instrumental

in giving a wise and useful direction to so many minds ; to have set in motion such a mighty machinery, and still to live and think and speak, in so many representatives, is an honor which but few men can secure for themselves, under the most favorable circumstances.

Upon the merits of Dr. Dwight's writings we have no room for further enlargement. The good which his system of divinity has already accomplished beyond the Atlantic, where it has been carried through many editions, would be a rich reward for a thousand fold more labor than it cost ; while a vast increase of popularity and usefulness is confidently anticipated. The celebrity of the author, and the intrinsic value of the work, give it both currency and credence, where no other American Calvinistic preacher could gain an equally favorable hearing ; and thus, the doctrines which have been so eminently owned of God on this side of the water, are in a fair way of extending their influence on the other.

At home, the call for Dr. Dwight's theological works has, perhaps, hitherto been less urgent than might have been anticipated, from the extensive acquaintance and high popularity of the author in his lifetime. But this may be accounted for on principles which cannot long stand in the way of a wide and useful circulation. The eloquent voice of the preacher imparted an interest to his discourses, which it is hardly possible for a silent perusal to afford. Of course, those who heard them delivered, are likely, when they read them in print, to feel something like a disappointment.

The prevailing taste of the age, moreover, demands excitement rather than solid instruction ; and Dr. Dwight has made very little provision for this sickly appetite. What he offers, is the product of thought, is full of thought, and requires thinking to digest and make it profitable. But these causes must be temporary. The existing generation will soon pass away. The commanding elocution of the author will be no more remembered. Readers will again be willing to reason and to think, as in times gone by ; and then, we venture to predict, will the discourses, both doctrinal and practical, which have now passed under our hasty review, be read with increasing interest, and will enjoy an enduring popularity.



JAHN'S HISTORY OF THE HEBREW COMMONWEALTH. *Translated from the German, by Calvin E. Stowe, A.M., of the Theol. Seminary, Andover. With an Appendix from the French of Basnage.* Andover, Flagg & Gould. 1829. pp. 692.

We regard this work as an invaluable accession to the cause of biblical learning. It supplies a deficiency which has long been

felt by those who have made the Bible their study. The best works of the kind to which the student has hitherto had access, are, the *History of Josephus*, and the *Connexions of Prideaux and Shuckford*. The work of Josephus is of great value as one of the original sources of information; but Josephus alone is insufficient as a guide. It was evidently his object to raise his countrymen in the estimation of the Greeks and Romans; and for this purpose, he sometimes gives a gloss to a passage in the sacred history, which he feared would excite the ridicule of the pagan. Fabulous tradition is frequently mingled with authentic history, and the reader has no means of making the requisite distinction. He adopts, without correction, many of the gross mistakes of his countrymen, in regard to the history of the pagan nations, and particularly of the Persian empire. These remarks will be understood, of course, to apply only to those periods of history, which precede the reign of Herod the Great; for in regard to all which occurred in his own age, the authority of Josephus is unimpeachable.

It was the object of Prideaux merely to connect the Old and New Testament histories. He begins with the reign of Ahaz, and proceeds as far as the time of Christ. Prideaux was a laborious, faithful and accurate historian; but, like most of the scholars of his time, he was encumbered with his own learning. He frequently forsakes his main subject, and employs himself in tedious discussions of subordinate topics, by which he swells his book to an immoderate size, and exhausts the patience of the reader. Besides, there have been great advances in the knowledge of these subjects since the time of Prideaux.

Shuckford designed to complete the work of Prideaux, by composing a history of the interval from the creation to the reign of Ahaz; but he has carried it only as far as the time of Moses. Shuckford was far inferior to his predecessor in scholarship and judgement; and his work is filled, to a much greater extent, with irrelevant matter.

Dr. John Jahn, the author of the work before us, is well known to the American public, by his *Dissertation on the best mode of studying the original languages of the Bible*, translated several years since by Professor Stuart; also by his *Biblical Archæology*, translated by Professor Upham; and his *Introduction to the Old Testament*, lately translated by Professor Turner, of the Episcopal Seminary, New-York. His character appears in a most interesting light, when we consider the variety, extent, and value of his labors, and at the same time, the disadvantages of his situation. He was educated in the Catholic Church, and lived in the heart of Austria, where the freedom of the press and freedom of speech are unknown, and where civil and ecclesiastical tyranny are combined to suppress, so far as possible, the freedom of thought. Notwith-

standing his connexion with the Catholics, as a dignitary of the Holy Church, and the fact of his being a protégé of the Austrian emperor, he was always a strenuous defender of the supreme authority of the Bible. Without coadjutor, and without encouragement, he spent a life of almost incredible labor in the elucidation of the sacred books, and in defending them against the attacks of open infidels, and pretended Christians. When the oppressive policy of the Austrian government prevented him from communicating the results of his investigations in his own country, he frequently sent them to the Evangelical Protestants of Tübingen, where they appeared with the works of Storr, and Flatt, and Bengel, and other defenders of the Orthodox faith in the University. His writings have had an important influence in counteracting the baneful effects of the loose principles of criticism, which have prevailed in the north of Germany.\* He died in 1816, aged 66.

The History of the Hebrew Commonwealth is regarded by good judges as among the most elaborate and useful of his numerous works. It commences with a survey of civil society from its origin to the time of Moses. In this survey, as well as in the following chapter, which treats of the civil constitution of the Hebrews, the author exhibits a mind accustomed to profound reflection, and a happy talent of deducing rational conclusions upon subjects, where the remoteness of facts obliges the writer to make full proof of his own judgement.

The author has placed the Old Testament history in an interesting light, by representing Jehovah as the *chosen King* of the Hebrew nation. At first, this seems more like an embellishment of poetry than the soberness of historical truth. But from the reply which Jehovah made to Samuel, when the people petitioned for a king; from the whole tenor of the Divine communications to Moses; and from the fact that in the Chronicles, and the book of Numbers, the land of Canaan is represented as the royal possession, of which the Hebrews were to be the hereditary occupants, rendering to Jehovah a double title, as the Egyptians did to their king; we think the author is warranted in exhibiting this view of the case in the light of a literal representation. By considering the government of the Hebrews as a theocracy, and them as required to regard the Divine Being as their immediate and rightful Sovereign, a very aggravated guilt is made to attach to

\* An interesting fact relating to the influence of Jahn's writings, has lately come to our knowledge. It is well known that the younger Rosenmüller was formerly sceptical in regard to the Pentateuch, and the prophetic character of the Psalms. In the last edition, however, of his Commentary, he gives notice in the title page, that it has been so much altered as to be, in fact, a new work: "Sic ab auctore, recognita emendata, et aucta, ut novum opus videri possit." The authority of these sacred books is *established* in the Prolegomena of this edition; and there is satisfactory evidence that the change in his opinions was effected by a Dissertation of Jahn, written just before he died, and published after his death in Bengel's Archives at Tübingen.

every transgression of the Israelites. Their relapses into idolatry are so many acts of treason against their Sovereign. Their multiplied violations of known and written laws are all instances of rebellion, not against Moses, but against Jehovah. And while we are impressed with the greatness of his condescension, in permitting himself to be called their king, we are induced to watch their conduct with a deeper solicitude, and when they go astray, we tremble with the expectation that his wrath will be kindled against them and consume them.

In the tenth section, which treats of the relation of the ancient Hebrews to other nations, the author gives us valuable information respecting those nations which the Israelites were commissioned to destroy. In speaking of their civil polity, he exhibits the same happy talent, above mentioned, of deducing from several passages of Scripture the nature, design, and character of the various orders of magistrates which existed among them. The closing remark in the following quotation is worth noticing.

“In all these employments, the priests and Levites, equally with the other Hebrews, were strictly prohibited the use of magic oracles, necromancy, astrology, omens, soothsaying from the entrails of sacrifices or the movement of clouds, and all those artifices which, among the Egyptians and other ancient nations, were the usual means of managing the populace. Thus the Hebrew priests, who are so little esteemed by many at the present day, were the only priests of antiquity who were not allowed to impose upon the credulity of the multitude.”

After the conquest of the land of Canaan, the history is divided into separate periods, for the sake of easy reference. The division is such, that the state of the nation at any particular period can be satisfactorily ascertained, with a very little trouble. We would refer to the twenty-second and twenty-third sections, which treat of the office of the judges, and the condition of the Hebrews during their administration, as instances of the great assistance which the author has afforded, in obtaining information respecting those periods which are referred to only in several disconnected passages of the Old Testament.

The history of the nation from the introduction of monarchy to the revolt of the ten tribes, is one of the most interesting portions of the work. We were particularly pleased with the commencement of the history of David.

“The invisible Ruler of Israel so directed events, that Saul himself contributed the most towards rendering this magnanimous young man an experienced and worthy viceroy of Jehovah. For when, by continually brooding over that determination of God, so unwelcome to his feelings, he at last fell into a deep melancholy, in order to divert his thoughts, he took David into his court as a private musician; and thus gave him the first opportunity to become acquainted with court life, and the business of government. The personal bravery of the young minstrel did not long remain unnoticed by the veteran hero, and he soon elevated him to the honorable station of royal armor bearer.”

None but a wise and pious observer of the hand of Providence would have noticed these circumstances in such a manner.



After the revolt of the ten tribes, those of Judah and Benjamin, who remained firm in their allegiance to the house of David, were considered as one tribe, because the capital, Jerusalem, was situated on the frontiers of both tribes, and were called by the common name of Judah. The history of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel is divided into five periods; and the history of each kingdom is given separately, until the time of the Babylonian captivity.

In the chapter relating to the captivity, the author has drawn much of his information from the *Zend Avesta*. The genuineness of this work has been satisfactorily established by Professor Rask, of Copenhagen, who has lately travelled and made researches in Persia. This is one of the means of information which Josephus did not possess;\* and will be seen by every one to be invaluable, as a contemporary source. This chapter contains an account of some of the Assyrian kings, and a survey of the history of Media, the conquest of Babylon, and the destruction of the Chaldee-Babylonian empire. It contains, also, strictures upon the authority of Herodotus, and a comparison between this historian and Xenophon.

The next period in the history extends from the return of the Jews to the time of Alexander. The author gives an interesting account of Daniel and Cyrus, and of the first caravan of the Hebrews to Judea. We shall have occasion to refer hereafter to his opinion respecting the return of the ten tribes.

In the account of the building of the second temple, we find the origin of the hatred between the Jews and Samaritans. It will be observed that the first caravan, under Zerubabel, was composed principally of the tribe of Judah. When they had arrived in their native land, and were engaged in building the temple, colonies arrived from Samaria, where many of the ten tribes had dwelt during their captivity, and with whose inhabitants they had intermarried and formed one people, under the common name of Samaritans. These Samaritans, who were idolaters, had placed Jehovah among their gods, represented by golden calves, and on this ground they insisted upon their right of being associated with the Jews in building the temple. The Jews were aware that, if they granted this request, they should be continually in danger of falling into idolatry. The measures which the spiteful leaders of the Samaritans took, in consequence of their refusal, to impede the building of the temple, are well known. The people were disheartened, and it was with great difficulty that they could be incited to the work. The hatred of the Samaritans, thus occasioned in the minds of the Jews, led at last to an entire cessation of friendly intercourse.

The account of the building of the second temple is followed by an historical survey of the Persian empire. In the introduction,

\* It was first published in 1771, and translated into German by Kleuker.

the author corrects an error of Ptolemy, who reckons the number of the kings of the Persian universal monarchy at ten, omitting four kings, because they did not continue upon the throne a full year. The history of these kings is concise, and at the same time contains an account of all the principal events in their respective reigns. We know not where the same information is to be found in so small a compass. The author gives it as his opinion, that the Artaxerxes of Ezra and the Ahasuerus of Esther are names of Xerxes I. The second caravan of the Hebrews to Judea proceeded during this reign.

The history of Alexander and his immediate successors, occupying about thirty pages of the work, is drawn up with great care, and to a degree of particularity which will suffice for the common purposes of investigation. If our object were merely to gain information respecting the conquests of Alexander, and the history of his successors, and not to follow the connexion between sacred and profane history, we think that we should refer to this work in preference to any other.

During a period of fifty-eight years, under the successors of Alexander, the Jews were uninterrupted by foreign or domestic troubles. This was a favorable opportunity for the cultivation of learning, and they improved it for gaining an acquaintance with Greek literature. It is said that the sect of the Sadducees originated during this period. Joseph, a president of the Sanhedrim, taught that men should be influenced in the service of God by disinterested motives, and not by the hope of reward. Two of his disciples, in their zeal for this principle, asserted that no rewards were to be expected after death; and hence the origin of the sect above mentioned. There is certainly an inconsistency, as Jahn observes, in this tradition; still there is no doubt that the sect originated in this period of the Jewish history.

After a series of wars and oppressions under the Syrian kings, and a temporary independence under the Macabees, the Jews at length fell into the power of the Romans. Jerusalem and the temple were taken by Pompey, about sixty-two or sixty-three years before the birth of the Saviour.

The history of the Jews from this period to the time of Christ is so intimately connected with that of the neighboring princes, and of the Roman arms, that it would be difficult to present the reader with a satisfactory view of their condition without exceeding our limits. Dr. Jahn gives us, in this period, an interesting account of Cleopatra, a history of the Roman conquests in Syria and Egypt from the close of the Mithridatic war, and a particular account of the reign of Herod the Great.

Our Saviour made his appearance as a public teacher, while Pontius Pilate was procurator of Judea. The celebrated passage

in Josephus,\* the genuineness of which has been so much disputed, is considered by Jahn in this part of the history; and though he does not undertake to settle the question, he observes that the objections which have been brought against the passage are unworthy of the importance which has been attached to them. We presume that an abstract of the most important objections, together with the answers of Jahn, will not be unacceptable.

I. *The passage stands too early in order of time.*

In this period of the Jewish history, when Josephus was a child, it is not to be supposed that he could have treasured up the dates of events with perfect accuracy.

II. *If we omit the passage the connexion of the history would not be interrupted.*

Should we omit all the passages in an author, especially in Josephus, whose omission would not interrupt the connexion of the discourse, large portions of their writings would be rejected. We should then omit the whole of the third book of the Jewish wars.

III. *It is contrary to the plan of Josephus, who designed to relate only the memorable events of his nation; but the history of a despised Nazarene could not be considered by the Jews as worthy of a place in their history.*

But the history of Jesus had become memorable when Josephus wrote, since many of the most distinguished men among the Gentiles were his disciples.

IV. *A zealous Pharisee, like Josephus, would not call Jesus the Messiah, (or Christ.)*

This name had become well known when Josephus wrote; and all that he meant to say, was, This "was the Christ," from whom the numerous sect of Christians is denominated.

V. *The passage is wanting in several MSS.*

It is quoted by Eusebius, Jerome, Ambrose, Rufinus, Cassiodorus, and others; of course it was in the MSS. of their times, and these are the best authority.

During the administration of Felix, the procurator, (53—60 A. C.) the predictions of Christ in regard to false prophets and false messiahs began to be fulfilled. The country was full of these pretenders. Robbers, magicians, and impostors of all kinds, and a set of assassins, called Sicarii, from the short dagger (sica) which they used, filled the nation with tumult and bloodshed. The assassins perpetrated their daring crimes even in the temple, where they could easily conceal themselves in the crowd. Josephus observes in relation to this state of things,

\* "Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man: for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was the Christ. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him; for he appeared to them alive again the third day; as the prophets had foretold these, and many other things, respecting him. And the sect of Christians, so named from him, is not extinct at this day." Josephus. Antiq. xviii. 3: 3.

"This seems to me to have been the reason why God, out of his hatred to the wickedness of these men, rejected our city; and as for the temple, he no longer esteemed it sufficiently pure for him to inhabit therein, but brought the Romans upon us, and threw a fire upon the city to purify it, and brought upon us, our wives and children, slavery, as desirous to make us wiser by our calamities."

Jewish Wars, II. 3: 3.

The remaining part of the history is very full and satisfactory in regard to the most important transactions, from the beginning of the Jewish war to the destruction of Jerusalem. The narrative is enlivened by a great variety of subjects, such as the general revolt of the Jews, preparations for war, and frequent statements of the condition of the nation. The siege at length commences, and the author leads us, step by step, through the various scenes which mark its progress. Within the city, we see everything in commotion, occasioned by three demagogues, with their respective parties, each striving for the sole authority. Such is their fear and hatred of each other, that they are prevented from making a united and vigorous defence. The noise of the Roman battering rams, stationed without, excites a cry of terror and distress. At last, two of the parties unite for common defence, and in their attempts to fire the machines, many of them are taken by the Romans and crucified. A breach is now made in the outer wall, the Romans take possession of the enclosure, and the Jews retire into the inner city. In the account of this most distressing part of the siege, the interest is not suffered to abate by a detail of trifling events, but curiosity is rather awakened, as the narrative proceeds. We forbear to recount the horrid barbarities which took place, in consequence of the state of starvation to which the inhabitants were reduced. The reader will find enough upon every page to awaken the strongest sympathy, and send a thrill of horror through his frame. When he has read the account here given of torments which none but infernal spirits could have invented, and of the voluntary sufferings by which death was purchased to avoid the insults of the conquerors and the ignominious death of the cross, he will see the propriety of the declaration of Christ, that the afflictions which were to come upon that generation were '*such as were not from the beginning of the creation, neither should be.*'

Before proceeding to the Appendix, which, in fact, is an entirely separate work, we shall take the liberty to state, in brief, our reasons for giving this History the preference over every other work of the kind which we have seen.

1. It is the only book which we know of that contains the entire history of the Jews, in connexion with that of the neighboring nations.

2. It settles the chronology of the Old Testament more satisfactorily, than has been done before; and considering the immense labor which has been expended by learned men upon this subject, this is no small praise to the author.

3. It is convenient as a book of reference. The divisions of the work are such that we can ascertain the condition of the Jews, or anything relating to their foreign relations or domestic polity, during any period of their national existence, with very little trouble.

4. It contains an Index of Prophecies fulfilled during that portion of the Jewish History of which it treats. This was added by the translator, and is a very important appendage to the work.

5. The work is interspersed with valuable tables; as for instance, a table of the kings of Israel and Judah; of the kings of Babylon, Media and Persia; of the Greek-Syrian and Greek-Egyptian monarchs. At the close of the work, we find a table of Manetho's Dynasties of the kings of Egypt, extracted from Julius Africanus and Eusebius. These tables, collected and arranged as they are in this book, will save a wearisome search through volumes of Ancient Histories.

The execution of the work, in its English dress, reflects much credit upon the translator. The style is easy and perspicuous, exhibiting a competent acquaintance with the German and English languages, and is entirely free from foreign idioms. We should not suspect it of being a *translation*. We could not help contrasting its style, in this respect, with that of Whiston. There is no standard work in the English language, whose dull, inharmonious sentences so grate on the ear, as Whiston's translation of Josephus.

The Appendix to this History had no connexion with the original work, but was prepared from the *Historie des Juifs* of Basnage. It continues the History of the Jews from the taking of Jerusalem to their revolt under Adrian, and ends with their settlement in Spain, Germany, France and England. The information it affords is valuable and interesting. It contains, it is true, a great number of Rabbinical stories, which the reader hardly knows whether to treat with levity, or with sober contempt. Those who have not been acquainted with the fables of the Rabbins, will probably be amused by them; while the learned will be sorry to find them in this work. It would seem, at first, that Basnage was a firm believer in all the stories which he has here communicated; for they are given without any marks of quotation, either by characters or introductory clauses. But this is hardly possible, as he was a first rate scholar and a sensible man. He was, we believe, minister of the Walloon church at the Hague. Voltaire said of him, that he was more fit to be a minister of state, than of a parish.

The reader will find in this Appendix a long and interesting discussion of the celebrated question relative to the ten tribes. It is the opinion of Jahn, that as the invitation of Cyrus to build the temple at Jerusalem was addressed to all the people of God, many of the Israelites (or ten tribes) returned to Palestine. But as they came in successive companies, and at different times,

their return is not distinctly mentioned. It is certain that all, whether of the Israelites or of the tribe of Judah, who returned to Palestine, were afterwards called by the common name of Jews. And as the jealousy between Judah and Israel had now ceased, as the prophets had predicted; it is probable, that those of the two kingdoms who remained in exile were united too, under the common denomination of Jews. For these reasons, he supposes, whether correctly or not we do not here pretend to determine, that all questions and investigations for the purpose of ascertaining what has become of the ten tribes, are superfluous and idle.

The style of Basnage is loose and discursive. The translation is in this respect an improvement upon the original.

Although the History of the Hebrew Commonwealth was primarily designed for scholars, we can recommend it to intelligent private Christians, with the assurance that they will find it both interesting and profitable. The author turns aside occasionally to settle a point in chronology, or to correct an error in some historian; but this is generally done in the form of a note, and the thread of the history is not interrupted by neglecting it. We know of no book of the same size with the work before us, that contains so much information respecting the Old Testament. It would be an excellent plan to read the Old Testament with this work for a guide, following the course of the history as it is here laid down, and illustrated by references to the chapters of the Bible. The information which is given of the state of the nation when the several prophets made their appearance, will be found to impart new interest to the record which has come down to us of their predictions.

We rejoice, moreover, at the appearance of this volume, because we believe that it will have a tendency to awaken an interest in behalf of the Jews. It is impossible for any one, possessing the common feelings of humanity, to read this work, and not feel a deep sympathy for that unhappy people, on whom the vials of God's wrath have been so long poured out; and the question will arise whether it is not high time to pray and labor for the fulfilment of those promises which relate to their conversion and salvation.

---

## SELECTIONS.

### THE DEDHAM CASE.

It will be understood that we solicit repeated attention to this case, not so much for its own sake, as on account of the principles involved in it, and the consequences growing out of it. These, as it is already seen and *felt*, have a tremendous bearing upon the churches of this Commonwealth, destroying their

corporate existence, taking away their property and rights, and leaving them little more than a name. The following cursory examination of the case was first published in the Boston Recorder of June 16, 1821, and is known to have been from the pen of the late Judge Stebbins of Maine. Our readers will learn from it how the case was viewed by an able and honest man, and an experienced Jurist, shortly after the decision.

The first and most obvious trait of the case, as stated, is its intelligible, simple, distinct meaning. Property has been given to a church. A church has been known as a body corporate, from the landing of our forefathers at Plymouth; was recognized and confirmed as such by the earliest statutes; was, by the law of 1754, which the Court copiously quote, expressly empowered, among other things, "to call the deacons to account" respecting their property, "and if need be commence and prosecute any suits touching the same." It is not shown that, at any time, churches have failed to hold property, nor that the right has been doubted. Towns have uniformly been known as corporations, but totally distinct from churches. Towns also have uniformly acted as parishes, where parishes have not been established as separate corporations, distinct from towns or churches; and that one of these corporations would ever have been mistaken for another, is wholly gratuitous and imaginary. But, however unexpected, a decision is past, that, "although the grants of land and donations to the church in Dedham purport to be for the use of the church, yet the church could not hold the same, never having been incorporated as a body politic; and that said grants and donations *must be considered* as made for the whole town of Dedham. Churches, as such, have no power but that of divine worship, church order and discipline."

Thus situated, this is a case of unusual impression. The dispute respects the right to certain grants and donations; the grants and donations "purport" to be one thing, and "must be considered" a different and opposite thing. We have therefore only to hear and learn how the court make out their result. I shall merely touch the points, and refer to the report for their correctness.

A parish is not that into which a church is changed, by transmutation; the church has never ceased to exist; the parish is in no case the successor of the church, but, *as a parish*, takes, distinctly, the place of the town, and the town only, in cases where, from a different organization, the town ceases to act as a parish.

The court are pleased to intimate that the *place* in which the church worshipped is to have a leading operation to determine that a gift *made* to it, must *be* to the society. This position is unsupported. An addition of territory might have been made to Dedham; all the old territory of Dedham might have been formed into new parishes; and the "residuum," or old parish, might now be wholly on the new territory; yet by the express terms of the report, Mr. Lamson would, in such case, be entitled to the benefit of the donations, *because* he would be the minister of the *same old parish*, though in a different place.

In the reasoning by which the honorable Court brought themselves to their result, we have a right to expect pertinence and pre-

cision. But why are we, in a judicial report, called to witness an impassioned, vivid display of the horrors, persecution, and rebellion consequent upon the appointment of a minister for the church and society, by the church alone? Does a denial that the Governor can appoint Judges without the Council, imply that the Council can appoint without him, and in spite of him?

How did it pertain to the case before the Court, in which the Dedham church had put in issue the question of their corporate rights, to remind them that they were a minority of the society? The assent of the church to the ordination of Mr. L. is pronounced wholly idle and inoperative, amounting to nothing. Why then is the withholding their assent so prominently brought into the case, as a plea of *necessity*, to excuse the society for proceeding alone, and to silence the church from complaining, when, according to the decision, the assent would have been wholly insignificant? What point of law is illumined by the admonition that "those are mistaken, who imagine that the cause of religion would be served, public worship promoted, or religion and morality more extensively encouraged, by restoring to the churches the power which they once enjoyed, of electing the minister, without the consent of the people or congregation, or by the aid of a council which they might select to sanction their choice." It is not easy to see why so stern a reprehension, applying to nobody, should be thus introduced, unless to evince the sincerity and zeal of the Court in their decision; which could hardly be necessary, the whole tenor of the report being abundant for this purpose. A hypothesis on the other side of the question might be presented, not more remote from pertinence and verisimilitude; "those are mistaken who imagine that the cause of religion would be served, &c. by vesting in parishes, or congregations, the exclusive right of appointing a pastor over the church, with authority to call meetings of the church, and exercise over the members the whole pastoral office; to superintend their covenant duties; to administer to them the holy ordinances; to be their comforter in affliction, their supporter in the hour of death, and their guide to heaven; though he may be a man without religion, without a profession of it, in bitter hostility to the church, bent on all means to degrade the members, and to turn into ridicule their faith in their divine Redeemer." It does not become me to say *of churches*, in the decisive language which the Court apply to *the people*, "they never would consent;" but I may say with humility, and, if the answer is doubtful, I must say with trembling of heart, is such the law of our land?

The Court allude to Chief Justice Parsons, and "agreed with him in estimating highly these ancient usages." Why that should be estimated highly, which is merely vain and nugatory, is not perceived. The late Chief Justice, in delivering the opinion of the Court, from which it does not appear that the present Chief Justice dissented, (*Burr vs. Sandwich*) decides that, to be an inhabitant of the parish, is not a necessary qualification of a church member; an opinion which, if just, and it is as just as the practice is uniform, prostrates, from the root, the principle assumed by this Court, that



those who withdraw from the society cease to be members of that particular church. Judge Parsons observes, that the minister of the parish is *admitted* a member of the church; this Court declare that by virtue of the act of ordaining him over the parish, he becomes the minister of the church: then, while the subordinate relation depends on the church's assent, the superior relation may be imposed on them.

That ordination is nothing but setting apart, installing, or inaugurating one who has been chosen to the office, and tendering him the fellowship of the churches who assist at the ceremony; that it is but a carrying *by the people* of their choice into effect; that no power spiritual or temporal is conferred *by the imposition of hands*; and yet, by *virtue of the act of ordination* over the parish only, a man becomes the lawful minister of the church, has a right to call church meetings, and do all other acts pertaining to settled and ordained ministers:—all this, taken together, it is not wise to attempt to understand. It is not the imposition of hands which confers power; it is the *act of ordaining*: the *distinction* is occult, but the *difference* is represented to be prodigious.

That a church has no legal existence, except when it happens to have property, and even then exists as a fictitious entity, for the sole equitable purpose of holding its own property in trust for the parish, may be gathered from observations interspersed among the facts stated, and statutes cited: but facts and statutes do not support observations, merely by juxtaposition.

The question whether, when a donation is made to a church, the church has a right to enjoy it; the late opinion of the court; the letter and spirit of the grants considered in that opinion; the letter and spirit of the law; the language and understanding of the parties to those grants: the natural import of the subject; and the paramount authority, the popular sense and meaning, are before an intelligent public, who will not fail to consider, to compare, and to judge. It is hoped the Court will have opportunity to reconsider the decision, if that course is better than a correction by the Legislature.



#### ON RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY.

From Dr. Mason's Christian's Magazine.

The prejudice against controversy, unlike those lessons with which truth and wisdom preoccupy the heart, will appear, upon a close inspection, as destitute of solidity, as it is assuming in manner. For,

1. It admits not of dispute, that the holy Scriptures point out an opposite course. Their injunction is to *buy the truth, and sell it not—To cease from the instruction that causeth to err from the words of knowledge—earnestly to rountrud for the faith once delivered to the saints—to try the spirits whether they are of God.*—All these directions imply, not that men are to spend their lives in laying the foundations of their faith; but that they are to employ their opportunities

and faculties in selecting the true from the false; that they are to prize it when selected; to enrich it with fresh acquisitions; and to defend it with their utmost skill. How can this be done without controversy, so long as there are "deceivers in the world," it is incumbent on them to show, who would suffer the truths of the Gospel to be sacrificed, one after another, by men of "corrupt minds," rather than raise a finger, or press an argument, for their protection. It is, indeed, not more lamentable than true, that a host of candidates beset the inquirer. Every sect cries out, *We are the people, and the Law of the Lord is with us*; every partizan enforces the pretensions of his sect. But this, though frequently urged, is the weakest of all reasons for keeping aloof from investigation. The amount is, "the danger of going astray is great; the consequences fatal; therefore I will shut my eyes." Good sense would say, "the danger of error is great, the consequences fatal; therefore I will use all my diligence that I may not be misled." For certainly, if "strait be the gate and narrow be the way which leadeth unto life," we have the strongest inducement possible to search out and embrace the few who find it. We are, therefore, reduced to this alternative, either that there is no truth at all, or that we are bound to seek it through every peril, to distinguish its voice amid all clamors, and to possess it at any price. If this condition seem hard, let it be remembered,

2. That it is not left to our discretion whether we shall choose or not.

The determination to choose *nothing*, is a determination *not to choose the truth*; and this draws after it the condemnation of those who "love darkness rather than light." The most high God having given us his word as the rule of our faith and duty, a neglect to seek its counsel, because men wrangle about its meaning, is to make the hazard of going wrong a reason for never being anxious to go right. It would be like the excuse of a servant, who having, in common with others, received his master's orders to repair to a certain place, should resolve not to stir, because his fellow servants quarrelled about the road. Their disobedience could never justify his. Nor is there a man upon earth who would not pronounce it to be the plea of a fool, that out of his pure love of peace, he had never been at the trouble to ascertain the import of his master's instructions! The fact is, that no medium can be assigned between receiving and rejecting the truth. If rejected, we seal our own perdition—if received, we must reject whatever is hostile to it; that is, we must institute a comparison between conflicting claims; which is precisely the object of controversy.

Pursuing the argument a little further, we shall perceive,

3. That in disclaiming all controversy, we set out with a principle which it is impossible to carry through.

In what department of society, or on what subject of discourse, do the thoughts of men accord? The law has long been celebrated for its fertility in litigation. Medicine is hardly inferior to the bar: agriculture keeps up a sharp debate with commerce: and the politician has always to navigate a "tempestuous sea." Not a project, a

character, nor an incident, can be introduced into common conversation, without calling forth different strictures, according to the views, habits, relations, and tempers of the company. And it is by no means unusual for some who abhor controversy in *religion*, to be both talkative and disputatious, if not dogmatic and bitter, on other matters. The world is a vast scene of strife. A man must either take it as he finds it, and bear his part in the general collision, or else go out of it altogether. It is the inevitable consequence of imperfect knowledge, and depraved appetite; of that confusion of intellect and corruption of heart which flow from sin. When, therefore, we are under the necessity of either being exiled from society, or of giving and receiving contradiction; and when we submit to this necessity without murmuring in all cases but those which concern religion, what is it but to declare, that principles affecting our duty toward God, the highest happiness of our nature, and our responsibility for a future state, are the only things not worth contending for!

The pretence, that religion is a concern too solemn and sacred for the passions of controversy, is like the pretence with which some justify their "restraining prayer before God;" that he is too high and holy to be approached by such beings as they are. And thus, to display their reverence, they become profane; and live like atheists from pure devotion! Both are cases of error without excuse; we may neither be light in prayer, nor wrathful in debate.

If it be alleged that religion loses more than she gains by controversy; this, with an allowance for the mismanagement of unskillful advocates, is a direct censure of her champions, and a surrender of her cause. Are they who espouse such an opinion prepared for its consequences? Are they willing to say, that when the world was lying in ignorance, in wickedness, and in wo, the introduction of light from above produced more evil than good? That the Gospel is a plague and not a blessing, because, through the malignity of its foes, it has often brought a sword instead of peace? That it had been better for men never to have "known the way of righteousness," than risk opposition in following it? That the reformation of religion was a senseless scheme; that the martyrs died like fools; and that all the heroes who have been "valiant for the truth;" all the "ministers of grace," who have explained and established it; all the "apostles and prophets and wise men," whom the wisdom of God commissioned to reveal it; and that wisdom itself in the person of Jesus Christ, were disturbers of human tranquillity, and spent their time in no better labor than that of "turning the world upside down?" If you start at these things, what do you mean by asserting that "religion suffers from controversy?" For all prophets, apostles, wise men, and the Redeemer himself, fought her battles, and yielded their latest breath in her defence!

You cannot stop even here. Religion, you say, suffers from controversy. Then it cannot endure investigation. It shrinks from the touch of reason, for controversy is reasoning; and, of course, it cannot be true; for truth never yet declined the test, nor sustained the slightest harm from the most fiery ordeal. On the assumption,

therefore, that religion has truth on her side, you can hardly do her a greater injury than to forbid her entering into the lists with her antagonists. They will represent, and argue, and claim. They will solicit, and soothe, and flatter, and sneer, till they pervert the judgement of many, and seduce the affections of more: and religion, betrayed and insulted, her banner thrown down, her weapons shivered, her lips sealed, her limbs bound "in affliction and iron," is to be laid at their feet and left to their mercy, in testimony of the respect and attachment of her friends! It was not in this way that they formerly treated her; nor is it to this treatment that we owe our privileges. Her enemies, potent, subtle and persevering, were encountered by her sons, and defeated as often as they ventured into the field. Those masterly defences of revelation, those profound researches into its sense, that flood of light which has been poured upon its peculiar doctrines, and its benign institutions, are the recompense of the war which Christian zeal and talent have waged in its cause. Had apathy like ours enthralled the spirit of our fathers, we should hardly have been able, at this day, to distinguish in religion, between our right hand and our left.

The prejudice, therefore, against religious controversy, is irrational and hurtful. It is a prejudice against the progress and victories of truth. The misconduct of opponents to each other, is a personal concern. It disgraces themselves, but belongs not to the nature or merits of any controversy. This, in itself considered, is but the comparison of jarring opinions; with a reference, in matters of religion, to the scriptural standard. There is no more necessity for falling into a rage, when demonstrating a proposition in Christianity, than when demonstrating a proposition in mathematics: although the infinitely interesting quality of the one above the other, will involve a deeper feeling; will furnish an explanation of the warmth which is apt to accompany it; and will draw from candor an allowance for our common frailty.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### WAS DR. WATTS A BELIEVER IN THE SUPREME DIVINITY OF JESUS CHRIST?

Unitarians claim to rest their faith, not at all on the authority of names, but on the ground of reason and revelation. Yet no people, perhaps, were ever more fond of appealing to names, than they. The few distinguished names of which they boast, as Newton, Milton, Locke and Watts, have been repeated, till their own friends, we are sure, must be tired of hearing them.

To say nothing, at present, of the other individuals mentioned, we have long been satisfied that to the name of Watts they were not entitled. Indeed, we

have considered the case so clear, as scarcely to admit of inquiry or discussion. Since, however, Dr. Watts continues to be claimed as a Unitarian, and not unfrequently in a style of confidence, as though this was a given point; we have thought it would be well to call the attention of our readers to the question above proposed. We believe it may be determined by a weight of evidence which ought to put it at rest forever.

It is admitted, on all hands, that Dr. Watts was educated in a belief of the proper Divinity of Christ, and that he continued in this belief during the greater portion of his life; but it is alleged by some, that he renounced the doctrine in his more advanced years, and became a decided Unitarian.

That the views of Dr. Watts respecting the Trinity and the person of Christ underwent a degree of change in the course of his life, is not denied. But what was the *nature* of this change? and to what did it amount? These are the questions;—and in replying to them we shall show, conclusively, that the change of sentiment on the part of Dr. Watts did not amount to a renunciation of the Trinity, but merely to a different, and, (as *he* thought,) a more full and consistent explanation of it; and that he continued, to the last, a *firm believer in the supreme divinity of Jesus Christ*.

Before offering direct proof on this point, it may be proper to examine the evidence which has been adduced to show that Dr. Watts did become, towards the close of life, a Unitarian.

This pretence was first set up many years ago; and was examined, refuted, and put to silence, by Mr. Samuel Palmer, in his appendix to Johnson's Life of Watts. More recently, the same story has been revived by Mr. Belsham, in his Memoirs of Lindsey, which has led to another publication by Mr. Palmer, entitled, "A Refutation of the Testimony of Dr. Lardner, as brought forward in the Rev. T. Belsham's Memoirs," &c. To these works of Mr. Palmer, we shall have occasion frequently to refer.

The amount of Dr. Lardner's testimony is, that "in the latter part of his (Dr. Watts') life, for *several* years before his death, he was a Unitarian." And again, "Dr. Watts' last thoughts were completely Unitarian."\* Dr. Lardner founds the opinion here expressed, partly on certain unpublished *manuscripts* of Dr. Watts; and partly on the *testimony of a Mr. Neal*.† We propose to examine both these sources of evidence.

It has been urged frequently and confidently, by others as well as Dr. Lardner, in proof that Dr. Watts became a Unitarian, that he left manuscripts disclosing his change of sentiments, which were destroyed by his executors.—The manuscripts of Dr. Watts were entrusted to Doctors Jennings and Doddridge, He had himself personally requested these gentlemen to take charge of them, and the same trust was committed to them in his Will, with directions "to publish or suppress, as they should judge best." He had made Dr. Jennings acquainted, in general, with the number and character of his manuscripts "three or four years" before his death; and, at the time of making his Will, he arranged them under eight specific heads or titles, a complete list of which is published by Mr. Palmer in his Appendix. Three out of the eight unpublished collections, as appears by the titles, were on the subject of the Trinity; but that neither of them contained sentiments different from what appear in the last works which the author himself published, we have complete proof. For,

\* Dr. Lardner here uses the word Unitarian as synonymous with Humanitarian; for he says, "I think Dr. Watts never was an *Arian*, to his honor be it spoken."

† This Mr. Neal was a son of the historian of the Puritans, and nephew of Dr. Lardner.

in the first place, they were all written *previous* to his own last publications on the same subject. If written "three or four years" before the author's death, according to the testimony of Dr. Jennings, they must have been written as early as 1745. At any rate, they were written previous to July, 1746, the date of his Will. But it was near the *close* of 1746, that Dr. Watts published his last work, on the "Glory of Christ." Consequently, his unpublished manuscripts, whatever they might be, did not contain his *last* thoughts respecting the person of the Saviour.—But one of the three manuscripts on the subject of the Trinity, and the *last* of them, has since been published, and is found to contain nothing different from the work on the "Glory of Christ." It appears also from the titles of the other two, as given by Mr. Palmer, that they were in the same strain, going to show "the ill effects of incorporating the *Divine doctrine of the Trinity*\* with the human explications of it;" or, in other words, to set forth, as we may presume, the supposed advantages of his own peculiar "explications" of this "Divine doctrine."

Dr. Lardner saw some of the manuscripts of which we are speaking, and had they clearly disclosed the fact that Watts was a Unitarian, he would, we doubt not, have insisted on their publication. But instead of this, he tells us, "*They were not fit to be published.*" Dr. Watts "had never been used to a proper way of reasoning on such a subject." He had never reasoned himself, it is true, into the same conclusions with Dr. Lardner. Another "gentleman of veracity, who had seen the manuscripts, assured" Mr. Palmer, "that they appeared to him to contain *nothing new*, being only a farther illustration of his (Dr. Watts') sentiments concerning the Trinity, which he had before published to the world."

We turn now to the testimony of Mr. Neal, as reported by Dr. Lardner.

"My nephew, Neal, an understanding gentleman, was intimate with Dr. Watts, and often with the family where he lived. Sometimes, in an evening when they were alone, he would talk to his friends in the family of his new thoughts concerning the person of Christ, and their great importance, and that if he should be able to recommend them to the world, it would be the most considerable thing that ever he performed. My nephew, therefore, came to me, and told me of it, and that the family was greatly concerned, to hear him talk so much of the importance of these sentiments."†

Now, taking this language just as it stands, what evidence does it furnish, in support of the conclusion of Dr. Lardner, that the "last thoughts of Dr. Watts were completely Unitarian?" Obviously none at all. Could not Dr. Watts, in his old age, cherish any "new thoughts concerning the person of Christ," and thoughts which seemed to him of "great importance," without becoming a Unitarian? The truth is, that Dr. Watts did, in the latter part of his life, acquire some "new thoughts concerning the person of Christ"—thoughts which he unfolded and endeavored to defend in his last publications; but these thoughts, he believed, and strenuously insisted, were entirely consistent with the supreme Divinity of his Lord and Saviour.

\* Strange phraseology for a Unitarian—"THE DIVINE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY."

† This testimony, it should be observed, passed through several Unitarian hands, before it was made public. Mr. Neal reported it to Dr. Lardner; Dr. Lardner to a Mr. Merrivale; Mr. Merrivale to Dr. Priestly; Dr. Priestly to Mr. Belsham; and Mr. Belsham published it. These reports, however, or the most of them, passed in writing.

We mean not, in anything we have said, to charge Dr. Lardner with intentional misrepresentation; but he evidently drew a wrong conclusion from the testimony of Mr. Neal. And in further proof that he did, Mr. Palmer appeals to the different members of the family in which Dr. Watts lived and died, and who, as Mr. Neal says, were "greatly concerned to hear him talk so much of the importance of his new thoughts concerning the person of Christ." He appeals "to the Rev. Thomas Taylor, who for many years lived as chaplain in the same family;" to "Mr. Joseph Parker, his (Dr. Watts') amanuensis, who was constantly with him;" and to Mrs. Abney, at that time mistress of the family; neither of whom had the least reason to suppose, from what they saw or heard, that Dr. Watts ever adopted any sentiments relative to the person of Christ, different from those contained in his last publications. Mr. Palmer also quotes Dr. Gibbons and Dr. Stennett, both of whom visited him but a short time before his death, and found "his soul swallowed up with gratitude and joy, for the *redemption of sinners by Jesus Christ*," speaking "particularly of our *dependence upon Christ*," as the foundation of all our hopes. "So far," says Dr. Stennett, "from having embraced the Socinian system, he expressed his firm belief of the doctrine of Christ's atonement, and lamented, even with tears, that so many should have given it up. Correspondent with which," adds Mr. Palmer, "is the epitaph which Dr. Watts ordered to be inscribed on his tomb—*IN UNO JESU OMNIA—In Jesus alone is my all.*" It should be further observed, that Dr. Jennings, a thoroughly Orthodox divine, and one of those who were entrusted with Dr. Watts' manuscripts, preached at his funeral, and afterwards published the sermon, in which he speaks of the religious character of his departed friend in the *highest terms*—a thing which he certainly would not have done, had he discovered, from the manuscripts of Dr. Watts, or from any other source, that he became, at last, a Unitarian. Indeed, Mr. Belsham himself, who brings forward and arrays the evidence from Lardner, does not appear to consider it of much force, or to believe that Dr. Watts ever regarded himself as a Unitarian. "There can be little doubt," says he, "that, owing to early prejudice, he (Dr. Watts) would, to the *latest day of his life*, have started from the imputation with horror."

One of the papers, left by Dr. Watts and published by his executors, contained "a solemn Address to the Deity," imploring light and direction in his inquiries on the subject of the Trinity. This has often been referred to, as evidence that he became a Unitarian. But so far from proving the point in question, it proves directly the contrary.

"Hast thou not ascribed Divine names, and titles, and characters to thy *Son*, and thy *Holy Spirit* in thy word, as well as assumed them to thyself? And hast thou not appointed to them such glorious offices as cannot be executed, without something of Divinity or *true Godhead* in them?" Speaking of Christ in this prayer, Dr. Watts says, "I believe he is a man, in whom dwells *all the fullness of the Godhead* bodily. I believe he is *one with God*; he is *God manifested in the flesh*; and that the *man Jesus is so closely and inseparably united with the true and eternal Godhead, as to become one person*, even as the soul and body make one man."

Strange, that a prayer, containing expressions such as these, should be quoted as evidence that its author was a Unitarian!

It has been said by some, that Dr. Watts, at his decease, left a corrected copy of his Psalms and Hymns, from which he had expunged all those expressions

which speak of the Trinity, and the Divinity of Christ.—On this point Mr. Palmer well observes,

“The evidence of this fact is by no means satisfactory. What became of the copy thus corrected? Mr. Parker, the Doctor’s amanuensis,” without whose assistance nothing was done, “*knows of no such thing, and never heard of the author’s having such a design.*” “This, like some other reports, is without any just foundation.”

Others have alleged that Dr. Watts was dissatisfied with some of his hymns, and wished to make alterations; but that, having disposed of the copyright, his bookseller would not suffer them to be corrected.—That Dr. Watts wished to make alterations in some of his hymns is not improbable. They were written and published in early life, and it is not strange that, after frequent revision, alterations and improvements should be suggested as desirable. Indeed he has told us that this was the fact. “I wish some things were corrected.” But does it follow from this that Dr. Watts had become a Unitarian, and wished to expunge the doctrine of Christ’s Divinity from his Psalms and Hymns? By no means. There is no evidence of his having ever indulged a wish or thought of this nature, but abundant evidence, as we shall show, to the contrary.

It has been inferred from some expressions in the later writings of Dr. Watts, and particularly from a letter to Dr. Colman of Boston, written the year before his death, that he had renounced the Divinity of Christ, and become a Unitarian. The letter to Dr. Colman is as follows:

“I am glad my book of Useful Questions came safe to your hand. I think I have said everything concerning the Son of God which Scripture says; but I could not go so far as to say with some of our Orthodox divines, that the Son is *equal* with the Father; because our Lord himself expressly says, “My Father is *greater* than I.” I hope there is nothing contained in my book of ‘The Glory of Christ,’ which I now send you, with a volume of ‘Evangelical Discourses,’ but what Scripture is express in determining, that Jesus Christ, at least his human soul, is the first of the creation of God.”

On this letter we remark, that it professedly followed Dr. Watts’ last work but one, his “Useful and Important Questions,” and accompanied his last work, on the “Glory of Christ,” in both of which the supreme Divinity of Christ is, as we shall show, very largely inculcated. We cannot, therefore, interpret any expression in the letter in opposition to the general sentiment of the books. But what is the doubtful expression in the letter? “I could not go so far as to say, with some of our Orthodox divines, that *the Son* is equal with the Father.” In explanation of this, it need only be observed, that Dr. Watts considered the phrase, Son of God, as referring entirely to the *human nature* of Christ. It was a part of his theory, that the human soul of Christ was created before the world, before angels, that it was “the first of the creation of God,” and that his *Sonship belonged entirely to his human nature*.\* In this sense, he might well hesitate to say, that the Son is equal with the Father.

\* “The *Son of God* is throughout represented as dependent on the Father, and receiving all from the Father, which is hardly consistent with the idea of supreme Godhead, if THAT WERE INCLUDED IN SONSHIP.” Useful Questions, &c.—“Perhaps the *Sonship of Christ* may be better explained, by attributing it to his HUMAN SOUL, existing by some peculiar and immediate manner of creation, formation or derivation from the Father, before other creatures were formed.” Glory of Christ, &c. p. 206.—We say



Having now examined, with as much particularity as we think they deserve, all the principal arguments by which it has been attempted to prove that Dr. Watts was a Unitarian,\* we proceed to offer direct and positive evidence, that he died as he lived, a *firm believer in the supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ*.

Dr. Watts died November 25, 1748. In the beginning of 1746, he published a work, entitled "Useful and Important Questions concerning Jesus Christ, the Son of God;" and, near the close of the same year, another work, entitled "The Glory of Christ, as God-man, displayed in three Discourses." These were his last publications, and may be regarded as an expression of his last thoughts respecting the person of the Saviour.† His posthumous papers on the subject of the Trinity were all written, as we have shown, previous to the publication of these works. One of these papers, and the *last* of them, entitled "A faithful Inquiry after the ancient and original doctrine of the Trinity," has since been published. It seems that this tract, or a few copies of it, was printed by the author, in 1745; but, at the suggestion of friends, it was suppressed, and the copies were burned. One only is known to have escaped the general conflagration. This was found, in a bookseller's shop, in 1796, and was published in 1802. From these three works, the "Faithful Inquiry," the "Useful and Important Questions," and the "Glory of Christ," we shall now make a variety of extracts. In view of them, the public will judge, whether Dr. Watts was not, to the last, a *decided believer in the proper Divinity of Christ*.

1. *The "FAITHFUL INQUIRY," &c.*

"It is evident that he (Christ) is often called God in Scripture, and since he is true God as well as man, we have plain directions from Scripture to suppose that this second person, or this man Christ Jesus, has the true Godhead united to him, or dwelling in him in a peculiar manner,—so that they are often represented as one complex person."

"The benefits which we are to receive from Jesus Christ are, pardon of sin through his *full atonement* or satisfaction, for which the dignity of his person is sufficient, as he is one with God. The dignity of this union spreads itself over all that Christ did and suffered, and makes it divine and all-sufficient. This union enables him to raise his church out of this world; to change the hearts of men, and turn them to himself; to give his presence to his people

nothing here as to the propriety or impropriety of this representation. Such was undoubtedly the sentiment of Dr. Watts.

\* A letter from a Mr. Walrond of England to Cotton Mather, dated March 10, 1725-6, has lately been published in the *Christian Examiner*, (vol. v. p. 367.) in which Mr. W. says, "Mr. Bradbury now writes me that in London they are under a new alarm from Mr. Watts' book on the Trinity, which seems to open a Socinian scheme upon us." To this letter of Mr. Walrond it is sufficient to reply, 1. That it was written more than twenty years before Dr. Watts' death. Nobody now pretends that he was at *that time* a Socinian. But, 2. The Mr. Bradbury, who gave Mr. Walrond his information, was a *personal enemy* of Dr. Watts. The following account of him is given in the *Monthly Review* for 1779, p. 131. "Bradbury was a man of wit and spleen. In his merry moments, he would laugh at some of Watts' hymns; and in his spleenetic and zealous hours, would *abuse his principles, and call in question his Orthodoxy.*" Watts, in replying to his railery, speaks of "the doctrine of the Trinity as a *first principle.*"

† These were among the manuscripts which Dr. Watts presumed he should leave behind him, when he spoke to Dr. Jennings, "three or four years" before his death, to take the charge of them. Contrary to his expectations, he lived to publish them himself. They furnish a good comment on the declaration of Lardner already quoted, that "for *several years* before his death, Dr. Watts was a Unitarian."

in their worship; to preserve his church from all their enemies; to rule and govern the nations; to raise the dead, and to judge the world."

"The doctrine of the blessed Trinity, or of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, with their peculiar characters and offices, is a special doctrine of the Christian religion.—This sacred Three in the Trinity are plainly represented in Scripture, and have been generally represented by Christian writers, like *three persons*, or three distinct personal agents, as acting different parts, and sustaining different characters in the affairs of our salvation; and yet it seems to be abundantly evident also in Scripture that they are all Three represented as having *true and proper Deity* some way belonging to them, and that the names, titles, attributes, and operations of Godhead are ascribed to the Three, in the Old Testament and in the New.—This is the substance of the doctrine itself, as revealed in the Bible,—and the writers on the Trinity have so often proved it, that I need not repeat the proofs here."

2. *The "USEFUL AND IMPORTANT QUESTIONS," &c.* In the Preface to this work, Dr. Watts says,

"He freely and delightfully confesses these following articles borrowed from the *Athanasian Creed*, viz.: 'We believe and confess the Lord Jesus Christ the Son of God is both God and Man; God of the same substance with the Father, a Man of the substance of his mother, *born* into the world, perfect God and perfect Man; of a reasonable soul and human flesh, subsisting *together*: Equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, and yet inferior to the Father as touching his manhood: One, not by conversion of the Godhead into the flesh, but by taking of the manhood into God, *so as to become one personal agent*, or one person: and, as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man are one Christ, who suffered for our salvation."

In the body of this work, commenting on 1 Cor. xv. 38, Dr. Watts says,

"This text will not prove that Christ is not God; for he is so by personal union to the Divine nature; he is 'God manifest in the flesh'; he is God and man in one complex person."—"We may justly call Jesus Christ 'God manifest in the flesh'; a man 'in whom dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily'; a man of the seed of David, and yet 'God over all blessed forever.'"

3. *"THE GLORY OF CHRIST," &c.* The very title of this work, the last of Dr. Watts' publications on the subject, it should seem, is decisive as to the question now before us. "*The Glory of Christ as GOD-MAN displayed.*" And from beginning to end, the work is strictly conformable to its title.

"It is very evident to me," says the author in his preface, "that our blessed Saviour is often represented in Scripture as a complex person, wherein *God* and *man* are united, so as to make up one complex agent, one intellectual compound being, God joined with man, so as to become one common principle of action and passion." p. iii.

"Though we learn from Scripture, that true and proper Deity is ascribed to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and that they

are represented often in Scripture as *distinct personal agents*; yet after all our inquiries and prayers, we may be still much at a loss to describe exactly wherein this *distinct personality* consists, and what is the distinct communion of each of them in the Divine nature. We have never yet been able, with any strong evidence and clear certainty, precisely to adjust this sacred difficulty, *how far they are one, and how far they are three.*" p. iv.

"All that I pretend to maintain here is, that our blessed Saviour must be *God*, and he must be *man*; *God and man in two distinct natures, and one person.*" p. v.

"There is not one sentence in all these discourses but what is very consistent with a firm belief of the Divinity of Christ, and a just and sincere concern for the most eminent and glorious truths of the Gospel, as they are professed by Protestants among us, against the *Socinian and Arian errors.*" p. vii.

The first discourse in this work is entitled "A Survey of the Visible Appearances of Christ, *as God*, before his Incarnation;" and the drift of the whole is to show, through almost a hundred pages, that the Jehovah of Israel, in all his visible appearances under the former dispensation, was no other than the Lord Jesus Christ.

"There is the most abundant probability, that Jesus Christ was that angel who generally appeared in ancient times to the patriarchs and to the Jews, assuming the peculiar and incommunicable names of God, and manifesting the invisible God to men." p. 60.

"The 'Angel of the covenant,' Christ Jesus, is God himself, is intimately and personally united to Godhead, and is one with God, because he assumes Divine names and titles, and speaks the words which can belong only to God." p. 75.

"The denying of these glorious and sublime titles of *Jehovah*, the *Lord God*, the *God of Israel*, &c. to belong to Christ, or the interpreting of them into such a diminished and inferior sense as may belong to a mere inferior spirit, a contingent or created being, without any such personal union to Godhead, seems to run contrary to the most plain and obvious sense and meaning both of the sacred writers, of the ancient Jews, and the primitive Christians." p. 98.

"The union of the Divine and human natures in the complete person of Christ, the Mediator, is one of those sublime wonders which could never have been found out by the reason of man, and which were revealed slowly to the church in successive ages.—In these latter days we have a most evident and certain revelation made to us, that Christ Jesus, the Mediator, who was 'of the seed of David according to the flesh,' is 'God over all, blessed forever.'" p. 99.

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, considered in his complete person, has the Divine nature joined to the human; this has been proved with abundant evidence in ancient and modern writings." p. 101.

"We *know* that Jesus Christ is true God, and that his human nature is united to the Divine." "The sacred doctrine of the Divinity, united to the human nature in Christ, ought to be supported, by all just expositions of Scripture. It is an article that *we cannot part*

*with out of our religion, without shaking the foundation."* pp. 102, 103.

"We are assured by the word of God that there is a glorious union between the man Christ, and the Divine nature." p. 141.

"We firmly believe that his name is Immanuel, or God with us, and that God and man are united to constitute the complete person of our Mediator." p. 150.

"I am well assured of the doctrine of the Deity of Christ from many Scriptures; so if there be anything which I have asserted that runs counter to that doctrine, I desire it to be expunged and forgiven." p. 232.

"The infinite merit of his sufferings to satisfy for the infinite offences of mankind, in my judgement, arises still from the dignity of his whole person, who is God as well as man, and includes in it the infinite Deity, united to a finite or created nature." p. 235.

"There are many and sufficient arguments drawn from the word of God to support the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, which cannot, with any evidence, or truth, or justice, be turned to another sense." p. 257.

Quotations of a similar character to those here given might be multiplied to almost any extent. In order to feel the force of them, it needs only to be kept in mind, that they are from the *last* publications of Dr. Watts on the subject, and exhibit "the last authentic account of his sentiments, as avowed by himself." He made this avowal of them, long after his last controversy with Mr. Tomkins, an Arian—after the time when Dr. Lardner supposes he became a Unitarian—and indeed but a few months previous to the confinement which terminated with his life. And he left no writing or declaration, of which the public have any knowledge, which goes at all to contradict the views here expressed. So far from it, if we may credit the worthy family in which he lived and died—if we may credit those who visited him in his last sickness—if we may credit the respectable clergyman who preached at his funeral—if we may credit the inscription on his tombstone, which was ordered by himself, he held fast his integrity to the end, and continued faithful unto death.

The public, therefore, will determine, whether, as has been so frequently and confidently pretended, Dr. Watts became, in his latter years, a Unitarian; or whether he persevered, to the last, a *firm and acknowledged believer in the supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ.*—For ourselves, we will only say, that were the Unitarians of Massachusetts such as Dr. Watts, we would hail them as brethren, and bid them God-speed, in every work of faith and labor of love. Yes, more than this, we would come and sit at their feet, and hear them discourse of the "Glory of Christ," and sound forth, as he did, the wonders of redeeming love.



#### ORIGINAL LETTER OF DR. RYLAND.

The following letter from the late Dr. Ryland of Bristol, England, to a respected clergyman in this country, has never before been published. It will be read with interest by the friends of religion.

Bristol, March 15, 1815.

My very dear Brother,

For some months I have refused to see a newspaper, because I could not bear to read of the cruel contests between brethren of the same blood, and among whom there were so many spiritual worshippers of the same God. This day I hear peace is confirmed, and now I write once more to the dear friend whose letter rejoiced my heart twelve months ago, longing to know how the work of God is going on, with you, and with Dr. West, who I hope is still out of heaven, and will stay, till he has been the instrument of preparing many more to follow him. I grieve for the miseries of mankind everywhere. But Buonaparte, who is returned to France, and Louis, must fight it out, till our supreme Ruler has fulfilled his designs upon the continent of Europe; only may the Lord grant that Britons, and the descendants of Britons, may fight with each other no more; but may our two countries enter now on a most loving contest of rivalry, who shall do most to spread pure and undefiled religion all over the globe; and let each side rejoice to see themselves outdone by the other. I hope you received my little packet by Captain E——, though I did not see him, (to my regret,) the last time he was in England. We have lately had tidings from India, mostly of a pleasing nature. The work of the Lord is going on in various parts.

Increasing exertions are making in this country to spread religious knowledge. Some hopeful plans are commencing in France; but it is probable the renewal of internal commotions may check them for awhile.—Spain is in a wretched plight. Ferdinand has learned nothing by adversity, but reminds one of Proverbs xxvii. 22. I hope such changes will take place in South America, as will make an opening for the Gospel; and I trust you, that are their next neighbors, will avail yourselves of them. Could no mission be set on foot toward the south, beyond all settlements of the Spaniards and Portuguese? I know not how far they extend, but suppose you could easily obtain information. Whether they are sufficiently civilized to encourage the attempt, I know not. Are there not some islands between you and the eastern coast of Asia,\* which some Americans have already frequented, and have taught the inhabitants to make considerable improvements in the arts, and would not these be a likely situation for American missionaries to be received in a favorable manner?

I was very much pleased with the additions made by Dr. West to his book on the Atonement, respecting the Divinity of Christ. I have lent the book to Mr. Kinghorne of Norwich, one of the most learned men in our denomination, and a very excellent, godly man. My dear old friend Sutcliff of Olney, in Buckinghamshire, one of those who first set on foot our mission, is gone. Dear brother Fuller is often afflicted with bilious complaints, but I hope God will still spare him to us.

There was a young man of the name of Burritt, a pupil of Dr. Dwight's, who was a prisoner at Stapleton, near Bristol, but who

\* Referring to the Sandwich Islands.

has been removed for a considerable time to Dartmoor, who seemed pretty much concerned about his salvation, and ready to promote the instruction of his fellow prisoners. He once wrote to me, and I replied to him, but I could not find an opportunity of going over, as my time is exceedingly engrossed by the duties of my station. I hope he will be found a true convert.

I would beg you, if you have opportunity, to remember me most affectionately to Dr. West, and Dr. Dwight, and Captain E——. I hope I may have the pleasure to see the latter again. Dr. Romeyn of New-York, preached once for me, when he was in England. I invited him to sit down at the Lord's table with a little Pedobaptist church to which I break bread in the morning of the second Lord's day in the month, and in the afternoon I administer to the Baptists, some of whom object to mixed communion. But as Mrs. Romeyn was gone forward, he could not conveniently stay behind her. It would otherwise have been gratifying to me to have sat down at the Lord's table with a minister from America, and at the same time with Mr. Lindeman, from the East Indies, and his wife, a Malay, who were with us that day. A friend has unexpectedly called, who has engaged to forward this letter, which I therefore am obliged hastily to close, and subscribe myself,

Dear Sir,  
Yours, &c.

JOHN RYLAND.

---

#### VIEWES OF THE HOLLIS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY ON THE INSPIRATION OF THE APOSTLES.

We extract the following from the Sermon of Dr. Ware at the Ordination of Mr. Lamson, p. 13.

“ We are led to distinguish between the *doctrines* delivered by the apostles and primitive teachers, and the *arguments, illustrations, and topics of persuasion*, which they employed to enforce them. The *former* we are to consider as given them by *revelation*; the *latter* were the *SUGGESTIONS OF THEIR OWN MINDS, in the exercise of their respective talents, and the kinds and degrees of knowledge they possessed.*”

As it is the common opinion of Unitarians that the writings of the apostles do not consist extensively in the annunciation of particular *doctrines*, we infer that the Hollis Professor regards but a small part of what they have left us as anything more than “ the *suggestions of their own minds.*”

---

#### RELIGIOUS ANNIVERSARIES.

The late Religious Anniversaries in Boston were, in general, well attended, and the week of Election was one of deep interest, and we hope of profit. Great harmony prevailed in all meetings of the friends of Evangelical religion. We must leave particulars to be given in the newspapers, and reserve such remarks as have occurred to us till another number.

THE

# SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

VOL. II.

JULY, 1829.

NO. 7.

---

## COMMUNICATIONS.

ON ENVY BETWEEN CHRISTIANS IN THE DIFFERENT CLASSES  
OF SOCIETY.

A Letter from a Pastor in the country to an influential member of his church.

THERE is a subject which burthens my mind, and which, with a view to avail myself of your counsel and aid, I wish to communicate to you, for the present, confidentially. I should do it verbally, but that I wish to reduce my thoughts to order on the subject, and to lay it before you in continuation, and in its connexions as a whole.

From the time of my settlement in this place, I perceived the existence, occasionally, of unpleasant feelings in the minds of some towards the families in the village, as if they were greatly under the dominion of pride, thought themselves better than their neighbors, and despised the other families of the congregation. These feelings I regarded with regret, as an infirmity of human nature, occasioned by difference of property, education, professions, dress and manner of living; but without alarm, believing that the prevalence of piety and a discreet pastoral influence would prevent any serious evil—an expectation which was, as I thought, for a number of years happily realized. But for some time past, this feeling towards the families of the village has been steadily increasing; and at this time seriously affects the minds of nearly all the families of the congregation. Recently, it has entered some of our best families, who had not, to my knowledge, experienced any such impressions before.

In giving a true statement of the manner in which these suspicions and alienations have been spread through the congregation, I have been afflicted to perceive that they seem primarily to have originated in members of the church, and in the more immediate

JULY, 1829.

45

vicinity of the village; and from hence, as intercourse or family connexion has furnished opportunity, to have been extended to the families more remote.

The evils of such a state of feeling in the church and congregation are many and great. It prevents greatly all society attachments, and cordial concentrated action for the preservation and prosperity of the congregation—that feeling of mutual confidence and interest, and that spontaneous, noble, vigorous exertion, which makes even the feeble strong, and the strong invincible. I know not a society in the land who have their own prosperity more entirely at their own disposal, were they kindly affectioned one toward another, than our own. But a society divided against itself is easily brought to desolation; for, in that case, all those little difficulties which, in a better state of feeling, would be waived and got over, become, from the predisposition to irritation, the occasion of new animosities and violence. Every movement for the good of the society becomes dangerous, and nothing can be done. The blood is in such a state of inflammation, that every pimple becomes a boil; and such a train is laid, that every spark produces an explosion. From this state of feeling have arisen our difficulties about the renting of pews, and about singing; and when these are gone by, if they should, some new cause of as great moment may suffice to throw us into a state of fermentation.

These evils are increased by the magnifying power of rumor. The story which, in the *beginning*, may have been amplified by suspicion and jealousy, changes its features, and increases its size, as it moves on from one family to another, until the village, seen from a distance through this magnifying mist, looms up like a tower of Babel, and is regarded almost as the habitation of dragons. From the language which, from time to time, falls upon my ear, I am persuaded that not a few of our brethren and sisters in the village are regarded, by members of the church at a distance, as *haughty grandees*, who not only do not love the poorer members of the church, but too much despise them even to speak to them, and as being nearly, if not entirely, without evidence of piety.

Nor is this all. In the midst of us, and around us, there are unprincipled persons, who not only delight to propagate slanderous reports, but who make it a business to frame falsehoods, and put them in circulation. I once thought that the notoriety of their characters would be an antidote to the mischief; but by experience I am taught otherwise. Where so much predisposition to believe evil of a particular class of the community exists, persons who are known to be liars can get their falsehoods into circulation, and have them gain credence; for, if they are not believed as coming from them, they will soon be reported by persons of more credit, and their origin will be lost, and their credit be established by the respectable hands through which the falsehood is allowed to pass



from one to another. In this manner does this jealousy of feeling enable the most worthless persons to sport with our Christian confidence and affection, and with the interests of our society, and with the cause of Christ.

The same state of feeling renders the families of the village accountable for every foolish word uttered by any weak headed man, woman or child, who may feel as if they were showing their wisdom by chattering impertinence and folly. It would be too severe a requisition to insist that in all our families there shall be no indiscreet individuals, or that we shall in such case be able to bridle their tongues; and yet a few such speeches of vanity and folly are set down as evidence of the entire feeling of the families in the village, as really as if they had come together, and appointed a chairman and secretary, and approved of the speech by a unanimous vote. This is one of the evils which is continually meeting me, and which occasions me more frequent trouble, perhaps, than any other. Another consequence of the evil I am considering is, the advantage which such feelings and speeches against influential members of our own church and society give to the enemies of religion to do us injury, while they profit by our dissensions. From our lips, the irreligious take injurious statements about professors of religion, to justify their assertions, that religion itself is a matter of mere hypocritical pretence. While others employ them to prejudice other communions against us, and to prejudice our people against their own society, and so prevail on them to leave us and unite with them. I have stood amazed at the improvidence of the members of our church and society in this respect. As if our enemies could not annoy us enough by their own weapons and wiles, we frame and put into their hands weapons more destructive to us than they could otherwise possibly obtain. Other denominations, if offences take place in their communion, seem disposed to keep them back from public notoriety. But we, as if we would make a full experiment whether we can destroy ourselves, by the aid of others added to our own efforts, publish unceasingly the offences of our community, even in Gath, and in the streets of Askelon.

There is another evil implied in what has been said, but which, from its magnitude, demands a distinct illustration. It is the effect which this habit of murmuring and accusation has upon the children and youth of our society. As the law now stands, we have nothing to perpetuate our society and way of worship but the education of our children, and the early and strong attachment nurtured in them to their own society, and sanctuary, and forms of religion; but taught, as many children seem likely to be taught in the family, that a large number of the families in the society are proud, and look down on them with contempt; hearing this allegation a thousand times repeated by their parents, and by mem-

bers of the church and of the society ; and being thus enveloped in a continual fog of exaggerated reports, and of absolute falsehoods, and all the while pricked up to feeling and irritation by having these things thrown in their teeth, at every turn, by persons of other denominations ; what can we expect but that they will become, at first indifferent towards the sanctuary of their fathers, and, either obeying the impulse of covetousness, stand aloof, or, obeying the impulse of passion, go over to a denomination which they do not like, only because they are more disgusted with their own. It has occurred to me also, that the habit of reviling all distinctions in society is the offspring of pride, is blasphemy against the fifth commandment, which enjoins subordination in society, and against the providence of God, which measures out to men different portions of prosperity, and different employments for the general good. I have feared, moreover, that it may eventuate in a kind of insubordination of children to parents, apprentices to masters, and an insurrection of the base in society against the honorable ; some indications of which I seem to have witnessed in the prostration of the laws, the violation of the Sabbath, and indecorum in public worship ; and if rebellion begins at the house of God, what will be the end of it among those who fear not God nor regard man ? As it respects the church, as a spiritual community, the feeling and practice of which I have spoken are, in the first place, a sin of great magnitude. Allowing all to be *true* which is believed and alleged as to the pride of a certain part of the church, the members of the other part are not at liberty openly to accuse them, to murmur against them, and revile them, before their families and before the world. How would it answer for that portion of the church which is assailed in this manner to retaliate ; to constitute themselves judges of their brethren, decide what are their besetting sins, and blazon them before the world ? The directions of Christ in the eighteenth of Matthew, and the multiplied exhortations in the epistles to brotherly love, and the prohibitions of evil speaking and censorious judging, show that we sin against heaven when we allow ourselves to animadvert publicly upon the failings, real or supposed, of our brethren. Besides, the naked sin of violating Gospel precepts, great as it may be, is the least portion of criminality incurred. The passions of the heart, which are stirred up and nurtured in the bosoms of those who give themselves to these murmurings, are of the very worst kind. It is pride mortified and incensed by the supposed contempt of pride in others ; and it produces envy, jealousy, malignity, whisperings, backbitings, anger, revenge, contention, and every evil work. The Christian graces, in the neighborhood of such passions, die—a spirit of prayer is extinguished, and the Spirit of God withdraws his influences, and gives up churches, and societies, and families, and individuals, to their own heart's lusts.

It remains only that I disclose the effect of this state of things upon my own feelings, and upon my pastoral labors. And here I may truly say, it constitutes the beginning, and middle, and end of all my trouble in presiding over this church, and superintending the concerns of the society. If my people would be as kind towards one another as they have been towards me, my situation would be one of the most enviable in the land. As it now is, it is thought by some to be a very difficult congregation to be held together, demanding incessant and most arduous labor for the purpose. All this, however, I would cheerfully go through, could I be permitted to reap what is sowed, to retain what is gained. But when I have, by great effort, continued lectures in different parts of the society, and have been enabled to remove prejudices against myself, against the doctrines of the Gospel, and against our society and worship, and to awaken public attention, to gain the public ear, and to gain some souls to Christ, and to turn the popular stream in favor of seriousness and the way of truth,—to have it all turned back by the foaming out of rumors, and murmurs, and falsehoods, concerning particular families of the church, is most severely trying. Yet this is the process of labor and trial which I have gone through again and again, with reiterated grief and heaviness of spirit. This state of feeling, with its effects, is the source of all those fears and forebodings which at times distress me, and of nearly all the discouragement and sinking of heart which I feel. It is often a weight which oppresses my spirits when I lie down to sleep, which hangs on my heart through the night, and hangs upon it through the day. From the influence of this cause, more often than any other, I either do not enter my study from incapacity to command my thoughts; or leave it, after a long and unsuccessful struggle to shake off care and bring my heart and my mind to the work. Sometimes I feel exhausted—feel as if all would be lost which has been done, unless followed up by a ceaseless, vigorous effort, which still I feel unable to make. And I have seriously considered whether my past exertions and present anxieties and cares would not bring upon me the faintness of heart and the debility of a premature old age.

With respect to the means of counteracting this evil, I suggest the following things:—I must have a cordial and decided assistance. It will not answer for me longer to struggle against it alone, or to brood over my sorrows and anxieties in silence. My strength is not equal to the exertion which will be necessary to hold the society together against the repelling influence of so powerful a cause in universal and constant operation. Besides, there is danger of my increasing the evil by attempting to allay it; for while I, believing these apprehensions concerning the feelings of the members of the church in the village to be unfounded, shall attempt to allay abroad these suspicions, I am liable to bring myself

directly at issue with others of my friends, who verily believe the whole to be true, and of consequence to forfeit their confidence, as taking sides with the people of the village, and being as proud as they. It is obvious, therefore, I think, that I must have help from those in the society, who do not live in the village, who yet possess the confidence of the families abroad, and who can unite and extend silently a kind of concert of families, to contradict falsehoods, allay and efface jealousies and envyings, and study to restore a cordial and solid union of the families of the church and society. It ought, I think, to be considered, whether, if the families in the village are as censurable as they are thought to be, the evil is so great as to more than balance all the blessings which we enjoy by our alliance as a church and society; whether the destruction of both would not be a remedy worse than the disease; and whether, if we in reality intend to live as a church and people, it would not be policy, at least, to make the best of an evil by which God, in our case, as in all others, has set good and evil one against the other, that nothing should remain to men of unmingled good upon the earth. The society in the village is made up of persons from different parts of the State, less united to each other and the town than if born here, and must in this respect remain much as it is. But if we magnify the evil constantly, we cannot remain as we are, and we must decide, whether we will destroy our society, or bear the evil for the sake of the good. But it is worthy of most serious investigation, whether there is any just foundation for the charge of pride, and despising the poor, so often made against particular members of the church. That there is no sin of this kind, and no indiscretion of speech or action, need not be pretended; but is there any proof to justify honest men and sober and devout Christians in believing and representing, that certain of their brethren and sisters are worldly, and proud, and haughty, and filled with disdain of their poorer brethren? Such charges ought not to be publicly made, if they were true of individuals, against a large section of the church. But has the evidence been given, such as before the church, or a secular tribunal, would substantiate the charge? such as before God justifies the belief and propagation of it? Proud as they are thought to be by some, does the Gospel allow their brethren and sisters to proclaim their failings to the world? Should these same brethren set themselves up to judge their brethren around them, as envious and jealous, and to report them as such on every occasion, and in all sorts of company, before their children, and before strangers, in town, and out of town, would they not violate the rules of the Gospel? If their morality did not forbid such a habit of animadversion, it is desirable to extend, silently, the feeling that Christian *policy* should do it. If we experience some evils from the different conditions of those united in church and society, they are not unbalanced

by advantages. A market is furnished for the agriculturist, and employment for the mechanic, and a large proportion of the support of the Gospel is contributed by those who are thus misrepresented. After all, I do think that the idea that the heads of families in the village despise the families of the congregation around them, is wholly untrue, and an injurious aspersion upon them as Christians and as men. It is a heavy charge for Christian brethren to bring against Christian brethren. I have been conversant with the families in the village for several years, and in this whole period I have not heard, in a single instance, one word expressive of slight, or contempt, or low estimation. I have heard regret expressed, that such apprehensions should be entertained. I have known many things to be done, with the hope and expectation of removing these suspicions. On the contrary, I have as high evidence as men of veracity can give me, of the sincere respect and high estimation in which the families of the congregation are held, and of the sincere affection with which the members of the church abroad are regarded. It seems to me indispensable, that parents should cease to make such accusations in presence of their children, or to countenance them when made; and that those who live in the immediate vicinity of the village should especially be careful not to excite in the minds of the families more distant such apprehensions. They, living remote, would not be liable to be excited by their occasional intercourse. But, taking it for granted that the people near by know what is true, and being assured that the village is made up of pride and haughtiness, their jealousies are of course excited; and the evil extends, and by new impressions, made from time to time, is kept up all over the congregation. Now if those of the church and congregation who live contiguous to the village will abstain from irritating communications to the families of the congregation abroad, and exert a soothing, peace-making influence, the evil, great as it now is, may be checked, and in time banished; and could I perceive a solemn impression made of the sin and danger of the habit of accusing the brethren, and an effort begun to pursue the things that make for peace; with such cooperation, I could go forth with confidence to allay the evil—I could study and preach and pray with hope—I could feel as if God were near, and that his wonderful works would soon declare his presence. Until this is accomplished, I expect that my harp will hang upon the willow, and that we shall be fed with our own tears, reproved by our own backslidings, and reproached with the taunt of the enemy, ‘Come sing us a song of Zion.’ I expect to feel, as I have felt, discouragement, from laboring in vain and spending my strength for naught. I expect my heart to break forth, as it often has done, with the ejaculation, ‘O that I had wings like a dove, for then would I fly away and be at rest.’

## DANGEROUS COMBINATIONS.

A pamphlet has recently been put into my hands, entitled, *A Discourse delivered at Hamilton Centre, July 4, 1828, by Nathaniel Stacy*, which contains some very serious charges against a large and respectable body of men in this country. Similar charges have been made by others, and by some, who, I presume, consider themselves as of more consequence in the world than the above mentioned Nathaniel Stacy.\* It is alleged, that the leaders of certain powerful religious sects have engaged in a systematic and well matured plan, to deprive other Christian denominations of their rights, to place themselves at the head of the civil power of the country, and to effect a union between church and state.

Whether these allegations originate with the real and decided enemies of religion, who by such means seek a plausible pretext for opposing the benevolent operations of the day; or whether they arise from the jealousy of some religious sects, who feel themselves in danger of being eclipsed by the superior zeal and activity of their fellow Christians; or whether some people are really and honestly alarmed at the growing influence of religious men, it is not my present business to inquire. I am disposed to take the most charitable view of the motives of the accusers, and allow that they themselves really feel the terrors with which they attempt to inspire others. But I would ask, what ground is there for alarm? What evidence is there of the existence of such a conspiracy?

It is very true, that Christians throughout the world are more zealous, active, and united, than they ever have been, since the first promulgation of Christianity; it is very true, that the most strenuous, self-denying, and persevering efforts are made, to supply every nation and every family with the written word of God, to send the cheering light of the Gospel to those who are involved in the darkness and misery of paganism, to seek out the abodes of the ignorant, the vicious, and the suffering in Christian lands, to enlighten their minds, to reform their manners, and to alleviate their woes; it is very true that slaves are redeemed, prisoners visited and instructed, and intemperance, with its kindred crimes and its thousand sorrows, is resolutely and systematically resisted: but what is there in all this that looks like an attempt to overthrow our civil liberties, or establish ecclesiastical domination? Are those who plot the subjugation of their fellow-beings wont to exert themselves so much to enlighten their minds and reform their manners? Are knowledge and virtue, or ignorance and vice, the best pre-

\* "There is to be a *combination* among the most powerful sects to seize the civil power," &c. Christian Examiner, vol. v. p. 298.—"There is a *conspiracy* entered into all over the country to put down Unitarianism." Dr. Channing.—See also Mr. Johnson's Report to the Senate of the United States on Sabbath mails.

paratives for the introduction of political and spiritual despotism? Do the sects accused of forming dangerous designs against the liberty of their country encourage virtue, or vice? knowledge, or ignorance? Do they disseminate the Bible, or the Age of Reason? Do they erect churches, or theatres? Do they establish schools, or distilleries?

But all this zeal for knowledge and virtue, and all this parade of benevolence, it is said are only assumed as a cover for other designs; and the treasures collected, ostensibly for the best of objects, are secretly hoarded for the accomplishment of the basest purposes. This is indeed a very serious and heavy accusation, and ought not to be ventured upon without some evidence to support it. But when, or by whom has this evidence been produced? Who will pretend to say that the funds hitherto collected by benevolent societies have been more than sufficient to effect the good purposes which they have actually accomplished? Before any one reiterates this accusation, let him carefully examine the sources of income enjoyed by these societies, and ascertain the expense actually incurred in the promotion of the good objects which they ostensibly have in view; and, so far from finding a surplus revenue, he will see that the expenses have actually exceeded the income, and that they who have been engaged in carrying forward these benevolent operations, have done it at a great personal sacrifice of time and property. If, then, benevolence is merely the *pretence*, and power the real design, the pretence has as yet cost so much, that nothing has been left for the accomplishment of the design; and this is likely to be the case some time longer; for the operations of real benevolence are extended even faster than the means for carrying them into effect are actually afforded. At the rate these men have gone on, it will take them a great while to acquire the surplus fund necessary for the overthrow of the civil liberties of the country, and the present generation need be under no apprehensions for themselves, their children, or even their grandchildren. If the conspirators are politic, they will certainly adopt some more efficacious and expeditious mode of accomplishing their purpose.

The various operations of Christians at the present day are not done in a corner. The subject lies entirely open to public investigation, and the parties accused demand and challenge an investigation. No honest man will repeat so heavy a charge against a large and respectable body of his fellow citizens, till he has made a thorough and satisfactory examination of the whole matter, and is prepared to lay undeniable proof of the crime before the public. In all common cases, a man is presumed to be innocent till he has been proved to be guilty. Why should the rule be reversed in this case? guilt be presumed, and the proof of innocence re-

quired? Is the character of the accused so base and hateful as to justify such an unusual and severe mode of judging?

The charge is often urged in a form somewhat less gross and offensive. It is not asserted that the persons accused intend to make any open and forcible attack on the existing government, but that, by the wealth which they acquire, and by the splendor of their benevolent achievements, they design to gain a gradual and imperceptible influence, which will ultimately enable them to sway the civil authority, and control the liberties and the consciences of their fellow citizens. The very nature of such a charge renders it incapable of proof or refutation from direct evidence. It can be made out, or disproved, only by comparing circumstances, and drawing inferences from what we observe in the suspected party.

Now, from the inuendoes and insinuations of interested antagonists, I would appeal directly to the private character of the individuals composing the sect against which such an outcry is made. How are they in their domestic life, and daily conduct? Are they not peaceful and industrious, moral and useful citizens? As religious men, are they not apparently sincere and devout, lovers of the Bible, and true worshippers of God? Select some persons of this sect with whom you are personally acquainted, and scrutinize their characters as severely as you please; are they not kind and hospitable neighbors? In your dealings with them, have you not found them honest men, on whose veracity you could safely rely? Are not some of them your relatives and intimate friends? And have you any relatives or friends who appear more worthy of your esteem and love? or any (religious discussions apart) whose society you more highly enjoy, or to whom you more readily impart your confidence? And can you believe that these relatives and friends of yours, whose virtues you so highly esteem, are engaged in a conspiracy, to deprive you of your rights, and to control your liberties? Can you believe that they are capable of such a design? and believe it too on the word of men who are strangers to them, and who hate them merely on account of their religious belief?

Will you say, that you do not suspect your particular acquaintances and friends of any evil intentions, but that they are deceived and misled by their religious teachers? Have they, then, less discernment or less intelligence than others, that they should be less capable of penetrating the evil designs of ambitious men? In the transaction of their ordinary business, in the part which they take in civil affairs, do they appear deficient in acuteness or sagacity? How then do you suppose they can be so easily duped in their religious concerns, or be less capable than you are of discerning the character and designs of religious teachers? Remember, that those with whom you are personally acquainted are probably specimens of the whole body, and that the charges against them come



not from men who know them, but from strangers, who judge thus harshly respecting them, merely because they belong to a particular religious denomination.

I am fully persuaded that these charges would never be made, if those who make them were sufficiently aware of what they are doing. They deceive themselves, by the use of general terms, and by accusing the whole party in the gross, instead of directing their thoughts to the individuals composing it, who are within the circle of their own acquaintance. If those who are now loudest in their accusations would forbear their loose and general reproaches against the whole body, or against individuals whom they know only by report, and would confine their strictures to the known conduct of persons with whom they are daily conversant, they would shrink with horror from the severe terms of reproach which they now so freely use, without considering on whom they fall. But if they do not accuse those whom they know, what do their accusations amount to? And if they deal only in general reproaches, what credit is due to their allegations?

It is a little remarkable, that the men who are so prone to think evil of their neighbors, and to put the worst possible construction on their words and actions, should be the loudest in their professions of universal charity, and utter the heaviest denunciations against censoriousness and bigotry. They condemn, in no mild accents, the uncharitableness of religious men, who cannot conscientiously hold intercourse with them, as Christians, on account of their supposed fatal errors, but who are perfectly willing to live with them on peaceable and friendly terms as men and citizens; and yet these very advocates of universal charity do not hesitate to accuse men, whose private character they must acknowledge to be excellent, and above all reproach, of the foulest crimes, of high treason against their country, and of designs ruinous to the liberties and happiness of their fellow citizens. Which is the greater breach of the charity that *thinketh no evil*, conscientiously to withhold religious fellowship from those whom we honestly believe to be the advocates of fatal error, while we treat them kindly as men, and perform in regard to them all the duties of philanthropy; or publicly and repeatedly to denounce a numerous class of peaceful and industrious citizens as traitors to their country, and rebels against the government under which they live; to impute to them the worst of motives, and accuse them of the blackest designs, and to do all in our power to excite the prejudices of the community against them, while every action of their private life shows that they are men of strict integrity and sincere piety?

It is indeed hard, after one has sacrificed his worldly interest and comfort for the good of his fellow men, and while he knows that he has been impelled to his painful efforts by no motive but love to God and His creatures, to be viewed and treated as the

vilest criminal, and as an enemy to his country. But this is a hardship which many a faithful servant of God has been called to endure. The pretended patriots of Judea entreated that Jeremiah might be put to death, because *'he weakened the hands of the men of war, and of all the people;'* of Paul it was said, *'We have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition;'* and of Christ himself, *'We found this fellow perverting the nation.'*

There is another inconsistency in the language of these accusers which deserves to be noticed. At one moment, they represent Evangelical religion as tottering to its fall, and all the strenuous efforts of its friends at the present day as but the last struggles of an expiring monster; and then, in the same breath, the party is so powerful and dangerous, that all the energies of the people must be aroused to crush it, lest it sweep away their rights and destroy their liberties. Are not men who are actuated solely by a love of truth, and a desire for the good of their species, usually more consistent in their allegations against their enemies? Is it not possible, that in the case under consideration, there may be as much of party spirit and sectarian hatred, as of genuine patriotism and philanthropy? Without causelessly imputing base motives to any, it is not going too far to say, that if some men had not been blinded by their zeal for the interests of their own sect, the acknowledged sincere piety and general good conduct of Evangelical Christians would have protected them from the abuse with which they have been loaded.

That the pious should be slandered by the impious and the vile, is nothing strange; for these can never look with pleasure on the conduct of a good man, while it is a constant reproof of their own, nor appreciate his motives, while they are so totally diverse from any by which they themselves have ever been actuated. They condemn his conduct in self-defence, and misrepresent his disinterested efforts for the good of mankind, through incapacity of apprehending any but mean and selfish inducements to action. But that gentlemen, whose feelings are sufficiently refined to enable them to form an idea of pure benevolence; that literary men, whose minds are ennobled by long converse with the master spirits of the world; that Christians, whose rules of moral obligation are derived from the Scriptures; should lend any aid to the senseless clamor which has recently been raised against some of the best men of the age, is altogether shameful, and throws disgrace on the men who have debased themselves to so ignoble a purpose.

Even if the moral character of the Christians accused were not sufficient to shield them from abuse, it would seem that the very absurdity of the charge against them carried with it its own refutation. For who are they that are charged with the design of oppressing their fellow citizens? Principally the Presbyterians and the Orthodox Congregationalists; certainly not one third part of

the professors of religion, nor one fiftieth part of the voters, in the United States. How is one fiftieth part of the citizens, in such a country as this, to control all the rest, even supposing that they were united in the project? But who will pretend to say, that among all the Presbyterians and Orthodox Congregationalists, there are none whose conscience, or whose patriotism would resist encroachments on the liberties of the nation? When have they shown themselves such enemies to liberty, such unworthy citizens of a free republic? But supposing them to be as bad and as tyrannical as they have been represented, are there not powerful men in every part of the country, attached to no particular religious sect, to resist their usurpations? Are there not, besides, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Episcopalians, and numerous other sects, as respectable as they for numbers, wealth, and intelligence, to watch over them with sleepless eyes, and keep them within their proper limits? Indeed, if any man can look at the state of Christians, divided as they are into so many different and rival sects; and at the state of the world, so large a portion of which is indifferent or opposed to religion; and then join in the outcry against *dangerous combinations* among religious men; such a man might well be expected to shiver with cold in the burning sands of Sahara, or to cry *fire* amid the swellings of Noah's flood.

Such men have entirely mistaken the spirit of the age in which they live. It is not in this country only that Christians are aroused to extraordinary effort; but in Great Britain, in France, in Germany, in every part of the Christian world, there is the same activity and zeal, and exerted, too, for the same purpose—the glory of God, and the highest good of His creatures. Trace all their operations, examine them minutely, scrutinize them as closely as you please, and when you have done, judge of them candidly by the effects which they have produced. This is all we ask or desire.

I would now address a word to those who are attempting to disseminate these jealousies and prejudices.—You profess to be the friends of mankind, and believers in the Bible. The Orthodox, you must acknowledge, do effect some good, however you may suspect the purity of their intentions. Very well; let them go on and do all the good they can. Imitate the example of Paul. ‘*Some indeed* (says that noble Apostle) *preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will. What then? Notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.*’ If you suspect them of evil intentions, (to say nothing of the *charity* of judging so harshly respecting the motives of men whose general conduct is irreproachable,) keep your eye upon them, watch them closely; but judge them fairly, and be careful not to *bear false witness against your neighbor*. Where is the wisdom of attempting to prevent a certain good, through apprehension of an uncertain evil,

when that evil can be equally well guarded against, in another and a more profitable manner? Be as zealous and as active as your Orthodox brethren are, in alleviating the woes of the suffering, in supporting religious institutions, in disseminating the Bible, in suppressing vice, in promoting the education of the young; and there will be no danger of political or clerical oppression. Nothing can bring us under such a curse, but our own ignorance and vice; and nothing can save us from it, but knowledge and virtue. Those, therefore, are the truest patriots, who do most to promote the knowledge and practice of Christianity, though they raise no clamor against their fellow Christians for their alleged but unproved ambition and treachery; and they are the real enemies of their country, who suffer one of its citizens to live in ignorance and vice, while it is in their power to prevent it, however loud they may be in their outcries against tyranny and clerical domination. One half the time and effort which it now costs you to spread evil reports against your neighbors, would do far more than all your present labors towards preventing the evils you appear to dread, if applied directly to the suppression of notorious vice, and the promotion of useful knowledge. And would not this be a more pleasant, charitable, and Christian-like mode of proceeding, and one much more likely to secure the blessing of God?

Become better acquainted with those whom you accuse, and I can assure you, on the word of an honest man and a Christian, that you will think better of them. Seek their company; converse with them in a frank and friendly manner; ascertain, from the proper sources, their views and intentions; and see whether they are in reality so wicked and dangerous a people as you imagine. Perhaps you are mistaken in your estimate of their character. Have you never found an honest or a pious man among them, that you pass such unqualified censures upon them? Are there not some, even among their leaders and preachers, whose piety and devotion to the cause of religion entitle them to your respect?

At any rate, accuse those only whom you know, and with whose plans you are definitely acquainted; and no longer condemn in the gross, and charge a large body of your fellow citizens with the most detestable crimes, on mere suspicion, lest you be found guilty of the horrid wickedness and base ingratitude of slandering the best of men, and of doing all in your power to diminish the influence and injure the feelings of those who have devoted their lives to the noble purpose of doing good to mankind.

Supposing they should at last prove innocent of the charges which you allege against them, (and are you quite certain of their guilt?) what judgement will yourselves then form of the course which you are now pursuing? What estimate does your own conscience make of the crime of attempting to deprive a good man of his well-earned reputation, and to stigmatize him as the vilest mal-

efactor? It is better to keep on the safe side. Tell only what you *know*, and tell *all* that you know, both good and bad; and if your scorn and reproach is not soon turned to admiration and eulogy, then I will acknowledge that I am grossly mistaken in my estimate of the Orthodox Christians of this country. I do not say that they are *better* than any other class of people; but I do say that their characters are altogether above the base suspicions and imputations under which they are doomed to suffer.

To the Christians who have been thus calumniated, I would say, Be neither angry nor alarmed; for your cause is perfectly safe, so long as you continue quietly and humbly at your work, relying on the aid of Almighty God. '*Think it not strange concerning the fiery trial that is to try you, as though some strange thing had happened unto you.*' Make no clamor; treat all with kindness; proceed steadily and straight forward in the path of duty, and leave the care of your reputation to God. He will vindicate you from every false charge in due time; for the day is coming '*when the secrets of all hearts will be revealed. Commit your souls to Him, therefore, in well-doing, as to a faithful Creator;*' always remembering that '*the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are His. Having your conversation honest among the Gentiles; that, whereas they speak against you as evil doers, they may, by your good works which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation. For so is the will of God, that with well-doing, ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men.*'

---

## REVIEWS.

THE UNCONDITIONAL FREENESS OF THE GOSPEL; *in three Essays.* By Thomas Erskine, Esq., Advocate, Author of *Remarks on the Internal Evidence for the Truth of Revealed Religion.* Boston: Crocker and Brewster. New-York: J. Leavitt. 1828. pp. 250.

The previous publications of the author above named had led us to expect no ordinary degree of pleasure in the perusal of this little volume. Nor have our expectations been altogether disappointed. The writer exhibits, and labors to diffuse, a spirit of fervent piety, and of universal obedience to the divine law. He shows that his heart has been deeply affected with the consideration of the guilty, ruined state of man, and of the atonement which Christ made for sin. In many passages, he exhibits highly interesting views of evangelical religion, and makes touching appeals to the heart.

But in some very important respects, this publication has occasioned a serious and painful disappointment; and how reluctant soever we may be to animadvert upon the faults of a writer who has been so endeared to the community, we are urged, by the high obligations which bind us to the cause of our Divine Master, to speak on this subject without reserve, and to express our utter dissent from some of the peculiar views entertained by this devout and respectable layman.

We perfectly agree with our author in holding that the salvation of the Gospel comes to us *without money, and without price*; that no child of Adam has any title to the Divine favor on the ground of his own worthiness; that every blessing conferred upon us is a free gift; that nothing which we can do in order to salvation is to be considered as a condition, in such a sense as to imply that we merit salvation, either in whole, or in part; that the reward which Christ will hereafter bestow upon his most faithful servants, will be '*a reward, not of debt, but of grace*;' and that the *freeness* of the gift of eternal life is not in the least degree diminished by the circumstance of its being conferred on none but believers. The question, therefore, whether forgiveness, or any favor which God bestows on sinners, is perfectly gratuitous, is a question on which we have no controversy with our author. But to several of the opinions which he advances, and to the general aspect which he has given the subject, we have very strong objections. And we must say, that these objections cannot be obviated by any quotations which he has made, or can make, from the creeds or other writings of uninspired men, however favorable in a general view to the great doctrines of revelation. For whatever may be our respect and veneration for any of the friends and advocates of evangelical truth, whether ancient or modern, we remember that the word of God is our only infallible guide, and that it is from this we are to learn *the principles of religion, and the manner of teaching them*.

The opinion which our author maintains with the greatest zeal, and which seems to deserve the most particular consideration from us, will be exhibited in a few citations from the work under review.

"When you read that men are saved by faith, it does not mean that they are pardoned on account of their faith, or by their faith. No; it means that they are pardoned already, before they thought of it; that the sentence of exclusion has been reversed."—"The reversal of the sentence of exclusion, which I here consider to be pardon, is universal." pp. 53, 54. "I think the pardon which is asked (i. e. in prayer,) is a sense of the Divine pardon, and not a repeal of the sentence of exclusion." p. 60. "A universal amnesty is the subject of the Divine testimony."—"Pardon is entirely irrespective of all the varieties of human character."—"How shall we, who have, in the person of our representative, paid the penalty, yet continue under it?" p. 63. "The use of faith is not to remove the penalty, or to make the pardon better; for the penalty is removed, whether we believe it or not." p. 26. "This pardon is an unchangeable thing, like God himself." p. 30. "The limitation is not in the pardon, but in the belief of it. *All* are pardoned." p. 64. In p. 135, it is spoken of as very exceptionable, that "*the phrase, free offer of pardon, is so interpreted, that the very existence of the pardon is made to depend on the acceptance of the offer.*"

From these passages, and various others which might be quoted, understood as they must be by all who are acquainted with the language of Scripture, or of common religious discourse, it appears to be the opinion of our author, (and he shows it to be a very favorite opinion,) that *Christ so bore the penalty of the law, that all men, without exception, are delivered from it; that all are actually pardoned without respect to their repentance or faith, or to any condition whatever on their part;—all pardoned or forgiven, whether they believe or not.*

Now it is incumbent on us as Christians, and as Protestants, to inquire, whether this opinion of our author, and his manner of expressing it, correspond with the word of God. This is a very *safe* inquiry; because God certainly knows all that pertains to our forgiveness, and whatever he has taught us in his Word may be relied upon as pure truth. We may also be sure that the manner in which he gives instruction is proper in itself, and best suited to promote the interests of religion. Indeed, the inquiry which we propose, is our *only* inquiry; because there is no one but God who fully understands the subject of forgiveness, and no instruction but that contained in his word which deserves to be received with full and implicit confidence.

The moment we enter on our inquiry, we are met with the fact, that the sacred writers frequently represent certain things as necessary to be done by us in order to our obtaining the Divine forgiveness; that they do this in very plain and forcible terms; and that they evidently attach great importance to this representation. The apostle Peter, who had enjoyed the particular instructions of Christ, had been divinely commissioned to preach the Gospel, and had received the promise of the Holy Spirit to guide him into all the truth, spoke of forgiveness as a blessing *to be obtained*, and pointed out to the Jews the way in which they were to seek and obtain it. “Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out.” Acts iii. 19. The same apostle said to those who were assembled at the house of Cornelius, “To him (i. e. to Christ,) give all the prophets witness, that, through his name, *whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.*” In perfect accordance with this, is the representation of the apostle Paul, Rom. viii. 1. “There is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit;” clearly implying that freedom from condemnation, which is the same as pardon, is the peculiar privilege of believers, and is limited to them. In Matt. vi. 14, 15, and elsewhere, Christ represents forgiveness as belonging exclusively to those who have a forgiving temper. “If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your heavenly Father forgive you.”

Between these representations of Christ and the apostles, and those of our author, the disagreement is palpable. His position is, that *all* men are pardoned *absolutely* and *unconditionally*; pardoned, whether they believe or not; pardoned, though they die in their sins. While the Scriptures teach that those and those only are pardoned, who repent and believe, and have a forgiving temper, and walk in the Spirit.

Our author, however, is very far from holding that all men will be saved. He makes a distinction between those who are pardoned, or freed from the sentence of condemnation, and those who are members of Christ's kingdom, and actual partakers of salvation. He speaks of unbelievers as "pardoned, but not saved." According to his mode of thinking, though forgiveness belongs to all, the blessings of eternal life belong to none but those who are sanctified.

But is this distinction of our author founded on the word of God? To determine this, we have only to advert to those passages which represent forgiveness as including all the blessings of salvation. The passage, Rom. iv. 1—9, is decisive of itself. The apostle, speaking expressly of the happy state of those who are justified by faith, identifies *justification* with *forgiveness*. He says, "To him that worketh not, but believeth on him who justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom the Lord imputeth righteousness without works," that is, whom he justifieth. But what is the description which David gives of the blessedness of those who are justified? The apostle tells us. It is this, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, whose sin is covered." Thus the blessedness of those who are *forgiven* is, in the apostle's view, the same as the blessedness of those who are *justified*. The same apostle identifies *forgiveness* with redemption. "We have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." The New Testament frequently represents forgiveness as the great and comprehensive blessing of the Gospel dispensation. *Forgiveness* and *salvation* are spoken of interchangeably, as the object of Christ's death, and *pardon* is represented to be exclusively the privilege of *believers*, just as much as eternal life. Thus Christ speaks of Divine forgiveness as belonging to those only who exercise a *forgiving temper*, that is, to those who are *holy*.

An unprejudiced and thorough examination of the Scriptures will, we are persuaded, satisfy any man, that there is no foundation for the distinction which our author here makes; and that he was led to make the distinction, by a wish to avoid the force of certain difficulties which might better be avoided in some other way. It is perfectly clear to us, that the sacred writers speak of *forgiveness* and *salvation* as essentially the same thing, procured



by the same means, and belonging to the same persons. And this we should naturally expect they would do, from the nature of the case. *Forgiveness* is freedom from deserved punishment,—freedom from the evils to which we are exposed by sin. The sum of these evils is exclusion from the kingdom of heaven, or the loss of eternal blessedness. How then can we be *forgiven*, and yet be excluded from heaven, or subjected to the loss of eternal blessedness? What would be the value of that pardon, which would leave us enemies to God, and exiles from his kingdom? Suppose a father should give to his offending children assurance of his hearty and perfect *forgiveness*, and yet should keep them under the weight of his displeasure, by excluding them from his house, and utterly depriving them of their inheritance; what would be the difference between such a forgiveness, and no forgiveness at all?

But notwithstanding what our author advances to show that all sinners are pardoned, whether they believe or not, and that the pardon of every human being is absolute and immutable, it would seem that, at times, he had other and better views of the subject, and that whatever the language he employed to express his opinion, he intended nothing more than what is commonly meant by *the offer of pardon*. He says, p. 47, that “pardon is not so much a particular act, as a manifestation of God, opening the inviting arms of his love to perishing sinners, and urging them to come to him that they may have life.” Again, p. 132, he speaks of pardon as a gift of Christ, laid at the door of each heart; but he says it cannot enter separate from Christ, and until it enters it does nothing. And if his general representations and reasonings on the subject had been consistent with these passages, we should have had no occasion for controversy with him. But the fact is, that he generally speaks of pardon as a good actually possessed by all, and that it is absolutely unconditional. He holds that the Gospel requires nothing of us, as a condition of forgiveness; that its proclamation is, not that we shall be pardoned and freed from condemnation, if we will repent and believe, but that we are *already pardoned*, and pardoned *unconditionally*. He also denies that repentance or faith is a condition of eternal life. And the particular reason he assigns for considering forgiveness and salvation as thus *unconditional* is, that any condition would be utterly incompatible with *the freeness of the Gospel*.

In order to a right understanding of this subject, it is only necessary to attend to these two questions. First, *What is meant by a condition?* Second, *Is forgiveness, or salvation, any the less free, or gratuitous, for being conditional?* When any good is spoken of as offered or bestowed *conditionally*, the meaning is, that there is something required as a means of obtaining that good, or as necessary to the enjoyment of it; that it is limited to those who possess a certain character, or do a certain thing; that if we

have that character, or do that thing, we shall enjoy the good ; otherwise not. A father tells his children he will bestow such a gift upon them, if they will be *dutiful* ; and a king sends word to a company of rebels, that he will pardon them, if they will lay down their arms and swear allegiance to him. In these cases, the favor proposed is *conditional* ; and the condition is the thing required as necessary to the favor's being bestowed, or as the means of obtaining it. This is what we intend by the *condition of forgiveness*, or *salvation*. It is that which sinners must do *in order to obtain forgiveness*, and in the neglect of which they cannot be forgiven. What *are* the conditions or terms of salvation we learn with perfect clearness, in those texts which inform us, that whosoever believes, or repents, or calls upon the name of the Lord, shall be saved ; that those who repent shall be pardoned ; that those who forgive, shall be forgiven ; that those who are pure in heart shall see God ; that those who are faithful unto death shall have a crown of life. Here the condition is the thing mentioned as what will secure the good proposed, or will be the means of obtaining it. On such a condition, the enjoyment of the blessings promised in the Gospel must be suspended, unless the doctrine of Universal Salvation is true.

But the mere existence of *conditions* is no proof that the good proposed is not gratuitous. If indeed we give a merely equitable pecuniary reward to a man, on condition of his doing a particular service for us, the *nature* of the condition precludes the idea that the reward is *gratuitous*. We speak of such a reward as a man's *wages*, not as a favor bestowed upon him. But if a man is deeply in debt to us, and is rendered unable to pay any part of the debt by the wasting influence of intemperate drinking ; and if we make him the offer of remitting the whole debt, and besides this, of giving a generous support to him and his family, on the condition of his leaving off his intemperance, the good offered in this case is surely none the less gratuitous or free, because it is *conditional*. On the contrary, it is evident that the condition is itself the dictate of benevolence, and that it tends directly to enhance the value of the favor. So in the case now under discussion. If the condition required were such, that our compliance with it would give us a just claim to forgiveness or salvation, on the ground of our *personal merit*, or a title to it, as a *merely equitable reward* ; then indeed forgiveness would not be *free*, and salvation would not be of *grace*. But the conditions of the Gospel are in fact of such a nature, as not to detract in the least from the freeness of the offer, and not to render the good, when bestowed, any the less a matter of grace. Without producing any formal proofs of this, we make our appeal directly to the discernment and feelings of good men. Does the devout Christian regard his repentance, or faith, or obedience, as constituting a personal merit, which entitles him to forgiveness

and salvation, as an equitable reward? Does he regard the gift of eternal life as less *free*, or less expressive of the *grace* of God, or less above and beyond what is *justly due to him*, because he is required to perform the conditions referred to? On this subject all enlightened Christians must, we think, feel alike. And the strong objections of our author to the idea of any *conditions* in the Gospel must arise from his affixing an unusual meaning to the word, or else from the mistakes which have been made respecting the doctrines of the Gospel by men inflated with pride and self-righteousness, or blinded by the god of this world. And it is very pleasing to add, that he himself insists, with the utmost earnestness, and with powerful reasoning, on the indispensable necessity of repentance and holiness in order to salvation, and evinces, from the very nature of the case, that, without these, it is impossible for men to belong to the family of Christ, or to enjoy the blessedness of his kingdom. Still, he strenuously objects to making salvation *conditional*, because he considers conditions of every kind to be wholly repugnant to the freeness of the Gospel. Our opinion is, that the errors and dangers which he wished in this way to avoid, may be avoided much more effectually, by clearly explaining the nature of those conditions, on which salvation is offered, and by showing that they are perfectly consistent with that great doctrine of the Gospel, that salvation is *not of works, but of grace*. This doctrine the apostles plainly teach, and they teach as plainly, that repentance, and faith, and prayer, and obedience, are conditions on which free salvation is offered and bestowed. They never show any fear, that such conditions as these will clash with the freeness of the Gospel. And why should we? They make it their object, not merely to declare the truth that Christ procured a free salvation, but to induce men to perform the conditions, on which that salvation is offered. And why should not we do the same?

Another sentiment of our author, on which we feel ourselves constrained to animadvert, is, *that men cannot be excited to obedience by the hope of a future reward*.

If Christians would be satisfied with the representations of God's holy word, there would be no occasion for any controversy on this subject. For it is a fact, which no attentive reader of the Scriptures can overlook, that the sacred writers labor to excite men to obedience by the promise of future rewards. And this fact certainly implies, that we ought to regard those rewards as proper motives to action, and that we ought to be influenced by them in our daily conduct. We learn from the Scriptures, that in former times, the servants of God did in fact regard the subject in this light; that they had *respect to the recompense of reward*; and that, for the sake of obtaining that reward, they submitted to the severest labors and sufferings. And we perceive, too, that their con-

duct in this respect was commended by the inspired writers, and approved by God. Surely, then, our being influenced by the hope of future rewards is consistent with Christian benevolence, even that which is the most pure and disinterested; because patriarchs and apostles were thus influenced, and Christ himself endured the cross for the joy that was set before him.

Every difficulty in regard to this subject will vanish, if we will consider the nature of those rewards which the Gospel promises to believers, and which, notwithstanding some representations of our author to the contrary, must be regarded chiefly as future. It is a well-known principle, that a man is mercenary and selfish, or otherwise, according to the nature of the object which he seeks. There are rewards of such a nature as to be suited to the depraved, selfish heart, such as Jesus referred to, when he said of those who sought praise of men, "They have their reward." And there are rewards which are suited to a *pure and benevolent* heart. The rewards promised in the Gospel are all of this kind. They may be summed up in *the eternal enjoyment of God*, which is the blessedness of heaven. Now it must be perfectly evident, that the more fervently a man *loves* God, the more will he desire to enjoy him, and the more will he be influenced by that desire. If a man has a high degree of benevolence and holiness, he will set a high value upon the happiness of dwelling forever in a perfectly benevolent and holy society, and will feel a strong dread of banishment from God, and of the *pollution*, as well as the *misery* of hell.

Instead, then, of doing anything to supersede or diminish the influence of future rewards and punishments, we should put forth our best endeavors to increase it. It will be utterly in vain to think of bringing men to serve God, except by the motives which God himself has sanctioned. It is *faith* in the realities of the future world, which moves the affections of the heart, and controls the actions of the life. The apostle to the Hebrews, when describing the active principle which governed the holy patriarchs, teaches us, that *they sought a heavenly country*. He represents this as an excellence in their character. It must be an excellence, and the opposite must be a moral deformity and a crime. If God, by an unparalleled operation of his infinite love, provides everlasting happiness for his people; and if he holds it up before them as a worthy object of pursuit, and as adapted to excite them to holy diligence in their work; must they not be chargeable with criminal insensibility, if they disregard that provision of his benevolence, and suffer the desire of everlasting happiness to exert no salutary influence upon them?

It will be seen from the following quotation, that our author was capable, in spite of his theory, of being strongly moved by the consideration of future rewards.

“Some moralists,” he says, “have thought, that the hope of heaven taints the purity of virtue, by destroying its disinterestedness. But they do not know what heaven is. It is the sense of his spiritual corruption, rather than the sense of sorrow, which makes the Christian long after heaven. The holiness of heaven is still more attractive to him, than its happiness. In heaven also the affections meet, and are forever united to their proper object. They are filled and satisfied with the presence of God. It is this that they thirst after. They desire his favorable presence, as their chief good. It is an interest undoubtedly—the highest interest. But is it a selfish interest? Shall the desire of a son to behold once more the face of his father, after a few years of absence, be esteemed a pure and generous desire; and shall the desire of a spirit, long exiled from his native sphere, to return to its Father and its God, the Fountain of light, and life, and love, be called a selfish or interested desire? No; it is a pure desire, which is sent down into the heart from the Spirit of God, and which remains unsatisfied, until it has again mingled with its source. No, it is a noble desire, and speaks a noble origin. And the fear connected with the idea of missing this object, is not a base fear,—it is the horror which a pure spirit feels at the thought of mixing with pollution, and of being tainted by it.”

The general representation which our author gives of faith, we consider to be very defective and erroneous. It cannot surely be a difficult task to determine what faith is, when we have in our hands that sacred book which is its perfect standard. To *believe*, in the Scripture sense, is *to have confidence in whatever God declares*. Taken in the more restricted, evangelical sense, it is *to believe the truths of the Gospel*. Now the Gospel proclaims salvation to those who are lost. It informs us how forgiveness was procured for sinners, and how we are to become partakers of it. On these points, our faith is to be conformed exactly to the instructions of the Bible. If the Bible teaches that God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son to be our Redeemer, and that this Redeemer shed his blood for the remission of our sins, this is what we are cordially and thankfully to believe. If the Bible teaches that we are to obtain forgiveness and eternal life by repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, we are also to believe this. And so of all the rest. But according to our author, faith consists mainly in believing the simple proposition, *that we are all pardoned*. If by this proposition he means, that a *free pardon is offered to all*, and that those who repent and believe in Christ shall actually receive forgiveness, he is undoubtedly correct in making this an article of Christian faith. But if the meaning of his proposition is, that we are all actually pardoned, that our sins are really forgiven us, and that we are freed from condemnation, and all this absolutely, and without any respect to character; then we must say, that the proposition is far from being any part of Divine truth, and, of course, the belief of it is far from being any part of Christian faith. Nay, further, as such a proposition is totally contrary to the word of God, which expressly declares that all unbelievers are under condemnation, to believe it is to believe a lie, and a lie, too, of the most ominous tendency.

The notion of faith which our author maintains is no new thing. It has been maintained by many men of distinguished talents and

piety. But, in our judgement, it has been often and satisfactorily proved to be contrary to the holy Scriptures. It would be easy to refer to a host of excellent writers in Europe and America, who have clearly exposed the error of it. For ourselves, we cannot but consider this view of faith to be at variance with Christian experience, and with the word of God; and wherever it prevails, it must, we apprehend, prove a vast hindrance to the conviction and conversion of sinners, and to the spiritual health of Christians. The churches of Christ, both in Europe and America, have long experienced the hurtful influence of error in regard to the nature of evangelical faith. The opinion of our author on this subject is one which Edwards, and Brainerd, and Fuller, and a multitude of other distinguished divines, have, with equal ability and success, labored to confute. We hope that Christians will pause, and search the Scriptures, and seek the guidance of the Holy Spirit, before they accede to the position, that pardon actually belongs to the whole human race, and that all sinners, impenitent as well as penitent, rebellious as well as obedient, enemies to Christ as well as friends, are forgiven, and freed from the condemnation of the Divine law.

But, in our author's view, it is the belief *that we are all absolutely and unconditionally pardoned*, which produces repentance, and love, and obedience. He says,

"The use of faith is, not to remove the penalty, or to make the pardon better, but to give the pardon a moral influence, by which it may heal the spiritual diseases of the heart."—"Men are sanctified by a belief of the pardon."

It has appeared not a little remarkable, that our author, who generally shows such aversion to the idea that we are to be influenced by the hope of future rewards, because such an influence would fall in with the selfishness of the heart, and mar the disinterestedness of the Christian character, should, in the case now before us, represent a personal benefit, bestowed upon us by God, as the principal, and indeed the *only* means of exciting our love to God, and of transforming our whole character. If a good actually in possession may have a salutary influence upon us, why may not a good in prospect,—a good to be enjoyed hereafter? Our author thinks that our being absolutely and unconditionally pardoned has a salutary effect upon us, because it clearly displays the infinite love and grace of God. And is not his infinite love as clearly displayed, by the eternal inheritance which he has prepared for his saints? Why then should not this manifestation of his love be as well suited to have a salutary effect upon us, as the one which is supposed to be made by a present unconditional pardon?

Of the practical influence of faith, we are taught by the Scriptures to entertain the highest conceptions. But the faith to which the inspired writers attribute so mighty an influence, is, not a belief of present unconditional forgiveness, (which is no doctrine of

the Bible,) but a cordial confidence in all the Divine declarations, whatever they are, and to whatever subjects they relate. The faith of which they treat receives the whole circle of Divine truth, and brings it into contact with the moral sensibilities of the mind. To be sanctified through the *truth*, is the same as to be sanctified by *faith*. The truth cannot sanctify us, unless we believe it; and our faith cannot sanctify us, unless it embrace the truth. Nor is it just to single out one particular truth, and ascribe to it the whole work of our renovation. Every doctrine, every precept, every promise, every display of God's character in his word or in his works, is suited to produce a sanctifying effect. And the greater the range of Divine truths with which we become acquainted, and which we cordially believe, the greater will be the power of our faith to sway our feelings, and to move all the springs of action within us.

We hold that our faith in the doctrine of forgiveness, properly understood, is suited to be eminently the means of our sanctification. Forgiveness through the blood of Christ makes a manifestation of the wisdom, and love, and holiness of God, more illustrious and moving than is made in any other way. On this account, the doctrine of forgiveness has a peculiar worth, and our faith in it has a peculiar efficacy. But the measure of influence which faith in this instance possesses, arises from the excellence and glory of the particular truth to which it relates. And let it be kept in mind, that faith in every other exercise of it has an influence of the same kind.

We have one more remark. Our author decidedly rejects the doctrine of the Universalists. But must not his favorite position, so far as it is believed, have an influence very similar to the doctrine of universal salvation. To affirm that all men are unconditionally pardoned,—that, whether they believe or not, they are all freed from the sentence of condemnation,—tends to produce upon the minds of men generally much the same effect as to affirm that all men will actually be saved. For who will be likely to perceive any essential difference between universal, unconditional *forgiveness*, and universal, unconditional *salvation*.

The free remarks we have made upon this little book will, we hope, put those who read it upon their guard, and lead them to distinguish what is true and excellent from what is erroneous and hurtful. The faults of our author in respect to arrangement, and order, and continuity of thought, cannot escape the notice of any intelligent reader. But on these we have no wish to remark.

THE RIGHTS OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES OF MASSACHUSETTS. *The Result of an Ecclesiastical Council convened at Groton, Massachusetts, July 17, 1826.* Boston: T. R. Marvin. 1827. pp. 63.

VINDICATION OF THE RIGHTS OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST. *First printed in the Spirit of the Pilgrims.* Boston: Peirce and Williams. 1828. pp. 47.

REVIEW OF THE RESULT OF AN ECCLESIASTICAL COUNCIL CONVENED AT GROTON, &c. *First published in the Christian Examiner for March and April, 1827.*

REVIEW OF THE VINDICATION OF THE RIGHTS OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST. *Published in the Christian Examiner for July and August, and for November and December, 1828.*

The first two publications, whose titles are here given, though from different pens, and prepared without previous concert, aim at the same general object, and advocate substantially the same views. They advocate the cause of the churches, and are a vindication of their rights. The last two are presumed to be from the same author, and were intended as replies to the two former. To avoid circumlocution, we shall call the author of the first pamphlet Dr. B.; the author of the second (which was first published as a communication to this work) our Correspondent; and the author of the third and fourth, Mr. L.

Mr. L. thinks "there has been no small share of address, and what the world would call artifice, in the manner in which" the publication of our Correspondent "has been brought out." He supposes Dr. B. to have been so astounded and overcome by his review of the Groton Result, that, with some vain threats and ineffectual attempts to frame a reply, the project was abandoned; and, "after one year's delay," our Correspondent "appears, with what is in fact but a new edition of that Result, without a single change of the argument, and without even an attempt to meet one of the objections to that extraordinary production." vol. v. p. 302. Now we can assure Mr. L. that this account of the matter is purely imaginary, and that all his boasting and fancied triumph are vain. Dr. B. did intend to reply to his review, and did make some preparation for that purpose. That such was his intention, was known to many, and, among others, to our Correspondent; consequently, in preparing his article, he intentionally avoided any express reference to the review of Mr. L. But after the communication of our Correspondent was published, it was thought by Dr. B., and by many others, that a professed reply to Mr. L. was no longer necessary. The labor of preparing one was therefore suspended. This is a true account of the whole matter—the sum total of the "address" and "artifice" which have been used.



We have said already that the first two publications whose titles we have given, aim at the same general object, and advocate substantially the same views. They both insist that "there were *churches* in the days of the Apostles, distinct from congregations;" that the ground of distinction between the two was "*evidence of faith*, or a visible, credible profession of piety;" that the churches then were "*voluntary associations* for religious purposes," the members of which "were united by some agreement or covenant, expressed or implied;" and that, in their associate capacity, they had the power of "admitting and excluding members, choosing their own officers, holding and managing their own property," and transacting generally their own concerns. All this is expressly stated by our Correspondent, and is expressed or implied in the publication of Dr. B.

To this, no reply is attempted in either of the reviews of Mr. L.; and in the last of them he says,

"We may admit this to be true, without in any degree conceding the inference drawn from it. When the whole world was heathen, with the exception of the apostles and a few converts, it may be admitted that many attended their preaching who were not converted to Christianity." vol. v. p. 313.

It is insisted on, both by Dr. B., and our Correspondent, that "there have been *churches* in Massachusetts distinct from towns, parishes, or any other mere civil incorporations, from the first settlement of the country." This also Mr. L. expressly admits; (vol. v. p. 313,) and in so doing contradicts Chief Justice Parker, who affirms that there was "little practical distinction between church, and congregation or parish or society, for several years after our ancestors came here."\*

It is shown at large by both of the writers in defence of the churches, "that the Congregational churches of Massachusetts consisted, at the first, of such, and only such, as made an open *profession of their faith*, and entered into a *solemn covenant* with God, and with one another, to obey the precepts, and observe the ordinances of the Christian religion." To disprove this, no attempt is made in either of the publications of Mr. L.

It is further insisted on by the writers in behalf of the churches, that "the Congregational churches of Massachusetts have been, from the first, *religious societies*, or *voluntary associations* for religious purposes, possessing, like all other associations for lawful purposes, the power and the right of self-organization, preservation, and government." "They have ever had the sole right of admitting and excluding members." They have had, and they have exercised, the right of choosing their own officers. They, from the first, chose their *Pastors*; as is shown by many examples, and might be shown by many more.—This, too, is unequivocally admitted by Mr. L.

\* Mass. Term Reports, vol. xvi. pp. 498, 514.

"We have said, that we might safely admit all that has been advanced by the vindicator of the rights of the churches, as to the early usages of the churches of New-England, without in any degree impairing the force of the reasoning, by which the late decisions in the Supreme Judicial Court were supported."—"The churches did unquestionably usurp the power of choosing the minister." vol. v. p. 478.

In the early settlement of this country, the church had the power, not only of choosing its own Pastor, but of choosing a minister for the town or parish. This continued till 1692; at which time it was enacted, that "every minister, being a person of good conversation, able, learned and orthodox, that shall be chosen by the major part of the inhabitants of any *town*, at a town meeting duly warned for that purpose, shall be the minister of such town, and the whole town shall be obliged to pay towards his settlement and maintenance."\* In commenting on this law, our Correspondent expressed an opinion, that what it took from the church was, not the right of choosing its own pastor, but the power of choosing a minister for the town. At this, Mr. L. is greatly scandalized, and after quoting what we believe every reader will consider the *very temperate* language of our Correspondent, breaks out upon it in his usual manner :

"We doubt whether any example in the Cromwellian dynasty can equal it in sophistry and misrepresentation."—"It affects the character of the work in which it appears, and of the writer. Did he expect that any intelligent man would believe it? Or did he believe it himself?"—"None are so blind as those who will not see." vol. v. p. 280.

Now we can perceive no justifiable reason for all this heat and invective: For, in the first place, the point in question is one of no present, practical importance. The law continued in force but for a single year, and has never since been reenacted. But, in the second place, we are clearly of opinion that our Correspondent was right in the interpretation which he gave of it. There were, and had been, two perfectly distinct bodies, a *church*, and a *town* or *parish*. Up to this time, (1692,) the church had held the power, by law, not only of choosing a Pastor for itself, but of choosing a minister for the town. Now the law above quoted went to transfer this last mentioned power from the church to the town—the body to which it properly belonged. But how it can be understood as depriving the church of its long exercised and unalienable right of choosing its own presiding officer, when not one word is said, in that section of the law which has been quoted, respecting the church, we are unable to perceive.—The church is indeed mentioned in another section of this law, and in a manner which shows conclusively that the right of election was not intended to be taken from it. "The respective churches in the several towns within this province shall, at all times hereafter, use, exercise, and enjoy *all their privileges and freedoms* respecting Divine

\* Province Laws, p. 255.

worship, church order, and discipline, and shall be encouraged in the peaceable and regular profession and practice thereof." (Act of 1692, sect. iii.) Is it possible that a law, containing this provision in one section, should, in another, take away the right of election from the churches? confirming, in one part, "all their privileges and freedoms," and in another, taking away the most important of "their privileges and freedoms"?—We have further evidence of the correctness of the opinion expressed by our Correspondent as to the import of the law of 1692, in the fact, that the reason urged for its repeal in 1693 was, not that it had taken away the rights of the churches, (a reason which would certainly have been urged, if it had taken them away,) but "the unpracticableness of the method therein proposed for the choice of a minister, in divers towns wherein there are more churches than one, and inconveniences attending the same, not so well before seen."\* (Act of 1693, sect. vii.)

Our Correspondent, having quoted the acts of 1693 and 1695, securing expressly to the churches the right "to choose their own ministers," and to the towns or parishes the right of a concurrent choice, and, in case of disagreement, submitting the question to the determination of an Ecclesiastical Council, adds,

"Here the subject rested, until the adoption of the Constitution, in 1780; a period of eighty-five years. During all this while, the church continued to choose its own pastor, and the town or parish its own minister; and the choice falling ultimately, in almost every case, upon the same person, the churches had rest, and the interests of religion were secured and promoted." p. 14.

"This," says Mr. L., "is a palpable, and if the writer lays claim to any character as an accurate writer, [which he certainly does,] a wilful misrepresentation." Mr. L. insists, that while these acts continued in force, which was almost a century, neither church nor parish possessed the right of choice.

"Where then was the right of the church, the immemorial, undeniable right of the church to elect their own pastor from 1693 to 1780, when the Constitution vested the ultimate right in the people? They could not choose their own pastor, without the concurrence of the town or parish. This pretended right was, therefore, as the lawyers say, in abeyance, for a century. It could not be exercised." vol. v. p. 481.

"The parish," under these laws, "had no power to select a teacher. It must have waited, however long, till the church should select one agreeable to itself. The act of 1693 was a violation of the natural rights of the parish." vol. v. p. 492.

We will have no dispute with Mr. L. as to the meaning of words. If he means that, while church and parish were united, and chose to remain united, they could not both, or either of them, exercise an entirely separate and independent choice; or, in other words, if he means that a concurrent choice on the part of two bodies is not in all respects the same, as a perfectly separate and independ-

\* In 1692, the Rev. Joseph Belcher was invited to become the minister of Dedham, and received his call from both church and parish—showing conclusively how the law we have considered was understood at that time.

dent choice on the part of each; we certainly shall not dispute with him. But if he means, as his language asserts, that from 1693 to 1780, the churches did not choose their Pastors, nor the parishes their ministers; we deny it. Who did choose them, if they did not? Or will he contend that the settled clergy of that period were not chosen, in any sense at all? The acts of 1693 and 1695 went to secure to the churches, in express terms, the right "to *choose their own ministers*;" and this right they regularly and constantly exercised. They were accustomed to assemble, in regular church meeting, and, after prayer and deliberation, to give their votes for a particular individual to be their Pastor. The members of the parish were also accustomed to assemble in regular parish meeting, and to give their votes for a particular individual to be their minister. Transactions such as these, we believe may properly be termed a *choice*—a choice by the church, and a choice by the parish. If the choice of both bodies fell on the same person, (as it almost invariably did,) and the individual chosen accepted the invitation, and was regularly inaugurated; he then became an officer of the church, and an officer of the parish, and, by virtue of his joint office, the religious teacher of both. This was the actual state of things from 1693 to 1780, and even later—a state in which "the churches had rest, and the interests of religion were secured and promoted."

It has been determined by the Judges of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, in some late decisions, that by a clause in the third article of the bill of rights prefixed to the Constitution of the State, the right of the churches to elect their pastors is taken away, and the whole power of election is given to parishes or towns. This doctrine is strenuously insisted on by Mr. L., and as strenuously opposed by both the writers in behalf of the churches.

As this point is one of radical importance, it will be necessary to examine it with particular attention. The clause in the bill of rights, which has given rise to this discussion, is in the following words: "The several *towns, parishes, precincts*, and other *bodies politic or religious societies*, shall at all times have the *exclusive right of electing their public teachers*, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance." That this language was intended by the convention who framed the Constitution, and by the people who adopted it, to deprive the churches of the right of election is to us incredible,—and for the following reasons: In the first place, the words of the clause in question do not imply it. To quote the language of our C. on this point,

"The Constitution says "that towns, parishes, precincts, &c. shall have at all times the exclusive right of electing their public teachers." &c. And so say we. It is their natural right, and they ought to have it. The church has no right to impose a religious teacher, an officer, upon the town or parish, against its will. Let the parish have, what the Constitution gives it, the exclu-

sive right of choosing its own religious teacher.—But is the exercise of this right on the part of the parish at all inconsistent with the rights of the church? We think not. The parish has a right, by the Constitution, to choose a minister for itself; but no right to choose a pastor for the church. The church is quite another and distinct body—distinct in *nature* as well as fact; and the right of one body to choose officers for itself, conveys no right to choose officers for another body.”

As the language of the Constitution does not necessarily imply, that the right of election is taken from the churches, it is impossible to suppose that the Convention who framed it, could have entertained such a design. For who constituted this Convention? We have lately seen and examined a list of the members, and find that it was composed, to a great extent, of the members of Orthodox Congregational churches. Numbers who belonged to it, and who were strenuous advocates for the adoption of the third article in the bill of rights, were *ministers* and *deacons* in these churches. Says a writer in the Independent Chronicle for March 2, 1780, “A considerable number of the members of the Convention are *teachers of Christianity*; the greatest number of whom were **WARM ADVOCATES** for it,”—the third article.—To show how the *clergy* of that period regarded the right of the churches to elect their own pastors, we quote the following from an “Address of the Convention of Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts, **UNANIMOUSLY** offered to the consideration of the churches, in 1773.” “Neither Diocesan Bishops, nor Lay Presbyters, nor magistrates, as such, have power to appoint officers to a particular church. **THIS IS THE UNALIENABLE RIGHT OF THE BRETHREN, BY A FREE ELECTION.**” Thus said the Ministers of Massachusetts, *with one voice*, in 1773. Now can we reasonably suppose, that some of these same men, with their deacons, and brethren of their churches, should in 1780, only seven years after, unite in forming a Constitution of Government, and be the “*warm advocates for it*,” which took away the right of election from the churches? Would they take away that in 1780, which in 1773 they declared to be an “unalienable right?” In the language of our Correspondent,

“Would they, by a single clause, take from perhaps five hundred churches, a right which had been guaranteed to them by immemorial usage, by long established laws, and (as they supposed) by Christ himself? Would they take from five hundred associations of persons for the most solemn purposes of religion, a right which is claimed by all voluntary associations—the right of *electing their own officers*, and oblige them to receive as officers, as pastors, who should preside in their meetings, administer their ordinances, and break to them the bread of life, those whom other and foreign bodies, mere civil corporations, should please to set over them, or force upon them?”

The Convention who framed the Constitution, in their communication to the people urging its adoption, address them in the following terms:

“In the third article of the declaration of rights, we have, with as much precision as we were capable of, provided for the *free exercise of the rights of con-*

*science.* We are very sensible that our constituents hold these rights infinitely more valuable than all others; and we flatter ourselves, that while we have considered morality, and the public worship of God, as important to the happiness of society, we have sufficiently guarded *the rights of conscience from EVERY POSSIBLE INFRINGEMENT.*" p. 10.

But how could the Convention use language such as this, if, in the article they had prepared, and were at this moment endeavoring to recommend, they had taken from the churches the right of election? Did they not know that, with many, the exercise of this right was a most solemn matter of conscience? a point which they never could surrender, consistently with their views of duty, and of the Divine command? And would they have mocked their constituents with a pretence of "guarding the rights of conscience from *every possible infringement,*" while, on the supposition we oppose, they were now in the act of invading these most sacred rights and taking them away?

But if we can suppose that a majority of this Convention entertained and avowed the design of taking from the churches the right which has been mentioned, and that they succeeded in accomplishing it; we cannot possibly suppose that they succeeded *without opposition.* There would have been opposition. There *must* have been. Even if the "*teachers of Christianity*" in the Convention all turned traitors to the churches, and were the "warm advocates for" an article which was understood and designed to take away their "unalienable rights;" still, other voices would have been raised against it. Objections would have arisen from some source. So great an innovation was never effected in this country, nor in any other, without debate. Had it been said by the Committee who reported the third article, 'The churches, to be sure, have all along had a distinct voice in the election of their pastors, but to this they are not entitled, and they shall have it no longer. The right of election must be taken from them, and given entirely to parishes or towns;'—had language such as this been used, would it have been heard without objection or remark? Would there have been none to institute an inquiry, or to raise a note of remonstrance against it? \*

\*The following very just and forcible observations on this subject are from a publication of Hon. Judge Haven of Dedham. "To bring the new doctrine to a fair test, let us suppose the following words to have been added to the questionable clause in the third article, 'And the churches shall have no right to choose their pastors;' or 'Churches shall have no agency in the settlement of ministers.' Does not every one believe that the people would have been struck with astonishment, and have rejected the article?—It is not to be supposed for a moment, that those wise and good men, who were so carefully endeavoring to guard the rights of all, and at the same time to establish Christian worship, should, at the very instant, become persecutors of the Christian church, in the Congregational form—that child of liberty, and of the prayers, tears, labors and sufferings of their pious progenitors. But this would be the result of the doctrine now contended for, that of *imposing a pastor over the church against its consent.* If any other man, or body of men, has a right to do this, the church is no longer free; liberty of conscience is at an end. If one kind of man may be put over them, another may—one to whom they have no attachment, but an aversion; one whom they believe destitute of religious principle; one whose views and feelings are diverse from theirs, or concerning which they have no

Or if we can suppose the third article, thus explained, to have passed the Convention without debate, and to have gone forth to the several towns for their acceptance; would it have met with no opposition from the people? Is it reasonable to suppose it?—And yet the public may be assured, there *was* no opposition to this article any where, on the ground of its taking the right of election from the churches, or in any way affecting this right. The third article of the bill of rights was more discussed, and more opposed, in Convention and out, than any other part of the Constitution;\* and yet not a whisper of opposition was heard from any quarter, on the ground which has been suggested. We have examined an abstract of the debates in Convention on this very subject; we have examined the returns from the several towns in the Commonwealth, with their remarks upon the Constitution in general, and upon the third article in particular; we have examined several volumes of newspapers for the years 1779 and 1780, and read all that was published, in favor of the third article, and against it, while it was under discussion before the people; and we fearlessly aver, that there was no opposition to it, from any source, such as might have been expected, on the ground that it was understood to take from the churches the natural, immemorial, and unalienable right of electing their own pastors.

The grand objection to the third article, at the time of its adoption, was, that it was *too favorable* to the churches—that it proposed to do too much for them—that it went to enlist the civil authority for their support and benefit. It was contended by its advocates, among whom were the “teachers of Christianity,” that without it, “the churches would be in danger;” and it was urged, once and again, against the men who opposed it, “These men mean to set our churches all afloat.” To which it was replied, on the other hand, “Why plead for the right of the civil magistrate to support the churches of New-England by law?” “The church of Christ has a sufficient security to flee unto and be safe. Lo, says the Head of the church to his disciples, I am with you always, unto the end of the world.” We here quote, not only the reasoning, but the very *language* of the times.†

And now, to sum all up, can we conceive that this Convention, composed, as it was to a considerable extent, of ministers, deacons, and members of the churches—of those who professed the highest respect for the rights of conscience, and a determination to “guard them from every possible infringement”—of men, some

knowledge; one to whose administrations they must submit without edification, and with disgust, or be driven from their birthright. What characteristic of persecution is there, of which this measure does not partake?”

\* “This article underwent *long debates*, and took time in proportion to its importance.” Address of Convention, p. 10.

† See Independent Chronicle for April 13, 1780, and Boston Gazette for June 12, and for August 14th, 1780.

of whom, only seven years before, declared the right of election in the churches to be "an unalienable right"—of men who were charged with having *an undue* regard for the churches, and with preparing the article in question with a view to their support and benefit—of men who could reply to the opposers of this article, 'You mean to set our churches all afloat, and this is the reason why you oppose it ;'—is it possible to conceive that these very men, and in this very article, should have designed to take away from the churches the "unalienable right" of electing their pastors? Or if we can suppose them to have intended such a thing; is it possible to conceive that the design could have been accomplished, without, so far as appears, a whisper of opposition, from clergyman or layman; in writing, or in debate; before the Convention, or before the people.\*—He who can frame a supposition like this, and satisfy his mind as to the truth of it, need have no trouble with his understanding or his conscience afterwards. His wishes and prejudices, as it seems to us, will carry him any where, and he will be able to believe, with evidence or without, just as his convenience or his inclinations dictate.

Were it necessary, we might appeal here to the *practice* of the churches, everywhere the same after the adoption of the Constitution that it was before, and continuing the same, except in a few Unitarian societies, to the present day—all going to show, that the people—the *people*, to whom the Constitution was submitted, and who consented to adopt it, had not the most distant idea that it took from the churches their long established usages and rights, in regard to the choice of their religious teachers.

But without insisting further on this point, we proceed to show, that the third article in the declaration of rights, so far from depriving the churches of their right of election, absolutely *secures* to them this right. On this point, the discussion is brought within narrow limits. Are churches, in the sense of the Constitution, "bodies politic or religious societies?" If they are, it is admitted on all hands that the Constitution secures to them the right of election. "We are quite ready to admit," says Mr. L. "that if churches were then (in 1780) well known and understood to be bodies politic, they are within the provisions of the Constitution."

\* The principal objections to the third article, in 1780, were the following :

1. It is not sufficiently explicit. It is ambiguously expressed. It is capable of being variously, and of course wrongly, interpreted;—an objection which experience has shewn to be too well founded.
2. It gives to the legislature a power of compulsion in matters of religion—a power to which civil government is not entitled, and which has often been made the instrument of oppression. And,
3. It may be made to infringe on the rights of conscience, giving to a majority power to oppress a minority, or to one denomination power to invade the rights of another.

These, and similar objections, were often repeated, and variously expressed and urged; but we find no objection from any source, nor an intimation that it had entered the mind of any person, that the third article took away from all the churches of Massachusetts the right of electing their own pastors, or in any way affected these rights.



vol. v. p. 496. The words of the Constitution are “bodies politic or religious societies.”

That churches are religious societies is evident from the *nature* and *structure* of them. They are “voluntary associations of professedly religious persons for purely religious purposes.” Surely it is not an improper use of terms to call such bodies “religious societies.” What are they, if they are not religious societies? Chief Justice Parker admits that churches “may be religious societies, under the statute of 1811.”\* And Mr. L. admits that the expressions, churches and religious societies, may be used interchangeably, the one for the other. “It is not certain, that when these historians, (Winthrop and Hubbard,) used the word churches, they did not use them [it] in the popular sense, meaning *religious societies*.” vol. v. p. 501.

But let us consider the language which, at different periods of our history, has been applied to churches. In the early settlement of the country, the formation of churches was frequently called their “*incorporation*.”† Mr. Cotton speaks of the church as “a spiritual *political* body.”‡ They are spoken of in the Platform as “*political* churches.” (chap. v.) Mather calls the church “a sacred *corporation*.”§ Mr. Wise repeatedly terms the churches “*incorporate bodies*.”§ The late Governor Sullivan represents the church as, in a certain point of view, “a *civil society*,” and “a *civil corporation*.”¶ The Editor of Winthrop speaks of “each of our churches as a *body corporate*.”\*\*\* And what is more to the purpose than either, and, in our view, decisive—in the statute of 1754, reenacted in 1786, but a few years after the adoption of the Constitution, churches are expressly denominated *bodies politic*. In the section which limits “the income of *church* grants,” it is provided “that the income to any one such *body politic*”—the very phrase of the Constitution—“shall not exceed three hundred pounds per annum.”

But we have an argument, if possible, more conclusive than this. We are able to show, that in the discussions attendant upon the formation and adoption of the Constitution, the “*religious societies*,” spoken of in the third article, were understood to mean CHURCHES; so that to churches, as well as to “towns, parishes, precincts,” &c. is secured, by the Constitution, “the exclusive right of electing their public teachers.”

\* Mass. Term Reports, vol. xvi. p. 205.

† Hist. Coll. vol. iv. pp. 111, 128, 135.

‡ Discourse about Civil Government, p. 5.

§ Magnalia, vol. ii. p. 130.

§ Vindication, &c., pp. 19, 39.

¶ “A church, I know, is often mentioned as a *body* in our laws: they may *take donations*, &c. So far as they receive strength from the civil laws, so far they are a *civil society*; and when they derive all their strength from civil authority,” as they do in respect to certain things, “they are then a *civil incorporation*.” Strictures, &c. p. 32.

\*\* Vol. i. p. 95.

It appears from the *Boston Gazette* of May 22, 1780, that the minority in Boston offered eight distinct objections to the third article in the bill of rights. The third of these objections was as follows:—"The people have no right to invest the legislature with power to 'authorize and require *religious societies*,' &c. because, **BY RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES, WE ARE TO UNDERSTAND THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST**, which *churches* can receive no authority, nor be subject to any requisition of any legislature under heaven."—In the return from Framingham, we find this objection quoted and adopted in precisely the same words.—We find the same, also, in the return from Holliston.

In the return from Ashby, we find the following objection to the article under consideration. "The third article says, the people of this Commonwealth have a right to invest their legislature with power to make laws that are binding on *religious societies*, as such, (as we understand it,) which is as much as to say, We will not have Christ to reign over us—that the laws of his kingdom are not sufficient to govern us—that the prosperity of his kingdom is not equally important with the kingdoms of this world—and that the ark of God stands in need of Uzza's hand to keep it from falling to the ground. But let us attend seriously to this important truth, that I will build **MY CHURCH** upon this rock, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. Now where resides this power? In Christ only—or in the legislature?"—From the reasoning as well as language of this objection, it is impossible not to perceive, that the phrase, *religious societies*, in the third article, was understood as including *churches*.

We quote the following from the *Independent Chronicle* of April 6, 1780. "Another part of the article which ought to be rejected with abhorrence is this, 'The legislature shall have power to authorize and require *religious societies* to support the public worship of God, and the teachers of religion.' **BY RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES, I SUPPOSE WE ARE TO UNDERSTAND THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST,**" &c.

Of the same bearing is the following from the *Independent Ledger* of June 12, 1780. "My antagonist," (an *advocate* for the third article,) "attempts to get along by saying that the legislature have a right to require **RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES or CHURCHES** to perform a civil duty. To which I reply, that the legislature may require the members of *churches*, considered as citizens, or in their civil capacity, to perform a civil duty. But as *members of churches*, or in their religious character, they have no authority over them."

In the controversy between Governor Sullivan and the late Dr. Thacher of Boston, agitated in 1784, Mr. S. expressed the opinion that "the custom of the country," according to which the church preceded the parish in the "choice of the minister as their pastor, was done away by the declaration of rights;" to which Mr. Thacher

replies, "*Ministers did not suppose that there would be such a total change in the system of their church government, as Mr. S. hath suggested; NEITHER HAD THIS GENTLEMAN HIMSELF IDEAS OF THIS NATURE AT THAT TIME,*" (the time of the adoption of the Constitution,) "*unless I am much mistaken.*" Mr. Thacher then proceeds to say, an "idea hath been to this day entertained of the NECESSITY of the concurrence of the church with a society in the choice of a minister." pp. 16, 20.

To the quotations here made, and to the conclusion inevitably growing out of them, what will Mr. L. reply? He has expressly admitted, as all must admit, that if, in 1780, churches were known and understood to be "bodies politic or religious societies," they are within the provisions of the Constitution. And we have produced proof upon proof, from the returns of towns, from the discussions attendant upon the adoption of the Constitution, from the testimony of eye and ear witnesses, that the religious societies spoken of in the Constitution *were* then understood, on all hands, to include the churches.

In further proof of the same general conclusion, we here present another class of testimony, extracted from letters which have been received in consequence of the recent discussions relating to this subject. The first is from the late venerable Dr. Dana of Ipswich, dated April 13, 1827.

"I have a perfect remembrance of what passed in 1780, when the Constitution was pending. After the frame of it was voted in Convention, it was sent to all the towns for their adoption, with such variations as two thirds of them might wish for. It was read in town meeting where I live, and a committee appointed to consider it and report. I was on that committee. Besides this, it was read publicly, and considered by parts for several days. Explanations were likewise given, as they were desired, by a venerable member who had attended the Convention. At all these meetings I was present. But *at none of them all did I meet with one intimation, or expressed apprehension, of such a kind of exclusive right of towns, parishes, &c. as we are now called to believe in. In fact, had we then believed that such an exclusion of the church was intended, it is past conjecture, that nine-tenths of this ancient town would have rejected it. Nor is it believed that it was with such an understanding, that the Convention itself agreed, or could have agreed in it. In every view, their silence on the subject is conclusive evidence.*"

Respectfully,

J. DANA."

The following is from a venerable and highly respectable layman, of Groton, (Mass.) dated Nov. 1827.

"I was twenty-eight years of age, and had been a member of the church eight years, when the Constitution of this Commonwealth was framed. I well remember the concern which religious people appeared to feel about the third article of the bill of rights; but

those members of the Convention with whom I conversed assured me, that though the word *church* was not used in said article, it was included or meant by the words, "*religious societies*," and, as such, was recognised in the closing part of the first section, and its duty made sufficiently plain; and in the proviso following, its right of choosing its own pastor sufficiently secured;—that the rights and usages of the church were so far from being lessened or invaded, that they were not meddled with at all, but were considered as left altogether secure, as they always had been. It was my understanding, that the Convention considered the rights of the church as above their limits, as out of their power, and as above the power of human legislation or jurisdiction; therefore, they left the rights of the church out of the question, leaving her to the full enjoyment of her own rights and usages. And the closing section of the aforesaid article was considered as affording or securing the protection of law to a *church*, as a *religious society*, as well as to towns and other corporate bodies.

WM. NUTTING."

To these, we may add the certificate of one of the aged and worthy ministers of Newton, (Mass.) dated June, 1829.

"In reply to the question you propose, allow me to state, that from 1776 to 1781, the date of my settlement in the ministry, I resided chiefly in Boston, my native place. I was there during the sittings of the Convention who framed the Constitution of Massachusetts, and often attended for the purpose of hearing their debates. And I can assure you that I heard nothing, either in Convention, or abroad among the people at that day, so far as I can recollect, which led me to suspect that any part of the Constitution was designed to take from the churches their natural and immemorial right of choice in the election of their Pastors.

Respectfully yours,

W. GREENOUGH."

We have here exhibited an array of evidence which we think *must* satisfy every impartial mind as to the meaning attached to the disputed clause in the third article of the bill of rights, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution of Massachusetts. And this, let it be remembered, is the *precise point to be determined*—not what meaning can be put upon the words of the article now—but what was the *received* meaning—how was it *understood*—in 1780? Then it was, that the people *agreed to it*—and the *SENSE* in which they agreed to it, is the *SENSE OF THE CONSTITUTION*. No man, or body of men, has a right to alter it, *by putting a different construction on the words*, more than by altering the words themselves. And after all the attention we have paid to the subject, we have no doubt—we *can* have none—that this article was then understood and adopted, not as taking away from the churches their right of choice in the election of their pastors, but as *confirming to them this right*. We have proved, we think, with abundant evidence, that the churches were then understood as be-

ing in the number of those bodies, who were to "have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers, and of contracting with them" (if they pleased) "for their support and maintenance."

If it be asked here, what will be the effect, in churches and parishes "connected and associated in public worship," of giving to each the exclusive right of electing its own religious teacher; we answer in the language of our Correspondent;

"The effect will be according to circumstances. If, owing to radical differences of opinion, or to any other cause, the choice of each cannot be made to fix upon the same person; then *they must separate*—as it is undoubtedly best they should. But if they *intend to remain united*; then care must be taken, that the eyes, the hearts, and the choice of each may ultimately rest upon the same individual. A spirit of conciliation and kindness must be cultivated, and each must endeavor (so far as duty will allow,) to meet the views and wishes of the other. When things are prepared for an event of so much interest, the church has a meeting by itself, and makes its choice. The parish also has a meeting by itself, freely chooses the same person, and contracts with him accordingly. After an acceptance of overtures, and ordination in the usual form, this person sustains a *twofold office or relation*. He is the pastor of the church, and the minister of the parish. As pastor of the church, he is to guide its devotions, administer its ordinances, and preside in all its meetings for business. As minister of the parish, he is to take the lead in its worshipping assembly, teach the doctrines and duties of religion, and perform customary parochial services. To a person sustaining this twofold office or relation, it not unfrequently happens, that one part of the connexion ceases, and not the other. His ecclesiastical connexion perhaps terminates, while his parochial contract and office remain. Or his contract with the parish terminates, while his connexion with the church remains."

Mr. L. thinks this doctrine of two associated bodies, each having an exclusive right of election, and the distinction growing out of it between pastor and minister, an absurdity and a novelty, of which he regards our C. as the sole discoverer, vol. v. pp. 315, 493. But we can easily satisfy him that, in respect to this, he is mistaken. The late Gov. Sullivan, in the pamphlet to which we have already referred, observes, "I consider the character of a minister of the Gospel, settled in the *common and ordinary way of New England*, as the PASTOR OF THE CHURCH, and the MINISTER OF THE PARISH." And he proceeds to show, that a pastor may be dismissed from his church, and "still be the *minister of the parish*, and entitled to his salary." p. 20. Of the same import is the following sentence, taken from the Result of the Ecclesiastical Council which ordained Mr. Lamson over the first parish in Dedham. The Committee of Council who prepared the Result were Doctors Reed, Kirkland, Channing, and Lowell, and Hon. John Davis.

"The Council here convened do indeed esteem the concurrence of the church and parish in the settlement of a minister as very desirable; but they believe that EACH OF THESE BODIES HAS A RIGHT TO ELECT A PASTOR FOR ITSELF, when it shall be satisfied that its own welfare, and the general interests of religion, require the measure; THIS RIGHT BEING SECURED TO THE CHURCH BY THE ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES OF CONGREGATIONAL POLITY, and to the parish by the Constitution and laws of the Commonwealth, as well as by the free principles of the same polity, and of the gospel of Christ."

In this sentence, the wide distinction between church and parish, and the exclusive right of each to elect its own religious teacher, are explicitly stated and maintained. Doctors Kirkland, Channing, Lowell, &c. here express their belief, that the right of election is "secured to the church, by the *essential principles of Congregational polity*.\*

Another point, strenuously insisted on by both the writers in behalf of the churches, and positively denied by Mr. L., is, that the churches of Massachusetts are, in a sense, *corporate bodies*—in the lawful possession of *corporate powers and privileges*. If this point can be fairly sustained, it will not only confirm all the arguments in support of the right of the churches to elect their pastors, bringing them clearly into the number of those bodies to which the right of election is secured by the Constitution; but it will also confirm to them the natural and just right of *holding and controlling their own property*. This then is a point of very great importance, and deserves to be considered with special care.

In proof of the corporate powers of the churches, our Correspondent adduces several arguments; as

1. "The original churches of Massachusetts were gathered according to law." This "proves" says Mr. L., "that churches were legally organized and established," but not "that they were corporate bodies."

2. "The churches in Massachusetts, or rather their members, were for many years entrusted with *great civil power*." To this Mr. L. makes no reply, except to say that it does not prove the point for which it was adduced.

To test the validity of these arguments, the proper question to be determined is, not whether a body may be established by law, and still not be a corporate body, but whether *such bodies as were the early churches of Massachusetts*—possessing such extensive powers and liberties—the power of admitting and excluding members; of appointing and maintaining their own officers; of holding and controlling their own funds; of self-organization, preservation, and government; and of settling, in regard to any individual in the state, his right of suffrage and eligibility to office,—whether *such bodies* could be legally organized and established, and still not be legal incorporations? Does not their legal establishment, with such powers, imply that they may legally *exercise* all these powers,—or, in other words, that they *are* incorporations?

3. The third argument urged by our C. to prove the corporate existence of the churches, is, "that in the early settlement of Massachusetts they exercised *parochial* authority. They built and owned the first meeting houses, and had the power of levying and

\* Do these Gentlemen *now* believe, that the Constitution of Massachusetts was designed to *subvert* the essential principles of Congregational polity?

collecting money for this object. They had also the power of raising money by tax for the support of their pastors." These positions of our C. are supported by the express declarations of Winthrop and Hubbard, who inform that some churches raised money by "rates" and "compulsion by levies" to build their houses of worship; that they raised money "by way of taxation" for the support of their ministers; that this mode of doing it "was very offensive to some;" and particularly that "one Briscoe of Watertown, being grieved that he and others who were *no members* were *taxed*, wrote a book against it."\*—To this Mr. L. replies, "that the practice of taxation by churches, even if it existed, was not *general*," and consequently could not have been authorized by any "provision or enactment of the General Court." But might not the General Court confer a power on the churches, which all of them did not think proper to exercise? The inference from Winthrop and Hubbard is, that though all the churches might have raised money "by way of taxation," the church in Boston, with some others, *preferred* to do it by weekly contribution.

But in opposing this argument, Mr. L. principally relies on a discovery he has made in the records of Watertown, that a sum of money was raised by the *town*, in 1642, for the support of their ministers. Now we see no difficulty in reconciling such a grant by the town, with the testimony of Winthrop and Hubbard as to the parochial powers of the church. For the church might have made to the ministers another grant, in addition to that made by the town; or the historians mentioned might refer to some year other than 1642;† or if it shall appear that they were mistaken in supposing the church at Watertown to have raised money by a tax, it will not follow that they were mistaken in regard to all the other churches to which they refer, of which Hubbard tells us there were "*many*." If the tax complained of by Briscoe was not raised by the church, why did he, on account of it, "cast reproach upon the *elders and officers of the church*?" And why was his "book fuller of teeth to bite and reproach the *ministers* of the country, than of arguments to convince the readers?"

We shall now introduce some additional facts and witnesses, going to illustrate the parochial power and authority of the first churches of Massachusetts. Emerson, giving the early ecclesiastical history of the country, says, "The mode of raising the salaries of ministers was different in different *churches*. Some did it by *TAXATION*; others by voluntary contribution." Again, speaking of his own church, he says, "The *fiscal*, as well as religious concerns of the society, were now managed entirely by members of the church; and the pastor probably, for the most part, was

\* Winthrop, vol. ii. p. 93. Hubbard, p. 412.

† Winthrop's record, from which Hubbard's was probably taken, is dated 1643.

present and *presided*. At these meetings" (*church* meetings where the pastor presided) "a variety of matters was usually agitated; and *provision for the ministry*, for the stranger, for the poor, for the reformation of morals, and for the *preservation of church property*, was often made at the same meeting." Again, he says, "Until now (1730) the *church*, that is, the *male communicants*, were alone concerned in *fixing the minister's salaries*, and in making *all pecuniary appropriations*."\* Does not this look like parochial power?

The Old South *church* in Boston own the land on which their meeting house and ministerial houses now stand, the same having been conveyed to them (in 1669) by deed from Mrs. Mary Norton, relict of Rev. John Norton, teacher of the first church. On this spot, the *church* erected their first house of worship, completed in 1685. In 1729, this house was taken down, by vote of the *church*, and a new one was built immediately after, by vote of the same body.

It will serve to illustrate the parochial powers of the churches to make some quotations from the records of this church, relative to these and similar proceedings.

"At a church meeting, April 21, 1722, a consultation was held respecting repair of the meeting house. Voted to spend about £40 to make the roof tight."

"At a church meeting, Feb. 27, 1728, the church voted to build a new meeting house."

"At a church meeting, April 23, 1728, voted that the new meeting house be set upon the place where the old one stood."

At a church meeting, June 26, 1728, the church voted to build the new house with brick, having at a former meeting deliberated whether it should be built with wood, stone, or brick."

"At a church meeting, Feb. 18, 1729, the church voted to take down the old meeting house. At the same time, voted to assemble in the old brick meeting house (belonging to the first church) for the first time on the ninth of March, and to desire the congregation to assemble with us."

"At a church meeting, Oct. 29, 1729, voted that the Treasurer be desired and empowered to borrow such a sum of money as the Committee for building shall judge needful for expediting the building, not exceeding, £800."

At a church meeting, April 19, 1730, the church voted that they would assemble for worship in the new meeting house next Lord's day;—and that the congregation be notified accordingly."

If here is not a full exercise of parochial power, we are at a loss to know what such power is, or how it can be exercised.

4. Our Correspondent next refers to "the act of the General Court accepting and establishing the Cambridge Platform," as "a

\* Hist. of the first church in Boston. pp. 77, 139, 174.



virtual incorporation of the churches." This argument, Mr. L. passes over in profound silence. It would not be known from his Review that he had ever seen it.—There can be no doubt that the Cambridge Platform was "*by law established*;" and that, being thus established, it became, what it was often denominated, "*the religious constitution of the colonies*," the "*constitution of our Congregational churches*."\*

5. Our Correspondent further urges the corporate powers of the churches, from the fact that they have uniformly *acted as corporations*, in buying, selling, holding and controlling different kinds of property.

"They held, as we have seen, the first houses of worship. They early commenced the purchasing of lands. Would they have done this, if they were not allowed to take them in fee, and to hold them in succession? Frequent grants of land, and donations of other property, were made to the churches, all which supposes that they were acknowledged to have the power of holding and improving them. And the property thus acquired, they *did hold and improve*. They have held it, by their deacons, in uninterrupted succession, and (as was proved in regard to the church in Dedham) have 'had the *exclusive control and management of it*,' to the present time."† p. 23.

"This argument would alone sustain the corporate existence of the churches, were all that has been said previously, to be set aside; For the churches, it appears, have *so long* and by *so general consent* exercised the powers of corporations, in holding and controlling property, that their claim to be regarded as incorporate bodies is well established on the ground of *prescription* or *custom*, if on no other." p. 24.

To this Mr. L. replies,

"In Massachusetts we have no corporations by prescription. There are no vacancies in our statute books, no lost acts; and therefore there can be no presumption that there may have been acts of incorporation which are now forgotten." vol. iv. p. 150, vol. v. p. 487.

How a gentleman, pretending to know as much about law as Mr. L., could have hazarded assertions such as these, we are at a loss to imagine. "No vacancies in our statute books!" Does he not know that "the *oldest* edition of the legislative acts of Massachusetts is that of 1672"—forty two years subsequent to the commencement of the settlement? And that "no edition of the Province laws is known to have comprehended a *complete series* of the public statutes from the charter of 1692, to the time of the revolution?"‡ Has he never read in the Massachusetts Reports, that "a corporation may be proved by *reputation*, if it appear from regular evidence that no act of incorporation can be found? For by the fires in the town of Boston in 1711, and 1760, a great part of the public records of the late province were destroyed; and unless the existence of a corporation may be proved by reputation, many towns and parishes would lose all their corporate rights

\* See Hutchinson's Hist. vol. ii. p. 13. Trumbull's Hist. vol. i. p. 239. and Mass. Term Reports, vol. iii. p. 165.

† Mass. Term Reports, vol. xvi. p. 491. "The church meetings," in the ministry of Mr. Haven, "were convened principally to give instructions for the management of the church lands," &c. See Worthington's Hist. of Dedham, p. 103.

‡ See Preface to the Colony and Province Laws.

and privileges."\* Has Mr. L. never read or heard of facts such as these, that he ventures to assert before the public "Our statute law has no chasms! We have no lost acts!"

That the churches of Massachusetts have, from the first, acted as corporations, in holding and disposing of property, is matter of unquestionable and acknowledged fact. In 1644, the original church of Plymouth purchased of the natives "in the *name of the church*," and the Court of the Colony "granted unto *the church*," all the territory now included in the towns of Eastham, Wellfleet, and Orleans.† In this instance, did not the church act, and was it not recognized, as a corporation?—By extracts from the records of the first church in Boston, published in Mr. Emerson's History, it appears that that church sold lands, and "*executed sufficient deeds, IN DUE FORMS OF LAW, for passing and conveying the same;*" recovered debts; contracted with its ministers, and fixed their salaries, &c. In all such instances, did it not act as a corporation?

In a manuscript now before us, prepared by the late Dr. Eckley, urging the rights of the church, (the Old South) of which he was pastor, he says, "From the foundation of the church, for upwards of one hundred years, *the land, ministerial houses, and meeting houses have been claimed, managed, and used by the church, as its OWN PROPERTY, and so acknowledged by the congregation, with the exception that the pews have been considered as the property of the purchasers and their heirs, not however as estate in fee simple, or as giving any right to, or property in, the soil,*" (these belonging to the church) "but for the advantage of enjoying the privileges of public worship on certain conditions, which conditions not being complied with, they have reverted to the church."

The first church in Charlestown has uniformly acted as a Corporation, in holding property to the amount of several thousand dollars, consisting of lands, notes, bonds, bank stock, mortgages &c.—in leasing and renting its lands—and in recovering debts, by *legal suit*, and otherwise. The following is a copy of a certificate of Bank stock, now in possession of the treasurer of this church. "UNION BANK STOCK. Be it known that the *first church in Charlestown* is holder of eight hundred dollars in the Union Bank Stock, transferable only at the Bank, by the treasurer of said *church* or his attorney, and there producing this certificate."

Witness the hand of the President, &c.

The first church in Cambridge has been for a long time in the possession of property to a considerable amount, obtained in part by contributions at the Lord's Table. At one period, it held a demand *against the parish*, on which the interest was paid regularly, from year to year. This church has had the entire control and management of its funds, from their origin to the present time.

Indeed there can be no question, and we presume there is none, that the churches of Massachusetts have, from the first and uni-

\* Vol. iii. p. 276. v. p. 517. xii. p. 400.

† Hist. Coll. vol. viii. p. 165.

formly, acted as corporations, in holding and controlling their own property. But is not this, of itself, sufficient and conclusive proof of their corporate existence and powers? In the case of Dillingham vs. Snow and another, the north parish in Harwich was proved by reputation to be a corporate parish, on the ground that its inhabitants had exercised parish powers for more than forty years.\* And in the case of the inhabitants of Stockbridge vs. the Inhabitants of West Stockbridge, West Stockbridge was proved to be a town, from the fact that “for more than thirty years, its inhabitants had exercised and enjoyed all the powers, privileges and immunities of a town.”† But many of the churches of Massachusetts have unquestionably acted as corporations for almost two hundred years. On what grounds then can their corporate existence and privileges be denied and taken from them?

6. We come now to the sixth and last argument urged by our Correspondent.

“In 1754, an act passed the Provincial Legislature, which went to *confirm* and *establish* the corporate existence and powers of the churches. In this act it is assumed, that grants and donations had previously been made, not only to the churches, but to “the poor of the churches,” and to the officers of the churches. It is farther assumed, that “these several grants and donations” were intended to “go in succession.” But, “*doubts* had arisen, *in what cases* such donations and grants might operate, so as to go in succession.” Doubts might well arise as to what had been given to “the poor of the churches,” and to the officers of the churches, if not in respect to church property itself. Wherefore, to remove *all* doubt, this law of 1754, was enacted, and “the deacons of the several Protestant churches (not Episcopal) were incorporated, to take in succession all grants and donations, whether real or personal, made either to their several churches, the poor of their churches, or to them and their successors, and to sue and defend in all actions touching the same. And wherever the ministers or elders shall, in the original grants or donations, have been joined with the deacons; in such cases, such officers and their successors, together with the deacons, shall be deemed the corporation for such purposes as aforesaid;—saving, that no alienation of any lands belonging to churches, hereafter made by the deacons, without the consent of the church, or a committee of the church, for that purpose appointed, shall be sufficient to pass the same. And the several churches in this province, are hereby empowered to choose a committee, to call the deacons, or other church officers, to an account, and if need be, to commence and prosecute any suits, touching the same, and also to advise and assist such deacons in the administration of the affairs aforesaid.” ‡ pp. 24, 25.

To this argument, as urged by our C., Mr. L. attempts no reply. Indeed, he scarcely alludes to the act of 1754, in the whole of his second publication. In his first publication, he endeavors to prove from this act, that the churches were not previously incorporated. “If churches had been corporate bodies, the act would have been superfluous.” But has Mr. L. forgotten, or did he never know, that it is as much the duty of the legislature to *confirm* existing corporate rights, when they come to be doubted, as to create new ones when they are needed?—He insists, however, that the framers of this law “do not say there were *any doubts*

\* Mass. Term Reports, vol. v. p. 517.

† Ditto, vol. xii. p. 400.

‡ Province Laws, p. 606.

about the corporate powers of the churches, but in what cases grants and donations may operate; and they then proceed to put an effectual end to all doubts as to the corporate powers of the churches; they decline to grant to the churches any such powers," &c. vol. iv. p. 141.

How the framers of this law could "put an effectual end to all doubts as to the corporate powers of the churches," while "there were no doubts about the corporate powers of the churches," we shall leave for Mr. L. to explain. And how he can show that, by this act, "they declined to grant to the churches any such powers," when they did grant them powers to control the deacons, to call them "to an account, and, if need be, to commence and prosecute any suits against them," we are equally at a loss to imagine.

Mr. L. urges several objections against the corporate existence of the churches. The first is, that they are *without names*. But this assertion is not true. The churches are not without names. It is as easy to speak of the first church in Cambridge, as of the first parish in Cambridge; and the name of the former is as definite and distinctive as that of the latter—and probably more so. There is not now a church in Massachusetts which has not a known and distinctive appellation.

But, secondly, "the churches have never sued, or been sued, nor are they capable of suing," &c. That the churches have power to commence suits is expressly ascertained in the act of 1754. "The several churches in this province are hereby empowered to choose a committee to call the deacons, or other church officers, to an account and, if need be, to commence and prosecute any suits," &c.

Thirdly, the churches in this state, says Mr. L., have no *common seal*.—And neither have many towns, parishes, school-districts, &c. They may procure a common seal, if they please; and so may the churches.

Finally, there is not "a lawyer in the state who would hazard his reputation, by contending that the churches are, in any sense, corporations." We can easily satisfy Mr. L. as to what some lawyers have said on this subject, and said without feeling that they "hazarded their reputations." Is not the writer of an article republished from the Anthology in the first volume of the Spirit of the Pilgrims, (p. 498) entitled "The Rights of Protestant Churches in the town of Boston," a lawyer? Was not the late Judge Stebbins a lawyer? Is not Judge Haven too a lawyer? Are not the respectable gentlemen who appeared as advocates for the church in the Dedham case, lawyers? And is not the author of an article in our number for March of the present year, a lawyer? If Mr. L. wishes it, we can refer to many lawyers, by name, gentlemen of high respectability, in different parts of the state, who are entirely convinced of the general correctness of the views we have ad-

vocated in regard to this important subject. Indeed, we are told expressly by one of the writers to whom we have referred, that the decision of the Dedham case, which went to annul the corporate rights of the churches, "has never been well received or acquiesced in *by the bar*, or by *intelligent lawyers* of the Commonwealth."

Our Correspondent, having established the corporate rights of the churches, proceeds to examine the decision of Chief Justice Parker in the Dedham case. He first considers, under seven particulars, all the arguments by which this decision was attempted to be supported. He next urges his ten or twelve objections to the decision, showing that it is "inconsistent with the natural inherent rights of the churches;" with "their corporate rights, and with existing laws;" with their "independence;" with "Scripture and the institution of Christ;" with "other previous decisions;" with "historical truth;" and, finally, "with itself." On all this part of the discussion, extending through twenty pages, Mr. L. "preserves a discreet silence." He here and there pounces upon a paragraph, or a sentence; but nothing like a regular reply is attempted. His readers cannot fail to perceive, from the style and spirit of what he has written, that the *will* to reply to this part of the argument of our C. was complete. The ability, or something else, it seems was wanting.

In going through with a review of this discussion in something like a regular order, several points deserving consideration have been omitted. To these we now call the attention of our readers.

Mr. L. urges repeatedly, in proof of the correctness of the late judicial interpretations of the third article in the bill of rights, that the Convention of 1820 for revising the Constitution, proposed no alteration of this article.—But that the article in question has been incorrectly interpreted, may not be a sufficient reason why it should itself be altered. The article is well enough, if it can be understood and applied, as it was understood by the good people who adopted it. They did not think it inconsistent with the rights of the churches, but intended it rather for the *security* of these rights.

Besides; this subject was not a matter of discussion in 1820 as it is now. The Dedham case had not then been decided. The operation of previous decisions was not generally understood, and the evils resulting from them were but beginning to be felt. Of course, the friends of the churches (who do not often trouble themselves or others with legal discussions) were not aroused, and their attention had not been particularly directed to the subject.

But further; the Convention of 1820 did not sanction the interpretation which the Judges had put upon the third article of the bill of rights. They determined nothing respecting it, one way or

the other. After considerable discussion, and an attempt to blot the article entirely out, they concluded to leave it as they found it, and as the people had left it in 1780.

It should be remembered, too, that the lapse of a few years does not sanction oppression or wrong. If the advocates of church rights, did not complain in 1820, when the existing evils were but beginning to be felt, that is no reason why they should not complain now. That they have been forbearing and long suffering, is no reason why they should be forever oppressed. And it is poor consolation, after ten years of patient endurance, to be told, 'You should have complained sooner and louder—your rights are now forfeited by outlawry—you have been so quiet, and peaceable, and patient under injury, that no relief can now be afforded you.'

Mr. L. frequently intimates, in both his publications, that the interests of *parishes* are in danger, and that there is a design, on the part of some, to deprive them of their "natural rights." His first production was circulated in a pamphlet, entitled "*The Rights of Congregational Parishes*;" and throughout there is an effort to set churches and parishes at variance, and to excite the latter against the former.—But this only proves, either that Mr. L. does not understand the subject himself, or that he is unwilling it should be understood by others. The truth is, the advocates of church rights have no wish, as they have often said and shown, to detract a particle from the rights of parishes. They do not claim the right to choose a parish officer, or to touch a cent of parish property. They only ask that the churches may be allowed to choose their own officers, to hold their own property, and to manage in general their own concerns. They ask that churches may not have pastors imposed on them against their conscience and their will, and that their property may not be torn from them to support those whom they have not chosen, and on whose ministrations they cannot attend. This is what the friends of the churches ask, and this is all. And we appeal to an enlightened community to determine, whether the request is more than reasonable.—There is no colorable reason for supposing that the interests of churches are different from those of parishes, or that the members of churches have any intention or desire to encroach upon parish rights. They have no such desire. Why should they have? They are themselves connected with parishes, and have just as much interest in preserving parish rights, as church rights. Indeed every consideration, growing out of the interests of both church and parish, will prompt them to desire and endeavor that the two bodies may enjoy, each its own rights, and move onward harmoniously together.

Mr. L. speaks of the churches in a style of contempt, as "poverty-stricken institutions," and says that "nine-tenths of them have no property whatever, except their communion plate." vol. iv. p. 150., vol. v. p. 310.—But suppose the churches are poor: Is this

a sufficient reason why their rights and interests should be disregarded and despised? Suppose they are comparatively destitute of property, (though in the case of many churches this is not true :) shall what property they have be wantonly taken from them? Are the rights of the poor any less sacred, in the eyes of justice, than those of the rich? Was the rich man in the parable justified in taking away the little lamb of his poor neighbor, from the mere circumstance that he was poor?—The reproach of poverty comes with an ill grace from those who are exerting their whole influence to prostrate the churches, and to strip them of their remaining all. Time was, when some churches in Massachusetts were not poor, whatever may be their circumstances now; and it ill becomes those who have exerted an influence to plunder them, and to take away the funds of which they have “had the exclusive control and management” for almost two hundred years, afterwards to despise and reproach them on account of their poverty.

Mr. L. says of the advocates of the churches, “They appear to think the church an *ambulatory* body, capable of *locomotion*, and separable from all other human society.” vol. iv. p. 142. His idea is, that churches are necessarily confined to one place, and are incapable of removal. Now it is strange that a man who pretends to know so much of the early history of this country, and is so ready, on every occasion, to reproach others with their ignorance, should have fallen into so gross an error. Our Correspondent mentions a variety of well authenticated instances of the *removal of churches*, (p. 42.) to which several others may be added. The church at Midway in Georgia removed from Dorchester, (Mass.) more than one hundred and thirty years ago.† The church at Granville, (Ohio,) was formed at Granville, (Mass.,) in 1804, and removed in a body to the former place.‡ Indeed, events of this kind are of no extraordinary occurrence in our Ecclesiastical history.

“Property granted to churches, was granted,” it is said, “from *local* attachment; from attachment to the society and place in which the donor worshipped.” Consequently, if a church removes, even to the other side of the street, it cannot carry its property with it.—Now, admitting that “property granted to churches was granted from local attachment,” the conclusion attempted to be drawn will not follow. The property granted to parishes may have been granted from local attachment; but cannot a parish exchange its place of worship, and still retain its parochial property and rights? We do not believe, however, that the property given to churches has been given, ordinarily, so much from *local* attachment, as from other and higher considerations;—not so much from

\* An attempt has recently been made, (and the case is now pending before the Judges of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts,) to take away even the communion furniture of a church.

† See Dr. Holmes' Anniversary Sermons, p. 23.

‡ Boston Recorder, vol. xiv. No. 7.

regard to a particular house or spot where the church assembles for worship, as from a regard to the *body itself*, to its doctrines, its discipline, and to the holy cause in which it is embarked. So that it is no perversion of endowments, when a church is driven from one place of worship, to remove with its property to another place; but a gross and wicked perversion, for another body, a parish, to seize upon its property, and appropriate it to the inculcation of principles which its pious donors rejected and abhorred.\*

A consideration on which, from the "frequency and pathos with which he refers to it, we should think Mr. L. materially relied in replying to the Groton Result, is, that it was written by a "Connecticut gentleman"—an "imported director of Massachusetts consciences"—a native of another state. But really we cannot see the force of such an argument, or the pertinency or decency of such allusions. A distinguished clergyman from Connecticut has been invited, and has consented, to take the charge of a church and society in Massachusetts. And now must he not open his mouth on subjects of the greatest interest to his adopted State, merely because he is a native of Connecticut? Any man—except the author of these reviews—would be ashamed of such an argument. We had supposed it of more consequence to refute the reasonings of a writer, reply to his statements, and remove his objections, than to reproach him, over and over again, with having been born in another State. What reply would be made by some of the Unitarian clergy of Boston, and all the Unitarian clergy of the middle and southern States, if they were reproached as "imported ministers," and as having been born in a different State from that in which they now reside?

With all his arrogance, Mr. L. complains bitterly of *persecution*. "The English church has continued its persecution of dissenters to this hour." And "there is not a *tithe* of the principles of religious toleration in the Exclusionists of the United States, which exists in the Established Church of Great Britain." vol. v. p. 300. In other words, the English church are persecutors, and the Orthodox of this country are *ten times more flagrant persecutors than they*. But in what do their flagrant persecutions consist? Do they burn or imprison those who dissent from them? Do they deprive them of their property, or any of their civil rights? No; but they are "Exclusionists." The plain English of this is, they honestly

\* In Mr. Worthington's History of Dedham, a work discovering no partiality to Orthodoxy or the church, it is admitted that the funds of the church in that place have been sadly perverted. "It cannot be believed," says he, "that the inhabitants of Dedham in 1659, who made such exertions to establish a pure church, who talked much of their power to open and shut the doors of the church, and who would not permit the town to have any participation in the choice of their two first pastors, could ever have consented to such a method of controlling their funds as is now adopted, one which virtually gives the parish the power of controlling them, in exclusion of the church."—"Of all heresies, they would probably have deemed that the *greatest*, which would place the funds, by them given, under the control of a *Unitarian parish*, to the *exclusion of an Orthodox church*." p. 126.



believe that Unitarians have departed from the faith of the Gospel, and rejected some of its essential truths. Consequently, they cannot embrace them as brethren in Christ, or extend to them the hand of Christian fellowship. And for enjoying their own honest opinion on these subjects, and acting agreeably to it, they are denounced as persecutors.—We are willing that Unitarians should think for themselves, and act according to their principles; and we claim, on our part, the same liberty. But no: They must think, it appears, not only for themselves, but for us too; and we must conform our practice, not to our own principles, but theirs; and if we are unwilling to yield them as much as this, then we are flagrant persecutors.

In the publications of Mr. L. we find frequent and manifest *self-contradictions*. A few of them it may be proper to notice.

Speaking of the reasons which, he thinks, induced our Correspondent to publish his article, without any “allusion whatever to either of the former publications,” he observes, “There were gross and palpable errors, as well as imprudent concessions, in the Groton Result, which it was found not possible to defend, and not politic to admit.” vol. v. p. 485. Consequently, our Correspondent was induced to write and publish independently, and to assume *new and more defensible ground*. But, on another page, the article of our Correspondent is represented as, “in fact, but a new edition of the Groton Result, *without a single change of the argument*.” p. 302.

Mr. L. contends, that, according to the act of 1693, which gives a concurrent vote to the church and parish, “the parish had no power to *select a teacher*. It must have waited, however long, till the church should select one agreeable to itself.” vol. v. p. 493. But on another page, he says, “Surely no man will be so absurd as to contend, that the parish, even if they had but a concurrent vote, had no right to *select their candidate*.” vol. iv. p. 130. No man will be so absurd as to contend for this—and yet Mr. L. contends for it himself.

In one place, he informs us “that *FREQUENT disputes arose* between the church and people as to the right of choosing the pastor, between the passage of the still-born act of 1695, and the adoption of the Constitution.” vol. iv. p. 138. But in another place, he says, “There were *FEW cases of dispute* between the churches, and the towns and parishes, between 1693 and 1780.” vol. v. p. 482.

Mr. L. admits, in one part, that churches are “legally organized and established”—that “the church is a body *known to our laws*.” pp. 310, 499. But in another part, he says, “A writ in the name of a church would be at once abated, as being in favor of a body *not known to our laws*.” p. 486.

Mr. L. scouts the idea, that the Unitarians of Massachusetts "are a *new* denomination," of "*recent origin*," and pretends that there were "*many* eminent Divines of Massachusetts who held these opinions, before the middle of the last century." vol. iv. p. 132. But when the Constitution was adopted, in 1780, he asserts, (and he tells the truth,) that "*nearly the whole people*" of the State, "were Orthodox." p. 143.

Palpable contradictions such as these, to use one of Mr. L.'s own phrases, "have no tendency to gain our confidence."

We now proceed to examine a long catalogue of assertions in the publications of Mr. L., to which we shall not venture to give a name. Our readers may call them anything which they think proper. In making our quotations, we shall proceed in the order of pages.

1. "In 1816, Dr. Morse and Doctor Lyman were very zealous in the good work of introducing the Connecticut system of Consociations. It is well known that they made a report to the Convention of Ministers, which was referred by the Convention to the people, and which was so odious, that not one parish approved of and accepted it." p. 127.

No report of this nature was ever made by Dr. Morse and Dr. Lyman to "the Convention of Ministers," or "referred by the Convention to the people."

2. "The General Association of Massachusetts" "was intended to supply the place of the Connecticut Consociations." p. 127.

"The General Association of Massachusetts was" not "intended to supply the place of the Connecticut Consociations;" nor is it possible, according to its constitution and structure, that it ever should supply their place.

3. "Mr. Todd was sent to Groton, one of the richest towns in the county of Middlesex, at the expense of an Orthodox missionary fund." p. 129.

"Mr. Todd was" not "sent to Groton at the expense of an Orthodox missionary fund."

4. "The Council" at Groton "was not a mutual council, but an *exparte one*."

The Council at Groton was neither mutual nor *exparte*, but a Council called by the church and pastor to give advice in relation to their own proper concerns.

5. "The laws in question" (those relating to the churches) "do not apply to the Catholics, the *Episcopulians*, the Baptists," &c. p. 132.

The law of 1754 relates expressly to *Episcopulians*, and incorporates "the wardens" &c. of their churches.\*

6. "The great mass of Christians, who are non-communicants, and comprise, among us, seven-eighths of the Christian public," "are contemptuously stigmatized as the *world*; and lest you should doubt what they" (the Groton Coun-

\*The late judicial expositions of the Constitution relate to Presbyterians and Baptists as really as to Congregationalists; and our brethren of other denominations will find it so, should their churches and parishes ever come to be at variance.

cil) "understand by this term, they define it to be the *immoral, debauched, profane* and *unbelieving* part of society." p. 133.

The Groton Council nowhere describe "the great mass of Christians, who are non-communicants, seven-eighths of the Christian public," as "*immoral, debauched, and profane.*"

7. "It is distinctly stated by this candid Council, that if the right of election *be restored* to the great mass of Christian worshippers, from whom it *has been wrenched*, there will be an instantaneous decline and final extinction of religion." p. 134.

The right of election has not "been wrenched" from "the great mass of Christian worshippers." Parishes have, and ought to have, the free and exclusive right of electing their own ministers.

8. "The act of 1693 was repealed by the act of 1695." p. 137.

The act of 1695 was an addition to the act of 1693, but not a repeal of it. It is entitled "an act in further *addition* to the act, entitled an act for the settlement and support of ministers."

9. "Our churches are, and *always de facto and de jure have been*, associated in public worship with towns, parishes, precincts," &c. p. 142.

This is not true. The first churches of Massachusetts, were organized, *before* the towns or parishes were incorporated. And churches now are often formed, *before* societies are gathered to cooperate with them. Every instance of the *removal* of a church exhibits a church as existing separate from a parish. Indeed, some churches of long standing among us have never been associated with parishes at all. Witness the churches in the Colleges and Theological seminaries.

10. "Why did not they" (the framers of the Constitution) "insert the word *churches*, instead of the words *religious societies*, which last is [are] strictly technical, and used as such, in all the acts of incorporation before and since." p. 144.

The words *religious societies* are not so strictly technical, nor were they so understood at the time<sup>1</sup> of the adoption of the Constitution, as not to signify the churches of Christ.

11. "The parishes" (by the law of 1800) "are liable to a perpetual and increasing fine, renewable every six months, for not *electing* and providing a religious teacher." p. 146.

The law of 1800 does not oblige parishes to *elect* or *settle* a religious teacher, but "to be constantly provided with a public protestant teacher of piety, religion and morality"—in other words, to continue a supply.\*

\* A town or parish "is required by law to have a public teacher of piety, religion, and morality, but the law knows nothing about any ordination for him, or any ecclesiastical character attached to him. It is not even necessary that he should be settled or permanent. He may be shifted as often as caprice, or any other motive, shall lead to it. If the town is not without one 'for the term of three months in any six months,' the law is answered." Judge Haven.

12. "No church *can make* a contract. No church *ever did make* a contract, either before or after the Constitution was adopted." p. 149.

"Until now," (1730) says Mr. Emerson, "the *church*, that is, the *male communicants*, were alone concerned in fixing the ministers' salaries, and in making all pecuniary appropriations."

13. "No man in Massachusetts was so ignorant, or so bold, as to affirm, that either of these descriptive names" (in the third article of the bill of rights) "applied to churches." p. 149.

There were men in Massachusetts at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and have been ever since, bold enough to affirm, that the words "religious societies," in the third article, apply to the churches.

14. "In Massachusetts, we have no corporations by prescription. Our statute law has no chasms." "There are no vacancies in our statute books; no *lost acts*." pp. 150, 487.

"By the fires in the town of Boston in 1711 and 1760, a great part of the public records of the late province were destroyed; and unless the existence of a corporation may be proved by reputation, many towns and parishes would lose all their corporate rights and privileges." Mass. Term Reports, vol. iii. p. 276. vol. v. p. 547. vol. xii. p. 400.

15. "If the people are fit to be trusted with power, they must be supposed to be capable of comprehending the clearest language. We know the Orthodox rule is different; *credo quia impossibile est*."\* p. 151.

And we know that this is a slander and a falsehood. The Orthodox have no such rule as is here asserted.

16. "Its (the Spirit of the Pilgrims') *real purpose* is to awaken a war of extermination against all Christians who do not belong to the dominant sect," meaning doubtless its own sect. p. 298.

We claim to know as much on this subject as Mr. L., and affirm, that the "real purpose" of the work to which he refers is here invidiously and grossly misrepresented.

17. "There is to be a combination among the most powerful sects to seize the civil power." p. 298.

This is said, not only without evidence, but against the clearest and most convincing evidence. There is not to be, there never can be, any such combination.

18. "We demonstrated that the churches of this state *had never been considered* as corporate bodies." p. 301.

And we have shown "that the churches of this state" have been considered and represented by *many*—lawyers, Judges, &c. as corporate bodies.

19. "The humble defender of the Groton Result intimates, in terms easily understood, that the Judges Parsons, Sedgwick, and Sewall, violated their solemn oaths of office—were guilty, in fact, of perjury, by making a decision in favor of their own religious opinions." p. 302.

\* I believe it, because it is impossible.

“The humble defender of the Groton Result” has intimated no such thing.

20. “That they” (the conductors of the Spirit of the Pilgrims) “do make such a charge against Chief Justice Parker, their language abundantly proves.” p. 302.

The conductors of the Spirit of the Pilgrims have not charged Chief Justice Parker with violating his oath of office, or with the guilt of perjury. He did not engage, by his oath, that he would make no mistakes, or that he would always decide correctly.

21. “He” (Chief Justice Parker) “is moreover charged with Plagiarism.” p. 303.

Chief Justice Parker is not charged with Plagiarism. There may be a resemblance, “a striking resemblance,” in the views and language of two writers, and neither of them be guilty of Plagiarism.

22. “Here” (in the article of our Correspondent) “is an implied charge of wilful falsehood.” p. 304.

Our Correspondent made no such charge against Chief Justice Parker, nor said anything which implied it.

23. “The Exclusive sect,” (meaning the Orthodox,) “virtually deny to all other men the right of private judgement.” p. 305.

The Orthodox do not “deny to all other men,” nor to any other man, “the right of private judgement.”

24. “Some Connecticut casuists, accustomed to a state of things, in which, we had almost said, *the clergy hold all the power, and the people are accounted as nothing*, have been, in a time of excitement, imported into this State.” p. 306.

No Connecticut casuists, now living, were ever accustomed to a state of things such as is here described.

25. “Bringing with them their own ideas of the supremacy of the clergy, they quarrel with the liberal and ingenuous feelings of our people, and wish to persuade them that the chains and fetters of Connecticut are indeed very comfortable things, and well suited to the wrists and ancles of the stubborn freemen of Massachusetts.” p. 306.

They neither “quarrel,” nor “wish,” nor “persuade,” nor do anything else, as is here represented.

26. “They” (the Connecticut casuists) “tell us, in plain terms, that the liberty which we have acquired, with great toil and suffering, during a contest of two centuries, is no liberty at all, and that if we would only quietly consent to the easy handcuffs which they, from long experience, have learnt to forge, we shall [should] be more at our ease than we were before.” p. 306.

They tell us no such thing.

27. “These imported directors of Massachusetts consciences assure us that we are anxious for this change from freedom to slavery—that tens of thousands of our people really groan under the liberty, which our excellent Judges, by a correct and manly exposition of the Constitution, have opened to us.” p. 306.

All false;—no such assurances or representations are made.

28. “They” (the Orthodox) “invoke upon” “those in rule and authority” “the maledictions of the whole community.” p. 309.

This also is entirely without foundation.

29. "The only question at issue," in this discussion, is *merely a question of property.*" p. 310.

The questions at issue in this discussion are not merely questions of property. The churches claim the right to elect their own pastors, and to be distinct, corporate, independent bodies.

30. "Church property consists of donations to the church; but in *all cases*, without *one exception*, to the church of a particular parish." p. 311.

This is not a correct statement. Property has frequently, and we believe generally, been given to churches, without any mention of an associated parish.

31. "Suppose that the people, under the constitutional provision, choose a minister, which it is now *reluctantly* admitted they have a right to do," &c. p. 311.

It is not reluctantly admitted that the people have a right to choose their own minister. This is *cheerfully* admitted—*insisted* on—and would, if necessary, be *strenuously contended for*.

32. "Our author," (meaning our Correspondent,) "seems to admit, that though a church may remove a mile, yet they could not carry the church funds to Ohio—a concession which yields the whole argument." p. 312.

Our Correspondent makes no such concession. His language is, "The right of churches to remove with their property out of the Commonwealth need not here be *asserted or denied*. It will be in time to settle the question of this right, when such a removal is seriously attempted." p. 33.

33. "They" (the early settlers of this country) "were usurpers over God's heritage"—"they interfered with the civil and political rights of the people"—"they extorted laws which fettered the civil ruler and the people"—"the clergy often dictated to the legislature what laws they should enact—they forced down the Cambridge Platform," &c. &c. "*All this is admitted on both sides.*" p. 314.

"All this is" not "admitted on both sides." We will not be associated with those who prefer such charges against the venerated fathers of New-England.

34. "This act" (of 1692) "provides that the people of every town shall have the sole and exclusive right of electing their minister. It provides that *all persons in the town* shall be liable for the support of such minister. *This the Constitution also provides.*" p. 480.

The Constitution does not provide, that "all persons in the town shall be liable for the support of such minister" as the majority chooses. So far from this, it expressly provides that dissatisfied individuals may withdraw their support, and give it to another denomination.

35. Our C. had said, "The law of 1692 was not sufficiently explicit, and in many places *could not be enforced.*" "This," says Mr. L. "is *unfounded*. As it was repealed in one year, it is *impossible that there could have been many places in which it could not be enforced.*" p. 481.

To show that the statement of our Correspondent was correct, and that Mr. L. is *incorrect*, we quote the following from the repealing section of the law of 1693. "Upon further consideration of said section or paragraph in said act, (of 1692,) and the IMPRACTICABLENESS of the method therein proposed for the choice of a minister in divers towns, wherein there are more churches than one, and *inconveniencies* attending the same, not so well before seen," therefore, the said section or paragraph is repealed.

36. "The church" (from 1693 to 1780) "did not choose its own pastor. It chose a minister for the parish—for all the parish." p. 482.

The church, during this period, did choose its own pastor; and did not, so far as appears, in a single instance, choose a minister for the parish. The person chosen by the church never became the minister of the parish, until the parish had met and chosen him.

37. "The churches, from 1630 to this hour, have never sued, or been sued; nor were they *capable of suing*," &c. p. 486.

The law of 1754 expressly empowers the churches "to commence and prosecute *any suits*," &c. Instances have occurred in which they have collected their honest dues by legal process.

38. "This language" (of the third article) "has been thought by half a score of Judges, and *all the lawyers in the state*, to take from the church the right of electing its own pastor." p. 486.

*All* the lawyers in the state do not think as is here represented. Many of them, and some of the first respectability, are known to be of a different opinion.

39. "When the Convention lately met to revise our Constitution," "the construction put upon the proviso of the third article in the bill of Rights" "in the *Dedham case*, was well understood." p. 490. This decision was "all *published* before the discussions in the late Convention." p. 152.

The Dedham case was not decided at the time of the meeting of the late Convention. The Convention closed its sessions, Jan. 9, 1821. The Dedham case was decided in March of the same year, and the report of it published in the summer following. Worthington's Hist. of Dedham, p. 114.

40. "This writer" (our C.) "after declaring the right of the parish to elect its teacher a *natural* one, desires to thank God that many churches have an opposing, and consequently an *unnatural* right, and may exercise it whenever they please." p. 494.

Our C. did not desire to thank God for any right belonging to the churches, which opposes the natural right of parishes to elect their teachers. He expressed a desire to be thankful, that the Constitution secures to the churches the right to elect *their own pastors*, and to contract with them (if they please) for their support and maintenance.

41. "We have, we must confess, been wholly at a loss to reconcile this *entire readiness*" (on the part of those who attend the trust-deeded churches) "to surrender the rights of conscience, to put on the livery of religious slavery, to be marked on the forehead as *bought men*," &c. p. 495.

The persons here referred to (among whom are some of our most respectable citizens) so far from having "surrendered the rights of conscience," continue to exercise these rights without let or restraint; their religious freedom is unimpaired; and they no more deserve the stigma of marked men, and "bought men," than Mr. L. himself.

This catalogue of assertions—to which we prefer not to apply a name—might be extended to greater lengths; but we think it unnecessary. It should be added, that the author of them professes to regard all random assertions as scarcely distinguishable from wilful falsehoods.

"We are not, casuists enough to decide the precise shade of difference in a moral view, between assertions made at hazard, which those who make them do not know to be true, and those which are made against knowledge and conviction."

Unitarians often complain of the *spirit* manifested by their opponents—of their uncharitableness, their personalities, the asperity of their style and language. We do not mean to retort these charges; but it may be proper to close this article with several quotations from the Reviews here examined, that our readers may have the means of judging for themselves as to the style and spirit of the late *Christian Examiner* and *Theological Review*.

"We shall not insult the understandings of our readers by replying to, or retorting the sometimes canting, sometimes inflammatory, and sometimes threatening language of this Result. Take a specimen; it would not have disgraced a midnight meeting in the *Convent des Jacobins*." vol. iv. 152.

"Are we to infer, that these reverend assailants of the character of one of the highest coordinate branches of the government, hope to screen themselves by employing the pen of another? Or do they believe, that their clerical character, and the sacredness of their cause, will justify their departure from the laws of society, and relieve them of the responsibility which is attached to other citizens?" vol. v. p. 304.

"Our reverend critics of the decisions of our highest tribunals, were fully aware, in their new edition by another hand, that they would be charged with an indecent attack upon the Judiciary. Their consciences were alarmed, and they attempted to parry the attack, by what, we are reluctantly compelled to say, are merely hollow and hypocritical compliments to the court whom they traduced." *ib.*

"We think that the most candid will admit, that, if such contradictions had appeared in the writings of one of the 'world,' or an 'unconverted sinner,'—a 'saint' would have had no hesitation in pronouncing the subsequent eulogy of Judge Parker to be mere cant, intended to soften the just indignation of the public." *ib.*

"When Divines, mistaking their duty," "stamp with their ill-informed censures the decisions of the Courts, as oppressive and cruel to large masses of citizens, whom they arrogantly call the saints—the elect of the earth, and whom they intimate to be as far superior to ordinary men, as heaven is above earth—we may well pause, and we do pause, to ask, whether there exists in this country, or in any country not Papal, such a power to denounce whole masses of professing Christians." vol. v. 306.

"How modest and delicate this reproof of a Court of Law, on the part of a divine who is discussing and reviewing the decisions of eminent jurists!—of a divine, who quotes Coke upon Littleton, and prates about prescriptions and *cestui que trusts*, with the confidence of a barrister of fifty years' standing! It



was, however, no point of theology, upon which Chief Justice Parker, in a course of reasoning, expressed a private sentiment. It was simply a question of history, to which he was as competent as his reverend reviler." vol. v. 308.

"The habit of abuse has been so confirmed by long indulgence, on the part of the Exclusive sect—they have so freely and so incessantly arraigned the clergy and the flocks of the Liberal party, that they cannot check the disposition to it. The highest tribunals have become the objects of their scorn and contempt. The very fountains of justice are attempted to be disturbed, and instead of honoring, as the apostle of their Lord and Master commanded them, those in rule and authority, they invoke upon them the maledictions of the whole community." vol. v. 309.

"We are glad to receive, on the part of Exclusive Christians, any concessions whatever, however insincere we may know and can prove them to be. It shows that the cause of christian liberty has made some progress, when its most inveterate enemies feel compelled to use such language. It is something to have an admission, that parishes have a *natural right to do anything*, without the consent of the church. It is much more, when a writer in the 'Spirit of the Pilgrims' admits that the law of 1695, enacted by the Pilgrims and their descendants, was an '*imposition*' on the parishes which he is '*willing*' to give up. '*Willing*' to give up? No. The pretension is false and hollow, and we shall now show from his own words, and the conduct of his party, that it is so." vol. v. 493, 4.

"We have now only to ask the pardon of our readers for dwelling so long on a work so replete with unfounded assertions, inconclusive reasoning, and breathing a spirit so revolting to every man who has the least pretensions to good breeding, correct morals, or christian benevolence." vol. v. 505.

"HAPPY IS HE THAT CONDEMNETH NOT HIMSELF IN THAT THING WHICH HE ALLOWETH." Rom. xiv. 22.

The following letter from Rev. Dr. Crane was received too late to appear in its proper place, p. 382. We gladly give it an insertion here.

"NORTHBRIDGE, June 25, 1829.

Dear Sir,

Your letter has this moment come to hand, and I hasten to give you something like an answer. I am one of the few now living, who attended the Convention in 1780, not as a member, but a spectator. I listened to the debates, and do remember better what was then said, than I do things of recent date. You ask whether it was my impression that the third article went to take away the right of election from the churches. I answer, that no member of that Convention of any party, *wished to take away that right*. It was the design of the framers of the Constitution to *secure and confirm* the rights which the churches and religious societies had enjoyed; and I am confident that the Convention was *very jealous of the rights of the churches*.

I am yours in affection,

JOHN CRANE."

## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *The Imitation of Christ, in three books, by Thomas à Kempis; Rendered into English from the original Latin, by John Payne: with an Introductory Essay, by Thomas Chalmers, of Glasgow.* A new edition: Edited by Howard Malcom, Pastor of the Federal-st. Baptist Church, Boston. Boston: Lincoln and Edmands. 1828. pp. 228.

The public are here presented with a new and beautiful edition of an ancient and valuable work. Indeed, a work of so much value, written by a monk of the fourteenth century, would be deservedly esteemed (were it not in so general circulation) a great curiosity. The Imitation of Christ is said to have passed through "near forty editions in the original Latin," while "above sixty translations have been made from it into modern languages."

2. *Sermons on War.* By the Rev. Thomas T. Stone. Boston: Peirce and Williams. 1829. pp. 92.

In these Sermons, (six in number,) are considered the "arguments in favor of war;" "the alleged right to engage in war;" the "origin of war;" the "calamities of war;" the "moral results of war;" and "the remedies of war." The design of the author is to discuss "principles, rather than relate facts;" and "to transfer the question about war, from the mere ground of expediency, to the higher and more solemn ground of rectitude." The sermons are neatly and closely written, and merit an attentive perusal.

3. *Letters of Maria Jane Jewsbury, addressed to her young friends.* To which is added, *Legh Richmond's Advice to his Daughters.* Boston: Perkins and Marvin. 1829. pp. 180.

These letters are said to "comprise a real, and not a fictitious correspondence. They were originally published in an English magazine, and are now, for the first time, collected in a volume. In giving their character, we cordially adopt the language of the American Editor:

"These letters are admirably fitted to benefit such young persons as are careless respecting the welfare of their immortal souls, or are disposed to treat the whole subject of religion with constant contempt."—"The thoughtless worldling is shown his foolishness and presumption, in neglecting a subject of such infinite importance, with a tenderness and power well nigh resistless. The backslider is most affectionately entreated to return from the vanities and husks of this unsatisfying world, to the rich, exhaustless consolations of a consistent, elevated Christian. Little children are called upon, now in early life, to give their hearts to that Saviour who said, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not."

4. *Simple Memorials of an Irish Family.* A Narrative of Facts. By a Clergyman, author of the *Missionary Geography.* Boston: Perkins and Marvin. 1829. pp. 108.

This simple narrative closely resembles Legh Richmond's tracts, and is scarcely inferior to them in point of interest. The circumstances related, it is said, are "not only generally true, but they are so in every particular; both the occurrences and the conversations having been noted down at the time." We recommend the book to the story-reading community, as among the best of the class to which it belongs.

THE

# SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

VOL. II.

AUGUST, 1829.

NO. 8.

---

## COMMUNICATIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS ;

SIR,

The following investigation of two important Scriptural words, the meaning of which is often drawn into controversy at the present day, was not originally designed for any Periodical. My intention was, provided the friends whom I might consult should think it best to publish it, to issue it in a pamphlet form, as the first number of several little publications of a similar nature, relating to the same general subject with which the following pages are connected. Circumstances have occurred, since the results of my investigation were committed to paper, which have induced me to send them to you for publication in your useful Miscellany, if you should, on the whole, judge it to be expedient. I have hesitated in regard to this method of publication, (although judicious friends for whose opinion I have great respect have advised me to it), principally because your Work is of a popular cast, as it is very proper it should be. But there are parts of the following dissertation or exegesis, which are of quite a different cast, and which are adapted only for critical scholars. It had been very much easier for me to write in the popular way merely, and to omit all the careful, minute, (I hope I must not say, tedious), investigation, through which I have here past. But to have written thus, would only have been *agere actum* ; to do that which has already been done, some hundreds of times, and to as great purpose as I could accomplish it, to say the least ; I may well say, to a much better one. Yet a critical, radical, philological and exegetical investigation of the important words, *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, is at least not commonly to be met with ; and if it is to be found, (I mean in such a shape as is satisfactory to an earnest inquirer, who lays aside attachment to system and seeks for simple truth), it is not within the compass of my knowledge of books.

Under these circumstances, I have, at the request of friends, ventured to send the following pages for insertion in your Journal. If they shall assist any of the numerous and earnest inquirers after Scriptural truth, who peruse your pages, in their inquiries with regard to the infinitely important subject to which

they are related, the object which I have in view will be answered, and I shall reap the best reward of my labours.

I must venture to add a wish, that, if you think it best at all to publish the enclosed sheets, you would publish them without any separation, i. e. in one and the same number of your work. My reason for this is, that it would be very inconvenient for the reader to separate one part of the investigation from another; and that it would, on the whole, detract from the force and impression of the subject.

I am, with much respect and affection,  
Your friend and brother in the gospel,

M. STUART.

Andover, 3d July, 1829.

### *Αἰών and Αἰώνιος.*

To a being endowed with a spirit which can never cease to exist, and who can live at most but a few years in the present world, the question, What is to be his *future* condition? is the most important question that can possibly be agitated. Will his condition after death be unchangeable? Will his probation be at an end, when his present life shall cease? And if so, on what does the happiness or misery of his future state depend?

An instinctive desire of happiness and dread of misery, form an elementary part of the nature which man possesses. They are interwoven with the very being of his soul, and must be immortal as the spirit from which they spring. At the prospect of happiness, he is filled with delightful anticipations, which make existence a blessing, and cause the soul to exult in the possession of its powers and capacities; at the prospect of misery without relief and without end, an instinctive horror closes every avenue of pleasure, and the soul loathes its own existence, and would fain resign the possession of it.

This, however, it cannot do. He who made us *in his own image*, made us immortal like himself; immortal in regard to the powers and faculties, as well as the existence, of the soul; the immortal subjects, therefore, of happiness or misery in the future state. We can no more cease to be the subjects of the one or the other, than we can cease to be what we are—rational, sentient beings, whose very constitution, whose essential nature, necessarily involves with its existence the experience of either happiness or misery.

However discrepant the views of men may be, in some respects,

with regard to our condition in a future state, there will be—there can be—no important difference of opinion in regard to the point now under consideration; at least, there can be no important difference, among those who believe in the immortality of the soul. To all such, then, the questions, Whether we shall be happy or miserable in another world? and, Whether we shall be *unchangeably* so? are of such unspeakable moment, as to make all other questions appear to be of comparatively small importance.

How are these great questions to be answered? The immortal soul, that is not sunk in the grossest ignorance, or rendered insensible by the most debasing sensuality and love of the world, cannot but feel an interest—an all-pervading interest—in this inquiry. Good men exhibit their interest in it, by long-continued and solicitous inquiries into their spiritual condition and prospects; and even the wicked, in most cases, exhibit their interest also in the question, by their constant efforts, in one way and another, to bring themselves into a condition of quiet with regard to it.

All sober and rational men will surely be disposed to ask, From what quarter can these all-important inquiries have light thrown upon them? What cheering sun is there, which will shed his radiance over the darkness which rests upon them, and disclose them to us by the full light of day?

And is not the answer to these last inquiries comparatively easy? *The light of nature* can never scatter the darkness in question. This light has never yet sufficed to make even the question clear, to any portion of our benighted race, Whether the soul of man is immortal? Cicero, incomparably the most able defender of the soul's immortality of which the heathen world can yet boast, very ingenuously confesses, that after all the arguments which he had adduced in order to confirm the doctrine in question, it so fell out, that his mind was satisfied of it, only when directly employed in contemplating the arguments adduced in its favour. At all other times, he fell unconsciously into a state of doubt and darkness.

It is notorious, also, that Socrates, the next most able advocate among the heathen for the same doctrine, has adduced arguments to establish the never-ceasing existence of the soul, which will not bear the test of examination. Such is the argument by which he endeavours to prove, that we shall always continue to exist because we always have existed; and this last proposition he labours to establish, on the ground that all our present acquisitions of knowledge are only so many *remiiscences* of what we formerly knew, in a state of existence *antecedent* to our present one. Unhappy lot of

philosophy, to be doomed thus to prop itself up, with supports so weak and fragile as this ! How can the soul be filled with consolation, in prospect of death, without some better and more cheering light than can spring from such a source ? How can it quench its thirst for immortality, by drinking in such impure and turbid streams as these ? Poor wandering heathen ! How true it is—and what a glorious, blessed truth it is—that ‘ life and immortality are brought to light in the gospel ! ’ It is equally true, that they are brought to light *only* there.

Thus much then, is certainly plain. If the heathen did not, and (all their circumstances and passions considered) could not, sufficiently answer the inquiry which respects the immortal existence of the soul ; much less could they *satisfactorily* answer the questions, Whether our future state is to be happy or miserable ? And if either, On what conditions is our happiness or misery suspended ? These awfully momentous questions, they never did answer. ‘ The world by wisdom knew not God. ’ Nor did they know that he had made man in his own image ; much less that man had been redeemed by the death of God’s own beloved Son. They did not know any thing definite, respecting either the happiness which the gospel proffers to the penitent and obedient, or the miseries which are threatened to the impenitent and disobedient, in the world to come.

Nor has all the light which has been cast upon the subject of the soul’s immortality, since the gospel was first published, enabled men, independently of the gospel itself, to demonstrate this truth ; certainly not to shew, with any good degree of satisfaction, what the future state of the soul will be.

If there be any satisfactory light, then, on the momentous question of a future state, it must be sought from the word of God. After all the toil and pains of casuists and philosophers, it remains true, that the gospel, and the gospel only, has ‘ brought life and immortality to light ’ in a satisfactory manner.

Most men among us either expressly acknowledge this, or else implicitly concede it. The latter even those do, who make strenuous efforts to shew that the Scriptures can be construed in such a way, as to render the doctrine of the ultimate, universal happiness of mankind at least probable ; although, at the same time, unconsciously perhaps to themselves, they reason from principles which are not deduced from the Scriptures, but from their own apprehensions in regard to what is proper or improper, under the divine government of rational beings.

The Bible, then, is the only *sure* source of knowledge, in regard to the future destiny of our race. This alone is to be relied on, in the ultimate settlement of the great question, whether we are to be forever happy or miserable.

But how is this question to be settled by the Bible? Is this to be done, by carrying along with us, when we go to interpret the Bible, principles which decide before-hand what in our view the Bible *ought to speak*, and to draw from these, conclusions as to what it *does speak*? Is any other book on earth interpreted in this manner? Or, at least, if it be so, do not all men declaim against the unfairness and the partiality of such an interpretation? After all, surely it cannot be for the ultimate interest of any intelligent and rational being, who is favoured with the Scriptures, to force on them a method of interpretation which he would complain of, when applied to any other book. It cannot be for his ultimate interest, to make a mistake in respect to the tremendous subject of a future state. Above all, if it should at last prove to be true, that the present life is the only state of probation for men, a mistake as to the consequences of this probation, must be of an importance which no language can describe, and of which no heart can even conceive.

And even supposing that there is a future state of probation, which is disciplinary, and in which the wicked are subjected to pain and distress; what reasonable and considerate man would desire to incur the risk of this, by flattering himself in such a way as to continue in his sinful course while in the present world, and venture upon the consequences of this in the world to come?

May it not be hoped, then, amid the conflicting spirit of the times, and the widely spread belief that all our race will eventually be happy in another world, that there are some, at least, who will feel it to be their duty and their interest, seriously and impartially to examine and consider what the Scriptures have said, relative to the important question about the *duration* of future happiness and misery? I must hope that there are at least some, (who have as yet been wandering in uncertainty, and who may have inclined, or rather have wished, to believe that they shall be finally happy, and that the Bible has not decided the question against the ultimate hopes of those that die in a state of impenitency), who will now consent seriously and carefully to examine the ground of their hopes and wishes, and to be guided by the sentiments of the Bible, investigated by means of the usual and impartial principles of interpretation.

For such, the following investigation is specially intended. It is not my design to occupy the *whole* ground, covered by the great

question which relates to the inquiry, Whether our condition in a future world is immutable ? To do this, would require a volume instead of a few pages. It would so multiply topics of consideration, also, as to have a tendency rather to distract and confuse the mind, than to enlighten and satisfy it in the most simple way.

I purposely avoid, therefore, all remarks here on objections against the doctrine of endless future punishment, drawn from considerations respecting the divine benevolence, which the minds of many men appear to entertain, in consequence of reasoning abstractedly, and independently of the Scriptures, about the nature of God and the desert of sin. To settle the question, whether *endless* punishment is possible, *before* we come to the Scriptures for investigation ; and then to search them merely to see whether we cannot find something to confirm our views, or to remove the difficulties which the Bible throws in our way ; is virtually to renounce the Scriptures as our guide, and to set up our own conclusions and reasonings in the place of them. But how are men to answer to their own consciences, and to that God who is the author of the Bible, for so doing ? And after all, what is to be the ultimate rule of the divine proceedings, in regard to us ? Are we at our own disposal ? Or are we in the hands of an *almighty* God ? Are *our* views and conceptions to be the rule of his dealings with us ; or are *his own* views of right and wrong, of merit and desert, to guide his disposal of us and ours ? Supposing, then, that with the utmost confidence we cherish and advocate principles, in regard to the administration of the divine government, which in the end turn out to be inconsistent with the statutes of heaven as contained in the Bible ; what influence will our belief and opinions have on the eternal Judge, in the great day of retribution ? Can they have any ? And if not, of what avail is it for us to argue and decide, independently of the Bible, and to risk our eternal salvation, on conclusions which are made out in this manner ?

I would hope that such considerations as these, may have a tendency to check the proneness of some minds, to indulge in *a priori* speculations on this great subject ; and may help in persuading them, to lend a listening ear to any serious and impartial attempt, to describe the real state of Scripture testimony in regard to it.

For the subject of the present investigation, I have chosen only one word, or (more correctly perhaps) only one species of words, used by the writers of the New Testament. It is in the New Testament, that 'life and immortality are brought to light ;' and it is there too, that we may of course expect the state and duration of



either reward or punishment in the future world, to be most fully and clearly revealed. I seek not doubtful evidence. I aim to exhibit that which is, or ought to be, convincing. At least, I intend to exhibit that, which my own mind is unable to resist; and which, I would therefore fain believe, may assist others in their inquiries and belief relative to our subject.

The words that I have selected for present investigation, are *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, commonly translated *forever, ever, eternal, everlasting*; specially so translated, when they are connected with objects that relate to the invisible world. I have been induced to select these words, because I have, at various times, and specially of late, met with not a few speculations and criticisms on them, which are singular, and, in my view, widely departing from the sober rules of legitimate interpretation. I have seen, to my deep regret, many remarks on this awful subject, which seem to betray much levity and inconsideration of mind; and not a few, also, which disclose a resolute determination, (come what will of the laws of exegesis), to support notions on the subject of a future state, that have been adopted independently of Scriptural inquiry, and seem to be maintained in spite of all which the Bible has declared.

I hope I shall not expose myself to censure here, by speaking thus respecting criticisms of this nature. I would not treat with disregard any opinion in theology or criticism, which appears to be the offspring of serious investigation and real effort to seek after the truth, although its author may have greatly mistaken the path of truth. But when I see rash and adventurous criticisms thrown out before the public, which are evidently the offspring neither of patient investigation, nor yet of a serious desire to know what the Bible has decided, but intended only to remove the difficulties which the Scriptures throw in the way of opinions entertained by the authors of such criticisms, and to lull the consciences of men who are uneasy about the subject of future punishment, I feel constrained at least to make an effort, to bring before the public a full investigation of the meaning of the words in question, and to afford them, if it be in my power, more easy and ample means of judging in regard to the criticisms above named, than is afforded by any of the popular works now generally read.

I must advertise my readers, that in order to do this, I cannot confine myself to a merely *popular* exhibition of the evidence with regard to the words in question. Their importance in respect to the great subject of a future state, all must acknowledge who have any good acquaintance with the Scriptures. They form, indeed, the *leading*

testimony in regard to the evidence which respects the duration of future punishment. But then, let it be remembered also, they are far from constituting the *only* testimony of the Scriptures, in respect to this subject. I desire that this may be very explicitly understood. It is not my design, for the present, to aim at adducing *all* the evidence, relative to future punishment, which the Scriptures afford ; but only to examine one important part of it : and this, because it has, of late, been so often drawn into question.

It will be easily seen by every intelligent reader, that I cannot appeal to the Scriptural usage of the words *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, in such a way as to make the investigation a fundamental one, without a reference throughout to the original Scriptures. These are the only legitimate source of *ultimate* appeal, in all controverted subjects of religion. It is to these, indeed, that such of the advocates of universal salvation, as are able to do it, profess to make an appeal. I must take the same ground, therefore ; and yet, while I do this, I would hope to make myself intelligible, in most cases, to all well-educated readers, although they do not possess a knowledge of the original. A few things must, in an investigation like the present, necessarily be without the circle of their apprehension. But I would fain hope, that this will not detract from the general impression and object of this essay.

In pursuing the inquiry about the Scriptural meaning of *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, (*for ever* and *everlasting*), I propose to investigate,

1. The meaning of these words, among profane Greek writers.
2. Their meaning in the New Testament.
3. The meaning of the corresponding words in the Old Testament, which have been translated by *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, and also the meaning of these last words in the Septuagint.
4. I shall endeavour to present a brief view of the bearing, which the testimony exhibited in respect to these words has on the *duration* of future punishment ; and,

Lastly, Make some remarks on the abuse of these words, and on some mistaken criticisms with regard to them.

I. *The classical use of the words in question.*

Respecting this, there can be but little or no doubt. *Αἰών* means, (1) *Length or space of time* ; and so, *time of life, age of man, age* considered as a space of time. (2) *Long time, eternity, long indefinite space of time*. These are the usual significations of the word, as given by those excellent lexicographers, Schneider and Passow. There is a third *unusual* meaning sometimes attached to the word, viz. *mark*, which has no bearing on our present inquiry,

and seems to have arisen from a mistaken derivation of the word from *αἶω*, to notice, to mark.

The word *αἰώνιος*, as defined by Passow, means, *long-continuing, everlasting, eternal*; and with this Schneider agrees.

Most of the shades of meaning which these words have in the classics, are also given to them in Scriptural usage; and along with these, some others also, which are peculiar to the writers of Hebrew Greek. No one acquainted with the nature of this Greek, will wonder at this. A great proportion of the Greek words, employed in the New Testament and the Septuagint, are used in a similar manner. Not only do they bear many senses foreign to *classic* usage, but many of them are employed in a manner wholly foreign to the Greek, classical authors. If any one desires proof of this—overwhelming proof—he has only to inspect a few pages of Schleusner, or of Wahl's Lexicon of the New Testament, which will solve all his doubts.

H. *The meaning of the words in question, as employed by the writers of the New Testament.*

On this inquiry, of course, depends substantially the issue of the question before us. I must beg my readers, therefore, to have patience, and bear with me while I endeavour to conduct them, step by step, through every instance in which the words *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* are employed in the New Testament.

There are shorter methods of despatching the subject in hand; and these are, either to decide it by affirming positively in regard to it, and substituting this for a laboured process of proof; or by producing a few instances, which may seem to support the theory advanced by a writer, and neglecting the rest; or, lastly, by conjecturing what the words in question *ought to mean*, instead of proving what they do mean.

But as I have engaged in the severe task of endeavouring to make a thorough examination, I cannot knowingly adopt either of these methods. I have endeavoured to take a view of the *whole* ground for myself; and I am now desirous to submit the results of this labour to the inspection of others, who are willing seriously and laboriously to inquire, what they ought to believe in respect to the momentous subject before us.

If there be any *future* punishment, it belongs, of course, to a *future state*, i. e. to the invisible world. Our first inquiry, then, will naturally be, In what sense are the words *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* employed, *when used with reference to the things of the invisible world?*

I omit all those cases, in which these words are connected with the subject of *punishment*, for the present. I shall inquire, first of all, how they are employed in regard to all other things belonging to the invisible world, i. e. all other objects which exist there, or transactions, or occurrences, or condition, or circumstances, belonging to that world.

### 1. *Aiōn*.

As the most common and appropriate meaning of *αιῶν*, in the New Testament, and the one which best accords with the corresponding Hebrew word עוֹלָם, (which the Septuagint nearly always renders by *αιῶν*), and which therefore deserves the first rank in regard to *order*, I put down,

(1) *An indefinite period of time; time without limitation; ever, forever, time without end, eternity; all in relation to the future.*

As to the various instances now to be cited, the reader will see, that some one or other of these shades of meaning applies to all. If he be accustomed to philological and exegetical studies, he will also perceive, that so far as the simple idea of the word *αιῶν* is concerned, the sense of it is substantially the same, in *all* the cases now to be designated; and that the different shades by which the word is rendered, depend on the object with which *αιῶν* is associated, or to which it has a relation, rather than on any differences in the real meaning of *αιῶν* itself. The idea which this word preserves through the whole, is that of *unlimited, indefinite time*; which, in one case, in consequence of its connection, must be rendered *ever*, (joined with a negative, *never*); in another, *forever*, etc., in all the various ways already mentioned above.

To the following instances I now make the appeal, in confirmation of what has just been stated.

(a) I begin with those which have reference to God, to what belongs to him, or is rendered, or will be rendered to him, and which (from his nature and the nature of things) cannot be supposed ever to have an end, or ever to cease from existing, or being rendered, etc.

Rom. 1: 25, the Creator, who is blessed *forever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας: surely, not merely for a period which is to have an end!

Rom. 9: 5, God over all, blessed *forever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας: plainly in the same sense as above.

Rom. 11: 36, to whom be glory *for ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Rom. 16: 27, to the only wise God . . . be glory *forever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

2 Cor. 11: 31, God . . . who is blessed *forever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Gal. 1: 5, to whom [God] be glory *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Eph. 3: 21, to him [God] be glory . . . to all the generations of the age of ages or of eternity, τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων i. e. to him be eternal glory. The form of expressson is plainly *intensive* here.

Phil. 4: 20, to God . . . be glory *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

1 Tim. 1: 17, to God . . . be glory *for ever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

2 Tim. 4: 18, to whom [to the Lord] be glory *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Heb. 13: 21, to him [God, or Christ] be glory *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

1 Pet. 1: 25, the word of the Lord abideth *forever*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

1 Pet. 4: 11, to whom [God, or Christ] be glory and praise *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

1 Pet. 5: 11, to him [God] be glory and praise *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

2 Pet. 3: 18, to him [Christ] be glory both now and *forever*, νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος.

Rev. 1: 6, to him [to God] be glory and praise *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Rev. 1: 18, and behold! I [Christ] live *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Rev. 4: 9, glory and honour . . . to him [God, or Christ], who liveth *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Rev. 4: 10, they worshipped him [God, or Christ] who liveth *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Rev. 7: 12, blessing and glory . . . to our God *for ever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Rev. 10: 6, [the angel] sware by him who liveth *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Rev. 15: 7, vials filled with the wrath of God, who liveth *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

(b) The second class of texts under the present general head, are those which have reference to the *happiness of the pious*, especially to their *happiness in heaven or the future world*.

Of this tenor are the following ; viz.

John 6: 51, if any one eat of this bread, he shall live *forever*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα i. e. he shall be happy always, without end.

John 6: 58, the same expression, in the same sense.

John 8: 51, if any one shall keep my word, he shall *never* see death, οὐ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα by which expression, the *never-ending* happiness of the righteous is surely designated.

John 8: 52, he shall *never* taste of death, οὐ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα in the same sense as in the preceding example.

John 10: 28, they shall *never* perish, οὐ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα where the endless happiness of the righteous is clearly asserted.

John 11: 26, he that believeth in me shall *never* die, οὐ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα to the same purpose as the above example.

2 Cor. 9: 9, his righteousness abideth *forever*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα i. e. his charitable benevolence shall be eternally rewarded.

1 John 2: 17, he who doeth the will of God, shall abide *forever*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα i. e. he shall ever be secure and happy.

Rev. 22: 5, they [the servants of God] shall reign *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων i. e. shall occupy a station of exalted dignity and happiness forever.

(c) Another application of *αἰών*, in a sense that classes under our first general head, is, to designate a *period unlimited*, or *without bounds*, i. e. *ever*, and (with a negative) *never*. This is clear from the following examples ; viz.

Matt. 21: 19, let there be no fruit of thee *forever*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. The words have respect to the fig tree which was cursed. That an *unlimited* i. e. *endless period* is here meant, seems very plain ; for it has respect to all future time.

Mark 11: 14, the same words, in the same sense.

Mark 3: 29, whoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, shall *never* have forgiveness, οὐκ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Comp. under No. 4. a. Matt. 12: 32.

Luke 1: 33, he (Jesus) shall reign over the house of David *forever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. There may be some difference of opinion here, as to the class of meanings to which the phrase, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, is to be assigned. The majority of interpreters give to it the sense of *forever*, and appeal to the nature of the Messial's kingdom, and also to the corresponding assertion in the latter part of v. 33, "of his kingdom there shall be *no end*, οὐκ . . . τέλος." On the other hand, interpreters who construe εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας somewhat differently, appeal to 1 Cor. 15: 24—28, in order to shew that the

kingdom of the Messiah is to have an end, and that therefore the expression in question is to be regarded only as designating *an indefinite period, a very long time*. They add, too, that the passage in Luke plainly has a relation to the kingdom of Christ *as Messiah*; a kingdom which must cease, of course, when the office of Messiah ceases, which will be after the general judgement, I Cor. 15: 24—28. The reasoning of the latter seems to be weighty; and I should feel bound to accede to it, unless it might be said, with propriety, that there is a *spiritual* kingdom, one *purely of a moral kind* and adapted to the heavenly world, that will continue after the appropriate reign of Jesus *as Messiah* shall cease. This is certainly favoured by those passages in the New Testament, which ascribe *endless* dominion and power to the Son of God in the same manner as to the Father; e. g. Rev. 5: 13. 11: 15. Heb. 1: 8. On the whole, I am rather inclined to class *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας* here, with those passages which designate an *unlimited period*; particularly because of the *οὐκ . . . τέλος*, which follows in the same verse. Yet I should not be very confident in maintaining this classification, for the reasons stated above.

If I am correct, the passage might be classed under *a* above.

Luke 1: 55, [God] remembered mercy to Abraham and his seed *forever*, *ἕως αἰῶνος*; i. e. he *always, ever* has remembered, and *ever* will remember, mercy to Abraham and his seed; he is unchangeably and *perpetually* propitious to them. This text might be referred, also, to the class *b* above.

John 4: 14, whoever shall drink of the water which I shall give him, shall *never* thirst, *οὐ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*; a full negative, and for a period plainly without any limitation. This also might be referred to the class *b* above.

John 8: 35, the servant abideth not *forever*, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, but the Son abideth *forever*, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*. Here an unlimited period, a time that has no bounds, is plainly designated.

John 12: 34, we have heard out of the law, that Christ abideth *forever*, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*. The passage expresses the opinions of the Jews, in regard to the Messiah, who, they supposed, would be altogether exempt from death. Of course, *αἰῶνα* here means, *an unlimited, endless period*.

John 13: 8, thou shalt *never* wash my feet, *οὐ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*.

John 14: 16, that he [the Comforter] may abide with you *forever*, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*. Here *always*, i. e. constantly and for an unlimited time, is plainly the idea conveyed by *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*.

I Cor. 8: 13, I will *never* eat flesh, *οὐ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*.

Heb. 1: 8, thy throne, O God, is *forever and ever*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος. The idea which this expresses, seems to be the same as that in Luke 1: 33 above; which see. It may be remarked here, in confirmation of what will be said by and by about the use of the singular and plural number, that εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος differs not at all, in *sense*, from εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Heb. 5: 6, thou art a high priest *forever*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα i. e. for a period unlimited, undefined, a very long period; *forever*, while the nature of things shall permit or require this office.

Heb. 6: 20, Jesus . . . made high priest *for ever*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα in the same sense as above.

Heb. 7: 17, thou art a priest *forever*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα in the same sense as before.

Heb. 7: 21, the same expression, in the same sense.

Heb. 7: 24, but he, because he remaineth [a priest] *forever*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα in reference to the same subject as the three last examples above.

Heb. 7: 28, but the word of the oath . . . maketh the Son [high priest], who is exalted to a state of glory *forever*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. This might be ranked under No. 1. *b*; but I have chosen to arrange it here, in consequence of its intimate connection with the four preceding texts.

Heb. 13: 8, Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to day, and *forever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας i. e. Jesus Christ invariably, always the same.

2 John v. 2, [the truth] shall be with you *always*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

Rev. 11: 15, he [Christ] shall reign *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. See on Luke 1: 33 above.

Rev. 5: 12, to Him that sitteth on the throne, and to the LAMB, be . . . glory and power *forever and ever*, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

Thus far, all the examples which have been cited, refer to FUTURE TIME. But there is another small class of examples, in which αἰών refers to PAST TIME, and which require a distinct head of enumeration. They are of a nature kindred with the various species of meaning already mentioned under No. 1. *a. b. c*; and therefore I shall designate them here as belonging to No. 2, under the general arrangement. I observe, then,

(2) That αἰών sometimes means, *an indefinite or long period in time past, ancient days, times of old, long ago, always in time past, generations or ages long since.*

Of this tenor are the following passages; viz.



Luke 1: 70, as he [God] promised by the mouth of his holy prophets *in ancient times*, or of his holy prophets *long ago*, ἀπ' αἰῶνος.

Acts 15: 18, Known unto God *of old*, ἀπ' αἰῶνος, are all his works; i. e. God knew all his works from the most ancient times, or always in times past.

1 Cor. 2: 7, which God decreed *long ago*, or *ages since*, πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων i. e. *from eternity*.

Eph. 3: 9, the mystery hidden in God *from ages*, ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων i. e. hidden during all ages past, or always hidden during ages past.

Eph. 3: 11, according to the purpose *of ages*, τῶν αἰώνων i. e. according to the ancient or eternal purpose.

Col. 1: 26, the mystery hidden *from ages*, ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων in the same sense as Eph. 3: 9 above.

Under this head also should be classed John 9: 32, *never* was it heard, ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσθη, that one opened the eyes of him that was born blind; i. e. during all ages past, or from the most ancient time, such a thing has not been heard of.

The cases which I shall next rank under No. 3, may not appear, at first view, to be very nearly related to those already exhibited. But the experienced interpreter will easily perceive, that there is in them a tacit reference to the idea of *age, period of time, seculum*; and also, that this has particular reference to quantity of time as a whole, and may relate either to a *past*, or a *future* age. In accordance with this, then, we may say,

(3) That *αἰών* occasionally means, *age* in the sense of *dispensation*, viz. age (Jewish), age (Christian).

In this case, it is obviously employed as we employ the word *age* in English, when we speak of *the patriarchal age*, *the antediluvian age*, etc. Of this meaning may be found the following examples; viz.

1 Cor. 10: 11, on whom the ends *of the age* (ages) have come, τῶν αἰώνων i. e. who live at the close of the Jewish age or dispensation.

Eph. 2: 7, that he might shew *in the ages to come*, ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσι τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις, the exceeding riches of his grace. This may be construed of *the [gospel] ages*; or it may be taken in the general sense of *secula*. The former is, perhaps, consonant with New Testament usage; but the latter is the more probable sense.

Heb. 6: 5, who have tasted the good promise of God, and the

powers of the age to come, *μέλλοντος αἰῶνος* i. e. of the miraculous powers bestowed under the *gospel dispensation*.

These are all the examples which occur, that require to be ranked under this head ; and of these, Eph. 2: 7 might be ranked under another category, and considered merely as an example of the *classical* sense of *αἰών*, viz. *seculum, ævum, age* simply considered.

It will be perceived, that most of the meanings of *αἰών* under the preceding heads, are in accordance with those which the word not unfrequently has in the Greek classic writers. In this respect, however, the New Testament usage differs from the classical one, viz. in that *αἰών*, in the New Testament, *most usually* means, *an indefinite, unlimited period of time*; whereas in the Classics, the sense of *ævum, seculum, age, generation* (in respect to *time*), appears to be its more usual meaning.

I come now to a *secondary* and *peculiar* use of the word in question ; one altogether different from any thing in the Greek classics, and derived, as it would seem, entirely from the Hebrew usage of the word *עוֹלָם*, which the Seventy have translated so uniformly by *αἰών*.

In the ancient Hebrew Scriptures, the word *עוֹלָם* properly means, *eternity*; as I shall have occasion by and by to shew. Like *αἰών* also, it is frequently applied to designate *an indefinite period of time*, which is spoken of in reference to a great variety of objects, and with shades of difference, like those which have been named in regard to the use of *αἰών*. But the sense of *world, the present world and the future world*, (when connected with *הַזֶּה* *this* and *הַבָּא* *that which is to come*), is one which does not appear ever to have been attached to *עוֹלָם*, by the most ancient Hebrew writers; nor is it found in the Hebrew Scriptures, unless it be in Ecc. 3: 11, which is so doubtful, and so much disputed, that no philological conclusions can be safely deduced from it.

In the later Hebrew, however, (i. e. the Talmudic and Rabbinic), the word *עוֹלָם* is employed, in innumerable instances, in the sense of *world*; and this, either *present world*, or *future world*. From this usage in the *later* Hebrew, (yet not so late but that it preceded the time when the New Testament was written), it comes, that *αἰών*, in the New Testament, is not unfrequently employed in a similar manner.

No one, who is at all acquainted with the multitude of Hebrew meanings attached to Greek words, both in the Septuagint and in the New Testament, will feel any surprise at this, or hesitate a mo-

ment about admitting the possibility or the reality of it. Hence we may assign to *αἰών*,

(4) The meaning, *world*; also *present world*, and *future world*, when such qualifying words are joined with it, as shew that it refers to the one or the other.

(a) It is sometimes employed to denote the *present world* and *future world*, with special reference to *time* or *duration*, i. e. the period of their existence, or of one's existence in them. Of this character is the word in question in the following passages; viz.

Matt. 12: 32, [the man who has uttered blasphemy against the Holy Ghost], shall not be forgiven, neither *in this world*, nor in that *which is to come*, οὐτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι, οὐτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι [αἰῶνι]; i. e. he shall not be forgiven during his continuance in the present world, nor in that which is to come; an affirmation plainly added by way of intensity, in order to strengthen the declaration, οὐκ ἀγεθῆσεται αὐτῷ, *forgiveness shall not be extended to him*, which immediately precedes.

Mark 10: 30, [the man who has forsaken all, that he might follow Christ], shall receive a hundred fold *in the present time*, ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ, and eternal life *in the world to come*, ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ. Here *αἰών* is used for *world*, with special reference to *the period of its duration*; as is plain from its being placed in antithesis with *καιρῷ τούτῳ*. This might be translated *age*, and ranked under No. 3, but with a classical sense, like that of Eph. 2: 7.

Luke 18: 30, the same words, in the same sense.

On the whole, all the instances here, under *a*, might be rendered in the same way, and make a sense well fitted for the passages in which they stand. If any one prefers this method, I shall not object against it. Thus construed, all these texts, with that of Eph. 2: 7, must be considered as examples of the more common *classical* sense of *αἰών*.

(b) *Αἰών* is sometimes employed to denote *the world with all its cares*, or *business*, or *temptations*, or *allurements to sin*. Just so we often employ it in the English language. *A man of the world*, is a man devoted to the cares or pleasures of the world. In a like sense, the later Hebrew עֵלְוָה was often employed.

The examples of such a sense are as follows; viz.

Matt. 13: 22, the cares *of this world*, τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου . . .

choke the word; i. e. worldly business, occupation, engagements, stifle the impressions which religious truth had made.

Mark 4: 19, the same expression, in the same sense.

Luke 16: 8, the children of *this world*, τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, are wiser in their generation, etc.

Luke 20: 34, the children of *this world*, τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, marry, etc.; i. e. worldly men, men devoted to worldly pursuits, etc.

Rom. 12: 2, be not conformed to *this world*, τῷ αἰῶνι τοῦτου i. e. to the sinful pursuits and pleasures of this world.

1 Cor. 1: 20, where is the disputer of *this world*, τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου i. e. the worldly disputer, one who disputes after the manner of men of the world.

1 Cor. 2: 6, but not the wisdom of *this world*, τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, i. e. not the wisdom of worldly men; nor of the princes of *this world*, τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, i. e. of worldly-minded princes.

1 Cor. 2: 8, which none of the princes of *this world* knew, τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου i. e. which no worldly-minded princes knew.

2 Cor. 4: 4, whom the god of *this world*, τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, hath blinded; i. e. whom Satan, who reigns in worldly men, hath blinded.

Gal. 1: 4, that he might select us from *the present evil world*, ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστώτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ.

2 Tim. 4: 10, Demas hath forsaken us, having loved *the present world*, τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα.

Tit. 2: 12, let us live soberly and righteously and godly, in *the present world*, ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι where the antithesis shews, that *the world of temptation and trial* is meant.

(c) From the preceding use of *αἰών* it comes, that the word is sometimes employed simply to denote *the world itself*, as an object, or as an actual existence, i. e. simply *mundus*, κόσμος; and this, either *present* or *future*. Of this, the following seem to be evident examples; viz.

Matt. 13: 40, so shall it be in the end of this world, ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου; i. e. when the final consummation of all things shall take place, and the world comes to an end or is destroyed.

Matt. 13: 49, the same words, in the same sense.

Matt. 24: 3, what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of *the end of the world*? τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, which (as the phrase was used here by the disciples) seems probably to mean, *end of the world* in a sense like that of the two preceding instances.

Matt. 28: 20, I am with you always, *unto the end of the world*; a clear case of the same meaning with the preceding words, as *πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας*, *always*, plainly shews.

In Matthew, it appears that the usage of *αἰών*, almost throughout, (in passages where the reading is not doubtful), is in accordance with the *later* usage of the Hebrew in respect to the word עֵלֶּם. What influence this may have on the critical questions, Whether Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew? and of course, Whether the present Greek is only a translation? I cannot stop here to inquire; but critical readers will not fail to note the circumstance, to which I have now adverted.

Luke 20: 35, they who are counted worthy to obtain *that world*, τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐξέλθον; viz. the *future world*, in distinction from αἰῶνος τοῦ ὕποϋ in the preceding verse, or in opposition to it.

1 Cor. 3: 18, if any man thinketh to be wise among you, *in this world*, ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ. In the next verse, κόσμος is put for αἰών. This example might, perhaps, be referred to No. 4. *b*; and be taken in this sense, viz. if any worldly-minded man among you, etc.

Eph. 1: 21, above every name . . . *in this world*, and in that which is to come, ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ [αἰῶνι] μέλλοντι. This, some may suppose, might be put under No. 4. *a*; but it does not appear, that a special relation to *time* is here designated.

1 Tim. 1: 17, now to the king of *the world* (worlds), τῶν αἰώνων. i. e. the king of the earth, or, the king of the universe. So in the Old Testament, Ps. 47: 7, *God is king of all the earth*. Zech. 14: 9, *the Lord shall be king over all the earth*; and so, in innumerable places, God is styled *king*, *king of Israel*, etc. That the plural number (*αἰώνων*) is here employed, makes no difference in the signification; as appears from Heb. 1: 2. 11: 3. The same usage is extended to many other words, e. g. מִשְׁכָּן *tabernacle* and מִשְׁכָּנִים *tabernacles*, אֱלֹהִים *God* and אֱלֹהִים *God*, יָם *sea* and יָמִים *seas*, οὐρανός *heaven* and οὐρανοὶ *heavens*, σάββατον *sabbath* and σάββατα *sabbaths*, etc.; which, (although I have translated some of them in the singular and some in the plural), are *indiscriminately* employed in both numbers, by the sacred writers. *Αἰώνων*, then, may mean here, as in Heb. 1: 2. 11: 3, *world*; or in all these cases it may be rendered *worlds*, if any one should prefer this. But I am not aware, that the Hebrews applied the words עֵלֶּם and αἰών, to designate any of the planets except the earth. If so, then the *plural* number here is to be rendered in conformity with the usage above intimated; just as אֶרֶץ *terra* and אַרְצוֹת *terrae*, עֵלֶּם

*mundus* and מִן־עוֹלָמוֹ *mundi*, are promiscuously used, not unfrequently, in one and the same sense.

The objection to construing *αἰώνων* here as meaning *ages*, is, that the idea of *eternity* or *immortality*, (which would thus be designated by it), is expressed by the very next word which follows, viz. ἀφθάρτου, *incorruptible, imperishable, immortal*.

1 Tim. 6: 17, charge them that are rich, *in the present world*, ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι. Without any violence, this might be referred also to the class *b*, which precedes the present head.

Heb. 1: 2, by whom also he made *the world* (worlds), τοὺς αἰῶνας. See on 1 Tim. 1: 17 above, in regard to the use of the plural here.

Heb. 11. 3, by faith we perceive, that *the world* (worlds, τῶς αἰῶνας), was created by the word of God. See as above.

Nearly all of the above instances, are very clear and striking examples of the purely *Hebraistic* sense of the word *αἰών*, as sometimes employed by the writers of the New Testament.

To the meanings above specified, I now subjoin one which is peculiar, and one, I may add, which is of so doubtful a nature, that no philological conclusions can be safely deduced from it.

(5) As דָּוָר, in Hebrew, means *generation of men*, considered either as to the *time* in which they live, or as to the *persons themselves*, so *αἰών*, in one case, seems, like this word, to have the meaning of *generation*, i. e. *race, progeny, a class of men in existence*.

Of this peculiar meaning, the following appears to be an example; viz.

Eph. 2: 2, in which [trespasses] ye walked, in accordance with *the generation of this world*, κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου i. e. according to the course pursued by men of this world. The idea is heightened by the writer's adding immediately, "According to the prince of the dominion of the air;" i. e. in accordance with the designs of Satan, who, being supposed by the Jews to dwell in the air, was called *the prince of the air*.

One is almost tempted, here, to adopt the translation of *Acon*, as an evil spirit presiding over the wicked world, and called, in the next clause, *the prince of the dominion of the air*. But the uncertainty whether the Gnostic philosophy had yet introduced its speculations about *Acons* (*Αἰῶνες*); and particularly, whether this term, in such a sense, was known to any of the writers of the New Testament; seems to forbid such a rendering of *αἰῶνα* here. I cannot help thinking, that it is safer to build on the analogy which the

Hebrew  $\text{רָעָה}$  affords, and which makes a sense apposite to the subject.

(6) Under a distinct head, also, I will now arrange, (for the sake of completing my view of *αἰών*), the cases which have reference to the punishment of the wicked.

I do not expect the reader to pronounce judgement on this part of the subject here. I have made the present arrangement only for convenience' sake; not designing either to anticipate a judgement in regard to the meaning of *αἰών* in this connection, or to forestall the opinion of the reader. His judgement may be suspended, for the present, on this class of texts; and he may regard them here simply as a record of facts, i. e. of expressions actually occurring in the New Testament.

2 Pet. 2: 17, to whom [to transgressors] is reserved the blackness of darkness *forever*, *εἰς αἰῶνα*.

Jude v. 13, for whom [for the wicked] the blackness of darkness is reserved *forever*, *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*.

Rev. 14: 11, the smoke of their torment, [the torment of those who worship the beast], shall ascend up *forever and ever*, *εἰς αἰῶνας αἰώνων*.

Rev. 19: 3, and the smoke of her, [of Babylon the mother of abominations], ascendeth up *forever and ever*, *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*.

Rev. 20: 10, and they, [the devil, the beast, and the false prophet], shall be tormented continually, *forever and ever*, *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*.

These are all the instances of *αἰών* which are found in the New Testament, where the genuineness of the text is unquestionable. All the cases of a questionable nature I have purposely omitted. They cannot be built upon with safety; and dispute about the genuineness of any particular texts, would be quite foreign to my present design. I therefore omit the instances of *αἰών*, in Matt. 6: 13. Rev. 5: 14, which are decidedly rejected by Dr. Knapp as *spurious*; and also the instances in Acts 3: 21. Eph. 1: 12. 1 Pet. 1: 23, which are considered and marked by him as *dubious*.

The result of the preceding investigation, (excepting the cases of doubtful readings), is as follows; viz.

The whole number of instances in which the word *αἰών* is employed, amounts to 95.

Of these, 16 are used in the ascriptions of praise, glory, honour, blessing, etc. to God and Christ; and in regard to these, there can be no rational doubt, that *αἰών* designates a *period unlimited, never-ending*.

Equally certain is the same meaning, in the 5 cases in which it is applied to God, or to Christ, *who liveth forever*.

In 4 cases, it is employed in designating the dominion of Christ; viz. Luke 1: 33. Heb. 1: 8. Rev. 5: 13, and Rev. 11: 15. But the meaning here may be called in question. See on Luke 1: 33 above, p. 416. As to Rev. 5: 13, I have rendered the word *κράτος*, *power*, Hebrew *יָצַד*; but as *יָצַד* appears in a few cases to mean *praise, honour*, some may insist on that sense being given to *κράτος* here. If they should do so, this will not alter the meaning of the *αἰών* which follows, because it stands connected with *the glory given to God*, as well as to Christ, and therefore, it plainly means *a time unlimited*. The text in Rev. 11: 15, seems to ascribe dominion to Christ, in the same sense as Luke 1: 33. Heb. 1: 8; and it may therefore be questioned by some, whether *eternal* dominion be here meant.

In *one* case, 1 Pet. 1: 25, it is said of the *word of God*, that it abideth *forever*; which plainly means, that it will *always* be accomplished, or *always* remain stable, certain.

In 9 cases, it is applied to the future happiness of the saints.

In 13 cases, it designates the sense of *ever*, (with a negative) *never, always, without ceasing*, etc.; and in a great majority of these cases, it is applied to something which Christ is, or does.

In 7 cases, it is applied to designate *an indefinite period in ages past, ages long ago, very ancient times*.

In 3 cases, it is applied to designate *age* in the sense of *dispensation*, either Christian or Jewish. But one of these is susceptible of another interpretation.

In 3 cases, it seems to designate *the world either present or future*, considered with special reference to a period of duration, i. e. with the adsignification of *continuance*.

In 12 cases, it designates *the world*, as the scene or place of cares, trials, enticements to sin, etc.

In 11 cases, it seems to designate, more simply, *the world present or future*, considered merely as a place of residence for men, as an object of real existence, etc.

In one case, Eph. 2: 2, it seems to be equivalent to the Hebrew word *דָּוָר*, and to designate the idea of *generation, homines seculi hujus, genus hominum*.

In 5 cases, it is applied to the subject of future punishment.



In comparing these cases together, it appears that those which have a simple respect to time, i. e. to *time future*, are employed in the sense of *unlimited time*, *indefinite time*, *ever*, *always*, *forever*, etc. Of this number are 49, besides the *five* cases which relate to future punishment, and the *four* which relate to the Messiah's kingdom.

Only *seven* cases of *αἰών* have relation to *time past*; and these designate either *a period from eternity*, or *ages long ago*, *very ancient times*.

The *four* cases which relate to the dominion of Christ, may be understood variously, by different interpreters who disagree about his nature or his dominion. The passages are noted above. At least, these cases must designate a future *indefinite period*.

All the other cases of *αἰών* (of which there are 30), may be classed under the general signification of the Hebrew word עוֹלָם, (as employed in the Talmudic and Rabbinic Hebrew), viz. *world* in some sense or other, either present or future, Jewish or Christian. Of these, there are *four* shades of meaning, viz. *world*, in reference to the period of time which it comprises, of which there are 3 cases; or *world*, in reference to its cares, pleasures, enticements, etc., of which there are 12 cases; or *world* as a place of abode, an existing, real object etc., of which there are 11 cases; or, finally *world*, Jewish or Christian, i. e. dispensation, of which there are 3 cases. I leave Eph. 2: 2, out of the account here, as the instance is so peculiar.

We come then, by virtue of this examination, to the conclusion, that whenever *αἰών* is employed for the purpose merely of designating *future time*, as a *period of duration*, it designates an *indefinite unlimited time* in all cases; (those of future punishment being, for the present, excepted). In nearly all, it designates *a period in the most absolute and extensive sense unlimited*; as in the 49 cases mentioned above, independently of those which have relation to future punishment, and those which relate to the Messiah's kingdom.

The use of *αἰών* in order to designate *past time*, is seldom in the New Testament, as the above examples shew; there being only *seven* cases in the whole. Of these, *six* relate clearly to an *indefinite, unlimited period in ages past*, i. e. they signify *eternity a parte ante*, as the older theological writers were wont to call it. Of this tenor most clearly are Acts 15: 18. 1 Cor. 2: 7. Eph. 3: 9. 3: 11. Col. 1: 26. See above, under signification No. 2. In one case

only, *αἰών* means *long ago, in ancient times* simply, viz. in Luke 1: 80; in one case, with the negative *οὐκ*, John 9; 32, it means *never*.

We have, then, at least 55 instances in the New Testament, in which *αἰών* certainly means, *an unlimited period of duration* either future or past, *ever, always*; omitting the cases in which it respects future punishment, and those which have regard to the dominion of the Messiah. If these be included, we have 64 cases, (out of the whole 94 which occur), in which *αἰών* means *unlimited period, boundless duration*.

Unless we except Luke 1: 70, (which however can hardly be excepted, it being a clear case of employing *αἰών* in a manner designating an *indefinite* kind of period), there is no case in which *αἰών* is employed in order to designate simply a *definite, limited period*, in all the New Testament: I mean, there is no case of this nature, where *αἰών* is employed with the intention of conveying the simple idea of *duration, or time during which any thing shall continue to exist or to be done*. The New Testament writers employ *ἡλικία* and *γενεά*, to designate simply the age or period of men's lives. In no case is *αἰών* employed by them simply in this sense; or at most, we can except only Eph. 2: 7.

It is clear then, that whenever *αἰών* simply marks time in the New Testament, it marks *indefinite, unlimited time*, and such only. In some very few cases, there are circumstances accompanying the use of it, which shew that eternity, in the absolute and simple sense of the word, cannot be intended. But an overwhelming majority of cases designate *eternity a parte post*, (as the technical expression is), i. e. *a future period without any limits or bounds*.

In regard to the other sense of *αἰών*, (i. e. its meaning when it is not primarily designed to mark *time*), it is plainly derived, as has been shewn above (p. 420 seq.), from the later Hebrew *עוֹלָם*, in the sense of *world*; and it is employed merely to designate this, with the adsignifications of *continuance, or of cares, business, pleasures, etc.*; or else to designate *world* simply as a place of residence, action, etc.; or world Christian or Jewish. All these meanings are obviously foreign to the question about future punishment; with the exception of those, however, which speak of the *future world, the world to come*, as the abode of sinners in their state of retribution. Of these, more hereafter.

We are now prepared to advance to the investigation of the second word in question, viz.

2. *Αἰώνιος*.

This is plainly a derivate of *αἰών*, according to the common laws of the Greek language. The question of course will now come up, Whether *αἰώνιος* the *adjective*, corresponds in meaning throughout with *αἰών* the *substantive*?

The classical sense of this word, as given by Passow, is *long-continued, everlasting, eternal*; all, of course, designating an *indefinite, unlimited* period, and agreeing with the meaning of *αἰών*, in all those cases which have a simple relation to time.

The *ancient* Hebrew has no corresponding adjective here; but it employs the noun עוֹלָם in the place of one, as is usual, in a multitude of cases, with this ancient language. But the later Talmudic and Rabbinic Hebrew employs an adjective formed from עוֹלָם, (just as the Greek *αἰώνιος* is derived from *αἰών*), in the sense of *perpetuus, eternus, sempiternus, perpetual, eternal, everlasting*. The adjective is עוֹלָמִי. It is somewhat remarkable, also, that although only the later Hebrew employs the word עוֹלָם in the sense of *world*, as above described, yet this same Hebrew, which alone employs the adjective עוֹלָמִי, never uses it in the sense of *worldly* etc., but only in the sense of *eternal, everlasting*.

We shall see that in this respect, also, the Greek adjective, *αἰώνιος*, corresponds in the New Testament, almost uniformly with the Hebrew adjective עוֹלָמִי; and that all the uses of *αἰώνιος* correspond with the *first* class of significations which *αἰών* bears, and not with the Hebrew-Greek meaning of it.

We come now to the usage of the word, as exhibited in the New Testament.

(1) It signifies *perpetual, never-ending, eternal*.

(a) It is so employed, *in regard to the happiness of the righteous*.

Matt. 19: 16, what good thing shall I do, that I may inherit *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Matt. 19: 29, whoever shall forsake houses, or brethren . . . for my sake, shall receive . . . *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Matt. 25: 46, but the righteous [shall go away] into *everlasting life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Mark 10: 17, the same as Matt. 19: 16 above.

Mark 10: 30, the same as Matt. 19: 29 above.

Luke 10: 25, like the case in Matt. 19: 16 above.

Luke 16: 9, that when ye fail [die], ye may be received into *eternal mansions*, εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους σκηνάς i. e. into eternal abodes of happiness, comp. John 14: 2.

Luke 18: 18, the same as Matt. 19: 16 above.

Luke 18: 30, the same as Matt. 19: 29 above.

John 3: 15, he that believeth on him [Christ], . . . shall have *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

John 3: 16, that whosoever believeth on him [Christ], . . . should have *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

John 3: 36, he who believeth on the Son, hath *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

John 4: 14, it shall be in him a well of water, springing up to *eternal life*, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

John 4: 36, he shall gather fruit to *eternal life*, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

John 5: 24, he who believeth on him that sent me, hath *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

John 5: 39, by them ye think ye have *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

John 6: 27, labour for the meat which endureth to *eternal life*, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

John 6: 40, he who believeth on him [Christ], shall have *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

John 6: 47, he who believeth on me [Christ], hath *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

John 6: 54, he who drinketh my blood hath *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

John 6: 68, thou hast the words of *eternal life*, ζωῆς αἰωνίου.

John 10: 28, I give *eternal life* to them, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

John 12: 25, he who hateth his present life, shall preserve it [his soul] for *eternal life*, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

John 12: 50, I know that his commandment is *eternal life*, ζωὴ αἰώνιος i. e. the keeping of his commandment leads to eternal happiness.

John 17: 2, that he [Jesus] might give to them [his disciples] *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

John 17: 3, this is *eternal life*, ζωὴ αἰώνιος.

Acts 13: 46, ye have judged yourselves to be unworthy of *eternal life*, ζωῆς αἰωνίου.

Acts 13: 48, and as many believed as were ordained to *eternal life*, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Rom. 2: 7, to them . . . who seek for glory . . . [God will give] *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Rom. 5: 21, so shall grace reign . . . unto *eternal life*, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Rom. 6: 22, ye have the end [of obedience], *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Rom. 6: 23, the gift of God is *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιος.

2 Cor. 4: 17, a far more exceeding and *eternal weight* of glory, αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης.

Gal. 6: 8, he who soweth to the spirit, shall of the spirit reap *life everlasting*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

2 Thess. 2: 16, God . . . who hath loved us and given us *eternal consolation*, αἰώνιον παράκλησιν.

1 Tim. 1: 16, an example for those who should believe in him unto *eternal life*, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

1 Tim. 6: 12, lay hold on *eternal life*, τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς.

2 Tim. 2: 10, with *eternal glory*, μετὰ δόξης αἰωνίου.

Tit. 1: 1, in hope of *eternal life*, ζωῆς αἰωνίου.

Tit. 3: 7, that we might be heirs, according to the hope of *eternal life*, ζωῆς αἰωνίου.

Heb. 5: 9, he became the author of *eternal salvation*, σωτηρίας αἰωνίου.

Heb. 9: 12, he obtained *eternal redemption* for us, αἰώνιον λύτρωσιν.

Heb. 9: 15, that they who are chosen might receive *the eternal inheritance*, τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας.

1 Pet. 5: 10, God . . . who called us unto *his eternal glory*, εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν.

2 Pet. 1: 11, an entrance into *the eternal kingdom*, εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν.

1 John 2: 25, he hath promised to us *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

1 John 3: 15, no murderer hath *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

1 John 5: 11, God hath given to us *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

1 John 5: 13, those who believe have *eternal life*, ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

1 John 5: 20, the same is the true God and *eternal life*, ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος.

Jude v. 21, expecting the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, unto *eternal life*, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

(b) The next class of cases are those, *which have respect to God or his glory*.

Rom. 16: 26, according to the commandment of *the eternal God*, τοῦ αἰωνίου Θεοῦ.

1 Tim. 6: 16, to whom [to God] be honour and *everlasting praise*, *κράτος αἰώνιον*. Here *κράτος*=*ἰσ*.

(c) There are a few solitary, *miscellaneous* cases, which I shall arrange under one head.

2 Cor. 4: 18, the things which are not seen, are *eternal*, *αἰώνια*.

2 Cor. 5: 1, we have a habitation not made with hands, *eternal*, *αἰώνιον*, in the heavens. This might be arranged under a.

In Heb. 9: 14, it is applied to the Spirit, (either of Christ, or of God); who by *an eternal Spirit* offered up himself, etc., *διὰ πνεύματος αἰώνιου*.

Heb. 13: 20, the blood of an *everlasting covenant*, *διαθήκης αἰωνίου* i. e. of a covenant *never* to be changed or abrogated.

1 John 1: 2, we declare unto you *the eternal life*, *ζωὴν αἰώνιον* viz. Jesus the author of eternal life.

Rev. 14: 6, an angel . . . having *the everlasting gospel*, *εὐαγγέλιον αἰώνιον*.

In Philemon v. 15, *αἰώνιον* is used adverbially, in the sense of *forever, always*.

(2) In *three* cases, the word *αἰώνιος* seems to bear a sense kindred to that of *αἰών* under No. 2 above, viz. *ancient, long since, very early, remote*.

The following are the examples of this sort, viz.

Rom. 16: 25, the revelation of the mystery, which was kept in silence *in ancient ages*, *χρόνοις αἰωνίοις* i. e. during all preceding ages, or always hitherto, from eternity.

2 Tim. 1: 9, according to his own purpose, and the grace given us, through Jesus Christ, *before the ancient ages*, *πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων* i. e. before the primitive ages, which means, before the world began, from eternity. Thus in John 17: 5, the glory which I had with thee, *before the world was*, obviously means, *from eternity*. So our English version, in 2 Tim. 1: 9, *before the world began*, *πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων*, which they have repeated in Tit. 1: 2, where the Greek expression is the same as here.

Tit. 1: 2, eternal life, which God, who cannot lie, promised *before the ancient ages*, *πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων* evidently in the same sense as the phrase above.

These are all the instances in the New Testament, which have relation to *past* time; and these, it is very evident, have an intimate connection with the use of *αἰών* in No. 2 above.

There remain,

(3) The instances where *αἰώνιος* is used, with relation to future punishment; viz.

Matt. 18: 8, it is better for thee to enter into life lame or maimed, than having two hands to be cast *into eternal fire*, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον.

Matt. 25: 41, depart from me, ye cursed, *into everlasting fire*, εἰς τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον.

Matt. 25: 46, these shall go away into *everlasting punishment*, εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον, [but the righteous *into everlasting life*, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.]

Mark 3: 29, whoever shall utter blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, shall never obtain forgiveness, but be obnoxious to *eternal condemnation*, αἰωνίου κολάσεως.

2 Thess. 1: 9, who shall be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord, ὄλεθρον αἰώνιον.

Heb. 6: 2, not again imparting elementary instruction with respect to repentance . . . and *eternal judgement*, i. e. eternal condemnation or punishment, αἰωνίου κολάσεως.

Jude v. 6, suffering the punishment *of eternal fire*, πυρός αἰώνιον.

I leave these cases without remark for the present, reserving my conclusions, until I have made some additional remarks.

It appears from the above representation, that there are 66 cases in which *αἰώνιος* is employed in the New Testament. Of these, 51 are used in relation to the happiness of the righteous; 2, in relation to God, or to his glory; 6 are of a miscellaneous nature, but the meaning of *αἰώνιος* in them all is quite clear; and 7 relate to the subject of future punishment.

In regard to all the cases of *αἰώνιος*, which have a relation to *future time*, it is quite plain and certain, that they designate *an endless period, an unlimited duration*. I except, of course, for the present, those 7 cases which have respect to future punishment. But in regard to the rest, if they have not the meaning which has just been stated, then the Scriptures do not decide that God is eternal, nor that the happiness of the righteous is without end; nor that his covenant of grace will always remain; a conclusion which would forever blast the hopes of Christians, and shroud in more than midnight darkness all the glories of the gospel.

The above are all the instances in which *αἰώνιος* is employed in the New Testament; with the exception of 1 Tim. 6: 19, where

the reading cannot be satisfactorily defended. I purposely avoid all readings of this nature, in the present investigation.

In seeking for all the examples of *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, in the New Testament, I have used the Concordance of Schmidt, which, having been published before the critical investigations of the Greek were made, may possibly contain some two or three instances less of these words, than are to be found in the Greek text of Dr. Knapp, which is the one that I have used. If it should prove to be so; or, that I have overlooked some one instance, in such a minute and protracted examination; it will not have any effect on the reasoning or state of evidence at large, in regard to the subject before us. I trust, moreover, that it will not be imputed to any design on my part.

The reader has now before him, a full view of the manner in which the sacred writers of the New Testament employ the words *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*. We might next proceed, therefore, to draw some conclusion, by comparing the whole together, and in this way shewing in what sense the sacred writers probably applied these words to the future punishment of the wicked. But I must beg the reader to delay a while longer, in order that we may obtain a fuller view of facts relating to the usage of these same words by the Septuagint translators, and of the corresponding Hebrew word עֵוֶן. I shall be as brief as possible here; not considering it necessary to produce more than a few citations, as examples in proof of what may be stated. The *direct* evidence I have fully stated; the *indirect*, I may be indulged the liberty of producing in a briefer and more summary way. I come then,

III. To inquire, *What are the meanings of עֵוֶן in the Hebrew of the Old Testament?*—and, *What are the significations of αἰών and αἰώνιος, in the Septuagint?*

(1) The meaning of the Hebrew עֵוֶן.

This is, (*a*) *Eternity, unlimited duration.*

So Gesenius, in the recent edition (the third) of his Hebrew Lexicon, “עֵוֶן, *eternity* ;” which is the only definition that he gives. He goes on, however, to say, that “the expression in Hebrew, as among us in common life, is often used in an inaccurate manner, i. e. when merely a very long space of time is denoted.” Of this, more in the sequel.

I would remark here, for the sake of brevity, that the words in the quotations which follow, that are printed in *Italic*, correspond to the Hebrew word עֵוֶן, in some one of its forms. After this ex-



planation I shall not repeat the Hebrew word, but only quote the English.

Gen. 9: 16, that I may remember the *everlasting* covenant.

Gen. 17: 7, I will establish my covenant . . . for an *everlasting* covenant.

Gen. 17: 13, my covenant shall be . . . an *everlasting* covenant.

The same in Gen. 17: 19.

Gen. 21: 33, Abraham . . . called on the name of Jehovah, the *everlasting* God.

Deut. 33: 27, the *eternal* God is thy refuge.

Ps. 90: 2, *from everlasting to everlasting*, thou art God.

Ps. 103: 17, the mercy of the Lord is *from everlasting to everlasting*.

Ps. 112: 6, the righteous shall be in *everlasting* remembrance.

Prov. 10: 25, the righteous is an *everlasting* foundation.

Is. 35: 10, the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Zion, with songs and *everlasting* joy upon their heads.

Is. 40: 28, the *everlasting* God.

Is. 51: 11, the redeemed of the Lord shall return . . . and *everlasting* joy shall be upon their head.

Is. 56: 5, I will give them an *everlasting* name, that shall not be cut off.

Is. 60: 19, Jehovah shall be thine *everlasting* light. The same again, in 60: 20.

Is. 61: 7, *everlasting* joy shall be to them.

Is. 63: 12, to make himself an *everlasting* name.

Jer. 10: 10, the living God [is] an *everlasting* king.

Jer. 31: 3, I have loved thee with an *everlasting* love.

Dan. 12: 2, some [shall awake] to *everlasting* life; and some, to shame and *everlasting* contempt.

These are only a small proportion of the cases which might easily be produced; but these are enough to shew what meaning עָלְמָיִם usually bears, in the Hebrew Scriptures.

As a confirmation of this, I will add a few cases where the phrase עָלְמָיִם עַד, עָלְמָיִם עַד etc. are employed, which correspond to εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, εἰς αἰῶνα, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, etc., in the Septuagint and in the New Testament.

Ex. 14: 13, ye shall see them [the Egyptians], no more *forever*.

Deut. 12: 28, that it may be well with thee, and thy children after thee *forever*.

1 Sam. 20: 15, thou shalt not cut off thy kindness from my house *forever*.

2 Sam. 3: 28, we are guiltless . . . *forever*.

Ps. 89: 4, thy seed will I establish *forever*.

Ps. 131: 3, let Israel hope in the Lord *forever*.

Ps. 136 exhibits 26 instances, where the same sense is certain in them all.

Under the form עֲדָיִם (*εἰς αἰῶνα*) alone, in the sense of *forever*, Taylor, in his Hebrew Concordance, has arranged some 175 instances. If we add to these, all the various forms of עֲדָיִם, to which the meaning, *forever, always, time unlimited, or without end*, is clearly to be attributed, several hundreds more must be added to the 175 cases. It is impossible to doubt, in regard to the *usual* meaning of the word עֲדָיִם, in the Hebrew Scriptures.

But then, as Gesenius remarks, it is sometimes applied, (as in common life), to things which endure for a *long time, for an indefinite period*. So it is applied to the Jewish priesthood; to the Mosaic ordinances; to the possession of the land of Canaan; to the hills and mountains; to the earth; to the time of service to be rendered by a slave; and to some other things of a like nature. But all the instances of such a nature, taken collectively, amount to a very small proportion of the whole, and can in no way be looked upon as any thing more than a kind of exception to predominant, plain, certain usage.

In our own language, (where *eternal* and *everlasting* surely designate a *period without end*), we often employ the same words to designate *that which seems to have no end, or the end of which is not defined or seen*. Thus we say, *everlasting talker, perpetual scourge, eternal vexation, endless trouble, everlasting disquiet*, etc.; all employed, in common parlance, for that which endures a great while, or for an indefinite period, or which is without intermission. Yet who supposes, that on this account the words *everlasting, eternal, perpetual, endless*, are not, with the strictest propriety, applied to *time which has no bounds, or in other words, to eternity?*

Thus much then for the Hebrew word עֲדָיִם, when it relates to *future time*. It is very clear, that when Gesenius defines it, *Ewigkeit* [eternity], he rightly defines it. This is its sense, in an overwhelming predominance of examples. All the meanings derived from this, are only exceptions, and amount to mere examples of *catachrestic* usage, i. e. usage which is uncommon, or aside from the strict sense of the word. Such is the usage in all languages, with regard to more or less of important words.

In respect to עֲדָיִם, as applied to designate *time past*, it has the same shades of meaning with the Greek αἰών, αἰώνιος, as explained

in pp. 418. 432 above. This usage is not very frequent, when compared with the designation of *time future*. Still, there are, in the whole, a considerable number of instances; enough clearly to exhibit the *usus loquendi* in this respect. Any one may easily find them, by consulting his Concordance. A number of these I will here subjoin, to illustrate the usage in question.

Is. 63: 9, 11. Job 22: 15. Ps. 143: 3. Prov. 23: 10. Is. 42: 14. Mic. 5: 2. Prov. 22: 28. Jer. 18: 15. Ezek. 36: 2. 26: 29. Ps. 93: 2. 103: 17. 77: 5.

From what has been exhibited in regard to אֵלֶּיךָ, it is plain, that it corresponds throughout with the Greek *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* of the New Testament, when employed in their *primary* sense, viz. as having reference to *time*, either *future* or *past*. Of this agreement, we shall soon have occasion to take further notice.

But in regard to the secondary class of meanings which *αἰών* bears in the New Testament, viz. that of *world* with the various adsignifications noticed above; there is no case in the Old Testament Hebrew in which אֵלֶּיךָ bears this sense, if we except Ecc. 3: 11 which is too doubtful to build upon. Putting, therefore, this class of meanings out of the account, (all of which are deduced from the meaning affixed to אֵלֶּיךָ, after the Old Testament Scriptures were completed, i. e. by the later Hebrews), the coincidence between *αἰών* and אֵלֶּיךָ is very striking; so much so, that nothing can be more evident, than that the one corresponds with the other in most cases throughout, and each reflects light upon the other. He who thoroughly understands the use of אֵלֶּיךָ, is better prepared to understand the meanings of *αἰών*; and he who has a complete knowledge of the use of *αἰών*, is well qualified to understand the use of אֵלֶּיךָ.

One point only of difference worthy of remark, do I find. This is, that it so happens in regard to the use of *αἰών* in the New Testament, that it is applied, in no case, to designate simply a period of time which has *definite limitations*; I mean such limitations as from the nature of the case must be regarded as definite, and as known to be so. For example; in the Old Testament, אֵלֶּיךָ is applied to the Jewish ordinances, priesthood, and kingly succession; to the hills, mountains, and world; to the possession of the land of Canaan, etc. But in the New Testament, no instances of a use so *cataphoric* as this occur. An *indefinite, unlimited period*, is the basis of all the significations of *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* there, wherever they have a simple reference to *time*. At most, we can only ex-

cept some few cases, where the reference is to *past*, and not to *future* time.

The distinctive trait of usage in the New Testament which has now been pointed out, deserves consideration, and ought to have its proper weight, in determining the signification of the words in question, by the *usus loquendi* of the New Testament writers.

We come next,

(2) To the use of *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, in the Septuagint.

If I have counted rightly, *αἰών*, in some of its forms, is employed in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament 308 times; all as translations of עֹלָם, in some one of its forms. Of these, 184 instances correspond to עֹלָם in the Hebrew; and 71, to עַד עֹלָם, its equivalent. In almost the whole of these instances in which *αἰών* is employed, the signification of *time unlimited, a period without end*, is, beyond all reasonable question, absolutely certain; just as it is with respect to the Hebrew words, to which *αἰών* corresponds. In the great number of instances, in which *αἰών* is employed in the Septuagint, some cases occur of its *catachrestic* use; precisely in the same manner as of the Hebrew word עֹלָם, which has already been noted above, p. 436. In short, the most unpractised observer as to the phenomena of language, cannot help remarking that *αἰών* is, throughout the Old Testament, the word corresponding to עֹלָם, which the Seventy have *almost uniformly* appropriated to this purpose. Nothing can be clearer, than that they considered it as the *equivalent* of עֹלָם. So much is this actually the case, that I have been able to find only about 20 cases, in the whole, where the word *αἰών* is employed by them, unless it be as the translation of עֹלָם. Most of these cases, also, plainly relate to expressions in Hebrew, which are equivalent to עֹלָם, viz. such as חַיִּים וְעַד, עַד, עַד עַד, and לְעַד. The few other cases which exist, plainly result from a reading in the text of the Septuagint translators, different from that in our present Hebrew Bibles.

In regard to *αἰώνιος*, I find 92 instances, in which the Septuagint has employed it. In six of these, it corresponds to other words than עֹלָם; in all the rest, to some form of this word.

In respect to the meaning of *αἰώνιος*, it is perfectly obvious that the great body of the cases in which it is employed, will admit of no other meaning than that of *eternal, everlasting*. But there are a few cases, in which the *catachrestic* use of it must be admitted. Thus, the mountains, the Levitical statutes, priesthood, rites, covenant, also landmarks, waste-places, etc. are called *αἰώνιοι*, precisely:

ly in the same manner as עָלָם is sometimes applied in the Old Testament, and corresponding throughout with it. The word *αἰώνιος*, therefore, is, in the Septuagint, less strictly applied to *indefinite time, an unlimited period*, than it is in the New Testament. Just the same is the case with *αἰών*, as we have already seen.

I refrain from pursuing my inquiries through the Apocryphal books; from which a great copiousness of examples might also be adduced, to confirm the views which have already been given of the meaning of *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*. It is quite superfluous to pursue the investigation any further. We have critical materials enough before us to make up a decision, if such materials can ever avail for this purpose.

We have now surveyed the use of the words *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* in the whole latitude of their Scriptural use; and we come, at the close, with all the views before us which this investigation and discussion have afforded, to see if we can form a satisfactory judgement as to the meaning of the words in question, when applied to designate the period of *future punishment*.

Let us first lay aside all those various meanings of *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, which cannot have any direct bearing on the great question before us. Of this class, plainly, are all those, in which *αἰών* has the *secondary* meaning of *world*; some few peculiar ones only excepted, which I shall hereafter notice.

Of the same class, too, are all those meanings of *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, which have relation to *time past*.

It is plain, moreover, that inasmuch as *future* punishment must belong to *future* time, so *αἰών*, when connected with the designation of such punishment, must, (if the laws of universal analogy in philology and exegesis are to be observed), have a like meaning with that which it has, when applied to other things belonging to a future world, and which are yet to take place.

In all the cases where glory and praise are ascribed to God *forever*, or *forever* and *ever*, it will not be credited that the sacred writers mean to declare, that this will take place for *only a definite period of time*, or, *for certain ages only*. It will not be doubted, that when God is called *eternal*, *αἰώνιος*; or when the things of the heavenly world are said to be so; that *eternity* in the proper sense of the word is meant.

I trust it will not be questioned, in regard to the 9 cases, where *αἰών* is *applied to the happiness of the righteous* in another world; and the 51 cases, where *αἰώνιος* is applied to the same; that a

happiness *without limits, without end*, is intended to be designated. For all these cases, which I shall not repeat here, I must refer the reader to pp. 415. 429 above, where he will see them produced at full length.

Can it be reasonably doubted, then, that the 15 cases in which *αἰών* is applied to the future punishment of the wicked, and the 7 cases in which *αἰώνιος* is applied to the same subject, have a meaning like that of the preceding cases? The time designated in both is *future*; the world is *future*. The intention of the writers seems very apparently to have been similar in both cases. The invariable laws of interpretation, therefore, would seem to demand a like exegesis.

Let us for a moment, examine this last position.

I take it to be a rule in construing all *antithetic* forms of expression, that where you can perceive the force of one side of the antithesis, you do of course come to a knowledge of the force of the other side. If *life eternal* is promised on one side, and *death eternal* is threatened on the other and opposite one, is it not to be supposed, that the word *eternal* which qualifies *death*, is a word of equal force and import with the word *eternal* which qualifies *life*? In no other case could a doubt be raised, with regard to such a principle. I venture to say that the exception here, (if such an one must be made), is without any parallel in the just principles of interpretation.

If then the words *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* are applied 60 times (which is the fact) in the New Testament, to designate the *continuance* of the future happiness of the righteous; and some 12 times to designate the *continuance* of the future misery of the wicked; by what principles of interpreting language does it become possible for us, to avoid the conclusion that *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* have the same sense in both cases?

Will it be said, that we must appeal to arguments here deduced from the light of nature, in order to determine the probable meaning of *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, when connected with the future punishment of the wicked? But how can we do this? The light of nature at best, as we have before seen, merely renders it probable, in some degree, that the soul may always exist. Does it—can it—determine, then, what is to be its condition; and how long this is to continue? It is impossible. Or if we insist still on what the light of nature can do, then let us go to those who enjoyed it, and see how they decided in relation to the question before us. Did not the Greeks and Romans hold to the *eternity* of future punishments? Notoriously they did. And could we, with such light merely as they had, come to an *opposite* conclusion?

But if the declaration of the Scriptures is to be our guide, in regard to our creed on this point; and if we are to ask simply what the Bible declares, and not, what in our view it ought to declare; then must this great question, like every other one in *revealed* theology, be ultimately settled by an appeal to the nature, power, and laws of language. Such an appeal I have endeavoured to make: and the result is what I have expressed above.

It does most plainly and indubitably follow, that if the Scriptures have not asserted the *endless* punishment of the wicked, neither have they asserted the *endless* happiness of the righteous, nor the *endless* glory and existence of the Godhead. The one is equally certain with the other. Both are laid in the same balance. They must be tried by the same tests. And if we give up the one, we must, in order to be consistent, give up the other also.

But if the eternity of God's glory, attributes, and existence; if the eternity of future happiness; is to be given up, as *revealed* doctrine: on what basis is this doctrine to be placed? How are we entitled any longer to receive it as true, and to hold fast to it as certain?

Tell me not of *the light of nature* here. I must believe, (I trust there are very many others who will feel constrained with me to believe), that *the GOSPEL has brought life and immortality to light*, and that no mere "son of nature" "hath seen God at any time;" "but that the only-begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath revealed him." Believing this—fully believing this—I must feel, that the criticism which would decide against the *endless* punishment of the wicked, must also, to be consistent, blast my hopes of eternal life, and cover the glories of the Godhead with everlasting darkness.

I feel constrained, moreover, to ask here, If *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* do not signify *eternity* and *eternal*, in the Greek language of the Septuagint and New Testament, then what terms has this language to express such an idea? Will any one venture to say, that the sacred writers had no such idea as *eternity* and *eternal*? If he will, I do not think him worthy of refutation. But if it be admitted, that the idea in question was familiar to them, then by what terms could they express it in the Greek language, so appropriate as those which have now been examined?

I admit that a Greek could convey the idea of *eternity* and *eternal*, in a variety of ways, by different modes of expression; just as we can in English, or as a Hebrew could in his language. It is true, moreover, that the New Testament writers, and the Septua-

gint, have conveyed the ideas in question, occasionally, by the use of other words, and by peculiar phrases. But after all, the essence of the difficulty remains. The question is substantially unanswered by these considerations. It cannot be shewn, that any words are *so appropriate* to the object named, as the words *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*.

Still clearer if possible is it, that the proper word in Hebrew for *eternity*, is עֶצְרָה; to which, in so many hundred instances, *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος* clearly correspond.

Must not every philologist and every serious inquirer feel, then, that *conjecture* is out of question, in regard to determining such a case as that before us? The meaning of such words is not to be *guessed at*; but to be made out by analogy, and by a regular, impartial application of the laws of language.

I admit the awful nature of the conclusion, that the punishment of a future world is to have no end. I do most fully admit, that it is indeed “a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.” But what if I should doubt or deny it? Can this have any influence on that eternal Judge, who will pronounce my final sentence? None. Can my denial of what he has said, or my refusal to explain it in analogy with all his other declarations relative to things of the future world, or my efforts to fritter away the meaning of his declarations—can all this avail me, when I stand an unembodied, naked, helpless spirit before his searching eye, and the tribunal of his almighty power? O the dreadful thought! What if I deceive myself, and cry out, “*peace! peace!*” while my God saith, “There is no peace to the wicked?” Will this repeal his law, alter its meaning, or frustrate its penalty? It is indeed a fearful hazard, for men to cast themselves for safety on such a desperate wreck as this!

If there be any relief for the dark prospects of the wicked as to the future, it must come only from this source, viz. that the Bible has disclosed some method of *future* relief; some encouragement that *future* reformation and penitence will restore the lost favour of God. But alas! where is this to be found? On this subject of unspeakable and everlasting moment, of tremendous interest, there is not one assertion—one word even—in all the book of God, which, when construed by the usual laws of language, can afford a gleam of hope. Where is another state of probation described? What are the means of grace to be enjoyed in *Hell*? Is it the preaching of the gospel? Is it the influence of the Spirit of God? Who *preaches*, in the bottomless pit; or how shall the Spirit of God dwell with blasphemers and reprobates?

Will *miser*y of itself make men penitent? And this, in a world



from which the means of grace are excluded? All, all makes against such a supposition. There is not a sentence in the Scriptures which asserts it, or even gives any countenance to it. All the warnings and exhortations which the Scriptures contain, go upon the ground of men's *present* state of trial being their *final* and *decisive* one. It is impossible to believe rationally, that men of such benevolence as were the writers of the holy Scriptures, should not have told us something about a *future* probation and acceptance, if these were known to them. If they have not told us of these, then, it is because they did not believe in them, they did not know any thing of them. And if they did not, how can we venture to believe that we have any knowledge of them?

On this point, I acknowledge my convictions are strong. I have long searched, with anxious solicitude, for a text in the Bible which would even seem to favour the idea of a *future* probation. I cannot find it. If others have been more successful in their researches, let them shew us the proof of it. When this shall be done, in accordance with the simple laws of interpretation, and without the application of *a priori* theology to the Bible, then I promise to renounce my feelings and views, in regard to the whole subject before me.

Until then, I must hold to the *endless* punishment of the wicked, or give up the *endless* happiness of the righteous. And if the hope of this must be abandoned, then may we well ask, what the gospel has revealed that is worth our knowing; or of what value is the existence which the Creator has given us?

I take it for granted, that all my readers will understand, that the evidence in respect to future punishment, derived from the use of *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, is only a part—a moderate part—of what the Scriptures contain relative to this subject. My design, in the present inquiry, was not to present at large the subject of future punishment. To produce *all* the arguments, and examine *all* the objections, would require a book instead of a short essay; and years of study, instead of a few days.

Whether I shall go on in the critical examination of other important Scriptural words, relative to the punishment of the wicked, in a manner resembling that above, must depend on the reception with which the present effort may meet, and on circumstances over which I can of myself have no effectual control.

Thus have I endeavoured to present, as briefly as my plan would

permit, the result of a philological and exegetical examination of the words *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, as employed by the writers of the New Testament. I may have performed a work superfluous for some of the readers of the Spirit of the Pilgrims; who perhaps have elsewhere found what has better satisfied their minds, than that which has now been laid before them. But if there be any critical and hermeneutical essay of this nature, which goes the full length of the subject, it is unknown to me; and I have merely followed my own plan in the above researches, and made all my investigations, without the aid of any lexicons or commentators. My reason for this has not been, an aim to be *original*; much less, a disregard to the opinions of others. It has been simply this, viz. a desire not to embarrass my mind with any *previous* opinions or views. I wished to form my conclusion merely from the word of God, investigated with diligence and care, and in a manner as unembarrassed as it was possible for me to adopt, in my circumstances.

The result seems to me to be plain, and philologically and exegetically certain. It is this; either the declarations of the Scriptures do not establish the facts, that God and his glory and praise and happiness are *endless*; nor that the happiness of the righteous in a future world, is *endless*; or else they establish the fact, that the punishment of the wicked is *endless*. The whole stand or fall together. There can, from the very nature of antithesis, be no room for rational doubt here, in what manner we should interpret the declarations of the sacred writers. We must either admit the *endless* misery of hell, or give up the *endless* happiness of heaven.

---

As a kind of supplement to the above investigation, and for the sake of communicating a fuller view of the words in question than most of my readers may readily find, I must beg the liberty of adding, by way of Appendix, a few strictures on the manner in which Lexicographers and others have treated *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*. It is high time that these words were accurately understood, and handled in a manner truly philological. If what I have said, or may say, will contribute toward the accomplishment of so important an object; or, at least, excite others to do what needs to be done; my labour will not be in vain. Such of my readers as pursue the critical study of the Scriptures, will probably not be uninterested in the remarks which follow. Others may omit the reading of them, should they find them to be destitute of special interest to their own minds.

In regard to the Lexicons, I shall be brief. I perceive, on an

examination of Schleusner, that my arrangement differs in some respects from his. I will not delay here for the purpose of controverting his arrangement, but only to make a few remarks on some parts of it. I must leave the rest to the judgement of every reader, who will take the pains to examine this author.

The first meaning which he gives to *αἰών*, is, *a definite and long time*, i. e. a long continued, but still a *definite* period of time. Under this head he arranges Matt. 21: 19, which is the case of the fig-tree that was cursed. The Saviour is represented by the evangelists as saying, 'Let there be no more fruit from thee *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, forever;' which surely does not imply, that the time would come to an *end* in which this tree would be barren, or after which it would again bear fruit. In other words, *definite* time is clearly *not* marked here.

Again, he puts John 8: 35 under the same head; 'the servant does *not* abide in the house *forever*,' οὐ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, but the Son abideth *forever*, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Can this mean, in either case, a *definite* period of time?

His second head is, *life of man, age of man, or time during which he lives*.

As an example of this, he appeals to Matt. 12: 32; 'They shall not obtain forgiveness, neither *in this world*,' ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι which he renders, *with in this life*, i. e. in this age of man. But on this ground, what does *αἰών* mean in the antithesis, viz., οὐτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι [*αἰῶνι*], nor *in the life to come*? If a *definite* period is simply meant in the first part of this antithesis, what is the *definite* period of the life to come? In other words, When will it cease? This incongruity is avoided, when the sense of *world* is given to *αἰών* in each case. Both expressions together then make out an *intensive* affirmation, equivalent to *never, never*.

Schleusner also appeals to Matt. 28: 20, in confirmation of the sense which he here gives to *αἰών*. 'Lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world,' ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος; (in which however, he has omitted to insert *always*, πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας). This he construes as meaning simply, 'I am with you to the end of your lives;' thus making the whole promise attach only to the apostles. I cannot persuade myself that this was the meaning of Christ, or the only tenor of this promise.

He then arranges the meaning of *αἰών* under, (3) *Men of any age*. (4) *External things of the present life, riches, pleasures, etc.* (5) *Method of living, genius of the age, manners of the age*. (6) Vi-

*cious men of any age.* After all these, comes the meaning on which the whole of them turned, viz. (7) *World, universe.* He comes only in No. 9, to the meaning of *eternity, unlimited period.*

How incongruous this arrangement is with the meaning of the word *αἰών* as used in the New Testament or the Old, must be apparent from the preceding exhibitions of this word which have been made. How loose and indefinite some of the meanings here given are; and how far deflected from the original significations of *αἰών* and *αἰώνιος*, even in the Old Testament; must be very apparent even to an unpractised observer. Indeed, it is plain that the Hebrew usage of *עוֹלָם*, as distinguished into the *ancient* and *modern*, did not once occur to Schleusner, in its proper form; and of course, he has failed to do justice to the corresponding *αἰών*.

On the whole, I must consider the article *αἰών*, in his Lexicon, as one of the most unfortunate specimens of imperfect lexicography, which now and then occur in this venerable, and (in general) truly valuable writer.

The Lexicon of Wahl, in regard to this word as well as very many others, affords a far better specimen of skill, neatness, and accuracy of arrangement. Wahl has arranged thus; (1) *Time, unlimited duration, ævum.* (2) *The universe, mundus.* (3) *An age, period of the world;* under which he arranges, (a) *The present age,* i. e. the Jewish age or period antecedent to the Messiah. Under this head he arranges the following senses, viz. (1) *Simply, age.* (2) *Age,* with the accessory idea of *vitiosity, imbecility,* etc. (b) *The future age,* i. e. the reign of the Messiah, a period of happiness, liberty, piety, etc.

This is indeed a great amendment of Schleusner's mistaken, unphilological, and (I had almost said) unaccountable arrangement. But this exhibits some important mistakes, which, (unless I am greatly in error), are adapted to mislead the student of the original Scriptures, who places too much confidence in lexicographical guides.

Under No. 2, he arranges the signification, *universe, mundus.* I had myself, before I gave *עוֹלָם* and *αἰών* an extended and minute investigation, been accustomed to suppose, that *αἰῶνες* in 1 Tim. 1: 17. Heb. 1: 2. 11: 3, must mean the *universe;* particularly, because the *plural* number is here employed. It was doubtless on the like account, that Wahl also gave to *αἰῶνες* the same signification. But a minute inquiry into the grounds of such a rendering, has convinced me of my own mistake; and of course, that Wahl is also in an error.

In recurring back to the ancient Hebrew usage of *עוֹלָם*, I ob-

serve that there is no apparent difference between the use of the plural number, and the singular, in order to designate *time*. So 1 Kings 8: 13, a settled place . . . to abide in *for ever*, עֵלְמֵי. See also, for the like examples, 2 Chron. 6: 2. Ps. 61: 5 (4). Ps. 77: 6 (5), where עֵלְמֵי has the sense of *ancient times*. Ps. 145: 13, (*everlasting*). Is. 26: 4. 45: 17. Dan. 9: 24. Is. 51: 9, (*ancient*). Ecc. 1: 10. (id.) Ps. 77: 8 (*for ever*). Is. 45: 17, עֵלְמֵי, עֵלְמֵי, *ages of perpetuity, for ever and ever*.

These instances make it clear, that the plural is used in the same sense as the singular, or, at least, without any assignable difference of meaning. If there be any difference at all, it must consist merely in this, viz. that the plural number is a somewhat more *intensive* form of expression than the singular. But although this is often the case, in Hebrew, yet in the present case, the nature of the several instances, where the singular and plural are used, being compared and well considered, it will be plainly seen, that there is no ground for making any assignable difference of meaning between the different numbers.

In just the same way, the Seventy have employed *αἰών*. Sometimes they have rendered the plural of עֵלְמֵי, by the singular *αἰών*, e. g. Dan. 5: 10, let the king reign עֵלְמֵי (Chaldee), εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. So Is. 47: 17, they shall not be ashamed עֵלְמֵי עֵלְמֵי, Septuagint ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος ἔτι. In the same verse, עֵלְמֵי is translated by αἰώνιον. In like manner Is. 51: 9, דְּרוֹת עֵלְמֵי is rendered γενεὰ αἰῶνος. So Ps. 90: 8, עֵלְמֵי, *our secret* [sins], plural number; but the Seventy, reading it עֵלְמֵי, have rendered it ὁ αἰὼν ἡμῶν, Ps. 89: 8. By a like mistake in reading, they have again rendered עֵלְמֵי, *little children*, in Job 19: 18, by εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, because they read it עֵלְמֵי.

On the other hand, the Seventy have used the plural of *αἰών*, in order to translate the singular of some words which are equivalent to עֵלְמֵי; e. g. עָרָן in Ps. 55: 20, is rendered πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων by the Septuagint, Ps. 54: 19.

So also, the plural form of עֵלְמֵי is often used, in the Hebrew, as equivalent to the singular, i. e. as having the same meaning; e. g. 1 K. 8: 13. 2 Chron. 6: 2. Ps. 61: 5. 77: 6. Dan. 2: 4 (Chaldee). 3: 9. 6: 22, and so frequently.

I have only to add, that a comparison of usage in the New Testament, will lead to the same result with regard to *αἰών*.

So far then as it respects the designation of *time*, the singular and plural of *αἰών* answer the same purpose. But is this the case,

in regard to the use of *αἰών* in the *secondary* and *later* sense of עוֹלָם, viz. that of *world*, etc. ?

If we go back to Hebrew usage, we shall find no example in it to justify the use of the *plural* number in the sense of *worlds*; i. e. in such a sense as astronomy has taught us of the present day to employ this plural word. In the old Hebrew, אָרֶץ means *earth*; but the plural אַרְצוֹת, means *lands* only in the sense of *countries*, not in the sense of *worlds*. The other appellation for *world* is תִּבְלָל, which is employed only in poetry. This has no plural.

When the Hebrew wanted to designate the *heavenly bodies*, he said, *host of heaven*, צְבָאָה הַשָּׁמַיִם; or כּוֹכָבִים, *stars*; or sun, moon, and stars; or שָׁמַיִם *heavens*, simply. There is no intimation in the Scriptures, as I can find, that there is more than one *world*.

Hence, I must take *αἰῶνες* in 1 Tim. 1: 17. Heb. 1: 2. 11: 3, to mean *world* simply, i. e. our world, this earth. And if it be asked, Whether the Scriptures do not ascribe any thing more than the creation of our world to the Son of God? the answer is given in Heb. 1: 10, 'Thou, Lord, didst lay the foundations of the earth, and the *heavens* are the work of thy hands.' The same sentiment also may be found in Col. 1: 16. Eph. 3: 9. John 1: 3, and in other passages.

That the plural and singular of nouns are often employed in the same manner, and to designate one and the same thing, no tyro in sacred philology can fail to know. For example, in Hebrew; מִשְׁכָּן *dwelling*, מִשְׁכָּנַיִם *dwelling*; אֱלֹהִים *God*, אֱלֹהִים *God*; יָם *sea*, יַמִּים *sea*; חֵכְמָה *wisdom*, חֵכְמוֹת *wisdom*; יָשָׁר *the upright*, יִשְׁרָיִם *the upright*; רָשָׁע *the wicked*, רָשָׁעִים *the wicked*; תְּהוֹמוֹת *the abyss*, תְּהוֹמוֹת *the abysses*. So in Hebrew Greek; *σάββατον* *the sabbath*, *σάββατα* the same; *οὐρανός* *the heavens*, *οὐρανοί* the same, etc.

There is nothing at all peculiar, then, in using *αἰῶνες* in the same sense as *αἰών*, or in employing either of them indifferently, to designate the idea of *world* in the singular number.

I should not have said thus much on the error in the Lexicons with regard to the *plural* of this word, had I not seen much reasoning about the meaning of *ages of ages* (*αἰῶνες αἰῶνων*), that is built on a supposed distinction of meaning between the singular and plural number. Many writers would seem to ask, 'What can *ages of ages* mean, unless *age* (*αἰών*) is a *definite, limited period*? Of course, must not *ages of ages*, after all, be only a series of *limited* periods, and finally have a *termination*?'

The answer to this is not difficult. In regard to the plural number *αἰῶνες*, it imports of itself no more than the singular. In re-

gard to the form of expression *ages of ages*, or *age of ages*, or *age of age*, (for all these are indifferently employed), it is a mere *intensive* form of expression, and nothing more nor less. What are *servant of servants*, *lord of lords*, *holy of holies*, *heaven of heavens*, etc., but *intensive* forms of expression? And if any one should ask, Whether any thing can be added to the idea of *eternity*, of *unlimited duration*? in order to shew that there is an incongruity in employing *αἰών*, in the expressions now before us, with an *unlimited* sense; I would reply by asking, Whether *forever* in English does not mean *eternity*, *unlimited duration*? If so, then how can we *add* to it? Yet we do say, *forever* and *ever*; that is, we do use an *intensive* expression, in order to designate with emphasis the idea of a *never-ending* period of time. Could not the Hebrew, then, say *לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד*; and the Greek, *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*, in the very same sense, and for the very same purpose, as we say *forever* and *ever*?

He could; he did: and all criticisms on these phrases, which would deduce any thing more from them than *intensiveness* of expression, is built on an imaginary basis, not on one which has its support in the *usus loquendi* of either the Greek, Hebrew, or English language.

There is another mistake, (as it seems to me), in Wahl's article on *αἰών*. He has, throughout, made *present world* etc., and *world to come* etc., mean, the age preceding the Messiah, and the age after his advent. In doing this, he has appealed to the Jewish usage of *this world*, and *the world to come*, *הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה* and *הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא*. But this appeal is very far from sustaining him. The Rabbinical Jews divided *this world* into *the lower world*, i. e. the proper earth with all that it contains; *the middle world*, i. e. the region of the air, including the heavenly bodies; and *the supreme or upper world*, i. e. the world of angels, etc.

In regard to *world to come* or *future world*, some held it to be the *new world*, which would arise after the destruction of the present; others, (and this I take to be the general usage), held it to be the world of souls, i. e. the future world in the same sense in which we now use this phrase in English; *some* only, (Buxtorf merely says *quidam*), regarded it as meaning, *the days* or *age of the Messiah*. Could any one justly expect such a train of deduction from this, as appears in the Lexicon of Wahl?

Of all the numerous cases, which he arranges under the head of *age before and after the Messiah*, not more than three will stand the test of investigation; viz. 1 Cor. 10: 11. Eph. 2: 7. Heb. 6: 5. Of these, Eph. 2: 7 is by no means necessarily arranged under the head

in question, as it may easily be understood simply of *ages to come*, and more probably should be so understood.

As to the other cases, where *the present αἰών* and the *αἰών to come*, are expressed or implied, I take nothing to be more certain, than that the arrangement of Wahl is fundamentally erroneous. It is not only without any basis in predominant Jewish usage; but it would force on the text of the New Testament a sense strange enough in some cases, and unnecessary in all.

When our Saviour, in the parable of the sower, says, 'The cares of *this world*:' is there any special relation here to the *age which preceded the Messiah*? Was there, then, to be no *world* in the sense here plainly meant, *after* the Messiah had come? Rather, does not the whole parable represent all the occurrences to which it alludes, as taking place *under the gospel-dispensation*? Yet *this world*, if we may credit Wahl, was now no more, inasmuch as the *world to come* had already begun.

Let any one now examine Mark 4: 19. Luke 20: 34. Rom. 12: 2. 1 Cor. 1: 20. 2: 6. 2: 8. 2 Cor. 4: 4. Gal. 1: 4. 2 Tim. 4: 10. Tit. 2: 12. Matt. 13: 40, 49. 28: 20, and see what these texts can possibly have to do exclusively with the age that *preceded* the Messiah. And yet, if Wahl be in the right, they all fall under this class, having a relation more or less distinct to such an age.

How easy to be misled, when we fall upon *theory* that looks attractive! Wahl fell upon the above theory, in Bertholdt's *Christologia Judæorum* etc. p. 38 seq., and thought it would solve many apparent difficulties about *αἰών* in the New Testament. But the theory itself, like many other things in that undigested and hasty book, needs much more confirmation than has been given to it, before it can be so extensively applied as Wahl has applied it.

The remarks which I have just made, on the meaning assigned by Wahl to *present* and *future αἰών*, will apply, in all respects, to the article on this same word in the Lexicon of Brettschneider; who, under the same guide (Bertholdt), has fallen into the same errors.

Had he and Wahl simply read, with attention, the article עוֹלָם in Buxtorf's immortal Hebrew, Rabbinic, and Chaldaic Lexicon, they might have avoided such a mistake. This Coryphaeus of all Rabbinical investigators, has given no occasion that any attentive and intelligent reader should be misled.

But it is time to retreat from the examination of Lexicons. Enough has been said, I trust, to put the student on his guard against implicitly following the authority of dictionaries; especially,



on an important article like the present, and when the *whole* of the evidence is not laid before him.

I must beg leave, in closing, to make a few remarks on a singular criticism upon the word *αἰώνιος*, which I have recently met with in one of the Journals of the day.

The writer proposes to render *αἰώνιος*, *spiritual*. His reason is, that Aeons (*Αἰώνες*) were counted as incorporeal, i. e. spiritual, beings; and therefore *αἰώνιος*, may mean *Aeonic*, i. e. *spiritual*. In accordance with this, he construes the various passages which exhibit *αἰώνιος*, and which have a relation to future punishment.

This criticism has, at least, the merit of novelty. At all events, it is novel to me, inasmuch as I never met with it in any writer before; nor did it once ever occur to my mind, as a probable or possible meaning of *αἰώνιος*. But then, the author of it might very justly say, 'This is no good argument against the probability of the criticism; much less against the *possibility* of it; and a better ground than this may very properly be insisted on, for rejecting it.'

I cannot deny the reasonableness of this; and I therefore, out of respect to one who appears to be seriously inquiring after Scriptural truth, would suggest the following grounds, why I must reject the exegesis which he has proffered.

I. The question remains to be settled, whether the Gnostic system, (the one from which the imagination of *Aeons* sprung), had an existence, or at any rate, was known in the western parts of Asia, before the propagation of the gospel, or even at that period. Whoever has read Tittmann, *de Vestigiis Gnosticorum in Nov. Test. frustra quaesitis*, will have vehement doubts, as I must think, in regard to the point in question; more vehement still, whether the New Testament exhibits any certain marks, that the writers of it had an acquaintance with the *Aeonic* system.

The Aeons were, (if we may credit the statement of the Gnostics who believed in their existence), beings of both good and bad characters, i. e. there were some of each, belonging to the different classes. They were regarded as *secondary* or *derived divinities*, *θεοὶ δευτέροι*. There were spiritual beings above them, and below them. Why then should *Aeonic*, be chosen to designate *spiritual*, any more than an adjective borrowed from the God above them, or the sub-divinities below them?

But how dubious, too, must such an adjective be! The majority of the Aeons were *apostate* ones. *Aeonic*, then, would be about the same as *diabolic*, in regard to its meaning. Suppose now, I

should assert, that *diabolic* means *spiritual*, because the devil is a *spiritual* being; would this be a well-chosen epithet to supply the place of *spiritual*? Can it be probable, then, that *Aconic punishment* and *Aconic life*, are used by the New Testament writers to denote *spiritual* punishment and *spiritual* happiness? If it could be shewn, (which it cannot be), that the New Testament writers had an acquaintance with the system of the Gnostics; it must still appear very improbable that they would coin such an unfortunate adjective as *Aconic*. But until we are better ascertained whether they knew any thing about Aeons, we can never be entitled to give such an exegesis to their writings.

2. But there is another conclusive argument against the interpretation in question. This is, that the exegesis proposed would make *spiritual misery* or *happiness* to begin only *after* the general judgement. Matt. 25: 31—46 represents, (as the critic in question concedes), the judgement of the *future world*. Is it then true, that *spiritual* happiness commences with the righteous only after that period; or that *spiritual* misery then first begins with the wicked? Neither the one nor the other; and consequently I cannot admit the exegesis, which, without any support at all from philology, would force me to such a conclusion.

3. But if the meaning, *spiritual*, is to be given to *αἰώνιος*, as a general one in the New Testament, then cases would arise of the most revolting nature, in regard to the application of it. For example; 1 Tim. 6: 16, [to God] be *κράτος αἰώνιον*. Shall we render, *spiritual power*?

Heb. 9: 14, who [Christ] by an *eternal Spirit*, *διὰ πνεύματος αἰώνιον*, offered up himself, etc. Shall we say, *by a spiritual Spirit*?

Philemon, v. 15, for he (Onesimus) was absent a little while, that thou mightest have him *αἰώνιον*—*spiritually*?

Rom. 16: 25, the revelation of the mystery, which was kept in silence *χρόνοις αἰώνιαις*—*in the spiritual ages*?

2 Tim. 1: 9, the grace given us . . . *πρὸ χρόνων αἰώνιων*—*before the spiritual ages*?

But I have pursued this illustration far enough. I know not how to think that the writer on whom I am animadverting, can seriously persuade himself, that he has made out a philological argument in favour of his position. If not, then why should he venture to urge such a position on his readers? when in his own conscience he must know, that grounds of reasoning *a priori* have inclined him to embrace the doctrine which rejects the *eternity* of future punishment; and not the language of the Bible. Let him shew that a day of grace, a preached gospel, an offered Mediator, a sanctifying Spirit, and pardoning mercy, are proclaimed in the Scriptures as proffered to sinners in another world, who have rejected them all in this; and then we may lend him a listening ear. Until then, we must believe that "the unjust will be unjust still; and the filthy, filthy still."

## MISCELLANEOUS DEPARTMENT.

## THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

In 1791, was published in London "An Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity and Worship of the Primitive Church, that flourished within the first three hundred years after Christ. By an Impartial Hand." This "impartial hand" is known to have been the hand of Sir Peter King, afterwards Lord Chancellor of England. His work (a truly learned and valuable one, of which we should be glad to see a new edition) is often quoted by Unitarians to prove that, in the primitive age, there was no distinction between church and parish—the whole assembly were considered as the church—and all were entitled to vote together in the choice of their religious teachers. We have recently examined the work of Chancellor King with this object specially in view, and shall now present to our readers the result of our inquiries.

Our author describes "a particular church" of the primitive age, as "a company of *believers*, who, at one time, in one and the same place, did *associate themselves together*," and concur in the participation of *all the institutions and ordinances* of Jesus Christ, with their proper pastors and ministers." p. 3. The members of the primitive churches, as will be seen from this definition, were all of them *communicants*. We celebrate the sacrament," says Cyprian, "the *whole brotherhood being present*."

The terms of admission to the communion of the ancient churches are thus described by Chancellor King :

"Those persons who designed to leave heathenism and idolatry, and desired to be members of a Christian church, were not presently advanced to that degree, but were first continued a certain space of time in the rank of the Catechumens, or the catechised ones. These were candidates of Christianity, who were to stay sometime in that order for these two reasons ; The one was, that they might be catechised and instructed in the articles of the Christian faith ; and the other was, that they might give demonstrations of the reality of their intentions, *by the change of their lives, and the holiness of their conversation*." "When they had changed their manners, and rectified their irregular carriages, then they were washed with the water of baptism, and not before ; for as Tertullian saith, 'We are not baptized that we may cease to sin, but because we have already ceased.'" pp. 100—103. "The person to be baptized was first asked several *questions*, by him that officiated, unto which he was to give his answers." † "Now these questions and answers were

\* Pliny says the Christians in his time "voluntarily bound themselves by a solemn oath, to abstain from vice, and to relinquish every sinful pursuit." Epis. Traj. Imp. Lib. x. Epis. 97.

Tertullian describes the Christian church as united "by an *agreement in discipline and a covenant of hope*." Apol. ad. Gen. cap. xxxix.

† Here was a formal *examination* previous to admission.—Justin Martyr, in his second apology, says, "They *examine* such as are admitted to their communion, whether they be able in all things to conform themselves to the word and will of God."

two-fold First, of abjuration of the devil and all his works; and secondly, of a *firm assent to the articles of the Christian faith.*" "Cyprian writes that, at baptism, they asked the baptized person's assent to this creed, 'Whether he believed in *God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, remission of sins, and eternal life through the church!*'" "For in the days of the Apostles, as well as afterwards, it was the practice at baptism, to demand the baptized person's assent to the fundamental articles of the Christian faith; among which fundamentals, we may be certain they reckoned the DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY, and that of the *unity of the Godhead*, and that of the *resurrection of the body, and life everlasting.*"

"The water being consecrated, the person was then baptized in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. So, writes Justin Martyr, 'They are baptized in the name of God the Father, Lord of all, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost.' This baptizing in the name of the Trinity, Origen terms, 'The invocation of the adorable Trinity,'" pp. 24—72, part ii. "As soon as they were baptized, they commenced members of the church universal, and of that particular church wherein they were so baptized, and became actual sharers and exerters of all the privileges and powers of the faithful." p. 103.

After this account of the manner and terms of admission to the primitive churches, given in the very language of Chancellor King, our readers will know how to estimate the appeals which are often made to him, as affording countenance to the views of Unitarians respecting the church. He does indeed say that, in ancient times, "a parish and a particular church were synonymous terms;" but he takes special pains to show that, in saying this, he does not use the word church as synonymous with *parish in the modern sense*, but the word parish as synonymous with *church, in the old, to which his assent comprehending none except the communicants.* For he mentions the case of a certain heretic whom the parish to which he belonged would not receive; that is," says King, "the particular church to which he appertained excluded him from communion." p. 17.

The work before us, so far from proving that the whole assembly, in primitive times, were considered the church, and entitled to privileges as such, proves directly the contrary.

"As for the persons *communicating*, they were not, indifferently, *all* that professed the Christian faith, as Origen writes, 'It doth not belong to every one to eat of this bread, and to drink of this cup;' but they were only such as were in the number of the faithful, such as were baptized, and received both the *ceremonials* and *practicals* of Christianity. Such as these, and none else, were permitted to communicate." "Hence, when the other parts of Divine worship were ended, and the celebration of the Eucharist was to begin, the catechumens, penitents,\* and *all, except the communicants, were to depart*, as Tertullian says here of, 'Pious imitations drive away the profane; these being mysteries which were to be kept secret and concealed from all except the faithful.'" "The catechumens, with

\* Those who had been suspended from communion, and though seemingly penitent, were not yet restored.

others, being *gone out and none remaining but the faithful*, the celebration of the Eucharist next followed." pp. 104—106, part ii.

The primitive churches, constituted as here described, are represented by our author as being to a great extent *independent* bodies, having the right of admitting, censuring and excluding members, choosing their own officers, and managing, in general, their own concerns. Indeed, except in the article of infant communion—a practice which commenced about the time of Cyprian, and which Chancellor King rests on his testimony alone, the primitive churches, as exhibited in this work, correspond in most particulars to the Congregational churches of New England, as established by our venerated ancestors.



#### VIEWS OF THE PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANS RELATIVE TO THE ATONEMENT.

The following is from an Epistle of Justin Martyr to Diognetus, contained in the works of Justin, Ed. Paris, 1636, p. 599.

“When the measure of our iniquities was filled up, and it was perfectly manifest that now the retribution, even *pain, lament and death*, was alone to be expected; the time came which God had predetermined, for the manifestation of the goodness and power so surpassingly his own; so that his *sole love* from a kindness to man exceeding all thought, [has wrought this work of grace.] He has not branded you with his hatred, nor cast you off; nor remembered your wickedness; but, in his long suffering and forbearance, he has said, ‘*He bore our sins.*’ *Himself hath given his own Son, a ransom price for us; the Holy One for the transgressors, the Innocent for the wicked, the Righteous for the unrighteous, the Immortal for the mortal. For what, but his righteousness, could cover our sins? In whom was it possible that we, transgressors and ungodly, could be justified, but in the Son of God alone? O delightful substitution! O unsearchable work! O beneficence beyond all expectation! That the iniquity of the many should be lost in the Righteous One; and the righteousness of the One should justify the many transgressors!* Thus then, in the time past, God hath demonstrated the impossibility that our nature should, [by its own powers] obtain life; and now he hath displayed the Saviour, who is able to save, contrary to all [human] possibility. In both hath he declared his will, that we should trust in his goodness; and account him our Nourisher, our Father, our Teacher, our Counsellor, our Healer, our Understanding, our Light, our Honor, our Glory, our Strength, our Life.”



#### RELIGIOUS CHARACTER OF THE HON. FISHER AMES.

Mr. Ames entertained a firm belief in Christianity; a belief founded on a thorough investigation of the subject. He perused most of the best writings in defence of the Christian religion; but found his mind satisfied by a view, rather of its internal, than external evidences. He has been heard to say, that it appeared to him impossible for any man of a fair mind to read the Old Testament, and

meditate on its contents, without a conviction of its truth and inspiration. The sublime and correct ideas which the Jewish scriptures convey of God, connected with the fact that all other nations, many of them superior to the Jews in civilization and general improvement, remained in darkness and error on this fundamental subject, was in his view a conclusive argument. After reading, on a particular occasion, the book of Deuteronomy, he expressed his astonishment, that any man versed in antiquities could have the hardihood to say, that that book was the production of human ingenuity. Marks of divinity, he said, were stamped upon it.

His views of the doctrines of religion were generally *Calvinistic*. An enemy to metaphysical and controversial divinity, he disliked the use of technical and sectarian phrases. The term *Trinity*, however, he frequently used with reverence, and in a manner, which implied his belief of the doctrine. His persuasion of the *divinity of Christ*, he often declared. This testimony of a liberal and discriminating mind in favor of a great doctrine of the Gospel, which many have disputed, is the more valuable, as it seems to have resulted from a particular investigation of the subject. Mr. Ames remarked to a friend, that he once read the Evangelists with the sole purpose of learning *what the Saviour had said of himself*.

He made a public profession of religion in the first Congregational church in Dedham. With this church he regularly communed, till precluded by indisposition from attending public worship.

His practice corresponded with his profession. His life was regular and irreproachable; more so perhaps than that of any other man equally exposed to temptation by necessary intercourse with the world. It is doubted whether any one ever heard him utter an expression calculated to excite an impious or impure idea. The most scrutinizing eye discovered in him no disguise or hypocrisy. The same uprightness, which marked his public deportment, seemed to attend him in all his private walks, and in all his secret retirements.

His views of himself, however, were humble and abased. He was often observed to shed tears, while speaking of his closet devotions and experiences. He lamented the coldness of his heart, and the wanderings of his thoughts in secret duties.

He recommended the teaching of the Assembly's Catechism; not perhaps, because he was perfectly satisfied with every expression it contained; but because, as he remarked, it was 'a good thing on the whole;' because 'it had become venerable by age;' because 'our pious ancestors taught it to their children with happy effect;' and because he was opposed to innovation—unwilling to leave an old, experienced path, for one new and uncertain.\*

On the same ground, he approved the use of Watts' Hymns,

\* On this subject, the sentiments of Mr. Ames harmonized with those of the late Governor Sumner, who, in his last sickness, expressed himself to some of his friends to the following purport: That though he had once thought favorably of modern liberality in religion, he was now *alarmed*—its effects on society were to be deprecated. He would much prefer, he said, the religion of our ancestors with all its strictness and precision (it being on the whole salutary) to the polished religion of modern times, which had little or no influence on mankind.

and version of the Psalms. 'No uninspired man,' he said, 'according to his judgement, had succeeded so well as Watts, in uniting with the sentiments of piety, the embellishments of poetry.' He strenuously opposed the proposal to introduce a new collection into the religious society to which he belonged.

He was an admirer of the common translation of the Bible. He said, it was a specimen of pure English. And though he acknowledged that a few phrases had grown obsolete, and a few passages might be obscurely translated, yet he should consider the adoption of a new translation as an incalculable evil. He lamented the prevailing disuse of the Bible in our schools. He thought it important that children should be early made acquainted with its contents. Beside its happy effects in impressing good sentiments on their susceptible minds, he considered it a principal instrument of acquainting them with their own language in its purity. 'I will hazard the assertion, that no man ever did, nor ever will become truly eloquent, without being a constant reader of the Bible, and an admirer of the purity and sublimity of its language.'

In his last sickness, when near his end, and when he had just expressed his apprehension and belief of his approaching dissolution, he exhibited perfect submission to the divine will, and the fullest assurance of divine favor. 'I have,' said he, 'peace of mind. It may arise from stupidity; but I think it is founded on a belief of the Gospel.' At the same time, he disclaimed every idea of meriting salvation. 'My hope,' said he, 'is in the mercy of God, through Jesus Christ.'

Such, (though the portrait is extremely imperfect) was FISHER AMES—an amiable man, an exemplary Christian; a distinguished orator and statesman, a blessing to his country, and an ornament to his species.

#### AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

ON the evening of May 26th, the American Unitarian Association held its fourth annual meeting in the Unitarian church in Federal Street, Dr. Bancroft (the President) in the chair. After prayer by the Rev. Dr. Ripley of Concord, the annual Report was read by the Domestic Secretary, Rev. E. S. Gannett of Boston. The President then rose, and addressed the meeting at some length. The purport of his remarks was, that though many among the Calvinists still persisted in the indulgence of a spirit of bigotry and denunciation, he believed, and felt encouraged in the belief, that the rough features of Calvinism were beginning to assume a milder aspect. He thought religious inquiries and discussions were at present conducted in a much better spirit than they were formerly. The change he attributed to the gradual prevalence of liberal principles. At the close of his address, the Report was accepted.

The following resolution was then offered by Rev. Mr. Stetson of Medford: "Resolved, that the progress of Christian truth is not to be estimated by the number of religious societies, or by any *visible* triumphs, but that its silent diffusion is sure and constant." In support of this resolution, Mr. S. spoke at great length of the silent, invisible progress of Unitarianism; observing that

often, in families where the parents are Orthodox, some of the children are Unitarian—that of a Presbyterian church in the city of Philadelphia, in regular standing with the Presbytery, a considerable proportion of the members are Unitarians\*—that the popular literature of the day all breathes a liberal spirit, and tends indirectly to promote Unitarianism—that Unitarians do not wish to estimate their triumphs by the number of their new parishes—that they deprecate the practice of breaking over parish lines—that a few years ago such lines were held sacred, and the spiritual fields of Mass. were peaceful and green; but ministers had been imported, as rulers used to be, who knew not our feelings and habits—that the spoiler had come, and with the *feelings of the arch apostate*, had looked in upon our green fields, had represented them as covered with dry bones, as Missionary ground, and had entered on the work of dividing parishes and families, and filling the land with confusion and discord. Many small parishes were nearly broken up, and new parishes had been created, which could not long support the institutions of religion, and whose houses of worship were scarcely distinguishable from common school houses.

Mr. Stetson was followed by Hon. Jonathan Phillips of Boston, who spoke at considerable length, much in the strain of some of Dr. Channing's late publications upon the divinity of human nature, insisting upon the dangers attending religious associations, and exhorting every individual to look inward, to respect himself, and to rely upon his own powers. Mr. Phillips had the merit (if it be any) of being the only speaker, whose remarks were not controversial.

The resolution offered by Mr. Stetson was now adopted, and Dr. Channing rose to address the meeting. He observed that he had no resolution to offer, but wished to make a few remarks. He thought he could trace the progress of Unitarianism in the minds and hearts of those who professed to have embraced it. Their conviction of its truth was evidently stronger, and its good influence upon their characters was more visible. "He could believe that there was piety among those who adhered to Orthodox views—that it existed in what are called revivals of religion, even in the popular phrenzies of the West; because he believed that religion was so *natural* to man, that it sprung up under almost any circumstances; but that none but liberal views could prepare the mind for a high elevation." As evidence of the progress of Unitarianism in the hearts of its professors, he referred to the spirit which they had manifested under recent provocations. Their private characters had been attacked, and various means had been resorted to, to cover them with reproach. Never perhaps had a people been so opposed, and never had a people met opposition with such exemplary moderation and forbearance. He spoke of a coalition which had been formed, a *conspiracy* which had been entered into, all over the country, to *put down Unitarianism*. But, said he, Unitarianism, whether right or wrong, must not, *shall not*, be put down in this way. Dr. C. spoke with great earnestness of the value of religious liberty, observing that if *he* had ever arrived at any enlarged and elevated conceptions of things, it had been in consequence of the free atmosphere which he had breathed.

The meeting was next addressed by Hon. William Sullivan of Boston. He bore witness to the evils of which the gentlemen who preceded him had complained. The quiet of parishes and families was invaded, and the land was filled with tumult and discord. How shall this be prevented? What is the remedy? The clergy alone cannot accomplish the work; they must be seconded and supported by the efforts of others. And persons of all classes, young and old, male and

\* Will some of our friends in Philadelphia have the goodness to inform us respecting this alleged Semi-Unitarian Presbyterian church?



female, were called on, to contribute of their influence and their property, to advance the cause of Christian truth, and stop the spreading evil.

Mr. Sullivan was followed by Hon. Mr. Saltonstall of Salem, who presented the following resolution: "Resolved, that the gross personalities and libellous insinuations to be found in religious publications of the day, are to be discountenanced, and severely reprobated, by the friends of candor and decency." He referred to several instances of the evil of which he complained in a way to be distinctly understood, and, without attempting "the refutation of a single alleged fact, seemed to make it his object to inflame the minds of his audience, and prejudice them against all inquiries into the character and proceedings of public officers." Mr. S. spoke with much warmth and bitterness, and seemed not aware that he was himself indulging in as gross personalities as any which he could pretend to condemn in others.

In the foregoing account, we may not have given (though we have aimed to do it as far as was practicable.) the precise words of the several speakers. In regard to the *sentiment*, we feel entitled to speak with a degree of confidence, as we have copied from notes taken down immediately after the meeting—have compared our notes with those of others—and have consulted respecting them with several gentlemen who were also present.

It is not a little remarkable that, among the various anniversaries attended during Election week, that of the American Unitarian Association should stand alone, as being of a highly controversial character. The exercises of all the other meetings, of which we have any knowledge, though fitted to awaken interest and excite to action, were nevertheless entirely pacific. They respected the plans and objects of the respective meetings, plans of general benevolence, with scarcely a reference or allusion to those who entertained opposite views. But the speeches before the American Unitarian Association, with but a single exception, were directly and severely controversial. They contained numerous reproaches and accusations of the Orthodox, and were fitted to excite, against a large portion of the religious community, the prejudices and passions of all with whom they had influence.

In the preceding account, the public will discover convincing evidence that Unitarianism, of late, has made no outward progress. No such progress is pretended to have been made. Nothing is said of "*visible triumphs*," though much hope is expressed as to its silent and invisible diffusion. Indeed, we consider the resolution, and much of the speech, of Mr. Stetson, in the light of an *apology* to the public, for the very limited success of recent endeavors to propagate Unitarianism.

The *inconsistencies* in the speeches above reported are numerous and manifest. Dr. Bancroft, for instance, insists, that religious inquiries and discussions are at present conducted in a much better spirit than they were formerly. But shortly after, the whole meeting resolves, "that the gross personalities and libellous insinuations to be found in religious publications of the day, are to be discountenanced and severely reprobated." Mr. Stetson congratulates himself, that Unitarianism, in its silent progress, is entering and dividing families and churches; but he makes it matter of reproach against Orthodoxy, that it is the occasion of similar divisions. He reprobates the practice of breaking over established lines, and entering into the parishes of others—a thing which Unitarians have uniformly done, whenever a favorable opportunity presented. Mr. Saltonstall reprobates personalities in controversy, while he is himself indulging in personalities, and while he had just been hearing from one who preceded him,

personalities the most gross and abusive. He had heard a distinguished individual alluded to in terms sufficiently intelligible, and charged with being actuated by "the feelings of the arch apostate."

On the subject of *personalities* in controversy, we think it needful to offer a few remarks, showing what in our judgement is, and what is not, justly offensive.—And we wish it to be distinctly understood, that we consider a needless attack upon the character of an individual—an exposure of his foibles or his faults, without any manifest important object, and for no other purpose than to give him pain—such personality we regard as wholly inadmissible. And whenever it can be shown that we have been guilty of it, we will humbly ask forgiveness of the injured party, and of the public. But we do not consider it offensive personality, to inquire into the *public conduct of public men*. The acts of individuals in high and responsible public stations ought to be scrutinized. There is no other way in which the public can be saved from imposition, or in which the confidence of the people in those who serve them can be sustained.

And so far as the general character of the prominent adherents to any particular system of faith or doctrine goes to illustrate the nature, tendency and influence of that doctrine, and its claims to be commonly received or rejected, we think it right that such character should be investigated. If discreditable it ought (for the *benefit of the public*,) to be exposed; and no offence can reasonably be taken, if it is exposed. It was right for our Saviour to expose the hypocrisy of the Scribes and Pharisees. It was right for Luther to expose the iniquitous practices of prominent individuals in the church of Rome. It was right for Pascal to expose the immoralities of the Jesuits. It was right for the defenders of Divine revelation to expose the characters of the deists in France. And when a system of religion is proposed now, and urged upon the public attention and acceptance, it is right for the public to be made acquainted with the characters, at least of its more prominent advocates. This rule of procedure, it is believed, is well understood, and the propriety of it is generally admitted. Indeed it commends itself at once to the conscience, and is a rule of which none, whose characters are truly reputable, will be likely to complain. If some leading Unitarians cannot abide the operation of such a rule, it is their own fault, and they must take the consequences. Those who apply it will not be culpable.

---

#### NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

*A Series of Lectures delivered in Park Street Church, Boston, on Sabbath Evening.* By EDWARD D. GRIFFIN, D. D. *Third Edition, Revised and Corrected.* Boston: Crocker and Brewster. New York: J. Leavitt, 1829. pp. 260.

We are glad to see a new and corrected edition of these popular Lectures. If books should be valued according to their utility, few American productions deserve to be estimated more highly than this. It has been exerting a salutary influence—has been *doing good*, from the first moment of its appearance to the present time; and its good influence, we doubt not, is destined to continue, 'for a great while to come.' The subjects discussed are of the utmost importance, and the manner in which they are discussed has proved

highly satisfactory to the generality of Evangelical Christians. To those who are acquainted with the work, it needs not our commendation; and to those who are not, a general idea of its contents may be best communicated in the words of the author, taken from his concluding lecture.

“I have selected four articles of faith, viz. total depravity, regeneration, election, and perseverance, not only because they form an indissoluble chain, but because if these truths are believed and understood, we shall not be likely to err in regard to the rest. As I passed along, I touched also upon the means of grace and the powers of man, on account of their relation to the other topics; but the great hinges of the system, and what I had principally in view, were these four. To support these, I laid, in the outset, a foundation for the whole system, by establishing on independent ground, the doctrine of total depravity. I next showed you that from this truth followed the unavoidable inference that God must change the heart, uninduced and unaided by man, and must make one to differ from another according to his sovereign pleasure; all which could not be true, if men were *not* totally depraved. I then proceeded to support this view of regeneration by plain and positive declarations of Scripture. I next showed you that from this truth inevitably followed the doctrine of absolute personal election; which could not be true if regeneration was *not* what it had been represented. I then proceeded to support this view of election by a great number of texts of the most explicit and decisive cast. I next opened the Bible and showed you that none but the elect are regenerated. This being settled, it was manifest that from election unavoidably followed the perseverance of the saints; which could not be accounted for on *any other* principle. I then proceeded to establish the doctrine of perseverance by a large array of scriptural proofs; a part of which supported the point independently, and a part showed its indissoluble connexion with the preceding article.

There still remain some arguments in confirmation of the whole system to be drawn from *the analogy of faith*, and some remarks illustrative of the practical importance of the truths established. That I may glean up what remains, I will attempt,

I. To show, from some additional considerations, that these four articles, as they have been explained, really belong to the true Gospel.

II. To prove that every system which rejects these four doctrines, is “*another gospel*.”

III. To urge the infinite importance of ascertaining, by deep and careful examination, what the true Gospel is.

The whole of this last lecture is convincing, impressive, eloquent, in the highest degree. Those who have often read it may well afford to turn to it again; and those who have never read it will find it an intellectual and spiritual treasure of which they should not remain in ignorance.

2. *An Account of Memorials presented to Congress during its last Session, by numerous Friends of their country and its Institutions, praying that the Mails may not be transported, nor Post Offices be kept open, on the Sabbath.* Boston. 1829, pp. 32.

In this interesting pamphlet, we have a compendious history of the exertions which were made, during the last session of Congress, to prevent the transportation of mails on the Sabbath. The whole number of petitions presented is stated to have been *four hundred and seventy-six*—which came from almost as many different places, in all parts of the United States. The names of these places are here given; extracts are also given from the petitions, and a selection of names from among those who subscribed them.—The whole

is arranged with care and judgement, and we rejoice to hear that the work is circulating, far and wide, throughout our country.

3. *An Address, occasioned by the Death of Nathan Smith, M. D., first Lecturer in the Medical School of Maine, at Bowdoin College, delivered by appointment of the Faculty of Medicine, March 26, 1829.* By WILLIAM ALLEN, D. D. Brunswick. pp. 31.

A valuable production—containing, in addition to a biographical sketch of the distinguished physician, on occasion of whose death it was delivered, much that will be interesting to the historian, the philanthropist, and the Christian. Feeling, as we do, the importance to this community that our physicians should be men of God, we read with deep interest the names of several eminent American physicians, as Ramsay, Ridgely, Redman, Rush, &c. &c., who lived and died in the faith and consolations of the Gospel. Our readers are acquainted with the character of Dr. Good, who, from being a Materialist, Universalist, and Socinian, became a joyful adherent to the truth as it is in Jesus. The name of Bateman may not be equally familiar to all, and the following account of him is therefore subjoined.

“You are conversant with the writings of BATEMAN. He pursued his studies at Edinburgh the year after Dr. Smith visited that city, and he died in England in 1821. For many years he held a high rank in his profession. Besides his other writings, he wrote most of the medical articles in Rees’ Cyclopaedia. He was a gentleman of great genius and taste, as well as of deep learning. But unhappily during his anatomical and physiological studies he had imbibed the doctrine of materialism, and was sceptical concerning the truth, and a stranger to the hopes of the Gospel. Amidst all his intellectual efforts and useful professional toils, he lived without God in the world, wholly negligent of public worship and of all the duties of religion. Even after a severe illness of four years’ continuance and the threatened loss of sight, he was still blind to the resplendent glories of the Gospel. But at last came the day of God’s mercy. At last he said—“All these sufferings are a just punishment for my long scepticism and neglect of religion.” Now he read the Scriptures with intense earnestness and prayed with fervor; and in the great doctrine of expiation for sin by the crucified Son of God he found the hope of forgiveness. For the remaining year of his earthly existence, he led a new and holy life, a life of enlarged and active benevolence as well as of piety, having been ‘brought out of darkness into marvellous light.’ He had loved the pursuits of literature and science, and he gathered abundantly of their honors. He had loved the world, and he drank deeply of its amusements and gratifications. But all his past pleasures were now despicable in his eyes, compared with ‘the joy and peace in believing,’ which he tasted, and “one particle of which,” he said “ten thousand worlds would not tempt him to part with.”—“The blessing of his conversion,” he often said, “was never out of his mind day or night, and it was a theme of perpetual thanksgiving.” As he went down to the grave, the strength and clearness of his intellect were unimpaired and the brightness of his hope undimmed. His animated conversation in the night preceding his death was almost wholly on the joys of heaven. His last words were—“What glory! the angels are waiting for me! Lord Jesus, receive my soul!” ” pp. 24, 25.

4. *An Appcal in behalf of Missions: Addressed to Episcopalians. A Sermon preached before the Board of Directors of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in St. James’ Church, Philadelphia, May, 12, 1829.* By ALONZO POTTER, Rector of St. Paul’s Church, Boston. Boston: R. P. & C. Williams. pp. 44.

We have seldom read a more earnest and touching appeal on the subject of missions, particularly foreign missions, than this sermon

presents. Mr. P. addresses himself directly to his brethren, and calls upon them, "as men of taste—as men of feeling—and above all, as Christian men," to arise, and give to the efforts now making to evangelize the world, "their prayers, their counsel, and their substance." In addition to the *present* sufferings of the heathen, he urges, that they have immortal souls, which are in imminent danger of perishing forever—that nothing can save them but the Gospel—that this Gospel is in our hands, and we are under indispensable obligations to dispense it. He urges the many wrongs which have been inflicted on Pagans, by the cupidity, avarice, treacheries, and debaucheries of nominal Christians. He urges, that now is the time to make reparation for these wrongs, and to discharge the spiritual debt which, with Paul, we owe 'to the Greek and the barbarian, to the wise and to the unwise.' He urges, that the Foreign Missionary enterprise, instead of enfeebling and depressing the church at home, is the most likely means of giving energy, strength and glory to the church.—In short, Mr. P. reasons and expostulates like a man in earnest, and as one resolved to awaken the same earnestness in others. His discourse, wherever circulated, cannot fail of doing good.

5. *Theology, and not Religion, the source of Division and Strife in the Christian Church.* A Sermon preached May 14, 1829, at the Ordination of Mr. John L. Sibley, as Minister of the Church in Stow. By CHARLES LOWELL, Minister of the West Church in Boston. Boston. pp. 24.

A wide distinction is attempted to be made in this Discourse betwixt *religion* and *theology*, and most of the evils which have afflicted the church are charged exclusively to the account of the latter. Accordingly Dr. L. exhorts his young friend, the pastor elect, to labor to make his people "*religious*," but not "to make them *theologians*."

"I know you will be told that you must indoctrinate your people with your own theological system, if you unfortunately have any, in self-defence.\* This language is unbecoming Christians."—p. 21.

Dr. L. is pained, as usual, at the prevalence of controversy, and almost loses the composure of his feelings, in describing the evils of which it is the occasion.

6. *A Discourse on the Proper Subjects of Christian Baptism.* By SAMUEL ARNOLD, author of two Discourses on the Mode of Baptism. Boston: Peirce & Williams. 1829. pp. 88.

This Discourse is presented to the public with high recommendations, which we think it deserves. It is plain, serious and practical; is adapted to the capacities of ordinary readers; exhibits a spirit of kindness towards brethren who entertain different views; and is, in general, well fitted for circulation among those who need instruction relative to the proper subjects of Christian Baptism.

\* What young minister was ever before told, at his ordination, that to have a theological system of his own should be regarded as a misfortune?

7. *A Discourse preached before the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company, June 1, 1829, being the 191st Anniversary.* By BERNARD WHITMAN. Cambridge: E. W. Metcalf & Co. pp. 36.

In the commencement of this Discourse, Mr. W. inquires,

“For what purpose have you assembled in this consecrated temple? Is it to hear the angry notes of theological warfare, and to have feelings of uncharitableness aroused and confirmed? I think not. Although you belong to different denominations, and are called by the names of various sects, and have embraced different speculations on some religious subjects, and consider your peculiar opinions vastly important; yet I believe you meet this day as Christian brethren.”—“I sincerely respect your feelings of harmony. And God forbid that I should intentionally utter one word to disturb your Christian union.”—“You assemble in the spirit of our holy religion, and God forbid that I should intentionally utter one word inconsistent with the pacific principles of the Gospel.”

Such are the pledges with which Mr. W. commences his discourse. We shall see in what manner he regards them.

The subject of the discourse is *national defence*—considered as “of a twofold character, *physical and moral.*” In regard to the latter, Mr. W. thinks we are chiefly “in danger of not having our best men in all public offices;” and a great part of his discourse is taken up in the consideration of things which he believes will go to prevent our best men from holding or accepting public offices.—The first of these is “the licentiousness of the press.” Under this head, notwithstanding his solemn and repeated pledges, Mr. W. utters himself in the following language:

“Even those calling themselves Christian ministers, have publicly denounced some of our most eminent and upright civil fathers; they have accused them of partiality and injustice and sacrilege in the administration of the laws; they have endeavored to excite against them a popular odium merely on account of their honest theological opinions; and for this same cause they have slandered the first literary institution of our country, and in the most wanton and inhuman manner attacked the character of some of its most distinguished officers. But this is not the worst of the case. Public journals, calling themselves religious, have exhibited repeated specimens of wilful misrepresentation and falsehood, malicious slander and defamation, and a persecuting, savage disposition.” p. 15.

This language, if we do not mistake the intended application of it, is as devoid of truth and pertinency, as it is of decency. Are not the public acts of public men to be examined, except by Unitarians? If individuals sincerely believe that some of our public men have erred, or have been mistaken in any of their public acts, shall they not be allowed to state their reasons for so believing? Or if, in the opinion of some, the legacies of the pious dead have been perverted, shall they be denied the privilege of placing before the public, who are concerned in these things, their honest convictions? Mr. W. would not have a licensed press, and yet, if any, except his own party, express their views of public measures, or call in question the decisions of public men, especially if these men are Unitarians, then must they be denounced as “*exhibiting specimens of wilful misrepresentation and falsehood, malicious slander and defamation, and a persecuting, SAVAGE DISPOSITION.*” And the militia in arms must be called upon to “provide some remedy against the threatening danger.”

Another thing, tending to prevent "our having our best men in all public offices," is the "attempts to unite civil and religious affairs."

Under this head Mr. W. says, that "*many* individuals in certain sects are making the attempt to *unite church and state*, and that we have the evidence of this in their own writings."—On what authority, we have a right to demand, is this slanderous accusation here preferred? Let Mr. W. name the "*many* individuals" who are making this attempt. Let him refer us to the page and paragraph in their writings which contain the evidence of which he speaks, or else let him bear the application of his own words, and stand before the public convicted of "*malicious slander and defamation, of wilful misrepresentation and falsehood, of a persecuting and savage disposition.*"

In this connexion Mr. W. says, "The religious partisans of the present day possess very little of the spirit of their heavenly Master." But is it possible that he should be so ignorant of his own character, or of the estimation in which he is held by the public, as not to consider himself a religious partisan? Can he, on almost every occasion, not excepting Funerals, Thanksgivings, Mechanics' Institutes, and Artillery Election, exhibit a bitter party spirit, and still believe that he is no partisan? Or does he mean to concede in this place that he has himself but "very little of the spirit of his heavenly Master?"

In the beginning of the discourse, Mr. W. compliments the company before him, as being the "descendants of the *puritans*, who wished to live on terms of amity and friendship with every tribe and nation. You, gentlemen, are their representatives, and I presume you partake of their spirit and character. I believe you are actuated by the same *high and holy motives.*" But speaking of these same puritans on another page, he says, "They came to this country for the express purpose of enjoying religious liberty; but no sooner had they secured the power, than they *condemned, persecuted, and even murdered* those who differed from their human creeds."—Thus does our author despatch business, in his usual way. He first commends the Ancient and Honorable, as the "descendants of the puritans," and as being "actuated by the same high and holy motives" with them; and then, in a few pages, when he wishes to reproach those who profess the same religion as the puritans, he describes them as a band of persecutors and murderers!!

Mr. W. is very warm in his defence of religious liberty.

"I do wish the public mind could be aroused on this subject; for there is no question more important to our national welfare; and there is no cause in which I would so soon gird on the weapons of war, as in defence of religious liberty. Should the pious Jew erect his synagogue on one side of my door, he should worship the God of his fathers in peace. And should the devout Mussulman build his mosque on the other, he should be protected in his conscientious worship." p. 22.

The reader will notice the sentiment here expressed. "The *pious Jew*"—who rejects Christ of course, as do all who adhere to the Jewish religion; and "the *devout Mussulman*"—who believes

Mahomet to have been a greater prophet than our Saviour. But he is right in defending their religious freedom. Jew or Turk, they should enjoy unmolested their liberty of conscience. He proceeds, however, to say,

“Should an arm be raised to compel either of them [the Jew or the Mussulman] to offer his devotions in my church, or to deprive either of them of any office of honor or trust or profit, merely on account of his honest religious views, I would strike that arm to the ground, even though it were the arm of my dearest friend, and even though I should lose my life in the undertaking.”  
p. 22.

Very well. This is much to the purpose. But what if some of Mr. W.'s friends should *compel* these pious Jews, or these devout Mussulmen, to *pay for a seat in his house of worship for his support*? What then? Would Mr. W. buckle on the armor, and go out for their defence? Would he publish the story of their grievances, and call upon the Ancient and Honorable to come to their aid?

In the page preceding the one last quoted, Mr. W. demands,

“Is there a man in our country, one who deserves the name of a man, who would wish to be excluded from civil offices on account of his religious opinions?—who would wish to be deprived of the means of an honest subsistence, because he served God according to the dictate of his conscience?” p. 21.

This, too, is well said, and we hope it will be well remembered. ‘No one is to be compelled to worship in any particular church, nor would any one, who deserves the name of a man, wish to be deprived of the means of an honest subsistence, because he serves God according to the dictates of his conscience.’ With this distinct and correct avowal, the public will compare the following simple statement of facts. It is, then, “a living truth,” (to use one of our author’s favorite phrases,) that several hundreds of laboring people are obliged to pay for Mr. Whitman’s support as a minister, or be deprived of their places as laborers. All who are employed in the Boston Manufacturing Co.’s service at Waltham are the subjects of this compulsion, though many of them (not pious Jews nor devout Mussulmen, to be sure,) do conscientiously worship in another house. And though they have respectfully remonstrated against this oppression, and petitioned that they might be allowed their Christian liberty, they have been refused, and told by the agent of said company, that “they had a perfect right to worship elsewhere, *but not on that account to be exempted from the tax.*” And for almost four years, this same Mr. W. has been receiving no inconsiderable part of his salary from those, who, though they conscientiously worship, and liberally pay for their own worship, in another house, *must yet pay for a seat in his house, or be deprived of their places.* And, as if to add insult to injury, they are told by some Unitarians, ‘There is no oppression in this—no abridgement of liberty—nothing *illiberal or uncharitable*, for any one is at liberty, at any time, to leave that service, whenever he finds it for his interest or convenience so to do.’—Mr. W. says in the sermon before us, and says the truth,

“Should any one sect ever succeed in establishing a national religion, then farewell to our social and domestic enjoyment, farewell to our freedom and independence, and farewell to Christian morality.”



And yet his own church is precisely on the basis of a national establishment! Let the principles which compel a man to give his money for worship which he cannot attend, or leave his place by which he gains an honest subsistence, be extended to the community at large, and you may as well say, There is no abridgement of liberty in making religious sentiments a test of office, or of employment of any kind. You need not enter into this or that service; you need not accept of office unless you please; or if you are in office, you may retire at any time when you find it for your interest or convenience so to do. It is time for the public to look at this, and consider whether the first link is not already forged in what Mr. W. calls "the chain of spiritual slavery." And where has this dreaded link been forged? Where, but in his own diocese, and under the droppings of his own sanctuary!

We sincerely rejoice that Mr. W. has preached and published this sermon. For, notwithstanding its bitter spirit and its self-contradictions, it contains some things that ought to be noticed and remembered by a certain portion of this community. We rejoice in particular that he was led to give utterance to the sentence we have already quoted—a sentence which we wish might be inscribed in capitals upon the pulpit of his church, upon the gate-posts of the factory in Waltham, upon the front door of the agent, and of every member of the Boston Manufacturing Company, NOW IS THERE A MAN IN OUR COUNTRY, ONE WHO DESERVES THE NAME OF A MAN, WHO WOULD WISH TO BE EXCLUDED FROM CIVIL OFFICE ON ACCOUNT OF HIS RELIGIOUS OPINIONS? WHO WOULD WISH TO BE DEPRIVED OF THE MEANS OF AN HONEST SUBSISTENCE BECAUSE HE SERVED GOD ACCORDING TO THE DICTATES OF HIS CONSCIENCE?

It is indeed language which courtesy would scarcely have allowed us to use in relation to men, many of whom we respect and honor. But as Mr. W. has himself used it, we trust we may be excused for applying it.

"Want of Christian morality," says Mr. W. "may be another means of preventing our having our best men in all public offices." Under this head, he notices the maxim, '*All is fair* which will enable men to secure their own ends.' And this, he tells us, is applied, not only to politics, and trade, but to religion.

"Religious partisans are practising on the same abominable principle. The undisguised language of their conduct is this: All is fair in religion; the end sanctifies the means; increase your party at the expense of truth, and social and domestic peace, and Gospel order, and the most important Christian graces."

For aught we know, this may be true, as Mr. W., a violent religious partisan, may have evidence of the truth of his assertions, of which we know nothing. But he adds,

"And it is a living truth, that measures have been adopted in this Commonwealth for swelling the numbers of a sect which would disgrace a political faction," (or as he preached it) "a gambling club."

Now as Mr. W. cannot be supposed to apply this to himself, or to any of *his* party, (and certainly we would not,) we ask, who does he mean? He has here brought high charges against somebody. Even the Christian Register apologises for his severity, on the ground

that "he was opposing *principles, not men.*" But why do the conductors of the Register thus endeavor to deceive their readers, for the purpose of screening and sparing an individual? Is it *principles* that are acting on this abominable principle? Is it *principles* that are using such disgraceful measures to increase a sect! Mr. W. affirms that many *men* are attempting to unite church and state. And here again, he accuses a body of *men*, a religious denomination, of conduct "which would disgrace a political faction," or a club of gamblers. We repeat the question, *Who does Mr. W. mean?* Did he not intend that his audience and readers should understand him to mean somebody? Did he not know, and did he not intend, that this charge should fasten upon a particular denomination of Christians, and just so far as he was believed, excite against them a prejudice and odium? Why then, with all his blustering, had he not courage enough, and with all his professions, ingenuousness enough, to name the individuals or body of men who are so exceedingly base, and who are pursuing measures so disgraceful?

Mr. W. says to his audience, in the commencement of his discourse, that they have not "assembled to have feelings of uncharitableness aroused and confirmed," and solemnly calls upon God to prevent his uttering a word which should disturb the Christian union of a venerable company, composed of different denominations; but with his usual consistency, before he closes, he accuses one of these denominations of acting from the basest motives, and practising the most wicked and shameful conduct, such as "would disgrace any political faction, or a gambling club!" And lest some present might possibly think him a party man, or somewhat uncharitable, he declares, after all, that "he has not spoken in the spirit of party," but "in accordance with the spirit and teachings of the Gospel!"

This sermon is written in the usual style and manner of Mr. Whitman. The language is plain, the appeals direct, the assertions bold and reckless, the spirit exasperated and violent, the topics commonplace, and the contradictions glaring. Almost the worst wish we could utter, for him or his party, would be, that he might continue his career as an author for years to come, in the same manner, and with the same degree of applause from Unitarians, that he has done for several years past.

---

#### NOTICE.

We would apologize to our readers for the length and *seeming* abstruseness of the leading article in this number, were it not that an *apology* seems to us improper. We rather think that we ought to *congratulate* our readers, on being able to present them with a communication of so much value. We hope every one, whether acquainted with the learned languages or not, will give it an attentive perusal. The discussion is seasonable as well as important; it goes to the bottom of a most solemn and interesting subject; and few will find any part of it unintelligible.—Our succeeding numbers in general, may be expected to contain a greater variety.

## SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS

VOL. II.

SEPTEMBER, 1829.

NO. 9.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

LETTERS ON THE INTRODUCTION AND PROGRESS OF UNITARIANISM  
IN NEW-ENGLAND. NO. V.

DEAR SIR,

It was intimated, you will recollect, in my last, that the manner in which Unitarianism gained the ascendancy in Harvard College would be considered in another communication. To this branch of the general subject, allow me now to call your attention.

Harvard College, you know, was instituted with special reference to the exigencies of the church, and for the maintenance and promotion of true religion. Accordingly, "the first law in the College code respecting the students, enacted by the Overseers in 1642, was, that 'Every one shall consider it the *main end* of his life and studies, to know God and Jesus Christ, which is eternal life.'" For many years after its establishment, the Institution continued to fulfil the object and the wishes of its pious founders. During the first half century, nearly all the ministers who were settled in New-England received their education at Harvard College. And until within the last thirty or forty years, by far the greater part of the clergy of Massachusetts were graduates of the same institution. The College, at different periods of our history, partook deeply of the religious character of the times; or perhaps I might better say, it *gave* a character to the times. Those who were first educated, in the days of the original settlers, and under the enlightened and fervent ministry of Mr. Shepherd, were in general pious and devoted men.\* A season of declension afterwards followed, in the College, as well as throughout the country. It should be said, however, of Dr. Increase Mather, the sixth President of the College, and perhaps the most distinguished of all its Presidents, that he strenuously opposed the introduction of the half-way cove-

\* It was from a regard, says Mather, to "the enlightening and powerful ministry of Mr. Shepherd, that, when the foundation of a College was to be laid, Cambridge, rather than any other place, was pitched upon to be the seat of that happy seminary." Book iii. p. 87.

nant, and the views of Mr. Stoddard relative to the terms of Christian communion.

When Mr. Whitefield visited the College in 1740, he found it in what he considered a state of lamentable declension. "Tutors" says he, "neglected to pray with and examine the hearts of their pupils. Discipline was at a low ebb. Bad books had become fashionable amongst the students." The forms of religion were maintained, but its power was not felt. It should be added, that Cambridge profited less from the revival under Whitefield, than most other places in the vicinity of Boston. Still, however, there was no avowed and open defection from the faith of the New England churches, till many years subsequent to the time of Whitefield.

Dr. Langdon, who was elected President in 1774, and resigned in 1780, was a decided Calvinist, as appears from his "Summary of Christian Faith and Practice," published in 1768. The younger Wigglesworth was at this time Professor of Divinity, who, though less explicit on some points than his father, was certainly a Trinitarian and a Calvinist. Dr. Willard\* succeeded to Dr. Langdon; was inaugurated Dec. 19, 1781; and continued in the Presidency till his death in 1801. He was a literary man, and was thought by many to be an Arminian. He did not insist on some theological points so fully as most of his predecessors; still, if he used words and phrases in their customary acceptation, he is to be regarded as a man of Evangelical principles. In his farewell sermon to his people at Beverly, he exhorts them to choose a successor, "who will preach Jesus Christ, and him crucified, as the *great foundation of their hopes.*" In his sermon at the ordination of Mr. M'Keen, his successor at Beverly,† he speaks of Christ as having "*assumed our nature,*" and "*offered himself a sacrifice and atonement for a guilty world.*" He calls the church "*the flock of Christ, which he hath purchased with his own blood,*" and directs his hearers to pray for "*pardoning mercy through the merits of our blessed Redeemer.*" In his sermon at the funeral of Rev. Mr. Hilliard, of Cambridge, he says, The good minister "*will direct the views of his hearers to Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation for the sins of a guilty world, that he might be the great foundation of men's hopes.*" President Willard knew very well the sense in which this phraseology was customarily used, and all who do not wish to charge him with intentional deception will agree with us in the belief, that, though less explicit on some points than might be desirable, he was, on the whole, a man of moderate Evangelical principles—very different, certainly, from the Unitarians of the present day.

\* Great grandson of the first President Willard, who published Lectures on the Assembly's Catechism.

† Afterwards President of Bowdoin College.

The late Dr. Tappan was constituted Professor of Divinity at Cambridge in 1792, and continued in the office till his death, in 1803. He was an amiable and excellent man, whose name is still revered, and whose memory is precious. His influence was great, while connected with the College, in arresting the progress of infidelity and corruption, which then threatened to overspread the land. His religious principles were decidedly of the Orthodox or Evangelical stamp. "It is well known," says his biographer, "that his views of the most important subjects, such as Christ's character and atonement, God's eternal scheme and all-directing providence, depravity and regeneration, the distinguishing nature of religion, and future retribution, were conformed to the views which the founders of the College and the fathers of New England entertained. They were such as are exhibited in the renowned Assembly's Catechism, which, for the sake of distinction, has been generally called the Orthodox or Calvinistic scheme." This representation of the religious sentiments of Dr. Tappan is abundantly confirmed, by quotations from his published works. See Panoplist vol. i. pp. 185—192.

Of the religious character of President Webber, who succeeded President Willard in 1806,\* I am not particularly informed. He was chiefly distinguished as a mathematician, and probably exerted but little direct influence in forming the religious character of the College. Professor Ware, in the eulogy pronounced on occasion of his death, in 1810, speaking of his religious character, says, "His views of doctrines were *liberal and enlightened.*" I infer from this, that Dr. Ware considered him a Unitarian; and probably he was one. At any rate, he exerted no influence to check the progress of Unitarianism, which was insidiously spreading all around him, during the period of his administration.

After the death of Dr. Tappan, the Professorship of Divinity was vacant for more than a year. The Corporation were divided, and for a time equally divided, so that nothing could be done. At length, a change was known to have taken place, so that a majority could be obtained for the present incumbent;† and in Nov. 1804, the Corporation were called on in the public papers to act, and not to wait for greater unanimity. A warm newspaper discussion now commenced, and was continued, chiefly on one side of the question, till after the election was made and confirmed. In opposition to the election of Dr. Ware, it was urged that he was understood to be a *Unitarian*. But his friends replied, that he had never professed the sentiment imputed to him, and that to mention such a thing was "a *calumny.*" Indeed, the pretence

\* The Hon. Fisher Ames was appointed to succeed President Willard, but declined.

† Two of the Corporation died in 1804, viz. Dr. Howard and President Willard; and in place of Dr. Howard, Dr. Elliot of Boston was elected. After his election, the Corporation consisted of Hon. Oliver Wendell, Hon. John Davis, Rev. Doctors Lathrop, Elliot and Pearson, and Ebenezer Storer, Esq., Treasurer.

that his religious principles were unsound, was ridiculed, as one not entitled to serious consideration. "It is well known," it was said, "that an alarm has been raised: 'Beware, he is an Arminian! he is an Arian!'"

"'Fœnum habet in cornu—longe fuge.'"

One of the principal writers in favor of Dr. Ware professed to be "solicitous to establish the opinions of our forefathers about *essential doctrines*," but urged the liberality of the Hollises as a reason for not being strenuous, and cautioned his opposers against imputing to him "unpopular or erroneous sentiments." It was urged by some, that the creed of the proposed Professor was of no consequence; that he need not inculcate, or so much as avow, his particular sentiments; that his business was to open and explain Divine subjects, and leave his pupils to form their own opinions.\*

In this controversy, the press was quite at the service of the friends of Dr. Ware, and it was with great difficulty that those of a different opinion could procure the insertion of their communications. One writer in particular, calling himself Calvinus, sent an article to the office of the Centinel, where it was detained for some considerable time, then promised an insertion, and then refused. It was afterwards published in the Palladium, though attempts were made to dissuade the conductors of that paper from inserting it. (See Palladium for Dec. 18, 1804.)

The grand objection to the election of Dr. Ware, or rather to the confirmation of his election by the Board of Overseers, was, that the Board had no evidence of his possessing the qualifications required by the founder of the Professorship. Mr. Hollis, the founder, had required *expressly* "that the man chosen, from time to time, to be a Professor" on his foundation, should be "of sound or *ORTHODOX principles*;" and the Corporation of the College had solemnly pledged themselves and their successors, by a written bond, that the orders of Mr. Hollis, in respect to this, should be fulfilled. But the Overseers had no evidence that Dr. Ware was a man "of sound or Orthodox principles," according to the intent of Mr. Hollis; nor could they obtain any satisfaction on this point. "The right to examine him was denied" them. His "particular religious principles, though often asked for, *were not disclosed*." "It was particularly asked, whether he was a believer in that important doctrine, the *Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ*;" but "the reply conveyed no precise or satisfactory answer on that point."† Indeed, so far were the opposers of Dr. Ware's election from being convinced that he was "of sound or Orthodox principles," according to the intent of Mr. Hollis, they had the

\* See Columbian Centinel, from Nov. 1804, to March, 1805; also the Anthology for Feb. 1805.

† See Morse's True Reasons. &c. p. 19.

utmost reason to believe, from his silence, and from a variety of collateral evidence, that this was not the case. It was insisted, therefore, that whatever they might think of him as a man, and whatever judgement they might, as individuals, form in regard to his principles, they were bound by the orders of Mr. Hollis, and by the solemn pledges which had been given him, and could not vote to confirm the election.

Those who opposed the election of Dr. Ware, were at that time the subjects of much severe reproach. They were attacked in some of the publications of the day, without decency or mercy; and the most of them have gone down, unforgiven, to the grave. But posterity, certainly, will do them justice. Future generations will appreciate their motives, and honor their correctness of principle, their decision and firmness.

For, in the first place, whatever meaning we attach to the requisition of Hollis, Dr. Ware had no right to the Professorship, until he had been examined, and ascertained to be in the belief of the principles prescribed. If by "sound and Orthodox," Hollis meant Unitarian, Dr. Ware was not certainly known to be a Unitarian, and his friends denied that this was his sentiment. Or if, by "sound and Orthodox," Hollis meant Universalist, Dr. Ware was not certainly known to be a Universalist. "The right to examine him was denied." His "particular religious principles, though often asked for, *were not disclosed.*" Consequently, whatever meaning the Overseers might attach to the words of Hollis, they could not know that the candidate was of the prescribed belief, and therefore could not with propriety vote to confirm his election.

But, secondly, those who opposed the election of Dr. Ware had no doubt, and could have none, as to what meaning they were bound to put upon the words of Hollis. These words, they knew, had a *definite* theological meaning in the time of Hollis, as they now have, and this meaning they felt themselves bound, as honest men, to regard.—Or if they receded from this ground, and consented to interpret the words of Hollis by his own principles, they were brought to the same result: For Hollis, they knew, was Orthodox in the *technical sense*; i. e. he was a decided *Trinitarian and Calvinist*. They had heard him (by his letters) express his full approbation of the works of Calvin. "I imagine they will please you (Dr. Coleman) **AS THEY DO ME.**" They had heard him lament his "corrupt nature," and ascribe his salvation to the "rich, free and *sovereign electing love*" of God. They had heard him say, "My rejoicing is in Jesus Christ, *my God and Saviour*. My hope is to be accepted in the beloved, and to be acquitted and justified before God the Father, *only on account of the obedience, active and passive, of the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world.* He is the *propitiation* for our sins, and through faith in him I hope for peace with God, the continued influences of his

Spirit, and complete redemption. Glory be to God in the highest, while we *adore the economy of the DIVINE THREE* in the revealed works of our salvation. Amen.\* And lest it should be said (as it has been) that he afterwards changed his principles; in a Poem pronounced on occasion of *his death*, they had heard his zeal for the Calvinistic doctrine very highly extolled.

“Rather proclaim for ancient truths his zeal;  
 For truths there were Hollis would boldly own,  
 Loose as the age, and desperate, is grown.  
 Such did *imputed righteousness* appear,  
 Title to heaven, and ground of pardon here;  
 Such, Christ, the honors of thy rev’rend name;  
 Such, glorious Spirit, thy celestial flame;  
 Such the grand mystery of the *ETERNAL THREE*,  
 Persons if meant—but ONE, if Deity.  
 On these, he *frankly did his thoughts disclose*;  
 For these, his *int’rest frequent interpose*.”†

To these lines, the following Note was appended by the Poet: “I have been informed that Mr. Hollis entertained a very honorable esteem for the doctrines of the *ever blessed Trinity*, the *imputed righteousness of Christ*, &c., and that his openly avowing these principles was a check upon some, who appeared to have no great opinion of them.”

A respected member of the Board of Overseers requested leave to present, for the consideration of the Board, the evidence that Hollis was a Calvinist; but *he was refused*—a majority fearing probably (for I can account for their refusal in no other way) that the light might derange their intended proceedings, and therefore choosing to move in the dark.

Knowing therefore, as the opposers of the election of Dr. Ware certainly did, the religious principles of Mr. Hollis, they could not doubt as to the sense in which he used the words “sound or Orthodox.” He used them, beyond all dispute, in the proper sense—the technical sense—the sense in which he was himself Orthodox—the sense in which every person of similar sentiments, whether in old England or New, would have used them, who expected or wished to be understood.—Besides, Mr. Hollis left a practical comment on the phraseology of his orders, in the first Professor Wigglesworth, who was examined and chosen under his inspection, and with his entire and avowed approbation.

With all this evidence before them as to the meaning of Mr. Hollis’s orders—with the solemn promise staring them in the face that these orders should be fulfilled—without any evidence, or the means of obtaining any, that Dr. Ware was such an one as these orders required—but in the possession of abundant evidence that

\* *Morse’s True Reasons*, p. 3.

† Extract from a Poem on the death of Thomas Hollis Esq., by Sayer Rudd, London, 1731. p. 23.



this was not the case; how could those who opposed his election have done differently from they did? Manifestly they acted from principle, and they acted right; and the time has already come, when their once injured names, are revered and honored for the stand which they then took, and the firmness which they exhibited.

Of Dr. Ware himself, I have no disposition to speak reproachfully. His situation is, of all men's, least to be envied. He is approaching that period when the countenance and the caresses of interested and partial friends will avail him nothing. He may possess many estimable social qualities, and I doubt not he does; but on the question of his accepting and holding the Hollis Professorship of Divinity in Harvard College, the impartial of all denominations have formed their judgement, and it will not be reversed. He knew the conditions of this Professorship; he knew the solemn pledges which had been given in respect to it; he knew also his own religious sentiments, though he took care that others should not know them; yet, he accepted the appointment, promised that he would "religiously observe the statutes of his founder," and for almost twenty-five years has been receiving his bread from a Professorship, which was founded by a strictly Orthodox man, and was consecrated and pledged for the support of such a man, in all future time.

Nor is even this, perhaps, the worst of the case. In 1747, Daniel Henchman, Esq. of Boston left a legacy to aid in the support of the Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard College—on the *express* condition that "the person in that office," "shall *profess and teach* the principles of the Christian religion, *according to the well known Confession of Faith drawn up by the synod of the churches in New England.*" This legacy was accepted, on the annexed condition, and added to the endowment of Mr. Hollis. But the present Hollis Professor neither professes nor teaches the principles of the Christian religion, according to the New England Confession of Faith. He professes and teaches entirely different principles. Yet the Henchman legacy is retained, and during his whole term of office, Dr. Ware has consented to receive the avails of it.

For this perversion, I know not that an excuse has ever been attempted. To justify their appropriation of Mr. Hollis's donations, Unitarians have alleged, that in requiring his Professor to be "of sound or Orthodox principles," Mr. Hollis did not bind him to embrace the sentiments which he himself approved—or to embrace any particular system of doctrine; but merely to be Orthodox in his own opinion—to prefer his own principles—to be fully persuaded in his own mind. But this obviously is mere trifling—wicked trifling. It is to impute to Mr. Hollis the folly (after consulting, as he tells us he did, with "some of the most learned divines who had been

educated at the first Universities in Europe")—the folly of affecting to say something, when in reality he said nothing. For who is not, in this strange, unheard-of sense of the term, Orthodox? Who does not not prefer his own religious sentiments? Who would not say that he thought his own principles correct; at least if by so saying, he could secure a lucrative and honorable appointment? The Catholic prefers his own opinions; and so does the Universalist; and so does the Mahometan; and so does the Infidel; and so does every body else; and hence, according to the interpretation here given, no person is disqualified, or ever can be, in point of religious sentiment, to be the Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard College. But really such a perversion of language is too gross to be seriously refuted or examined. The resort to it only shows the straits to which persons are sometimes driven, and in which they force their consciences to acquiesce, in order to secure a favorite object.\*

I have dwelt at length on the circumstances of Dr. Ware's appointment, as this was in fact the triumph of Unitarianism in Harvard College. Unitarian hooks had been previously circulated, and the minds of many had been deeply poisoned. But now the evil assumed character and prominence, and took possession of a seat from which, of all others, it could be propagated with the greatest facility. During the Presidency of Dr. Webber, the religious concerns of the College were almost entirely under the direction of Dr. Ware; and the opportunity was improved to create and extend an influence in favor of "the new doctrine." Unitarian sentiments were strongly inculcated; Unitarian ministers and lawyers were raised up and sent forth; Unitarian Professors and tutors were appointed; and a system of measures was put in operation to advance the cause of Unitarianism, make it popular, and give it currency and favor. Still, however, the name was not

\* The instance here considered is not the only one in which the funds of Harvard College have been appropriated to objects the most remote from the intentions of the pious donors. In 1657, Hon. Edward Hopkins, previously Governor of Connecticut, died in England, and, among other instances of his great liberality, ordered that "£500 be made over into New-England, for the upholding and promoting the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ in those parts of the earth." This sum afterwards fell to the Corporation of Harvard College, and the avails of the fund created by it, to the amount of 700 dollars a year, are now appropriated to the support of *Unitarian students in the Cambridge Theological School*. Gov. Hopkins came to this country in company with Mr. Davenport, in 1637—was a *strict Puritan and Calvinist*—a parishioner and admirer of the excellent Mr. Hooker. He considered Unitarianism as not only different from, but *opposed to*, "the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ," and would sooner have sunk his money in the ocean, than have given it for the education of Unitarian ministers.

Further; at the time when Mr. Hollis founded the Professorship of Divinity at Cambridge, he made provision for an annual bounty of £100, to be distributed equally among ten "*pious*" young students, devoted to the work of the ministry." No one acquainted with the principles of Hollis can doubt as to the sense in which he must have used the qualifying word "*pious*." He certainly used it in the Calvinistic sense, as denoting those who believed the *doctrines of grace*, and had been hopefully *renewed by the special operations of the Holy Spirit*. It was for the education of such young men that Hollis gave his money; and to apply it, as it is now applied, for the education of Unitarian ministers, is a gross and wicked perversion of it.

avowed, and the existence of the thing, at times, was scarcely admitted.

President Webber died suddenly, July 17, 1810; and on the fourteenth of November of the same year, President Kirkland was inaugurated. He commenced his administration by attending a ball on the same evening, "given by the students." See *Anthology* for Nov. 1810. Dr. Kirkland had, at this time, made no open profession of Unitarian sentiments; and I have good authority for saying that he owed his elevation to the concealment which he had practised. In a letter from the Rev. Francis Parkman, one of the Unitarian ministers of Boston, to a friend in England, dated Feb. 20, 1812, I find the following candid and explicit avowal:

"You say that Dr. Kirkland is a professed Unitarian, and mention him, as if his election to the Presidency of Cambridge University, were a decisive proof of the prevalence of your sentiments among us. Dr. K. was formerly one of the ministers of Boston, and whatever his particular friends may think of his opinions, he never preached these sentiments. Nay, I may venture to say, that had Dr. Kirkland been an *acknowledged defender of Unitarianism*, he would not have been elected to that place. Unitarianism is too unpopular in the country, and his friends, who are at the same time the friends and governors of the University, with all the respect they most justly entertain for his exalted talents and character, and particularly for his candid and liberal mind, would, I believe, have deemed it necessary to sacrifice their private wishes, and consulted the interests of the University in electing a President, whose sentiments were more agreeable to the great body of the Massachusetts clergy, of which, *ex-officio*, he is generally considered the head, and to the sentiments of the community at large. Had a decided Unitarian been elected, I really believe that the number of the students would have been diminished."

To this statement of the grounds on which President Kirkland came into office, I need add nothing. His elevation was clearly an imposition on the public; for as Mr. Parkman well observes, "Had Dr. Kirkland been," at that time, "an *acknowledged defender of Unitarianism*, he would not have been elected to that place."

Of the measures taken to promote Unitarianism in College, during the Presidency of Dr. Kirkland, suffice it to say, that *all possible means were used*.—Periodicals were established; books in great numbers and variety were patronised and published; very large sums of money were, in some way, expended; Unitarian officers were appointed; and the work of innovation was carried on, until the whole concern was revolutionized. The late Dr. McKean, who succeeded Hon. John Quincy Adams as Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory, and received his appointment in 1809, was the last Professor, and I believe the last College officer of any kind, who made pretensions to Orthodoxy. He continued in office till his death, in 1818; though his situation is said to have been rendered unpleasant, at times, on account of his religious sentiments and character.

A Society for Theological Education in Cambridge University was formed in 1816; from which originated, shortly after, the Theological School. This school consists of three classes, each containing, perhaps, on an average, about seven or eight students;—a very small number, it may be thought, but sufficient, I believe, to meet the calls for Unitarian preaching—at least, such calls as the students think it an object to regard.

In introducing and spreading Unitarianism in this region, the community and College have exerted a mutual, reciprocal influence. Both became infected about at the same time, and each has contributed to sustain and assist the other in giving currency to the flattering error. Almost the earliest Unitarians in the country—a full quarter of a century before the name was acknowledged here—became connected with the Corporation of Harvard College. Doctors Lathrop and Howard of Boston were members of the Corporation, from the time of the adoption of the Constitution of Massachusetts, till their death. Judge Lowell became a member in 1784, Gov. Bowdoin (for the second time) in 1793, Judge Davis in 1804, Dr. Elliot in 1806, Judge Parsons in 1807, Hon. John Lowell in 1810. With gentlemen such as these, originated all the College appointments; and, under their influence, appointments would, of course, be made, so as to encourage and advance their particular views.

For the purpose of promoting and perpetuating Unitarianism in Harvard College, repeated alterations have been attempted in the constitution of the Board of Overseers. This Board consisted originally of the Governor, Lieut. Governor, Counsellors and Senators of the Commonwealth, with the ministers of the Congregational churches in Cambridge, Watertown, Charlestown, Boston, Roxbury and Dorchester. But as a body constituted after this manner was liable to continual changes, and Unitarians might not long constitute a majority, an alteration was, in due time, proposed and effected. “An act passed in 1810, prepared by the late Chief Justice Parsons, which he declared to a member of the legislature he had held in readiness for more than two years, waiting for a safe opportunity to bring it forward, according to which” the Board was to consist of the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and an elective body of fifteen clergymen, and fifteen laymen, with power to fill their own vacancies. By this law, Unitarianism was virtually enthroned at Cambridge, and the way prepared for its perpetual dominion. It was soon found, however, that what the legislature could do, the legislature could undo; as, in 1812, the new order of things was totally abolished, and the government of the College restored to its former standing. Only two years after, the law of 1810, with some alterations, was revived. “According to this last enactment, which is still in force, the Board of Overseers

consists of the Governor, Lieut. Governor, the Council, Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and an elective body of thirty persons, having power to fill their own vacancies.\*

The circumstances under which this act was introduced, were very extraordinary. The Rev. Dr. Griffin had been for some time pastor of a Congregational church in Boston, and as such, by the express language of the constitution, a member of the Board of Overseers of Harvard College. No notice, however, was taken of him, nor was he apprised of the time or place of any meetings. At length, he went unasked, and claimed his seat as a member of the Board. His claim was disputed, and the subject referred to a committee, a majority of whom reported in favor of Dr. Griffin. Still, his right was not allowed him; an adjournment was called for to save time; and, in the interval, the law of which we are speaking was whipped through the legislature, obviously for the purpose of excluding Dr. Griffin, and preventing others of similar sentiments from ever more obtaining seats, in the old established way, as Overseers of Harvard College. I am sorry to add, that Hon. Mr. Quincy, now President of Harvard College, was a leading instrument in this crooked business.

The existing act, although less odious, on account of the alterations, than that of 1810, is equally sectarian in its character and tendency, and equally an infringement of constitutional rights. There was an attempt made in the Convention of 1820 to incorporate this act with the Constitution of the State, and thus put it out of the power of any future legislature to repeal or alter it. But this attempt entirely failed. The article on the subject, prepared and sent out by the Convention, was, by a great majority, rejected.\*

The effect of the introduction of Unitarianism into Harvard College has been to change, throughout, the character and the intended results of the institution. It was originally devoted to Christ and the church; but instead of affording aid to the *church of Christ*, as this phraseology was understood by its founders, it has been, for several years, a principal engine of opposing and oppressing the church. It was originally intended to furnish to the people of New-England a succession of pious and devoted ministers, and in other ways to sustain the religious interests of the country; but for these many years, not one in ten of the ministers of New-England, and probably not a quarter of the ministers of Massachusetts, have been furnished from this institution, while its influence has been exerted in a variety of ways to subvert and supplant those views of religion, to a regard for which it owes its existence. This College was founded, and has been

\* A more full account of these legal changes, of the probable reasons which induced them, and of the circumstances under which they were accomplished, may be found in the Rev. Mr. Cook's "Reply to a Letter in the Christian Examiner," (pp. 31—33.) a work to which no answer has ever been attempted, and to which we solicit the attention of our readers.

liberally patronized by the government of Massachusetts, with the intention that it should be the *College of the State*; but by its departure from the principles of the New-England churches, and embracing and inculcating Unitarianism, it has forfeited the confidence of the people at large, ceased to be the College of the State, and became almost entirely the creature of a sect. Its departments are all filled with Unitarians, and Unitarianism is the religion which it labors, every where, and by all methods, to spread and propagate. It is even boasted of, as “the *bulwark of the Unitarian cause*”---“the *pure, uncorrupted fountain head of Unitarianism.*”

Do any ask, in this state of things, *What is to be done?*—Without mentioning all that may be done, one thing to me is very plain. As Harvard College has been seized upon, turned from its original design, and converted into the College of a sect, that sect should now be left to support it. Until Unitarians will so far relax their hold upon it, as to give other denominations a *fair* proportion of influence in its instruction, councils and government, they cannot expect other denominations to unite with them in its support. *Let Evangelical Christians, then, for the present, stand aloof, and give their scholars, their property and their influence to other institutions.* Propriety and consistency of character require this of them. And a regard for the cause of truth and for the immortal interests of those they best love requires the same. Says a student of Harvard College, “I consider myself bound to testify before the world, *that the influence there exerted against sound religious sentiments and vital godliness, is like a SWEEPING FLOOD; to the unfortified minds of youth, it is RESISTLESS.* I am acquainted with no situation where, in my view, (and I speak from sad experience,) a principle of Evangelical piety, and faith in the doctrines of the cross, would be less likely to be obtained, or, if possessed, would be placed in circumstances of greater peril.”\*

I propose the direction here given in regard to Harvard College, not surely because I am an enemy to the College, but because I am its friend;—because I wish to see it restored to its pristine usefulness and glory. It can never have the confidence or support of the Christian public, and can never permanently prosper, as it now is, and the sooner its governors become convinced of this, the better. Let them consent to abandon their present narrow, sectarian policy; adopt a truly liberal course; divide their authority and influence, in some *fair* proportion, among Christians of other denominations; restore the College to its original destination; and make it what it ought to be, the College of the State; and then they may look with confidence to the State to support it. Then may they solicit, without a blush or a fear, the countenance and patronage of a Christian people.

INVESTIGATOR.

\* Church Register, May 31, 1823.

## THE CHARACTER AND PROSPECTS OF THE HEATHEN.

What is the character, and what are the future prospects of the Heathen? The following particulars include a scriptural answer to this question.

1. The heathen are accountable subjects of the government of God. They possess all the powers requisite to complete accountability; intellect to understand law; conscience to feel obligations; and faculties to perform all which God requires of them. The knowledge of God, and of right and wrong, from the light of nature, is such, as creates obligation to love, worship and obey him; and renders them inexcusable for transgression. "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened." They are described also, as sinning wilfully: "Who, knowing the judgement of God, that they that commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." They are represented also, as being conscious of accountability and of guilt. "Not having the law," a written revelation, "they are a law unto themselves, their own consciences also bearing witness, and their thoughts, the mean while, accusing, or else excusing one another."

2. According to the Scriptures, the heathen are without holiness, and are disqualified for the society of heaven. They are a part of that great family upon whom the Lord looked down from heaven, to see if there were any that did understand and seek God, and sought, in vain, one faithful found among the faithless; all having gone aside, none remaining that did good, no, not one. The evidence of holiness, or christian character, has never been discovered among pagan nations, by missionaries, or by travellers.

3. The heathen are described in the Bible, as alienated from God. To this character is traced the idolatry which has overspread and darkened the earth: "When they knew God, they glorified him not as God;—did not like to retain him in their knowledge; but changed his glory into images of men, and of birds, and four footed beasts, and creeping things;—changed the truth of God into a lie; and worshipped and served the creature, instead of the Creator."

4. The worship which the heathen offer is not the result of involuntary and unavoidable ignorance, the well meant, though mistaken, yet acceptable worship of affectionate children, offered to God by symbols. Idol worship is uniformly forbidden as a voluntary, criminal, inexcusable diversion to other gods of the worship

due to Jehovah alone. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, nor the likeness of any thing;"—"thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them."—"Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves, for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spoke unto you on Horeb, lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image;—and lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, and all the host of heaven, shouldest be drawn to worship them." Nor is there any obscurity in the evidence of God's being and perfections, or any thing so specious in idol worship as to palliate the criminality of idolatry. On the contrary, it is represented as foolish, the prostration of reason, and the consummation of folly.

5. Idol worship is represented as worship offered to devils. "They shall no more offer their sacrifices to devils." Lev. xvii. 7. "They provoked him with strange gods; they sacrificed to devils, not to God." Deut. xxii. 17. "They sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils." Ps. cvi. 37. "But I say, that the things which the gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God." 1 Cor. x. 20. Devils are called the angels that sinned;—rulers of the darkness of this world;—and their leader is called the Prince of this world, the God of this world, the spirit who ruleth in the hearts of the children of disobedience.

6. The characteristics of idol worship have been, in all ages, impurity and blood. Without exception, a part of idol worship has consisted in prostitution; and the temple has been the concentration of obscenity, where, from age to age, abominations which cannot be named, have been practised. And in some period of the history of all pagan nations, the offering up of human sacrifices has constituted a part of idol worship. The Ethiopians, Scythians, Egyptians, Chinese, Persians, the inhabitants of ancient India, all the northern nations of Europe, the states of Greece, the Roman empire as late as the time of Trajan, the Gætæ, the Leucadians, the Goths, the Gauls, the Heruli, the Britons, the Germans, the Carthaginians, the Canaanites, the Arabians, the Cretans, the Assyrians, the Rhodians, Phocians, the Danes and nations of Africa, the islands of the Southern Ocean, and the Mexicans,—all these are recorded in authentic history, as having worshipped idols by human sacrifices.—The morality of pagan nations corresponds with the impure, malignant, and sanguinary character of their divinities, which remove from sin all the sanctions of the divine government, and give it the patronage and encouragement of their own character, example and worship.

In the temples, no salutary instruction is given; and no examples of virtue are presented, in their gods, or in their priests, or in their worshippers. But the very temple is the putrefaction of obscenity, and the stall of murder and blood. Consequently, all the



malignant passions, and all the wicked practices, in their greatest possible enormity, are described by inspiration as breaking out in the Roman empire; and as characterising not a few of the most corrupt, but as giving the image and body of the time; and that too, in a state of society more elevated and refined, than idolatry, before or since, ever formed.

For these crimes of the heathen, the greatest that can be committed, they are held guilty, and threatened with punishment in language the most energetic and terrific which heaven has any where employed: and the tokens of the divine displeasure, in the actual punishment of the heathen, are unsurpassed. It is concerning the heathen that it is said, "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, because, that which is known of God is manifested in them." And in the catalogue of heathen crimes, including all the abominations ever practised by man, the apostle says, "Knowing the judgement of God, that they which do such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them." The displeasure of God against idolaters is called fury, anger, vengeance, wrath and indignation; and the expressions of it convulse the heavens and the earth;—"The heathen raged, the kingdoms were moved, he uttered his voice, the earth melted."

7. Idolatry persisted in, excludes from heaven. It is no where taught in the Bible that the heathen are saved. No traces of holiness or of Christian character are recognized in them; while all the traits of unholy character, and abominations of life which constitute the evidence of ungodliness, are ascribed to them. It is the idolater "who feedeth on ashes; whom a deceived heart hath turned aside; who cannot deliver his soul, or say, is there not a lie in my right hand?" "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God?" "Be not deceived, neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor thieves, nor drunkards, shall inherit the kingdom of God." "The fearful, and unbelieving, and abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death." Will it be claimed that these crimes, classed with idolatry, do not exclude from heaven? How then can it be concluded that idolatry does not? What folly it is to be charitable, in opposition to the express and reiterated declarations of God!

8. According to the Bible, idolatry is irremediable by any power, but the power of the Gospel. All nations, in the absence of a revelation, have fallen away to idolatry, from which not one has been reclaimed, but by the influence of the Gospel. Science and the light of nature have never overturned a single pagan altar, nor recalled a single nation back to God. If a few men of superior intellect and knowledge have penetrated the gloom, and seen and felt

the folly of the reigning superstition, they have possessed neither power, nor courage, nor benevolence enough to set themselves successfully against it; and have usually practised the abominations which they despised. No power but Christianity has ever shaken down an idol temple, or put out the fire of human sacrifice, or stopped the nameless impurities of idol worship, and lit up the light of life in the region of the shadow of death. For time and for eternity, the condition of idolatrous nations is hopeless, till the day-spring from on high visits them, and the sun of righteousness arises upon them. It is therefore said, "How beautiful upon the mountains, are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation."—"How then shall they call on him on whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent?"

To this scriptural account of the character and condition of the heathen, and to the efforts which we make to evangelize them, objections are made, some of which demand an answer.

1. It is said, Why did God permit mankind thus to apostatize to idolatry?

Ans. He has done every thing to prevent it, which the nature of man, as a moral being, and his character as a just lawgiver, demanded. That he could have done more, consistently with the principles of his government, to prevent defection, it is easier to assert than to prove. The laws and institutions which God has provided to prevent idolatry, have in every age been wisely adapted to the existing state of society and condition of the world. The history of his providence is a history of moral influence on the part of God, to retain the allegiance of man; and of effort on the part of man, to flee from the hated knowledge of God into darkness. And now, shall the rebel, or his advocate, demand, why God did not defeat his efforts to depart from him?—"What could I have done, saith the Lord, that I have not done?" If force was relevant, there might be an answer. But if it was relevant, how can it be accounted for that a God of sincerity should ask such a question? The objector might just as well demand, Why does God permit men in Christian lands to rob and lie and steal and perpetrate all sorts of crimes.—Are men not guilty because God does not by force prevent their evil deeds? Then blame would be impossible—for if God did prevent, who could transgress; and if his not doing it took away blame, who could sin? The lawgiver is not accountable for the misconduct of his subjects, provided the laws are just, and they are free agents, and his administration is wise and good.—The heathen therefore have no cloak for their sin, unless the transgressor may plead his own offence in arrest of judgement.

2. If the Gospel is indispensable to the salvation of mankind, why has not God long since sent it to them?—Because, in the first place, pagan nations have ever maintained violent opposition to its introduction. When the Gospel was given to the Roman empire, the fire of ten persecutions raged against it; and when it triumphed, the delusion and the sword of Mahomet, and the lying miracles and persecutions of popery combined to supplant and expel it.—Because a majority of nominal Christians have opposed and hindered the sending of the Gospel to the heathen; as, probably, some who make this objection now do.—And because Christians have been too worldly, and slothful, and timid, and unwilling to do their duty.

God has provided the Gospel for all people, and commanded his disciples to send it to them; and if the heathen had been willing to receive it, and its enemies at home had not opposed sending it, and the friends of Christ had done their duty, the knowledge of the Lord might, long since, have covered the earth, as the waters do the sea. It is the fault of man, not of God, that the Gospel has not been sent to the nations. Is it to be expected that God shall send down angels to print Bibles and scatter them? We might as well insist that he should send them down to plough and sow for us, while we sit in idleness, or conspire together to hinder the work.

3. But if the heathen do, by the light of nature, as well as they can, ought they not to be accepted? The heathen do not do as well as they can, by the light of nature. This light teaches them to love and to worship God, to abstain from the idolatries and immoralities in which they indulge, and to practise the moral virtues which they neglect. Instead of doing as well as they can, they do as bad as they can. Imagination cannot contrive, or depravity execute wickedness, surpassing that which characterises the idolatrous population of the world. Their very temples and worship embody all that is impure, debasing, and inhuman. If there be a spot on earth where the attraction of guilt might be expected to draw down the exterminating wrath of heaven, it is in those idol temples, where six hundred millions of mankind worship devils, and persist in the practice of unutterable abominations.

4. But if the heathen cannot be saved without the Gospel, how can they help themselves, and how, of course, can they be to blame? They can be to blame, because they sin against the light of nature, in rejecting the worship of God, and preferring the worship of idols; and in every one of the gross immoralities which they commit, their crimes, if not aggravated by the presence of our superior light, are in themselves as enormous as they can be, and, with their light, eminently criminal and inexcusable; and it is as just that they should be punished for abusing the light of nature, as it is that we should be punished for violating the revealed laws of heaven. And as to their not being to blame for their sins, unless the Gospel discovers to them some way to escape punishment, it would be a sir-

gular maxim, that criminals cannot deserve punishment, unless they can discover some way to escape it. We thought it was the business of law, not to facilitate, but to prevent the escape of transgressors. What if a band of robbers and murderers, overtaken by justice, and inclosed within massy walls, should try in vain to undermine or scale them, or to burst the door of the dungeon; would they not be to blame, because they could not escape, and the government would not show them how, or aid their endeavors? But God from age to age has been attempting to show the heathen the way of escape, and they have hated the light, and refused to come to it. They went from it, because they hated it, and when it was sent after them, and it shined in their darkness with the splendor of noontday, they raged against it and put it out. Besides, it seems to be assumed in the objection, that it is merely for the wickedness committed in this world, that the heathen will suffer in the world to come; whereas they form characters here of immutable wickedness, and continue through eternity as voluntary and as virulent in their aversion to God, as they were in time. It would mar therefore the joy of heaven, and not benefit the heathen themselves, to introduce them to that world of moral purity and glory. They would recoil from the insupportable light, and seek alleviation in the more congenial darkness of the world below.

5. But it is said by some, that the heathen do not need the Gospel; they are as well off without it as we are with it.—Are they patriots, republicans, the friends of liberty, and the enemies of superstition and priest-craft, and foes to the union of church and state? Who say this? How little such men know about the condition of the heathen, or how much they calculate upon the ignorance of others, is manifest. The governments of all idolatrous nations are terrific despotisms. In all of them, the great body of the people are ignorant, poor, and vicious; are tormented by the fears of a dark and cruel superstition, and enslaved by a sordid priesthood; they are crushed by the united weight of a pagan church and state? union. No where is priestcraft so triumphant, or so terrible, as in pagan lands. There, too, the wife is the slave, and not the enlightened companion of her husband; and the blessings of the Christian family state is not known. Infanticide, and by the hands of the mother, is common; thousands of widows burn, annually, on the funeral pile with their dead husbands; and thousands of parents, when sickness or age has rendered them helpless, are carried from their own dwellings to die on the cold ground, by starvation and disease. Do not the heathen need the Gospel? are they as well off without it as we are with it? Were there no heaven to lose or hell to be endured, do they not need that peace on earth and good will to men which are found only in alliance with the Gospel?

6. It is said, that it is a libel on the character of God to suppose that so large a portion of the human race are so wicked, and ex-

posed to such punishment. But is the lawgiver accountable for the misconduct of his subjects? It may as well be insisted, that the crimes of Christian communities are not crimes and do not expose men to future punishment, because, to suppose it, would be a libel on our Maker. But was it ever alleged in behalf of criminals in a court of justice, that there were so many of them, that to suppose them guilty, and to punish them, would be a libel on the government? It belongs to governments to make good laws, and then to execute them, instead of rendering disobedience impossible, or the following a multitude to do evil safe.

7. But after all, these, it is said, are the harsh and repellant views of an obsolete theology, and that the modern and more enlightened views are much more amiable and consoling.

But again we answer, that the views here exhibited are the result of divine testimony, and unquestionable matters of fact; and the Russian campaign, or the existence of shipwrecks and piracies may as well be denied, because it is much more amiable and consoling to believe that they never happened. But was the innocence of an accused person ever pleaded in a court of justice, on the ground that the supposition of his guilt is a harsh and repellant view, and the supposition of his innocence a much more amiable and consoling conclusion?

8. But it is said, God can take care of the heathen; he does not need us;—and, it may be added, can take care of our health, and plough, and sow, and reap our fields, and send angels to educate our children, and preach the Gospel to them. He does not need us. But do you think he will do it, because he can? Does his ability to work without man, supersede the necessity of man's instrumentality?—The express declarations of the Bible, and the analogy of Providence, stamp the supposition with folly and presumption.

The fact is, that the heathen are unholy and miserable on earth, and, as certainly as heaven is a holy world, are disqualified for heaven. The Gospel is the only remedy, and on Christians devolves the duty of sending it to them; and to palliate or to deny their sin, does not alter their character or condition. To form charitable opinions, and hopes, and good wishes, does them no good, but rather irreparable injury; for the heathen will never be converted, until their guilt and misery are admitted, and every attempt to palliate their guilt and cover their wretchedness, is a barbarous effort to prevent the sympathy of the Christian world from waking up, and the charity and prayers of the Christian world from hastening to their relief. Who is willing to assume this responsibility? What Christian, redeemed by the blood of Jesus, will dare to do it? What Levite will look upon them, and pass by on the other side, and tell the world that they are not wounded, and do not need the healing balm of the Gospel? The entire heathen world groans and travails in pain until now, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God.

## PULPIT ELOQUENCE.

In the broadest sense of the term, the eloquence of a preacher will include all the qualities and advantages, which give him power to move the passions of his hearers and to persuade them to the practice of virtue and the service of God. If he has not knowledge and learning and a sound understanding, he will not be able to enlighten and convince. If he is destitute of fancy, he will be unable to draw from the great storehouse of nature, the images which may illustrate spiritual truths. Without rhetoric, he will not construct his discourses according to the rules of art, that is, so as to produce the greatest effect. Without deep feeling and the energy of his own kindled soul, he may indeed instruct and may please the imagination, but he will be unable to touch and inflame the heart. Even with all the indications of deep feeling, if his character be bad, or if any circumstance make his piety doubtful, he will speak in vain; he will bear away no one by the force of his eloquence. The first, and most important requisite, then, is a truly Christian character, a manifestly devout and benevolent spirit. Yet, strange as it may appear, there are some preachers, who, in their mistaken zeal to exhibit the highest powers of rhetoric, bring their own piety into question, and thus palsy the arm with which they hoped to strike an irresistible blow. I refer now to the rhetorical profaneness of appealing to God, of introducing the name of the Almighty, when there is no petition or request preferred to him, and merely for the purpose of rhetorical effect. It has been my fortune, or rather misfortune, in a few instances, to hear this kind of rhetoric from the lips of ministers of the Gospel, to my utter astonishment and confusion. If I am right in deeming this practice profaneness, it is right to expose it, and make it the subject of rebuke.

The great parliamentary orator and playwright, SHERIDAN, as is related by Moore, always prepared sketches of his speeches; the more showy passages were written on small pieces of paper, or on cards; and he even was accustomed to make a memorandum of the precise place, in which, with theatrical profligacy, he proposed to dishonor the name of God for the sake of rhetorical effect, by crying out—“*Good G——*, Mr. Speaker!” Such thoughtless and daring impiety is sufficiently shocking in the theatre, in parliament, in congress. Men accustomed to be profane in common conversation may be expected to be so in their public speeches. But can it possibly be believed, that precisely the same or very similar profaneness may be found in the writings, and heard, even now, in the discourses of the ministers of the Gospel, and immediately, too, after they have been praying, “*Hallowed be thy name?*” The evil has existed, and does exist, and however

deplorable the fact, there is no wisdom in disguising it. On the contrary it seems necessary to expose it, however dishonorable to a few individuals, in order that their examples may no longer be followed by the young, and that the holy Christian office may no longer, on this account, be subject to reproach.

The first offenders, whom I shall hang up by way of terror, are some reverend bishops and doctors of divinity. I begin with MASSILLON, bishop of Clermont, the most eloquent of French preachers; and in producing a few profane expressions from his sermons, and from the sermons of others, I should feel justified in doing it only for the correction of a great evil. Were I a rhetorical teacher, I should not dare to repeat the passages as specimens of eloquence, any more than, in relating a good anecdote, I should dare to dishonor Jehovah by the repetition of the profaneness which originally belonged to it. With this apology I proceed to my work.

MASSILLON. "Great God! how little does mankind consult reason in the point of eternal salvation!"—"If thus it is, who, O my God! will be entitled to salvation?"—"Great God! what portion can remain to me for pleasures and indolence, in a life so short and criminal as mine!"—"My God! how many holy characters have in solitude complained, that their days passed too rapidly away!"—"Great God! what light! what peace! what delicious transports!"—"What a consolation, Great God! is that of hatred?"—"Thus, O my God! foolish and puerile men feel not the loss of their heavenly inheritance."—"My God! in this manner doth the unfortunate soul deceive himself."—"My God! and shall the sinner, already so odious through his own crimes, be spared, when he becomes a snare to his brethren?"—"It would seem, O God! that the world doth furnish us with sufficient opportunities for our ruin."—"O God! can the ear of man listen to such blasphemies without horror?"—"Good God! that the church should be reduced, through the lukewarmness of Christians, to oblige them by law to participate in thy body and blood!"

These are not all the gems of profane oratory which might be produced from this writer. In the last passage, the address seems to be to Christ; and as the Catholic priest believed that he co-operated every day in the creation of his God in the mass, and ate him, it is no wonder he should thus make free with his name.

The next offender to be produced is an English bishop, the celebrated JEREMY TAYLOR, whose eloquence is incomparably superior to that of Massillon, Bossuet, or any other French preacher. "Is there any thing in the world so foolish as a man that is drunk? But, good God! what an intolerable sorrow hath seized upon great portions of mankind, that this folly and madness should possess the greatest spirits, the best company, the most sensible of the

word *honor*, the most jealous of losing the *shadow*, and the most careless of the *thing*?"

As this is only one instance of such an idle exclamation, which I have noticed in the writings of bishop Taylor, I will make all the excuse for him in my power. I endeavor to imagine, that in writing it he lifted his soul reverently to Jehovah, in astonishment, that his wise and holy laws should be contemned by drunkards. But, after all, I am persuaded this is a bad example, and I see in it more of rhetoric than of devotion.

Next comes Dr. South, whose wit was often stronger than his discretion. "But, *O blessed God*, to what a height our prosperous, audacious impiety arise! was it not enough that men once crucified Christ; but that there should be a generation of men, who should also crucify Christianity itself?"—"Good God! can all history show us any church or state since the creation, that has been able to settle or support itself by such methods?"—"If no more than matter of consent were here intended, where then (*in God's name*) would be the mystery?"—"But why (*for God's sake*) must the Socinians' reasoning abilities, all of a sudden, fail them?"—"And how, *for God's sake*, should it be otherwise?"—"If now we should chance to find a father corrupting his son, [*probably meaning Chesterfield*] as (*God knows*, such monsters have been seen within the four seas,) we must charge this barely upon an high predominance of vice, &c."—"The soul (*God knows*) is but seldom on the watch; its spiritual armor is seldom buckled on."—"The poor man (*God knows*) being no way guilty of any design of wit."

If any one, after reading these passages, can persuade himself that there could be in the breast of Dr. South any deep seated piety, the fear and the love of God; the evidence must be derived from some other source, than from these idle and profane appeals to God. South was a zealous royalist, in the time of the profligate and worthless Charles II. He was infected by the profaneness of the court and the kingdom. Whether he had any religion or not, it is hoped no preacher will follow his example—in dishonoring the name of his Maker.

I am sorry to bring forward the following passage from the sober and acute bishop BUTLER. "Let reason be kept too; and if any part of the Scripture account of the redemption of the world by Christ can be shewn to be really contrary to it, let the Scripture, *in the name of God*, be given up."

This appears to me to be an inexcusable rhetorical flourish: yet I should be glad, out of respect to the very eminent bishop, if it could be reconciled with a mind, imbued, at the time of writing it, with deep reverence towards the Almighty.

The following are some of the rhetorical flights of the Rev. EDWARD IRVING, now of London. "*In the holy name of Christ*,



and the three times holy name of God, have they declared aught to men, which should not work upon men the desire and the power of holiness?"—*Oh heavens!* how the soul of man is restless and unbound—how it lusteth after greatness!"—"O my God, what a blindness hast thou given us up to, that we should say the times are meek, and gentle, and charitable!"

It may seem rather ungallant to close this list of offenders with the name of a woman; but the benefits of public example seem to require, that Mrs. BARBAULD should not be overlooked.—"A rich, flourishing, cultivated mind, pregnant with inexhaustible stores of entertainment and reflection; a perpetual spring of fresh ideas, and the conscious dignity of superior intelligence: *Good heaven!* and what reward can you ask beside?"—We see here something of female gentleness and delicacy, in softening down South's stronger expression; yet to exclaim by heaven is to exclaim by him who maketh heaven his throne. Besides hearing some of the foregoing expressions, the lowest, mitigated form of profaneness which has come to my ear from the pulpit, is in the phrase—' *Would to God!*'

The grand rule, as it appears to me, by which preachers should be governed, and which every principle of piety exacts, is never to introduce the name of God by way of direct address, except in devout adoration, or earnest petition. Every exclamatory appeal to God, not followed by some devotional expressions,—and even when followed by them, if introduced for the purpose of rhetorical effect,—must be set down as an irreverent and impious trick of art, whether it comes from a parliamentary orator, or a Christian preacher. The pure ermine of the Gospel minister should be unstained by the slightest irreverence towards that great Being in whose name he speaks,—from whose frown he would save men,—to whose presence he would exalt them. A.

---

## REVIEWS.

LETTERS TO THE REV. WILLIAM E. CHANNING, D. D., ON THE EXISTENCE AND AGENCY OF FALLEN SPIRITS. *By* *Canonicus*. Boston: T. R. Marvin. 1828. pp. 156.

The doctrine of the existence and agency of fallen spirits has often been exposed to ridicule, in consequence of the enthusiastic or superstitious perversions which it has experienced from its injudicious advocates. This has led others, though persuaded of its truth, into the extreme of speaking of it with so much caution and reserve, that it almost ceases to exert any practical influence.

In order to avoid these extremes, and to present the subject in a true light, the doctrine ought to be exhibited, as nearly as possible, in the exact attitude in which it is presented to us in the word of God. It is there spoken of as a subject of no common importance; one which ought by every rational man to be regarded with the deepest interest.

The work now under review is admirably adapted to accomplish so important an end. In a former number of our work, we have expressed our favorable opinion of it, and recommended it to our readers as worthy of a careful examination. But general commendation is not all which such a work demands. It is evidently the fruit of much reading and careful thought; and presents, in a small compass, the results of extended investigations. It was also written with reference to the existing state of the controversy between the Orthodox and liberal parties, both in this country and in Europe. It cannot, therefore, be amiss to give an outline of the proper mode of reasoning on the general subject, and briefly to exhibit the present attitude of the two contending parties. It will then be easy to perceive the precise objects which this work is designed to accomplish, and to judge of the success of the writer in executing his designs.

When any facts are presented for our consideration, either by the natural or the moral philosopher, two inquiries at once arise: Can their truth be evinced by competent evidence; and, if so, are they of any practical importance? Concerning no facts in the moral world can these inquiries be more appropriately made, than those which are the subject of the work now under consideration. The facts alleged are, that there exists an order of fallen spirits, who have exerted, and still exert, a powerful and pernicious influence on the human race. Without evidence, we cannot admit the truth of these facts; but if their truth is admitted, there can be no doubt as it regards their practical importance. How then are we to be satisfied of their truth? Obviously not by an appeal to the senses; for neither the existence nor agency of spirits is cognizable by these. On this subject, then, we can appeal only to three sources of evidence, our natural knowledge of the moral government of God, the testimony of revelation, and such facts in the moral world as come within the sphere of our observation.

Nature teaches the existence, and the power, wisdom and benevolence of God. It also teaches the nature of free-agency, and the fundamental principles of moral government. But from the benevolence of God it cannot be argued that an order of fallen spirits does not exist, since we are compelled by *facts* to admit that the existence of moral evil is consistent with the benevolence of God. For though men differ in opinion as to the degree of human depravity, where can the man be found who will deny the existence of sin in this world in some degree? and most, doubt-

less, will admit that it has existed and does exist to a great and terrible degree. And in view of these facts, who is competent to assert that the existence of another order of sinful beings is inconsistent with the benevolence of God?

Nor can the fact that such beings do not exist, be inferred from the nature of free-agency, or from the principles of moral government; for the power to sin is essential to the existence of free-agency and of moral government. And how can the existence of a power to sin, furnish evidence that this power has not been exerted by the fallen angels, as well as by the human race?

Of course, nothing can be derived from these sources to invalidate the testimony of the word of God, which has usually been considered, and which for the present we suppose, to be unequivocally in favor of the existence of fallen spirits.—We proceed now to consider another kind of evidence, derived from known facts, which, though by itself insufficient to prove the doctrine, adds great weight to the testimony of the Scriptures. For, if it can be shown that the state of facts is precisely such as it would be, on the supposition of the truth of this doctrine, and that there are some facts fully explained by no doctrine but this, we have strong additional evidence of its truth. That this is the case, could easily be proved by an induction of particulars, especially by an examination of the various systems of error which, in some instances, have been framed with such skill and foresight as to imply a superhuman agency. It could also be shown, by an investigation of the history of opinions on this subject, not only in Christian, but in all heathen nations, that this mode of accounting for the disorders of the moral world has not seemed irrational to the majority of mankind. For it is a fact, that this doctrine, in some form, is found in the religious systems of nearly or quite all nations. But fully to exhibit this kind of evidence is at present impossible. Suffice it to remark, that no evidence against this doctrine can be derived from any source, and revelation and facts confirm its truth.

But no one acquainted with the present state of the Christian world needs to be informed, that there exists a large party, not only in this country, but also in England, in Germany, and other parts of the continent, who deny the truth of the doctrine in question, and contend that the Bible furnishes no evidence of its truth sufficient to satisfy a rational mind. The prevailing doctrines of this sect are, that men are not entirely depraved, nor by nature more inclined to evil than to good. Beginning thus, as might be expected, they find no need of the doctrine of the fall, nor of the agency of evil angels in seducing men from God, nor of regeneration, nor of an atonement, nor of the trinity, nor of the divine sovereignty in any form, nor of future endless punishment for the wicked. All the evils of this world are, of course, to be ascribed

to the agency of a race of beings not by nature at all inclined to sin; for God surely is not responsible for them, and evil angels do not exist. Still however, though nature, as it is confidently pretended, teaches the unity, wisdom, power and benevolence of God, and nearly or quite all the essential doctrines of the Christian system; still it has been a fact, that men, in all ages, if left without a revelation, have rapidly degenerated into idolatry, and have involved themselves in all forms of error and vice. Hence it became necessary for a messenger to be sent from God, to revive the doctrines of the dignity of human nature, of the unity of God, the loveliness of virtue, the odiousness of vice, and of the future state.

It has happened, however, that both the dispensation intended to prepare the way for his coming, and his own words, and those of his apostles, seem to have satisfied the great majority of the Christian world, that he not only taught the entire depravity of the human race, but also the existence of a mighty fallen spirit, who was the leader of many other spirits in a revolt from God, by whom men had been seduced, corrupted, blinded, and enslaved;—Also that Christ had come to destroy his works; that he was God manifest in the flesh, who designed by his atoning death to deliver multitudes of the human race from their lost condition;—That his efforts would be seconded by those of the Holy Spirit, another divine agent, who by the truth would produce in men repentance, and faith, and thus regenerate them, and translate them from the kingdom of Satan into the kingdom of God's dear son. Connected with this system are the additional doctrines of the trinity, the sovereignty of God, the endless punishment of the devil and his angels, and of all men who die unholy.

The advocates of liberal views, however, avow their full conviction that these doctrines are false and pernicious; that they are human inventions, introduced to corrupt pure Christianity. But in maintaining this ground, it is incumbent on them to answer the following inquiries. Why were these doctrines introduced? What is the character of those who maintain them? Why does the Bible seem to teach them?

In answer to these inquiries we are given to understand, that the advocates of this system have been in all ages ambitious, crafty and exclusive, and that the doctrines in question were introduced, and have been supported, designedly to promote party purposes, or else that they sprung from the ignorance of other ages, and have been retained for want of liberal enlarged views, or for sinister and exclusive designs.

Hence it seems that in the midst of a race of beings, *all* by no means naturally disinclined to goodness and truth, a set of men have in all ages, for some undiscovered reason, been malicious enough to conspire to blind and delude the majority. And that even although

God has interposed by a revelation to remedy this evil, the party commonly called evangelical have been ignorant or wicked enough to retain many gross errors to corrupt the system of pure Christianity. Why the advocates of this system have also been uniformly the most strenuous advocates of civil and religious liberty, and of efforts to extend religion through the world, is a fact which they have not yet explained. They all contend, however, that it is not to be ascribed to their religious principles; for of these the tendency is decidedly injurious.

But in answering the inquiry why the Bible seems to teach these doctrines, we are informed, that at the time when the various revelations of God's will were made, men were, for some unexplained cause, so deeply involved in error, that it was in vain to attempt at once to divest them of all their prejudices; and that the communications of God were of necessity in some measure accommodated to the errors of the age in which they were given.

Hence a system of interpretation, adapted to the use of men of liberal minds, has been introduced, founded on the principle, that numerous errors were inserted in the Bible, by prophets, evangelists and apostles, in accommodation to the errors of the age in which they lived; God it seems finding it necessary to compromise matters with his creatures, and lest they should reject his system entirely, to allow his authorized ambassadors to teach, and his subjects to believe, many errors now discovered to be pernicious, on condition that they would consent also to believe some simple truths, most of which reason teaches even without a revelation. One would naturally suppose that if men, without a revelation, fell into such errors, and that a revelation when made, so far from removing, tended only to confirm them, they were in a worse condition than before, at least in these particulars; for in order to find their way to the truth, it would be necessary to struggle against, not only the original influence of such errors, but also against the additional influence given them by the sanction of the Bible. But this has only furnished an opportunity for the more illustrious display of the ability of men in these days of superior mental illumination to overcome all obstacles which might impede the march of human intellect, and to rectify even the Bible itself, where God left it imperfect, by the light of their own reason. Hence one great object of rational divines is, to purify the Bible of such gross errors as were inserted in it by prophets, apostles and even by the Saviour himself, and so to elevate it, that it may keep pace with the progress of reason and refinement in modern days.

But if any retain the former prejudice that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, they are informed that we have not actually a revelation, but only the history of one. And although truth, as originating from God, must be pure, yet, flowing to us through human channels, it must be in some measure adulterated. More-

over, much of the Bible we are told was not intended for us. This is asserted to be especially true of the Old Testament, and when the New Testament writers refer to those of the Old, as predicting the sufferings and atoning death of the Messiah, and its consequences, or when the ritual of the Jews is explained as symbolical and indicative of the same great events, we are told, either that such language is an accommodation to the errors of the Jews, or that writings long regarded by the church as apostolical and canonical are not such. In this manner, the necessity of adopting the allegorical speculations of the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews is entirely avoided—and it is shown that no man of a liberal turn of mind, or of enlarged views, is under any necessity of believing any opinion taught in the Bible, in accommodation to the errors of a former age, or in an allegorizing manner, or which can obviously be ascribed to the ignorance of the sacred writer. And by the aid of modern illumination, it becomes, to any such man, too clear to admit of a doubt, that in one or another of these classes may be included every fundamental and distinctive doctrine of the Christian system. This system of modern liberalism, though multifiform in its aspects, is still at heart and in its fundamental principles the same. It is an expedient for destroying Christianity, and yet retaining the honor and influence of its name.

Its leading features have been cautiously disclosed in this country. For among the prejudices which have come down to us from our Puritan ancestors are some like these, that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, that the soul is of infinite value, that error will destroy, and truth save it, and hence that it is of great importance to know the opinions of their religious teachers. The habits also of thinking for themselves, and of subjecting all systems to the test of public sentiment, were quite as inconvenient as the fore-mentioned prejudices; for Unitarianism in this country depends for life on the breeze of popular applause, and will not long survive its loss. And had Unitarians poured their light too suddenly on the people of New England, many well meaning but prejudiced persons might have mistaken it for darkness, and by exciting the prejudices of the community, compelled them to abandon the enterprize as hopeless.

The safer course seemed to be that of sapping and undermining. Not even modesty herself could more cautiously avoid the public gaze, than did the advocates of free inquiry and liberal Christianity. Silent indeed, but not fruitless, were their labors. Harvard College, once the glory, now the bane of our religious community, was undermined, and many churches revolutionized in secret. At length, when compelled, the system began to disclose, one by one, its long concealed features, until nearly all was exposed to broad day light—except a full account of their views of inspiration, future punishment, and the existence and agency of evil spirits.

A few of the remaining prejudices of New England led to this course as it regards inspiration; and an additional fear of being classed with the Universalists, a less popular denomination, rendered them cautious of expressing their sentiments as it regards evil spirits and future punishment. But the time has come when even these features of the system begin to be unveiled, though cries of exclusion, bigotry, illiberality, and persecution are loudly uttered, whenever the covering is attempted to be taken off. But if any denomination cannot endure to have its principles candidly and fairly investigated without uttering such language in self-defence, impartial observers will be able to judge of the reason and of the merits of their cause.

The work now under review is designed, and admirably adapted, to aid in drawing the lines more and more distinctly between truth and error, in defending the former, and in exposing the true form and features of the latter. Its main object is to investigate, according to sound and well established principles of interpretation, the testimony of the word of God on the existence and agency of fallen spirits, and to vindicate evangelical views on this subject from the false philosophy and false interpretation of the liberal party.

And we do not hesitate to say that the author has proved, beyond all possibility of reply, at least one point, that our Saviour and his apostles did teach, and did intend to teach, and to be understood to teach, the doctrine in question. Indeed, it might seem almost incredible that any one could be found to deny this fact, so that to collect, arrange, and illustrate the testimony of the word of God on the point might be thought superfluous. But what language can be made so clear, that the ingenuity of a sceptical mind will not devise some mode of evading its meaning? Accordingly, attempts have been made to explain the plain language of the Bible on this subject, on some hypothesis which will remove the necessity of admitting the existence and agency of evil spirits. Either Satan is the principle of evil personified, or some human adversary, and his hosts of demons are not really fallen angelic spirits, but the spirits of fallen men, according to the prevailing superstitions of those days. Or if they are spoken of as fallen angelic spirits, we are not hence to infer that they really exist, such language being used merely in accommodation to the errors of the age. And the agency of evil spirits in the case of *dæmoniacs* is by no means to be admitted; since it is well known that it was only a popular mode of describing certain diseases then erroneously attributed to their influence.

In view of these and similar evasions of philosophy falsely so called, our author has constructed a scriptural argument which may be thus briefly characterized; it is popular, yet strictly philosophical; level to the most common apprehension, and yet philosophical and conclusive.

The sum of the argument is this. Christ himself was tempted and put to exquisite suffering by Satan. He also repeatedly, and explicitly taught the doctrine of personal diabolical existence. He taught this to the Jews as a people, to the Pharisees as a sect, and to his own disciples in private. Christ possessed and exerted the power of expelling devils from individuals tormented by them. This power he imparted to the twelve apostles and seventy disciples, which they also frequently exercised. Christ taught, concerning evil spirits, a continuity of agency, influence, and connexion, intelligible only on the supposition of personal existence. Christ distinctly represents a mighty evil spirit as occupying a usurped dominion in this world. After his ascension to heaven he confirmed the same truth. The apostles Matthew, John, Paul, James, Peter, and Jude, together with the disciples Mark and Luke, understood their commission to mean that men were literally to be turned "from the power of Satan unto God."

If there are any principles of interpretation on which the least reliance can be placed, if it is possible in any way to ascertain the import of language, we hesitate not to say that it is utterly impossible to evade or to break the force of this argument. There are some cases in which there is a foundation for an argument so clear, that when stated, it evinces at once its own irresistible strength, so that we cease to think of him who presents it, and yield, not to a human reasoner, but to the truth. Such a case is this. Nor shall we cease to regard this argument as unanswerable, until we see at least some effort made to show its weakness, or fallacy. As yet, no such effort has been made. We think too highly of the intellectual powers of the gentleman to whom it was addressed, and of some others of his party, to suppose that they can deem it unworthy of an answer; although the dignified silence hitherto maintained respecting it may be intended to bear such a construction. On the supposition that they are conscious, that while they admit the inspiration of the Scriptures, and follow sound principles of interpretation, no reply can be made, and that they are not yet willing to avow their real sentiments on this subject, and that they desire to excite as little attention to the work among their own party as possible, we see that silence is a stroke of policy entirely worthy of the cause in which they are engaged, and in perfect accordance with the principles hitherto adopted in propagating liberal Christianity, and a spirit of free, impartial and fearless inquiry. Nor in this view of the subject, shall we be obliged to deny them the merit of clearly discerning and of implicitly following that course, which the present state of the controversy, and of their own cause, imperiously demands.

We may, however, be permitted to doubt whether even this resort will finally avail. The circulation of the work may for a time be limited, among those who take the silence of some oracle as satisfactory evidence that a work is deserving only of contempt. But the number of such is, we trust, fast diminishing, and the day approaches when intelligent men will deem truth on so momentous a subject of more importance than fidelity to a party, and *real* free inquiry preferable to voluntary blindness or implicit submission.



But the author of this work is not only successful in accomplishing his main design ; in addition to this, he has thrown much light upon the general system of error of which the denial of the existence of evil spirits is a part.

We have seen, that the revolt of the fallen angels, and the consequent revolt of the human race, rendered necessary the work of redemption ; in accomplishing this work, the three persons of the Trinity, and holy angels,—and in opposing it, the devil and his angels, are engaged. It is the object of the liberal system to erase all traces of this work from the Bible. And it is obvious that such a work cannot be accomplished without principles adapted to the end. And the principles by which the doctrine of the apostacy of the human race, and of the divinity and agency of Christ and the Holy Spirit are removed from the word of God, are the same by which the doctrine of the revolt and agency of the devil and his angels are removed. And truly we know not where to find a parallel for the hardihood of such an undertaking. For it is in fact an attempt, not only to deny almost every fundamental fact in the history of God's government, but even to deny the personal existence of almost every conspicuous agent, or order of agents, which appears in the vast compass of this history.

He who should attempt to explain all the operations of Bonaparte, and his opponents on the continent, on the assumption that neither generals or armies existed on either side, and that all the accounts which we have of these events are merely allegorical narrations, or the statement of general truths in language derived from the errors of the days, would be considered as offering an insult to the common sense of mankind. True he might insist upon it, that the name Bonaparte signified the abstract principle of evil personified ; and that armies, swords, guns, and other implements of war were but the names of prevalent diseases of a deadly tendency ; and though men were represented as having an agency in causing battles and death, yet it was but a popular mode of representing the fact, that at certain periods such diseases were unusually prevalent, contagious and deadly. And all the stores of language, of history and of science might be ransacked to furnish illustrations and confirmations of such doctrines. But what could this avail against the voice of an intelligent community, capable of distinguishing between the desperate resorts to which they would be driven in attempting to support an absurd hypothesis, and the lucid reasoning of a sound understanding ?

Yet an attempt no less absurd, no less ridiculous, but far more injurious, is gravely made, to explain the simple narration of the history of the government of God on principles precisely similar. And it is high time that this subject were exhibited in its true light, and the public made duly aware how gross, how ridiculous, how

pernicious, the absurdities which men held in reputation for learning would pass off, as the sublimation of wisdom.

But this work can be done only by an induction of particulars. Modern liberalism will never expose itself. It will do its work, but hide its principles, and gloss them over with fair and specious names. And there is needed some man well versed in the wiles of this system, who should give a full and thorough exposure of them on all points, tearing off the veil, and calling things by their true names.

In this work, the author of the volume now under consideration has successfully engaged, in the notes appended to the main argument. In these, the rapid strides of modern liberalism towards Unitarianism and infidelity are fully illustrated, not by declamation, but by extracts from the writings of English, German, and American Unitarians.

We are confident that one of the most effectual modes of assailing the hundred headed hydra of modern liberalism, at least in this community, is to prove the fact that it has fundamental principles, that they can be clearly stated, and that they inevitably tend to certain fatal results. That there must be such principles, is undeniable. The work to be done imperiously requires them. It is no less than this, to eradicate all fundamental doctrines from the Bible, in spite of the evidences of inspiration, the laws of interpretation, and the testimony of facts, experience, and common sense. Is this a small work? Does it need no fundamental principles? Can we suppose that so many men in Europe and America, held in reputation for intellect and learning, and zealously engaged in this work, act without principles? Is it not rather a fact that a full avowal of these principles would be in this country the death of the system, and that the leaders are aware of this fact, and for this reason are fast declining controversy, and professing not to speak in the name of their party, and asserting that they have no system in common!

The truth undoubtedly is, that many called Unitarians do not understand the system, or its tendencies; and if they did, would at once start with horror, and abandon it forever. Can we wonder, then, that the leaders are so backward to give an open exposure of their principles? Such an exposure will never be made by them. If made at all, it must be made by the friends of truth. For it, there are ample materials; and it is high time for the community to be enabled to test a system of pretensions so lofty, by its own writings and deeds. This work is auspiciously begun. Light is fast falling upon the hidden things of darkness, and principles and practices long studiously concealed, are soon to be proclaimed upon the house tops.

We rejoice, therefore, in the efforts of the author of this work, and wish him God speed. He has done a real service to the cause

of truth, and we recommend, both to him and to others, new investigations in that extensive field in which he has already labored so successfully.

As correct views of moral government gain ground, and the gross conceptions of physical power, which are yet far too prevalent, both as it regards the agency of God, and of good and evil angels, are exploded, the subject of the influence of invisible spiritual agents on the affairs of this world, will be seen in its true light, and its vast importance, will be duly estimated. And the influence both of the Divine Spirit, and of good and evil angels will be so explained, as to imply no physical constraint on the good or bad actions of men, and no suspension or inversion of any of the principles of moral agency or moral influence. Then will all the superstitions and enthusiastic perversions of these doctrines disappear, and they will be seen as parts of a system of moral government, worthy of God for its author, and in no respect verging towards any thing irrational or degrading. The unseen agents of the spiritual world will be regarded, not merely as furnishing materials to aid a lively imagination in depicting elevated and benevolent, or dark and horrible deeds; not at all as designed to fill weak and superstitious minds with unfounded joys or terrors, but as an order of spiritual beings, numerous, active, vigilant, all originally great in intellect and power, resplendent in holiness, and occupying an elevated station in the service of God; but of whom some are now fallen, and degraded, and engaged in a horrid and hopeless warfare with their Maker, contending in malignant despair in prospect of the day of their final doom,—yet terrible, on account of perverted intellect and moral power, and concentrating all their energies in opposing the work of redemption, in which God and holy beings are engaged. Moreover, this is a warfare in which all must engage; from it there is no discharge; concerning it there can be no neutrality. He that is not for God is against him.

And all who are to partake the honors of the final triumph in this warfare, excited by an influence from above, will speedily leave the ranks of darkness, and put on the whole armor of God, as children of the light and of the day. In God, their leader, is their strength. Through him shall they be more than conquerors.

And as the god of this world is preparing for his last, desperate, and dreadful conflict, and musters his dark hosts for the day of battle, his deluded followers will rally around his standard, to share his hopeless warfare, and eternal defeat.

Let the inquiry then resound from every quarter, who is on the Lord's side? Who? It is no longer a day for indecision or timidity. The cause of God must be soon espoused, or it will be forever too late.

THE OMNIPRESENCE OF THE DEITY. A Poem. By *Robert Montgomery*.\* Philadelphia: Carey, Lea and Carey. 1828.

AMIDST all the dispositions which the fermentations of society have developed within the last half century, we cannot have failed to discern an extravagance in metaphysical philosophy—a passionate effort to search out the unreal and undefinable, as if there were no limits to the capacities of the human mind. This romantic disposition in philosophy, after fruitless endeavors to pass those bounds which no human intellect, however adventurous, can ever pass; after knocking long and loud at those fast and mysterious recesses which were never designed for human inspection, was exchanged for a spirit of sullen and conceited skepticism.

This sublimation of metaphysical philosophy was much more calculated to fire the imagination, than excite the reason. When reason had reached its horizon, and, confounded with its own weakness and short-sightedness, had lifted up its voice to deter from further progress, a fiery and audacious imagination dove deep into the abysses which reason could not fathom. And when the imagination awoke in those dark and unpeopled solitudes, where the voice of man was never heard, and light had never penetrated, fear, disquietude and terror were the consequences of its temerity. The skepticism of the thorough-bred, cold-hearted metaphysician is a very different matter from the skepticism of the man of ardent feeling. When that dark web is woven of the flimsy and unfeeling cobwebs of the brain, its influence may be confined to the solitary cloister; but when the warm and palpitating fibres of the heart are interwoven with it, it takes hold at once of matters of life and feeling; it colors every thought, every imagination.

\* The history of Mr. Montgomery (no relation, we understand, of Mr. James Montgomery of Sheffield, who is so favorably known to the public) is told in a few words. He is the son of a merchant in Bath, (England) and a relative of General Montgomery, who was so conspicuous in the American war. He received an excellent classical education; and while contemplating to enter Magdalen Hall, to prepare himself for the church, he produced several scraps of poetry, the success of which was not without its influence on his future resolutions. His first avowed attempt to appear before the public as an author was in a weekly periodical, entitled "The Inspector," which consisted of essays, sketches, and effusions of various kinds, though uniformly of a moral tendency. This pamphlet continued for six months in his native city, when it was removed to London, and soon after was abandoned. In June, 1827, our author, then but nineteen years of age, published a severe and biting satire, entitled "The Age Reviewed," which excited a great stir, and procured him the title, from several respectable journals, of the "Juvenal of the age." One year after, while yet in his minority, he published the "Omnipresence of the Deity," which passed into seven editions in five months. It was dedicated by permission to Dr. Howley, then Lord Bishop of London, and since Archbishop of Canterbury. Since the publication of the "Omnipresence of the Deity," he has repeatedly appeared as the author of several other poetical works, the principal of which, "A Universal Prayer; Death; and Vision of Heaven; and a Vision of Hell," written before he was of age, now lies before us. We fear he will be too hasty in his future productions, stimulated and flattered by past success. Were he at our elbow, we should repeat to him the story of Zeuxis, who, on its being once remarked to him that he was very long in finishing his works, replied, "I am, indeed, a long time in completing my works, but what I paint is for immortality!"

This effect of skepticism upon the imagination, so far from being fanciful, is apparent, in one form or another, in most of the poetry of the present day. Its direct influence was first felt upon the wild and romantic imagination of the Germans. The Faustus of Goethe, and the Wallenstein of Schiller, are personifications, with the flush and fever of life upon them, of those fears and agonies which originated in a skepticism that was united with blood-felt sensibility. England afforded another who had for a long time held secret communion with these same unnatural sentiments, and whose own character was an exact transcript of the personifications we have mentioned. Combining with these kindred spirits of Germany, he gave a formal, and, as it has since proved, a permanent existence to those disordered imaginings and misanthropical disgusts, which, until then, had only floated in an indistinct and unembodied shape in the minds of the more elevated and refined. This "lightning of the mind," having fallen upon its proper conductor, found its way over mountains and waters; it went abroad among men; and it met with a natural ally in the dissipation of morals then prevalent in all the European courts.

We may now overstep all those distinctions established by critics between schools and eras of poetry, and say, that before this period, there had been but one school—the great school of nature. The master-spirits who ruled in it played with the true, unaffected passions of men, which are found existing under probable circumstances. So true is this principle, and so extensive is its application, that it affords a solution of the otherwise inexplicable mystery by which we are able to sympathize with those spiritual existences which Dante and Milton have employed as the machinery of their sublime productions. Those beings are portrayed by these adventurous masters in mind like ourselves—actuated by human passions, which, though under extraordinary influences, are such as we ourselves have felt. But the skeptical poets, whose names have been mentioned, and others of a similar spirit, formed a new, and, in essential points, a peculiar school. A spirit of refined discontent, an elegant *ennui*, induced by this same skepticism, sealing up the warm and gushing fountains of kindlier sympathies, caused the study of human nature, the beautiful mysteries of human action, to be considered inapposite to the purposes of poetry. Life and the heart of man were no longer sketched in truth, simplicity, and resemblance; but imagination, frenzied by its skeptical fears, shrouded the one in the most unnatural gloom, and exhibited the other warped and distorted by her own spectral conceptions. These men were at war with the spirit of humanity—a tender spirit, which may, like a holier one, be driven out from its earthly tabernacle. And we saw them, after having in all their haughtiness and delusion insulted and

grieved away its quiet influences, left with "none to bless them, none whom they could bless," to wither and waste in the "leafless desert of the mind." They annihilated the elements of happiness within themselves, by disdaining all aptitude to the affairs of that life in which a so called destiny had placed them. With men, they would hold no communion; with all that was dear to man, his most tender and sacred affections—his benevolence, piety and devotion, they were at war. All this, and more, was the result of a haughty and reckless skepticism. This it is which has given to all the heroes of Lord Byron, though with various modifications, one changeless individuality.

How like his heroes are to one another!  
 Selim is Harold's, Conrad's, younger brother;  
 Juan is Lara in his morning hour,  
 And conjuring Manfred is Childe, Corsair, Giaour.

In singling out this one characteristic of Byron's mind, we have not aimed at an accurate estimate of his peculiar genius. It would be injustice to deny that there were some lovelier shades of emotion, mingled with all that was dark and wayward. He could not at once sever himself from the spirit of men; and, amidst all his stormy passions and tumultuous emotions, the still small voice of nature may occasionally be overheard. These expressions of quiet beauty, these overtures of the spirit with itself, are only so many birds of peaceful wing hovering with their golden plumage over the surface of a mind forever dark and agitated.

But it is skepticism which we are now considering. This was not confined to himself. The exhibition of such a mind as his, writhing under the agonies which he had brought down upon himself, excited first the pity, and then the sympathy of mankind. There was much that was spirit-stirring in this awful visage of an individual, stepping out into the broad view of men, and wrestling unto blood with the spirit his own incantation had conjured. This interest was the vehicle of contagion. There soon became gradations to this source of thought; and those intense and fearful sensibilities, those gloomy and unnatural sentiments, which this intellectual monarch flung to the winds of heaven that the *world* might hear, others brooded over in their own deep, pensive and unbroken silence. One glance at the agony of interest which thousands and tens of thousands felt in the waywardness of Childe Harold, is a living proof, that the quiet love of nature and simplicity was supplanted by a feverish desire for something more stimulating, even though it were improbable and unnatural. And when they caught that luxurious sadness, which came trembling on the echoings of Byron's harp, from the vales of Arqua and Ferrara, from the graves of Petrarch and Tasso, and that sublimity of despair which burst forth over the ruins of the Coliseum, they drank it in as the delicious draught for which they had long

panted. Here was an excitement for minds sunk in listlessness and dissipation. They no longer felt chained down to the events which happen under the ordinary dispensations of Deity, or obliged to commune with the sweet and sunny illusions of an innocent fancy; but seizing upon their own most hidden fears and inquietudes, their unrevealed miseries, they brooded over and clung to them with a diseased pleasure.

So much for the *direct* influence of skepticism. And were we to drop the subject at this point, after referring to the poetical works of Rousseau, Goethe, Schiller, Byron, Shelly, and others of a similar spirit, enough would have been said to demonstrate our original assertion, that skeptical philosophy has exerted something more than an imaginary influence upon works of imagination. But this same skepticism has exerted an *indirect* influence upon most of the poetry of our day, which is less apparent, but equally pernicious. True, no one has appeared possessed of all that intellectual power and beauty which are essential to a popular exhibition of skepticism in its nakedness. It comes not now in its gloomiest and most daring aspect. But it has engendered a craving after high excitement, an inability to be moved without the application of gross and violent stimulants, equally inconsistent with a healthful state of the mind. None can deny that a multitude of other causes are operating with a combined force to produce the same effect. Amongst these, we would mention the great national events which are transpiring in the world, and a general dissipation of morals. Probably neither of these causes has exerted so decided an influence in the creation of this unnatural fever of the mind, as the skepticism and the skeptical poets whose names have been mentioned. This has distorted the heart of man, the only mould in which true universal poetry is ever cast. It hath laid open to the morbid spirit those unseen and delicate parts of the moral system which, when rudely handled, will arouse the mind out of listlessness, and goad it on even to frenzy. It hath substituted for naked sublimity, heated and head-long passions; for stern beauty, an Ovidian effeminacy and Della Cruscan affectation. It has given to our poetry what we should, above all others, mention as its peculiar characteristic, a delicacy of *passion*, instead of a delicacy of taste. Though a just and elegant distinction has been made between these two things, by an eminent philosophical writer, yet we use the former in rather an unusual sense. We mean by delicacy of passion that sickly daintiness which is displayed to the life in so much of the literature of France. It leads directly to that ill-governed susceptibility, inconsistent with a free and manly tone of the mind, which engenders many erroneous theories of imagination concerning human life. While delicacy of taste, opening our souls to the spiritual loveliness of a pure and innocent imagination, enlarges our sphere of happiness, by directing and increasing our sensibility to

objects of which we can command the enjoyment. The former would destroy all which Campbell meant when he defined song to be the 'eloquence of truth;' it would exchange the inimitable and unaffected simplicity which breaths in the "Task," and the "Cotter's Saturday Night," for forced and unnatural excitement.

We need no further demonstration of these remarks, than what is furnished us by the very books with which the press is at this moment teeming. Has not the public taste, in its absolute demand for the excitement of which we speak, induced many, not only to suppress the pure and simple poetry which was stirring in their hearts, but led them to walk astray in solemn and sedate impurity? Is it slander to assert, that in obedience to the mandate of this same taste, poetry has been written within a few years, as dissolute as any in the reign of the second Charles? And some, abounding in the studious and prolix licentiousness of Elizabeth's age? We speak not this in accordance with that disgusting spirit of censoriousness, so prevalent with a certain class, who denounce all our literature as insipid, worthless, and vain; for we are free to say, that the present day has given birth to some of the few immortal names which are in themselves a complete refutation of this literary calumny. We need not specify them. But while the glow of pleasurable emotion is yet upon our cheek, as we repeat this gratifying acknowledgement, is it not chased away by the burning blush of shame, as the reflection steals over us, that some of these very men, who within a few years have achieved much to adorn and hallow their own reputation, have either, with a prompt refusal to be the caterers of the present public taste, withdrawn from the arena, and hung their armor on the lists, or else have given painful evidence, by their late productions, that they too have been tainted by a spirit now abroad among men.

It was our intention, when we undertook this article, to have given a moral estimate of the principal poetical works of the present day. But we perceive that our limits will not allow us to enter upon the execution of this design in the present number, and it must be deferred to some future occasion. But we cannot refrain from expressing our surprise and sorrow, that so few poets of any day should have begun, continued, and ended their labors, influenced by the solemn injunction of the scripture "Whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." That so few should have written in reference to judgement and eternity! That love of notoriety should have crushed or killed outright every moral principle; and that there is so little poetry, we mean such as deserves the name, which can be read and admired, without corrupting the hearts of men, or at least unfitting them for relishing the simplicity, the spirituality of the Gospel. It calls for weeping and lamentation, that of the 'great lights' of poetry, which stand so thick in the intellectual firmament, so few should have obeyed the laws of the moral sys-



tem which they have visited, and have guided mankind to a happy and holy immortality. That none should have gone up like the star of Bethlehem to its sweet repose of glory, to direct lost men to the redemption of Jesus Christ; whilst many a 'wandering star' has led thousands by its treacherous effulgence into the blackness of darkness forever!

Think of the influence of that man, to whom we have already referred, who lately wore, with a careless, confident, and undisputed right, the diadem of poetry. Will the influence of that mind soon pass away, which made the stars above us twinkle down with new lustre, and created new scenes and objects on which the mind gazes till it is dazzled and drunk with beauty? Nature had wooed him as her chosen one, had breathed upon him the blessedness and glory of her own calm and mighty existence; but he prostituted her bounties in the cause of infamous passions. He careered over the universe, and borrowed its glories, yea, pressed beyond the gates of clay into the very presence of Deity, and brought back images of divine glory to beautify his blasphemies! Oh! had his temper mingled with the bland spirit of Christianity, every element of his genius would have wasted nothing but incense to heaven. But he has led forth vice glittering in the magic of unwonted melody; the spirit of malignity comes clothed in the grace and glory of a seraph. Gleaming with brightness, the hearts of thousands leaped towards him with the assurance that he came with the unction and felicity of innocent emotion. But how many have been seduced by him to forget the enchantments of innocence, how many munitions of moral sentiment have been broken down by his influence, will never be known till revealed by Omniscience, in the day when the secrets of all hearts shall be made manifest.

We are inclined to be sweeping in our denunciation of this author's writings, "Touch not, taste not, handle not." True, his writings, even his most licentious, contain much which a devout heart might ponder over in its secret chambers; yet we set too high a value upon moral purity to attempt the selection, out of daring impiety and profane ribaldry. We are reconciled to the thought that thereby we are depriving ourselves of many glorious conceptions, images of beauty and grace, by the reflection, that when we shall have put on our immortality beside the 'crystal waters,' it will be no source of regret.

To say no more of all these skeptical or Anacreontic poets, who make no attempts to conceal the tendency of their profane and licentious writings, how few are there even of the remainder, upon whose writings, after a fair moral estimate, would not be stamped in burning characters, '*Tekel, Tekel!*' How often are we reminded, even by those who profess to consider the interests of piety as paramount to all others, that the 'tree of literature,' we

quote the words of the great novelist of the age, 'is one of good and evil, which, amidst the richest and most wholesome fruits, bears others, fair in color, and sweet to the taste, but having the properties of the most deadly poison.' And is not the moral influence of poetry to be taken into consideration? Does poetic license emancipate us from the moral obligations of God's law? Are we to yield ourselves up to the grace and witchery of song, without one inquiry whither it is floating us?—As for ourselves, we consider the estimate of talents, and their application, to be two distinct things; and the rank which any writer is to hold in our esteem is to be graduated by his influence upon us as moral and accountable beings. We hold this consideration to be paramount to the sweetness of song. We remember that for every thought and every imagination, we are to be accountable in the day of Christ. And we are determined to keep our souls steady and collected in this faith, though fancy should exert her utmost in spreading around us her paradisaical creations, and Muses should chaunt their syren songs, and pour over us delicious floods of melody, to drown all thoughts of our destiny. Not that we would calumniate or disparage intellect. We would make ample allowance for splendor of genius, for delicacy of taste, for power and freedom of imagination, and from these very circumstances would gather considerations, which should lead us to inquire, What has been the application of these surpassing endowments? To those who are dear to us we have given the advice, 'Follow the perusal of every work, poetical or prose, with the inquiry, What is its moral tendency? Is it in exact coincidence with the whole tenor of the Scriptures? Will it aid or impede me in my preparation for judgement and eternity?—Ever esteem that work, in the light of such considerations. Esteem that man, though he possess the harp and the intellect of the tallest archangel, who purposely injures the purity of the soul, as no better than the Prince of darkness, who has often transformed himself into an angel of light, in order to deceive and to destroy.'

Considering this unhappy state of the taste and literature of the present day, we are grateful for every honest attempt to correct their impurities, though we are at the same time constrained to yield our credence to the principle, that there is a difference of glory in poetry, as palpable as that in the firmament. It is in this view that we must acknowledge Pollok to have entitled himself to a high rank in our estimation, though we could not do such violence to our taste as other critics have done, by preposterously placing his 'Course of Time' beside the adamant of Milton. The two can be brought within no comparison, except as to their moral influence. Though the 'Course of Time' is not what we hoped and expected it would be, yet in this day of vain and sickly literature, we cannot doubt that it will tend, if not to elevate the taste, to what is a higher praise, improve the heart. We cannot doubt that the pious mind

will rise from its perusal, with juster conceptions of its own moral mysteries, and with a panting after something more ennobling and satisfying than the pomp and glory of this world. There is genuine poetry too in the 'Course of Time;' and it is for us to hope, that this and every effort which is commenced by invoking the inspirations of the Holy One, will operate as the golden point of Ithuriel's spear, to wake the true and universal poetry of the soul, which "is not dead, but sleepeth," to a fresher beauty and a healthier step.

It hath well been said by one\* who knows what is meant by poetic inspiration, that the "proper moral cast and mental habits of elevated genius are in striking coincidence with the whole tenor of the Scriptures." The converse of this beautiful proposition will find but few at the present day to believe, and fewer to exemplify it. True, there are some who 'superadd to the costume of gaiety and fashion a light transparent drapery of religion, ornate professors, frugal practisers of the faith,' who have much to say of the glorious influence of the essences of religious truth, in stirring up within them the free impulses of poetry. Let these "butterflies of genius" be told, that the Gospel, with its humiliating estimate of the moral condition of man as a being radically corrupt, and its grand moral peculiarities by which it insists on humility, faith, and penitence, contains or enjoins nothing which tends to weaken and confine the intellect, deprive the imagination of its vigor and elasticity, or adulterate the fountain of an innocent taste, and with one accord they will reply, that the influence of these practical doctrines is to bind the spirit as with a fetter, and shroud the soul with melancholy. Doubtless, this is the true state of the matter with such individuals. But we do not speak at random, when we say, that the ultimate tendency of evangelical religion, is to impart a new vigor, a growing and thriving impulse to every faculty with which a wise and benevolent God has endowed the human soul. In saying this, we abstract our minds from extrinsic and casual modes, and look at once into the revealed word, for the substance of religion. There we find a system, which, when it lays open the wayward and dark things of the human heart, proffers a purifying influence to make that heart "whiter than snow." We find a magnificence, in what some consider the humble truths of religion, filling, expanding, and exceeding the capacities of the human mind. These truths elevate the mind, but no created mind can elevate these truths. There can be no cause of distrust lest these truths, simple as they may seem to the wayfaring man, should not prove sublime enough, for the most elevated conceptions. Newton and Milton and others who are the glory of our species, felt them to be superior to their noblest contemplations. 'Though the principles of Christian truth have an invariable quality, yet,' as Foster has most happily express-

\* James A. Hillhouse, Esq. in his oration before the Alpha of Connecticut, 1826.

ed it, 'they were not imparted to man, to be fixed in the mind, as so many bare scientific propositions, each confined to one single mode of conception, without any collateral ideas, and to be always expressed in an unalterable form of words. They are placed there, in order to spread out, if I might so express it, into a great multitude and diversity of ideas and feelings. These ideas and feelings, forming round the pure simple principles, will correspond to the meaner or more dignified intellectual rank of the mind. Why will not men perceive that the subject which takes so humble a style in its less intellectual believers, unfolds greater proportions through a gradation of larger and still larger faculties, and with facility occupies the whole capacity of the amplest, in the same manner as the ocean fills a gulf as easily as a creek?'—When will wondering and despising skeptics come to feel, that the Gospel entails not a 'spirit of bondage again to fear,' but that it is the fountain of every lovely and pure inspiration: that every free and generous feeling, every reaching thought is nurtured and strengthened by that revelation which has brought 'life and immortality to light?'—We are speaking now of the influence of the Gospel upon the minds of men who really believe all which that Gospel contains, and who act in consistency with their faith; men whose vision is not bounded by earthly things, but which, extending down through coming years, takes in the whole compass of eternity! Who, while they act their part on this passing world, have their thoughts above the world, on things unseen and eternal; who live so near the battlements of Heaven, that they refresh themselves during their weary way with the clusters which hang from them. When will men acknowledge, that the Gospel, when thus cordially embraced, will never degrade the spirit of a man; but that it was commissioned by pure benevolence, for the very purpose of snatching that spirit from degradation, and the death-shade of fear, and to wake the 'hopes of glory,' by proffering to it the name and inheritance of a son of God?—When will they feel, that every precept of this Gospel requires a firm and noble soul; that every duty it enjoins, in suppressing unholy passions, in practising divine virtues, in seeking after and cherishing a spiritual loveliness, is graduating the glory of an intellectual, as well as the felicities of a moral being? That every prayer, if breathed out from the sincerity of a fervent heart, and borne upward by a faith which reads with a keen and clear-sighted vision, the 'deep things of God,' is advancing him who offers it in the dignity of a thinking being? And that the whole tendency of spiritual faith and worship, instead of imprisoning the spirit within a few narrow and unwelcome truths, is to elevate it above the 'smoke and stir' of a troubled world, above the reach of an "earthly, sensual and devilish" spirit, to the sublime serenity of a "life hid with Christ in God?"

And what a rapturous thought it is to the Christian poet, that if he preserve the humility and simplicity of faith, he is rapidly assimilating himself to beings of a higher order! That every effort of his genius, if accompanied with the purer influences of piety, is ensuring him an obvious ascendancy, not only over all whose category of wisdom is, 'let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die,' but over those who possess an equal degree of piety, but who never peep beyond the influence of sensible objects into the world of thought and fancy. By painting beautifully the works of God's fingers, by following contemplation up to her high places, and indulging in her transfigurations of mind, by breathing in the deep beauty of this exceeding great temple, he is, even when the fetters of the flesh are on him, acquiring clearer conceptions of a spiritual existence, and preparing himself to gaze deeper into the unfolding glories of those burning images which the Holy Ghost has employed to describe the mysteries of the world to come. Pure and lofty conceptions only will dwell in the soul of such a man, even as none but sweet odors floated on the stillness of the Holy Place. A peculiar light will be about his path, and when he goes down to the grave, it will be as when the day dieth, 'wrapping itself in a shroud of glory.' And when the light of the resurrection morn shall beat in upon the darkness and pollution of that grave, his spirit will put on its immortality with a deeper joy, and in the consciousness of its surpassing powers and intelligence, will say unto death, as the angel to the patriarch of old, "Let me go, for the morning breaketh."

It affords us much pleasure, that we are able to present our readers with another choice effort of pious feeling and superior genius. We hesitate not to speak in high terms of encomium both of the poetical merits and moral tendency of the "Omnipresence of the Deity." To say that the poet has done full justice to his subject, would be the same as to ascribe infinity to his mind. So far from cherishing any such idea, we could but think, during the perusal of some parts of the work, that the poet's mind was awed and confounded by the sublimity of a subject, "above the lip of cherubim to tell." While, in others, the vastness of his theme filled and expanded his soul, till, like the fairy tent of the poet, it enlarged so as to contain all that it was capable of comprehending. What else could we have expected from one of his feeling and imagination, when describing the existence of an all-pervading intelligence, who is to the wide universe what the soul is to the body. The spirit he breathes is simply this—'Deus est quodcumque vides, ubicumque moveris;' or, in the more sublime language of the Psalmist, "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there. If I make my bed in hell, behold thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in

the uttermost parts of the sea ; even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right hand shall hold me."

Considered as a literary performance, this work of Mr. Montgomery is one which most poets of the present day might be proud to call their own. And though he might be allowed to hide its defects under his 'score of summers', yet he will remember it with satisfaction when his head is grey.

The versification of the poem continually reminds us of Pope.\* Its general smoothness and elaborate polish remind us of Campbell. Were we disposed to be censorious, we should say that the resemblance in the latter case is, in a few instances, greater than we could wish. But there is a peculiar propriety in comparing the "Omnipresence of the Deity," with the "Pleasures of Hope," as they were both written by young men, and both bear the marks of juvenility. Campbell's name will live in his odes, rather than in the "Pleasures of Hope;" but as the production of so young a man, it was highly creditable, and a proof that he had within him deep wells of poetry. In his odes, he allowed these waters to flow out fresh and sparkling without restraint. The general fault of Campbell's earlier writings, their meretriciousness, is the great fault of the "Omnipresence of the Deity." This is apparent principally in an exuberance of similes, and in an immoderate use of double epithets. His similes, when they are unstudied, are peculiarly delicate and beautiful. Who hath not *felt* the following :

Last, softly beautiful as *music's close*,  
 Angelic woman into being rose. p. 20.  
 And the bright dew-bead on the bramble lies,  
 Like *liquid rapture* upon beauty's eyes. p. 28. &c. &c.

The extravagant use of double epithets is a fault peculiarly offensive to us. Redolent oleum. Montgomery is justly chargeable with this fault. Such expressions as the following occur on every page of his work : "lustre-weaving," "home-wed," "chance-abounding," "heart-entwining," &c. &c. He will drop them as he grows older.

With these general remarks, we proceed to introduce as many extracts as our limits will allow ; that our readers may see for themselves that the volume contains much, which more than atones for any faults we have mentioned. The Proem of about fifty lines, is so beautiful, that we wish we could insert it.

The following eloquent passage is the commencement of the Poem :

\* We know there are many who would consider such a resemblance anything rather than a commendation. But for ourselves, we not only consider the lines of Pope as melodious, but at times, we are inclined to go all lengths with Lord Byron's opinion of them. "I took Moore's poems, and my own, and some others," says he, "and went over them side by side with Pope's; and I was really astonished (I ought not to have been) and mortified at the ineffable distance in point of sense, learning, effect, and even *imagination, passion and invention*, between the little Queen Anne man, and us of the lower empire. Depend upon it, it is all Horace then, and Claudian now, and if I had to begin again I would mould myself accordingly."

THOU UNCREATE, UNSEEN, and UNDEFINED,  
 Source of all life, and fountain of the mind ;  
 Pervading SPIRIT, whom no eye can trace,  
 Felt through all time, and working in all space,  
 Imagination cannot paint that spot,  
 Around, above, beneath, where thou art not !

Primeval Power ! before Thy thunder rang,  
 And Nature from Eternity outsprang !—  
 Ere matter form'd at thy creative tone,  
 Thou wert ; Almighty, Endless, and alone ;  
 In thine own essence, all that was to be,—  
 Sublime, unfathomable Deity ;  
 Thou said'st—and lo ! a Universe was born,  
 And light flash'd from thee for her birth-day morn !

After this grand apostrophe to the Deity, our author proceeds to describe His constant presence and influence over all the works of His fingers. His allusion to the work of Creation, to the appearance of Jehovah on Mount Sinai, and at the Red Sea, are couched in the same singularly energetic and beautiful style. We could wish that he had introduced more out of the many signal interpositions of the Deity which are recorded in the Old Testament. The deluge, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, are among the most conspicuous. And if we have not formed an erroneous estimate, the bellowing waters, and the shrieks of a dying world, the rustling of the fiery storms in Heaven, and their rushing—rattling descent in the midst of quiet upon the busy cities, are subjects well suited to our author's genius.

The following extract is perhaps a favorable specimen of the style and versification of the poem. It is one of many passages, in which nature proclaims the presence and power of her Builder.

“ Ye giant winds that from your gloomy sleep  
 Rise in your wrath, and revel on the deep ;  
 Lightnings ! that are the mystic gleams of God,  
 That glanc'd when on the sacred mount he trod ;  
 And ye, ye thunders that begird His form,  
 Pealing your loud hosannals o'er the storm !  
 Around me rally in your mingled might,  
 And strike my being with a dread delight ;  
 Sublimely musing, let me pause and see,  
 And pour my awe-struck soul, O God ! to Thee.

A thunder storm !—the eloquence of heaven,  
 When every cloud is from its slumber riven,  
 Who hath not paused beneath its hollow groan,  
 And felt Omnipotence around him thrown ?  
 With what a gloom the ushering scene appears !  
 The leaves all flutt'ring with instinctive fears,  
 The waters curling with a fellow dread,  
 A breezeless fervour round creation spread,  
 And, last, the heavy rain's reluctant shower,  
 With big drops patt'ring on the tree and bower,  
 While wizard shapes the bowing sky deform —  
 All mark the coming of the thunder-storm !

Oh ! now to be alone, on some grand height,  
 Where heaven's black curtains shadow all the sight,

And watch the swollen clouds their bosoms clash,  
 While fleet and far the living lightnings flash,—  
 To mark the caverns of the sky disclose  
 The furnace flames that in their wombs repose,  
 And see the fiery arrows fall and rise,  
 In dizzy chase along the rattling skies,—  
 How stirs the spirit while the echoes roll,  
 And God, in thunder, rocks from pole to pole!" pp. 24—26

There is something delightful to the pious mind in the idea that God is present in all the diversified scenes of human life, and that no lot is too miserable to engage his paternal care. Our author presents us with the following expression of this interesting reflection; and then proceeds, in the second Part, to describe some striking events of human life, calculated to impress the mind with the ubiquity of Omnipotence.

"E'en now, while voiceless Midnight walks the land,  
 And spreads the wings of Darkness with her wand,  
 What scenes are witnessed by thy watchful eye!  
 What millions waft to Thee the prayer and sigh!  
 Some gaily vanish to an unfear'd grave,  
 Fleet as the sun-flash o'er a summer wave;  
 Some wear out life in smiles, and some in tears,  
 Some dare with hope, while others droop with fears;  
 The vagrant's roaming in his tatter'd vest;  
 The babe is sleeping on its mother's breast;  
 The captive mutt'ring o'er his rust-worn chain;  
 The widow weeping for her lord again;  
 While many a mourner shuts his languid eye,  
 To dream of heaven, and view it ere he die.  
 And yet no sigh can swell, no tear-drop fall,  
 But thou wilt see, and guide, and solace all!" pp. 40, 41.

The following lines, which are the closing part of an eloquent contrast between the skeptic and Christian, we had often admired before their appearance in this volume; and as Mr. Montgomery often published fugitive pieces in the *Imperial Magazine*, we presume this was one of the number.

"Go, child of darkness, see a Christian die;  
 No horror pales his lip, or rolls his eye;  
 No dreadful doubts, or dreamy terrors, start  
 The hope Religion pillows on his heart,  
 When with a dying hand he waves adieu  
 To all who love so well, and weep so true:  
 Meek, as an infant to the mother's breast  
 Turns fondly longing for its wonted rest,  
 He pants for where congenial spirits stray,  
 Turns to his God, and sighs his soul away!" pp. 106.

The poem concludes with a description of the final doom. We hope we shall not disoblige our readers by quoting its most imposing passages.

"O! say, what Fancy, though endow'd sublime,  
 Can picture truly that tremendous time,  
 When the last sun shall blaze upon the sea,  
 And Earth be dash'd into Eternity!  
 A cloudy mantle will enwrap that sun,  
 Whose face so many worlds have gaz'd upon;



And those sweet stars, that, like familiar eyes,  
 Are wont to smile a welcome from the skies,  
 Thick as the hail-drops, from their depths will bound,  
 And far terrific meteors flash around ;  
 But while the skies are scatter'd by the war  
 Of planet, moon, rent cloud, and down-shot star,  
 Stupendous wreck below—a burning world !  
 As if the flames of hell were on the winds unfurl'd !

'Tis o'er ; from yonder cloven vault of heaven,  
 Throned on a car by living thunder driven,  
 Array'd in glory, see ! th' Eternal come ;  
 And, while the Universe is still and dumb,  
 And hell o'ershadow'd with terrific gloom,  
 T' immortal myriads deal the judgment doom !  
 Wing'd on the wind, and warbling hymns of love,  
 Behold ! the blessed soar to realms above ;  
 The curs'd, with hell uncover'd to their eye,  
 Shriek—shriek, and vanish in a whirlwind cry !  
 Creation shudders with sublime dismay,  
 And in a blazing tempest whirls away !"

pp. 107—113.

There are several minor poems in the volume, some of which are of surpassing beauty. There is one, the liquid flow of which reminds us of the melodies of Moore. It begins thus :

Oh, beauty is the master-charm,  
 The syren of the soul ;  
 Whose magic zone encompasseth  
 Creation with control : &c.

But we have done with our extracts. Our readers will perceive that we have had little to do with canons of criticism. This is according to our original intention. Our object has not been to display literary acumen, or a flippant application of rules and technical terms. We hope it will not be considered a reprehensible motive, for we confess it hath been ours in the present article, to introduce an author to the acquaintance and favorable regard of our readers, who, in this day of vain literature, hath dwelt alone in his purity, and who cannot be criminated for hallowing profanity or licentiousness, by interweaving them with honorable and virtuous sentiments. While other presses are daily introducing to the world works, both poetical and prose, the tendency of which is exceedingly pernicious ; while men who hold responsible stations in the literary world, are striving with a combined force to crowd these works into a conspicuous rank in the estimation of the public, we shall have attained our end, if we are successful in persuading any portion of the reading community to exchange such demoralizing publications for one, which, while it stirs up the intellect, delights and purifies the taste, and will not poison the heart. Without analyzing rigidly its poetical merits,—without assigning it its proper place in the “many mansions” of poetry, we have made such copious extracts from the “*Omnipresence of the Deity*,” that they cannot fail of imparting to our readers a favorable impression of its general character. For ourselves, we consider it, as to its poetry, a very choice acquisition

to the literature of our day ; and as to its moral tendency, a charming voice inviting us away from the shining yet empty fruit of the desert shrub, from the impure and insipid streams of licentiousness which abound in the midst of us, to lie down in 'green pastures,' and to drink deeply of the 'still waters' of truth and purity.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### CONVERSION OF LUTHER.

The following is Luther's account of his own conversion, which took place while he was a monk at Erfurth.

"However blameless a life I might lead as a monk, I experienced a most unquiet conscience ; I perceived myself a sinner before God ; I saw that I could do nothing to appease him, and I hated the idea of a just God that punishes sinners. I was well versed in all of St. Paul's writings ; and in particular, I had a most wonderful desire to understand the epistle to the Romans. But I was puzzled with the expression, 'THEREIN is the righteousness of God revealed.' My heart rose almost against God with a silent sort of blasphemy : at least, in secret I said with great murmur and indignation, Was it not enough that wretched man, already eternally ruined by the curse of original depravity, should be oppressed with every species of misery through the condemning power of the commandment, but that, even through the Gospel, God should threaten us with his anger and justice, and thereby add affliction to affliction ? Thus I raged with a troubled conscience. Over and over I turned the above mentioned passage to the Romans most importunately. My thirst to know the apostle's meaning was insatiable.

"At length, while I was meditating day and night on the words, and their connexion with what immediately follows, namely, "the just shall live by faith," it pleased God to have pity upon me, to open mine eyes, and to show me, that the righteousness of God, which is here said in the Gospel to be revealed from faith to faith, relates to the method by which God, in his mercy, justifies a sinner through faith, agreeably to what is written, "the just shall live by faith." Hence, I felt myself a new man, and all the Scriptures appeared to have a new face. I ran quickly through them as my memory enabled me ; I collected together the leading terms ; and I observed, in their meaning, a strict analogy, according to my new views. Thus, in many instances, the work of God means that he works in us ; and the power and wisdom of God, means the power and wisdom, which his Spirit operates in the minds of the faithful ; and in the same manner are to be understood the patience, the salvation, the glory, of God.

"The expression, "righteousness of God," now became as sweet to the mind as it had been hateful before ; and this very passage of St. Paul proved to me the entrance into Paradise."<sup>\*</sup>

---

## CHARACTER OF THE FIRST MINISTERS OF NEW ENGLAND. †

"With respect to their religious sentiments, and those of their followers, they were Puritans. They were strictly Calvinistic, agreeing in doctrine with their brethren of the established church, and with all the Protestant reformed churches. They were all men of the most strict morals, serious, experimental preachers. Mr. Neal, after giving a catalogue of the ministers who first illuminated the churches of New-England, bears this testimony concerning them. "I

\* Luth. Op. præf. vol. i.

† From Trumbull's History of Connecticut.

will not say that all the ministers mentioned, were men of the first rate for learning, but I can assure the reader, that they had a better share of it than most of the neighboring clergy, at that time: they were men of great sobriety and virtue, plain, serious, affectionate preachers, exactly conformable to the doctrine of the church of England, and took a great deal of pains to promote a reformation of manners in their several parishes." They were mighty and abundant in prayer. They not only fasted and prayed frequently with their people in public, but kept many days of secret fasting, prayer, and self-examination in their studies. Some of them, it seems, fasted and prayed, in this private manner, every week. Besides the exercises on the Lord's day, *they preached lectures, not only in public, but from house to house.* They were diligent and laborious in catechising and instructing the children and young people, both in public and private.

They paid a constant attention to the religion of their families. They read the Scriptures, and prayed in them daily, morning and evening, and instructed all their domestics constantly to attend the secret, as well as private and public duties of religion. They were attentive to the religious state of all the families and individuals of their respective flocks.\* As they had taken up the cross, forsaken their pleasant seats and enjoyments in their native country, and followed their Saviour into a land not sown, for the sake of his holy religion, and the advancement of his kingdom, they sacrificed all worldly interests to these glorious purposes.

The people who followed them into the wilderness, were their spiritual children who imbibed the same spirit and sentiments, and esteemed them as their fathers in Christ."



#### EXTRACT FROM CHILLINGWORTH.

"I pray tell me," says Chillingworth, "why cannot heresies be sufficiently discovered, condemned, and avoided by them which believe Scripture to be the rule of faith? If Scripture be sufficient to inform us what is the faith, it must of necessity also be sufficient to teach us what is heresy; seeing heresy is nothing but a manifest deviation from, or opposition to the faith. That which is straight will plainly teach us what is crooked; and one contrary cannot but manifest the other.—Though we pretend not to *certain* means of not erring in interpreting all Scripture, particularly such places as are obscure and ambiguous, yet this, methinks, should be no impediment, but that we may have certain means of not erring in and about the sense of those places which are so *plain* and *clear* that they need no interpreters: And in such we say our faith is contained. If you ask me, how I can be *sure* that I know the true meaning of these places? I ask you again, can you be *sure* that you understand what I, or any man else says?—God be thanked that we have sufficient means to be *certain enough of the truth of our faith.* But the privilege of not being in *possibility* of erring, that we challenge not, because we have as little reason as you, to do so; and you have none at all. If you ask, seeing we may possibly err, how can we be *assured we do not?* I ask you again, seeing your eye-sight may deceive you, how you can be *sure* you see the sun when you do see it? Perhaps you may be in a dream, and perhaps you and all the men in the world have been so, when they thought they were awake, and then only awake when they thought they dreamt.—A pretty sophism this,—that whosoever *possibly may err*, cannot be *certain that he doth not err.* A judge may *possibly* err in judgment; can he therefore never have assurance that he hath judged right. A traveller may possibly mistake his way; must I therefore be doubtful whether I am in the right way from my hall to my chamber?"

\* See an account of the lives of many of them, in the Magnalia, b. 111. Particular tracts and manuscripts characterize them in the same manner.

## CONVERSATION AT AN INN.

From the Christian Magazine.

*Messrs. Editors.*—Travelling of late in a certain part of Massachusetts, which shall be nameless, I took lodgings for the night in a comfortable public house. Soon after my arrival, Rev. Dr. T., a respectable Unitarian clergyman, called on the same errand as myself. His face and name were familiar to me, though I was probably unknown to him. Having taken his supper, and rested himself a little, the Doctor fell into the following conversation with his host.

*Dr. T.* Well, Col. B., I understand you are about settling a Minister among you.

*Col. B.* We are so, indeed. The Society have given him a call, and the ordination is appointed.

*Dr. T.* Were the Society unanimous in his favor.

*Col. B.* Why, nearly so. There are several of us who do not like his sentiments; but then he advances them very cautiously, and seems to be accommodating, and we think it best to be quiet for the present.

*Dr. T.* He is a Calvinist, I suppose.

*Col. B.* He professes to be; though I have never heard him preach upon the more obnoxious points of Calvinism.

*Dr. T.* And what are his intentions in respect to ministerial intercourse?

*Col. B.* O, we have been careful to settle that point with him, I assure you. He has told us *explicitly*, that he should never take upon himself to withdraw from any who had been regularly inducted into the ministry; and that he should expect to maintain a free and friendly intercourse with Unitarians.

*Dr. T.* You have done well, Colonel, in being explicit with him on that point; and also in encouraging and aiding his settlement. From your account of him, he is *just such a man as we want*. You may be surprised when I assure you, that I think he will do more in behalf of our cause, than though he were a professed Unitarian.

*Col. B.* I am happy to have your approbation, Doctor; but I am somewhat surprised, I must acknowledge, at your last assertion. Will you be so good as to explain yourself?

*Dr. T.* I repeat it, my dear sir, we want *just such men*, and *ministers*, as you represent your pastor elect to be. We want them, in this region, more than we do open Unitarians. There is a strong tendency in the two classes of Congregationalists in this commonwealth to separate—separate, I mean, *in form*. But *we* are not yet prepared for such a separation. It would operate against us. Separated from the great Orthodox community, we should appear few and feeble. We should sink, both in the estimation of others, and in our own. We should be a more palpable object, than we now are, of public odium; and should be less able to resist it. *Our* policy, therefore, is to *keep off* a formal separation, at least for the present. And in doing this, we need the help of just such ministers as the one you are about to settle. They will serve as mediators—or rather as *links*, to bind the two parties together. They will also serve to keep us in *countenance*, with many who are inclined to reproach us. When *you*, for instance, hear it said, that this or that Unitarian minister does not preach the Gospel, and is not fit to preach at all; you can at once silence the allegation, by appealing to the conduct of your minister. ‘Our minister is a good man, as all admit; and he thinks that these Unitarians are good men and good ministers, or he would not suffer them to preach to his people.’—And besides; under the ministry of such a man as you are about to settle, the progress of Unitarianism among you will be not less sure, and probably not less rapid, than though he were a professed Unitarian. If he were a professed Unitarian, your Calvinist folks would be dissatisfied, and most likely would withdraw; and they would draw away a great portion of the people after them. Parties would in this case be formed, and all who had separated would be confirmed in their Calvinistic notions. But in the course you are now pursuing, there will be no difficulty. Your minister will preach very little distinguishing Calvinism himself; and the Unitarian ministers whom he introduces, will disseminate their principles, as far, and as fast, as they prudently can. Everything

will go on quietly in this way, and—my word for it—your next minister will be a Unitarian, settled, without opposition, over the whole parish.

*Col. B.* Well, I am happy, Doctor, to hear you talk in this way; but should you not like to be made acquainted with our expected minister?

*Dr. T.* I should indeed; does he board in the neighborhood?

*Col. B.* Directly across the street; will you walk over and see him?

*Dr. T.* I thank you, sir; it would give me much pleasure.

So they took their hats, and went out; and I took my pen and scribbled down the substance of their conversation—deeply sighing over the weakness of those brethren who thus suffer themselves to be made the dupes of designing men; and who become the mere tools of partisans, whom themselves can scarcely consider in any other light, than that of “*enemies to the cross of Christ.*”

I only add, that, as the conversation above given was not a private one, it is submitted to your disposal. It needs no comment.

#### NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *The Gospel according to Paul. A Sermon delivered Sept. 17, 1828, at the Installation of the Rev. Bennet Tyler, D. D. as Pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Portland, Maine.* By LYMAN BEECHER, D. D. Boston: T. R. Marvin. 1829. pp. 48.

The leading object of this Discourse is to show, that the system of theology, embracing the doctrines of entire natural depravity, “the impossibility of pardon by the deeds of the law,” the atonement, justification by faith, and “the dependance of man upon the Holy Spirit,” constitutes the Gospel which Paul preached, and is, of course, the *true Gospel*. And after repeated perusals, we are constrained to say, that we can form no conception of the state of mind and heart in which an intelligent reader can go through attentively with the discussion here presented, and not feel that this conclusion is *abundantly* supported. The apostle Paul was unquestionably an Orthodox preacher. He did, beyond all reasonable dispute, teach and preach the doctrines ascribed to him in the Sermon before us. Those of a different opinion may call this *dogmatizing*, or what else they please; we know on what ground we stand. We have studied the Epistles of Paul for ourselves, have considered the bearing and meaning of his words, and we want no higher and better Orthodoxy than they most clearly and fully express.\* And we regard all the attempts which have been made to force another meaning upon the language of Paul as futile and pitiable. Better, far better, if persons do not like the doctrines of

\* Mr. Soame Jenyns, “a writer of eminence in the polite world, who knew extremely little of theological systems, but, who, emerging from a careless infidelity, read the Scriptures with attention and good sense, thus describes the effect produced on his mind by an unbiased study of the sacred books:” “*That Christ suffered and died as an atonement for the sins of mankind, is a doctrine so constantly and so strongly enforced through every part of the New Testament, that whoever will seriously peruse these writings, and deny that it is there, may, with as much reason and truth, after reading the works of Thucydides and Livy, assert, that in them no mention is made of any facts relative to the histories of Greece and Rome.*” See *Smith on the Sacrifice of Christ*, p. 43.

“Any man who believes in the whole New Testament must either be a *knave at heart*, or a *fool in his head*, if he denies the doctrine of atonement by Jesus Christ.” *Ram-mohun Roy*.

Paul, to say, with the Germans, that he was *mistaken*—‘to be sure, he taught the Evangelical system, but this is no reason why we, in this enlightened age, should believe or teach it,’—far better to take this open ground, than to break away from the usual meaning of words, set at naught the established principles of interpretation, and throw doubt and uncertainty over the whole science of language, in the attempt to force upon the Epistles of Paul a meaning which he obviously did not intend to convey.

But to return to our author: his first inference is, “that we know with moral certainty, what is the true Gospel.” 2. “With equal certainty we know, that to proclaim pardon upon any conditions whatever, without an atonement, is to preach another gospel.”

“To represent the natural affections, sympathies, and amiable dispositions of men as conditions and evidence of pardon, is, to preach another gospel—for they are neither faith, nor evidences of faith. It is nowhere said, ‘being justified by natural affections, and amiable dispositions, we have peace with God.’ Atheists possess natural affections, and amiable dispositions; and so do many wicked men, whose vices declare that they shall not inherit the kingdom of God.

“Those who teach their hearers to rely on moral honesty, and a faithful discharge of relative duties, preach another gospel; for it is nowhere said, ‘whosoever shall pay his honest debts, and be a kind father, husband, and friend, shall be saved.’ Honesty is not faith; domestic affections are not faith; for a man may love father and mother more than Christ, and in doing so, may forfeit heaven.

“To associate the hope of pardon with powerful talents, great literary eminence, or public usefulness, is to preach another gospel. And yet there are many, who hesitate not a moment to canonize great orators, poets, statesmen, and the literary luminaries and benefactors of human kind of these and other ages. The Bible represents it as a matter of great difficulty, for a man to know even his own heart; and once those were deemed fanatical, who supposed that they could discover grace in a man’s countenance, voice, or movements. But in these days of illumination, the hearts of great men may be searched and grace detected—though ages and oceans intervene—merely from the stature of their intellect, or the providential results of their labors,—principles that, with equal efficacy, might canonize ‘archangel ruined.’

“To represent the sincere belief of error, as a condition of pardon and acceptance, is to preach another gospel; for it is not said, ‘he that *believeth* that he is right shall be saved,’ but he that *believeth* on the Lord Jesus Christ. Mere intellectual belief is no more an evangelical condition of pardon, than mere morality. Neither is the faith which justifies.

“To hold up charity, as the sum of Christian graces and a sure passport to heaven, is to preach another gospel; for the charity which is a Christian grace, is holiness of heart,—while the charity which is thus eulogised, means only a blind confidence in our neighbor’s honesty, piety, and safe estate. A hard way to heaven, indeed, if we must, of course, believe our neighbors honest, and pious, and safe, as the condition of our own salvation. But where is it said, ‘he that believeth his neighbor to be honest, and pious, shall be saved; and he that believeth not his neighbor to be honest and pious shall be damned’?

“Those who represent rites, and forms, duly administered, and followed by a moral life, as efficacious to save, by a sort of silent, unperceived sanctification, preach another gospel. It was such teaching, exactly, which the apostle opposed, and which he calls another gospel—and which is another gospel.

“Those who hold out the promise of pardon to all who believe intellectually that Jesus is the Messiah, without reference to what is included in the term, or to any corresponding affection of heart,—preach another gospel. Our disease is of the heart; and faith, the condition of pardon, is an affectionate reliance on Jesus Christ. But what is the efficacy of believing in a name, which means we know not what? Or of mere intellectual perception and admission of truth? The intellectual faith of devils, who confessed that Jesus was the Messiah, neither reconciled nor saved them. And how should it save us?

Correct eyesight might as well be prescribed as the condition of pardon, as a mere intellectual, undefined belief, that Jesus is the Messiah.

“The omission to preach the doctrine of the atonement, and justification by faith, is to preach another gospel. For if men encourage the hope of pardon, and do not propose the grounds of pardon, they do by implication admit the possibility, and authorise the hope of pardon by deeds of law. So they will be understood by their people; so they are understood—for, without exception, all who confide in them expect to be justified by the mercy of God and good works. And yet there are some who dare to take this course. With great and good men, they doubt, and have not exactly yet made up their minds, whether the doctrine of the atonement, and justification by faith, be the Gospel, or not. Therefore, lest they should offend some of their people, or be found fighting against God, they say nothing against these doctrines; and not being sure that they are true, nothing for them—but preach good morality, visit their people, attend marriages and funerals, and hope for the best. But in effect, they preach another gospel; for Jesus Christ himself said, ‘he that is not for me, is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.’” pp. 31–33.

3. “We may perceive the reasons of the practical inefficiency of the new gospel, compared with that which includes the doctrine of the atonement, and of justification by faith.” “It abates the requirements of the law,” and “the penalty for the transgression of such parts of the law as are not most mercifully given up, is most mercifully abolished.”

4. “A renunciation of the atonement and of justification by faith is a renunciation of Christianity.”

“We do not invade or withhold the rights of those whom we cannot recognize as Christians. We do not deprive them of the Christian name; they have a perfect right to call themselves Christians, and to be called Christians, by all whom they can persuade to believe them such. But they have no right to insist that we shall believe or call them Christians: for this would be, to deny to us the liberty of thinking for ourselves, and to insist that we shall judge of others according to their judgement of themselves, instead of our own; a requisition which would annihilate all liberty of conscience.” p. 38.

5. “This Discourse provides an answer to the oft reiterated complaints of exclusion and persecution, preferred against evangelical ministers, for refusing to hold ministerial intercourse by exchanges with those who discard the doctrines of the atonement and justification by faith.”

“The act of exchange is, in our view, a practical expression of our belief that the person, to whose instruction we commit our people, preaches the Gospel. But we do not believe that those who discard the atonement do preach the Gospel. And we cannot, by word or by deed, say to our people, that we believe what we do not believe. The act of exchange is saying also, practically, that we consider our doctrinal differences of little consequence. But it is not true that we do consider our difference from those who deny the atonement and justification by faith, of little consequence. And we cannot, by our deeds, say to our people what we do not believe. It is a practical declaration of our belief that no injury will be done to our people and the cause of truth by the exchange. But we do not believe this; for it sustains their confidence in men who, in our view, preach another gospel; and gives them an opportunity which they are not slow to embrace, to create and to foment dissatisfaction in our congregations with evangelical doctrines, and to form and mature conspiracies among our people for their expulsion.” p. 42.

6. “The rejection of the atonement by those who have possessed the evidence of its reality is inevitable destruction.”

“This is not said invidiously, or as a mere assertion, but as the logical inference from what we have proved. I may say on this subject, as the apostle said, ‘that I have great heaviness, and continual sorrow in my heart, for my

brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh.' But by all the laws of reasoning which give us certainty on other subjects, we have come to the conclusion, that Paul did preach the doctrines of the atonement, and of justification by faith, as the Gospel; and that the Gospel which he preached is the true Gospel. To reject the atonement, then, is to reject the Gospel. And we know that the rejection of the Gospel is fatal. It was fatal to the Jews. It will be fatal to all who reject it now." p. 47.

We have devoted to this discourse such attention as our limits allow—not such, by any means, as we think it deserves. Our readers must have the book for themselves. They will find it worth much more than it costs. They are wronging themselves and their families if they do not have it. It is written in the author's usual energetic manner, and in point of interest and usefulness is not a whit behind his best printed discourses.

2. *A Sermon preached in the second Presbyterian Church, Charleston (S. C.) May 24, 1829, on assuming the Pastoral Charge of said Church.* By WILLIAM ASHMEAD. Charleston. pp. 47.

The leading object of this discourse is to shew, that the faithful "servant of Christ cannot please men."

"They may respect him, and treat him with politeness. They may acknowledge his usefulness. They may admire his learning, and applaud his talents. They may attend, with a certain sort of pleasure, on his ministrations. But, after all, the truths which he inculcates must conflict with their habitual practice, and disturb, in some degree, their peace of mind. In one word, his preaching, in exact proportion to its efficacy and real utility, must render them dissatisfied with themselves. And this, let it be observed, is just what we mean, when we say, that he cannot please them." p. 10.

The faithful minister of Christ cannot expect to please men, on account of the *exclusive* and *uncompromising* character of the religion which he inculcates.

"The early believers in Christ were persecuted, as Gibbon informs us, not because they had embraced a new religion, but because they had the unparalleled presumption and effrontery to assert, that this religion was the *only true one*, and obstinately refused, under the influence of such an illiberal notion, to have anything to do with the superstitions, or the criminal pleasures, of the rest of the world." p. 17.

3. *Obligations of Christians to the Heathen.* A Sermon preached before the General Convention of the Baptist Denomination in the United States, in the Baptist Meeting House in Sansom st. Philadelphia, April 29, 1829. By DANIEL SHARP, Pastor of the Charles street Baptist Church, Boston. Boston: Lincoln and Edmands, pp. 24.

It affords us pleasure to meet and encourage our brethren of other denominations, in all their endeavors to promote the sacred cause of missions. In our last, we recorded our satisfaction at a recent animated appeal to the American Episcopal church, in behalf of this cause. With equal satisfaction, we now introduce to the notice of our readers a similar appeal to the General Convention of the Baptist churches. The discourses of Mr. Potter and of Dr. Sharp, though different in some respects—the former exhibiting more sprightliness of manner and apparent ardor of feeling, and the latter more maturity of thought and a deeper because a longer acquaint-



tance with the subject—are still, in many respects, similar. The religious sentiments advanced in each are the same; they aim at the same important object; and advocate, with nearly equal ability, the same cause.—To excite his brethren to “zealous, systematic and persevering measures for the conversion of the heathen to Christianity,” Dr. S. urges “the command of Christ”—“that the truths to be taught are adapted to the character and condition of all nations”—that they constitute, “so far as we know, the only means by which the heathen can be saved”—and that the labors of Missionaries have been already, in a high degree, successful.

“While the profane have made their benevolent and pious ministrations the subject of ridicule; while the sceptic has been doubting, and the mere worldly philosopher has been speculating; and while the nominal friends of Christianity have been predicting a total failure; the leaven of truth has been fermenting, the work of conversion progressing, and the devoted servants of Christ in foreign and sickly climes have been reaping the fruit of their toils. Whole nations have given up their gods. One island after another has renounced its superstitions, and assumed the Christian name. The word of God has mightily prevailed, and churches have been established in the order of the Gospel. Beings in the lowest scale of social and intellectual existence, have felt the elevating principles of this Gospel, and have started into new and glorious life.”

In conclusion, Dr. S. suggests to his brethren, as the most effectual means of co-operation in the work of missions, that “they feel the power of religion in their own hearts”—that they “endeavor to convince others of their duty”—that they “keep alive a missionary spirit in the churches”—and that they contribute generously and systematically for the support of those who have left their homes, and gone to the distant heathen.—This discourse indicates much thought on the subject of missions, a deep sense of its importance and its obligation, and the ability to plead on its behalf with a discreet, a chastened, and an earnest eloquence.

4. *Reasons for not embracing the Doctrine of Universal Salvation. In a Series of Letters to a Friend.* Published by the American Tract Society. No. 224.

This Tract, which we are unwilling to let pass without calling to it the particular attention of our readers, consists of nine letters, written with much plainness, candor and true Christian charity, on one of the most impressive and awful subjects of revealed religion. In the three first letters, several general and substantial reasons are urged “for not embracing the doctrine of Universal Salvation.” In the next four, the testimony of Scripture is adduced, and the various methods by which this testimony is evaded are considered. In the eighth and ninth, the objections of Universalists are removed, the consequences of their system are unfolded, and the whole is concluded with a direct and solemn appeal to their consciences. The writer evidently is one of no ordinary power. He has learning without the parade of it, and his eloquence is that of plain, direct, impressive truth. If we have a reader who is inclined to embrace the doctrine of Universal Salvation, we beg of him (as he approaches the vortex in which, if he persists, he will shortly be ingulphed forever) to procure and read this little tract. We know of nothing

better calculated to arrest his attention, enlighten his understanding, awaken his conscience, affect his heart, and prove (by the accompanying blessing of God) the commencement of eternal life in his soul.

5. *Outlines of Ecclesiastical History, on a new plan; designed for Academies and Schools.* BY CHARLES A. GOODRICH. *Illustrated by Engravings.* Hartford: H. & F. J. Huntington. 1829. pp. 424.

The public are already acquainted with Mr. Goodrich, as the author of several popular works intended for the use of schools. His small History of the United States has been received with a degree of favor, and has had a circulation, which it is the lot of few productions in this country to obtain. The work before us is on the same general plan, and is executed with equal fidelity and judgment. There are inherent difficulties, however, in the subject of Ecclesiastical History, of which the author seems to be conscious, which may prevent this work from receiving that degree of patronage which was extended to the History of the United States. It is impossible to state the more prominent facts connected with the History of the Church, and go into a necessary explanation of them, as to their nature, causes and results, without seeming to favor a particular religious system, and consequently to decide against its opposite. And those who find their religious notions condemned, instead of reviewing and renouncing them, will be much more likely to condemn the work, and prevent it, so far as they have influence, from obtaining currency and favor. We think Mr. G. has met this difficulty in the only proper way. He has not endeavored to frame a history which should be equally agreeable to all religious denominations: This would have been the extreme of folly. Neither has he endeavored, so far as appears, to disguise or conceal his own religious principles. He has not gone out of his way to cross the track of opposing systems; nor has he kept back what the regular course of the narrative seemed to require, for the purpose of saving the opinions of others. He appears rather to have gone directly forward, stating facts as they took place, explaining them according to the best of his judgement, and always treating those who may be disposed to cherish different opinions with candor and respect.—The incidents, in this work, are well selected and arranged; the style is sufficiently elevated and always perspicuous; and the volume will be found interesting and useful, not only in academies and schools, but in private families. The plan of making Ecclesiastical History the subject of attention and recitation in the higher schools, is obviously important, and we know of no work more suitable to be adopted as a text book, than the one before us.

THE

# SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. II.

OCTOBER, 1829.

NO. 10.

---

---

## COMMUNICATIONS.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE THREE PRINCIPAL SCHEMES, WHICH HAVE BEEN DEVISED, FOR EXPLAINING AWAY THE LANGUAGE OF CHRIST AND HIS APOSTLES, ON THE SUBJECT OF SACRIFICE AND REMISSION OF SINS.

1. The scheme, which first presents itself for consideration, may thus be stated: 'The doctrine of atonement is a mere *accommodation* to Jewish prejudices. It was a necessary expedient, for reconciling the Jews to the loss of their rites of religious worship, and preparing them to fall in with the grand conception of the author of Christianity, "of a pure, spiritual, and rational religion," adapted to the wants and circumstances of all mankind.'

This is a serious charge against the writers of the New Testament, who claim that they "teach the way of God in truth." Is it not in the highest degree dishonorable to their character? How far does it come short of those base designs, which "the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth" has impiously termed "pious frauds," and which she has pursued with the view of lauding "His Holiness," "the Vicar of God, and the successor of St. Peter"? But if the integrity of Christ and his apostles be not *above suspicion*, how can we pay any regard to them as teachers of truth? If their honesty consisted of such doubtful and plastic materials as to permit them, for the sake of securing the favor of the Jews, to give a wrong coloring to their doctrines, how can we hesitate to reject their instructions, any pretences to inspiration notwithstanding?

But let us appeal to facts. Facts are worth a thousand theories. Did Jesus and his apostles show such a tender regard to Jewish prejudices, as is here supposed? Were they so very solicitous to ingratiate themselves with the house of Israel? Look at their conduct, read their language, and form a conclusion for yourselves.

Oct. 1829.

68

You hear Christ calling the Jews hypocrites and deceivers; accusing them of "shutting the kingdom of heaven against men," "neither entering in themselves, nor suffering those that were entering to go in;" of "compassing sea and land to make proselytes," and "making them two-fold more *the children of hell than themselves*;" telling them that they were "like unto whited sepulchres," which, though beautiful outward, were "*full of all uncleanness*;" that they "omitted the weightier matters of the law;" that they made his Father's house "*a den of thieves*;" that they made long prayers to cover their hypocrisy and iniquity; that they were "*serpents, a generation of vipers*, that could not escape the *damnation of hell*." Is this *accommodation* to Jewish prejudices? What then would *opposition* to them be? In what language could it be set forth? If the above was time-serving policy, to make the Jews well-disposed toward Christianity, in what strains would he have spoken, had he meant to impugn them?

But perhaps the *apostles* were more accommodating than their Master. Let us hear them upon the point, then, before coming to a conclusion. And how often do we hear them upbraid the Jews for their unbelief, and charge them with denying the Holy One and the Just—killing the Prince of Life—and preferring a murderer to him? Did they not accuse them of crucifying the Lord of Glory, of putting from them eternal life, of always resisting the Holy Ghost, of being stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, of not keeping the law which was received by the disposition of angels, and of betraying and murdering him whom God had proved to be Lord of all? Did they not appeal directly to their consciences, when charging on them all this guilt, and ask whether it were right to hearken unto them, more than unto God?

In what respect, then, do we discover such compliance with Jewish notions as is supposed? On the contrary, did not their whole conduct show, that they "knew no man after the flesh;" that they were neither awed by threats, nor allured by favor, to adulterate the word of God; and that they sought not to please men, aware that if they did, they should not be the servants of Christ?

But, for the sake of testing the strength of this hypothesis, let us for a moment admit that our Saviour and his disciples were desirous of ingratiating themselves with the Jews. What need was there of saying any thing on the subject of *sacrifice* and *atonement*? It will be answered, doubtless, that these things were so inwrought into all the notions of the Jews, that it would have been shocking to their prejudices to propose to them Christianity, without making a substitute for their sacrifices. But what necessity was there for *Christ* to say or do any thing to reconcile them to the loss of their ritual? Had he ever said any thing of *abolishing their ritual*? Look over the gospels, and tell us if he ever hinted such an idea, as that his death was to demolish the fabric which Moses had

erected? Was there any ground, then, *on the hypothesis in question*, for the Saviour to say, "the Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many;" and that his "blood was shed for the remission of sins"? Such declarations were not called for to reconcile the Jews to the abrogation of their sacrifices; for Christ had never adverted to this subject.

Besides, how happened the forerunner of Christ, John Baptist, to speak of him whom he would manifest to Israel, as "The Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world?" What principles of accommodation made way for this, when *John had said nothing of the overthrow of Jewish sacrifices?*

But supposing that the apostles, who did speak of the abrogation of the Mosaic ritual, had adopted the phraseology in question to reconcile the *Jews* to their loss; how shall we account for what they everywhere said to the *Gentiles*, that "God hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation for the remission of sins;" that "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us;" that "He gave himself a ransom for all;" that "He made peace by the blood of his cross;" and that men are justified by his blood, and saved from wrath through Him?" These and the like sentiments run through all their epistles to the *Gentile churches*. But would the doctrines of rational religion be more readily received by *Gentiles*, for being tinctured with Jewish notions? Would the apostles have taken such pains, on every occasion, to show that men are pardoned and sanctified through the propitiation of Christ, and have formed their *whole system of doctrines* in conformity to this, for the very purpose of clogging their religion with Jewish absurdities? Would they have thus "interwoven these sentiments with all their practical instructions," merely on principles of accommodation, where there was no call for such a measure, but where common sense would have urged to an opposite course? Believe it who can.—But enough of this wild and romantic notion that the doctrine of the atonement had its origin in the accommodation of Christ and the apostles to Jewish prejudices.

2. The next scheme proposed for explaining away this great doctrine may be thus stated: 'The apostles, being Jews, and "strongly tinctured with the notion of sacrifices, atonements, and purifications," could not explain and defend the pure doctrines of Jesus, without giving them a Jewish complexion. They could not but run into the phraseology, to which they had been accustomed from their youth; and, therefore, in construing their language concerning the death of Jesus and the remission of sins, the rational principles of exegesis require us to make allowances for their early opinions.'

In remarking upon this hypothesis, it should be observed, that it casts dishonor upon the Saviour in the *choice* of his apostles. If

he chose men that were unsuitable to propagate his religion, for what reason, can we suppose, did he make such a selection? It must have been from ignorance, or prejudice, or want of love to the truth, or indifference to the wants of mankind. But if Christ chose his apostles through ignorance, or error in judgement, he was not himself qualified for the great work which he undertook. Nor would prejudice have been a better qualification, in one who was sent to enlighten and save the world. And who will take it upon himself to say, that Christ had not a love to truth, or that he was indifferent whether men were rightly instructed or not? Would not this have been inconsistent with one of the objects for which he appeared on earth; which was to unfold the will of God, that men "might know the truth, and have life by believing on his name"? If then he felt the importance of truth, and wished to enlighten and regenerate the world, why did he not appoint to the office of inspired teachers those who were not tinctured with Jewish prejudices? It surely will not be said, by those who praise Socrates, and Cicero, and Cato, and a host of such men, and who tell of the excellent precepts of the Vedant system, and the wise sayings of Rammohun Roy, that there were none in the world who were suitable, and might have been put in requisition, to propagate the Gospel!

But is it true, in fact, that the apostles could not undergo such a *change* in sentiment and habits of thought, as would fit them to publish the pure doctrines of Jesus? While we admit that they "were slow of heart to believe;" that they had many prejudices to overcome; and that it was a work of difficulty to change their early associations and feelings; do we not actually see them giving up one thing after another, and coming at length to count all things as loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus their Lord? Was it not their aim to abandon the traditions of the fathers, and to follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth? Did they not take joyfully the spoiling of their goods, and even amidst the flames of martyrdom preach Jesus and the resurrection, and die in the hope of salvation *by his blood*?

These things will perhaps be granted, since they cannot be denied; and yet it will be said, 'They might not have conquered *all* their early impressions.' But if it be intended by this, that the apostles were not fully qualified to preach the Gospel, and that they did make mistakes in doctrine; then is the sentiment nothing short of infidelity. For Christ certainly promised the Holy Spirit to his apostles, *to abide with them continually*, not only "to bring all things to their remembrance," which he had taught them personally, but "to guide them into *all the truth*." And, surely, this implies that they should be kept from errors in point of doctrine. For those are not guided into *all truth*, who still are left to fall into errors. Besides, the apostles *claimed* that they were

inspired, and that what they taught was "not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth."

We are not then to doubt, that Jesus fulfilled the promise which he made to the apostles, "that he would guide them into all truth," and must therefore maintain, that they were prepared to preach the Gospel of salvation *without giving it a wrong coloring*. If, however, any will insist, that Christ did not fulfil his great promise; that he left his apostles to fall into mistakes; or that they did not give their instructions, "in words which the Holy Ghost teacheth;" we must leave them, with other *infidels*, to be instructed from the light of nature. For those are not to be reasoned with from the *Scriptures*, who will not admit that the truths contained in them were spoken and written according to the inspiration by the Holy Ghost.

Leaving then this scheme for explaining away the atonement of Christ, and the doctrine of remission by his blood, since it cannot be maintained without running into infidelity, I proceed,

3. To consider the remaining system. This is an ingenious contrivance to blind the minds of people, and lead them to give up the doctrine, without shocking their prejudices. Orthodox phraseology is curiously wrought into it, Jesus is called "our Saviour," men are said to be "saved by the death of Jesus," and "all blessings are conferred through Jesus Christ our Saviour." But does it allow that "Jesus has become *the author* of eternal salvation?" No; but only that he is the *channel of communication*. Christ is not the author of those spiritual and everlasting blessings which are prepared for the friends of God, any more than an aqueduct is the author of the water that passes through it.

The scheme in question is the following; 'Those strong expressions, which represent the death of Christ as our *ransom for sin, our redemption, our peace with God, the propitiation for our sins*, and others of a similar import, are *figurative illustrations*, meaning only that "Christ fell a sacrifice in the cause of human welfare and happiness, and that his tragical death, and exalted virtue, present such a powerful motive to repentance and reformation, as will lead to true piety, and procure the remission of sins."

This system is preached under all the varieties of which it is susceptible, and with all the *Orthodox phraseology that can be wrought into it*, for the sake of "beguiling unstable souls," and conveying the idea that there is very little difference between Orthodoxy and Unitarianism. But let us examine the merits of the scheme.

It is true, indeed, that there is a connexion between the death of Christ and our repentance and reformation. It affords an example of patience, of obedience, of virtue, which is suited to make a strong impression upon the heart, and to make men believe that

the doctrines of Christ are from heaven. But still, if the apostles sought only for a *motive* to urge repentance and reformation, why did they not reason from Christ's *resurrection*? What would his death be without his resurrection, to give assurance of another and a better life? Is it not his *resurrection*, then, which affords the *strongest motive* for believing the Gospel, and practising that virtue which will secure peace with God? Is not this the broad seal of heaven, which stamps the doctrines of Jesus with Divine authority, and demonstrates all his pretensions to be in accordance with truth? And does it not likewise give assurance, that all who sleep in Jesus shall be brought with him to glory and immortality? Surely, then, the apostles would have made more of the resurrection than the death of Christ, had they sought only for *motives* to that virtue "which is to procure the remission of sins!"

But further, when the Apostles urge the death of Christ, as a motive for repentance and reformation, they draw the obligation as a *consequence* from the propitiation of Christ. "Forasmuch as ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but *with the precious blood of Christ*, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, *pass the time of your sojourning here in fear.*"

Again, Christ and his apostles taught unequivocally, that his death was designed for another purpose, aside from furnishing *motives to repentance*. "This is my blood which is shed for you, FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS." "The Son of Man came to GIVE HIS LIFE A RANSOM FOR MANY." "HE DIED TO REDEEM US FROM THE CURSE OF THE LAW, BEING MADE A CURSE FOR US." "God has set him forth as a *propitiation for sin*, that he might be just, and yet justify him that believeth in Jesus." "He made *reconciliation for the sins of the people.*" Schleusner commenting on these passages, says; "Christ became an object of execration in our stead." "He was made an expiatory offering, in the place of sinners, to procure their deliverance from the curse." "Christ was sent of God, for the *express purpose* of undergoing death, as the cause of human salvation; and God has proposed Christ, as the *expiator* or *expiatory victim.*" "Expiating the sins of mankind, by a sacrifice offered."

But omitting other passages which give the same view of Christ's death, let us consider some doctrines unequivocally taught by the apostles which are contrary to the hypothesis here examined. In many places, they represent that we are pardoned *freely*, through faith in Christ Jesus. But the scheme in question teaches us that we obtain the remission of sins *by repentance and reformation*. These two ideas can never be made to harmonize. For, if we are pardoned *freely* as a *gratuity*, it must be clear, that reformation is not the meritorious cause of pardon.



Another doctrine of the apostles contravened by this hypothesis is, that *Christ acquired the right of granting repentance and remission of sins*, by his suffering for our sakes. God had promised, that if he would make his soul an offering for sin, he should see a seed that should prolong their days, and that *he should justify many*. And in conformity with this, it is declared by the apostles that, “for his suffering and death, he is highly exalted as a prince and a Saviour, to give repentance and remission of sins.”

The apostles further teach us, that the death of Christ shows the righteousness of God in pardoning those who lived *before his advent*, and on whom his death *could not have operated as a motive*. “Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth as a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus.” Rom. iii. 24, 25. Schleusner says upon the phrase; *δια την παρεσιν των προγεγονοτων αμαρτηματων*; “*per remissionem peccatorum ante factorum seu commissorum*,”—“for the remission of sins before done or committed.” And it is evident, from the succeeding phrase, which is antithetical to the above, *εν τω νυν καιρω*, that he was speaking in the one place of the sins *anciently committed*, and of those *committed in the present age*. Rosenmüller also says, the passage refers to “*sins anciently committed*” (*peccata olim commissa*.) All commentators of note, from Chrysostom down to this time, give the same idea. Even Wakefield renders it “former sins,” and the Improved Version “past sins.”

But lest some should still say, that the phrase does not refer to the sins of those who died before the coming of Christ, I will pass to the consideration of another passage; “And for this cause, he is the Mediator of the New Testament, [Covenant] that, *by means of death*, FOR THE REMISSION OF THE TRANSGRESSIONS THAT WERE UNDER THE FIRST TESTAMENT, [Covenant] *they who are called might receive the promise of etcrnal inheritance*.” Heb. ix. 15. Will any pretend, that *none* who lived and died before the coming of Christ, were called to an eternal inheritance? But we are here told, that Christ died for the remission of the transgressions of all who are thus called. Rosenmüller renders it; “That by his own death he might *expiate even the sins which were committed while the ancient form of religion remained*; and that *all whom God adopted* might receive the promised eternal inheritance.” And Professor Stuart proves, that “*κεκλημενος* refers to just men of the times which preceded the Gospel dispensation.”

Thus it is made clear, that the death of Christ procured the remission of sins for those, to whom *it never could have been a*

*motive to repentance and reformation;—and the whole train of Unitarian arguments on the sacrifice of Jesus, and remission of sins by his blood, is shown to be but “the baseless fabric of a vision.”*



REMARKS ON A REVIEW OF MILTON'S "CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE," in  
the Christian Examiner. Vol. 3.

IN this Review, Milton is claimed as the advocate of Unitarianism. "We are unable," says the writer,\* "within our limits to give a sketch of Milton's strong reasoning against the Supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ. We must, however, pause a moment, to thank God that he has raised up this illustrious advocate of the long obscured doctrine of the Divine Unity. We can now bring forward the three greatest and noblest minds of modern times, and we may add of the Christian era, as witnesses to that Great Truth of which, in an humbler and narrower sphere, we desire to be the defenders. Our Trinitarian adversaries are perpetually ringing in our ears the names of Fathers and Reformers. We take Milton, Locke and Newton, and place them in our front, and want no others to oppose to the whole array of great names on the opposite side. Before these intellectual suns, the stars of self-named orthodoxy 'hide their diminished heads.' To these eminent men, God communicated such unusual measures of light and mental energy, that their names spring up spontaneously, when we think or would speak of the greatness of our nature. Their theological opinions were the fruits of patient, profound, reverent study of the Scriptures. They came to this work with minds not narrowed by a technical, professional education, but accustomed to broad views, to the widest range of thought. They were shackled by no party connexions. They were warped by no clerical ambition, and subdued by no clerical timidity. They came to this subject in the fulness of their strength, with free minds open to truth, and with unstained purity of life. They came to it, in an age, when the doctrine of the Trinity was instilled by education, and upheld by the authority of the church and by penal laws. And what did these great and good men, whose intellectual energy and love of truth have made them the chief benefactors of the human mind, what, we ask, did they discover in the Scriptures? a triple divinity? three infinite agents? three infinite objects of worship? three persons, each of whom possesses his own distinct offices, and yet shares equally in the godhead with the rest? oh no! Scripture joined with nature, and with that secret voice in the heart which even idolatry could not always stifle, and taught them to bow reverently before the One Infinite Father, and to ascribe to him alone, supreme, self-existent Divinity."

\* Rev. Dr. Channing.

We have nothing to do at present with Newton or Locke. We think, however, that it would be no difficult task to point out facts concerning their religious opinions, which would show their authority of little avail with the sect to which the author belongs. But we are now speaking of Milton, and our purpose is to show that modern Unitarianism has nothing to expect from pleading his authority. We might here say, that nothing can be more unsatisfactory to a thinking mind than the attempt to substantiate any doctrine whatever by the authority of great names. The greatest minds have their weaknesses, and it is not unusual that those weaknesses stand out in a prominence proportioned to their intellectual superiority. Origen was a great man. Yet who would be the advocate of his opinions in all their practical results? Paschal is a precious name; yet the conscientious practice of penance, observed by him, would now be called the height of absurdity. It is, however, both agreeable and profitable to know how great men before us have thought on those subjects which deeply concern ourselves. And as the authority of 'Fathers and Reformers' is so much pleaded, we are told, by Trinitarians, we ought to listen willingly to the citations of authority brought forward upon the opposite side; and we have only to lament, in the case now before us, that it is done with so little consistency.

Our first remark on the subject is, that Milton was not *always* an Anti-Trinitarian. This is obvious from the following extract taken from his supplicatory address to the Deity.—“Thou, therefore, that sittest in light and glory unapproachable, Parent of angels and men! next Thee I implore, omnipotent King, Redeemer of that lost remnant whose nature thou didst assume, ineffable and everlasting Love! and Thou, the third subsistence of divine infinitude, illumining Spirit, the joy and solace of created things! *one tri-personal Godhead!* look upon this thy poor and almost spent and expiring church.”

The time when the 'Treatise on Christian Doctrine' was written is involved in so much uncertainty, that no one can safely affirm that it was composed subsequently to the supplicatory address above quoted. For aught that can be proved, the prayer may have been subsequent to the treatise, and thus prove that Milton, on maturer thought, had renounced his Anti-Trinitarianism. When to this consideration are added the circumstances, that, in the view of many learned men, it is questionable whether Milton was really the author of the treatise, and that in all the rest of his works it is nowhere distinctly stated that he was an Anti-Trinitarian, we are authorized in saying, that the attempt to prove him such has never been quite successful.

Our second remark is, that, on the supposition that Milton was really the author of the famous treatise, he cannot, in justice, be claimed by modern Unitarians. He was very far from being a

Unitarian, in the present, received sense of that term. That in setting his authority against the champions of Orthodoxy, Dr. Channing intended to refer to all the most important points of difference between the opposing religious sects of the present day—the Orthodox and the Unitarians—is obvious from his own language—‘*Our Trinitarian adversaries*’—‘*Self-named Orthodoxy*,’ &c. Is it not plain that the writer of the Review aimed at aiding the cause of Unitarianism, as it *now* exists, by quoting the authority of Milton? And yet, in regard to the main points of difference, he is directly opposed to that system, in at least three cases out of four. Milton believed in human depravity, in the atonement, and regeneration, in such a manner as not only to differ entirely from modern Unitarianism, but in such a manner as *not* to differ essentially from the Orthodox statements of those doctrines which have prevailed in the Protestant churches of both continents. This is acknowledged by the author of the Review.

“We now arrive,” says he, “at that part of Milton’s work in which his powerful mind might have been expected to look beyond the prevalent opinions of his day, but in which he has followed the *beaten road*, almost without deviation, seldom noticing difficulties, and hardly seeming to know their existence. We refer to the great subject of the *moral condition of mankind*, and of *redemption by Jesus Christ*. The *doctrine of original sin he assumed as true*,” &c. “With respect to *Christ’s mediation*, he supposes that *Christ saves us by bearing our punishment, and in this way satisfying God’s justice*.” “On these great subjects, of *human nature and redemption*, we confess we are disappointed in finding the spirit of Milton satisfying itself with the degrading notions that *prevailed around him*.” “Having concluded the subject of redemption, he passes to what he calls ‘*man’s renovation, or the change whereby the sinner is brought into a state of grace* ;’ and here, though he is not always perspicuous, yet he seldom deviates from what was then the *beaten road*.”

The doctrines mentioned above are very important, and those upon which there is a vital difference of opinion between the two sects of the present time. Yet in *all these*, Milton is essentially with the Orthodox, and entirely opposed to Unitarianism. Besides these, he was a believer in the personality of the Holy Ghost, and in respect to His influences on the minds of men, carried his views almost to Quakerism. We do not say that Milton exactly agreed, respecting these doctrines, with the Orthodox of his own times, or those of the present time. We say, with Dr. Channing, that he essentially followed “the *beaten road*.”

Now what shall we say to these things? Shall the authority of Milton be claimed by the Unitarians, when he has favored them in one doctrine only, and opposed them in at least three others, equally important, and equally controverted? Is arithmetic so

much improved in the present *march of mind*, that three has become less than one? Might not Trinitarians turn upon this writer with his own weapons, and accost him in the following manner?—‘You and your brethren deery the doctrine of human depravity. You believe that men are born pure from sinful propensities, neither inclined to virtue nor to vice. We believe that man is naturally depraved. You are perpetually ringing in our ears the names of Priestley and Belsbam. We take Milton and place him in our front, and want no other to oppose to the whole army of great names on the other side. Before this intellectual sun, the stars of *liberal* Christianity hide their diminished heads. To this eminent man, God communicated such unusual measures of light and mental energy, that his name springs up spontaneously when we think or would speak of the greatness of our nature. His theological opinions were the fruit of a patient, profound, reverent study of the Scriptures. He came to this work with a mind not narrowed by a technical, professional education, but accustomed to broad views, to the widest range of thought. He was shackled by no party connexions. He was warped by no clerical ambition, and subdued by no clerical timidity. He came to this subject in the fulness of his strength, with a free mind, open to truth, and with unstained purity of life. And what did this great and good man, whose intellectual energy and love of truth have made him one of the chief benefactors of the human mind, we ask, what did he discover in the Scriptures? Was it that all men are naturally free from sinful inclinations—possessed of no wicked propensities? Oh no! Scripture joined with nature, and with that secret voice in the heart which idolatry could not always stifle, and taught him to bow reverently before the One Infinite Father, who has declared that “the carnal mind is enmity against God.”’

In like manner might the argument be conducted in favor of Orthodox views of the atonement and regeneration, and Milton’s authority, in both cases, be set against Unitarianism. So far, then, as the controversy now existing between the two sects in this country is concerned, the name of Milton is favorable to Orthodoxy in a threefold proportion. Did it possess in our view as much authority as our author attaches to it, we should regard it as an accession to our cause of no trifling magnitude. But we do not so regard it.

Our third remark is, that we attach but little value to the authority of Milton on *religious subjects*. We might almost infer the propriety of this conclusion from analogical reasoning. No man is great in everything. We often discover the most glaring blemishes in those whose greatness is blazoned through the world. When to this general fact is added the circumstance, that the highest degree of culture given to the fancy and the imagination is apt to destroy the balance of mind, and leave the faculty of reason, when turned

to other subjects than those of poetry, less sure and lucid, it should caution us against looking for the greatest theologian in the greatest poet. But we are not left to mere conjecture. Facts prove incontestably that Milton was not a faithful interpreter of the Bible. He deduced doctrines from that holy Book, which are now acknowledged to be absurd, and some of them of immoral tendency. Such a fact, capable of abundant proof, is enough to invalidate his authority as a religious teacher. In religious concerns we have no confidence in him, and we can have none, after listening to his statement of some of his peculiar sentiments, and his attempt to prove them. We omit, for the present, the notice of Milton's opinion, that there is no distinction between the soul and body of man, and his consequent belief that all consciousness is suspended between death and the resurrection. We say nothing of his disposition to attribute human shape to the Supreme Being. We say nothing of the disorganization which his principles would introduce into the ministry, if ministry it might be called, where "any believer is competent to act as an ordinary minister, according as convenience may require, provided only he be endowed with the necessary gifts, these gifts constituting his mission."

These things, and some others which we omit to notice, are sufficient to show, that Milton is an unsafe guide in religion. But we have other topics of a more serious nature to bring forward.

Milton advocated the lawfulness of polygamy, and on the subject of divorce advanced such sentiments and reasonings as would introduce the greatest disorders into social life. If Milton is of such amazing authority, why may not the Grand Sultan plead his name in favor of his harem? Why should we strive to convert the heathen nations of the earth from the practice of polygamy, if Milton's opinion in favor of the practice is to be confidently set against 'Fathers and Reformers?' Why should public opinion in civilized and Christian countries attach such high importance to conjugal vows as to make divorce almost impracticable, if Milton's authority to the contrary is of such indispensable weight?

If it be objected to these inquiries, that they are unnecessary, because no one would think of following Milton's authority in practices so strongly disavowed by the spirit of the present age, our reply is, that his opinions were *professedly deduced from Scripture*, and they are the opinions of that man whose sentiments on other points, derived from the same source, are boldly produced as an offset to all the authority of 'Fathers and Reformers.' Why should he be an infallible guide in the one case, and totally subversive of morality in the other? Why should this intellectual sun shine with such insufferable brightness, while Unitarians alone feel its influence, but when the Orthodox would behold its light, on a sudden become a dark planet, bringing only

disastrous eclipse? Why should it resemble the cloud of the Israelites, full of light only to those on the one side, but utter darkness to those on the other.

There is one other doctrine that Milton has advanced, which we feel bound to notice. He contends that the *fourth commandment* is abolished; and that, *under the Gospel*, no time is appointed for public worship! a doctrine much admired, we know, by some of our politicians high in office, but regarded by the sober, religious and philanthropic citizens of our country as utterly hostile to the prosperity, if not to the very existence of its boasted institutions.

Our readers know that great exertions are now making to secure the better observance of the Sabbath, and they know too that many who love to violate the sacred day feel very uneasy at the restraints likely to be imposed upon them in consequence of these exertions. They are aware that much has been written, more said, and still more felt, in opposition to such benevolent efforts. Now we ask, what greater argument can the violaters of the Sabbath wish than the authority of Milton, exalted as it is by Dr. Channing? Let them take their stand, and address the friends of the Sabbath in the following manner,—‘ You believe the institution of the Sabbath to be of divine obligation, and you also believe it essential to the prosperity of our country. We differ from you in both particulars. We think it was abolished with the rest of the Mosaic system, and that it is not recognized in the Gospel. You plead Fathers and Reformers in defence of your opinion, but we care not for this; we take Milton, and place him in our front, and want no other to oppose to the whole array of great names on the opposite side. He was shackled by no party connexions. He was warped by no clerical ambition, and subdued by no clerical timidity. He came to this subject in the fulness of his strength, with a free mind, open to truth, and with unstained purity of life. And what did this great and good man discover in the Scriptures? That the Sabbath is a divine and perpetual institution? Oh no! Scripture joined with nature and taught him that the Sabbath is abolished. We believe with him, that it became obsolete with the rest of the Mosaic system, and that it is not recognized in the New Testament. Its observance rests entirely on expediency, and though you think it expedient, we think otherwise, and, as citizens of a free country, our practice shall be different from yours.’

What must be the result of such an appeal? Either the sanctity of the Sabbath must be trodden under foot, or the authority of Milton must be abandoned.

Such is a plain statement of facts. Milton has advocated principles founded, in his view, on the Bible, which, in the opinion of the most enlightened men of the present age, are wholly untenable.

ble and even absurd, and some of them possessing a highly dangerous moral tendency; and yet, because in one point he agrees with Unitarians, he is boastfully set against 'Fathers and Reformers.'

As a *theologian*, we are obliged to speak of Milton disparagingly. We are compelled to this by a repeated examination of his works. We are unwilling, however, to dismiss the subject, without expressing our unqualified admiration of most of his poetical productions. It is here that we love to contemplate him, and nowhere else. In other departments, he seems to us like Bellerophon, mounted on his flying horse, and soaring in his dangerous and unprepared flight; we look with anxious eye till we behold the disastrous fall, and shudder to think of the sequel. We feel a pleasure whenever the name of Milton occurs—a pleasure arising, however, not from the recollection of the critic or theologian, but of the author of *Paradise Lost*.

---

## REVIEWS.

### REVIEW OF PROFESSOR STUART'S COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS, in several Numbers of the Christian Examiner.

Luther dedicated his treatise "De Servo Arbitrio" to his antagonist, the celebrated Erasmus. The Reformer was wont to use intelligible language, whether he addressed Popes, Princes, or Scholars. "You exceed Ulysses in caution; one while you affirm nothing, at another time you assume an air of positiveness. It is impossible to arrive at any distinct and satisfactory issue with such men,—unless indeed one had the art of catching Proteus."

Erasmus is not the only man, who, forbearing to express his real opinions till he could forbear no longer, has at last given them a doubtful utterance. Neither is he the last elegant scholar, whose perverted talents have been arrayed against the truth. "I am much grieved for yourself," says Luther, "that you should pollute your most beautiful and ingenious language with such sordid sentiments;" and again, "I feel most indignant to see such contemptible materials conveyed in the most precious and ornamental pieces of eloquence. They are like the filth of a dunghill placed in golden dishes."

Feelings akin to those of Luther we have experienced, on reading what purports to be a Review of Professor Stuart's Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, published in the Christian



Examiner. We have already paid some attention to the two first numbers of this Review, and, although the writer maintains a pertinacious silence relative to some questions of great practical importance we propounded for his consideration, we shall not think it labor lost to examine somewhat minutely the developements with which he closes his extended article.

With reference to the authorship and authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we deem it unnecessary to add another word. We do not, however, think the subject exhausted. But the arguments for and against the epistle are fairly before the public, and we are perfectly willing to leave the subject to the consideration of intelligent minds, and to the providence of that God whose Word endureth forever. Other and higher considerations invite or rather challenge our attention. We have always considered the contest relative to this Epistle as the mere skirmish of advanced guards. The great battle is yet to be fought. The main body is yet to engage.

Strategics, as sometimes defined, is the science of military movement beyond the visual circle of the enemy, or out of cannon shot. Tactics is the science of military movement, executed in the presence of an enemy, so as to be actually in his sight, and within the range of his artillery. Our liberal opponents, having long confined themselves to strategics, have recently exhibited a specimen of tactics for which we sincerely thank them. The Reviewer of Professor Stuart's work is the first American Unitarian who has presumed to inform the public that the Epistle to the Hebrews is not to be regarded as a part of the Sacred Canon. This is one instance of tactics. Having adventured on this step and mistaking audacity for courage, he follows up his first development, with another instance of tactics more astounding. "*The canonical books of the New Testament are not the revelation which God made by Christ.*"

Truly we live in an age of great light, or of gross darkness. For two centuries, the pilgrims and their children have clung to the New Testament as the revelation which God made by Christ. The sneers of the eloquent Gibbon, the fallacies of the skeptical Hume, and the scurrilities of Paine, have left the Sacred Volume sound and unscarred. The principle of vitality is within it, and it will live; a castle, surrounded by moats and bastions which the Lord hath erected, it will stand fast, and stand forever. Though an Arnold be within, his intentions will be defeated.

We propose to examine at more length, the opinions of the Reviewer already alluded to. In order to do him justice, we shall not limit ourselves to his last effort, but bring together various pieces which are attributed to the same pen. "If we wish to determine Semler's own opinion" says Eichhorn, "concerning the canon, inspiration, and revelation, it is difficult to find any certain ground.

Instead of clearly unfolding his opinions on these subjects, and connecting them together methodically, he threw them together, as it were designedly, in confusion, and veiled what was peculiar to himself concerning them in mysterious darkness."

With reference to the Reviewer, this "mysterious darkness" is *beginning* to disappear. A comparison of pieces published by him, we trust, will not be without service to the party with which he is associated, and which recognizes in him one of its most eminent and influential supporters. One reason for this collation and juxtaposition of passages is the well known maxim, *Quisque optimus verborum suorum interpres*. Should any thing like a contradiction be educed by this comparison, the writer can have the alternative of dogged silence, or, as he says of "a canonical book,—his own sense of it, he can endeavor to explain."

In 1819, Professor Stuart published his Letters to Dr. Channing. In the concluding Letter he wrote thus:—

"I am well satisfied, that the course of reasoning in which you have embarked, and the principle now in question by which you explain away the divinity of the Saviour, must lead most men who approve of them eventually to the conclusion, that the Bible is not of divine origin, and does not oblige us to belief or obedience. I do not aver, that they will lead you there. You have more serious views of the importance of religion, than many, perhaps, of those who speculate with you. Consistency with your present views will afford strong inducement not to give up the divine authority of the Scriptures. But are there not some who embrace Unitarian sentiments, that have no inconsistency to fear, by adopting such an opinion? Deeming what you have publicly taught them to be true, viz., that it is no "crime to believe with Mr. Belsham," who declares that the *Scriptures are not the word of God*; feeling the inconsistency, (as I am certain some of them will and do feel it,) of violating the rules of interpretation, in order to make the apostles speak, as in their apprehension they ought to speak; and unable to reconcile what the apostles say, with their own views; will it not be natural to throw off the restraints which the old idea of the inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures impose upon them, and receive them simply on the ground on which they place any other writings of a moral and religious nature? I make no pretensions to uncommon foresight in regard to this subject. I certainly do not say these things with invidious designs, and for the sake of kindling the fire of contention. Very far from it. On the contrary; I fear that the parties now contending here, will not cease to contend, until this ground be openly taken."

In the Christian Disciple of the same year is a labored article, purporting to discuss the subject considered by Prof. Stuart. The writer, alluding to the passage just quoted, repels the charge of a tendency to reject the Scriptures, in this manner:—

"Some of our opponents insist, in language which seems to us extremely presumptuous, that if we reject their doctrines, we must also reject the Scriptures, and give up our Christian faith. They are not very scrupulous in refraining from the use of those somewhat dishonorable weapons of warfare, insinuations and charges of real or virtual infidelity. We value Christianity quite as much as they can do; and we feel compelled to say, that we think we understand its real value much better than they do. We believe its divine origin in the highest and strongest possible sense of the words, quite as firmly as they can; and we think we perceive the intrinsic divinity of its character with in-

comparably more clearness, than it can be discerned by those, who, as it seems to us, have mistaken some of the grossest and worst errors of man for essential doctrines of the religion of God." p. 398.

Again, in another connexion:—

"To doctrines, which those who hold them contend make a part of God's revelation, we oppose the true revelation from God contained in the Scriptures." p. 383.

Again, p. 331:—

"We shall not be compelled to renounce the Scriptures in order to get rid of the doctrines of Orthodoxy. But we will concede so much as this to Professor Stuart; that if we did believe these doctrines to have been taught by Christ and his apostles, we should then think that a most overwhelming weight of external evidence would be necessary to establish the truth of a revelation, which would appear to us to contain so much internal evidence *against* its truth."

This writer, and the Reviewer in the Examiner, are understood to be the same. What occult meaning he may have attached to language, we will not say, but it is plain that he intended to be understood by the public as receiving the Scriptures as of inspired, divine, infallible authority. He professes to consider it "extremely presumptuous" to insist that Unitarians must ultimately reject the Scriptures. It is evident, that the Reviewer of Professor Stuart's Letters to Dr. Channing meant to deny the tendency of Unitarianism to a rejection of the Scriptures; meant, moreover, to claim for Unitarians a belief in the Scriptures as of inspired, infallible authority.

It may assist us to a correct apprehension of Unitarian understanding on this subject, to consider some other pieces published in the Christian Disciple and Christian Examiner. The first extract we present is from the former of these publications for 1819, p. 181.

"Many have appeared to think they could make the word of God better than he has made it, or at least that they could put it in better order than he has assigned to it. But why have not the evangelists and apostles given a regular system of Christian theology and duties? I answer, for the very important reason, that neither our Lord nor his apostles *taught* in this manner. Is it asked why they did not so teach? I answer, because they *better knew what was in man*; and what man required to be made *wise unto salvation*."

Here the Bible is the Word of God, presented to man in just that order which God assigned to it. This is Orthodoxy, though published in the Christian Disciple. In the Christian Examiner, first volume, is an essay entitled, "Christianity a Study for Intelligent Men." Page 24, the writer asks,

"How is it possible for us to overrate the importance of the inquiry, whether God has been pleased to make by a special and supernatural revelation a direct communication to mankind? Whether Jesus of Nazareth be the organ of this communication? Whether the Scriptures contain it? And if we admit that there are strong presumptions in favor of this fact, or indeed, as all must admit that

there is nothing impossible nor improbable in the supposition that such is the fact, ought any intelligent man to be content until he has made himself acquainted with the grounds on which Christianity rests its claims to be received?" . . . . . "Religion is the highest law of our being; ought it not therefore to be one of the first objects of our inquiry? Christianity comes as the immediate communication of God to man; and when God speaks, shall man refuse to listen? We are moral beings, made in the image of our Creator, intrusted with valuable talents, owing much to God and man, and bearing a high responsibility. Christianity proffers a complete and unerring rule of life; what instructor so valuable, what guide so important? We are eager in the pursuit of happiness, it is our anxious inquiry, who shall show us any good? Christianity proffers counsels on this subject, which are infallible; and discloses the only true and inexhaustible sources of happiness, where we may drink it pure." . . . "In Christianity we have a religion which comes thus clothed with divine authority; which imparts instructions thus useful and necessary; which inspires hopes thus consolatory and transporting; which proffers to us a system of duty and happiness, in which as yet the world has detected no error, has found nothing deficient and nothing superfluous. We appeal then with confidence to every intelligent and reflecting man, and ask only, what subject has claims upon his study and investigation in any degree comparable to the Gospel."

In the same volume of the *Christian Examiner*, we find a number of essays, entitled "Notes upon the Bible," understood to have been written by a gentleman of leading influence with his party. These "Notes" are, for the most part, a judicious compilation of valuable matter. The following extract is from page fifth.

"The Bible is regarded by Christians with reverence, as containing a revelation from God to men; and it is read with peculiar interest, as the sacred book from which is drawn the system of their religious faith. This reverence with which it is regarded, and interest with which it is read, alike by the whole Christian community, may be expected to excite a lively interest in every inquiry relative to the form in which it appears, its history, its contents, and its meaning. Every one must be desirous of knowing what are the true grounds of his respect for that book, and what the real value of the instructions which he receives from it. There are some misconceptions respecting it, I apprehend, which may be traced to our early impressions, and the manner in which it is put into our hands, in our childhood. It is put into our hands as a single volume, and we read it as the single work of a single author. There is indeed one point of view in which it may not be very incorrect thus to consider it. As containing a revelation from God, and giving a complete account of the divine dispensations in their connexion and harmony, it is to be read as a single book. Though delivered in parcels, at sundry times, in succession, through a long period, it reveals one system of doctrine, one rule of life, one object of hope, and is professedly communicated to the world by the direction and influence of one and the same Spirit."

By this extract it appears that in 1824, the Bible was read with the same interest and regarded with the same reverence by Unitarians as "by the whole Christian community;" read as "containing a revelation from God to men;" as "giving a complete account of the divine dispensation in their connexion and harmony;" as "revealing one system of doctrine, one rule of life, one object of hope, and as professedly communicated to the world by one and the same Spirit." A stronger declaration of the inspiration and infallibility of the Holy Scriptures could not easily be made. We forbear to adduce any other quotations in illustration of the inspiration and authority heretofore attributed to the Bible by Unitari-

ans. We do not assert that, while these high encomiums were paid to the Scriptures, nothing was said of a counteracting tendency; that no hints, no insinuations, no innuendoes escaped either these or other writers in the *Disciple* or *Examiner*. For certainly there were such hints and insinuations. But, it is manifest, that the current has heretofore set in the Orthodox channel on this subject. This Professor Stuart predicted could not long continue. It was but an eddy against the stream, and must ultimately be overborne. Disbelief in the Scriptures, as the infallible rule of faith and practice, having been incidentally oozing and leaking out, has at last burst forth in a crevasse which threatens to inundate the land, and to whelm in indiscriminate and common ruin man and beast, life and property. In the *Christian Examiner* for July 1829, p. 344, the Reviewer of Prof. Stuart's Commentary thus speaks of the canonical books of the New Testament:—

“These books, it is true, are not a revelation. They are nothing more than the best records which remain to us of the revelation which God made by Jesus Christ. This revelation—it is a truth which we wish were more widely and better understood—is not to be identified with the canonical books of the New Testament. It consists of a very few all important truths, the knowledge of which, if it had pleased God, might have been preserved in books very different from those we now possess, or through any mode of tradition, by which those truths, and the evidence of the divine authority of him who taught them, could have been, in a satisfactory manner, communicated to after ages. We will explain ourselves by an example. Let us suppose a philosopher of a mind as enlarged as that of Cicero, and of as high and pure moral sentiments, to have become convinced, during the apostolic age, that Christ was a messenger from God, and to have carefully collected and committed to writing all the information which could then be procured concerning his character, miracles and doctrines, and to have subjoined his own explanations and remarks. Let us, at the same time, suppose him neither called to be an apostle, nor having his mind miraculously illuminated, but left by God to the exercise of those natural powers which he had originally bestowed upon him. The work of such a writer would, as far as we can judge, have been at least of equal value with any book which remains to us; though it must have been altogether different from any book of the New Testament.

The canonical books of the New Testament are not the revelation which God made by Christ. The character which belongs to the latter is not to be transferred to the former. Neither the teaching of our Saviour, nor the influences of God's spirit in enlightening the minds of the apostles, preserved them from all the errors of their age, from the influence of all human prejudices and feelings, from all inconclusive reasoning, or from all ambiguity, impropriety, and insufficiency in the use of language.”

There it is—out at last. The skeleton is at length disclosed in its own shrunken, fleshless hideousness. July 1829 will form an epoch in American Unitarianism not soon to be forgotten. The very writer who in 1819 pronounced it “extremely presumptuous” in any of his opponents to charge Unitarians with a disposition or tendency to reject the Scriptures, is himself the man in 1829 to do the deed. Haaael was not the only self-ignorant man who has lived upon our globe.

We should not expect by any remarks we could make, or any arguments we might adduce, to influence in the least the mind of

this writer, compromised as he is to party, and goaded on by pressing circumstance and outbreking opinion. Neither do we expect to moderate the fury of the "forty men which have bound themselves with an oath that they will neither eat nor drink till they have" outrooted "the false estimate which is so general of the nature and uses of the holy Scriptures." But we do trust there are some candid, serious minds among Unitarians, who are disposed solemnly to think, to weigh arguments and anticipate consequences, before they cut themselves adrift from the rock Christ Jesus, to wander, without chart, compass, or quadrant, on the cheerless, shoreless ocean of infidelity. To such minds the following remarks of Michaelis, we trust, will not be without weight and benefit. They are from a Review of "A Dissertation for a free inquiry into the Canon by Semler," which Review was published some years since in the *General Repository and Review*, edited by Professor Norton.

"Here I must aver, that I know not how, upon these views, the Bible can continue a *principium fidei* (i. e. a rule of faith.) If we are to suppose that in the same book there exist, not passages interpolated, and which criticism might detect, but authentic portions from the hand of the author, which are not inspired, how is it possible to decide of other passages that they are inspired? 'It pleases me—it seems edifying to me—I should be improved by it;'—these are no criterions of inspiration to the inquirer. And suppose a passage which seems all this to me now, should hereafter strike me differently, should contain in my opinion a morality too severe or too indulgent, and in either case therefore false and injurious, I must reject it. Scripture ceases thus to be to be a source and foundation of knowledge, and my own independent views are the only source left me by which I must decide on divine revelation itself. *St. John teaches, according to the exposition of Dr. Semler, in the first chapter of his gospel, in the clearest manner; the true and eternal Deity of Christ.* Now if I were a Socinian, I might think that this first chapter was not inspired, for instead of containing any thing, which would conduce to my improvement, it would lead me into idolatry. I need not therefore in this case contradict this passage of John; I need not give it a different exposition from that of Dr. Semler;—I may say that I consider the other parts of St. John inspired, but as for this, it will not improve me, it will lead me into idolatry, and it is not from God. This is the real consequence of Dr. Semler's principle."

These remarks of Michaelis have a direct bearing upon the passage quoted from the *Examiner*. The consequence he deduces from Semler's principle, is the inevitable result of this Reviewer's principles. The Bible is no longer, according to the fundamental principle of Protestantism, the rule of our faith and practice, but the opinions, wishes, and feelings of each individual have expelled the word of God from its rightful supremacy, and usurped its place and its dominion. We will add one or two more extracts from Michaelis, on account of their pertinent and intrinsic worth.

"Mahomet used to complain, when the Arabians in his time pointed out contradictions in the Koran, that the devil was busy in suggesting to him passages of all kinds, which he often wrote down with those that were divine; and that this was the case with all prophets. He desired them not to doubt his divine mission, on account of the errors into which he might therefore sometimes fall,

but to give the credit to the devil, from whence they came, and hold fast what was divine. But certainly the dullest would not be so credulous as to be satisfied with this. He would answer—'Mahomet, thou art an imposter by thine own confession!' Can the Bible be tried in any other way by the unprejudiced inquirer? Now if the books of Moses contain history, which has no divine authority—this is enough;—it is a human production. You may persuade children, but not philosophers, that what you shall select from it as profitable and edifying is inspired." . . . . .

"The most important remark is, that the divinity of revealed religion depends upon facts; upon miracles alleged to have been done, and prophecies fulfilled. Whether these facts are real—whether the ancient book which relates the miracles was sufficiently contemporaneous with them, and whether the prophecies were really made before their fulfilment, we, who live at this later day, could not tell, if we had not a series of Jewish history down to the Babylonian captivity; for the Asiatic history of the Greeks, as far as it has any certainty or connexion, is later in its date, beginning with Cyrus. Allow therefore that the history from Abraham to Cyrus, which we find in the Hebrew books, contained nothing calculated immediately to improve our minds, still it would be indispensable to confirm to us the truth of the facts upon which revealed religion depends. . . . . So long then as Dr. Semler grants the value of the testimony of miracles [and of prophecies] to weaker minds—[i. e. to the great mass for whom a revelation is intended]—the series of the Old Testament history is worthy of a divine origin. *By such an origin we do not understand an immediate revelation of the facts, where the natural sources of history would answer the purpose, but we understand a divine command or direct impulse to write, and a preservation from all error.*

I would reconcile Dr. Semler a little to these histories, which seem so superfluous to him, by a sentiment which is not original, but which I actually heard from a child six years old. 'I think,' said he, 'the Bible is a very pleasant book; a child loves to read it, there are so many stories in it; God made it, as if he knew what one likes to read.' This is true. A revelation projected by a zealous theologian, which should contain nothing but moral aphorisms, would be relished by few. A revelation should be contained in a book for common use; which the unlearned and the child can read with pleasure. If it is not all of this kind, it should be so in part. Stories are a vehicle of conveying moral truths, even to him who does not expect them. To attain this end, it is not to be demanded that each separate story should be pointed with its moral, which is impossible in authentic history, but only that the series of the history should be beneficial in its moral influence. It may be a question whether Dr. Semler has not thought more like a professor of theology, and the author of the Bible more like a common father of mankind, and one who knows his children's wants."

We have been thus liberal in our quotations, because we could express in the language of the acute and learned Michaelis our own views of the inspiration, authority and character of the Sacred Writings, which are, and have been, and will be, to the end of time, the views of all real believers in the Divine origin of Christianity. We have had another reason for selecting thus freely from this Review of Michaelis. It may be gathered from the following notice, which was taken of it by the editor of the Repository at the time of his publishing it.

"In the life of Semler," says he, "which was presented to our readers in the two first volumes of the Repository, there were many opinions of his, expressed by his biographer, Eichhorn, from which, as was noticed then, the editor dissented. Some of those were his views of the canon of Scripture, which we

\* How often have Sabbath School teachers and others, employed in teaching youth the Scriptures, heard similar sentiments from children. Not many wise, not many mighty, understand these "magnificent simplicities of our religion." Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings God ordains and perfects praise.

think were ably refuted by Michaelis, in the following Review of one of Semler's principal works."

If the editor's present views, relative to the canon of Scripture, differ from those of Semler, which are "here ably refuted by Michaelis," we would certainly be obliged to him to point out the difference.

Having already, in preceding numbers of our magazine, presented a distinct view of the arguments which prove the inspiration of the Scriptures, we deem it superfluous, in this connexion, to repeat them. We have only wished to adduce a few considerations, auxiliary to those already suggested, which recent Unitarian developements have rendered necessary. The whole subject of inspiration is about to undergo an examination to which it has not heretofore been subjected on this continent. There are those among us, who, emboldened by habit, and desperate by defeat, conscious that they cannot conquer, and resolved not to yield, will fire the powder room rather than be taken. They may blow themselves to atoms, and sink in ruins, but the ark in which the Lord Jesus Christ hath embarked will still float in triumph upon the waters. The public may expect ere long to see an array of all the sophistries, perversions and misrepresentations of Collins, Tindal, and Paine, new vamped from the school of Eichhorn, Eckermann and De Wette. In 1819 the Scriptures were divinely inspired and of infallible authority. In 1829 the Scriptures are not divinely inspired, are not of infallible authority, but were written by men "subject to the errors of their age, to human prejudices and feelings, to inconclusive reasoning, to ambiguity, impropriety and insufficiency in the use of language." In 1839 what fragment, what splinter will remain, to which an *enlightened* Unitarian can misapply the term *revelation*?

Without entering into a full examination of the reviewer's recent developements, we shall subjoin a few additional remarks of a somewhat miscellaneous character.

The first fact which glares upon us, as we read his closing pages, is, that he *not only expresses no coherent views of revelation and inspiration, but falls into irreconcilable contradiction upon these subjects.* We have no doubt that he rejects himself, and means to prepare the Unitarian public to reject, the commonly received notions of a Divine revelation. His own declarations make this clear. Yet he dare not say this openly, fully and without qualification. He must throw in something which will be thought to modify his own notions, and render them coherent in themselves, and consistent with those views hitherto defended by Unitarians, and believed by all real Christians. The following paragraphs appear within two pages of each other.

"Neither the teaching of our Saviour, nor the influences of God's Spirit in enlightening the minds of the apostles, preserved them from all the errors of



their age, from the influence of all human prejudices and feelings, from all inconclusive reasoning, or from all ambiguity, impropriety, and insufficiency in the use of language."—"In ascertaining the truths which are to be believed upon this authority, [i. e. the authority of God or of Christ,] we are not to confound with them the opinions, conceptions and reasonings of any particular writer upon the different subjects which he may have happened to touch, or to regard that language which he may have used with the freedom and looseness of extempore speech, as if he had been made secure, at once from error and misapprehension, by an immediate interposition of the Almighty."—"The light from heaven, which shone into the minds of the apostles, giving them a view of the essential character of Christianity, preserved them from all essential errors respecting it; and, above all, from superadding any human doctrine as a part of that revelation they were to teach."—"We learn from the New Testament itself, that Christianity was very imperfectly comprehended by many of its earlier converts. In the minds of those who were not guided by the miraculous influences of God's Spirit, a mixture of human opinions and conceptions with the truths of our religion almost immediately took place; and the former were often regarded as, equally with the latter, of divine authority."

If by this latter passage the writer meant anything, he must have meant that "the minds of those who were guided by the miraculous influences of God's Spirit" were preserved from "a mixture of human opinions and conceptions with the truths of our religion." But those who were thus "guided by miraculous influences" could have been none else than the apostles, "into whose minds the light from heaven shone, giving them a view of the essential character of Christianity, preserving them from all essential errors respecting it, and, above all, from superadding any human doctrine as a part of that revelation they were to teach." How all this coheres and makes a consistent whole with their being exposed to "the errors of their age, to human prejudices and feelings, to inconclusive reasoning, to ambiguity, impropriety and insufficiency in the use of language," requires a lynx-eyed perspicacity of apprehension to perceive, which falls to the lot of few short-sighted mortals, gifted with but the ordinary powers of reflection, comparison and inference. How those who were preserved "by miraculous influences" "from a mixture of human opinions and conceptions with the truths of our religion," "from superadding any human doctrines as a part of that revelation they were to teach," could at the same time "have confounded, with the truths which were to be believed upon the authority of Christ or of God, their own opinions, conceptions and reasonings, in which they were not secure from error and misapprehension," we submit as a problem for liberal investigation.

Intimately connected with the remarks just made are some which suggest themselves relative to *the present state of Unitarian opinion on the canon, inspiration and authority of the Scriptures*. Though this reviewer and his associates in the Examiner exercise no slight influence in controlling Unitarian opinions, yet there are those, ranked with the Unitarian party, not so completely spell-bound by authority as to be unwilling, at least occasionally, to think for themselves. Among these are some, though we suspect

a small and rapidly diminishing number, who have heretofore received the Scriptures, the writings of Prophets and Apostles, men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, as the Thessalonians received the teachings of Paul: "For this cause also thank we God without ceasing," says that Apostle to the Christians of Thessalonica, "because, when ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received it, not as the word of men, but (as it is in truth) the word of God." There are still some Unitarians who have professed, and we doubt not have sincerely professed, thus to receive the Scriptures. But the young, the adventurous, those who consider themselves the more enlightened, those who can appreciate the force and pertinence of arguments, and feel the inconsistencies which throng and overwhelm their system as at present sustained, are ready to demolish the temples and break in pieces the statues they have hitherto erected to the authority and infallibility of the Sacred Scriptures, and bow themselves down with the philosophers of revolutionary France, and the dreaming mysticks, misnamed divines, of Germany, before the shrine of "the great goddess" of reason. Between those who receive and those who reject the Scriptures as a revelation from God, there may be an intermediate party, who either have no fixed opinions, or know not what they are, but are as softened wax, ready for any impression. All these, grouped together under the appellation of Unitarians, form a heterogeneous mass of incongruous and warring materials, bound together by no sympathies, except those which spring from hostility to evangelical religion.

In these remarks we refer, and wish to be understood as referring in a special manner, to the leaders of the Unitarian party, to individuals of prominent character and controlling influence. We gladly believe, indeed we have reason to know, that there are many still united with Unitarian congregations, who receive the Scriptures as their fathers and the church of Christ in all ages have received them, as *the Word of God, the Revelation of Eternal Truth*. It is, we doubt not, on account of such individuals that the Reviewer in the *Christian Examiner* uses his cautions, and falls into his contradictory language. Their prejudices must not be too abruptly disturbed. Though the time has come when the film must be removed, yet the light must not be let in with too liberal a glare upon the recently couched eye. The operator in the *Examiner*, with scientific skill, having depressed the film, which has hitherto overspread the pupil of many Unitarian eyes, immediately applies the bandage.

It is with this class of Unitarians, and with this class only, that we expect our remarks, should they fall under their notice, to have any influence. Thoughtful and conscientious, will they suffer themselves longer to be led blindfolded in that path which ends

with the precipice of infidelity? Heretofore, when we have charged the leaders of the party with rejecting the Scriptures as the Word of God, we have been accused of slandering the best men among us. Epithets, not to be transferred to our pages, have been applied to us, and the charge has been pronounced groundless, injurious and false. But, it seems, the time has come for the mask to be removed. We ask all, who feel that they have souls, that they are immortal, accountable, and that they must soon render their account to the Judge of quick and dead, if they can clasp infidelity to their bosom, the hideous skeleton of whose character has hitherto been concealed, and whose existence denied, in the place of the fair form of Christian truth revealed in the volume of God's only Son? This is the great question of the day, and this is the question each one must decide for himself.

Should any Unitarian reader of our pages think that we are unreasonably severe in charging infidelity upon the leaders of his party, we trust he will, before he pronounces sentence upon us, re-examine the developments made by the gentleman, whose Review is under consideration, in his three closing pages. We must, however, advertise such a reader, that the Reviewer has not yet spoken *all* he means. But by what already appears, we know what is to follow. However ignorant, prejudiced or bigoted any of our Unitarian readers may deem us, doubtless they will consider Eichhorn sufficiently liberalized to meet the present wants of "liberal Christians." The following remarks by that writer, presented to the American public seventeen years ago by the gentleman who now denies that "the canonical books of the New Testament are a revelation," may, perhaps, suggest trains of profitable thought and practical inquiry.

"The writings of the New Testament are the pole-star of our understanding when it wanders in the region of speculation; the touch-stone of instructions delivered to us; the living spark that preserves the flame of moral sentiment for the mass of mankind. Were it extinguished, it would be the extinction of the light of Christian morality, and its place could not be supplied by the illuminations of any philosophical system."

If Eichhorn, either in the same piece or elsewhere, presents views that conflict with these, he is not solitary, as we have already seen, in his self-contradictions. The editor of the Repository, at the time he published Eichhorn's life of Semler, appended to it the following qualification: "There are some remarks in the free manner of the modern German school of theology, which for ourselves we neither defend nor approve. Ed." vol. i. p. 277. Now he not only defends and approves them, but we strongly suspect that Semler's crudities would lag behind this gentleman's phantasies. What is Unitarianism? With great pretensions, what is it but a revolving mountain of ice, chilling all and destroying many that come within its influence, but gradually melting and disap-

pearing before the sun of truth? What is it but a summer's brook, that dries up and fails at the season of utmost need? What is it but a cloud without water, carried about of winds; a tree, whose fruit withereth, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; a raging wave of the sea, foaming out its own shame; a wandering star, to which is reserved the blackness of darkness forever?

What phases Unitarianism is next to assume it is unnecessary to prognosticate; but it is desirable that it should be understood by the whole community, that its recent evolution presents it with the distinct features and the tangible form of infidelity. While it concedes to the apostles, in one paragraph, a miraculous guidance, it strips them in another of all such guidance, and attributes to them such imperfections, errors and false conceptions, as deprive their opinions of any weight, and their decisions of all authority. And what is this but infidelity, though it come in "the questionable shape" of liberal Christianity, and with the arrogant pretensions of enlightened reason? Let children be amused with names, and gulled with professions; but let no man, into whose mind one ray of discrimination ever darted, be cheated by these thin and guileful pretences. Satan, when transformed into an angel of light, will deny with most outrageous yet oily persistency that he is the foul fiend. Is he therefore no longer Satan? He will claim with unblushing shamelessness to be Gabriel. Is he therefore Gabriel? If such questions and such considerations as we have suggested carry an air of severity, how, we ask, can we express our earnest convictions of truth on this most momentous subject, without appearing to be harsh and severe to those whose hollow professions we are called upon and constrained to expose? To be silent, were to be traitors to Christ. To speak, and to speak out, and with effect, we must use language, propound questions, and adduce considerations, that shall fall upon the ear, and the intellect, and the conscience of many, with no grateful harmony of numbers, with no pleasing recollections of the past, and no cheering anticipations of the future. We have been specially careful in what we have said relative to the former and present professions of Unitarians with respect to the Scriptures, to give our readers chapter and verse from the Repository, Disciple, and Examiner, that they could frame their independent opinions, and draw their own conclusions. In closing our remarks under this head, we will barely repeat, that heretofore Unitarians have generally and as a party professed to receive the Scriptures as the Word of God, as a revelation from heaven, as divinely inspired, and of binding, infallible authority. All this is now given up, as an exploded error; THE SCRIPTURES ARE NOT A REVELATION.

The review under consideration exhibits *a characteristic specimen of Unitarian credulity and skepticism*. Without a suggestion by a solitary writer for fifteen hundred years that Apollos was the

author of the epistle to the Hebrews, this Reviewer can believe him to have written it. Against the express opinion of Pantæus, Clement, and Origen, who visited the oriental churches, and sought out facts relative to their early history, who resided at Alexandria, and presided over the first Christian school in that flourishing city, against the general testimony of the primitive church, which attributes this epistle to Paul, this gentleman can array a conjecture of recent date, and assign to conjecture authority paramount to that of fact. An epistle, known and received by the churches of Rome and Corinth, and quoted by Clement of Rome more frequently than any other book of the New Testament, as Sacred Scripture and of divine authority, when writing in behalf of the Roman church to the Corinthian Christians,—such an epistle, having been for seventeen hundred years received as canonical, is now pronounced uncanonical.

We will put together some of the Reviewer's assertions, and notice the result.

“Let us suppose a philosopher of a mind as enlarged as that of Cicero, and of as high and pure moral sentiments, to have become convinced, during the apostolic age, that Christ was a messenger from God, and to have carefully collated and committed to writing all the information which could then be procured concerning his character, miracles, and doctrines, and to have subjoined his own explanations and remarks. Let us, at the same time, suppose him neither called to be an apostle, nor having his mind miraculously illuminated, but left of God to the exercise of those natural powers which he had originally bestowed upon him. *The work of such a writer would, as far as we can judge, have been of at least equal value with any book which remains to us ; though it must have been altogether different from any book of the New Testament.*”

Cicero's work would, according to this gentleman, have been of “at least equal value” with any book which remains to us. How much *more* valuable he does not assert. Do we press the writer's words beyond their intent when we infer from his supposition, that Cicero's historical collections, had he made them, would have been equally authoritative and valuable with the epistles of Paul?

We presume that this writer himself and our readers will allow, that he intended to attribute an equal value to the supposed memorabilia of Cicero, and all the productions of Paul, although he uses the expression, “any book which remains to us.” If any one questions the propriety of this inference, he may limit our remarks to the epistle to the Romans.

We will here adopt the Reviewer's translation of a passage in the epistle to the Galatians. He gives Paul's words thus :

“I declare to you, brethren, that the Gospel preached by me is not conformed to the opinions of men ; for I did not receive it from any man, nor was I taught it by any man, but it was revealed to me by Jesus Christ.” p. 337. He adds, “The evidence of the truth of Christianity, which had been vouchsafed to St. Paul, was direct and peculiar. Just conceptions of its essential character and great design had been imparted to him by immediate revelation.” Again, p. 346, “The light from heaven which shone into the minds of the apostles, (of Paul among the rest,) giving them a view of the essential character of Chris-

tianity, preserved them from all essential errors respecting it; and, above all, from superadding any human doctrine as a part of that revelation they were to teach."

The stamp of heaven, of certainty, of eternal, immutable truth, is here affixed to the doctrine taught by Paul in his epistle to the Romans. But, according to our Reviewer, had Cicero, or any other philosopher of as enlarged a mind and of as pure moral sentiments, gathered up what information he could collect relative to Christ and his doctrines in the apostolic age, by the exercise of his own unaided faculties, without any miraculous illumination, and had he subjoined his own explanations and remarks, "such a work would have been of at least equal value" with any production from the pen of an apostle, into whose mind the light of heaven shone and kept him from superadding any human doctrine as a part of the revelation he was to teach; would have been of equal value and equal authority with the epistle to the Romans. Is the intellect of Cicero, in this gentleman's apprehension, on a par with the Spirit of God? Does he intend to deify Cicero, or to make God "altogether such an one as himself!" Is the miraculous light from heaven, which shone into the mind of Paul, and kept him from error, and instructed him in truth, of no more value than the exercise of the natural powers of Cicero; powers exerted too without any miraculous illumination, and in which he must have been constantly exposed to misinformation and misapprehension? We must doubt whether the children of the Pilgrims can receive such monstrosities for truth, even though they issue from the spot hallowed by the recollection of men who lived for "Christ and the Church."

But another view of this subject presents itself. There *was* a philosopher of an enlarged mind, on moral and religious subjects, on the origin, the duty, and the destiny of man, on the character, perfections, and moral government of God, of a *more* enlarged mind and of more correct views than Cicero, possessed also of at least equally pure moral sentiments, "a man of letters, and well skilled in the Scriptures," one who received his knowledge of "the character, miracles and doctrines of Christ" from the associates of the apostles, and from the apostles themselves, especially from Paul, who afterwards was a fellow-laborer with that apostle, and who, as this Reviewer tells us, "differed from the apostles in no essential doctrine;" such a philosopher was Apollos, a Christian philosopher and not a heathen, one who "watered" the churches that Paul had "planted." According to this Reviewer, Apollos has left us his views of the Christian system of doctrines in the epistle to the Hebrews. "May we not, then, regard his work of at least equal value with any book which remains to us," especially as it has been so regarded by the great body of Christians from the age of the Roman Clement, at the close of the first century?

The Reviewer, feeling for a moment the absurdity of his own supposition and assertion, and anticipating the question just proposed, answers, "that whatever we may imagine as what might have taken place, *there are no books, except the canonical books of the New Testament, in which our religion can be safely studied.*" But why not? Why may not the enlightened Christian philosopher Apollos, the early, eloquent, intelligent, influential advocate of Christianity, the associate of apostles, whose doctrine, the gentleman himself being judge, is their doctrine, claim for "his work at least equal value" with nobody knows what work Cicero might have produced? The gentleman's familiarity with fancy renders him extremely fastidious and sensitive of facts. If he build castles in the air, and wish us to take them for tenable structures, he must not complain if we urge him to inhabit his own air-built edifices. Assertion, assumption, and self-contradiction, he will do well to recollect, are not arguments.

Two instances of equal credulity and skepticism it would be difficult to point out. Without a voice or a whisper from antiquity, which would show that Apollos was ever known as a writer, much less that he wrote the epistle to the Hebrews, this Reviewer can attribute it to him. Against the universal voice of the oriental, and the general testimony of the primitive church, he can not only doubt, but unhesitatingly deny, that Paul wrote it. Had Cicero, perchance, only written a work on "the character, miracles, and doctrines of Christ," without any supernatural assistance, and "had he subjoined his own explanations and remarks," he would have cheerfully received it as "of equal value with any book which remains to us." But Apollos, the pupil and associate of Paul, the primitive minister, the eloquent champion of Christianity, and "who differed from the apostles in no essential doctrine," has left us an epistle to the Hebrews, in which, the Reviewer tells us, "our religion cannot be safely studied, because it is not canonical." He also tells us that the "reasoning" of this epistle "cannot be regarded as of *any force* by an intelligent reader of the present day;" and that "it is difficult so far to accommodate our minds to the conceptions and principles of the author and his cotemporaries, as to perceive how it was adapted to produce *any effect*, at the time when it was written." vol. v. p. 40. All this may be *liberal* doctrine; whether it be rational, judge ye.

We add another general remark. Whatever they may have professed in the Christian Disciple and Christian Examiner, *this Reviewer, and other leading Unitarians, have actually for years rejected the commonly received views as to the inspiration and infallibility of the holy Scriptures.* We have already seen that he and other writers in those Unitarian magazines have repeatedly professed to receive the holy Scriptures as an authoritative and infallible revelation from God. When the tendency of their system and the disposition of their writers to reject these views of

the inspiration and divine authority of the Bible have been pointed out by Professor Stuart and others, with however much delicacy to individual feeling, they have indignantly repelled the charge, pronouncing it "extremely presumptuous," and throwing back accusations, which we need not repeat. The allegation, then, contained in our general remark, is one of great delicacy and great importance. It affects not the capacity but the honesty, not the attainments but the principles of certain gentlemen, who assert that the Orthodox "have mistaken some of the grossest and worst errors of man for essential doctrines of the religion of God." The charge here brought is not made without thought; nor, what is more, without proof.

Passages are not wanting in the introductory article to the first volume of the *General Repository*, written by the editor, that would go far towards substantiating our position. The sympathies of the writer were plainly with Lord Herbert. That the life of Semler by Eichhorn, with whatever qualifying clauses of vacant import it may have been accompanied, was designed to break the ice, and prepare the way for "a free investigation of the canon," i. e. for a rejection of the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures, will be doubted by few who are competent to judge. But, omitting evidence which might be gathered from the *Repository*, we shall briefly remark upon the Letters of Le Clerc on Inspiration, republished and recommended by the gentleman who edited that periodical. In 1820 he issued a little volume, containing Locke's Essay for the understanding of St. Paul's Epistles, and Le Clerc on Inspiration, accompanied with a short but pregnant preface, and a note of some length and much importance. Were we not aware of the mazes of the Unitarian labyrinth, of the ambidexterity of the system, we should feel at an utter loss to comprehend the state of that man's mind, who could yoke these two pieces together, and recommend them as equally valuable, and equally deserving the study and confidence of those who would skilfully interpret the Sacred Volume.—Locke, throughout his Essay, asserts or assumes the inspiration and infallibility of the sacred writers. In his view, this inspiration was complete, this infallibility entire. His work we could and do most cheerfully recommend to the diligent, attentive study of every individual who would understand the Sacred Records of our faith and hope. It contains scarcely a sentence that we could wish to see modified. It is a most valuable amplification of his own noble remark, "Study the Bible, especially the New Testament. It has God for its author, salvation for its end, and truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter."\* Not content, however, to

\* We would invite the young men *who think*, in the Theological School at Cambridge, to compare the above remark of Locke with the oracle recently uttered by the Magnus Apollo of the day. "Neither the teaching of our Saviour, nor the influences of God's Spirit in enlightening the minds of the apostles, preserved them from all the errors of their age."



leave the Scriptures to be received and studied, as Locke would recommend, the gentleman must also append, (we quote his own words,)—

“The substance of two letters on Inspiration, published, and there is scarcely a doubt, written by Le Clerc. Le Clerc was the cotemporary and correspondent of Locke and Newton. He was a scholar of the most remarkable compass and variety of learning, and scarcely less distinguished for his clearness of mind, good sense, and acuteness. *It may be doubted whether there is anywhere to be found a more perspicuous and satisfactory statement of the subject in question, than what this tract presents.* In republishing, however, these two very valuable tracts, it is not intended to vouch for the correctness of every opinion and expression which they may contain. The general views are believed to be correct. But in a few comparatively unimportant respects, both authors might have written somewhat differently, if they had written in our day.”

The qualification attached to this recommendation abates nothing from its force. It is one of those vague and pointless generalities that may mean anything, because it means nothing. The editor distinctly informs us that it is only in a few comparatively unimportant respects these men *might* have written *somewhat* differently, if they had written in our day. Not to dwell at present on the belligerent and unappeasable contradictions everywhere apparent between Locke and Le Clerc,\*—contradictions relating to fundamental and all-important principles—we will adduce a few passages from the latter, in which he presents, as his editor tells us, “a more perspicuous and satisfactory statement of the subject of inspiration than is anywhere else to be found.”

First, with reference to the Old Testament:

“No clear reason is brought to convince us, that those who made the Jews' canon, or catalogue of their books, were infallible, or had any inspiration, whereby to distinguish inspired books from those which were not.” p. 110.

This assertion is made to get rid of the books of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon and Job.

“It appears, methinks, hereby clearly enough, that there was no inspiration in this book, (i. e. Job,) no more than in the three foregoing.” p. 109. “These books, then, that we have spoken of, are not necessarily to be accounted divine for being in the canon, or catalogue of the books of the Jews, *which Jesus Christ never called in question*; and there is no reason to interpret the word canonical as if it signified inspired of God.† The Jews put in their collection

\* Were the game worth the chase, Le Clerc himself might be hunted down into contradictions and absurdities alike innumerable and irreconcilable. His assertions and his concessions are, like those of our Reviewer above quoted, directly at swords' points. To make contradiction consistent and absurdity reasonable, requires “a compass and variety of learning, a clearness of mind, good sense and acuteness,” not to be met with either in Le Clerc or his editor. What can human learning and ingenuity avail against truth, beaming from the throne of God in her own radiant and eternal splendor! Men may put out their eyes: Will the sun forget to shine! They may close their ears: Will the harmonies of the heavens, will the songs of the redeemed, cease!

† The following definition of the word canon is from the piece before quoted, entitled “Notes upon the Bible,” published in the *Christian Examiner*, vol. i. 1824, p. 8. “The term canon is used by theological writers to designate those books which are received by Jews and Christians as of divine authority, and are understood to contain their rule of faith. The Jewish canon contains those books, and those only, which constitute the Old Testament. The Christian canon is properly limited to those writings of the evangelists and apostles which have received the title of the New Testament. Though, in a looser

all the fragments they had remaining of their ancient books; they left out none, because they had no others. . . . They pretended not at first that this collection consisted of no other but what was divinely inspired."

Thus, either by direct assertion, or unavoidable inference, Le Clerc strips the Old Testament of infallibility, or "divine authority," and sends us adrift on the sea of gloomy distrust and disquieting conjecture.

But, secondly, of the New Testament :

"By these words, *The Holy Ghost shall teach you in that hour what ye ought to say*; or, as St. Matthew has expressed it, *It is not ye that speak, it is the Spirit of your heavenly Father that speaks in you*; Christ meant only to say this, viz. The spirit of courage and holiness, which the Gospel produces in your hearts, will teach you what ye ought to say. That is to say, that the apostles had no more to do, but to believe in the Gospel, to be assured that the disposition of spirit which that heavenly doctrine would give them, would never let them want words; not even when they were to defend themselves before the tribunals of the greatest powers."

In other and intelligible language, *the inspiration and assistance here promised by Christ to his apostles, consisted in, and resulted from, their being good and courageous men.* With whatever speciousness it may be disguised, with whatever ambiguity it may be cloaked, this is the purport and intent of Le Clerc's Letters upon Inspiration, which is pronounced by his American editor to be "a more *perspicuous* and satisfactory statement of the subject in question than is anywhere else to be found." Tell us not that there are passages in Le Clerc of a different and opposite character from that just quoted. We know it. Is a notorious liar not to be called such, because he sometimes tells the truth, especially to accomplish his sinister purposes? Is a man not guilty of perjury because his story is inconsistent and self-contradictory? Is the *absurdity* of his story proof of his *integrity*? Is his disagreement with himself indubitable evidence of his honesty? Le Clerc tells us further, that,

"The apostles had no extraordinary inspiration for writing their epistles." p. 121. "An inspiration is attributed to the apostles to which they never pretended, and whereof there is not the least mark left in their writings." p. 123. "It is very plain that the historians of the Scripture were not inspired, by the contradictions that are found in the several circumstances of their histories." p. 66.

Our limits forbid us to remark farther upon Le Clerc and his American editor and voucher. We cannot forbear, however, adding that they have both outgone Wakefield, whose rashness of interpretation, and fearlessness of conjecture and consequence, have been seldom surpassed, but who, in his Essay on Inspiration,

sense, we may speak of it as comprehending both the *Old* and *New*; since Christians admit in common with Jews, the authority of their sacred writings, as well as their own.

"When the canon of Scripture is spoken of, this catalogue of sacred books is meant; and when a book is spoken of as canonical, the meaning is that it belongs to this catalogue. The term was chosen to be thus used, as denoting that this collection of books is to be regarded as containing the complete and entire rule for the faith and practice of Christians; a *rule* being the original meaning of the word *canon*."

admits that supernatural assistance and influence were promised by Christ to the apostles in the passages above quoted.\*

These selections exhibit a prominent feature in "the perspicuous and satisfactory statement" of Le Clerc.

The following sentences are from an essay entitled, "The Beginning and Perfection of Christianity," published in the *Christian Examiner*, 1826. This is a piece of elegant incoherence which we would specially recommend to the attention of those who would understand Unitarian incomprehensibilities.

"These extravagancies of credulity are owing to the false estimate which is so general of the nature and uses of the holy Scriptures; as if they were really written by the hand of the Almighty, and the essence of religion were left to be extracted from them alone and forever." p. 105.—"Christianity is a blessing, which is not in any sense to stand still, but to be improved. It has never yet shown itself in its entire purity, or its full perfection. It is not so much to be restored to any former standard of now tarnished excellence, as to be carried on and perfected."—"The Gospel . . . is a revelation intended to be progressive."—"If Christianity does not consist in the writings which only testify of it, its perfection is not to be found in any arrangement of words into theories and systems."

But enough. It is perfectly clear that this writer and the editors of the *Christian Examiner*, who published his crudities without note or comment, had no belief in the commonly received views of the inspiration and infallibility of the Sacred Writings.

We give another quotation from the *Christian Examiner* for 1827, p. 347.

"We know very well that there was a time in the dark ages, and afterwards, when it was maintained, we cannot say believed, for *the proposition does not admit of being believed*, that the whole Bible, including the historical books of the Old Testament, was a revelation." "It is a proposition which is so unintelligible in any sense which one unacquainted with the writings of the New Testament can for a moment admit to be true, that we have no disposition to discuss it. *The revelation from God*, the glorious Gospel of the blessed God, does not consist of the historical books and epistles which compose the New Testament, but of the sublime truths which God has taught us by Jesus Christ."

The conductors of the *Examiner* may have found it necessary for the uninitiated, the timid and the conscientious, who follow their enlightened but precipitate leaders with circumspect reluctance, to utter their opinions in ambiguous and contradictory language. But we submit it to an enlightened and discriminating public to decide, whether the quotations we have made from Le Clerc, approved as they were by the editor, and from the *Christian Examiner*,

\* As a proof of Wakefield's independence alike of truth, reason, authority, or probability, we will adduce but one sentence. On page 37th of his Essay, speaking of the apostles after the day of Pentecost, he says, "Nor shall I be afraid of advancing it as my opinion, that many Christians in succeeding ages have been possessed of dispositions more benevolent and godlike, of understandings more liberal and enlightened, and have walked, in all respects, more worthy of their vocation, than most of the twelve apostles." Wakefield had read Le Clerc's Letters on Inspiration before he published his own Essay; but even his headstrong presumption shrunk back from denying that Christ had assured his apostles of assistance from on high in the texts above quoted. The classical tutor at Warrington could have received light, in our day, at Cambridge, N. E.

do not bear us out in the strong ground we have taken, that *the Reviewer of Stuart, and other leading Unitarians, have actually, for years, rejected the commonly received views of the inspiration and infallibility of the Holy Scriptures.* Our readers will now return for a moment to the quotations already made from the *Disciple and Examiner*, in which the writers profess to receive the Scriptures, as Christians generally receive them, and to consider it "extremely presumptuous" to charge them with rejecting those Scriptures, and then decide for themselves on the integrity and trustworthiness of those, who represent themselves as almost the only "rational and enlightened theologians" on the American continent.

Let it not be forgotten, that the Reviewer under consideration fills the highly responsible station of a teacher of those who are expected to occupy the pulpits of the Pilgrim Fathers of New England. It is with him, in a special manner, to mould the opinions of the liberal Clergy. His opinion is with numbers authority, and his decision law. But we ask the people of Massachusetts if they will receive their religious teachers from the guidance of infidelity, and with the stamp of skepticism? Would you suffer Hume to shape the minds of your clergy? Shall Cicero and Seneca, Bolingbroke and Lord Herbert be of equal authority in the pulpits of Boston with John and Matthew, Paul and Peter? People of Massachusetts, for what purpose have you founded and cherished Harvard University? Why have you reared those magnificent structures? Why have you collected those libraries of various learning, and apparatus of curious contrivance? Why have you liberally endowed those numerous professorships? Why have public patronage and private munificence poured their combined and accumulated treasures upon this favored spot? Have the people of Massachusetts of all denominations thus munificently endowed this ancient institution to make it "the bulwark," "the pure and uncorrupted fountain-head of Unitarianism?" Have all parties combined thus liberally to pour out the treasures of the State for the exclusive use and behoof of a sect, composing but a fraction of the Commonwealth? Citizens of Massachusetts, have you known and reflected that your donations, and the benefactions of the pious dead have been, and are still employed, to support men and advance principles that go to an entire subversion of the Word of God? Are you ready to renounce Revelation, and take in its stead the evanescent phantom of Rationalism? Have you given up your confidence in God's Word? If not, can you trust your sons to the guidance, and bestow your wealth to the support of those, who declare that "the Scriptures are not a revelation"? Spirits of the sainted dead, Hopkins, and Hollis, and Henschman, gave ye of your treasures, offered ye your prayers, to advance the cause of Infidelity, and to raise up enemies to the Word and the Son of God? We call upon the Overseers and the

Corporation of Harvard University, in the name of the State, whose most cherished Institution is entrusted to their care, and we ask them if it is by their consent, their sanction, and their authority, that the Scriptures are rejected as God's revelation? We ask them if they will continue in office a man who openly rejects the Scriptures, and teaches professedly religious teachers "that the Scriptures are not a Revelation?" These are solemn questions and we wish them to be solemnly considered. If the Overseers and the Corporation are prepared to sustain such principles as have been openly avowed in the late developements by this Reviewer, let the people of Massachusetts know it, and act accordingly.

In closing, we will suggest for the Reviewer's meditation, a passage which Hume introduced into his first edition of his "Treatise of Human Nature," though he expunged it from the later editions. "I am affrighted and confounded with that forlorn solitude, in which I am placed by my *philosophy*. When I look abroad, I forsee, on every side, *dispute, contradiction and distraction*. When I turn my eyes inward, I find nothing but *doubt and ignorance*. Where am I, or what? From what causes do I derive existence, or to what condition do I return? I am *confounded* with these questions; and I begin to fancy myself in the most deplorable condition imaginable, environed with the *deepest darkness*." De te, fabula narratur.

---

AN ACCOUNT OF THE CONTROVERSY IN THE FIRST PARISH IN CAMBRIDGE; 1827—1829. *Published pursuant to a vote of the Church.* Boston: T. R. Marvin. pp. 58.

CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE FIRST PARISH IN CAMBRIDGE AND REV. DR. HOLMES, THEIR LATE PASTOR. *Published by the Parish Committee.* Cambridge: E. W. Metcalf & Co. pp. 103.

Most of our readers know that differences have existed, for a considerable time past, between the venerable pastor of the first church and society in Cambridge, and a portion of the people of his charge. In the publications, whose titles we have given, the origin and progress of these differences are detailed. A Committee of the Church first published their "Account," &c. consisting of documents, or impartial abstracts of documents, with such notes and observations as were deemed necessary, in order to a full understanding of the subject. A committee of the parish, not satisfied with what the church had published, have followed with another and larger pamphlet, in which all the documents are said to be given entire, with explanatory paragraphs and remarks, intended as a reply to the representations of the church.

The abstracts, in the first pamphlet, of some of the communications to Dr. Holmes are called, in the second, "mutilations and *misrepresentations*;" though no instance is attempted to be shown in which the sense of them is not fairly stated. And if the committee of the church need an apology for not publishing all these communications entire, the committee of the parish have furnished a sufficient apology, by actually laying them before the public. For duller and more uninteresting papers than some of them prove to be, we have never tasked ourselves to examine. Take, for instance, one (pp. 31—39) occupying nearly eight large octavo pages of brevier, in which a variety of subjects, near and remote, are introduced. To those who wish to read themselves to sleep after a comfortable dinner, or to suffer a literary penance for previous delinquencies, we recommend the perusal of this "address" (so called) as an admirable specific.

But to return to the subject. Dr. Holmes was settled at Cambridge in 1792. He was then, and uniformly has been, an avowed Calvinistic minister. At that period, although a species of Unitarianism had been embraced by a few in Massachusetts, the existence of it was closely concealed. Nobody professed it—nobody preached it. There were differences of opinion among Congregational ministers, but none preached against the trinity, or the atonement, or perhaps any of the *essential* doctrines of the Gospel. Consequently, pulpit exchanges were, with propriety, promiscuous.

But after a course of years, the Unitarian leaven, which had been secretly operating, began to disclose itself. The evidences of its existence became more and more decisive. The name Unitarian was at length avowed; individuals ranged themselves on one side or the other; and the sect began to assume an appearance of organization. These changes on the part of Unitarians—all which are matters of unquestionable notoriety—brought Orthodox clergymen of the standing of Dr. Holmes into circumstances of peculiar difficulty and trial. To refuse an exchange of pulpits with an old friend and acquaintance on the bare *suspicion* of his being a Unitarian, seemed hardly justifiable; and to catechize him respecting his belief might be thought impertinent. The *easier*, if not the wiser and safer course seemed to be, to presume that things were in a good measure correct, hope for the best, and err (if it must be so) on the side of charity. In this way, Dr. Holmes proceeded in a course of promiscuous exchanges, till he felt that he could proceed no further. The principles in which he was educated, which he believed and valued, and which he had uniformly maintained, forbade it. He declined exchanges, as he saw reason to justify it, with individuals, and at length ceased entirely from ministerial intercourse of this sort, with those who are commonly regarded as Unitarians. Not long after this, in a season of special seriousness with some of his people, occasional

religious meetings were introduced, during the week, and on the evening of the Sabbath.

In the Unitarian part of his parish, which proved to be a majority of the legal voters, these measures produced a strong excitement, and were the commencement and ground of the controversy detailed in the publications before us. Two memorials from "sundry inhabitants of the parish" were first sent to Dr. Holmes; to both of which he replied. Four parish meetings were then severally held, the first January 7th, the second March 20th, the third April 5th, and the fourth May 17th, 1828, at which meetings the parish voted to request Dr. Holmes to exchange with ministers of "the liberal denomination;" to "reject Dr. Watts' Psalms and Hymns, and substitute therefor the collection used in the chapel of Harvard University;" to consent to the settlement of a colleague; to discontinue his evening lectures, and his exchanges with Calvinistic ministers; and, in case he refused compliance, "to ask a dismissal from his office." They also voted to invite Unitarian ministers to preach in the meeting-house, without asking the consent of Dr. Holmes; and afterwards to request him to give his consent. Against all these proceedings, a respectable minority of the parish remonstrated, and to all the requests made to him, Dr. Holmes replied. After the parish meeting in May, the long and elaborate "address," of which we have already spoken, was sent to the pastor,---to which he replied with a becoming brevity.

The next parish meeting was held on the 22d of last December, at which time a committee was appointed to propose to Dr. Holmes a mutual council to decide the question of his dismissal; and, in case he refused, to call an *exparte* council for the same purpose. At this meeting, two memorials were presented, one from a minority of the parish, and another from the church, requesting the parish to take no measures to effect the dismissal of the pastor, without the concurrence of the church; the church signifying, at the same time, its readiness to concur in the choice of a mutual council for the purpose mentioned, in case it may be admitted. Respecting these memorials no order was taken, except to lay them on the table.

From this point, commences the correspondence between the committee of the parish, and Dr. Holmes, respecting the calling of a mutual council. The committee propose such a council, according to the vote of the parish; and Dr. Holmes very readily accedes, on condition that the church (in conformity with right and usage) may be known and represented in the transaction. The church also expresses a readiness to concur, and a willingness that the committee of the parish should select one half of the proposed council. But no; the committee have no power to admit the church, and if they had power, they declare that they would not do it. After repeated communications, one way and

the other, in which Dr. Holmes does not refuse to unite in calling a council, even on the terms proposed by the parish, the correspondence is broken off by the committee, and an *exparte* council is called. Protests are entered against the jurisdiction of this council, by Dr. Holmes, a committee of the church, and a minority of the parish, on the ground that a regular mutual council had not been refused. The council, however, determined to proceed, and after hearing one side of the case, recommended the dismissal of Dr. Holmes. The parish voted his dismissal accordingly, and closed the house of worship against him.

Subsequently to this, another council was called by Dr. Holmes and the church, which decided that he "had not in any way forfeited his office as pastor of the first church and parish in Cambridge, but that he is still, according to ecclesiastical usage, the pastor and minister of said church and parish." Since his exclusion from the meeting-house, Dr. Holmes, with a large majority of the church, and a respectable minority of the parish, have continued to meet for public worship by themselves; and the two or three members of the church, who have acted with the parish, and continue to worship in the old house, now claim to be *the church*. They have taken it upon them, without previous notice or reproof, to dismiss the deacons; have substituted one of their own number, as a deacon; have admitted new members, &c. &c.

Such is a brief account of the origin and progress of this controversy, up to the present time. We have felt it important, first, to make our readers acquainted with the material facts in the case; we shall next proceed to offer a few remarks.

The public will here learn what are the claimed, exercised, and (so far as Unitarian authority goes) the admitted rights of a Unitarian parish. In the course of this controversy, the first parish in Cambridge have asserted certain things as their right, and the Unitarian Council have publicly honored and commended them for doing it. What then are some of the rights which, in the judgement of this venerable council, belong to a Unitarian parish? When they have themselves receded from the ground on which the society was established, adopted another system of religion, and become in fact another denomination, and their minister, holding fast his integrity, refuses to change his religion with them, they have a right to censure him and contend with him for his obstinacy, and for acting according to his own principles. They have a right to insist with whom he shall exchange pulpits, and with whom he shall not exchange; what Hymns he shall use in public worship, and what he shall not use. They have a right to invite other ministers to preach in his pulpit, without seeking his consent; to insist that he shall stop all special religious meetings; and in case he refuses or demurs in view of measures such as



these, that he shall ask a dismissal from office. And in taking measures to effect his dismissal, they have a right, not simply to proceed without the church when it refuses to take part with them, or chooses to stand aloof from them, but to reject and trample on the church, when its concurrence is offered and urged. And if the pastor hesitates as to the propriety of measures which go thus to degrade and annihilate the church, they have a right "forthwith" to call an *exparte* council of their own stamp to come and sanction his removal. And this council, having done the deed for which they were assembled, have a right to say in conclusion, "*We honor the members of this parish, for the marked deliberation, candor, frankness, veneration for the Christian ministry and for the institutions of the Gospel, apparent in all their measures!*"—It is well, at least, for churches and ministers, that the rights claimed for Unitarian parishes are beginning to be understood. Those connected with them will better know in future what pretensions are made, and what kind of treatment may be anticipated.

And here we cannot help inquiring what would be the effect, if rights such as those here asserted were generally exercised on the part of parishes. What would be the effect on the character and standing of ministers? What would become of their independence? What would be left to their discretion? Parishes might almost as well have wooden ministers, and move them about with a crank and pulley, and then there would be no further difficulty.

One of the measures of which the parish in Cambridge have complained, and which they deemed it their right and their duty to control, was the practice of holding special religious meetings. But why should they be displeased with such meetings, or undertake to put a stop to them? They were not compelled or urged to attend them. And if some of their neighbors wished peaceably to assemble—not to drink, gamble and swear; or to carouse, talk scandal, and make themselves merry—but to unite in solemn prayer and praise to God, and in attending to what they deemed the important truths of his word; why should they object and censure? Was this an evidence of their liberality? Suppose some half dozen families in the parish had agreed to meet occasionally at each other's houses for social and convivial enjoyment, and the members of the church had got together, and voted that these meetings should be discontinued; would not those who attended them have been displeased with such treatment? Would they not have declared it an infringement of their natural liberty and rights? Or suppose that some eight or ten individuals had been in the practice of meeting frequently, to read Unitarian papers and tracts, discuss debatable points, and promote their acquaintance with Unitarian doctrines; and Dr. Holmes and his friends had undertaken to stop them; would not the individuals in question have resented and resisted such interference? Would they not

have pronounced it insufferable insolence? But why might not Dr. H. and his friends endeavor to stop a meeting such as this, with as much propriety as his opposers might endeavor to stop his meetings? We repeat it, nobody was compelled to attend the religious meetings at Cambridge. Nobody, so far as appears, was unduly urged to attend them. All was voluntary, and all was carried on in a peaceable, unostentatious, quiet manner. Yet liberal gentlemen of the parish, who never attended them, and were never expected to attend, are greatly disquieted, and insist that the meetings shall be stopped; and if their minister will not consent to stop them, he shall be dismissed!

It is curious to observe the manner in which this demand of the parish is attempted to be justified. 'The majority of the parishioners have religious rights---they have the right to support their own principles---they have a right to defend them against all attacks and proselyting efforts---they have a right to protect them against being clouded, degraded and brought into contempt---consequently it is both their right and their duty to stop all religious meetings where principles are inculcated which differ from those of the majority.' p. 29. We have not quoted the argument in full, but we have given the scope of it, and as nearly as possible in the words of the writer. And truly---were it not for his surpassing originality---we should suspect he had borrowed it from some of the disquisitions of Archbishop Laud against Conventicles in England; or, more probably, from some labored argument by the Unitarian pastors of Geneva, who, 'to defend their system against all attacks and proselyting efforts, and to protect it against being clouded, degraded, or brought into contempt,' have prohibited all, "who desire to be set apart to the Gospel ministry" among them, from preaching on the Divinity of Christ, "original sin," "effectual calling," and "predestination." By the same argument, the Catholics might have justified themselves for suppressing the religious meetings of the early Protestants; or the star-chamber court of Queen Elizabeth for harassing and punishing the Non-conformists; or any illiberal and intolerant majority for distressing the consciences and trampling on the rights of those within their power.

The subject of pulpit exchanges was obviously a principal ground of the difficulty at Cambridge. Instead of leaving their minister to regulate his own exchanges, according to his discretion and his sense of duty, the parish undertook to regulate them for him. They took it upon them to tell him with whom it was their pleasure that he should exchange, and with whom he should not exchange; and their pleasure was, that he should exchange with ministers of their sentiments, and not with those of his own.

We have already seen that, owing to the steadfastness of Dr. Holmes in his religious principles, while numbers around him were

letting themselves down, step after step, and discarding one essential doctrine after another, he was brought, at length, into circumstances of great delicacy and difficulty, in regard to his ministerial intercourse. It is not necessary to determine whether all the trying questions of this nature, which came before him, were decided correctly; we doubt not they were decided conscientiously, and in the fear of God. There can be no doubt now that he has, in some instances, given up his pulpit (we are authorized to say unwittingly\*) to those who, at the time, were Unitarians. But certainly, as we think, the Unitarian part of his parish are the last persons who ought to reproach him with this, or to take advantage of it against him. Were they not pleased to have it so? And did they not importune him to continue his exchanges with Unitarian ministers, even after he had become satisfied as to their principles? With what face, then, do they now turn round upon him, and urge these exchanges as matter of reproach?

It is obvious that this subject of exchanges is one which lies very near to the hearts of Unitarians. It is one on which they lay more stress, probably, than on every other. A variety of considerations goes to convince us that they are comparatively indifferent in respect to doctrines. A man may believe this or that, and it is of

\* In the publication by the parish committee, Dr. Holmes is repeatedly charged with having exchanged pulpits with those whom he *knew* at the time to be Unitarians. But this charge he authorizes us to say is unfounded. And is it not unreasonable in those, who were so careful in former years to *conceal* their sentiments, to presume and allege now, that others must necessarily have known them! At the time of Dr. Kirkland's elevation to the Presidency of Harvard College (as Mr. Parkman informs us) *he had never preached Unitarian sentiments.* Of the members of the Boston Association in 1812, says the same writer, "there is only *one* whom, from anything I ever heard him offer, either in private or in his pulpit, I, or any body else, would have a right to call a Unitarian." Previous to 1815, there was but one *professed* Unitarian society in Boston or the vicinity, and this was never Congregational. Nor, previous to this year, are we aware that a sermon had been published by a Congregational minister in all the Eastern part of Massachusetts, from which it could be certainly known that he was a Unitarian. In 1815, the heresy was dragged into light; but still many of the Unitarian clergy were slow to acknowledge that they were in the number of its abettors. In some instances, when Dr. Holmes inquired of individuals of whom he had suspicions, they returned him no answer; and in others, an ambiguous answer was returned: "I was always a Unitarian; I always believed in one God." Unitarian sentiments were seldom expressed by clergymen in his presence; and when they were expressed, exchanges were afterwards declined with such persons. In regard to several, Dr. Holmes was left to infer that they were Unitarians, from their backwardness to give him desired information on the subject—or from the dissatisfaction of their Orthodox parishioners—or from their preferring to have intercourse with those whom he knew to be Unitarians—or from their connecting themselves with the American Unitarian Association. Doubtless, Dr. Holmes might have known more on this subject—perhaps he ought to have known more—than he says he did know. The subject was painful, and he was willing, if possible, not to look at it. He was slow to believe that any of his ministerial friends and acquaintances had departed from the truth as it is in Jesus. Certainly, however, Dr. H. is the only competent judge of what he knew, and of what he did not know, and he declares that the charge of continuing pulpit exchanges with those whom he *knew* at the time to be Unitarians is without foundation.

An attempt is made in the publication by the parish committee to fasten on Dr. H. the charge of *changing his principles*, on the ground that he once acted *conscientiously* in admitting those whom he *knew* to be Unitarians into his pulpit; and now acts *conscientiously* in excluding them. But Dr. H. denies that he ever has admitted those into his pulpit whom he *knew* at the time to be Unitarians. Consequently, the syllogism, constructed by the learned barrister with such exquisite art and workmanship, will be found at last like a "tub without a bottom"—or "a bag with holes."

little consequence. He may embrace or reject what doctrine he pleases; and if he will only believe them to be good Christians and consent to hold fellowship with them, it is all very well. But they do care about being separated from the general community of Orthodox believers, and left to stand by themselves. They do care about being refused ministerial fellowship and intercourse with those of other denominations.\* This being the case, does not the Orthodox minister, who still continues his exchanges with them, give over to them every thing they wish? Does he not yield the point to them, so far as they trouble themselves at all about it? And may it not be, that he is doing more to obstruct the progress of truth, and promote fatal errors, (we do not mean intentionally, but really) than though he was a Unitarian himself?—We wish not to treat this subject harshly. We know it is attended with difficulties in certain cases, and we are willing to make all due allowances. But it should be remembered that much light has been thrown upon it, since it came under public discussion; that all concerned have better means of understanding it than they once had; and that those few Orthodox brethren who still are hesitating on the point of ministerial intercourse—lingering between the two opposite systems, and endeavoring, if possible, to hold them together—doubting, whether to attempt getting round the cross, or to take it up—are standing in circumstances of extreme peril, and assuming a fearful responsibility.

It is admitted on all hands, that the validity of Dr. Holmes' dismission from the first parish in Cambridge, depends on the right of jurisdiction claimed by the ex-parte council by which his dismission was recommended. If that council was regularly convened, and had legal and proper cognizance of the case submitted to it, then is his dismission valid; but if not, his connexion with the parish still remains.

The objections to the jurisdiction of this exparte council are two-fold: First, a regular mutual council had not been refused, † so that no exparte council could properly be called; and secondly, if an exparte council might have been called, the one which was called was not impartial.—So far from refusing a mutual council, Dr. Holmes repeatedly and uniformly expressed his willingness to unite in such a council; and the church as often expressed their readiness to concur in the measure. And why was not the council in which they wished to unite a fair and proper one? It certain-

\* The parish committee inform us that "liberal preachers do not wish to exchange with Calvinists, as such, but are willing to maintain a pastoral intercourse with them, as *Christians*." p. 71. For the mighty distinction here made, the Committee are perhaps indebted to one of their witnesses, "distinguished" (as they say) "for his *veracity and truth*," (p. 36) who declared that he had not applied the term "denunciatory" to the preaching of Dr. Holmes, and should not; when, having been asked before the Council whether the Doctor's preaching was not denunciatory, he had testified that it was—although he did not himself supply the ellipsis, and make use of the obnoxious term!

† It may well be doubted whether a *regular* mutual council had been offered.

ly was agreeable to the usages of our churches; why was it not agreeable to reason and justice? Here were two bodies interested in an existing connexion, the church and the parish. Measures were proposed to be taken by the parish to dissolve this connexion; and why should not the church be consulted? In the Sandwich case, where the church *objected* to the calling of a mutual council, the parish were justified by Chief Justice Parsons in disregarding these objections, on the ground that if they had been allowed to prevail, no council could have been called, and the parish would have had no remedy. But here, the members of the church did not object to the calling of a mutual council. They approved of the measure, and were ready to unite in it. They were willing the parish should have a council, of which they might select one half, and before which they should be heard in any manner they chose. Here, therefore, the claims of the church presented no obstacle to the parish's obtaining a fair hearing, and all the remedy which they could reasonably desire. Hence, the reasoning of the Chief Justice, so far as it applies to the case before us, goes rather to show that the church ought to have been admitted. 'The church cannot be allowed to exercise their rights to prevent a dissatisfied parish from having a council—the only remedy which the law provides.' This is the principle established by Judge Parsons in the Sandwich case. But will it not follow from this, that the church *have rights*, and that when they are willing to exercise them in a proper way—in a way not to hinder, but to further, the calling of a regular council, *the parish may not object to their being exercised?*

If, according to the decision of our courts, a church and parish were so far distinct bodies, that a minister might be dismissed from the one, and still retain his relation to the other, there would be more reason in the doctrine that one body might take measures to effect his dismissal, independent of the other. But a distinction of this nature between the two bodies is not allowed. If a minister is dismissed from his parish, he is dismissed, we are told, from his church of course. And yet, will it be pretended—can it be, that the church are to have no voice in the question of his dismissal? Shall their pastor, their presiding officer, be taken from them by the vote of another body, a parish, and they not be permitted to say yea or nay?

The principal reason why the committee of the parish chose to disregard the rights of the church, and refused to unite with them in the choice of a council was, *they were afraid the church would oppose them.* The following are their own words:

"What good reason could exist, in favor of the parish's admitting them, as a body distinct from the parish, when it was certain from their preceding conduct, that they, if so admitted, would make all the resistance in their power to the attempts of the parish to remedy the evils of which they complained, and would give Dr. Holmes all their assistance and support in his opposition to the principles and wishes of the parish? The parish could not, without contravening their

principles, violating the dictates of their judgement, and endangering their most valuable rights, admit the church, as such, to be a party in the controversy, when they had numerous and strong reasons for believing, that such a hostile company would make great efforts to obstruct all their proceedings to regain their rights, and, if possible, defeat those rights."

But what if the church were expected to oppose the wishes of the parish? Was this a good reason why they should not be allowed their just rights? When two neighbors differ, shall one of them be prohibited from exercising his rights, on the ground that if they are permitted to him, he may be expected the more effectually to oppose the other? A very singular reason this, to be offered and urged before the public!

But on the supposition that Dr. Holmes, instead of offering and urging a regular mutual council, as he uniformly did, had actually refused one, so that the committee of the parish might be justified in calling an *exparte* council; they were bound to call an impartial council, and to constitute, so far as possible, a fair and equitable tribunal. On this point, the decisions of our courts are explicit. "We are *clearly* of opinion," says Chief Justice Parsons, "that when either party shall renounce the right of uniting in the election of a council, the other party ought, in their choice, to select men who are not *partiel, prejudiced*, or unfriendly to the character of the opposite party." Term Reports, Vol. ix, p. 290. But was the *exparte* council at Cambridge an impartial one? It appears on the face of the publications before us, that the Congregationalists of Massachusetts are divided into two parties. Indeed the whole controversy at Cambridge had its origin and foundation in such a division. But this parish committee, who were bound to select an impartial council, if they selected any, did actually select all its members from one of these parties, and from their own party. Every member was a decided Unitarian, and was doubtless selected because he was a Unitarian. Every member belonged to that denomination with which Dr. Holmes had declined ministerial intercourse, and might be expected to indulge prejudices against him on this very account.\* Yet the committee have the confidence to assure the public, that their council was impartially chosen!

We had intended to remark on the various misrepresentations in the publication by the parish committee, but shall have room to notice only a few.

It is said that the church in Cambridge wished "to govern the parish," and were determined "to exercise an absolute control over the parish." pp. 5, 17. But where is the evidence in support of these assertions? If the committee of the parish have a par-

\* The parish committee inform us that "neither law nor reason required the parish to choose, as members of that council, those who had adopted the Calvinistic exclusive system, and firmly united themselves to support it, and *decided the most important question in the case, before hand.*" p. 91. So they chose those exclusively who, by *rejecting and opposing* this system, had "*decided the most important question in the case beforehand*!!"

ticle of evidence of this sort, we can only say that they have not published it. In both the pamphlets, the church appears in the attitude, not of encroaching on the rights of the parish, but of defending its own rights; not of aiming at the control of others, but of protecting itself against the foot that was lifted to trample it in the dust. The communications of the committee to Dr. Holmes are many of them sufficiently arrogant,\* but we scarcely remember an instance in which they speak of the church, except in a way which implies contempt.

The parish committee assert respecting Dr. Holmes' predecessor, Mr. Hilliard, that "he was *perfectly Unitarian in his theology.*" p. 5. But this assertion is made, not only without satisfactory proof, but against it. Did Mr. Hilliard profess himself a Unitarian? Or did he ever preach against the trinity, or the proper Divinity and atonement of Jesus Christ? Never. So far from it, unless he can be supposed to have used language in a peculiar sense, and with the intention to deceive, he was a believer and defender of Trinitarian Theology. He taught that "our Lord Jesus Christ, as *Supreme Head and Lord of all things,* governs both it, [the church] and *all things in heaven and earth* for the good of it"—† that "the introduction of sin into the world gave rise to the *incarnation,* the sufferings and the death of Christ"—"that the offering which Christ made once for all is a *sufficient atonement* for the sins of men"—that "all who are justified, and so freed from death, are thus exempted from it *only by virtue of the blood of Christ*"—"that all spiritual blessings are conveyed through the one only Mediator, who is the *propitiation* for our sins, and our Advocate with the Father"—"that the hearts of all men are in the hands of God," and "that *his agency is absolutely necessary* to open men's eyes, and to lead them to consider the things of their peace"—that the impenitent should "seek earnestly to God, that he would give them a new heart and a new spirit"—that "the doctrine of the mediation of Christ is according to godliness"—and that "the Gospel unfolds the glorious plan of redemption, which was laid in the counsels of infinite wisdom and goodness before the foundation of the world."‡—Is this "*perfectly Unitarian theology?*" Is language such as this now heard from Unitarian pulpits throughout the country? Let those who sit under the droppings of such pulpits read and judge for themselves.

\* One of the most reprehensible traits in the publication by this committee, is the manner in which they often speak of Dr. Holmes. Witness a "preamble" p. 13, a "specification" &c. p. 65, and their notes and comments generally. Considering the age, character, and standing of Dr. H., and his long and useful ministry in Cambridge, it comports with all our ideas of propriety and decency to consider the language here applied to him as highly exceptionable and indecorous. Yet the Unitarian council "honor the members of the parish" for their "veneration of the Christian ministry"!

† These are not the words of Mr. Hilliard, but are quoted by him with approbation.

‡ Manuscript Sermons on Heb. xii. 25, on Isaiah liii. 1, on 1 Tim. vi. 3, on Rom. v. 15, 16, on 1 John i. 9, and on Eph. v. 1.

In order to show that Dr. Holmes, by refusing to exchange with professed Unitarians, has innovated on the practice of his predecessors, it is insisted by the parish committee that both Dr. Appleton and Mr. Hilliard "maintained a friendly pastoral intercourse with the most liberal Congregational ministers in the vicinity." p. 18. But how is this fact at all to the purpose? Were "the most liberal Congregational ministers in the vicinity," in the days of Dr. Appleton or of Mr. Hilliard, professedly Unitarian? Had they assumed this name? Or did they preach this doctrine? Nobody pretends it. There was not a professedly Unitarian Congregational Church in Massachusetts, previous to 1815, and there was scarcely a clergyman who would not have thought himself slandered, had he been called a Unitarian?

It is pretended, in the publication by the parish committee, that Unitarians have not "altered their religious principles," but are the same now that they were in the former part of Dr. Holmes' ministry. p. 42. But is this true? We do not believe that it is: Indeed we could show conclusively, from a comparison of the printed performances of several distinguished individuals, that such is not the case.—It is of less consequence, however, to ascertain whether Unitarians have actually changed their principles, than whether they have made a *fuller manifestation* of their principles: For while their principles were concealed and unknown, the same ministers might consistently have held intercourse with them, who now refuse it. But on this latter point, there is no room for a question. Previous to 1815, as we have already said, no Congregational minister or church in Massachusetts was professedly Unitarian. And subsequently to that period, the system has been unfolded and exhibited, slowly, gradually, and with the greatest caution. First, the Trinity is professedly given up; then the atonement;\* then the kindred doctrines of grace. Next, we are told that there is no devil, and no eternal punishment for the wicked. Some deny that there is any soul separate from the body; and some that there will be any day of judgement, or resurrection from the dead. Recently, the binding authority of the fourth commandment is set aside, and the New Testament is declared to be not a revelation from God. In this way, there have been continual changes—an increasing departure from the truth—a relinquishment of one point of doctrine after another, either in reality, in manifestation, or in both, from the first appearance of Unitarianism in this country, to the present hour. No change among Unitarians for the last thirty years! If the change is as great, and in the same direction, for thirty years to come; in some congregations there will be no trace or vestige of Christianity left—perhaps not so much even as the name.

\* Says Dr. Channing in his controversy with Dr. Worcester. "The doctrine of the atonement is not rejected by Unitarians." Remarks, &c. p. 17. This was in 1815.



We had noted many other topics in the history of this controversy, as requiring animadversion ; but our remarks must be hastened to a close. We cannot, however, forbear calling the attention of our readers to measures which have been taken by certain individuals, since the exclusion of Dr. Holmes from the house of worship. The church, as is their duty, continue with their venerable pastor, counsellor and friend. But two or three of the members—who have uniformly opposed the endeavors of their brethren to maintain the rights of the church, and co-operated with those who were striving to trample on and crush it—have forsaken their exiled pastor, and continue to worship with the parish. And these men now affect to consider themselves as constituting *the church*. They have held what they denominate church meetings—have taken it upon them to depose the deacons---have created a deacon (so called) from among themselves---have admitted new members, &c. &c. The pretence that measures such as these are according to the institution of Christ, need not be examined ; for (so far as we know) it is not urged. And we will not believe---no, for the credit of our country we will not yet believe, that they will be sanctioned by the courts of Massachusetts. The Dedham case, it has been thought, was bad enough ; but this surpasses even that : For there the exiled church had no pastor to follow, and consequently could not be sustained, in the course they pursued, by *all* the reasons which apply in the instance now under consideration.

But we need not enlarge. To the blessing of benignant heaven, to the protection of an Almighty Saviour, and to the sympathies, charities and prayers of all their brethren, we commit the once favored but now afflicted church in Cambridge. Sustained, as it has been, by the prayers and labors, and watered with the tears of many who are now with God, it will not, we confidently believe, be forgotten or forsaken. It shall yet arise from oppression, and be clothed with strength and beauty. And those who compose it shall be constrained to look up to their covenant Head and say, ' For a small moment hast thou forsaken us, but with great mercies hast thou gathered us. In a little wrath thou didst hide thy face from us for a moment, but with everlasting kindness hast thou had mercy on us, O Lord, our Strength and our Redeemer.'<sup>2</sup>

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## EXTRACT FROM A CHARGE BY THE REV. DR. EMMONS.

ON the 17th of June last, the Rev. Elam Smalley was ordained as colleague Pastor with the Rev. Dr. Emmons over the church and congregation in Franklin, Mass. The sermon on the occasion was by the Rev. Mr. Thompson of Rehoboth, and the charge to Mr. Smalley by the venerable senior Pastor. It is presumed that most of our readers, whether they entirely accord in sentiment with Dr. Emmons or not, will be interested to know how such a man would express himself on such an occasion. The following extract includes the greater part of his charge.

Dear Sir,—More than fifty years ago, while standing near this *memorable spot*, I was consecrated to the pastoral office over the church and religious society in this place, by my then fathers and brethren in the ministry, who have long since finished their course, and gone the way of all the earth. A vivid recollection of those past scenes and events awakens the most serious, the most painful, and the most grateful reflections, anticipations, and emotions in my breast, on this affecting occasion. Though I have very frequently attended the usual solemnities of an ordination; yet this, in which I am appointed to bear a part, is to me, in many respects, the most solemn and interesting one that I ever attended in the long course of my protracted life. I never read of but one man who was ever placed in a situation more striking, or more impressive than mine, at this present moment; and I hope I do feel, in some measure, as Aaron felt, when Moses, at the divine command, *took him and Eleazar his son* up to mount Hor, in the sight of all the congregation of Israel, on the day of his death; and there stripped off his sacerdotal robes, and put them upon Eleazar his son, and his successor in the most holy and sacred office on earth. This instance, dear sir, is instructive to us both. It tells me that I *must* soon die; but it supposes that you *may* yet live many years; and in that case, admonishes you to fill my place properly, and to supply my deficiencies in the great work which I have forever relinquished.

*Take heed* to the ministry which thou hast received of the Lord, that thou *fulfil it*. This weighty work, in all its branches, comprises not only great and important, but very various, difficult, and numerous duties; which ought to be discharged with sincerity, constancy, and fidelity: and which cannot be discharged in this manner without strict order, regularity, and punctuality, in dividing and appropriating certain seasons, days and hours to the particular studies and services of the pastoral office. Some seem to imagine that ministers have much leisure time on their hands; but the truth is, no men ought to prize every scrap of time more highly, nor improve it more diligently. A minister, by the prudent improvement of time, may *save* many years in the course of life, which those who are idle misspend and abuse. Read the lives of Henry, Doddridge, and Edwards, and follow their example of seizing and employing every fragment of time in some appropriate duty of their sacred calling. Be master of yourself, and let no trifling occurrence divert you from a steady and regular prosecution of your good resolutions and well-concerted purposes. Read the Bible seriously, and practically, and impartially compare your own character with the character of Christ, of the Apostles, and of the primitive believers, in order to try the *nature* of your religious affections, and obtain the full assurance of being a child of God and heir of eternal life. No man can be a sincere *follower*, and much less a sincere *minister* of Christ, without imbibing his meek, humble, and benevolent spirit, and living agreeably to his holy and exemplary life. If you should ever decline in vital piety, your decline will *begin* in the neglect, or careless performance of secret prayer. No one ever practised secret prayer so frequently, so sincerely, and so fervently as Christ did, while he lived and preached the Gospel in this evil and ensnaring world.

Follow his example, and when thou prayest, enter into thy closet; and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father, which seeth in secret, shall reward thee openly.

Follow Christ's example, not only in his secret devotions, but in his private and public life. He has, by example, taught his ministers *how* to conduct at all times, in all places, and in all circles, in which duty requires them to appear and act. He has taught them *how* to visit and converse with stupid and anxious sinners, as well as with desponding and joyful saints. He has also taught them *how* to discharge the higher, more difficult, and more important duties of their sacred office, in which they need to be as wise as serpents, harmless as doves, and bold as lions. Christ was the most *plain*, the most *doctrinal*, and, of course, the most practical preacher, that ever delivered the messages of God to men.

Remember, reverend sir, that this is the most interesting day to you that you have ever seen, or probably you ever will see in the course of life: it is the day of your public, solemn consecration of yourself to the service of Christ, in preparing immortal souls, *in this place*, for their future and eternal destiny. It will, in some measure, if not in a great measure, depend upon your pastoral care, instruction, and fidelity, whether they shall be holy or unholy, happy or miserable, through their interminable existence. While this amazing prospect opens to your view, duty tells you to answer Christ as he answered the call of his Father, "Here am I, send me," as thy instrument in forming the vessels of mercy and the vessels of wrath, and in accomplishing the purposes of thine unsearchable wisdom and sovereign grace. Preach then the preaching which Christ bids you, in a plain *language* and in a plain *method*, which every one can understand, *must* feel, and *cannot* forget. Declare all the counsel of God, without ambiguity and without reserve. Exhibit in lucid order, connexion and harmony, all the doctrines which God has revealed in his word, and which he designed should be preached to men, to make them wise unto salvation. Demonstrate the existence and attributes of the Supreme Being. Prove the necessity, the authenticity, the plenary inspiration, and the *powerful*, but not *omnipotent* influence of the Scriptures of Truth. Be a *revival* preacher, but never imagine that you can *make* revivals whenever and wherever you please; nevertheless, when you see the fields white already to harvest, and hear the sound of a going in the tops of the mulberry trees, then bestir yourself, and be a faithful and zealous worker together with God, in building up his kingdom and promoting the prosperity of Zion.



#### RULES FOR A PROFITABLE SABBATH.

From an Old Periodical.

In the first place. Watch and pray, as you value your souls, against a spirit of carelessness and indifference in religion. Remember that the life of a Christian is a life of self-denial. It is a race,—a pilgrimage,—a warfare! Its exercises are described by wrestling, striving, watching, and the like. And of all the drones in the world, drones in God's hive are the least deserving the approbation of the church, and the most under the frown of heaven. The Scripture probably contains no expression of displeasure more impressive than that which is addressed to the Laodiceans, on this very subject,—“So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot,—I will spue thee out of my mouth.” Yet it is astonishing how soon we may be beguiled into such a frame of mind. The commonness of religious exercises,—the attractions of the world,—and above all, the corruption of depraved nature, have a constant influence to produce this awful indifference. And few greater evidences can be afforded of it, than the neglecting the worship of God in his sanctuary, or carelessly trifling with the morning of a Lord's day.

Secondly. Rise early. Your enjoyment of the Sabbath, and your attendance upon the worship of God in the morning of it, greatly depend upon this. If you have much to do before you can unite with God's people in his house, the time

of your rising must be arranged accordingly. A lazy, sluggish professor, who can satisfy himself with consuming the best part of the morning in bed, is but ill prepared for the service of his Maker in the course of it. And scandalous it certainly is to any one who names the name of Christ, that a man who would rise for a sixpence, at almost any hour on any other day in the week, should shut his ears on the morning of a Sabbath, when God is calling to him from heaven, and be lulled by the devil to sleep.

The conduct of the wicked, who can rise at any time to unite in a party of pleasure; the conduct of heathens, who are waiting the rising of the sun, in order to pay the earliest adorations to him as soon as he makes his appearance; in a word, the conduct even of Satan himself, who is always on the alert, to destroy, if possible, the comforts and souls of men, is a sufficient reproof to such individuals.

Thirdly. Endeavor to enjoy a good Saturday evening. It was a custom with the Jews to have a season of preparation, previous to the duties of the Sabbath. Their Sabbath began at six in the evening; and at three in the afternoon began the preparation. God grant us that anxiety for the enjoyment of the Sabbath, which will lead to a preparation for it, as far as we are able; and a good frame of mind on a Saturday evening will seldom lull a person to sleep, or make him indifferent about the worship of God on a Sabbath morning.

Fourthly and lastly. Think of the rapid approach of death, and endeavor to realize to yourselves the views and feelings you will then have of what you have been, and what you have done, and what you have left undone, when you are just going to give in your account unto God. It is a lamentable fact, there are not a few in our churches and congregations who are all their life long planting thorns in that pillow upon which at last they must lie down and die; and none are doing this more effectually than the careless and the slothful. "Ah," says one on a death bed, "that I had been more actively engaged in the service of God!" "O," cries another, in the anguish of his soul, "that I could but live my time over again! What a different person would I be! O the sins I have committed,—the duties I have neglected,—the Sabbaths I have murdered!" But it is in vain! He is just on the borders of eternity; and all the wealth of worlds can neither purchase him a respite from death, nor afford him an opportunity of retrieving his condition forever! "O that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their latter end."



#### PROGRESS IN SIN.

From the Christian Observer.

"The climax of an atrocious crime is not reached by a process properly called delusion. *Nemo repente fait turpissimus*, said a theologian of the pagan world, and so far he was certainly orthodox; for we cannot concede that, according to the general economy of the Divine government, any man is, as it were, so taken by surprise as to be instantaneously degraded into a reprobate.

"We are surprised," said Mr. Newton, in his table-talk with his biographer, "at the fall of a famous professor; but, in the sight of God, the man was gone before; we only have now first discovered it. He that despiseth small things, shall fall by little and little." It is the same with persons occupying the lower, or lowest, walks of religion; and thus, individuals who pursue the ruinous path which, after numerous windings, terminates on a scaffold, may have measured many a league on their downward path, before their progress has been perceived by human vision. Take the instance of Judas: an observant reader of his history will mark the traitor's approaches to his ultimate crime, and will also mark our Lord's consciousness of the false disciple's character. There were the betrayer's affected compassion for the poor—his hardihood at the paschal supper, when his treachery was prophetically disclosed—and other circumstances, indicative of something hollow and suspicious—altogether a proof that his sin was premeditated, and only the overt act of a man whose heart had long been estranged from his Master. Yet his character and project were a profound

secret to his brethren.—When Jesus declared the presence of a traitor, the rest of the disciples *wondered of whom he spake*. But to the divine prescience of the Lord, he was already fallen. In the eyes of how many at Jerusalem did Judas probably pass for an irreproachable character, perhaps among the disciples themselves.

“The catastrophe of Dr. Dodd, in 1777, furnishes a further striking illustration of our positions. This person, in early life, was an associate of Bishop Horne, Jones of Nayland, and, we believe, of Mr. Romaine, and other religious persons of that age; and it was hoped that he would have continued in fellowship with them and their connexions. But he yielded to the seductions of the world, became giddy with popular applause, sought and obtained admission within the circles of high life, gained preferment and royal favor, and eventually was a stranger among the companions of his better days. He was conscious of this desertion, and, on one occasion—we quote from memory the anecdote in Jones’ life of Horne,—meeting with a lady who belonged to the relinquished party, he asked her, what his former associates thought of him: she only answered, “Demas hath forsaken us, having loved this present world”—a reply which, at the moment, deeply affected its object. Dr. Dodd, however, pursued his career; and finally endeavoring, and with success, to defraud his former pupil, Lord Chesterfield, for into *his* society and confidence he had ventured, was convicted and executed.

“All who have read this man’s melancholy story, will recollect the extraordinary, and, as many thought, merciless determination of his late majesty, in refusing to hear the universal prayer of the nation in his behalf. They will also call to mind the exertions of Dr. Johnson, and various other eminent men, in favor of the culprit.

“But we remember to have heard, many years ago, from a cotemporary of Dodd, that the king persevered in his resolution, not merely because of the act of forgery, but from having been personally acquainted with the forger’s previous conduct in many flagrant instances. When the king first heard of the fraud on Lord Chesterfield, it happened to be mentioned when the queen was also present; to whom his majesty instantly turned and said, “Why, this is the man who embezzled your charity funds;” the fact being, that Dodd, who was one of the Royal Chaplains, had been trusted by the queen as a private almoner. It was also then recollected, that he had offered anonymously a large sum of money to a lady of some political influence, if she would procure for him the living of St. George’s, Hanover Square; for which conduct, indeed, on being discovered, he had been dismissed from the office of king’s chaplain. When, therefore, it is said, that *Dr. Dodd was hanged for forgery*, this is literally true; but it was not true, that this was an insulated act of criminality, perpetrated by a man who, up to a *moment of delusion* had lived a stainless and honorable life—but by an offender, who having *at length* committed a deed cognizable by law as worthy of death, was delivered to the executioner, to pay the forfeit of his life, after many years of secret depravity. We have recurrd to the case of Dr. Dodd as confirmatory of the view we have taken of the cause of men’s being permitted to adventure into the snares of sin till they are fatally entangled, and perish; and especially, if they have been previously acquainted with religious principles. *Blessed is the man that feareth always!*”



#### VIEW OF UNITARIANS RESPECTING THE SABBATH.

The last number of the Christian Examiner contains a long article on “Associations,” in which “the General Union for promoting the observance of the Christian Sabbath” is spoken of in terms of strong disapprobation. As the views of Unitarians respecting the Sabbath are in this article pretty fully expressed, we have thought it might be interesting to our readers to be furnished with some extracts. Comment will be unnecessary.

“We know that it is confidently affirmed, that God, at an earlier period than the Jewish law, enjoined the Sabbath as a perpetual, universal, irrevocable law

for the whole human race. But can this position be sustained? For ourselves, we cannot see a trace of it in the Scriptures, those only sure records of God's revelation to mankind." pp. 128, 129.

"We maintain that the Christian world have in practice disowned the obligation of the Sabbath established by the fourth commandment. There is indeed a body of Christians, called Sabbatarians, who strictly and religiously observe the fourth commandment. But they are a handful; they are lost, swallowed up, in the immense majority of Christians, who have for ages ceased to observe the Sabbath prescribed from Sinai. True, Christians have their sacred day, which they call a Sabbath. But is it in truth the ancient Sabbath? We say, no; and we call attention to this point. The ancient Sabbath, as we have seen, was the last day of the week, set apart for rest, in commemoration of God's resting on that day. And is the first day of the week, a day observed in remembrance of Christ's resurrection from the dead, the same institution with this? Can broader marks between two ordinances be conceived? Is it possible that they can be confounded? Is not the ancient Sabbath renounced by the Christian world? Have we not thus the testimony of the Christian world to its having passed away? Who of us can consistently plead for it as a universal and perpetual law?" pp. 131, 132.

"The change of Sunday into a working day, we should condemn as earnestly as any of our brethren. Yet at the same time, we feel, that in this particular a Jewish rigor is not to be imposed on Christians, and that there are exigencies justifying toil on the first day, which must be left to individual judgement. The great purposes of this festival may certainly be accomplished without that scrupulous, anxious shunning of every kind of work, which marked a Jewish Sabbath, and which, however proper under a servile dispensation and in an age of darkness, would in us be superstition. We do not, for example, think Christians bound to prepare on Saturday every meal for the following day, or to study through the week how to remove the necessity of every bodily exertion on the approaching Sunday. We think, too, that cases may occur, which justify severe toil on this day; and we should judge a man unfaithful to himself and his family, ungrateful to Providence, and superstitious, who should lose a crop rather than harvest it during the portion of time ordinarily set apart for Christian worship. On these points Christianity has left us free. The individual must be his own judge, and we deprecate the attempts of Societies to legislate on this indefinite subject, for their fellow Christians." pp. 135, 136.

"In such a community as ours, how many persons may be found on every Sunday, the state of whose health, the state of whose families, the state of whose affairs, may require them to travel. It may happen, that another's property confided to our care may be lost, that a good object may fail, that some dying or departing friend may go from us unseen, if on this day we will not begin or pursue a journey. How often is it difficult for the traveller to find an inn, the quiet and comforts of which make it a fit residence for Sunday. An Association against travelling on Sunday, seems to us a very hazardous expedient, and its members, we think, will be fortunate if they escape the guilt of censoriousness and dictation, on a subject which Providence has plainly exempted from human legislation." p. 136.

"We apprehend that some, and not a small party, have a vague, instinctive feeling, that the kind of Christianity which they embrace, requires for its diffusion a gloomy Sabbath, the Puritan Sabbath; and we incline to believe that they are desirous to separate the Lord's-day as much as possible from all other days, to make it a season of rigid restraint, that it may be a preparation for a system of theology, which the mind, in a natural, free, and cheerful state, can never receive. The Sabbath of the Puritans and their Calvinistic peculiarities go together. Now we wish the return of neither." p. 137.

"In these remarks we have expressed our reverence for the Lord's-day. To us it is a more important day, and consecrated to nobler purposes, than the ancient Sabbath. We are bound, however, to state, that we cannot acquiesce in the distinctions which are often made between this and other days; for they seem to us at once ungrounded and pernicious. We sometimes hear, for example, that the Lord's-day is set apart from our common lives to religion. What! Are not all days equally set apart to religion? Has religion more to do with Sunday than with any other portion of time? Is there any season, over which piety should not preside?—So the day is sometimes distinguished as 'holy.' What!

Is there stronger obligations to holiness on one day than on another? Is it more holy to pray in the church than to pray in the closet, or than to withstand temptation in common life? The true distinction of Sunday is, that it is consecrated to certain means or direct acts of religion. But these are not holier than other duties. They are certainly not more important than their end, which is a virtuous life. There is, we fear, a superstition on this point, unworthy of the illumination of Christianity." pp. 138, 139.

---

#### EXAMINATION AT ANDOVER.

THE annual examination of the Theological Seminary at Andover took place on Wednesday, the 23d of September, when more than thirty young gentlemen left the institution, and went forth to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ. The exercises on the occasion were highly interesting, not only as literary compositions, but (what in our view is of much greater importance) as *scriptural, evangelical* discussions. They were fitted to leave, and did leave, a very serious impression upon a crowded auditory—the impression that the work to which the speakers were destined, and for which they had been pursuing the necessary qualifications, was regarded by them as a vastly solemn and responsible work. We were glad to see, in many of the performances, the great doctrines of the Gospel so clearly recognized, and in all, a disposition to deal faithfully with the conscience, and to make religion a home concern.

The object of such exhibitions, it should be kept in mind by all interested, is not mere literary display, or to gratify a vain curiosity. The speakers are supposed to be men of prayer, and of true piety. They have been studying with a view to prepare themselves to preach the everlasting Gospel; and their auditors have assembled, not to be amused, but to judge of their qualifications for this noble work. The occasion should always be a serious one. And the exercises, if appropriate, will be scriptural, practical, full of evangelical truth, and presenting in a variety of attitudes and lights the great doctrine of redemption by the blood of Christ.—We are happy to bear our testimony to the recent exercises at Andover, that they were of this high and appropriate character.

---

#### NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Objections against the Gospel Refuted. A Sermon preached March 4, 1829, at the Installation of the Rev. John Brown, D. D. as Pastor of Pine-street Church, Boston.* By DANIEL DANA, D. D. Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Newburyport. Boston: T. R. Marvin. pp. 24.

The object of this discourse, as its title imports, is "to suggest and refute some of those objections which have been raised in every age against the Gospel, particularly in regions of learning and refinement." These objections are—"the unparalleled *simplicity* of the Gospel;" "its *mysteries*;" its "*humbling* character and tendency;" "its *unyielding, unassimilating* character;" its "*rigid, impracticable*" requisitions; and its tendency to "*enthusiasm*." To

say that Dr. Dana has removed these objections, or shown them in some instances to be no objections at all, would be saying very little. He has taken occasion from them to unfold the high character and claims of the Gospel, to present it in its own attractive colors, and to urge it as worthy of all acceptance. We have seldom seen a discourse with which we have been more gratified, both as it respects matter, manner and spirit. The two following extracts are no more than a fair specimen.

“In commercial and populous cities, accumulated wealth never fails to induce luxury, dissipation, and an excessive rage for amusement. Pleasure spreads her snares, and is pursued through all her varied haunts. With thousands, amusement becomes the habitual pursuit, and the grand end of life. The Gospel comes and speaks to these triflers, of death, of judgement, of interminable joys and woes. It reminds them that they were not sent into the world to be amused; but to serve God and men, and to prepare for the high destinies of eternity. It warns them that a life of levity is a life of guilt; that many of their chosen pleasures pollute the imagination, and corrupt the heart; and that the most innocent, if pursued as a business, enervate the mind, banish serious thought, and close the soul against God and religion. And it faithfully warns them of the folly, the madness, the ruin of dreaming away those precious, fleeting moments on which their salvation depends. But in thus calling them off from the mere *phantoms* of enjoyment, it does not leave them without resource. It invites them to the fountain of pure and everlasting felicity. It bids them possess pleasures real, rational, elevated, unfailling—the unknown delight of opening the heart in love to God, and love to man—the luxury of doing good—the joy of an approving conscience—the transport of Christian hope—the sublime, heart thrilling anticipation of happiness beyond the grave.”

In answer to the question, whether, “amidst the improvements of art, and the not less astonishing revolutions of science, religion alone must remain stationary,” Dr. D. replies,

“The arts and sciences are inventions of man. What man invents, as it is of course imperfect, he may improve; and he may improve without end. Religion is a revelation from God. Like its Author, it is perfect, and is incapable of improvement. It admits no change, no progress, no diminution, no addition. Christianity was complete and consummate in its very infancy. Or rather, it had no infancy. Like the first parent of the human race, it came from the hand of its Author, mature in all its faculties; perfect in all its attributes. By every past attempt to improve it, it has only been deteriorated and debased. Nor is anything better to be anticipated for the future. Far sooner might weak, aspiring mortals hope to add lustre to the sun, or beauty and order to this fair and well adjusted creation, than to improve, by the refinements of learning and philosophy, that religion which has come to us direct from heaven, and which, in all its features, bears the impress of its perfect and divine Author.”

2. *A Sermon preached at West Springfield, at the Resignation of the Author's Pastoral Charge, July 26, 1829.* By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE. Boston: T. R. Marvin. pp. 40.

This discourse, unlike many on similar occasions, is not a mere gush of feeling; it is replete with instruction—and instruction which we hesitate not to characterise as appropriate and excellent. Says the author, in his introduction, “I would fain crowd into these fleeting moments as much of counsel and warning as I can.” The aim to do this was doubtless sincere, and the object aimed at is successfully accomplished. We have room but for a single extract, and we select this, not because it is the most eloquent, but because we



think the sentiment of great importance, especially to a destitute people, when laboring for the re-settlement of the gospel ministry.

“Do not consider it essential that your minister should be of the highest order, either of intellect or cultivation. In both these particulars, he ought certainly to be respectable: he should be a scribe well instructed; apt to teach; able rightly to divide the word of truth: but anything far beyond this, I verily believe, ought not to be an object of pursuit, or even of desire. And I have two reasons for this opinion. The first is, that men of very high intellectual endowments are rarely to be met with: and if you should aspire to obtain such an one, it is more than probable that you would fail of your object; and even if you should suppose that you had succeeded, possibly a more thorough knowledge of him might reveal to you the mortifying fact that you had been deceived. The other reason is, that you can feel no assurance that such a man will make you the most useful minister. It admits of no question, that other things being equal, the man of distinguished intellectual powers can accomplish more, in any sphere of usefulness, than one of humbler endowments: but it happens, in very many cases, that great eccentricity is the companion of fine genius; and the counteracting influence of the former upon the latter, reduces the actual measure of usefulness below that of many less gifted minds. And I appeal to the history of the church for proof of the fact, that those ministers whose labors have been most richly blest, especially within their own immediate charge, have generally been men—respectable indeed—but not highly distinguished for their mental powers;—men, characterized rather by what is sober and solid, than by what is striking and brilliant. Far too much stress is often laid upon a preacher’s manner. That it should be free from gross faults, ought perhaps to be considered indispensable; that it should possess a good degree of interest, is certainly desirable; but everything above this, when you become familiar with it, ceases to be of any great importance. A fascinating manner may hide a multitude of faults for a time; but it will not be long before discerning people, at least, will see through the covering. Should a man highly gifted in this respect come among you, you ought to be satisfied that, along with this attractive talent, he possesses those more solid and enduring qualities, on which his usefulness and your edification must chiefly depend.”

3. *Qualifications and Faithfulness of a Minister. A Sermon preached at Danbury, Conn. April 23, 1829, at the Ordination of the Rev. Anson Rood.* By HEMAN ROOD, Pastor of the Centre Congregational Church Gilmantown, N. H. New Haven: Baldwin and Treadway, pp. 28.

This is a very good discourse, on “the necessary qualifications of a gospel minister,” and “on the manner in which faithfulness requires him to discharge the responsible duties of his office.” We refer to one of the qualifications here insisted on—“*an acquaintance with the true evidence of piety*”—because we think it has been urged less frequently than its relative importance demands.

“By him his people are to try their hearts in the momentous concerns of eternity. The church are to be guided by him, in deciding who are qualified to be admitted to its sacred privileges. In private conversation also, he is to instruct and guide souls; to comfort the desponding disciple of Jesus; to detect and expose the heart of the hypocrite; and to check the self-righteous and heaven-daring who are ready to rush, uncalled, into the sacred portals of the church. To do this faithfully, so that the blood of souls will not hereafter be found in his skirts, requires a thorough knowledge of his own heart: an intimate acquaintance with Christian experience; and with the scriptural standard of piety. If I mistake not, a greater prominence ought to be given to this point in our schools of theology. Some of the old divines, Baxter, and Doddridge, and Flavel, and especially Edwards on the affections, ought to be carefully studied and made familiar. To distinguish the true from the false evidences of gracious affections, is one of the most difficult and responsible duties of a minister. At the same time, it is attended with vital interest to the church, and with everlasting importance to the salvation of souls.”

4. *The Essential Doctrines of the Gospel: A Sermon, by J. H. FAIRCHILD, Pastor of the Evangelical Congregational Church in South Boston.* Boston: Peirce & Williams. 1829. pp. 40.

The professed, and we doubt not the *real* object of this discourse is one of great importance—to remove misapprehension and prejudice, and thus prepare the mind for the discovery and reception of the truth. That there has been, and is, much gross misapprehension in this vicinity “with regard to the doctrinal sentiments of those who are usually denominated Orthodox,” is indubitable. Their principles have been misstated, and opinions and conclusions have been attributed to them with which they are not chargeable. To aid in correcting this evil, Mr. F. has prepared and published the Sermon now before us. It consists of a brief statement, explanation and defence of most of the leading doctrines of the Gospel. And though “the author lays no claim to originality,” his performance, on that account, will not be the less useful. We have seen enough of “new discoveries in theological science,” and we honor the man who is not ashamed of the Bible, because it is an old book, or the religion it reveals, because it is an old fashioned religion. That Orthodox Christians universally should subscribe to *every* sentiment inculcated in this discourse is not to be expected. Still all, we think, will agree that it contains much truth in a little compass, which “some may be induced to read, who would not bestow the time and labor necessary to the perusal of a more voluminous treatise on the same subjects.”—We are happy to learn that the discourse is already in extensive circulation.

5. *Statement and Evidence of the doctrine of the Trinity, in Three Lectures.* By HUBBARD WINSLOW, Pastor of the First Church in Dover, N. H. Dover: Samuel C. Stevens. 1829. pp. 66.

We have too long neglected to give our readers an account of these popular and useful lectures, and to recommend them to the notice of the public. In the first lecture, the doctrine in question is introduced, stated, and shown to involve no absurdity. Consequently it “is admissible to the common privilege of proof, and is to be believed on the authority of evidence, just like any other fact in religion or science.” In the second, strong Scriptural proof is exhibited, of the proper Divinity of Christ, and of the Divinity and personality of the Holy Spirit. In the third, the great importance of the doctrine of the Trinity is urged, as essentially modifying “our views of the Christian *atonement* ;” “our estimation of the *love of Christ*, as manifested in his sufferings and death ;” “our estimation of the *love of the Father*, in giving his Son to die for us ;” “our view of the *evil of sin* ;” and “of what is implied by *faith* in Christ.” This branch of the subject is very happily treated, and is to us the most interesting part of the performance. The style throughout is sprightly and animated, and the whole calculated to make a good impression. We know of nothing which has been published of late on the subject, which, owing to its peculiar popular dress, will be perused by the generality of readers with more interest and effect, than these lectures of Mr. Winslow.

THE  
**SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.**

---

VOL. II.

NOVEMBER, 1829.

NO. 11.

---

**COMMUNICATIONS.**

THOMAS HOLLIS.

IN my fifth Letter on the Introduction and Progress of Unitarianism in New England, published in the Spirit of the Pilgrims for September last, I was led to speak of Dr. Ware's appointment to the Professorship of Divinity in Harvard College. The orders of Mr. Hollis, requiring "that the person chosen from time to time" should "be a man of sound or orthodox principles," were referred to, as also the obligation by which the Corporation of the College had bound themselves and their successors, that these orders should be faithfully observed. It was then urged, that the appointment of Dr. Ware ought not to have been made, or if made, ought not to have been confirmed, because, in the first place, whatever religious principles the electors might think required by the words "sound or orthodox," he had not been examined and ascertained to be in the belief of such principles; and because, in the second place, they had no room to doubt, and could have none, as to the sense in which Mr. Hollis used the words "sound or orthodox." These words had a well known and *definite* theological meaning among the Dissenters of England at the time when he used them; and his own principles were "orthodox," in the technical sense. But the Overseers had no evidence that Dr. Ware was "orthodox," in this sense; on the contrary, they had much reason to believe, although he had not been examined, that this was not the case. Consequently, they ought not to have confirmed the appointment. And Dr. Ware himself, knowing, as he must, that his religious principles were not "orthodox" in the sense intended by Hollis, ought neither to have accepted the appointment, nor longer to retain the office.

NOVEMBER, 1829.

75

At the same date with the publication of my letter, an article appeared in the *Christian Examiner*, containing statements relative to Mr. Hollis and the Professorship, very different from those which I had made. The subject has since been taken up in the *Christian Register*, and several of my statements have been expressly contradicted. I think myself bound, therefore, before proceeding to another letter, to offer some remarks on these opposing publications, particularly the first, with a view to defend the ground I have taken.

It is not pretended, indeed, that Dr. Ware was examined previous to his appointment, or that one of the Overseers knew, or had the means of knowing, fully and certainly, what his religious principles were. It is conceded also, at length, that Mr. Hollis was a Calvinist—a concession which virtually yields the whole controversy. “He used the language of a Calvinist,” says the *Examiner*, “and THOUGHT HIMSELF ONE.” p. 97. The *Register* also decides that Hollis was “in speculation, in form, if not in fact, a Calvinist of the old fashioned stamp, retaining the original features of the Genevan image.” And again; “though Hollis was a Calvinist and a Baptist, he was not, therefore, a narrow minded and bigoted man.”

But it is urged that the words “sound or orthodox,” used in the orders of Hollis, are not so definite in their signification, as has been pretended. “Orthodoxy, in its strict and etymological acceptation, does not stand for any set of opinions or doctrines actually held in the church, but for the truth, or right opinion.” “The term orthodox is used in some places, as designating the opinions of the majority for the time being. By the Orthodox in Catholic countries, we are sometimes to understand those who strictly adhere to the decrees of the Council of Trent; by the Orthodox in England, those who maintain the Arminian interpretation of the thirty-nine articles; and by the Orthodox in this country, those who hold a modified form of Calvinism.” pp. 101, 102.

But in settling the meaning of the term, orthodox, as used in the orders of Hollis, we have no need of searching for the etymology of the word, nor of inquiring how it has been used in different ages and countries. The etymology of the term, Unitarian, would give it a much wider signification than is now claimed for it. It is well known, too, that the signification of all words is liable to vary, in different places, and at different times. The proper question is, *How was the word Orthodox used by Mr. Hollis, and by the Dissenters of England at the time when he lived? To what class of religious principles was it then customarily applied?*—And we perceive from the very orders of Hollis that the term was not then used, more than it is now, to mark mere circumstantial differences among those who were agreed on fundamental doctrines. His Professor must be “of sound or orthodox principles,” and yet he might be a “Congregationalist,

Presbyterian or Baptist." Consequently, the words "sound or orthodox" described a class of principles, not in which these denominations differed, but in which they were agreed. But what were the fundamental doctrines in regard to which these three denominations then agreed? Unquestionably the general doctrines of Calvinism. Not that all who were denominated Calvinistic or Orthodox explained this system of doctrines in the same way, but in the general characteristic features of the system they were agreed.\* That these were the Orthodox in the time of Hollis is evident from the concessions of Unitarians themselves. "Mr. Hollis was educated," says the Examiner, "in a belief of Calvinism, then the *prevailing* and *almost universal creed of the Dissenters.*" Again; "Doubtless the term in question was often used by the Dissenters in Mr. Hollis's time, and by Mr. Hollis himself, as *synonymous with Calvinistic.*" pp. 97, 102. The Register, too, speaks of Calvinism as the Orthodoxy "which *prevailed among the English Dissenters in the time of Hollis.*" The Reviewer in the Examiner speaks of the "champions of *Orthodoxy,*" as "sounding an alarm in the churches," at the commencement of the Arian controversy in England. Who were these "champions of Orthodoxy," but Trinitarians and Calvinists? Again, says he, the "term Arian" then, "like Socinian afterwards, and Unitarian now, conveyed no distinct idea to the *Orthodox* generally, but only that" the person designated by it "was a monster." p. 72. Who were these Orthodox, to whom the term Arian conveyed the idea of a monster? Were they Arians? The same writer, speaking of the Assembly at Salters' Hall, says, "Some of the more violent among the *Orthodox* interrupted the regular business, by moving that there should be introduced a declaration of faith in the holy Trinity." p. 75. Does not this look as though these Orthodox were Trinitarians? How difficult is it for men, after all their endeavors, entirely to obscure and conceal the truth!

It is evident from the letters of Mr. Hollis himself, in what sense he used the word, Orthodox. "I have expectation," says he, "of another parcel of books to send by this or next shipping; and if there happen to be some books not quite *Orthodox*, in search after truth with an honest design, do not be afraid of them. A public library ought to be furnished with *con* as well as *pro*, that students may read, try, judge, see for themselves, and believe upon argument and just reasonings of Scripture." What books the Calvinistic Hollis, and his Calvinistic correspondent, considered

\* This is a sufficient reply to the passage in the Examiner and Register, that if the Professor must be "Orthodox, in the sense of that term as used by the Dissenters a hundred years ago," then he must not only believe all the doctrines of Calvinism, but must *connect and explain* them, just as they were then explained. But the term was never used by Dissenters in a sense so restricted as this. And yet it will not follow that it was used without *any* restriction. Owen, and Baxter, and Flavel, and Peck were Orthodox; so were Watts, the Hemys, Dodridge, Gill and Guise; so also, in this country, the Mathers, the Edwardses, the Wigglesworths, and the late Dr. Tappan (notwithstanding any differences in explanation) were all, in the proper sense of the term, Orthodox.

as *Orthodox*, and what heterodox, will not probably be disputed. Again; "The late uncharitable reflections upon some of the Baptists, as not *Orthodox*, &c., makes me think it" (a written bond) "to be needful." It will be seen from this sentence, what we have already observed in remarking upon the orders of Hollis, that he did not use the term, *Orthodox*, as marking mere circumstantial differences, like those existing between Baptists and Congregationalists, but as denoting the general system of Calvinistic doctrine, in which both denominations were agreed.

If it should be asked, here, whether Arians and Socinians were not regarded as *Orthodox* in the time of Hollis; the Reviewer in the *Examiner* has furnished an answer. The "term Arian," says he, "like Socinian afterwards, and Unitarian now, conveyed no distinct idea to the *Orthodox* generally, but only that" the person designated by it "was a monster." p. 72. This, bating somewhat for rhetorical extravagance, is a true representation. And if any one doubts it, let him consult the publications connected with the Arian controversy, which commenced among the English Dissenters in 1717. The bare suspicion that two or three of the Presbyterian Ministers of Exeter were Arians, produced an excitement which convulsed the whole dissenting interest. An avowed Arian, in those days, was a heretic by his own confession. He would no sooner have claimed for himself the appellation, *Orthodox*, than he would have claimed it for an infidel; or if he had claimed it, it would no sooner have been allowed him. And as to Socinians, or Unitarians such as now prevail, they had, at that period, scarcely existence. Dr. Priestley, referring to a later date, says they "were *very few*. Dr. Lardner was known to be of this class, but he published nothing in defence of his principles till late in life; and even so late as 1770, I do not recollect the names of more than half a dozen dissenting ministers who avowed that" (the Socinian) "principle." \* And after the Socinians or Unitarians (as they now choose to call themselves) came into existence, and into notice; neither they, nor the professed Arians, laid any claim whatever to the title of *Orthodox*. Dr. Priestley, speaking of the instructors at Daventry when he was a student, says, "Our tutors were of different opinions; Dr. Ashworth taking the *Orthodox* side of every question, and Mr. Clark that of *heresy*." Again; "I saw reason to embrace what is generally called the *heterodox* side of almost every question." "The extreme of *heresy* among us was Arianism." Speaking of himself later in life, after he became a Socinian, and assigning the reason why he did not succeed in obtaining a school, he says, it was "not because I was thought to be unqualified for this employment" (school-keeping) "but because I was not *Orthodox*." †—We here see how the terms ortho-

\* Priestley's Church History, Vol. vi. p. 327.

† See Priestley's Memoirs pp. 13—37.

dox and heterodox were used among the Dissenters in England, not only in the time of Hollis, but at a later period. Dr. Priestley, neither while an Arian, nor a Socinian, ever laid any claim to be considered as Orthodox. He was a heretic by his own confession.

Considering the state of things in England at the time when Mr. Hollis's orders were framed, I suppose the first article (were there no other) fairly precludes a known Unitarian from being eligible to the office of Professor. The Professor must be "in communion with some Christian Church of one of the three denominations, Congregational, Presbyterian, or Baptist." It is doubted whether, in 1721, there was an open, professed Arian or Socinian in communion with a church of either of these denominations, in all England,\* or America; or whether it so much as entered the mind of Mr. Hollis that such an instance could ever occur.

But it is said that Mr. Hollis was a very liberal man, and that he entertained the most charitable feelings towards Christians of different denominations. Indeed the object of the article in the Examiner seems to be, not to prove that he was not a Calvinist, but to protect him "against the unjust imputation of being a bigot."—Now I admit that Mr. Hollis was a truly liberal Christian, and that he entertained the most charitable feelings towards his brethren of other denominations. The fact that, though himself a decided Baptist, he was a member and an officer of a Presbyterian church during the greater part of his life, as also the giving of his money for the support of college Professors and students who were not of his own denomination, are sufficient proofs of this. But what does all this prove? That he considered Unitarians Orthodox? And that when he required that his professor should be "of sound or Orthodox principles," he meant that he should be a Unitarian? No such thing. The truth is—as is now on all hands conceded—Mr. Hollis was a Calvinist. Being a Calvinist, he must have considered the whole human family as divided into two great classes, regenerate and unregenerate, believers and unbelievers, righteous and wicked, saints and sinners. All, of *every name*, who gave evidence to him of belonging to the first of these great divisions, he was willing, doubtless, to receive to his fellowship. They belonged to Christ—they bore his image—and he could own and embrace them as brethren. Towards those who were clearly of the latter division, he must, as a Calvinist, have felt very differently. He, no doubt, felt benevolently towards them; he felt concerned for them; he sought, and prayed, and labored for their good; but he could not acknowledge them as Christian

\* If an exception is to be made, it will apply to some few among the General or Arminian Baptists, a sect with which Mr. Hollis never had any connexion, and of which he entertained no favorable opinion.

brethren, or receive them as those who had been received of the Lord. All this results necessarily from his Calvinistic principles. He could not have been a Calvinist, in any sense, and not have made the distinction here represented. A question then arises, *Did his Christian fellowship extend to known and professed Unitarians?* He was liberal—charitable—no bigot;—this is on all hands admitted; *but did he embrace known and professed Unitarians, whether Socinians or Arians, as his Christian brethren?* Is there sufficient evidence that he did? The Reviewer in the Examiner thinks there is. The evidence which he has offered I propose now to examine.

The first thing which he urges is, the esteem of Mr. Hollis for the Rev. Dr. Hunt—his choice of him to be his Pastor—and his continuing under his ministry till his (Hollis's) death.—But was Dr. Hunt a known and professed Unitarian? Was he so at the time of his settlement, in 1707? I answer confidently, no. He had been educated among Trinitarians; he quietly succeeded a Trinitarian and Calvinist;\* and there is not a particle of evidence that he was himself, at that time, a Unitarian.—Was Dr. Hunt known as a Unitarian in the debates at Salters' Hall, in 1719? I answer again, no. My reasons for this answer will be given when I come to speak more particularly of those debates.—Was Dr. Hunt then a known and professed Unitarian in 1731, the year of Mr. Hollis's death, and ten years subsequent to the framing of his orders for the Professorship of Divinity in Harvard College? Again I answer that he was not. The writer of the celebrated "London Manuscript"—who is represented as a shrewd, observing man, and a Calvinist—specifies the sentiments of all the London Dissenting Ministers in 1731. The Presbyterians (among whom Dr. Hunt is reckoned by name) he classes thus—"nineteen Calvinists, thirteen Arminians, and twelve Baxterians"—no Unitarians.† We have all the evidence, then, which the nature of the case admits or requires, that in 1731, Dr. Hunt was not known as a Unitarian. What he became after this (for he lived till 1744) it is needless to inquire. I am aware that later Unitarians have claimed him, while at the same time they complain of him for concealing his sentiments.‡

\* Mr. Wavell.

† See Bogue and Bennett's History of Dissenters, Vol. iii. p. 373. Also Dissenter's Magazine, Vols. v. and vi.

‡ See Lindsey's Historical View, &c. p. 453.—The Reviewer in the Examiner has published copious extracts from the four volumes of Dr. Hunt's posthumous Sermons, for the purpose of exhibiting the religious sentiments of the author. In regard to these sermons, I observe, first, that probably the most of them were preached (so much as was preached) after Mr. Hollis's death. At least we have no evidence that this was not the case. But, secondly, the sermons, as printed, can hardly be called Dr. Hunt's. In a Memoir of the author, published in the second Volume of the Dissenter's Magazine, I find the following account of them. They "were collected from the author's manuscripts, and from notes taken by his friends as he preached. When it is considered from what imperfect sources this publication was formed, it is not surprising that it did not give satisfaction, nor render any great credit to the author's name: For even his manuscripts furnished the substance only of the sermons printed from them."



The next thing urged by the Reviewer, to show the sympathy of Mr. Hollis with Unitarians, is the part which he took in "the celebrated Salters' Hall controversy." In this affair, he is represented as having exerted himself in favor of the Arians, and in direct opposition to his Trinitarian brethren.

In order that this subject may be properly understood, it will be necessary to give a short account of the origin and nature of the Salters' Hall controversy. In the year 1717, suspicions were excited that some of the Presbyterian Ministers in the West of England, particularly Mr. James Peirce and Mr. Joseph Hallet of Exeter, denied the proper Divinity of Christ, and had become Arians. The excitement commenced, as might have been expected, at Exeter, but soon extended itself through the surrounding region. Great uneasiness was expressed by many of the hearers of the suspected ministers, and all likely means were used to obtain from them satisfaction in regard to their principles. In the mean time, though these ministers themselves were not sufficiently explicit to remove suspicion, they stoutly denied the charge of Arianism, and pretended to believe in the Divinity of the Saviour. The following declaration, dated Exon, May 6th, 1719, was subscribed by Messrs. Peirce and Hallet, and seventeen others :

"Whereas it hath been industriously reported, that some Protestant Dissenting Ministers are Arians, denying the Divinity of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and holding him to be a mere creature, and that they baptize only in the name of the Father ;—we, whose names are hereunto subscribed, do declare, that these reports, *as to us*, or any of our brethren as far as we know, *are false and slanderous* ; and we *solemnly protest*, as in the presence of God, the searcher of hearts, that we hold fast the form of sound words, believing all that the Scriptures say concerning the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost,—particularly, that the only begotten Son of God is the Word, who was in the beginning, who was with God, who *was God, by whom all things were made*, who was made flesh, and that *he is God, whose throne is forever and ever*," &c\*.

The same year Mr. Peirce declared that no "proof had been brought against him of having fallen into, persisted in, and taught" what was "called the pernicious error of denying the *proper Godhead* of Christ and the Holy Ghost."† Again he says, in the same year, "We never taught *anything like Arianism*," but "have taken all proper occasions to offer *our reasons against it*, and have *sufficiently guarded against all suspicions of Arianism* in our public ministrations."‡

These facts were all known, it seems, to the Reviewer in the Examiner ; for he says, "Even the Arians at Exeter, intelligent,

\* Remarks upon the Account of what was transacted in the Assembly at Exon, &c. p. 37.

† Animadversions, &c. p. 19.

‡ Answer to Mr. Euty, p. 102.

courageous, and high principled as they were,\* *persisted, for a long time, through fear, or policy, or the indistinctness of their views, in using language proper and consistent in Trinitarians only.*" p. 97.

It was in this state of things, though a little previous in the order of time that the aggrieved people at Exeter requested advice from their Dissenting brethren in London. Accordingly a committee of the three denominations (of which committee Mr. Hollis was a member) was appointed, who drew a "paper of advices" in the hope, probably, of restoring peace. In these "advices," they exhort their brethren at Exeter to "endeavor to allay all *unreasonable jealousies* concerning the sentiments and opinions of others, particularly Ministers;" and recommend that, if "some Christians shall accuse their ministers, as *not holding the Christian faith*, or as *propagating opinions which they conceive to be inconsistent with it*, no such accusation should be in the least regarded, by ministers or others, unless two or more persons shall subscribe their name to it;" and "that when there is a proper accusation made, and duly supported, the person accused should be first privately admonished," &c. It is clear from the language of these "advices," had we no other evidence in the case, that the question, as it presented itself to this committee, was not, 'Shall our brethren at Exeter rest satisfied and contented with their Arian ministers?' but, 'Are these ministers indeed Arians? Is there sufficient evidence that they are? Are not our brethren unduly suspicious of their ministers? Are they not proceeding against them, without previous admonition, and without proof?' This was the true state of the case, as it presented itself to the committee at London, and it was entirely to such a state of things that their very seasonable and conciliatory "advices" looked.

When the "advices" had been agreed upon in the committee, the Dissenting Ministers of the three denominations in and about London were called together at Salters' Hall, to consider and act upon them. In this assembly it was proposed by some, that the Ministers present should accompany their "advices" by a *written and subscribed declaration of their belief in the doctrine of the Trinity*. On this proposal, after much warm debate, the assembly divided, a majority of three or four being opposed to the subscription. The result was, that two papers of "advices" were sent to Exeter, the one accompanied by the proposed subscription, and the other without it; and the ministers of London were known, for some considerable time after, under the distinctive appellations of *subscribers* and *non-subscribers*.

Such is a brief account of the Salters' Hall controversy. In order to judge of it rightly, the real question at issue must be kept

\* "High principled" indeed, to deny that they were Arians, or *anything like it*, when they were such!

distinctly in mind; which was not, '*Are we Trinitarians?*' but, '*Shall we subscribe the proposed declaration?*' The non-subscribers insisted that, as Dissenting ministers who had refused subscription to the articles of the established church, they could not consistently subscribe any such thing. They professed to believe the doctrine of the Trinity, and to value it as highly as any of their brethren; but a voluntary subscription they could not make.—That these were the professed, and, so far as we know, the real views of the non-subscribing ministers, is abundantly evident from their own published account of the debates at Salters' Hall. The same is evident also from the circumstance, that, although they would not personally subscribe to an article on the Trinity, they accompanied their "advices" to Exeter with a letter, signed by their chairman, Dr. Oldfield, *in their name*, in which they say, "*We utterly disown the Arian doctrine, and sincerely believe the doctrine of the ever blessed Trinity, and the proper Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ.*"\* The same is further evident from a letter of the Rev. Edward Wallin, one of the *subscribing* ministers, to a friend in Boston, in which he says, "*Those who refused the subscription did it with the design to maintain Christian liberty, rather than with any design to promote and encourage Arianism.*"†

There is no doubt that in these debates, and in the divisions which grew out of them, the sympathies of Mr. Hollis were with the non-subscribers. But what conclusion are we to draw from this? That he harmonized with known and professed Unitarians? That he held them to be orthodox? Or that he was willing to have fellowship with them as Christians? No such thing. These are the conclusions which the Reviewer in the Examiner would force upon his readers; but in so doing he greatly misleads them, as all who have duly attended to the subject perfectly understand.

Another circumstance in the life of Hollis which the Reviewer mentions, as indicating his kind feelings towards Unitarians, is his intimacy with Lord Barrington. This gentleman, we are told, "seems to have been his *oracle* on all occasions."—On this point I remark, in the first place, that there is no evidence of any such intimacy between Lord Barrington and Mr. Hollis, as would give the former an undue or special influence over the opinions and feelings of the latter. But, secondly, Lord Barrington himself was not a Unitarian; at least, he was not known to the public, as such. Dean Swift, speaking of his religious principles, says, "He is a moderate man, frequenting the *church*" (Trinitarian worship) "and the meeting indifferently." Dr. Watts addresses him, in one of his Lyric Poems, not as he would a professed Unitarian.

\* See History of Dissenters, vol. iii. p. 244. Dr. Hunt was one of the ministers *in whose name*, and *by whose direction*, this letter was sent to Exeter, which proves that he was no Unitarian in 1719.

† See Backus' Hist. of the Baptists, vol. ii. p. 62.

"Thus, when our follies, or our faults,  
Call for the pity of thy thoughts,  
Thy pen shall make us wise."<sup>\*</sup>

Lord Barrington published an "Essay on the *Teaching and Witness of the Holy Spirit*"—a singular subject for a Unitarian. He also published Dissertations "on the Fall of Man," and "on God's visible Presence," in the last of which he endeavors to show, that the God who appeared so often to the Patriarchs, and to his people under the former dispensation, *was no other than our Lord Jesus Christ*.

It is mentioned as an important circumstance relating to the orders of Mr. Hollis, and one which ought to have weight in interpreting them, that they were drawn up by Dr. Hunt, and that the original copy is chiefly in his hand-writing.—But were they, I ask, the orders of Dr. Hunt, or of Mr. Hollis? If the former, then the religious character of Dr. Hunt ought indeed to be well considered in our endeavors to understand them. But if the latter supposition is the acknowledged truth, and if Dr. Hunt was employed only as an adviser and an amanuensis, I cannot see that his religious character, whatever it may have been, has any important bearing upon the subject.†—We are not altogether in the dark, however, in regard to the religious character of Dr. Hunt. It has been stated and proved, that at the date of these orders, and for many years after, he was, so far as the public had any knowledge, a Trinitarian.

The orders of Mr. Hollis were subscribed, and "unanimously recommended as necessary to answer his useful design," by the seven following ministers, viz. Daniel Neal, W. Harris, Jer. Hunt, Josh. Oldfield, D. D., Moses Lowman, Edward Wallin, and Arthur Shallett. "The religious sentiments of these clergymen," we are told, ought to be considered, in interpreting "any ambiguous words and phrases" of the orders. What then were the religious sentiments of these respected clergymen?

DANIEL NEAL. Mr. Neal, the historian of the Puritans, was an intimate and confidential friend of Mr. Hollis. He married a relative of Mr. Hollis, and resided several years in his family. He was not present at the debates in Salters' Hall, "but to every one who asked him, he gave *the most satisfactory assurances of his agreement with the subscribers in that important truth*"—the

\* This Ode or Epistle is dated "June, 1704," while Dr. Watts was comparatively young.

† The orders of Mr. Hollis were originally drawn up by the Orthodox bigots of New England (as the Examiner seems to consider our clergy of that period) at the request of Mr. Hollis; were "approved by the President and Corporation" of the College; and transmitted to London. There they underwent a careful revision, and such additions and alterations were made, as Mr. Hollis and his friends thought proper. The greater part of the articles, however, were suffered to remain, according to "the scheme which was sent from New England."

Trinity.\* The Examiner admits that he was "inclined to Calvinism."

W. HARRIS. Dr. Harris, we are told in the History of Dissenters, was "an avowed Calvinist, and always preached according to that system." vol. iii. p. 380. He wrote the notes on the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians in Mr. Henry's Commentary, which performances are decisive as to the question of his orthodoxy.†

JER. HUNT. Of the character of Dr. Hunt we have already spoken. He was at this time, and long after, so far as the public had the means of knowing, a Trinitarian.

JOSH. OLDFIELD, D. D. Dr. Oldfield, as we are informed in the History of Dissenters, "was zealous for the *Orthodox doctrines*, and published his sentiments on the Trinity in a sermon which united principle with practice, and combined the truth of the doctrine with its important use." vol. iii. p. 281. The Examiner admits that he was a Trinitarian.

MOSES LOWMAN. The posthumous works of Mr. Lowman I have not seen. In 1748, more than twenty years after signing and recommending the orders of Mr. Hollis, he published a learned and valuable treatise, entitled "The Rational of the Ritual of the Hebrew Worship," which proves conclusively that he was not then a Unitarian. He makes the Shekinah, or visible appearances of Jehovah in the Old Testament, a figure, an emblem, of the appearance of Christ in our flesh; who dwelt (*εσχηνωσεν*) *tabernacled*, or, as Mr. Lowman expresses it, *Shekinized* amongst us. See John i. 14. He asserts that Christ was the *Jehovah of hosts* whom Isaiah saw, (chap. vi.) that he was "*God manifest in the flesh*;" that he was "*truly God with us*," &c. pp. 374---395.

EDWARD WALLIN. Mr. Wallin was a respectable Baptist minister in London, and an intimate friend of Mr. Hollis.‡ He was among the subscribers at Salters' Hall, and is admitted on all hands, to have been a decided Calvinist.

ARTHUR SHALLETT. Of the religious character of this gen-

\* Hist. of Dissenters, vol. iii. p. 463.

† Remarking on Phil. ii. 6. Dr. Harris says, "Here are the two natures of Christ, his *Divine* nature, and *human* nature. 1. Here is his *Divine* nature; 'Who being in the form of God, partaking of the *Divine* nature, as the eternal and only begotten Son of God. This agrees with John i. 1. 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God.' It is of the same import with being 'the *Image of the invisible God*,' Col. i. 15. and 'the *likeness of his glory, and express image of his person*,' Heb. i. 3. 'He thought it not robbery to be equal with God; did not think him self guilty of any evasion of what did not belong to him, or assuming another's right. He said, 'I and my Father are one.' John x. 30. 'It is the highest degree of robbery for any mere man to pretend to be equal with God, or profess himself one with the Father. 'This is for a man to rob God, not in titles and offerings, but of the rights of his Godhead.'" See also to the same purpose Dr. Harris's Commentary on Col. i. 15—18, where he speaks of Christ as "so far from being a creature, that he is the *Creator*"—"the *end* as well as the *cause* of all things"—as "*being before all time*;" and "*from all eternity*." "The *whole creation*," says he, "*is kept together by the power of the Son of God*, and made to consist in its proper frame."

‡ See Wallin's Letters in Backus's Hist. vol. ii.

tleman nothing definite is known. The presumption is strong, that he was, like Mr. Hollis and the other signers, a Trinitarian.

The public will perceive that I have given a very different account of the religious character of some of these subscribers, from that given in the Examiner and Register. I can only say that I have endeavored to give a true account. I invite attention to the subject, and on whichever side misrepresentation may be found, there let the blame be cast. It has been stated and proved, that all these signers were, at the time of signing, professed Trinitarians. The most of them were very decided Calvinists. They all knew what was meant by "*sound or orthodox principles*," and they would no sooner have applied these epithets to the principles of an Arian or Socinian, than to those of an infidel.

The Reviewer in the Examiner "can hardly repress his indignation," on account of the examination to which the first Professor Wigglesworth was subjected, and the decisive expression of Calvinistic principles which he was led in this way to make.---But did Mr. Hollis ever manifest any indignation on this account? So far from it, he expressed himself as "*mightily pleased with the character*" given him of Mr. Wigglesworth; and after knowing all the circumstances of his election, and maintaining "an intimate correspondence with him for ten years, Mr. Hollis continued his *high approbation*." Here then, as I said in my letter, we have "a practical comment on the phraseology of the orders." We *know* the religious principles of Professor Wigglesworth, and we *know* that Mr. Hollis approved of them as "*sound or orthodox*," and as conforming in this respect to the orders he had given.

But we are told by the Reviewer that, "however we understand the term *orthodox*," it does not appear that Mr. Hollis *required* the electors to choose an orthodox man, but only that he *recommended* it." p. 101. In the *original* copy of the orders, the eleventh article commences as follows: "That it be *recommended* to the electors that, at every choice, they prefer a man of solid learning in Divinity, of sound or orthodox principles," &c. In the printed copy, the same article commences thus: "That the person chosen from time to time to be Professor *be* a man of solid learning in divinity, of sound or orthodox principles," &c. In the former case, there is a *recommendation*; in the latter, a *requirement*. But are we to presume that any one took it upon him to *alter* this article, and to print and publish it in a mutilated state, without the motion or consent of Mr. Hollis? Who is the vile forger, counterfeiter, that can be supposed to have done such a thing as this? The truth is, several alterations were made from the original copy, on other articles besides the one in question, and, as the Reviewer acknowledges, "*by the consent of Mr. Hollis*." It is past all question, therefore, that the alteration we are considering was made *by his consent*; so that the article, as

he chose to leave it, is not in the form of a recommendation, but of a positive *requisition*. It is strictly *required* of the electors, "that the person chosen to be Professor, *be* a man of sound or orthodox principles."

The Reviewer has no doubt that it was the intention of Mr. Hollis to leave the whole subject to the discretion of the electors. The Professor must be a man of "sound or orthodox principles," but the electors are to decide for themselves what constitute such principles, and "what shall be considered as evidence" of them. p. 101.

But how does this comport with the views of Professor Wigglesworth, as expressed in his sermon on the death of Mr. Hollis? "'Tis no mean stroke in his character in my account," says the Professor, "that he did not content himself to make ample bequests to this society, and then *leave it to the consciences of them who had, or might hereafter have, the direction of it, to see that they were well improved*; but hath, from first to last, taken the utmost care to put it, as far as possible, *out of our power to misimprove them, or in any measure to defeat his pious intentions.*"

Again; how does the opinion of the Reviewer, here considered, comport with other opinions which he has himself expressed? In one place we are told, "Nothing was farther from Mr. Hollis's intentions, than tying up the hands of the electors." "The candidate should be a man of orthodox principles, that is, of sound and correct principles; leaving it, of course, for the electors to decide what shall be considered as evidence of sound and correct principles." p. 101. But in another place we are told, that the very object for which Mr. Hollis insisted on a written bond, was to tie up the hands of the electors. "It was *to prevent* a body of bigoted Calvinists and Congregationalists from throwing aside his rules and orders, which were entirely liberal, and adopting others in their room, which he knew would be exclusive." He feared that alterations would be made, "to shut out forever from the office Baptists, Arminians, and Unitarians. This was what Mr. Hollis resolved *to prevent.*" pp. 98, 99.

But if Mr. Hollis intended to leave everything to the discretion of the electors, why, I ask, did he frame any orders at all? Why did he enjoin that his Professor should be "of sound or orthodox principles," if he meant to leave it to the electors to determine, without any regard to his sense of the words, what such principles were? Was he really afraid that they would choose men, whose principles *they* regarded as unsound and dangerous? On the hypothesis here examined, Mr. Hollis must be supposed (after consultation with some of the most learned divines in Europe,) gravely to have directed the Corporation of Harvard College

never to choose a man as his Professor, whom *they* thought to be a bad man—whose principles *they* regarded as unsound, unscriptural, and of pernicious tendency! Yes, and he must be supposed to have insisted “frequently and imperatively,” as the Reviewer tells us he did, “upon a written bond, by which the Corporation should *bind themselves*\* and their successors forever”—to do what? To choose men “of sound or orthodox principles,” according to *his* sense of the words? Not at all. This would have been the extreme of bigotry. But to choose men of such principles, according to *their own* sense of the words—that is, to choose men whose principles *they* thought correct, of whatever nature or character they might be!—Is not a supposition such as this in the highest degree absurd and preposterous?

To conclude all, we are told, that the question about the meaning of Mr. Hollis’s orders is one of very small importance, since the Professor does not receive more than about one hundred and fifty dollars a year, as the proceeds of the Hollis endowment.—But really I think a continued perversion of one hundred and fifty dollars a year is a thing of some importance in itself; and the principle is the same as though the sum were ten times as large. At the rate of one hundred and fifty dollars a year, the present incumbent has received already almost *four thousand dollars* of Mr. Hollis’s money, to which, according to the letter and meaning of the orders, he has no more right, than he has to the entire property of Harvard College.†

I only add that the Reviewer preserves a silence, as discreet as it is profound, in regard to the Henchman legacy, the avails of which the Hollis Professor is continuing to receive, which was bestowed and accepted on the *express condition* that “the person in that office” “shall *profess and teach* the principles of the Christian religion *according to the well known confession of faith drawn up by the synod of the churches in New-England.*”

INVESTIGATOR.

\* And yet “nothing was further from Mr. Hollis’s intentions, than *tying up* the hands of the electors?”!

† It was stated in my letter, that Dr. Ware “has been, for almost twenty-five years, receiving his bread from a Professorship, which was founded by a strictly Orthodox man, and was consecrated and pledged for the support of such a man in all future time.” “After such an assertion,” says the writer in the Register, “we cannot be surprised at anything in the way of statement or argument, admitted into the pages of” the Spirit of the Pilgrims. This writer evidently means to contradict my assertion, and to represent it as false and unworthy of regard. It will be observed I did not state that Dr. Ware had received *all* his support from the proceeds of the Hollis fund; but that he had “been receiving his bread from a *Professorship* which was founded by a strictly Orthodox man.” &c. The statement, I insist, was true *to the letter*; and if the writer in the Register did not *know* it was true, at the time when he virtually contradicted it, he will learn, I hope, in future to let subjects alone, until he better understands them.



## ON THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The following article was first published in the Christian Magazine for 1825, pp. 302—310. It has been revised, somewhat enlarged, and (by request) is now presented to our readers.

An *essential* part of the work of man's redemption is in Scripture ascribed to the Holy Spirit. Believers are "chosen unto salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth." They are saved, by "the washing of regeneration and *renewing of the Holy Ghost.*" "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit;" and "except a man be *born of the Spirit*, he cannot see the kingdom of God." The subject of the Spirit's operations is, therefore, of a most solemn and interesting nature. It should never be approached but with deep reverence and a prayerful reliance on the teachings of Him who is promised to guide us into all truth.

In considering the work of the Holy Spirit, it is proposed to inquire.

I. What are the offices which he at present performs for men.

II. In what manner he performs these offices. And

III. How far his present operations may be expected to conform to the established laws of the human mind.

One of the offices which the Holy Spirit now performs for men, is to *enlighten* them. It is by his enlightening influence, that he awakens the thoughtless, alarms the secure, impresses a sense of the importance of religion, promotes serious reflection, removes prejudices and unfounded hopes, and convinces the sinner of his guilt, and of the justice of God in his condemnation. It is by the same kind of influence, that he leads true Christians onward in a knowledge of themselves, of God, and of the way of life, and that he impresses those religious truths, by means of which they grow in grace, and are fitted for heaven.

Another office of the Holy Spirit is that of *Sanctifier*. Through his sanctifying influence, persons are led, in view of motives, to renounce the world, and to choose the Lord for their portion. They are led to love God, to submit to his will, to repent of their sins, to believe in Christ, and to feel a holy complacence in all the duties and services of religion. It is by this influence, therefore, that their hearts are changed, and dispositions are imparted which are opposed to sin, in love with holiness, and conformed to the moral image of their Maker.

Still another office which the Holy Spirit performs for his people, is that of *Comforter*. This work of the Spirit, though closely connected with that last mentioned, and growing out of it, is still, in some respects, distinct from it. Although happiness is intimately connected with holiness, yet it is not holiness; and the work of

imparting spiritual enjoyment, and that of producing holy affections, are to be regarded as distinct operations of the Divine Spirit. It is in his office of *Comforter* that the Spirit renders his people happy. He imparts to them a peace over which the world has no direct power—that “peace of God which passeth all understanding”—peace of conscience and “joy in the Holy Ghost.”

II. In what manner does the Holy Spirit perform those important offices which have been mentioned?

In prosecuting this inquiry, my single object will be to show, that he performs them *through the medium of our mental faculties*. He *enlightens*, not by a miraculous influx, but through the regular medium of the understanding and conscience. He *sanctifies*, through the medium of the will. And as spiritual enjoyment is a feeling of the soul, which necessarily implies some faculty of feeling, it is through the medium of this faculty, whatever it may be, that the Spirit accomplishes his work as *Comforter*.

The truth of these assertions is so obvious, as scarcely to admit of illustration or proof. How is it possible that Divine *light* should be let into the human mind, except through the medium of those faculties which alone are capable of receiving light? What is divine light? It is *truth*, relating to Divine, and moral subjects. But how is it possible, even for the Holy Spirit, to make men acquainted with such truth, to impress it upon them, and in this way to awaken and convince sinners, and enlighten the people of God, except through the medium of their understandings and consciences?

Holiness is a property of free moral exercises—exercises of *will*. Love, penitence, submission, faith, and all the various holy affections, are so many exercises of the will.\* How then can these affections be produced, or how can the Divine Spirit *sanctify* any person and make him holy, except through the medium of this important faculty? And the same remark may be made, respecting the work of the Holy Spirit as *Comforter*. Spiritual enjoyment must be imparted, if imparted at all, through the medium of those mental capacities or faculties by which alone we are enabled to receive it.—It is plain, therefore, that in all the offices which the Spirit is at present performing for men, he operates, and for aught that appears must operate, through the regular medium of our faculties.† He may enlarge our faculties, or he may open, strengthen, or quicken them, to any extent that shall seem to him desirable; but I trust I do no discredit to the Holy One in saying, that I cannot conceive of his having access to the human mind for any purpose, except through the medium of those faculties or inlets which he has himself created.

\* The term *will* is here used to express the great *acting* power of the human mind—that from which results, not merely such volitions as are connected directly with overt action, but all the internal, *voluntary* movements and affections of the soul.

† Doubtless the Spirit strives through the medium of the *memory*, the *imagination*, &c. as well as through the faculties already mentioned.

Let us now inquire, in the third place, how far those operations of the Spirit of which we have spoken, are conformable to the established laws of the human mind.—I would be far, indeed, from limiting the operations of the Divine Spirit. I know he is a Sovereign, who has the power and the right to do as he pleases; still I am satisfied that the operations of the Spirit, now that the age of miracles is past, may be expected, ordinarily, to conform to the established laws of mind.

This may be regarded as a just inference from what has been said. God, who gave us our faculties, has subjected them, in their operations, to fixed laws. He has wisely chosen and established that they shall operate in a particular way, rather than in any other way. Now, as the Spirit accomplishes his work through the medium of our faculties, shall we not suppose that he conforms his influence, ordinarily, to the instituted laws by which these faculties are governed? One of two things presents itself as certain: He either conforms his influence to these laws, or he goes contrary to them and for the time suspends them. But if he goes contrary to them and suspends them, then his operations constitute a continued series of miracles, and the era of miracles is not yet past. All who are unwilling to adopt this supposition, will be led of necessity to adopt the other,—that the present operations of the Holy Spirit are conformed to the established laws of mind. Nor is this supposition at all degrading to the work of the Spirit, but the contrary. For who established those general laws to which our mental faculties are subject? It was the infinite Being who formed our faculties, and who doubtless has fixed the mode of their operation in the wisest manner. He has ordained that they shall operate in a particular way, rather than in any other, because this is the best way. Is it then derogatory to the work of the Holy Spirit, to suppose that his influences upon the human mind are conformed to these wisely established rules? Or would it not be degrading his work, to suppose that ordinarily he violates these rules?

The design of these remarks, as must be evident to every candid reader, is not to call in question the reality of the peculiar work of the Spirit—or the necessity of this work in order to our salvation—or the proper sovereignty of the Spirit in accomplishing it—or the efficacy of prayer in procuring it; but merely to show, that the present work of the Holy Spirit, though in a sense supernatural, is not miraculous—that it is accomplished through the medium of our mental faculties, and in accordance with the established laws of mind, and that it will bear the investigation, as well of the enlightened philosopher, as of the Christian. Nor are the principles which have been established mere speculation. They lead to practical conclusions of great importance, several of which will be noticed.

1. It follows from what has been said, that mental philosophy, or an acquaintance with human nature and with the established

laws of the human mind, is intimately connected with the science of theology. The science of theology relates, not only to the being and perfections of God, but to the various dealings of God towards men. Consequently the operations of the Spirit of God upon the minds of men come directly within the scope of this important science. But, as these operations are, of course, on the *mind*—are performed through the medium of our *mental* faculties, and in conformity with the laws by which these faculties are governed, it is impossible duly to understand the operations of the Spirit, or the science of theology of which they constitute an important branch, without some acquaintance with the philosophy of mind. The relations of the two sciences in this view are very intimate—more so than some teachers of theology seem to have imagined—and so much so, that it is doubtful whether either of them can be fully studied and comprehended, without a knowledge of the other.

2. The work of the Spirit, as here explained, does not supersede, but implies, the necessity of a due acquaintance with the Sacred Scriptures. The truths contained in the Scriptures are the *instrument*, by which the various operations of the Spirit are performed. He enlightens, by opening and impressing Divine truth upon the mind; and he sanctifies and comforts, in view of motives and considerations adapted to these different operations. Now the Scriptures furnish the very truths, motives and considerations which the Spirit employs in all this high and momentous concern. The Word of God is therefore the *instrument* by which the Holy Spirit operates. It is that “sword of the Spirit,”\* with which he pricks the sinner in the heart, and wounds—to the saving of the soul.

3. We see how men may co-operate with the Holy Spirit in accomplishing his peculiar work. As there is room and necessity for the instrumentality of the Divine word—for the truths, motives and considerations of the Gospel—for the means of grace; men are able, and are required, to dispense these means. They may be, and ought to be, “*workers together*” with the *Divine Spirit*, in pouring light upon the blinded understanding, impressing obligation upon the slumbering conscience, exhibiting motives in favor of holiness, and urging considerations adapted to edify and comfort the people of God.

4. It is of great importance for those who are called by their sacred profession to co-operate with the Divine Spirit, and dispense the means of grace, to *adapt* these means in the wisest manner. It cannot be doubted that there is room here for the exercise of much skill and judgement. It cannot be doubted (other things being equal) that the most wisely adapted means will ordinarily be the most successful. There are good reasons why they should be so.

\* “The sword of the Spirit, which is the *Word of God*.” Eph. vi. 17.

The Holy Spirit, on whose influence every thing depends, operates, as we have seen, through the medium of our faculties, and in conformity with the established laws of mind. He awakens, alarms and convinces of sin, by exhibiting truth to the understanding, and impressing it on the conscience; and he converts and sanctifies, in view of the powerful motives of the Gospel. Now as men are laborers together with him in this work of exhibiting and impressing truth, and in presenting and urging motives; can it be doubted that that man labors the most efficiently, and will labor the most successfully, who most clearly exhibits Divine light—most powerfully impresses truth—most persuasively urges motives—and who adapts all the means he employs in the wisest manner?

The means employed should be wisely adapted, in respect to the *matter* of them. They should be enlightening, impressive, persuasive *in themselves*, and the more so the better.—They should be wisely adapted, also, in respect to the circumstances of *time and place*. Said our Saviour to his disciples on a certain occasion, “I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them *now*.” Not only should every person have his due portion of spiritual meat, he should have it “*in due season*.” The speeches which Paul made at Athens, at Jerusalem, and before king Agrippa, are all very different one from another, and neither of them could have been substituted in place of the other without the most glaring impropriety.—And the means of grace should be wisely adapted, in respect to the particular *manner* of employing them. Every lawful expedient should be employed to secure attention to means; for unless they are attended to, however excellent they may be in themselves, they certainly can do no good. There is a spot in every sinner's heart under the Gospel—it is the spot which, in the ordinary course of means, is the most exposed—which it may be feared has long ago become callous and impenetrable. The arrows of truth have continued to fall on it till they make no impression. Now it is to little purpose that ministers continue preaching and preaching at this hard place in the heart. They must level their arrows in new directions, and endeavor to find some tenderer part. Achilles was slain by an arrow of Paris, though said to be vulnerable only in his heel. No religious means will be likely to benefit the stupid, careless sinner, unless they wound him.\* He must “be pricked in the heart,” like the hearers of Peter, or he will never inquire as they did, “Men and brethren what shall we do?” And it should be the endeavor of those who preach the Gospel—by original and striking views of subjects—by direct, appropriate, and earnest address—by a wise and skilful *adaptation* of means—to affect the hearts of their hearers, and thus bring them to know and love the truth.

\* “The words of the *wise* are as *goads*,” Eccl. xii. 11.

Means, differently dispensed, are seen to produce different effects ; and usually those very effects which they are *adapted* to produce. Whitefield preached the Gospel in a way to arrest the attention of his hearers, impress their consciences, and affect their hearts. And the Gospel preached by him produced, extensively, these very effects. His labors were blessed, beyond those of almost any other man, in the conviction and conversion of sinners. The late Dr. Hopkins of Newport possessed as much intellect as Whitefield, perhaps as much piety, and he preached essentially the same doctrines. Yet few were known to have been converted under his ministry. And the reason is obvious : His preaching was not *adapted* to awaken and alarm the slumbering sinner. It would have been strange, next to miraculous, if effects of this nature had been, to any considerable extent, the result of his labors. If it should appear in the end, that Hopkins has been as useful to the church of God as Whitefield ; he will have been useful in a very different way. He was raised up and qualified for a different purpose.

It will be seen that the view here taken presents strong encouragement for the skilful and faithful use of means. Men have all the encouragement to use the means of grace, which they would have, if an accompanying Divine influence was not needed ; and perhaps more. In ordinary cases, ministers of the Gospel produce those very effects among their people, which the means they employ are *adapted* to produce. If it is the object of a minister merely to satisfy his people, keep his parish quiet, and live easy ; his preaching will, of course, have little good effect. But if it is his object to awaken careless sinners, to promote revivals of religion, to quicken and comfort the people of God, to save himself, and bring as many of his people as possible with him to heaven---if this is the object on which his heart is set, and which he pursues in a faithful use of the best adapted means ; in all probability he may see it in a good measure accomplished. The Spirit will not be wanting to him, unless he is wanting in the performance of duty. Let him use means as skilfully and faithfully as Paul did, and he may be blessed like Paul. Let him pray and preach like Whitefield, and his labors, he may hope, will be followed with the like effects. And if, with singleness of heart and ardor of purpose, he *does what he can* ; his work will not be in vain in the Lord.\*

I am aware that the subject, presented in this light, imposes a vast responsibility upon all who have the care of souls---upon all who are in a situation to use means and exert an influence for the good of others ; but if this responsibility is really upon us, we ought to feel it. I know it is much easier to say, when pressed

\* "Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine : Continue in them : For in so doing thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." 1 Tim. iv. 16.

with obligation, 'The time has not come,' than it is to take hold and build the spiritual temple of the Lord. I know, too, that it is much more soothing to an unquiet conscience to charge the blame of unfruitfulness to the absence of the Holy Spirit, than to our own mistakes and negligence. But will the Spirit bear the blame? Will it appear in the end that he ever failed his people, when they had done their duty, and had good reason to expect his accompanying influence?

6. It may be gathered from what has been said, that much skill and judgement---much acquaintance with human nature, and with the established laws of mind---as well as much experience in Divine things---are requisite, in order to qualify a person to direct, in the most proper manner, a revival of religion. Revivals of true religion are the work of the Holy Spirit. They are seasons when his operations are specially and gloriously exhibited, in awakening, convincing, and converting sinners, and in quickening and comforting the people of God. But in these seasons, as in all others, the Spirit operates through the medium of the human faculties, and in conformity with the established laws of mind. In these seasons, as in all others, there is room and necessity for the co-operation of men. And those who are called at such times to co-operate with the Divine Spirit, in dispensing the Word of life, and promoting the work of God, need themselves to be directed, in a special manner, by "that wisdom which is from above." Ignorance or error on their part may be even more fatal than avowed opposition. Mistakes may be made which can never be rectified, and which will be productive of incalculable evils.

The skilful, faithful pastor, in a season such as has been described, will acquaint himself minutely with the state of the revival, and with the feelings of all interested in it, so that every stroke may tell to good purpose, and every word may be a word in season. He will endeavor, not only to arouse those who continue stupid, but to keep up and increase existing impressions, and to bring them, in every instance, to a desirable result. Still, he will be cautious against creating an undue excitement of the passions, or endeavoring to promote the work by any other means than a plain and earnest dispensation of the truth. There is a degree of excitement beyond which the human faculties, in their present state, cannot go, and in which they cannot long be sustained. They will soon begin to droop, their energy will be relaxed, and good impressions will be speedily effaced. Great care should therefore be taken, in a season of general revival, that the work be not indiscreetly conducted, and in this way brought to an early close.---Many an earnest laborer, I doubt not, has had occasion on this ground for unavailing regrets. He has seen a state of feeling subsiding, which he had anticipated would be lasting, and

has been left to gather in a blighted harvest, where he had hoped to fill his joyful hand.

7. The subject suggests some reasons why revivals of religion have not been permanent. As they are the work of the Holy Spirit, the prime reason for their cessation is the *withdrawing of his influence*. The Holy Spirit is grieved away. This reason for the cessation of a revival is a *criminal* one---one which ought not to exist--and in view of which it becomes Christians to be deeply humbled.--But there is another reason for the fact under consideration, which is rather natural than moral, and which, in its origin, is not necessarily criminal. Revivals of religion are attended, perhaps always, with more or less excitement of the animal system. The animal spirits have an unusual flow, and a degree of mere animal feeling is experienced. Now it is not possible, in the nature of things, that this species of excitement should be perpetual. It would be a miracle, if it should. There is no religion in it, while it lasts, and it need not be expected to last very long. The unnatural excitement will subside, and for a time, the *animal* system may be expected to sink as much below its usual state, as it has been raised above it. These constitutional changes ought not to diminish the ardor of holy love, though often, doubtless, they become the *occasion* of doing it. Such an effect of them ought, therefore, to be guarded against with the utmost vigilance. God will not excuse us, and we must not excuse ourselves, if we suffer the vibrations of mere animal feeling to draw our affections away from him.

8. It may be inferred from the preceding remarks, that the religious experience, of which no *rational* account can be given, ought to be suspected. The Holy Spirit is the author of all true religious experience; but in producing it, he operates in a rational manner, and those who are the subjects of his saving operations can be expected to give a reasonable account of the views and exercises of their minds. The Spirit *enlightens*, but it is with the light of truth; and those on whose understandings and consciences the truth is impressed can mention the particular truths which impress them. The Spirit *sanctifies*, but it is in view of motives; and all who are truly sanctified can state the motives, in view of which their hearts have been excited to exercises of holiness. The Spirit also *comforts* the people of God, but it is by means of considerations adapted to this purpose; and those who are in the enjoyment of spiritual comforts can be at no loss what these considerations are. The experience and the hopes of true Christians are rationally founded, and they can render a *reason* of the hope that is in them with meekness and fear. And those exercises and hopes of which no rational account can be given, there is reason to fear, will not abide the scrutiny of the final day.



9. Will it not follow from this discussion, that much of the mystery which has been drawn around the work of the Holy Spirit, may be safely removed?—It is not discreditable to the piety of Christians, that this subject has been deemed a sacred one—too sacred, almost, to be trusted with mortal hands, or to be looked at with anything like a philosophical eye. On this account, a kind of awful mystery has been drawn around it, which, instead of heightening, has rather served to obscure its glory. It is indeed a sacred subject; but not too sacred to be carefully and candidly investigated. It is not too sacred to be understood, so far as it is capable of being understood by men. There is no virtue in wrapping it up, as too good to be looked at, but, on the contrary, the utmost danger. On no subject is ignorance more to be deprecated, as on no subject will mistakes be more likely to prove fatal. The work of the Holy Spirit may be, and ought to be, diligently studied. It is a study from which, if properly pursued, the greatest advantages may be expected to result.

I cannot conclude this communication, without endeavoring to impress, both on myself and my readers, a sense of *dependence* upon the Holy Spirit. Naturally, we are in a state of deep moral darkness. We have eyes, but we see not. We have understandings, but in respect to things purely spiritual, they are perverted and blind. We have consciences, but they are in a great measure seared. Under these circumstances, how much we need the Holy Spirit to *enlighten* us. How much we need his Divine assistance, to prepare our minds for the truth, and to present and impress upon us those considerations, without a knowledge of which we must perish forever.—Naturally, too, our hearts are un sanctified. We are capable of loving God, repenting of sin, and becoming holy; but we are entirely averse to holiness, and unwilling to do our duty. How much then we need the Holy Spirit, to make us willing in the day of his power. How much we need his *sanctifying* influence, to bring us to the possession of that holiness without which no man can see the Lord.—Naturally, also, we are as miserable as we are sinful. Disappointed in the pursuit of happiness, and dissatisfied with ourselves, we “are like the troubled sea when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt.” How much then we need the Divine Spirit as our *Comforter*. How much we need those spiritual consolations, with which the stranger doth not intermeddle, and which the world can neither bestow nor destroy.—Indeed, our dependence on the Holy Spirit is *entire*. Without his influence, neither the word of truth, nor the blood of the cross will ever save us. Without his influence, we are blinded, depraved and miserable in this life, and must be miserable forever.—How important that a sense of this entire dependence be more deeply and generally felt! It must be more felt, before the voice of prayer will be heard, and

needed influences will be bestowed. We must come more into the spirit of the apostle, when he said, "We are not sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves, but *our sufficiency is of God.*" "So neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth, but *God that giveth the increase.*" This sense of dependence, if it lead (as it ought) to earnest prayer, will also lead to diligent exertion. It will not be admitted, at all, as a reason or an excuse for negligence. For while we depend as implicitly, and pray as fervently, as though we could do nothing, we shall labor as diligently, and use means as faithfully, as though we could accomplish all that was necessary. And with whatever success it may please the Divine Spirit at any time to crown our exertions, we shall cheerfully lay all at the foot of the cross, exclaiming, with the grateful, humble apostle, "*Not I, but the GRACE OF GOD—that was with me.*"

P.

---

## REVIEW.

SERMONS by the late *Rev. Edward Payson, D. D. Pastor of the Second Church, Portland.* Portland: Shirley & Hyde, 1828. pp. 504.

Next to the study of the Bible, there is no employment more interesting and profitable, for the minister or the private Christian, than to study the characters of those who spent their lives in "holding forth the word of life," and shewing what is the meaning of Scripture precepts, by bright examples of conformity to them. To the minister of the Gospel especially, the study of the example and preaching of eminently holy ministers is of the utmost importance. Their "manner of life" illustrates to his mind great and fundamental principles, set forth in the Scriptures, respecting ministerial character. It may be that he has not fully apprehended the meaning of some portions of the Bible, till he has seen them illustrated in the living language of some such men's conduct and labors, as "men of God." Our divine Lord said of John Baptist, "He was a burning and shining light." And this was true of David and Isaiah, of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and of many of the holy men who preceded the Messiah, as well as of Paul, John, Peter and Timothy who followed him. But that we may see, as well as read of such, he blesses his churches with men of like character in every age—with the exception of their inspiration—men on whom other ministers may look, learn, and be humbled; and by whom they may be stimulated to increased diligence, to efforts for high attainment, and to faithfulness in their Lord's work. A painter studies pictures on the perishable canvass, or specimens

of sculpture which time will crumble into dust; discovers beauties and principles of art, admires, resolves to imitate,—if possible to exceed; and to enroll his name among theirs, for future generations. Much more, the minister of Christ should study these living pictures, drawn by “the Spirit of God,” these lively stones which shall stand forever in the temple above.

Were we to name a few such, we would mention Owen, Baxter, Edwards, Doddridge, Henry, Brainerd, in times past; and Martyn, Richmond, Mills, Parsons, Hallock, and Payson, of our own times. A young minister, who would get examples of eminent ministerial piety, who would see what are the true excellencies of a watchman for souls, and learn how to act on the high and holy motives which become an “ambassador for Christ,” should seek acquaintance with such men, and follow them wherein they followed their blessed Lord. He should feel it a privilege to spend a month, week, day, or even an hour, in the company of one such man; and use well his opportunities to study the Master in the beloved disciple, and learn something from such lips for future use in his own life and labors. Or if not privileged with a personal acquaintance with such men, still, from their reputation, as men of God; from contemplating them as distant lights, which reach him like the “stars in the firmament,” and by throwing himself open to that influence of their characters which is circulating in the Christian world, he may derive essential benefit from them. How many ministers have probably been the better for Henry Martyn’s having lived in the world, and left the influence of his character, like a sweet savor, in the church. And doubtless, with equal propriety we may say it, how many a minister in our country, who never saw the beloved author of this volume of discourses, has heard such things of him, as have given an impulse to his own feelings, and encouraged him to abound in the work of the Lord.

It will come more properly within the province of the biographer, to speak of the character of Dr. Payson as a man and a Christian. And we are gratified to learn that a memoir is in the course of preparation, which we trust will meet the wishes of many, to know more of this eminent servant of Christ. Our remarks, therefore, will be confined principally to his character as a preacher.

A volume of sermons, and the excellencies of a preacher, are valuable to the Christian, in a sense different from that in which other books and characters are valuable to the mere man of the world. The Christian wants counsel and assistance, as a “stranger and pilgrim on the earth;” and those books, and ministers, are most prized by him, which best answer these important purposes to his spirit. And we are confident that the Christian, who seeks in preaching or books that which shall most establish his faith, and stimulate his conscience in the way of holiness; who is accessible by appeals on the great motives of the word of God; who seeks food for his

soul, not amusement for a vain mind ; who wants help in the way upward to the everlasting hills, not the religion of forms and notions, to quiet him in a worldly course to destruction ; such an one will find that he has a valuable acquisition to his means of spiritual profit in the volume now before us,—a book which will reward him for reading it not once only, nor twice, nor thrice, but many times, in the course of his life.

We read, with deep interest, a thanksgiving sermon of our author, published eight or ten years since, which exhibited many of his excellencies as a preacher, and would have added to the value of the present volume. The first discourse here given, "The Bible above all price," has been for some years circulating in this country and in Europe, as a tract ; and, aside from the talent it exhibits in commending the word of God to inquirers, it is admirably adapted to disarm skepticism, and to give the Christian firmness and satisfaction in his reliance on the evidences of revelation. The other discourses in this volume are upon the following subjects : God's ways above man's ; All things created for Christ ; The old way which wicked men have trodden ; Sins estimated by the light of Heaven ; Men tried and found defective ; Our sins infinite in number and enormity ; The wicked, through pride, refuse to seek God ; Recollections of God painful to the wicked ; Sinners wilful and perverse ; Amiable instincts not holiness ; The promised fruit of Christ sufferings ; Messiah's victory predicted and desired ; Sinners entreated to hear God's voice ; The difficulty of escaping the damnation of hell ; The dead in sin made alive ; The universal law of forgiveness ; Fraud exposed and condemned ; The mark of deliverance ; The Christian manner of expressing gratitude ; The timely presence and salutation of Jesus ; A festival kept to the Lord ; The second coming of Christ ; Equality of men with angels ; The punishment of the wicked dreadful and interminable.

In reading these discourses, we marked numerous passages, rich in exhibitions of truth, and adapted to produce serious and important effects upon the mind of reader or hearer, which we designed to quote. We are aware, however, of the difficulty of knowing where to stop, in quoting from such a book, and we think it best for the reader to mark and admire for himself. Our quotations therefore will be few, and illustrative of remarks we shall have occasion to make on the author's more prominent characteristics as a preacher.

The first characteristic we notice in the discourses of Dr. Payson, is their richness in Scripture thoughts. Many passages are marked as Scripture quotations ; and where his own flowing and happy language is used, we still discover thoughts and modes of expression borrowed from the Bible. He manifestly had no fondness for playing the metaphysician, the hair-splitter, the popular moralizer, or the sentimentalist, in such a serious place as the pulpit.

Eternal, holy truth, spoken by God himself, and to be repeated by "ambassadors for Christ" as the divine message, seemed to fill his mind and heart; and he was at home and felicitous in dispensing this, as simply and directly as possible, from the sacred record. He went back to the "good way" of preaching in use by standard ministers in past generations; and it is devoutly to be wished that many more may follow him and them, in that way. We do not deem it needful to go back, with some preachers of our time, and bring into fashion the obsolete diction and laborious stiffness and cumbrousness of expression in former use, which is of no other advantage than to gratify a taste for the antique, and conceal deficiencies in matter: but to go back to the scriptural or biblical style in which they preached, is of an importance which cannot be too highly estimated.

The discourses in this volume prove that Dr. Payson attached high importance to the Bible, as the source of divine truth and instruction to which the minister should have continual recourse; and to its testimony, as furnishing the reasons of the Christian's faith, and the spiritual food for his soul,—as being the great and plentiful repository from which to derive the materials for sound doctrinal and preceptive argumentation. His sermons are such as we should expect, indeed, from the author of "The Bible above all price." The book of God was an exalted book in his esteem, for the purpose of shedding light on the darkness of men's minds, and for guiding them to God and heaven.

Some of the principles on which he proceeded in bringing forward the class of subjects called alarming, we find more particularly stated in the introduction to the concluding sermon; on the text, "Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

"A minister who would be faithful, must frequently compare his preaching with the Scriptures, and enquire, not only whether he preaches the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; but whether he gives to every particular doctrine and precept, just that place in his sermons which its importance deserves, or which is given it in the word of God." Respecting the subject in hand, he remarks; "It has not, of late, filled such a place in my sermons as it fills in the Bible, or as it fills in the discourses of our Great Teacher, Jesus Christ."

Speaking of the doubts of some as to the utility of preaching on certain subjects, he says;—

"It is my duty, not to decide what doctrines are likely to do good, but to preach such doctrines as I find in the Scriptures; not to determine what means will prove effectual, but to use the means which God has appointed." "In fine, I dare not pretend to be either more wise or more compassionate than our Saviour; and he thought it consistent, both with wisdom and with compassion, to utter the words of our text." "I dare not," says he in another discourse "suffer either a false tenderness, or a fear of giving offence, to prevent me from calling your attention to his record."

The principles of our author respecting the use to be made of the Scriptures in the pulpit, carried him into all the classes of subjects on which the Bible instructs men. His range was of course a wide one, and his preaching was enriched from all portions of

the sacred volume. We find lucid statements of the great doctrines and precepts of the Divine word, not presented so much in the form of regular theological discussion, as interwoven, to shew the intimate connexion of one with another, and with the system of truth. He preached not so much a system of theology, as the plan of salvation,—dwelt not so much on carefully stated propositions, as upon “the mystery of godliness,” that in which God is shewn to be glorious, while provision is made for the sinner’s salvation.

His preaching discloses clear and discriminating views of the plan of redemption, attended by no perplexity, no indefinite conceptions, and leaving no doubts in the mind of the inquirer, as to the way in which he must be saved. He evidently studied every point in the scheme, as set forth by the “Author of Salvation,” so that he might be able to give safe directions to perishing men.

His views of the gospel were heart-felt; and it seems probable that his heart had much to do in sketching the plan of his discourses. As an instance of this, we recollect one, which we once had the privilege of examining, on 1 Timothy i. 2. He began with a description of the gospel as “tidings;” went on to describe it as “glad tidings;” then, rising higher, as “glorious glad tidings;” and then higher still, as “glorious glad tidings of the blessed God.”

His preaching furthermore indicated a steady anxiety to guard men against mistake and error. He nowhere makes to unconverted men random statements, or dangerous concessions, of which the pride or deceitfulness of the natural heart would take advantage. He had impressive conceptions of the depth of self-abasement becoming the sinner; therefore his counsels tended to lead him humbly to the cross, and to “pour contempt on all his pride.” The kind of encouragement he gave to the sinner was such as to shew duty, and the door of hope, in the same line of vision; but not to relieve his anxiety, or soothe him into quietness and carelessness. He was peculiar for mingling, in an appropriate manner, the characteristics of the law and of the gospel, for the production of the entire effect needed from both, on the minds of the unconverted. He invited the sinner to happiness; but it was to the happiness of having his “heart right with God,” and of magnifying the riches of grace, as bestowed on a guilty wanderer.

It was also a feature of his preaching, as allied with the one just noticed, that he had solemn and exalted conceptions of the ministerial work. He addressed men as an “ambassador for Christ;” seems to have had in continual remembrance “the God whom I serve;” and in deep humility, yet with holy confidence, to have delivered the messages of the “King of Kings.” Consequently, he transacted with his hearers in the sanctuary with great faithfulness. He seems to have considered his pulpit as midway between the cross of Christ and dying men, and used it under a

deep sense of the solemn relation in which he then stood to the souls of his hearers, and their interests for eternity. He gave lively views of the exceeding greatness of the love of God to men, and delighted to dwell on this, and to magnify it, disclosing at the same time the tenderness of his solicitude respecting the reception or rejection of this love, by those to whom he ministered.

As the life of all his preaching, he everywhere gives most exalted views of Christ, beholding and declaring him as "God manifested in the flesh," and invested with all the prerogatives and glories of Mediatorship. He sought continually to bring Christ before the eyes of sinners, for whom he had suffered, bled, and died. "Christ Jesus and him crucified" was the sun of his system, he referred everything to Him, and showed all truth, duty, hope, privilege and happiness, as related to him. In a word, as Christ was everything to his feelings, as a humble truster in his mercy; so he was everything in the instructions which he imparted, as his minister. He had none of that affected scrupulousness of an erroneous conscience, which professes to shrink from giving to Christ "the glory due unto his name." Him, as "without controversy the "brightness of the Father's glory, the express image of his person," and who is "ever all, God, blessed forever," he loved to worship, honor, preach, and show to dying men, as the "confidence of all the ends of the earth."

As a natural consequence of the characteristics of Dr. Payson's preaching already mentioned, it was *plain, and instructive*. His sentences were *thoughts*, or rather the *chrysal containers* of thoughts,—and not mere clusters of words. If he spoke to the learned, it was a recommendation to their good sense that he was easy to be understood. And if among his hearers there were the uneducated and ignorant, he brought divine instruction within their comprehension. An eminent English statesman of the present time is reaching the minds of various classes of men, and helping others to do the same, in the communication of useful knowledge, by taking science out of the obscurity of technics, and by writing and speaking upon subjects in a known tongue. Dr. Payson, in the higher employment of a spiritual "instructor of the foolish," has had the start of this wise policy; and by taking Divine truth out of the obscurity in which human efforts to be wise often involve it, and presenting it in scriptural simplicity, so as to be understood and felt, has done much to give to many minds a saving knowledge in "the things of God."

Another feature in the character of Dr. Payson's preaching, as disclosed in the volume before us, is its adaptedness to affect the conscience. We once heard him remark; "It is one great aim and study with me, to get access to the conscience." He has at least accomplished this design in the discourses before us. And if he succeeded nearly as well in the rest of his sermons, his minis-

try was far from being one under which men could easily sleep away their Sabbaths and their lives. "I will never enter Dr. Payson's doors again," said one of his hearers, as he returned from church one Sabbath. The next Sabbath came, and the hour of public worship. "I will go once more," said he. He went, and returned with the same resolution in his mouth; and this repeated wrong resolution he repeatedly yielded. This is an interesting incident, showing the difficulty of quietly keeping away from such a ministry. The natural man, under the stinging power of the truth, said, 'I will hear no more.' But conscience, disturbed by the truth, seems to have resolved, 'you shall, if I have any power over you.'

The secret of this skilful and powerful preaching to the conscience, as it respected unconverted persons, seems to have been, that the author was accustomed to study their various states of mind and feelings, and their modes of thinking, that he might better understand how to adapt his instructions to their respective cases, and to get access to their souls. He showed an intimacy in the secret chambers of the human heart, such as is gained only by much self-acquaintance, and accurate observation of men; analyzed the operations of the unsanctified will and affections with peculiar skill; told the sinner, with startling particularity, of things that passed in his breast; followed him into his hiding places, to allure and warn him away; stated, with unshrinking faithfulness, humbling facts respecting his motives of action; described his errors and self-deceptions, with a fairness and exactness which could not easily be disputed; showed the hazards of his unscriptural dependences; and, in the full blaze of Scripture light, set forth all the dangers and guilt of self-delusion. If, therefore, the sinner was found again and again resting on some false foundation, or trusting in some vain refuge, it was not because the one had not been repeatedly broken up, and the other often beaten in pieces before his eyes, by this faithful servant of Christ; but because that, in the activity of sinful ingenuity and pride, the sinner had laid anew the one, and rebuilt the other. If the veil of self-deception was before the sinner's eyes, it was not because it had not been torn away, and that often, too, by a faithful hand; but because the love of spiritual blindness had replaced it, and the wretched man was choosing still the way of impenitence, ruin and death.

But he preached to the consciences of those in the church, who were in a state of spiritual declension, as well as to those who were living in impenitence. While he who had confessedly no hope and the self-deceived were made to tremble, the wanderer from the fold of Christ was also made to feel, and to confess, "I have sinned; what shall I say?" "Come, and let us return unto the Lord."



This leads us to speak of another distinguishing characteristic of Dr. Payson's preaching, the close discrimination he was accustomed to make between religion in name and profession, and religion in fact. He seems to have been accustomed to a close and unshrinking performance of the duty of self-examination, to much study of the influences of grace, and to a faithful comparison of his own heart with the word of God. His preaching everywhere presents the high and serious tests furnished in that word; and renders careful and faithful assistance to the professing Christian, in ascertaining the presence or absence of grace. This was not done in a way of random skepticism, into which ministers and private Christians sometimes fall, and in which painful uncertainty about one's spiritual state is still unrelieved by fair examination. It was a discrimination made by presenting the Scripture view of the evidences of grace, and the Scripture account of the modes and dangers of mistake respecting the existence of those evidences. If therefore there were many who, under his preaching, "trembled at God's word," as "searching the heart and trying the reins," they were those who were probably in a far safer state, living in greater faithfulness to Christ, and in better prosperity in the divine life, than where less, perhaps little, of such preaching is heard. Dr. Payson was a scholar in the philosophy of the mind, and a deep student, too, of the serious and interesting philosophy of the heart. And he brought his qualifications into important use, in "separating the precious from the vile" in the church as a body, and in the spiritual state of the individual Christian. And yet uncharitableness in his judgement of individuals, and decisive pronouncement on their spiritual state, were things which could not be laid to his charge. He laid himself out to exhibit, with seriousness, particularity, and earnestness, the means by which every professing Christian might know himself; and, his duty thus done, he left him to his own conscience and to God. Said a brother in the ministry to him, "What do you do with those in your church who you fear know not the grace of God in truth?" His reply was, "I let them alone."\*

The preaching of Dr. Payson was well adapted to "feed the church of God," and to promote the advancement of Christians in the divine life. This remark may be true, in a general sense, of all preachers of the truth. But with our author, this appears to have been an object of more than common thought and labor. Bunyan's character of Great Heart exhibits the qualifications of the spiritual shepherd in an interesting manner, and many of the features of it are discernible in the writer of these discourses. To elevate and enliven the faith of Christians, to increase the

\* This reply will be understood as referring to certain doubtful characters who had not, by any overt act or neglect, exposed themselves to the discipline of the church. To such, the truth was faithfully dispensed, and they were left to its influence.

fever of their love, to assist them to obtain and keep lowly views of themselves, to promote the tenderness of godly sorrow, and likewise to animate their joys, confirm their hopes, promote the increase and steadiness of their comforts, and to incite them to press forward and mount upward in their preparation for heaven, were the objects of much of his preaching. He sought to promote in Christians the progress and enjoyments of holiness in heart and life. He loved to witness Christian activity and faithfulness, and preached a religion to be lived, and which should make its possessors to "shine as lights in the world." He had his heart fixed on the promotion, in himself and others, of holiness, elevated, dwelling in daily communion with God, and made active in view of the cross of Christ, of the judgement to come, and of the prospect of heaven. And his conceptions of the obligations resting on the people of God to live in the exercise of such holiness were vivid and solemn. In short, the views he was accustomed to give of Christian character, were not of that well adjusted "form of godliness," in which "a name to live" may be preserved; but he exhibited the *Christian of the Bible*, loving holiness and seeking it, hating sin and flying from it;—he brought out the elements of grace, as to be manifested in living and active faithfulness. The concluding paragraph in the volume is an interesting specimen of his manner of appealing to Christians, on the claims of their Lord and Master for such faithfulness.

"But I cannot proceed farther in this strain. I would rather beseech, and melt, and win you by tenderness. Say, then, Christian, dost thou believe that Christ died to save thee from the misery, which has been imperfectly described? Dost thou believe that, if he had not loved thee, and given himself for thee, the gnawing worm and the unquenchable fire would have been thy portion forever? O then, where is thy gratitude, thy love? Where are the returns, which he has a right to expect? Hast thou already made him a sufficient return for such inestimable benefits? Has he not reason to say, at least to some of you, Did I die for thee, redeem thee from sin, and death, and hell, that thou mightest crucify me afresh, by thy unkindness and unbelief? Did I watch and pray whole nights that thou mightest neglect watchfulness and prayer? Did I purchase for thee divine grace, precious promises, and strong consolation, that thou mightest make light of them, or turn them into wantonness? And do I prolong thy forfeited life that thou mayest live carelessly, unprofitably, or like the world around thee? No, I redeemed thee that thou mightest be mine, wholly mine. I purchased for thee grace, that thou mightest grow. And I preserve thy life that thou mayest live, not to thyself, but to him who died for thee. I have revealed the knowledge of thy Maker, and taught thee the way of redemption, that thou mightest adorn the doctrine of God thy Saviour in all things. And wilt thou frustrate these purposes by thy sloth and negligence? Thou wilt do it, then, to thine own eternal injury; for the fearful and the unbelieving shall have their part, with the abominable, in the lake which burneth with fire that never shall be quenched."

The sermons of Dr. Payson are characterized by a deep and tender seriousness. He seems to have taken up his pen, at every sitting, with the text in mind, "For they watch for your souls as *they that must give account.*" However much his printed discourses may have lost of their impressiveness, by being separated

from the warmth of the living and speaking author, they still have much solemnity to the reader; for the matter of them is deeply serious. He poured forth his conceptions of the evil of sin, the guilt of the sinner, the danger of a state of hardened impenitence, the terrors of the violated law and the judgement to come, and the wretchedness of the finally lost, with the solemnity of godly fear. He sought to alarm the unconverted by a faithful representation of the ground on which, by the light of divine truth, he saw them standing. And we think it cannot have been easy for hearers of this character to sit undisturbed under the urgency of his appeals. He assailed, not alone the fears, but the consciences and hearts of his hearers; and sought to produce, not merely impression, but conviction. He seems to have thought and written as with his eyes on the coming judgement; and his hearers had occasion to believe that he did. Though the veil between him and eternity was unlifted, it did not prevent him from catching some glimpses, such as faith can take, and bringing thence thoughts, built on the realities asserted in the Word of God, which would create the feeling, "Eternity is near!" And then he would take up this *nothing*, the world, with all its things called great, exalted, beautiful, abiding,—and show it so truly, strip it so completely, and carry its lovers away (for a season at least, and in spite of themselves) with such impressions of the grandeur and terrors of the truth and of eternity, that it would seem they could not again return and make it their god, and be satisfied with it as their portion. He had that prime excellence of a good preacher which Massillon describes, dismissing his hearers, not in admiration of himself, but each one silent, hasting to be alone, to think, feel and pray. Out of the numerous passages we might quote, showing this characteristic, we can give but one.

"I cannot stand here coolly arguing and reasoning, while I see the pit of destruction, as it were, open before me, and more than half my hearers apparently rushing into it. I feel impelled rather to fly, and throw myself before you in the fatal path, to grasp your hands, to cling to your feet, to make even convulsive efforts to arrest your progress, and pluck you as brands out of the burning. My careless hearers, my people, my flock! death, perdition, the never dying worm, the unquenchable fire, are before you! Your path leads directly into them. Will you not then hear your friend, your shepherd? Will you not stop, and listen at least for a moment? Will you, O, will you refuse to believe that there is a bell, till you find yourselves in the midst of it? O, be convinced, I conjure you, be convinced by some less fatal proof than this. Yet how can I convince you? How can I stop you? My arm is powerless; yet I cannot let you go. I could shed tears of blood over you, would it avail. Gladly, most gladly, would I die here on the spot, without leaving the sacred desk, could my death be the means of turning you from this fatal course. But what folly is this! to talk of laying down my worthless life to save you. Why, my friends, the Son of God died to save you,—died in agonies,—died on the cross; and surely, that doom cannot but be terrible, to open a way of escape from which he did all this. And it is dreadful. The abyss into which you are falling is as deep, as the heaven from which he descended is high. And will you then rush into it, while he stands ready to save you? Shall he, as it respects you, die in vain? Will you receive the grace of God in vain? Shall those

eyes, which now see the light of the Sabbath, glare and wither in eternal burning? Shall those souls, which might be filled with the happiness of heaven, writhe and agonize forever, under the gnawings of the immortal worm? Shall I, must I hereafter see some who are dear to me, for whom I have labored and prayed and wept, weltering in the billows of despair, and learning, by experience, how far the description comes short of the terrible reality! But I cannot proceed. The thought unmans me. I can only point to the cross of Christ, and say, There is salvation, there is blood, which, if applied, will quench the fires, that are already kindling in your breasts. There is deliverance from the wrath which is to come."

Here we would remark, that there is something wrong in the feelings of not a few, who, we trust, are pious people, respecting the kind of language and preaching of which the above is a specimen. There is with too many, in the church even, a taste for *nice* sermons, written in a very select and smooth phraseology; a fastidiousness, caught from the preachers of a lax theology, and from intimacy with the admirers and stated attendants of such preachers. The taste of such persons takes disgust at the simplicity, solemnity and point which appear in the language even of the Word of God itself. For a minister in the pulpit to speak of men as "wicked," as "in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity;" to talk of the prospects of the sinner beyond the grave; to say "hell," "punishment," "condemnation;" to speak of being "born again," of "experience," of spiritual prosperity, of "joy in the Holy Ghost," is regarded by the class of hearers to whom we allude as dealing unnecessarily in the technics of Orthodoxy. We believe the great adversary of souls has much to do with this excessive and anti-christian fastidiousness; and that by this artifice he is seeking to exclude plain, solemn, pointed language from the pulpit, because it exhibits truth and duty too intelligibly for the quietness of those who are living in a state of unconversion; and that he is aiming to create a demand, by certain classes of hearers, for such a guarded and peculiarly tasteful phraseology, as shall turn the edge of truth, and muffle the point of the "sword of the Spirit." And too many even pious ministers are yielding to this demand; and a perversion of sound and sacred rhetoric is going on in their studies, which hinders the impressiveness and utility of their ministrations to an extent deserving very serious attention.

Dr. Payson was not one of the preachers who wasted time, mental vigor, and pious ardor in attempts to gratify a fastidiousness such as has been described. The Bible was his vocabulary; he chose and entered into the meaning of its language; he wrote it as "with the point of a diamond;" and he spoke it in the pulpit with the fulness and emphasis of deep and solemn feeling. He was never quaint or homely; neither did he seek to construct his sentences of liquids, that the music of sounds might prevent his hearers being startled by arousing sense. He was habitually the man of good taste in the choice of language; and in conceptions

and speech was frequently elegant, beautiful and sublime. But he seems to have forbidden every quality of mere style to interfere with the utmost plainness of address. He was never afraid of being too solemn, nor of using, in its high and impressive meaning, the language and imagery of the Book of God.

But in his most impressive solemnity, Dr. Payson loses none of the tenderness and affection which belong to the "watchman for souls." His most solemn and conscience-stirring appeals left still the impression in the minds of his hearers, 'Had he loved us less, he would have been less faithful.' He was the impassioned pleader with men who were destroying themselves; the anxious and agonized warner of the wicked to "flee from the wrath to come,"—and to flee *now*. He would win the heart by the power of holy affection, as well as take it by the power of solemn truth. He appeared as the messenger of long slighted mercy, with the whole weight of a dying people on his affectionate, anxious, mourning, hoping, trembling heart. And if he could find a heart broken, a proud spirit humbled, a sinful will subdued, how he delighted to minister for its healing, and to point the sinner upward to the "dear dying Lamb!"

It was a characteristic of Dr. Payson's preaching, very naturally associated with the one just noticed, that it was eminently dignified, and adapted to sway the mind of the hearer. The preaching of some men can be heard with light-mindedness, spoken of with levity when it is over, and the preacher himself be treated with thoughtless familiarity in the passing intercourse of social life. We can hardly conceive of this being easy or possible in reference to Dr. Payson and his preaching. The simple dignity and solemnity of his instructions, as a faithful declaration of the counsel of God, while they left men disturbed, possibly irritated, by the arousal of conscience, yet made it difficult for them to trifle, and forbade them to laugh or to scoff. Such a bringing of God and man together, such an introduction of the sinner into the presence of "Him with whom he has to do," would at least make him serious. The sublime and awful dignity of divine truth, in the pulpit, or in the personal interview, is too much for any man, who is not senseless in impenitence and unbelief.

Yet another peculiarity in Dr. Payson's preaching was, that he brought into frequent and happy use, both a powerful and a sanctified imagination. We have seen evidence of this, in quotations already made, in reference to the fearful consequences of sin, and the realities of eternity. He approached such subjects with awe and trembling, while he entered deeply into the dread import of the revelation of the Holy Ghost respecting them. It is doubtless as true respecting the awful reservations of divine justice for the ungodly, as it is of the mansions prepared for the children of God, that "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into

the heart of man to conceive" their terrors. But although they cannot be overpassed or reached by the mere flight of human imagination, it is yet the duty of man to render what feeble assistance he can to his fellow man in forming an idea of that doom which is liable to become his own, that he may shun it, and fly to the refuge divine mercy has provided. Let faith rule and direct the imagination, and its flights cannot be too lofty, its conceptions can never come too near to the realities themselves, of which we hear in the Book of God. What heathen poets have dared to do, in relation to the future scenes in which they believed, the Christian preacher is taught to do, "with reverence and godly fear," in relation to the things which "the only living and true God" hath declared "shall shortly be done." The Word of God has, to the eye of faith, given some gleams from the world of woe; it has opened also the world of glory. Grace teaches how to think and speak of both.

Of the future blessedness and glory of heaven, the conceptions of our author, as they appear in different parts of this volume, were lively and impressive. True, he had occasion to say, as to the particular circumstances of the heavenly world, "In vain my fancy strives to paint—the glories." But he took up the letter of promise from his Father's house, and dwelt on it with a liveliness of conception which was delightful. There are portions of his discourses, in which he seems to have drawn near the "everlasting doors," and with eyes of faith to have seen, and with ears of faith to have heard, the things passing around the throne of "the Lord God and the Lamb." He took what, in the Word, is written of heaven, and dwelt upon it, warmed his heart with it, strengthened his faith by it, and soared upwards towards it as on an angel's pinions. And this was not, either, that he might gratify the restless curiosity of imagination, but that he might bring near to his own heart, and the hearts of others, some of the inciting inducements to holiness. He talked of heaven, that he might raise us above this vain world; that he might increase our desires for its holiness and purity. He wanted to be there and be happy, but he wanted more to be holy, and sought to promote the same desire in all them who are "of the household of faith." Of this tendency is a passage which we quote from his discourse on "The Equality of Men with the Angels."

"To those of them, who are the disciples of Jesus Christ, our subject is full, not only of consolation, but of warning, of reproof, and of the most powerful motives to zeal and diligence, and untiring perseverance in performing the duties to which their profession calls them. That you may feel the force of these motives, my brethren, consider what is the language of your profession, what you say to the world, when you approach the table of your Lord, or perform any other act which indicates that you consider yourselves as the disciples of Jesus Christ. On every such occasion you do in effect say, 'I profess to be one of those to whom all the promises of the Gospel are made; one of those who are styled children and heirs of God. As one of this number, I expect

soon to be called to mingle with the angels, and to be made, in every respect, their equal. When I shall be exalted to this state is uncertain. It may be to-morrow. It may be the next hour, for there is but a step between me and death, and, consequently, but a step between me and an angel's seat.' Such, O professed disciples of Christ, is the lofty, and, as it must appear to the world, assuming language of your profession. And can you utter such language, will shame allow you to utter it, without attempting to live in a corresponding manner! If you do indeed look for such things, what manner of persons ought you to be, in all holy conversation and godliness! How far ought you to live above the world! How dead should you be to all earthly objects and pursuits! What spirituality of temper, what heavenly mindedness, should you feel and exhibit! What can be more obvious, more undeniable, than the conclusion, that, if you hope to be made equal to the angels hereafter, you ought to imitate, so far as is practicable, angels now. That you may be induced to imitate them, and to climb with greater diligence and alacrity the steep ascent before you, let me persuade you to fix your eyes upon its summit. A dense, impenetrable cloud appears, indeed, to conceal it from mortal eyes; but inspiration speaks, and the cloud is dissipated; faith presents her glass, and the sun-bright summit is seen. On him, who sits enthroned upon it, you cannot indeed gaze. His glories, though you shall see them unveiled hereafter, are too insufferably dazzling for mortal eyes to sustain. But contemplate the resplendent forms, which float around him in an atmosphere of pure celestial light. See their bodies, resembling sunbeams seven times refined. See their countenances beaming with intelligence, purity, benevolence and felicity. Through their transparent bodies look in, and contemplate the souls which inhabit them, expanded to the full dimensions of angelic minds, bearing the perfect image of their God, and reflecting his glories, as the polished mirror reflects the glories of the noon-day sun. This, O Christian, is what thou shalt hereafter be. These dazzling forms were once sinful dust and ashes, like thyself. But grace, free, rich, sovereign, almighty grace, has made them what they now are. It has washed, and justified, and sanctified, and brought them to glory. And to the same glory, O Christian, it is bringing thee. And canst thou then sleep, canst thou slumber, canst thou be slothful, canst thou complain of the difficulties which attend, of the obstacles which oppose, thy ascent to such glory and felicity as this? O let gratitude, let duty, let shame, if nothing else, forbid. Lift up, ye embryo angels, lift up the heads which hang down, and let the drooping spirit revive. Read, hear, meditate with prayer, deny yourselves, mortify sin but a little longer, and you shall mount up, not on eagles', but on angels' wings, and know what is meant by being made equal to resplendent intelligences."

We should do injustice to the character of Dr. Payson, did we not notice one more of his excellencies as a preacher. As a lover of the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of the millions of souls yet perishing, he was a powerful advocate for the efforts of Christian benevolence. Two of his discourses of this class were published, some months since, in the *National Preacher*, which, we trust, have augmented the tide of Christian benevolence, and promoted the interests of the cause advocated in them. He entered deeply into the import of the promises respecting the future glory of the kingdom of Christ on earth, and spoke with the confidence which becomes the believer. But he saw also that God had been pleased to call for the instrumentality of his people's prayers and labors, for the accomplishment of these great things to come. He was not, therefore, so much a predictor of what was going to be accomplished, as a practical and earnest counsellor of the people of God to "arise and build," as the means of accomplishment. He saw work to be done, before the Lord's house would be built; long and arduous toils to be sustained,

before the temple should be ready for the "bringing forth of the head-stone thereof with shouting, Grace, grace unto it." As a true and well-informed soldier of the cross, he knew that battles were yet to be fought, nay, painful and desperate, before the shout of victory could be raised, and the song of rejoicing be taken up, "The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." He had good courage, but it was courage to put forth strength, as well as to expect joyful events. He had a large heart, and devised and pleaded for "liberal things." He remembered the "Captain of his salvation," and seemed fully mindful what every one of his soldiers should be. High motives stimulated him, and no present attainment satisfied him; for he was the restless, ardent seeker of great things for Christ. Whether it were the conversion of his own people, or of the nations he should never meet till the day of judgement, his heart was full in its aspirations after their salvation. And all accomplished, or to be accomplished, he regarded as to be laid at the feet, and given to augment the glory, of Him, who is "Most Mighty."

With such characteristics as these, it is no mystery that Dr. Payson was eminently successful as a minister. Successful, we mean, not alone in acquiring and sustaining a high reputation, but in winning souls to Christ, and in edifying the church. Such preaching as his will do good; it will bring honor to the ministry of reconciliation, and to the Lord Jesus who has given it to the world. His influence too was extensive, and powerful; and it is doubtful whether any minister of the present generation in our country, has surpassed him in salutary influence on the ministers and churches which have known him.

It is a natural and important inquiry, What was the secret of these excellencies in Dr. Payson as a preacher, and of this success and influence? Other good men, and talented, and well furnished in attainments, have been useful, and happily so. But there has been something in the ministry of Dr. Payson, which is not often seen; an eminence above what we are accustomed to call eminence in other good men. What is it? We believe it was, in one sentence, this,—*He was a man of brighter eminence in PIETY than is often seen, even in the ministry.* It was written of Enoch: "*And he walked with God.*" We never had the privilege of knowing the person whose whole visible character so illustrated to us the meaning of this concise description of a "holy man;" or whose preaching gave more visible indications of such character. It was a piety, the ardor and heavenliness of which kept him near the cross and the throne of grace; which imparted a sweet cheerfulness and yet a deep seriousness to his deportment, which kept him ever active, "always abounding in the work of the Lord," and intensely devoted to the things of the kingdom of Christ. As shewing how the whole force of his character was brought to bear



upon this last and dear object of his affections, and the entireness of his consecration to his work,—it was related to us, by one of his church, that at a time—a few years before his death—when a pulmonary affection threatened him, he one day made to a Christian friend this remark: “If my health can be restored by the use of means, I will faithfully use them: but if I find myself going, I shall go about my work, and accomplish the utmost that I can for my Lord and master, with the strength and time I have left.” We were not privileged to see him in his last sickness; but the things we heard, from his death chamber, were just what we might have expected from one who could make the resolution here expressed,—he preached till he took his upward flight.

It is not a very natural inquiry to be made respecting such a man as Payson, Was he a man of commanding talents, and respectable attainments in learning? He was so. But this matter is thrown into the back ground, by the moral greatness and worth of his character. In reading the biography and writings, for example, of President Edwards, the conviction is felt that he was a man of talents and learning; but this is not the most prominent conviction. That he was a devout and holy man will have the principal place in the reader's mind. His talents and attainments will be admired, as sanctified and ennobled by *the grace of God*; and Edwards, the *man of God*, will stand before Edwards, the man of talents and learning.

Now that we have touched upon this point, we will consider it a little further. Much is said, and we think rightly, of talents and learning as important in the ministry. These are sought, by churches and congregations, in those whom they choose for pastors and teachers: and it is right, when this inquiry is secondary to the inquiry for exemplary piety. We have seen men in the ministry, whose talents and learning were in high reputation, but whose piety was less prominent; who had cultivated their minds more than their hearts; who had rejoiced in their strength to run the race of competition in intellectual pursuits, more than to run with patience the Christian race set before them; who have dazzled rather than instructed and edified; have been admired, rather than followed in the way of Christ's steps; have stood erect and tall among men, but have not soared heavenward in the fervor of holiness; and who, if so happy as to arrive in glory, will be found sitting, not by the side of Paul, but among “the least in the kingdom of heaven.”

We have also seen the Gospel minister, who had talents fitted to command respect, and attainments, the result of conscientious industry; but whose pretensions were modest, and whose retiring disposition forbade the sounding of the trumpet of popular applause before him. The thoughtless man of the world, who takes a seat in his place of ministry, from curiosity perhaps, goes away thinking him

a common preacher, because he has not "played well on an instrument." And yet there are some facts, respecting this preacher, deserving notice. Let the fastidious hearer, fond of display, judge and pronounce upon him as he pleases; there are conversions of sinners from the error of their ways occurring in his congregation, it may be every week. Almost every season for the administration of the Lord's Supper finds one, two, five, ten, perhaps more, "confessing Christ before men." Hundreds sit down to the table at which he dispenses the memorials of a Saviour's love. A church of intelligent, exemplary, prosperous Christians has grown up under his ministry, and exerted an influence upon those around it. You see an attentive assembly in the sanctuary; a thoughtful silence is observed by them, as they retire to their homes, Sabbath after Sabbath; the deportment of such as you meet during the week is marked with the sobriety of consideration; and the moral habits of those among them who make no profession of religion are manifestly influenced from some powerful cause. Putting these and other like things together, you inquire, *What is the secret?* You will know, in that great day of revelation of secret things, when He who searches the heart and all hidden things, discloses the secrets of that minister's study and closet, and by the light of that day introduces you into the sacred, and now unknown interior of his character. Men of the world know little about these "princes" who have "power with God."

Another case, we will suppose, and there are such—a man who stands confessedly high on the catalogue of great and learned men, and whose piety equals, perhaps exceeds his talents and learning, and whose influence and usefulness are in proportion. After estimating properly the instrumentality of his talents and learning, we undertake to say, still, that his *piety is the main-spring of his usefulness*. Are his reasonings cogent? it is because he puts forth in them the wisdom derived from above. Are his conceptions powerful? it is because he is taught by the Spirit, and because God's high thoughts, set before him in the word of inspiration, and cleared to his mind by the teachings of divine grace, are the matter of his conceptions. Is he eloquent? it is because his lips have been "touched as with a live coal" from the altar of God. Is he successful in winning souls to Christ? it is not the talented, learned, and eloquent man, so much as the man of humble piety, to whose instrumentality this is to be attributed. It is on the wings of the heavenly Dove that he rises; and with the strength of faith that he soars toward heaven.

These things then we regard as true. A minister may be what is called a great man, and yet not be a very useful man, not even a pious man. A minister may be a man of ordinary talents and attainments, and yet be eminently useful and holy. And a minister may outstrip thousands in attainments and usefulness, from

this primary cause, that his piety outstripped both their talents, and his own.

Ministers then are not to be estimated mainly on the ground that they are admired by men of the world, as talented and learned. Said a gentleman to his friend, "Why did you take me to hear your Dr. ———, to-day? he is a very common preacher, and his sermon was nothing." A few days passed, and it appeared that the underrated preaching of that day was instrumental in the awakening and conversion of six or eight persons, who were listening to Dr. ———, at the same time with this captious remarker. The estimation of a preacher by his ability, or lack of ability, to hold the man of the world entranced for an hour with admiration of his talents simply, is injustice to the sacred office, and to him who has sent ministers to be his ambassadors. It hinders also the efficacy of the truth on the hearer who makes such estimation; renders his seasons in the sanctuary profitless; and tempts the devil to "catch away the word sown in his heart;" till he has spent his Sabbaths and his life, thrown away all the precious offers of salvation, and only fitted himself to die a death of hoplessness and horror.

Furthermore: a minister's worth cannot be fairly estimated from his appearance on the Sabbath, and in the pulpit. What is he out of it, on every other day in the week, in his social intercourse, in his use of opportunities to do his people good by private counsels, in his labors in the lecture room and prayer meeting, and in his use of special providences, as occasions and means of instruction? Does he preach out of the pulpit, as well as in it; and with the emphasis which a holy life gives? Does his weekly walk and conversation furnish a commentary to help his people to understand what he means on the Sabbath? There are numberless situations in which a minister is to be reviewed and estimated, where he is not and cannot be the great man; where retired, unostentatious, industrious, affectionate usefulness is to be exercised, which will be seen and known only by his omnipresent Lord, and by the family circle in which he takes his seat for an hour, or perhaps only by some individual, on whose heart he urges the solemn instructions of God's record. In situations such as these, are to be exercised the faithfulness of Christian affection, and of earnest desire to perform duty and do good; the discretion and judgment of one wise to lead souls in the way to heaven; the instructiveness of one who has drunk deep at the fountain of divine wisdom—the "Scriptures of truth." Who thinks of a minister, under such circumstances, as a *great* man? He is greater in the simplicity and humble faithfulness of the Christian teacher seated in the conference room, or in the pastoral visit, than Cæsar, or Napoleon on his throne. The impression of his counsels of Christian tenderness, and his solemn warnings, give no opportunity for the hearer

to think of the man. It will be true greatness which causes him to think of God, truth, heaven, hell, eternity; and to feel, repent, believe and secure eternal life.

The estimate of ministerial character and worth, then, is to be made principally by the holy devotedness he manifests in his master's service, as seen in his whole manner of "watching for souls," and for the advancement of the glory of Christ's kingdom. He whose holiness before God has been the main spring of his usefulness, elevating every talent, making sacred every attainment, and who has laid down all his honors from men at the foot of "the cross of Christ Jesus his Lord,"—his crown at last will be brightest, his harp of praise loudest and sweetest, and his joy liveliest, while he stands before the everlasting throne.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### PAROCHIAL LAWSUITS.

Whatever tends to illustrate the customs and rights of Congregational churches, as understood by our fathers, is at present deeply interesting. Several decisions, detailed in the Massachusetts Reports, show how our churches have been considered in more recent times, as also the encroachments which have been made upon them, till they are scarcely allowed an existence or a name. But cases of great interest have been tried in this commonwealth, which, owing to their early date, are not noticed in the Term Reports. From the Minutes of an eminent lawyer now deceased, with which we have been favored, we are able to give our readers some account (we wish it were more perfect) of most of these cases.

The first is that of *Goss vs. the Inhabitants of Bolton*.—The Rev. Thomas Goss, the first minister of Bolton, was settled over the church and congregation in that place in 1741. After a course of years, a majority of his hearers became dissatisfied, and sought his removal. Several Councils were convened, but the people obtained no redress. At length, a church meeting was called, not by the Pastor in the usual way, but by notification from some of the members, in July 1771, when a large majority of the brethren present voted to dismiss Mr. Goss from his office of Pastor. The town held a meeting in the following month, and voted to concur in the dismissal of Mr. Goss. But he, not considering himself as legally dismissed, commenced a suit against the town for the payment of his salary. The case was tried in the Superior Court, Sept. 1778, and some of the most eminent lawyers of that day, such as Dana, Paine, Lowell, &c. were concerned.\*

In behalf of the church and town, it was urged, that the contract formed at the settlement of Mr. Goss was not, like marriage, a contract for life, or a contract for years, but a contract *at will*—to be dissolved at the pleasure of either party; and evidence was offered to show, that this contract had actually been dissolved by the votes of the church and the town. A certificate was produced

\* Messrs. Dana and Paine were afterwards Judges of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts;—Mr. Lowell of the United States' Court.

of the notification of a church meeting, and of the meeting of the church, at which time the character of Mr. Goss was investigated, and he dismissed.

This evidence was objected to by the council for the plaintiff, on the ground that the certificate did not proceed from a proper certifying officer—that it did not appear that the persons named in it were so much as members of the church, or that all the members were notified.

To this it was replied, that the law does not require any particular manner of calling a church meeting. Therefore, any evidence that can prove the transaction is proper. Who ever heard of a church meeting being called, where a summons was sent to every member? Mr. Dana, for the defendants, then observed, that as he had proved a church meeting, he should proceed to prove the *act of dismissal* by the church. The records of the church were produced in evidence.

Mr. Lowell, for the plaintiff, objected to this evidence, as the records were penned by interested persons, and were the records of the party interested.

Mr. Dana replied, that the records of the church had been produced on the other side, in support of their writ; and that to refuse the admission of them would go to destroy all contracts between ministers and people. 'The question is,' said he, 'whether the church are a *corporate body*, and can keep records, or not. If they are such, what other evidence can be had? For the same reason every record of a town, a county, or a state, might be excluded.'

Mr. Lowell still objected, that the records were not under the hand of a sworn officer, qualified by law to certify. But the court determined that the records of a church are proper matter to be given in evidence.

The vote of dismissal on the part of the church was then read; also the vote of the town concurring in the dismissal. Other votes were also read, showing, not only that Mr. Goss was dismissed, but that due notice of his dismissal was sent to him.

Witnesses were next offered by the defendants, to testify to the fact of a church meeting, and also to the proceedings of the church.—Mr. Lowell objected to any of the *corporation* (the members of the church) being admitted as competent witnesses. He said, the church must either be a corporation, or a collection of individuals. If a corporation, the members must be called together according to the rules of a corporation. The object of the meeting must be specified, and notice must be given to every individual where the body is to meet and act. If the church is a mere collection of individuals, then the agreement with the pastor cannot be dissolved, but by the consent of every individual who is a party to the contract.—The Court determined that witnesses to prove a church meeting were admissible.

Two witnesses, members of the church (though not, as it appears, members of the parish at the time of trial) were introduced, who testified that they were warned to attend a meeting of the church at the time specified—that they did attend—and that, by the votes of a majority of all the members of the church, and a great majority of the members present, Mr. Goss was dismissed. A witness was then offered, who was at that time a member of the parish. The plaintiff objected to him, on the ground that he was interested. In reply it was urged, that the interest was so small as not to disqualify him. It was urged, too, that as the church are always the first actors, in calling and dismissing ministers, and then the parish concur—and as the ordinary time of calling and holding church meetings is after the blessing on the Sabbath, when none but members of the parish can be supposed to be present—if such are not admitted as witnesses, it would never be in the power of a minister to

support an action. If such witnesses are excluded, what evidence ordinarily can be obtained?—The Court determined that the witness was inadmissible, on the ground of interest.

The Council for the defendants, thinking it sufficiently proved that Mr. Goss had been dismissed, by a vote of the church and a concurring vote of the town, proceeded to consider the operation of law in the case. Mr. Dana thought that the questions involved entered deeply into the freedom of the church. He said that ordination is only announcing to the world, by a church and congregation, who their minister is. The relation of minister and people commences from the time when the minister accepts the proposals made to him.

Some authorities were cited by the Council for the plaintiff, showing that the contract between minister and people is not a contract *at will*, to be terminated at the pleasure of either party.—In opposition to these, were urged the consequences of adopting any other supposition. Suppose a minister leaves his people; have they any remedy? Or suppose he refuses to preach to them, and to perform other incumbent duties; or if, instead of not preaching and not acting, his preaching and conduct are worse than none; have the church no power to dismiss him?—It may be asked, ‘If ministers are liable to be turned out, when the people please, what will become of ministers?’ They will be in as good a situation as other people, when they lose their business. But what is to become of the people, if, after a minister’s usefulness is at an end, they are obliged to support him?—At the time of settlement, there is an implied contract, to settle according to the Platform or religious constitution, which recognizes the right in the church to dismiss.—Suppose, at the time of settlement, the case in question had been explicitly stated, whether, if all the church and all the parish were totally dissatisfied, it should be in their power to dismiss? Would not minister and people have answered, yes? Or suppose it had been asked, if the minister should refuse to call church meetings, should dissolve such meetings, &c. as in the case before us, whether this should not be considered as manifest delinquency? Would not all parties have answered, yes?—In conclusion, authorities were cited, on the part of the defendants, to show that the views they had urged, as to the nature of the ministerial contract, were correct. It is clearly, they thought, a contract at will—the people, as well as the minister, have power to dissolve it—and, in the case under consideration, *it has been dissolved*.

In giving our readers some account of this interesting trial, we have intended, not only to express the sentiment, but to adopt as far as possible the *language* of the minutes before us—supplying only such words and phrases as seemed necessary, in order to connect and convey the sense. It will be seen how much importance was, at that period, attached to the *church*, and to its having met and acted, distinctly and separately, in the dismissal of its Pastor. It will be seen, too, that in the estimation of such men as Chief Justice Dana and Judge Lowell, who were concerned on opposite sides in this trial, **THE CHURCH WAS A CORPORATE BODY**. The Court, also, by admitting the records of the church in evidence, acceded to the propriety of this conclusion. But if the churches were corporations then, they are corporations now; for they have not forfeited or relinquished their corporate rights, nor is it in the power of any man to take them away. And, besides, if the churches were corporations in 1778, they were among the “bodies politic or religious societies” to which the Constitution, adopted only two years after, secures the right of electing their own religious teachers. In these points of view, the trial, of which we have furnished our

readers such an account as we were able, is of high authority, and of great importance.

The next case, of which we shall give a more brief account, is that of Mellen *vs.* the second precinct (parish) in Lancaster (now Sterling.) Mr. Mellen was settled over this parish in 1745. At the commencement of the revolutionary war, he was considered by many as a tory, and great dissatisfaction was on this account expressed by his people. Two Councils were convened, neither of which afforded them any redress. Consequently, at a church meeting duly warned, Nov. 1774, the church "voted to dismiss Mr. Mellen from his office as pastor and teacher in this church, and that all power by them committed to him be entirely reversed." The week following, the precinct held a meeting and voted, "that the character of Mr. Mellen is inconsistent with that of a learned and orthodox minister," and "that the precinct do now dismiss and dissolve him from his undertaking, office and charge of a minister to dispense the Word of God in this precinct." Mr. Mellen, not acquiescing in these measures, made a demand for salary, and the case was submitted to arbitrators, in 1778.

In behalf of the church and parish, it was urged, that their agreement with Mr. Mellen was either a contract at will, determinable at the pleasure of either party; or it was a contract for life, or for years, determinable on misbehavior.

A contract or estate for life may be forfeited, first, by *mis-user or abuse*; as if a judge takes a bribe, or a park-keeper kills deer without authority, or the steward of a court burns the court rolls.—On *this ground*, it was contended, and attempted to be proved, that Mr. Mellen had forfeited his office, even supposing it an office for life.

But, secondly, *non-user or neglect* in a public officer is cause of forfeiture. And is not a minister as much a public officer, as the steward of a court? Is not a parish, or a church, a *public corporate body*?—On supposition, then, that the ministerial contract is a contract for life, it was insisted that Mr. Mellen had forfeited his office by flagrant instances of neglect.

But admitting further, for the sake of argument, that the contract in question is an estate for life; it is an estate on certain *conditions*, either expressed or implied. Some estates have a condition annexed to them from their very nature, though no condition be expressed in words. Thus, if a grant be made to a man of an *office*, in general terms, without adding any other words; the law tacitly annexes hereto a condition, that the grantee shall duly execute his office. And on breach of this condition, it is lawful for the grantor, or his heirs, to oust him, and grant the office to another person. It is lawful, we say, for the *grantor* to do this—not for others;—and who is the grantor of the ministerial office? Is it the neighboring churches? Is it a council? Or is it not the church and parish themselves? Have not they, then, the right to judge, and to remove the incumbent, in case of misdemeanor or neglect? And have they not done it in the case before us?

It was contended, however, that the contract between Mr. Mellen and his people *was not an estate for life*, but a contract *at will*. This was urged—from the words of the contract—from the nature of the ministerial work, which, that it may be usefully performed, requires, in many cases, that ministers be removed—and from the fearful consequences of supposing the contrary. It was urged, that the right of determining who shall be their minister, and how long, is in the people, and that no law or custom has taken it from them. According to the Platform, the church may, if it pleases, *ordain* without a council; and why not dismiss? These are acts belonging to the same body.

In this case, as in that of Mr. Goss, we see how much importance is attached to the *church*, and to the due exercise of its powers and rights. An essential part of the argument consisted in showing, that the church had met and acted, distinctly and separately, in the alleged dismissal of Mr. Mellen. The church too, is spoken of in this case, like the former, as "a public *corporate body!*"

Another case, of which some account will be given, is that of Fuller *vs.* the inhabitants of Princeton. In 1767, the church and society in Princeton invited Rev. Timothy Fuller to become their minister. He accepted the invitation, and was settled over them in the usual manner. At the commencement of the revolution, he, like Mr. Mellen, was supposed to entertain principles unfavorable to the American cause. Much uneasiness was manifested on this account by his parishioners, and measures were taken to effect his dismissal. A mutual council was proposed, which he was understood to decline. An *ex-parte* council was then called, a great majority of which advised to his dismissal.\* He was accordingly dismissed, by vote of the church, and of the town, in 1776. Not considering his dismissal valid, he afterwards made a demand for salary, and the case was tried in the Supreme Court, Oct. 1783. Some of the principal lawyers in the Commonwealth were concerned on the trial;—among others, Mr. (afterwards Chief Justice) Parsons.

On the part of the town, it was urged, that the agreement with Mr. Fuller was a mere contract *at will*; and that there is nothing in the nature of the ministerial work, or in the customs of the country, which goes to prove the contrary.—Mr. Parsons however contended, on the other side, that the settlement of a minister is not a contract at will, but a connexion of a more serious and permanent character.

It was argued, therefore, by the council for the town, that on supposition the plaintiff had an estate in his office *for life*, determinable on misbehavior; it was already terminated. There must be some mode of deciding when a minister misbehaves, and of adjudging his dismissal. Who then are to judge;—the court, the church and the town, or an ecclesiastical council? We say the church and the town are the competent judges. In the first place, they alone can tell whether the *ends* of preaching are answered to them. And they are always interested to judge in favor of the minister, to avoid the expense and trouble of a dismissal and re-settlement.—But, secondly, the town is required by law to settle a minister, which supposes a power in the town—including *the church*—to choose and to dismiss.—The definition of a church was here quoted, as given in the Platform. The law also was quoted, which provides that the respective churches shall at all times use, exercise and enjoy all their privileges and freedoms respecting divine worship, church order and discipline, and shall be encouraged in the peaceable and regular profession and practice thereof. The question was then asked, What are the privileges and freedoms which the law determines that a church shall use, exercise and enjoy? In answer to this question, it was shown, by reference to the Province laws, that the church have power to *choose their own minister*; and the major part of the town concurring, and he accepting, he becomes their minister. It was shown, too, from the Platform, that the churches have expressly the power of electing, and, where there are no elders, of *ordaining*, their ministers. It was urged, as a necessary inference, that they must have the power of dismissing.

\* See Sullivan's *Strictures*, &c. p. 16.



But if the advice of a council is necessary, a mutual council, it was said, had been proposed and refused; and an ex-parte council had advised to a dismission. A council can, in no case, do more than give advice; it must be optional with the church and town whether to accept their advice, or not. In this case, the advice given was accepted, and Mr. Fuller was dismissed.

Chief Justice Parsons gives us some account of this trial, in his decision of the Tyringham case. Mass. Reports, vol iii, p. 183. The question, it seems, turned mainly on this, whether a mutual council had been refused by Mr. Fuller. The case, it is understood, was determined in favor of the town.

This case is the more interesting, because, although it was decided *after the adoption of the constitution*, the same importance is attached to the church, and the same validity ascribed to the acts of the church, as in the former instances. The previous ecclesiastical laws are referred to as still in force, and the Platform is quoted as good authority. It is attempted also to be shown, by various arguments, that the church have not only the power of *electing* their pastor, but even of dismissing him.

The fourth and last case, of which we propose to give our readers an account, is that of Chaplin *vs.* the second parish in Sutton (now Millbury).---The Rev. Ebenezer Chaplin was called by this church and parish, and ordained over them, in 1764. Mr. Chaplin, it appears, was settled, on the ground, and with the understanding, that a church and parish have the right of dismissing their minister. This sentiment he is said to have expressed and acted upon, not only at his settlement, but in the course of his public ministry.\* Dissatisfaction began to be expressed by his people in 1790. A mutual council, chosen by the pastor and church, was convened in December, 1791, by which he was advised to ask a dismission, and the people were advised to grant it, on such pecuniary conditions as should be agreed on, or as impartial persons should award. This advice was accepted on the part of the people; but the pastor neglecting to signify his acceptance, in March 1792, both the church and the parish, acting distinctly and separately, voted to dismiss Mr. Chaplin. He, not considering himself as legally dismissed, demanded his salary the following year. The case was argued in the Supreme Court, in the autumn of 1796, and decided in favor of the parish.

In behalf of the defendants, it was urged, as in the previous cases, that the agreement entered into between Mr. Chaplin and his people was a mere contract *at will*. The church and parish ask Mr. C. to become *the church's pastor*, and to settle with them in the work of the Gospel ministry. *The church* engage that they will form a *religious relation* with him, and they do it; and the parish engage to pay him a stipulated salary, so long as he continues in that *religious relation*. No length of time is agreed on by either party; but it is evident, from the nature of the case, that it should be considered as a contract at will. Religion is an individual, personal concern between the creature and his Creator. It is conversant with a man's thoughts and affections, and the secret actions of the soul. Towns, parishes, churches, or other corporations, are not capable of religious exercises. Who ever heard of a church conscience, or a parish conscience? Men ought to be free in choosing their religious teachers, and in dismissing them; and the connexion between them, from the very nature of it, is, and ought to be, a contract at will.

\* He advocated this sentiment in two Ecclesiastical Councils at Bolton, and assisted in settling a minister there, while Mr. Goss claimed that he was not dismissed.

It was said also, that ministers regard this connexion as a contract at will. They leave their people when they think proper, and no action for damages is ever brought against them.—It was further said, that to consider the connexion as a contract at will would have a happy influence on the character and habits of a minister, rendering him more diligent, faithful and useful.—But especially was it insisted on, that it was understood and agreed, on all hands, at the time of Mr. Chaplin's settlement, that the connexion formed should be a contract at will, and that the church and parish reserved to themselves the right of dismissing him.

But if all this reasoning be set aside, and the contract be regarded as an estate for life ; still, it is determinable on *misbehavior*. Misbehavior must be judged of, by a jury—by the church and parish—or by a council. Witnesses were here introduced, and admitted, to prove misbehavior on the part of Mr. Chaplin. It was contended, however, that *the church* and *parish* are the proper judges in the case. They can best tell whether the *ends* of preaching are answered to them. The Platform and the Province laws secure to *the church the right to choose its own pastor*. The Constitution also says that towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic or religious societies, shall at all times have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers. Clearly, therefore, the right of *choice* is now in the church and parish. But if they have a right to choose, then they must have a right to dismiss.

But even admitting that a council is necessary : There has been a council—advice has been given—and the plaintiff neglected to comply with it.

What, gentlemen of the jury, does the plaintiff now ask of you ? To determine that the church have no power to judge of his conduct, and dismiss him ;—that he is still their pastor ;—that their present pastor is no pastor ;—that the church and parish shall prostrate themselves at his feet, and purchase their ransom, like Algerine prisoners.

We have no adjudications of court, or precedents, to produce. The only two I know of are those of Goss and Fuller. The parish leave their cause with you, confiding in the integrity and good sense of their country.

It will be seen that in this case, as in each of the preceding, a high degree of importance is attached to *the church*. It is spoken of in a way which implies that it was considered a *corporation*. The third article in the declaration of rights is referred to, as securing to the *church*, as well as the parish, the right of choice. The pastor is spoken of as emphatically the *church's* pastor. The pastor and church call the mutual council. In all the controversy, the church acts distinctly and separately from the parish, and its acts are regarded as of at least equal importance to those of the parish.

The minutes of these cases, especially the last three, we have not quoted at full length ; but on all points at present disputable we have given, as nearly as possible, the *precise words* of the writer. It will be seen that the question chiefly agitated in our religious community, at the time of these law-suits, was not, whether there was any church distinct and separate from the parish, —lawyers then would no sooner have questioned the independent existence and powers of the church, than they would, whether there were any meeting houses or ministers in the country ; but the great question was, whether churches and parishes had the right (with or without a council, as they pleased,) to dismiss their religious teachers. It will be seen, too, that the distinguished counsellor, whose minutes we have quoted, was a strenuous

advocate for what he considered the rights of churches and parishes, against their ministers.—On this once agitated question, we hardly need now express an opinion. It has long since been settled, by the practice of the churches and the decisions of courts, in a manner with which we have reason to be satisfied. A mutual council, chosen, half by the aggrieved party, (whether this be the church, the parish, or the pastor, or either two of them,) and half by the other party, and in the convening of which all parties interested are allowed duly to participate, is doubtless the proper body to give advice in Congregational, ecclesiastical disputes. When such a council has been fairly offered and refused, and not before, an *ex parte* council, chosen with as much impartiality as possible, may with propriety be called.

If the parties in the several suits of which we have given some account were now living, it might be doing them injustice to publish a sketch of the arguments on one side, and not on the other. But the thought has been often in mind, while penning this article, that nearly or quite all those who were once so deeply interested in these litigations, plaintiffs and defendants, judges and jury, lawyers and witnesses, have gone together into the eternal world, to appear before an infinitely higher tribunal. Our object in what we have written has not been to do injustice, or to wound the feelings of any, but to snatch from oblivion what little remains to us of these important cases, and to exhibit their bearing upon questions of great present interest, especially to the churches of this Commonwealth.



#### DARRACOTT'S FAREWELL.

ALMOST a hundred years ago, there lived a very distinguished minister in the West of England, whom Whitefield denominated "The Star of the West." His name—an honored one, though as yet but little known in America—was Risdon Darracott. Worn out with a course, comparatively short, of faithful and successful labor in the cause of Christ, he died March 14th, 1759, in the forty-second year of his age. Though he had much to attach him to earthly scenes, he was effectually weaned from them, and but a short time previous to his departure, and in full prospect of that solemn event, he penned the following *farewell to the world*.

"Farewell, my dear Christian friends; I have taken sweet counsel with you in the way; but I leave you for sweeter, better converse above. You will soon follow me, and then our delightful communion shall be uninterrupted, as well as perfect, and our society be broken up no more for ever.

"Mourn not that I go to Jesus first. It is but a little while, and you will come after. And O! with what joy, think you, shall I welcome your arrival on the heavenly shore, and conduct you to him, whom our souls so dearly love!

"Farewell, thou my dearest wife! my most affectionate, delightful companion in heaven's road, whom God in the greatest mercy gave me, and has thus to the end of my race graciously continued to me! For all thy care, thy love, thy prayers, I bless my God, and thank thee, in these departing moments. But, dear as thou art, and

dearest of all that is mortal I hold thee, I now find it easy to part from thee, to go to that Jesus, thine and mine, who is infinitely more dear to me. With him I cheerfully leave thee, nor doubt his care of thee, who has loved thee, and given himself for thee. 'Tis but a short separation we shall have; our spirits will soon reunite, and then, never, never know separation more. For as we have been companions in the patience and tribulation of our Lord's kingdom, we shall assuredly be so in his glory.

"Farewell, my dear children! I leave you; but God has bound himself, by a most inviolable promise, to take care of you. Only choose him for your own God, who has been your father's God, and then, though I leave you exposed in the waves of a dangerous and wicked world, Providence, eternal and almighty Providence, has undertaken to pilot and preserve you. With comfortable hope, therefore, I bid you my last adieu; pleading the faithful and true promise, saying as the patriarch, 'I die,' my dear children, 'but God will be with you: praying in humble faith, that your souls, with those of your parents, may be bound up in the bundle of life with the Lord your God.'

"Farewell, ye my dear people! to whom I have been preaching the everlasting Gospel, that Gospel, which is now all my hope, and all my joy. Many, very many of you, are my present rejoicing, and will be my eternal crown of glory. And now I am leaving you, I bless God for all the success he has been graciously pleased to give my poor labors among you: for all the comfortable seasons of grace I have enjoyed with you. I part with you, this day, at the sacred table of our blessed Lord, in the confidence and hope, that though I shall drink no more with you this fruit of the vine, I shall drink it new with you, in the kingdom of our heavenly Father. Only, my brethren, my dearly beloved and longed for, my joy and crown, so stand fast in the Lord, my dearly beloved.

"But, for the rest of you, I mourn to think in what a miserable condition I am leaving you; and though you will no more hear my voice, and have often, alas! heard it to no purpose, this once, hear, and regard my dying charge—that you do not continue in a Christless and unconverted state, nor meet me in that state at the day of judgement.

"And now, farewell praying and preaching! my most delightful work! Farewell, ye Sabbaths and sacraments, and all divine ordinances! I have now done with you all, and you have done all that was to be done for me. As the manna, and the rock, in the wilderness, you have supplied me with sweet refreshment by the way; and now I am leaving you, I bless my God for all the comfort and edification I have received by your means, as the appointed channel of divine communications. But now I have no more need of you. I am going to the God of ordinances; to that fountain of living waters, which has filled these pools below; and, instead of sipping at the streams, I shall now be for ever satisfied from the fountain-head.

"Farewell now, my poor body! Thou shalt be no more a clog to my active spirit, no more hinder me in the service of God, no

more ensnare my soul, and pollute it with sin. And now, an everlasting farewell to all sins and sorrows, all doubts and fears, conflicts and temptations! Farewell to earth and all terrestrial scenes! Ye are now no more! An infinitely brighter prospect opens to me!"

“ See the guardian angels nigh,  
 Wait to wait my soul on high!  
 See the golden gates display'd!  
 See the crown to grace my head!  
 See a flood of sacred light,  
 Which shall yield no more to-night!  
 Transitory world, farewell!  
 Jesus calls, with him to dwell.”

◆

THE BEGINNING OF ARIANISM IN BOSTON.

THE following is extracted from a sermon by A. Crosswell, preached and published in Boston in 1767, soon after the settlement of Dr. Howard. It exhibits the state of feeling at that time prevailing here, among both the favorers and opposers of insidiously spreading error.

“ The Divinity of Christ is an antiquated doctrine; very unfashionable and unmodish. The high mode is to laugh at it, and all that hold it; or at least, by words and actions to say, ‘ ’Tis of but little consequence.’ Trinitarians can be concerned in settling ministers, where they are satisfied Christ will be preached only as a subordinate God. But they who have fellowship in such undertakings, if they are not Arians themselves, are next door to Arians. Their zeal for Christ’s God-head is not thankworthy. Such men, whether ministers or others, can carry on the cause of Arians for them, *better than they themselves can.*—These have been the chief instruments of promoting it, through the land in general, and especially in the metropolis. There hath not been done so much against the Divinity of Christ in Boston, for an hundred years before, as has been done against it, in an *oblique* manner, within these ten months past.”

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *An Exposition of the Old and New Testament, with practical Remarks and Observations.* By MATTHEW HENRY. Edited by the Rev. George Burder, and the Rev. Joseph Hughes; with the life of the Author by the Rev. Samuel Palmer. First American Edition; To which is prefixed a Preface, by Archibald Alexander, D. D. Professor of Theology in the Seminary at Princeton, N. J. In Six volumes, royal Octavo. Philadelphia: Tower & Hogan, 1828.

This edition of Mr. Henry’s Commentary should be regarded as a precious offering to the American public. We deem it no dispar-

agement to other popular and useful works of the kind to say, that for a *Clergyman*, in the daily business of his profession, none will be found of such essential service as the Commentary of Mr. Henry. True, it may not afford him so much assistance in elucidating obscure and difficult passages, as some later and more critical works; but it will do that which will be of far greater importance—it will open, to his admiration, seemingly *plain* passages, and present them in new and interesting lights. It will suggest to him profitable hints on which to enlarge—points of Christian doctrine and practice on which to insist—subjects in abundance for written sermons, and expository lectures: it will feed and sustain his own soul, while it enables him to feed the souls of others;—and, in these ways, will afford him that very assistance which he daily and continually needs, in prosecuting his arduous and responsible labors. Lest this should be thought by some to be exorbitant praise, we add a few of the many testimonies which might be offered, as to the value of the work before us.

DR. WATTS. “I could wish young ministers in the country might be allowed by their people to read a part of Mr. Henry’s Exposition of the Bible, one part of the Lord’s day.” \*

DR. DODDRIDGE. “Henry is, perhaps, the only Commentator, so large, that deserves to be entirely and attentively read through. There is much to be learned in a speculative, and still more in a practical way.” †

MR. TONG. “As long as the Bible continues in England, Mr. Henry’s admirable Expositions will be prized by all serious Christians. In them, his clear head, his warm heart, his life, his soul, appear.” ‡

MR. W. ROMAINE. “There is no comment upon the Bible, either ancient or modern, in all respects equal to Mr. Henry’s.” §

DR. EDWARD WILLIAMS. “Our young preachers would do well to read, with devotion and care, those parts of Mr. Henry’s practical and *incomparable* Exposition, which relate to the subject on which they are to preach.” ||

MESSRS. BOGUE AND BENNET. “Matthew Henry stands without a rival, as an Expositor of Scripture, for the edification of the church of God.” ¶

To crown all, it is related of “the Apostolic Whitefield,” that he “was trained, as a Christian and a preacher, by Mr. Henry’s Commentary—that he literally studied it on his knees—read it through four times—and to the close of life, spoke of its author with profound veneration, ever calling him ‘the *great* Mr. Henry.’” \*\*

We only add, that the value of the present edition is not a little enhanced by the instructive and judicious preface of Dr. Alexander, in which the characteristic merits and uses of the Commentary are ably delineated.

\* Memoirs by Dr. Gibbons, p. 156.

† Works vol. v, p. 474.

‡ Funeral Sermon, pp. 30, 31.

§ In Life of Henry, p. 312.

|| Christian Preacher, p. 52.

¶ Hist. of Dissenters, vol. ii. p. 296.

\*\* Hist. of Dissenters, vol. iii. pp. 17, 18.

2. *The Works of the Rev. H. Scougal, A. M. S. T. P. containing the Life of God in the soul of Man, with nine other Discourses on Important Subjects. To which is added a Sermon preached at the Author's Funeral, by George Gairden, D. D.* Boston: Lyman Thurston & Co., and Peirce and Williams, 1829.

The Rev. Henry Scougal was born in 1650; entered the University of Aberdeen at the age of fifteen; became an instructor there at nineteen; was appointed Professor of Divinity when but twenty-four; and died before he had completed his twenty-eighth year. This account shows in what high estimation he was held by his cotemporaries, and doubtless with sufficient reason. His understanding was of the first order, his judgement mature and solid, his piety sincere, and his literary acquisitions far beyond what could have been expected in one of his years. His course on earth was short, but it was splendid and useful. He seems to have been one of those extraordinary geniuses, which early ripen, and are early removed.

The volume before us is supposed to contain all his published works. The principal of them is a Treatise, entitled, "The Life of God in the Soul of Man." It was originally addressed to a young nobleman for his private advantage, and was first published by Dr. Burnett, afterwards Bishop of Sarum, in 1677. The plan of the author is, first, to show "what religion is," distinguishing it from all outward persuasions and forms, and describing it as "a Divine life" in the soul. Secondly, he sets forth "the excellency and advantage of religion;" and, thirdly, what we must do to obtain religion. Under this last particular, instead of saying with the Apostle, "Repent ye, and believe the gospel," he prescribes a long and laborious process to be passed through, in order to gain the desired object. He falls into the common inconsistency of his age, in getting his pilgrim half way to heaven, before he passes the wicket gate; or in directing him to do many things of the very nature of religion, as indirect means of obtaining religion. Many of his advices under this particular, if addressed to the young and growing Christian, would be pertinent and excellent; but, as addressed to the anxious, inquiring sinner, and not with the understanding that they go to the reality of religion, and that if he complies with them he will be a Christian, but only that he will be in a hopeful way to become a Christian at some future period,—considered in this light, they are little better than preposterous.

The discourses in this volume were transcribed from the author's manuscripts, and published after his decease. Though written with less care and precision than the treatise, they are, in our estimation, more than equal to it, as giving just views of the nature of religion, and urging it upon the attention and practice of men. With the sermons on "loving our enemies," on "the advantage of early afflictions," on "the small number of the saved," and on the sufferings of Christ, we were particularly pleased. Many passages in the sermon on "the importance and difficulty of the Ministerial function," are truly eloquent and excellent. Addressing his brethren in the ministry, he says,

“We have to do with rational and immortal souls, those most noble and divine substances which proceeded from God, and are capable of being united to him eternally, but withal in hazard of being eternally separated from him; and on us it doth in some measure depend to whose share they shall fall, whether they shall be angels or fiends. We may say with reason of our work, what the painter did vainly boast of, *Laboramus aternitati*: The impresses we make shall last for ever. My beloved, the most serious of our thoughts come very far short of the inestimable worth of the depositum, the treasure which is committed to our care. He who did create and redeem the souls of men, doth best understand their value: and we see what esteem he putteth upon them, by the pains he is pleased to take about them. Their salvation was contrived before the mountains were brought forth, before the foundation of the earth was laid; the design was formed from all eternity; and glorious are the methods by which it is accomplished. To this purpose did the Deity empty itself, and was clothed with the human nature; to this purpose was that strange and wonderful conjunction, God and man united together! Hitherto did all the actions and all the sufferings of our blessed Saviour aim—for this he was born, and for this he did die. And shall we undervalue the price of his blood, or think it a small matter to have the charge of those for whom it was shed? It is the church of God we must oversee and feed: that church for which the world is upheld, which is sanctified by the Holy Ghost, on which the angels themselves do attend. What a weighty charge is this we have undertaken! Who is sufficient for these things? St. Chrysostom says, *ex ecclesie ministris non arbitror multos servari*;\* words so terrible, that I tremble to put them into English: and yet, if a man should speak fire, blood, and smoke—if flames could come out of his mouth instead of words—if he had a voice like thunder, and an eye like lightning, he could not sufficiently represent the dreadful account that unfaithful pastors shall make. What horror and confusion shall it cast them into at the last day, to hear the blood of the Son of God plead against them—to hear our great Master say, It was the purchase of my blood which ye did neglect! God died for these souls, of whom ye took so little pains! think not, therefore, to be saved by that blood ye have despised, or to escape the torments whereunto many others are plunged through your faults!”

“O, what a hard matter it is to deal with people that are ready to leave the world, and step in upon eternity; when their souls do, as it were, hang on our lips; and they have one foot, as we use to say, already in the grave!”

The religious sentiments of Mr. Scougal, were, in the general, Orthodox, though he was less inclined to dwell on points of doctrine than most of his cotemporaries. His works are chiefly of the practical kind, and will be read with interest and profit by intelligent Christians of the present day.

3. *Christian Essays*. By the Rev. Samuel Charles Wilks, A. M. From the Second London Edition. Boston: Perkins and Marvin. 1829. pp. 348.

It will be enough to excite attention and expectation in regard to this volume, to know that its author is the Editor of the *Christian Observer*. Nor will any reasonable expectations, which this fact may occasion, be disappointed by a perusal of the work itself. We have rarely seen, in the same number of pages, so much valuable religious instruction, clothed in such simple and appropriate language. The sense, always interesting and important in itself, is clearly and forcibly expressed throughout, with scarcely a superfluous or a misplaced word.

\* I do not believe that many of the ministers of the church will be saved.



The volume contains eleven Essays, on the following subjects: True and False Repose in Death;\* Full Assurance of Understanding; Full Assurance of Faith; Full Assurance of Hope; Christian Obedience; The Form and the Power of Religion; Sources of Error in Opinion; False Modesty in Religion; Affection between Ministers and their Flock; Natural and Revealed Religion; The Influence of a Moral Life on our Judgment in Matters of Faith.

In point of religious sentiment, these Essays are of the same general character as the Christian Observer. The great doctrines of the Gospel are clearly and practically stated, without much regard to metaphysical distinctions, but with a close adherence to the representations and language of the sacred writings. The work, like most which we receive from the evangelical clergy of England, is fitted rather to instruct the inquiring, than to alarm the stupid—rather to establish and improve the thoughtful Christian, than to awaken and convince the careless and hardened sinner.

We had hoped to present our readers with copious extracts from this volume; but have room only for a single paragraph. In reply to the sentiment that repentance alone is a sufficient *ground* of pardon, Mr. Wilks observes,

“Against this doctrine of repentance being a natural atonement for sin, it is no trivial objection, that the most virtuous and sagacious heathens did not make the discovery. Socrates himself, the very high-priest of deism, candidly allowed that he could perceive no way in which the Deity might consistently forgive human transgressions. He felt that there was a radical defect in the religion of nature, and, in consequence, doubted not but that the Almighty would at length condescend to reveal, by some divinely-taught instructor, that most interesting of mysteries, how he would see fit to pardon sin. This hope—it might almost be denominated this prophecy—of Socrates, has been realized by the Christian dispensation. How absurd then is it to build our expectations for futurity upon a system which appeared fundamentally defective in the eyes of its greatest advocates, and which is now confessedly superseded by the brighter discoveries of revelation!”

4. *The Evidences of Christianity, stated in a popular and practical manner, in a course of Lectures on the Authenticity, Credibility, Divine Authority, and Inspiration of the New-Testament, delivered in the Parish Church of St. Mary, Islington.* By Daniel Wilson, A. M., Vicar. Boston: Crocker and Brewster. New-York: J. Leavitt. 1829.

As we hope, ere long, to present an extended review of this interesting work, we shall do little more now than to state its object, and recommend it to the notice of our readers.

“The design of the following pages is to unite the historical with the internal evidences of Christianity, and present them in a popular and practical form. The elaborate productions on the Evidences, with which our literature abounds, are calculated rather for the sceptic, than the unestablished Christian. The cautious and measured language; the careful abstinence from mysterious or unwelcome topics: the repeated pauses for the consideration of objections; the abstract, speculative tone of discussion, almost uniformly prevalent in such works, are not the most favorable means of producing an effect upon the heart. A fluctuating or uninformed Christian requires plain information; an accumulation of arguments; a bold and manly address; the fair and undisguised statement of the whole case; an exhibition of the direct moral and

\* From this Essay was taken an article, published in our first volume, p. 212, entitled the “Death-bed of Dr. Johnson.”

spiritual benefits of Christianity; and practical appeals to the conscience and feelings. In a word, his professed principles should be taken for granted, and acted upon; and the historical evidences considered only as the introduction to the claims of Christianity upon his obedience, as a moral and responsible creature. It is the author's firm opinion that much injury has been unconsciously done to the cause of Christianity, amongst the class of persons to whom he is referring, by complimenting away the peculiarities of revelation; by debating the evidences as a merely intellectual question; by treating as a slight matter the evil of unbelief; and by keeping out of sight the main blessings of redemption, and the temper of mind in which these should be inquired into and received. The author thinks, that secret infidelity will never be effectually checked amongst us, and pure Christianity revived, till the infinite importance of practical religion pervades, more apparently, the whole manner in which we endeavor to establish our people in the evidences of the Gospel."

Such is the *object* of the work before us, and such the views with which the estimable author entered upon his responsible undertaking. We hazard nothing in expressing the confidence that he has accomplished the undertaking with singular ability. Said a learned and pious friend, a few days since, taking up the volume before us, 'This is just such a book as I have long wished, but never expected to see;—the evidences of Christianity made a *practical* subject, and stated, not so much to refute the cold infidel, as to instruct and establish the sincere Christian.'

The work was prepared for the special benefit of the *young*; and we recommend it to their particular attention. It is of great importance that our youth, at the present day, should be able to assign better reasons for their reception of Christianity, than those arising from education and custom. There is evidence sufficient to convince their understandings; and their understandings should be enlightened and convinced. A conviction such as this will be a *permanent* principle, not soon shaken, not easily effaced. "When the affections are cold, and the will vacillating, the *judgement* may retain its hold upon the Divine evidence of Christianity, and thus help to support the soul when everything else is for a moment lost."

5. *A Memoir of Mrs. Barbara Ewing.* By her husband, Greville Ewing. Boston: Lincoln and Edmands. 1829. pp. 224.

We have here "the monument which the trembling hand" of an afflicted husband has "reared to his beloved and lamented wife." It consists of a brief account of the early years of Mrs. Ewing; of her hopeful conversion, from a perusal of Doddridge's "Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul;" of her settlement in life, in connexion with the author; of her various plans and labors of usefulness; and of her sudden and painful departure, occasioned by the upsetting of a coach. The volume contains a variety of letters of the deceased, and numerous testimonials, in prose and verse, from individuals and public bodies, of the general grief and sympathy which were felt in consequence of her removal. The description of her last few days, succeeding the injury which caused her death, is peculiarly interesting. Her closing scene was eminently peaceful. On the whole, we have been interested in the volume, and doubt not it will be read with pleasure by the lovers of religious biography.

THE

# SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

VOL. II.

DECEMBER, 1829.

NO. 12.

---

## COMMUNICATIONS.

WILLIAM WHISTON.

THE individual, whose name is here given, was among the most learned, and quite the most honest, of the Unitarians of the last century. He is often referred to with great respect, and as one whose authority ought to have influence, by Unitarians of the present day.—I propose, in what follows, to give a brief account of the leading events of his life, together with his religious opinions, and to close with such reflections as the narrative may suggest.

William Whiston was born in the year 1667, at Norton, in the county of Leicester, of which place his father was rector. He entered the University at Cambridge in 1686, where he distinguished himself as a diligent and successful student, particularly in mathematics. Soon after receiving his first degree, he was made a fellow of Clarehall, and commenced the business of a private tutor. He continued in this employment, till obliged to relinquish it by the failure of his health; when he accepted an invitation to become chaplain to the Bishop of Norwich. He was ordained in 1693. The next year he became acquainted with Sir Isaac Newton, by whom he was induced to abandon the Cartesian philosophy, and commence the study of the newly published *Principia*. In 1698, he obtained a living and became a parish minister in Suffolk,—about which time he entered the marriage state, and thereby vacated his fellowship at the University. Near the beginning of the century, Sir Isaac Newton nominated him as his deputy, in the Lucasian professorship of mathematics at Cambridge, shortly after which the great philosopher resigned, and Whiston was appointed his successor. Previous to this, he had published his “*New Theory of the Earth*,” designed to show that the Mosaic account of its creation is agreeable to reason and philosophy; a work which added not a little to the reputation of its author.

It was in 1706, that he first entertained doubts on the subject of the Trinity. With characteristic honesty, he soon began to publish in defence of his Arian or Semi-Arian views. His publications on this subject brought him into trouble with his associates at the University, and he was publicly discharged from his professorship, October 30, 1710. After this he removed to London, being dependent for a livelihood on his literary efforts, and on the contributions of his friends.

It was a favorite opinion of Whiston, that "the Apostolical Constitutions" (so called,) a compilation of the fourth or fifth century, were really the work of the apostles themselves. Accordingly, he held these constitutions to be "the most sacred of the canonical books of the New Testament." He had disclosed his views on this subject before his banishment from Cambridge; but in 1711, he published a work in four volumes octavo, entitled, "Primitive Christianity Revived," a principal object of which was to establish the authority of "the Apostolical Constitutions," with several other apocryphal books. Respecting the influence and success of this work, he entertained the most extravagant expectations. After speaking with admiration of the philosophical discoveries of Newton, he adds, "Nor can I forbear to wish, that my own most important discoveries concerning true religion and primitive Christianity may succeed, in the *second* place, to his surprising discoveries, and may together have such a divine blessing upon them, that the kingdoms of this world may soon become the kingdoms of the Lord and of his Christ."\* He expected shortly to restore the Christian religion, both in respect to matter and form, as the Saviour left it; for, says he, "*I well know what this was, in almost every single point.*"†

After his banishment from the University, he was attacked by the Convocation, and prosecuted for heresy in the spiritual court; but from both these attempts against him he escaped uninjured. He was proposed as a member of the Royal Society in 1720, but by the influence of Sir Isaac Newton, his former friend, he was rejected. He long wished and expected to establish a congregation, according to his views of the primitive church, and actually prepared a liturgy to be used in such an assembly; but in this respect, as in many others, he was disappointed. He had never much opportunity of using his liturgy, except in a very private way. He continued to worship and commune with the established church (though for years he was accustomed to leave the house on the reading of what he called "the horrible Athanasian creed") until 1747. At this time he finally withdrew, and attached himself to the General or Arminian Baptists.

He ever manifested the greatest integrity of character, administering reproof to all persons, and on all occasions, as he thought

\* Memoirs, p. 38.

† Ibid. p. 152.

his duty required; so that at length he gained, as he deserved, the very creditable appellation of "the honest Whiston." As an instance of this, it is related that Queen Caroline, wife of George II., with whose society he was occasionally honored, knowing his reputation as an unsparing reprove, once requested him to tell her her faults. He, without hesitation, observed to her, that her talking and apparent indifference at chapel, in time of service, was very offensive to her religious friends. She thanked him for the suggestion, and requested him to point out other instances in her conduct which he disapproved. But he excused himself by saying, that until she had corrected the fault already mentioned, it would be needless to tell of others.

In 1749, Whiston published memoirs of his own life, in two volumes, to which a third was afterwards added. He died in 1752, at the advanced age of eighty-five, and was buried at Lyndon, where a handsome tomb is erected to his memory.

In the religious opinions of this extraordinary man, of which it is proposed now to give some account, we may see the operations and wanderings of an honest, inquisitive, and somewhat enlightened mind, when once it has departed from the infallible standard of truth. We may learn, too, the downward course of error, and the danger of turning away, for a moment, from that "sure word of prophecy, to which we do well to take heed, as to a light shining in a dark place."

In 1706, as I have already said, Whiston began to doubt on the subject of the Trinity,—soon after which he openly declared himself a Unitarian.\* In 1709, he published a sermon to disprove the endless punishment of the wicked. He afterwards rejected the Canticles from among the sacred books, regarding it as of dangerous and immoral tendency. The Bible, however, was much more enlarged by him, than diminished; for, between the years 1708 and 1745, besides large additions to the Old Testament, he increased the number of the canonical books of the New Testament from twenty-seven to fifty-six. In the list of these added books, all which he held to be "*real Bible*," were the following: The Apostolical Constitutions, in eight books; the Book of Baruch; the Epistle of Baruch to the nine tribes and a half; the fourth Book of Esdras; the eighteen Psalms of a second Solomon; the Book of Enoch; the third Book of the Maccabees; the Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs; an Epistle of the Corinthians to St. Paul, with St. Paul's Answer; the Epistle of Timothy to Diognetus, and the Homily; two Epistles of Clement to the Corinthians; Josephus's Homily concerning Hades; the catholic Epistle of Barnabas; the ten Epistles of

\* He called himself a Eusebian, or Semi-Arian. He held Socinians to be "*real heretics*, contradicting some of the fundamentals of the Christian religion," and believed that their baptisms were not valid. *Memoirs*, p. 486.

Ignatius; the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians; and the Martyrdom of Polycarp.

Mr. Whiston objected to the baptism of infants, till they were of sufficient age to be instructed, confirmed, and admitted to communion. He held that the candidate for baptism should first be anointed with oil; then three times immersed in water; then sealed with ointment; and, lastly, be clothed in a white garment, in token of purity. In the Eucharist, he believed that the wine should be mixed with water; and that, both in the communion and burial service, there should be prayers for departed saints.\* He speaks of baptism and the Lord's supper (without confining them, however, to his own singular mode of administration) as "necessary to salvation." p. 489. He firmly believed that "Adam and Eve both died on the same day or year in which they fell, according to the Divine malediction, Gen. ii. 17. and were in no very long time raised again from the dead." p. 662. He asserted that "neither a Bishop, a Presbyter, nor a Deacon ought to be *more than once married*;" that "primitive Christianity forbade either Bishops, Presbyters, or Deacons to *marry at all after their ordination*;" and that, "in the days of the apostles, a fourth marriage was entirely rejected, even in the laity." p. 467. He held that the message of the apostles to the Gentile converts, requiring them to abstain "from things strangled and from blood," Acts xv. 29. is "one of the plainest laws in either the Old or the New Testament," and is still binding upon all Christians, p. 471. He believed that the passage, James, v. 14, directing that the sick should be anointed with oil by the elders of the church, is "a certain law of the Gospel;" that this anointing is "an *eminent* branch of the duty of Christian presbyters at this day;" and that where it is administered and received in faith, it almost invariably results in a cure. Indeed he urges the cures which he thought had been effected among the Arminian Baptists by this means, as one of the reasons for connecting himself with them. pp. 356, 474.

Mr. Whiston believed that the introduction of the Trinitarian doctrine, with other superstitious notions, into the church, was the occasion of the cessation of miracles; and that when the church is once purged of these errors, the gift of miracles will be again imparted.\* He discovered to his entire satisfaction that the Millennium would commence in 1766. So confident was he of this, that in 1749 he published a chronological table, stating the progress of events from year to year, down to the beginning of

\* Memoirs, p. 424. The Rev. Mr. Pierpont of Boston agrees with Whiston as to the propriety of praying for the saints in heaven. See his Sermon on the Intercession of Christ, p. 12.

† Account, &c. p. 17. The Unitarians of Massachusetts are so thoroughly purified from Trinitarian delusions, that, according to Whiston's theory, one would think the gift of miracles might now be daily expected.

this happy period. He "foretold" that, previous to the appointed year, "the Turkish Empire, the House of Austria, the German Emperors, and the Popes of Rome," would be "suddenly destroyed;" that the "two witnesses" (the Vaudois) would mystically ascend; that the Jews would be literally restored; that "the temple of Ezekiel would be built upon mount Zion, as the former had been upon mount Moriah;" that the Messiah would appear personally upon earth; that the first resurrection would take place; and that the saints would commence their happy reign of a thousand years. pp. 334, 636. Mr. Whiston believed, with Mahomet, that there were seven heavens; and he even went so far as to publish "a scheme of the heavens," describing the seven apartments, and showing how far they were asunder.

But the most remarkable of his opinions, and that which I most regret to expose, remains yet to be noticed. It was imbibed in the latter part of his life, and he seems to have been forced into it by his Unitarian, Pelagian theology. After having added almost thirty books to the New Testament, he virtually denied the *inspiration* of nearly the whole of it. That I may do him no injustice, I shall here give his own words. "What Paul says to the Jewish converts, in his Epistle to the Romans, about *original sin*; about the *prevalency* of that original sin or corruption in himself, at least while he was *unregenerate*; and about *election* and *reprobation*, in his fifth, seventh, and ninth chapters, seems to have been *no part of Christ's revelation to him*, but rather *certain strange and weak reasonings of his own, accommodated to the weak Roman Jews of that time only.*" After offering eight distinct reasons in support of this opinion, he concludes by saying, "If, after all, any think that this my opinion takes away the strict inspiration of Paul's Epistles, which they suppose of dangerous consequence to Christianity, I confess it does imply, that under what degree of Divine conduct or wisdom soever Paul wrote his Epistles, yet is that degree to be esteemed *inferior to what ought to be properly called inspiration*, such as the prophets were under in the reception of their prophecies; which proper inspiration I take to be here groundless, and *never pretended to by any writers of the New Testament*, excepting the prophetic parts of Hermas in his admirable visions, and the prophetic parts of St. John, in his no less admirable Revelation." pp. 638—642.

We here come to the end of the chapter in regard to Whiston—the same end to which we may trace almost every other person who, with equal ardor and presumption in the search of truth, has suffered himself to wander from the perfect standard,—**INFIDELITY**. Not that Whiston avowed himself an infidel, or thought himself one; but he virtually *was one*. A certain part of a canonical book of the New Testament—an acknowledged Epistle of Paul, is "*no part of Christ's revelation to him,*" but

“certain *strange and weak reasonings of his own.*” “*Proper inspiration was never pretended to by any writers of the New Testament, excepting,*” forsooth, “the prophetic parts of Hermas, and the prophetic parts of the Revelation of John.”

Whiston is not the only man who, having swerved from the infallible standard of truth, has been blown about by every wind of doctrine, till at length dashed upon the desolate shores of a virtual, if not an avowed, infidelity.—Look at Chillingworth;—and I here quote Whiston’s own account of him. “This Mr. Chillingworth had a strange diffidence and mutability of temper, which made him, when first a Protestant, to turn Papist; and when a Papist, to turn Protestant again: then to favor Arianism, and on that account, by refusing to sign the thirty-nine articles, to lose some expected preferment; then to sign the thirty-nine articles, and accept of preferment; and, after all, to defend Socinianism itself;—which is such a round of contrarieties, as is hard to be paralleled in any other learned man whomsoever. To be sure,” says Whiston, “he at first wanted my darling motto, *Consider well, and act steadily*; nor had he the Apostolical Constitutions for his immoveable guide and standard, as I have now had near forty years, which would have prevented all this uncertainty of conduct.” p. 389.

Matthew Tindal was for many years a member of the church of England. He afterwards turned Catholic, and then Unitarian, —at which time he was regarded with much favor by the celebrated John Le Clerc. In 1730, he published his “Christianity as old as the Creation,” and he died—an infidel.

John Toland was born, a Papist, in 1670. In early life, he turned Protestant, and connected himself with the English Dissenters, by whom he was supported, while pursuing his theological studies at Leyden. He was known as a Unitarian, and published his treatise entitled “Christianity not mysterious,” in 1696. Like Whiston, he was at much pains to invalidate the canon of the New Testament, by adding to it a great variety of apocryphal books. He became at length a Deist, a Pantheist, and died most probably an Atheist.

In 1714, Thomas Chubb was an Arian, and published a work entitled “Eight Arguments on the Supremacy of the Father.” In 1718, he avowed himself a Socinian, though “he owned that the New Testament favored the Arians.” He soon became a confessed infidel, and so continued to the end of life.\*

The infidel Morgan appeared first in public, as a Presbyterian minister. In a short time, he became an Arian, left the ministry, and devoted himself to the study of medicine. He afterwards turned Quaker, and Deist, and, “with very little knowledge of the Scriptures, fell upon them outrageously.”\*

\* See Whiston’s Memoirs, pp. 276, 313. Anthony Collins, a celebrated infidel, commenced his career as an author, in 1707, by writing against the doctrine of the Trinity.



A similar course of apostacy and error was traversed by the German Semler. From being the pupil and admirer of the Orthodox Baumgarten, he passed through all the descending grades of professed Unitarianism, until, though nominally a teacher of theology, he really was no better than an infidel. He had studied the Scriptures more than some of the English Deists, but it may well be doubted whether he regarded or treated them with any more respect.

An instance of the same kind, we have in the late Dr. Priestley. He was once, as he himself informs us, "a Calvinist, and that of the strictest sect." Afterwards, says he, "I became a high Arian, next a low Arian, and then a Socinian, and in a little time a Socinian of the lowest kind, in which Christ is considered as a mere man, the son of *Joseph* and *Mary*, and naturally *as fallible* and *peccable* as *Moses*, or any other prophet." He further tells us, as well he might, that he "does not know when his creed will be fixed." He adds, "I have frequently declared myself *not to be a believer in the inspiration of the Evangelists and Apostles, as writers.*"\*

As instances equally in point, I might mention Wakefield, Lindsey, Belsham, and several others, who, having swerved from the perfect standard of truth, and from the sacred principles of the Gospel, came, at length, to deny the inspiration of the Scriptures, and "fell endlong" into the "Serbonian bog" of a virtual infidelity. But enough, I hope, has been said to show the *danger* of the course pursued by these men, and to impress upon all my readers, especially those in youth, the importance of clinging to the Bible as *the word of God—as itself a revelation from heaven—as an infallible standard* both of doctrine and duty. "Trust in the Lord at all times, and *lean not to thine own understanding.* In all thy ways *acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths.*"

Unitarians profess to believe that the Bible is clearly in their favor—that the plain, common reader, who goes to it without prejudice, and studies it with diligence and candor, will inevitably leave it a Unitarian. But, if this is true, why have Unitarians always taken such unwarrantable liberties with the Bible? What necessity, if this is true, for their new and free translations; for conjectural emendations; for adding or taking away, as their system requires; for their making so frequent allowance on account of the ignorance, the prejudice, and the artful accommodations of the sacred writers; and especially for their denying that the Scriptures are the word of God. That all these things

Lord Bolingbroke, too, was a great enemy to the doctrines of the Trinity, and of atonement by the blood of Christ. See Leland's *View of Deistical Writers*, vol. i. p. 94. vol. ii. pp. 224, 231.

\* *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever*, Part ii. pp. 33—35. *Def. of Unit.* for 1787, p. 111. *Letters to Horsely*, Part i. p. 132.

have been done, and are now doing, by Unitarians, is unquestionable. But what necessity for doing these things, if the Bible, as it stands, is all in their favor? If the Bible, as it is, does not ascribe Divine names, attributes, works and worship to the Saviour of men; what need of so much effort to translate and explain away the various passages which treat of this subject? If the Bible, as it is, does not teach the doctrines of human depravity, of atonement, of regeneration, of justification by faith, of the election and perseverance of saints, and of eternal punishment; what need of so much learned labor to get these doctrines out of the Bible? If the Bible, as it stands, does not teach the separate existence of the soul, and the existence of angels, fallen and unfallen; what need of sliding over such a multitude of passages, by referring to the alleged superstitions of ancient times?

Whiston found certain "vexatious passages" (to borrow an expression from Mr. Dabney\*) in the Epistle to the Romans, which he was constrained to consider as "no part of Christ's revelation" to the apostle, but "rather certain strange and weak reasonings of his own." The German Unitarians regard the accounts given us of the miracles of our Saviour as mere popular language, which was never intended to be literally understood. The English Unitarians set aside whole verses and even chapters, because they cannot interpret them consistently with their opinions. Professor Norton not only rejects, as uncanonical, the entire Epistle to the Hebrews, but says that "the *canonical* books of the New Testament are not the revelation which God made by Christ.† And Dr. Ware directs us "to distinguish between the *doctrines* delivered by the apostles and primitive teachers, and the *arguments, illustrations, and topics of persuasion*, which they employed to enforce them. The former," says he, "we are to consider as given them by revelation; the latter were THE SUGGESTIONS OF THEIR OWN MINDS, in the exercise of their respective talents, and the kinds and degrees of knowledge they possessed."\*—But how is this and such like treatment of the Bible to be accounted for, on the supposition that the Bible is a Unitarian book, and that, in its plain, obvious meaning, it goes to favor the Unitarian cause? Are men accustomed to take so much pains, and resort to such a variety of expedients, to get rid of testimony which makes entirely in their own favor?

Evangelical Christians have ever been distinguished, as those who venerate the Bible. They regard it, not as *containing* a revelation, but as *being itself* a revelation. They hold its writers to have been *supernaturally inspired*, and that what they wrote is truly *the word of God*. Going to the Bible in this view, under a

\* Annotations, p. 409.

† Chris. Exam. for July, 1829, p. 344.

‡ Sermon at the Ordination of Mr. Lamson, p. 13.

deep sense of obligation to receive it as it stands, and to receive it all, Evangelical Christians find there, without any effort at interpretation or misinterpretation, all the articles of their faith. They find the Divinity of Christ, his humanity, and his atonement. They find the Divinity and personality of the Holy Spirit, and the various operations which are ascribed to his efficiency. They find what man is by nature, and what he must be by grace; what God has done for him, and what he must do for himself, in order to inherit eternal life. They find the great plan of redemption for fallen, ruined creatures satisfactorily delineated, from its foundation to its top stone. They find a plain but awful disclosure of eternal realities—the resurrection, the judgement, the mansions of glory, and the regions of despair. Finding communications such as these plainly before him in his Bible, the true Christian does not hesitate or question. They are clearly in the Bible, and the Bible is the word of God; and this is enough for him. He reads, he believes, he admires and adores. And his great concern is, not vainly to speculate upon the revelations of God, but to form and sustain that holy character without which he knows he cannot meet his Judge in peace.



HINTS TO A YOUNG MINISTER, ON THE USE OF PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

My Dear Sir,

I AM happy in the confidence I feel that you possess the great elementary qualifications requisite in the sacred work on which you have entered. Compared with these qualifications, there are numerous minor things which are but as dust in the balance; and yet no wise preacher would wish to indulge himself in any careless infelicities of language, or in blunders of any sort, even in trifles, that might by any impossibility impair his usefulness in a holy and elevated calling. “*Hæ nugæ seriâ ducent.*”

My present object is, to caution you against some of these *nugæ* of the pulpit, the principal mischief of which is, that they may raise a question in hearers of intelligence, whether the preacher, who falls into them, has not something *trifling* in his character.

An example of my meaning you have in the substitution of the *plural* pronoun for the *singular*, where the preacher means *himself*. You may have observed this in some preachers of respectable sense and scholarship; and yet, if you undertake to analyze the usage, you can hardly fail to lose your gravity, the thing is so ridiculous.

In the first place, it is a gross violation of English *idiom*, and has no authority from the first orators of the language, either secular or sacred. About thirty years ago, here and there a preacher in England, and in this country, called *himself, we*,—in imitation of the French idiom. The same tribe of imitators caught at the rhetorical *ah!* of the French pulpit, and the *Mon Dieu!* and other profane invocations of God, introduced to ornament a sentence, in direct violation of Horace's canon, "Nec deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus inciderit." All this is gone by, except the partiality for the pronoun *we*, by which now and then a grave minister chooses to designate himself.

In the next place, as this usage violates English idiom, it of course leads to *confusion of sense*. All our grammarians have taught that *I* is a singular, and *We* a plural pronoun. If we do away this distinction by making them identical, or if we amalgamate both into one, the question arises, whether that one expresses unity or plurality of sense. In regal style, probably the king originally said *we*, meaning himself and court. And yet "*we*, George the IV," seems plainly to mean but *one man*; and the attempt to make out the rest of the sentence amounts to a burlesque on "the king's English." Take an example translated from a proclamation of the Russian Emperor; "*we* Alexander first, Autocrat of all the Russias, &c,—With respect to *ourselves*, we request all our subjects to offer up fervent prayers to God, that he may receive *our souls* into his everlasting kingdom." Now if a naughty tyro in grammar should ask his English teacher,—how am I to parse this sentence?—how many emperors does it take to make one man?—and how many *souls* has that man?—he could only be told that royal style is not intended to be *parsed*, like that of common sense; and especially that this style, in foreign idiom, is not subject to the laws of English grammar.

*Editors* too are a privileged class of men; though several individuals have so often been associated in this class by partnership, that *we*, as used in this case, is commonly understood to denote *plurality* of sense. "*We* the Editor,"—would now sound so strangely, that perhaps this word, in process of time, will come, like "tongs," "bellows," &c. to have no singular.

But allowing all convenient latitude to emperors and editors, what occasion has the Christian preacher to confound grammar and sense, in using the personal pronoun. For example, "*we* shall attempt my brethren, to establish the truth of the following proposition." Whom does the preacher mean by *we*? Himself and hearers?—or himself and other preachers?—or himself *only*? Neither the hearers who are present, nor the fraternity of preachers who are absent, have anything to do in proving that proposition. Why then should *one man* speak of himself in the *plural*, because he is in the pulpit, any more than if he were talking to a

tenth part of these hearers in a conference room, or to one of them in his study, or giving instruction to his child or domestic? Again; “*We* know that while, as a minister of Christ, it is our duty to urge you to repentance, *we* are a sinner before God, as well as you.” That the following examples are not occasional trips of haste is probable, because they are taken from sermons printed by their authors. “And now brethren, *we* affectionately ask, why is not this duty faithfully performed by *you* all? What is your objection?” That the preacher began this address as one man, is evident, because he continues it in the singular; “*I* know that *I* speak to some,” &c. and thus, for some time, *I* goes on with the exhortation which *we* had begun. Again; an address at an ordination has this instance, “*We* know well the anxieties that press upon your spirits at this solemn hour; for *we* have felt them all, and can tell you, after *seven year’s* experience, that there is just cause for them all.” The obscurity of sense is cleared up by a little reasoning, thus; the preacher could not mean, “*we* the assembly know,” &c. —for they had not been seven years in the ministry; nor *we* the ecclesiastical council,”—for it were marvellous that they should all have been ministers *just* seven years; but, “*we* the preacher know,” &c. This is the correct solution no doubt; for a little before, this plural preacher, calls the candidate *my* beloved brother,” and repeatedly says, “*we* speak not,” &c. and “*we* speak,” &c. in reference to what had been said by his single self.—In the following quotation I aim only at substantial not verbal exactness. *We* do not offer *ourselves* as a learned *expositor* of that revelation which God has given *us*; but *we* say that he is without excuse, who rejects the testimony of God, so often repeated by *us*, that he “gave his Son to die for *us*.” A revelation given to the preacher! A Saviour given to die for the preacher, in distinction from other men! His incongruous use of pronouns makes him say this; but surely this is not his meaning. One more instance may be added; it is a sentence with which I heard a minister begin his closing prayer after sermon. “*We* pray thee bless the truths which *we* have now dispensed to these dying hearers.” In a petition thus expressed, how could the assembly unite? The hearers had not been dispensing truth.

Now, my dear sir, if you have fallen into this solecism in pulpit phraseology, just look a moment at the simple language of Christ and the Apostles, and see what a strange transmutation of the New Testament would be made by such a blending of personal pronouns. One example from Paul must suffice. “Let no man think *us* a fool. Are they Hebrews? so *are we*. Are they Israelites? so *are we*,” &c. ‘Thrice *were we* beaten with rods; once *were we* stoned,” &c. What a curious address must this have been to the *Gentile* converts of Corinth?

But modesty offers its apology. 'Though an apostle might speak of himself in the first person, this would be *egotism* in a common man, especially a young man.' And what is *egotism*? Not using proper terms to express proper thoughts. It consists in a *spirit of ostentation* with which a man speaks of himself, and not in the words he uses. In illustration of this point, the following anecdote was some time since related, by a writer in one of our periodicals. "Among the theological pupils of the celebrated Dr. Bellamy, was a young man named B——, whose vanity was often offensive to his instructor, and who was one day reading for criticism a manuscript containing many sentences like this, "Such is *my* opinion, whatever others may think, and *I* am confident that *my* opinion is correct." At the close of such a sentence, the Doctor, in his peculiar, authoritative manner said, "Stop, B—— *I, I*, who is this *I*?" The writer adds, "When I hear a preacher, who seems to be nothing more than *one man*, saying to his hearers, —' *We* as an ambassador of the cross, exhort you to receive the truths which *we* have now delivered,' I often feel inclined to say, 'stop,—who is this *we*?' "

There are several other points of sagacious refinement in the phraseology of the pulpit, to which I should have called your attention, had I not extended the foregoing remarks beyond my own intentions. One of these is, the habit of some spruce young preachers, "righteous overmuch" in accuracy, who say, "the *first two* and the *last two*" verses of a psalm, instead of the *two first*, &c.

Perhaps at some convenient time I may give you some further hints on these "trifles" of our profession. In the meantime I am very sincerely yours, &c.

---

## REVIEWS.

REMAINS OF THE REV. CARLOS WILCOX, *Late Pastor of the North Congregational Church in Hartford, With a Memoir of his Life.* Hartford, Edward Hopkins. 1828. pp. 430.

Owing to circumstances beyond our control, we are obliged to pass upon this volume a much later and briefer notice than was originally intended, and than we think it deserves. In coming to speak of it, we can hardly forbear allusion to the emotions it excited, on its first appearance. It seemed like an affecting call to turn aside, and weep over the grave of him we loved. It assured us that death had entered one of the most sacred retreats of friendship, and sundered some of her tenderest ties;—that a standard bearer had fainted and fallen;—that a light was removed, which

had shone for a little time with unusual splendor, and in the view of which many were walking with safety and delight. We were impressed with these feelings, not simply because a volume of "Remains" had come before us: *We knew and loved the man* who had left them, and we pressed them to our bosom as a remembrancer of his worth.

Regard for the memory of a departed friend too often betrays survivors into acts of ill-judged kindness. They cannot rest, till they have told the whole story of his birth, and life, and death. A volume must vegetate from his grave, and they hold themselves tasked for its production. And then the stranger must read with their eyes, and feel with their sensibilities, and weep with their tears,—or he is accounted stupid. In such a state of things, it is not strange that occasionally there should come forth a work, which honors neither the memory of the dead, nor the judgment of the living. Such, however, is not the volume of Remains now before us; nor such, we feel assured, the feelings which gave it to the public. It is a volume, which will enrich the library both of the Christian, and the mere man of letters. It contains the history of one making his way into life, which many a youth may read with profit.

Mr. Wilcox, was born in Newport, N. H. in the year 1794. He descended from pious parents, and was baptized in infancy. His mother, on whom his early education principally devolved, says of his childhood:—

"As soon as he began to talk, I began to teach him to repeat the Lord's prayer, the Assembly's Catechism, and devotional Hymns. He was very active, and appeared much delighted with receiving instruction. He early showed a great fondness for books. When only two years old, he would often ask me to instruct him. When I was engaged in necessary domestic avocations, and informed him that he must wait, he would stay by me, or follow me with his book in his hand, until he had repeated his lessons. He could read and spell correctly before he attended any school. He was healthy, active, persevering in everything he did, whether at his lessons, work, or amusement." p. 10.

Observation, inquisitiveness, perseverance, manliness, were especially characteristic of his early years. On reaching his tenth year, he wounded himself severely in the knee, and by taking cold in the wounded limb, suffered excruciating pain for many months; nor did he ever recover from the consequences. This is of little importance here, save as it went to exhibit character, and to decide the destinies of his future life. His sick room was a place of uncommon interest. One of his physicians, who visited him but occasionally, "twenty years after could not speak of it without deep emotion." He was so interested "in his demeanor, and in the nobleness of his mind;" he saw "something so marked in his temper and manners, and so mature and judicious in his conversation," that he gave to his first son the name of the "little sufferer" who had so won his affections.

The lameness, which resulted from his wound, determined his father to assist him in obtaining a public education. He pursued his preparatory studies in an Academy at Castleton, Vermont. In his fifteenth year he entered Middlebury College. During the first year of his college life he became hopefully pious, and was led to devote himself to the future work of the ministry. In college, he distinguished himself in all the departments of study, but especially in the languages and belles lettres. Originality, neatness, purity and elevation, characterized his compositions. He was graduated with the highest honors of college. His valedictory oration, "On the reputation of greatness in the cause of humanity," showed that he was then capable of writing with distinguished excellence.

Having closed his college course, and spent part of a year in Georgia, in the Autumn of 1814 he returned, and entered upon the study of Theology in the Seminary at Andover. In the spring of 'his first year he delivered a funeral address, at the request of his class, on occasion of the death of one of its members. In doing this, he gave convincing evidence that his talents were of a superior order.

The constitution of his mind, his excitability, and his nervous temperament throughout, were those of a poet. In the original contexture of his soul, such was its delicacy, that it shrunk from the touch of everything polluting and earthly. He loved seclusion. He lived in other worlds, breathed other airs, basked in other suns, saw other seasons change. Owing to this peculiarity, so characteristic of poetical minds, he suffered keenly at times, while a member of the Seminary, from mental depression. In one of his letters he says :—

"I dread the sight of my pen and half written sermon. Sometimes I sit for whole days without advancing a single letter. I sit with my cheek leaning on the palm of my hand, and scarce a day passes in which I do not weep—walk my room with my hands clasped in anguish, and my eyes streaming with tears—sit for hours and gaze into the fire, or on vacancy, or out of the window, without noticing any particular object, or having any particular train of thought, but a deep feeling of indescribable wretchedness.

I dare not look at the setting sun, the placid and beautiful moon, the mild planet of the west, the pure blue heavens, the white flying clouds, the lofty mountain with its waving forests, the valley with its green meadows and crystal streams :—I dare not listen to the sweet bird that comes to the tree before my window, and sings from the fulness of its heart, pouring forth a stream of melody." p. 21.

Well might one of his confidential friends say to him in correspondence, "I have no objections to your drinking occasionally at the fount of Helicon, but I have great fears that you will tumble in and be drowned."

He closed his regular course of study at Andover, in the Autumn of 1817. From choice, however, he passed the subsequent winter at that favored place. The next spring he returned to his father's



house, where he spent a year in feeble health. During this period, he conceived definitely his plan of a poem to be entitled the "Age of Benevolence."

At the end of the year he commenced preaching, and for a twelve-month hardly failed a sabbath. From the spring of 1820, to that of 1822, he spent the time upon his favorite poem, and prepared the first Book for the press.

He now gave himself, in an improved state of health, to the preaching of the gospel, and in October 1824, received a call to settle over a newly organized Church and Society in Hartford. He sustained the office of pastor but about a year and a half, when the failure of his health led him to seek a dismissal. He was torn from the hearts of his people. Thirteen months brought him to his grave. During this period, he occasionally preached. His last days were in Danbury, where his body was buried. Subsequently it was removed to Hartford by the people of his former charge, and laid by the side of Dr. Strong.

We now turn more especially to the volume. It consists of a Memoir, from which the preceding sketch has been taken,—a collection of Poetical Remains, and fourteen Sermons. The Memoir consists principally of letters, written, doubtless, without the least expectation that they would ever be given to the public. Yet for purity of style, ease, dignity, and native simplicity, they will hardly suffer in any comparison. Much as we love Cowper, and fondly as we linger on the pages of his letters, we can turn to some presented in this volume, and realize no loss from the transition. The letter giving an account of his tour to the White Mountains, after the destructive slides in 1826, will ever be read with painful interest. In a letter from New Haven, he replies to his correspondent thus:—

"Ten thousand thanks for your delightful letter. It was put into my hands by H—, at a moment when I needed something to exhilarate my spirits. I had just been gazing in solitary pensiveness, over the beautiful elms of this city, as their thick and fresh foliage slept without motion in the light of a golden sun-set. I had looked till the city, with its deep green groves, was left in the shade, and only the spire of its loftiest tower, was shooting up into the region of brightness. I had watched the last beams, till they had climbed the glittering pinnacle, and vanished in mid-air; and with my eyes still fixed in their upward direction, and my head resting on my hand, as I sat alone at my window, I was musing on those bright visions of happiness, pursued by the imaginative youth, till they vanish in the clouds, and leave him to the dark realities of the world below,—when I was waked from my reverie, by the arrival of your letter. I read it again and again, till I felt completely restored to the region of common sense, and common life—the world of living, and acting beings of flesh and blood. The account that you give of the state of things in your society, reminds me that I am in a world where something must be done, besides musing and dreaming. But with all your matter-of-fact plainness, you have, now and then, a touch of the romantic. "The little tumbler keeps its place on the mantle piece, and frequently receives its potion of Scotch roses." This is to my liking. It is just as our friend Cowper would have written; and therefore it is just as it should be. "Your flowers have come up; but it is ten to one, if they do not get choked with potatoes and mustard, they being staple commodities here."

Well, let the flowers go ; for if they were good to make "nectar and cherubim broth," we, creatures of clay, must take up with potatoes and mustard. The flowers of poetry and fine sentiment are often choked to death by the eatables of this eating world." pp. 53, 54.

We give one gratulatory extract, addressed to those who had called him "brother :"—

"DEAR BROTHER AND SISTER,

"Your letter came to hand just in time to relieve me from the fear of being forgotten, and from the fear that all was not well with you. I am permitted to call you brother and sister. That word sister sounds very novel and sweet in my ear. I was never before permitted to call any one by the tender and endearing appellation. Permit me to congratulate you with all my heart on the birth of a young poetess. Does not the little stranger already begin to sing? Do not the bees begin to light on her lips, to sip honey while she sleeps in the cradle, as according to the fable they did upon those of Pindar?

We refer to one letter more. Soon after leaving Hartford, he writes back from Newport, R. I. thus :—

"I have just seated myself in my new lodgings. My room is in the third story, and the south-west corner. The west window looks over the town, and the south commands an enchanting view of the ocean, extending almost half around the horizon. I have been sitting for half an hour, with my eyes fixed on this circular expanse, admiring the beautiful blue, and the white sails moving over it. Fifteen or twenty are now in sight, scattered along the line where the sky and sea seem to meet. I have no reason yet to complain of fogs ; but the wind from the water is often too fresh for my comfort, and I fear for my health. The people here think a north wind the softest and sweetest of all the airs of heaven. What a world of contradictions is this? and what contradictory creatures are we that live in it. As long ago as the days of Horace, the rich and the gay of the city were forever talking of the beauty of fields, and groves, and lakes, and mountains, and sighing to enjoy them ; while the poor and plain people of the country were always admiring the palaces and pomp of the city, and panting to live in the midst. And now the inhabitants of the sea-board are praising the air from the country, and welcoming it, with great delight ; while those of the interior are quoting poetry about the cool breath of ocean, and opening all their windows and doors to invite it in." pp. 70 71,

On turning to the poetical Remains of Mr W., we find a poem of about a thousand lines, which he pronounced before the Phi-Beta-Kappa Society of Yale College, on the "Religion of Taste." Were not a necessity laid upon us, we would not pass this poem with simply giving its title. And with this necessity, we will venture to introduce the writer for a moment. He was captivated with the soft and airy beauties of a band of "Nymphs and Graces." He was full of trouble that he could not paint them. With a "pencil of soft sunbeams" dipped in a "rose and lily dew-drop," he oft essayed to catch their forms ; and they as oft, melting away, his skill eluded. He tells his troubles thus :—

I see them passing in the blended light  
Of their own forms, as in an atmosphere  
Of rosy lustre ;—but they mock my sight ;  
Now as they flit along in order clear  
Each seems herself, and now they all appear  
Lost in each other, like some sister band,  
Giving and taking loveliness, as here  
And there, they dance and mingle hand in hand ;  
Now in a sunny mist they vanish where they stand." p. 182

Besides this production, we find the unfinished parts of a didactic poem, which Mr. W. intended should be the grand fruit of his life. His theme was one of inspiring interest. His heart was full of it. He longed, with an angel's pen, to transcribe the Benevolence of heaven, to bring it down to earth, and here array it, so far as mortal could, in the resplendent glories of its native region.

Here it may be asked, Why did he not accomplish this favorite undertaking? And in reply, to cover the nakedness of our land, it might be said, he died too soon. The truth however is, he was under debts and must go to work to pay them; he must eat and drink to live, and must go to work for bread. Again and again did he lay aside his manuscripts, and bustle into the world to get some little pittance, with which he might once more retire, and expatiate on the theme that had so filled his soul. At length, sickened of earth, and with no raven, as Elijah had, to feed him, while he should draw, in earth's behalf, a portrait of heaven's brightest attribute, he laid down his harp, and fled to sing with angels what he could not sing with men. Thus do we, with confidence, account for one more blank page in that volume of native genius, at which so many from beyond the waters point the finger, and so many among us sigh.

He had proceeded so far, however, as to leave his general plan among his papers. This was, that the Poem should consist of five Books:—Book I. Benevolence the Glory of Heaven; II. Benevolence on Earth the Resemblance of Heaven; III. Need of Benevolence on Earth; IV. Rewards of Benevolence; V. Triumphs of Benevolence.

The first book, consisting of nearly two thousand lines, though published in a separate form some years since, has, much to our gratification, been republished in the Remains. Extracts are also published from the other books. Though we have never seen the manuscripts of the writer, we venture to express a regret that these extracts are so limited. From one of his confidential letters, it appears he had written as many as five thousand lines; whereas only about three thousand are published.

That Mr. W. did not mistake in cherishing his poetical genius, was the opinion of not a few men of discernment and distinction, while he was living. Several, after coming to know him, and especially after an examination of some of his papers, strenuously urged him to suspend everything else, that he might give the energies of his mind to the "Age of Benevolence." His letters show that not unfrequently he had to answer urgent requests to keep to his pen. Under one date we find him saying, "If I can have my health, I must preach, or do something to enable me to pay my debts. I cannot write poetry while I am thus embarrassed." Under another, he says, "I thank you a thousand times for your offer, but I cannot consent to accept of it. I cannot, because if I

should die before I become able to refund the loan, you might lose it." Numerous testimonies might be given as to the estimation in which Mr. W. was held as a poet ; but extracts we presume will be more satisfactory than testimony. And in making extracts, instead of trying to gratify a fastidious relish, by cutting a little slice here and there, we shall carve out a generous page from a single paragraph, leaving our readers to judge, whether we are caught by poetry, or sentiment, or both. It will be recollected that the theme, on which the third book of his principal poem was to proceed, is "The need of Benevolence on earth." The argument, so far as made out by the author, is "Profaneness, Sabbath-breaking, Intemperance, Slavery, War, the Heathen." Of the unfinished fragments on these topics, we select a page from that on Slavery. Looking out upon our nation, on one of her annual jubilees, and seeing her "sons of liberty" rallying—flourishing the sword—bidding the cannon roar—and exulting because they are free, the poet exclaims :—

"Your joy is merciless, while its glad sounds  
From more than half the land return in groans ;  
Throw down your banners lifted to the sky,  
They will not float in this impoisoned air.  
Away with feast and song, come, fast and weep—  
Away with all defiance and disdain  
Of foreign tyrants ; humbly mourn our own.  
For who are tyrants ? they that make men slaves.

With needful food supplied, the slave, say some,  
Desires no more, and void of care is blest.

And is it just  
To shut him from all rational delight  
Until he feel no wants but those of sense,  
Then call him happy, to excuse the crime ?  
Or is it then no blessing to be free ?  
And were they fools who struggled to obtain  
Our independence—to throw off a yoke  
Far less oppressive than the one we bind  
On Afric's sable sons ? Are they not tax'd ?  
Yes ! to the very blood that warms their veins.  
No rights have they, not one for self-defence.  
The master may inflict whate'er he will  
On this side death ! may lash, and maul, and kick,  
All which these eyes have seen ; may chain and yoke—  
And if the sufferer but a finger lift  
Against the madman to preserve his life,  
The law condemns him, friendless and unheard.

Hail, land of liberty ! Come, all ye kings  
And tyrants of the world, come near and view  
This land of liberty, where men are free  
To task, and scourge, and chain their fellow men  
At their own pleasure, and without the fear  
Of any human bar.  
O proud Columbia, hide thy towering head  
Low in the dust, in shame and penitence,  
Till from thy robes be wash'd the stain of blood ;  
Then, like a goddess rising from the sea,  
Then, rising in thy glory, prove thyself

'The queen of earth, the daughter of the skies.  
 I see thy glory with prophetic eye,  
 I see thee with thy crown of many stars  
 On thy fair head, and clothed in spotless robes,  
 Moving in state toward the Atlantic shore :  
 With one hand casting to the waves below  
 The last of all thy slave oppressing chains,  
 And with the other holding to thy breast  
 The book of God. I hear the shouts of joy  
 That ring from end to end of thy domain.  
 I hear the sounds prolong'd from wave to wave,  
 And now they strike and echo on the coast  
 Of joyful Africa. The time will come—  
 Sure as the groans of earth shall all be lost  
 In the hosannas of millennial bliss—  
 The time will come, when slavery shall cease.  
 O for some Wilberforce to lead the van !  
 To rise and say, ' It must and shall be done ;'  
 To rise the hundredth time, unaw'd by frowns,  
 Undamp'd by failures, and repeat the same,  
 Till victory crown him with a fairer wreath  
 Than hero ever won or poet feign'd."

We now pass to the other department of the volume, viz. the Sermons. And in describing them, we shall not say that they surpass all other sermons, or that, in trains of thought or beauties of style, they admit of no comparison. But we do say, that they are evidently the production of a highly cultivated mind, a refined taste, and a devoted heart. Truth is happily unfolded, by clear thought, strong argument, and pertinent illustration. Piety is portrayed and commended, as with an unction from the Holy One. And not unfrequently a poetical genius throws over the whole the charms of taste, and the living images of a chastened yet glowing imagination. If the writer does not, like Irving, astonish with the magnificence of his machinery and the circumstantial pomp and parade of his rhetoric, so neither does he, like Blair, prune away the luxuriance of a lively fancy, and obliterate the images of her creation, merely to purchase what a fastidious critic might chance to call correctness of style. Mr. W. evidently gained, previous to utterance, a clear apprehension of the sentiment, the metaphor, or the train of illustration which he intended to present. It seems to have been floating on the surface of his mind, like a vessel with her last yard of canvass spread ; and when he takes his pen, the conception sails forth to view, like that vessel from behind an island.

Perhaps we shall best give an idea of Mr. W. as a preacher, by a short analysis of a single sermon. And the interest we feel in the rising generation, and not any superiority in that sermon over the others, leads us to select the fifth, which is from the text, "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth, while the evil days come not, nor the years draw nigh, when thou shalt say, I have no pleasure in them." Eccl. xii. 1.

"It is often the practice of the sacred writers," says the preacher in introducing his subject, "to express the whole of religion by some essential and prominent part of it. They call it 'the *knowledge* of God,' 'the *fear* of the Lord,' and 'the *wisdom* that is from above.' In exhorting men to become religious, they often think it enough to exhort them to the performance of some one of the essential and prominent duties of religion. For each of these particular exhortations there exists an appropriate reason. The specific object of the text is, to excite to the practice of early piety; and the specific object of the present discourse is, to exhibit to the younger part of my audience motives to induce them to become pious now in the days of their youth."

But here, perhaps, the impenitent among the aged will say to the preacher,

"In exhibiting the peculiar facilities of the young for obtaining an interest in the salvation of Christ, 'You give to our condition a sad, disheartening aspect. In showing to the young the brightness of their prospect, you show us the gloominess of our own. We, of all men, most need to hear the language of encouragement. Instead of being told of the obstacles in our way, we should be told of every possible facility which our condition admits.'"

To such persons the address is pertinent:—

"If you are made to feel the impediments under which you labor, what is so likely as this feeling, to rouse you to immediate and successful efforts, in the work of your salvation? If you are sensible of the multiplied hindrances in your way," what may more suitably be expected of you, than that, as "you look back, over the waste of years to the morning of life," you should, "from the borders of the eternal world, echo back the command of God to the young, 'Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth, while the evil days come not, nor the years draw nigh, when thou shalt say, I have no pleasure in them.'"

The preacher now proceeds to urge motives to induce the young to become pious. The first is, "Their susceptibility of religious impression."

"Youth is particularly the season of feeling. The heart is then comparatively tender; and the conscience is seldom seared, as it often is in riper years. The truths of revelation are directed ultimately to the conscience and heart. The understanding must indeed be won; but only as ground on which to stand, and push the conquest forward to the moral faculties of the soul. Hence, that tenderness of conscience and heart, so general in youth, renders it a season peculiarly favorable for the reception of divine truth in its all-subduing power. When will the love of Christ, the sufferings of Calvary, the wonders of redemption, the holiness of God and his law, and the glories and terrors of the coming judgement, call forth the tears of deep and cordial penitence, if not in the susceptibility of youth?"

"A second motive to induce the young to enter upon the service of God without delay, is, Their freedom from long confirmed habits of transgression.

"Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then may he, who has long been accustomed to do evil, learn to do well.' When a man has lived fifty or sixty years in the neglect of prayer, for instance, with how many difficulties will he meet in the commencement of this duty at this late period; especially in its commencement as an act of family worship, in the midst of children whom he never taught to pray by precept or example, never instructed in the doctrines and duties of Christianity, and never restrained from the company and practices of the irreligious. The mental agony of the parent in such circumstances, while he hears, or, with conscience all awake in view of his past life, imagines that he hears, among his thoughtless children, the half stifled laugh of contempt, and the noise of wearisome constraint, has sometimes overcome, for a while at least, his best resolutions, and driven him well

nigh to the renunciation of all his hopes of the favor of God and the rewards of his kingdom.

“A third motive to early piety is, The happiness attending its exercise.

“The pleasures of vital religion consist in deliverance from the reigning and destroying power of unhallowed passions; in a growing conformity to the holy character and perfect law of God; in the exercise of devout, benevolent, heavenly affections; in the favor of God, and the approving whispers of a good conscience; in the humble hope of present and everlasting forgiveness of sin; in that settled calm of the soul, which cannot be entirely broken up by any or all of the agitations of the world; and in the sustaining, animating prospect of the full enjoyment of God in the midst of his holy and happy family in heaven forever. What has the world to present to you, my young friends, that can for a moment bear the most distant comparison with these pure, substantial, divine pleasures of the child of God?

“A fourth motive to early piety is, Its power to preserve from the snares of the world.

“Who can safely venture forth in the busy world, without the guiding and protecting influence of the religion of Christ? What but this will certainly preserve the inexperienced youth from being led far astray by vicious companions, to the destruction of his character, his peace and that of his friends, and to the annoyance of society, till he terminate his career in the infamy of the dungeon or of the scaffold? What but this will certainly preserve him from the gulf of intemperance, which every year swallows up the reputation, domestic comfort, health, fortunes, lives, and souls of thousands? If the restraints of divine grace be withheld, who can set bounds to human depravity?

“A fifth motive to early piety is, The exposure to early death.

“There is no order in death. The eldest of a family, for instance, does not uniformly die first, and then the next in age, and so on to the youngest. The whole multitude of the living, from the man tottering beneath the weight of fourscore years down to the infant of yesterday, are all confounded together, and the arrows of death are flying among them promiscuously in every direction.

“A sixth motive to early piety is, The fact that almost all the pious become such in early life.

“It is beyond all dispute that by far the greater part of the followers of Christ become such in youth. The young come not one by one into the courts of the Lord to profess their allegiance to him, but flock together, and crowd the sacred gates. It is from among them that converts to righteousness are multiplied as the drops of the morning dew.

“Another motive to early piety is, The particular promise of God in its favor. ‘They that seek me early shall find me.’

“One more motive to early piety is, The obligation of mankind to give to God the best of their days.

“Under the reign of the Mosaic law, the best of the flocks, and the first ripe fruits of the field, were required by God as a sacrifice to himself. And shall we spend our strength, and health, and activity, in the service of the world, and then offer to God our weakness and infirmity?

“There is still another motive to piety in youth. It is the one brought to view in the text, viz. A consideration of the ‘evil days’ of after life.

“It must be dreadful, my young friends, to drag out the evil days of old age without the supports and consolations of religion—dreadful to go stumbling down the hill of life into the valley of the shadow of death, without a lamp to guide the dim eye along the dreary way, or an arm to bear up the sinking frame—to behold the world receding till almost out of sight, and still no heaven of glory opening to view—to see the shades of night fast gathering round, without any good hope of the morning of an eternal day.

“Not long since, a young man in the vigor of health, with the fairest prospect of a long and prosperous life, was thrown from a vehicle, and conveyed to the nearest house, in a state that excited instant and universal alarm for his safety. A physician was called. The first question of the wounded youth was, ‘Sir, must I die? must I die? deceive me not in this thing.’ His firm tone and penetrating look demanded an honest reply. He was told that he could not live more than an hour. He waked up, as it were, at once, to a full sense of the dreadful reality. ‘Must I then go into eternity in an hour? Must I

appear before my God and Judge in an hour? God knows that I have made no preparation for this event. I knew that impenitent youth were sometimes cut off thus suddenly, but it never entered my mind that I was to be one of the number. And now what shall I do to be saved? He was told that he must repent and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. 'But how shall I repent and believe? Here is no time to explain the manner—Death will not wait for explanation—The work must be *done*. The whole business of an immortal being in this probationary life is now crowded into one short hour—and that is an hour of mental agony and distraction.' Friends were weeping around, and running to and fro in the frenzy of grief. The poor sufferer, with a bosom heaving with emotion, and an eye gleaming with desperation, continued his cry of 'What shall I do to be saved?' till, in less than hour, his voice was hushed in the stillness of death.

"But if you, my young friends, will not listen to the voice of heavenly wisdom—if you will break through all this array of motives, and, in spite of them all, live as you list—why, go on a little longer. It can be but a little.—'Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth, and let thine heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thy heart and in the sight of thine eyes;—give yourself up to the pursuit of vanity; hurry away from one scene to another of dissipating and riotous mirth; raise the song of midnight revelry; make as much of the world as you can; resist the striving Spirit of mercy; stifle the rising conviction of conscience; disregard the entreaties and admonitions of pious friendship; make a mock at sin, and the everlasting burnings of hell; live a few more precious days of grace in forgetfulness of your Creator, 'but know thou,'—yes, 'know thou—that for all these things—God will bring thee into judgement.'" pp. 285—296.

Let our youthful readers remember, in conclusion, that the writer of this sermon is gone, in early life, to the judgement seat of Christ, to reap, as we trust, the blessedness of complying with the exhortation in the text. He remembered his Creator in the days of youth, *before the evil days came*. He early devoted himself to Christ—he endured to the end—and he found the promise verified, "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee." He died exclaiming, "The Saviour! O all heaven praises him; let the whole earth praise him; let all intelligent beings praise him! Eternity is too short to praise God and the Lamb!"

---

ANNOTATIONS ON THE NEW TESTAMENT; COMPILED FROM THE BEST CRITICAL AUTHORITIES, AND DESIGNED FOR POPULAR USE. *By J. P. Dabney.* Cambridge: Hilliard and Brown. 1829. pp. 562.

There is scarcely an employment on earth to which is attached a higher responsibility, than that of an expositor of the Bible. Here is a book claiming to be a revelation from God to men, and to disclose to them (as might be expected if its claim is valid) the most interesting and important things;—things relating, not only to this world, but the untried future; not only to the concerns of the body, but the everlasting destiny of the soul. An individual receives this extraordinary communication, and undertakes to explain it for the benefit of others. What higher responsibility



can he assume? What weightier interests can he take upon him to direct? If he mislead his fellow travellers to the eternal world, what shall become of them? and what shall become of him? If the blind lead the blind, shall they not both be destroyed together?

The work before us is entitled "Annotations on the New Testament." From the title it would be inferred that it was intended as an explanation of the whole New Testament. This, however, is not the case, as no exposition of the Revelation is attempted, and of the other books, not a quarter of the verses are explained at all.

The work also professes to be a compilation "from the best critical authorities;" and the names of Calvin, Beza, Doddridge, &c., are inserted, as among the authors from whom extracts are taken. Accordingly, the work has been represented, by persons interested to give it circulation, as rather of a neutral character, and not likely to contravene the opinions of any. But this account of it, as will be abundantly manifest before we are through, is altogether deceptive; and those who expect to find in it any of the distinguishing sentiments of Orthodox commentators will be sadly disappointed.

Mr. Dabney commences with a sentence of condemnation upon the common version of the New Testament.

"The compiler has known no impediment, in the prosecution of this work, like that growing out of the necessity forced upon him, of taking, as the basis of his labors, the Received or Public Version. He was wholly unsuspecting, when he began, of the extent of the mistakes, which the negligence, prejudice, or ignorance of its authors had created." p. vi.

We are far from identifying the common version of the New Testament with the New Testament itself; or from pretending that, unlike other human performances, it does not partake of imperfection. But where—in the present state of things among those who speak the English language—where shall we look for a better translation? or from what quarter are we likely to receive a better? Compared with the "liberal translations" for which we are invited by Unitarians to exchange it, as those of Harwood, Wakefield, and the misnamed Improved Version, it is entitled, we had almost said, to an infinite preference. Indeed, we hold it degrading to the common version to bring it into any such comparison.

It may be a question, hereafter, on whom the responsibility of the work before us rests. To be sure, Mr. D. is the compiler of it; but if charged with holding the sentiments it contains, he will perhaps say, 'I did not write the book; I am not its *author*; I have merely collected and exhibited the opinions of others.' Or if the responsibility should be fastened upon Mr. Dabney, Unitarians may demand, 'And who is this Mr. Dabney? What connexion has he with us? Or what authority has he to speak on

our behalf?"—The facts in the case, however, are very plain. The book is actually published, under the signature of Mr. D. If he did not think the sentiments contained in it worthy of notice and credence, why did he publish them? And as to leading Unitarians, they have made themselves, in a sense, responsible for the work, by their high commendation of it. The *Christian Register* has been puffing it, and exciting expectation in regard to it, almost ever since it was announced. And no sooner was the publication completed, than it was ushered into life, by the conductors of that paper, in the following terms :

"This work, which we have frequently remarked upon with approbation, as the successive numbers of it came from the press, is now completed. A perusal of the whole in connexion has convinced us that the *commendations* we have from time to time bestowed on the separate parts, *were not extravagant*. We have no hesitation in saying, that there is not another volume in the English language, of the same size, from which the unlearned student of this portion of the sacred writings can derive so valuable assistance in his biblical inquiries."\*

The work has now been for several months before the public, and no contradictory sentiment, so far as we know, has been expressed. We may fairly infer, therefore, that it meets with general approbation, and expresses the prevailing sentiments of leading Unitarians at the present day.

It was to be expected that, in a Unitarian commentary, certain important doctrines, such as the Divinity of Christ, the Divinity and personality of the Holy Spirit, depravity, regeneration, atonement, &c. would have no place ; and that all likely means would be employed to put a wrong construction on the passages in which these doctrines are inculcated. In this respect, the work of Mr. D. will meet the expectations of all his readers. But in regard to some other points, we confess he has exceeded our expectations. He has made a disclosure of Unitarian opinions, not beyond what we supposed was believed, but beyond what, in this country, is often published to the world. It will be necessary, in illustration of this remark, to descend to particulars.

1. An attempt is here made to explain away all those passages which speak of the *pre-existence* of Christ, and of his possessing a nature *superior to the human*.

When our Saviour speaks of being "in heaven" (John iii. 13.) the meaning, we are told, is, not that he then was, in any sense, "in heaven," but that he was "entirely possessed of the Father's favor and confidence." By his "coming down from heaven" (same verse) we are to understand that he was commissioned to "communicate the Father's counsels to the world." His "coming from above" (v. 31.) means, that he exhibits "clear evidence of a Divine authority ;" and his being "above all," (same verse,) that he is superior to "the prophets who preceded him."

\* August 22, 1829.

“What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up *where he was before?*” John vi. 62. This is represented as referring to “Christ’s *resurrection*,” or to his rising from the grave to a life on earth, “where he was before” his decease.

“Glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee *before the world was.*” John xvii. 5. Christ here speaks, we are told, of the glory which he had from eternity, “*in the Father’s purpose and decree*,” or which the Father from eternity decreed to give him.\*

“Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that *though he was rich*, yet for your sakes he *became poor.*” 2 Cor. viii. 9. Here is no reference, it is said, to “a *transition* from a higher and happier, to an inferior condition;” but only that when “our Saviour had the means of wealth, by the miraculous powers conferred upon him,” he chose to remain poor.

Our Saviour is spoken of in these Annotations as “a mortal man,” “a crucified man,” &c. pp. 147, 330. As this is not to be understood, of course, in the Trinitarian sense, or that Christ was God as well as man; it must be understood in the Unitarian sense, or that Christ possessed no nature superior to the human. He was “a mortal man,” and nothing more.

2. There is an attempt, in the work before us, to explain away the passages which speak of the *separate existence of the soul*.

When our Lord raised the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue, it is said that “her *spirit* came again.” Luke viii. 55. This only means, says Mr. D., that “her *breath*” came again; and remarking on the common opinion that this passage teaches “the separate subsistence of the soul,” he adds, “Such reasoning it is not easy to enter into, or understand.”—The prayer of Stephen, “Lord Jesus, receive my *spirit*,” is understood to mean no more than this, Receive “my *life*, or *last breath*;”—and the declaration of James, that “the body without the *spirit* is dead,” (ii. 26.) imports only that the body “without *breath*” is dead.

“I pray God your whole *spirit*, and *soul*, and *body*, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.” 1 Thess. v. 23. Referring to the distinction here made between the “spirit, and soul, and body,” Mr. D. remarks, that “Paul does not hereby mean to approve, still less to teach, this, or any theory on the subject.”—God is spoken of by the apostle as “the Father of *spirits*,” (Heb. xii. 9.) which, we are told, is but saying that he is “our spiritual Father.”—“The spirits in prison,” spoken of by Peter, (1 Peter iii. 19.) are interpreted to mean “the *Gentile world*, who were in bondage to idolatry, ignorance, and vice.”

\* Unitarians can be strenuous for the doctrine of Divine decrees, when it suits their purpose.

3. If there is no soul separate from the body, but the whole man is material; then there can be no state of conscious existence between death and the resurrection. Accordingly, in the work before us there is a labored effort to explain away the passages which refer to such an intermediate state.—Speaking of the appearance of Moses and Elias at the transfiguration of Christ, (Matt. xvii. 4.) Mr. D. observes, that on the supposition those patriarchs *really* appeared, (which is represented as doubtful,) “it merely shows that *they* were already in a glorified state, even though *the rest of mankind might be still under the dominion of death.*”

“I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead, but of *the living.*” (Mat. xxii. 32.) On this passage it is remarked, that “our Lord herein goes upon the supposition that *there is no intermediate state in which the soul subsists, separately from the body.*”—Of the story of the rich man and Lazarus, (Luke xvi. 19.) it is said, “This parable has been applied to support the notion of the consciousness of the soul in a separate state; but *with very little reason.*”—Our Lord declared to the repenting thief, “*To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.*” But this is got over by saying, that “the phrase *to-day* imports simply assurance and certainty, being applied to things decreed and determined, though *not transpiring till some time afterwards.*” So that the thief was only assured that he should be in paradise at some *indefinite future period*, after the resurrection.

4. The work before us uniformly proceeds on the supposition, that there are no such beings as “the devil and his angels.”—The demoniacs of the New Testament were only diseased persons; and the language of our Saviour and the inspired writers respecting them was the result, either of their ignorance, or of their willing conformity to the superstitious notions of the times.—“The term Satan,” it is said, “is applied by Jesus to an *allegorical personage*, the *supposed* cause of all evil, natural and moral, and who, before his coming, had reigned in the world without control.” p. 105.—Speaking of the account given us in the first chapter of Job, it is said,

“This representation is an allegory, founded on the idea of God’s keeping a court, like that of an eastern prince, and holding on certain days, what we now call a levee, when his chief ministers attend upon him to show their respect and to receive his orders. This figurative description, therefore, gives no authority for hence inferring the *real existence either of Satan or his angels.*” p. 397.

“Ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the *Prince of the power of the air,*” &c. Eph. ii. 2.

“This refers,” we are told, “to a Jewish tradition that the air was inhabited by evil spirits: whose imaginary ruler had power to regulate the changes of the atmosphere. Paul speaks naturally as a Jew, agreeably to these prevalent notions; yet not thereby giving any countenance to so unworthy and improbable a fancy.” p. 423.

“If God spared not the *angels that sinned*, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgement.” (2 Peter ii. 4.) “And the *angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation*, he hath reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness, unto the judgement of the great day.” Jude 6.

These fallen angels are supposed by some *rational* Christians to signify “those antediluvians who are called (Gen. vi. 2.) the *sons of God*, and who, with the rest of the old world, were destroyed in the deluge.” By others, no less *rational*, they are supposed to signify “the spies who were sent out by Moses to explore the land of Canaan.” For their sin, in bringing “back an evil report of the land,” they “were struck with a *judicial blindness of mind*, and in the judgement of the great day, *the day of the plague*, they were destroyed.”

In different parts of this commentary, the words Satan, devil, devils, &c., are understood to mean “bodily evils or maladies,” p. 111; “the persecuting power,” p. 230; “the persecuting Jews,” p. 328; “deified men,” p. 358; “the civil abettors of the pagan superstition,” p. 381; “heathen adversaries,” p. 432; “ill disposed persons,” p. 459; “the giants, or ghosts of the dead,”\* p. 527; “the false accuser,” p. 629; “the calumniator,” p. 540; &c. &c.

5. If there are no such beings as fallen angels, and if men have no souls to be happy or miserable separate from the body; it follows, of course, that there is not now, and never has been, any *place of suffering* in the other world. For who is there in that world to suffer? There are no fallen, miserable angels; and departed men are all slumbering unconsciously in their graves. Accordingly, the general course of remark in the work before us goes to obscure the plain language of the Bible in regard to future punishment, and do away the whole force of the subject by involving it in suspicion and uncertainty. “The original word rendered *hell*, denotes strictly the valley of Hinnom.”\* p. 73. “The wrath to come,” signifies “the vengeance about to be taken on the Jewish nation.” p. 91. “According to the *popular belief* [the superstition] of the Jews, the demons were to be sent, in due time, to some place of punishment under the earth, or under the sea, until which they were to range at large.” p. 101. In speaking of the hell in which the rich man was tormented, and between which and heaven a great gulf was fixed, we are referred for illustration to the fabulous notion of the Greeks, “that Hades

\* As it is denied that there are literally any “ghosts of the dead,” here must be a sort of *double personification*, one resting upon another.

† As this word is used in the New Testament, does it “denote strictly the valley of Hinnom”? We know the origin and literal meaning of this Greek word; but in what sense was it used by our *Saviour and his apostles*? See an article on this subject in the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, vol. i. p. 573.

included the states of Elysium and Tartarus, with the river Cocytus or Acheron between them." p. 120. When Judas, the son of perdition, went "to his own place," (Acts i. 25.) we are told that he went into "*the grave*, the place which he now occupies." p. 223. The "sin unto death," (1 John v. 16.) has "no relation," it is said, "to spiritual death," but to "diseases inflicted as a punishment for sin," which the elders had no power to heal. p. 554. The fallen angels being "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgement of the great day," merely signifies that the false spies "were struck with a judicial blindness of mind, and that in the judgement of the great day, the *day of the plague*, they were destroyed." p. 557. The apostle tells us that "Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them are set forth for an example, suffering the *vengeance of eternal fire*." (Jude 7.) Here is thought to be no reference to future punishment, but only to these "cities as having been finally destroyed."

Persons who explain the Bible after this manner may pretend what they please ;—they may affect to despise Universalists ; may express an occasional regret at the prevalence of Universalism ; may interlard an expression, here and there, implying that they do not embrace the doctrine ; and children may be gulled by artifices such as these : The truth is, they are themselves laboring to bring in and extend Universalism, to the utmost of their power.

6. The objection to the existence of fallen spirits is not so much, it may be presumed, to the idea that they are fallen, as to the idea that they are spirits. The notion of an order of beings that are not material, but purely spiritual, is one which the most *rational* Christians find it "not easy to enter into, or understand." The objection is as strong, therefore, against the existence of holy angels, as of fallen ones. Accordingly, in the work before us, most of the passages in the New Testament which speak of the existence of *holy angels* are assailed, with the intent to explain them away. "By the term *angel*," we are told, "the instruments of God's providence, of whatever kind or name, are described in Scripture." p. 8. Again: "In the language of Scripture, the instrumentality, whatever it be, which God makes use of to execute his purposes, is described by the term *angels*." p. 120.

After our Saviour's temptation, "*angels* came and ministered unto him," (Mat. iv. 11.) which only means that "he received miraculous refreshment."—Of Christ's "little ones," it is said, that "in heaven *their angels* do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." (Mat. xviii. 10.) This, we are told, is no more than "an emblematical representation of the care of Providence over little children."

"An *angel* went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water." (John v. 3.) "Its occasional fluctuation,

which proceeded from some secret, unknown cause, was, in the popular language, said to proceed from the agency of an angel."

"Who having received the law by the disposition of *angels*," &c. (Acts vii. 53.) "It [the law] was ordained by *angels* in the hand of a Mediator." (Gal. iii. 19.) These angels, in the first instance, are said to be "Moses, Aaron, Joshua, and the succession of prophets in the Jewish church." In the second instance, Moses is represented as the mediator; and "the angels are the loud sounds, the cloud, the fire, the quaking of the mountain, and the voice by which Jehovah gave his commands."

The apostle speaks of our Saviour as "being made much better than the *angels*," &c. "For unto which of the *angels* said he at any time, Thou art my Son," &c. "Let all the *angels* of God worship him." (Heb. i. 4—6.) These angels are represented as the preceding *prophets*, Moses, David, Solomon, &c.—"Of the *angels* he saith, Who maketh his *angels* spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire." (verse 7.) Angels here are thought, "beyond doubt," to signify the *winds*.—"Are not they [the *angels*] all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" (verse 14.) Here again the angels are represented as "the former *prophets*." The *prophets* are also said to be the angels spoken of by Peter, when he affirms, "Into which things the *angels* desired to look." (1 Pet. i. 12.)—Angels, in other parts of this commentary, are made to signify, "armies," p. 40; "human messengers," p. 236; "servants," p. 495; "rulers and teachers in the Jewish church," p. 427; &c.

7. We find, in these Annotations, a very singular and suspicious interpretation of certain passages which relate to the *general judgement*. Take the following as examples.

"It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the *day of judgement*, than for you." (Mat. xi. 22.) Here, and in the many parallel passages, there is said not to be "the least reference to the day of general judgement," but only to the calamities which were coming on the Jewish nation. pp. 20, 68, 104.

Speaking of the declarations, that "the saints shall judge the world," and "judge angels," (1 Cor. vi. 2, 3,) and "of Christ's putting some on his *left* hand, and others on his *right*," it is said, "All this is *figurative* language." "What it is that is to be understood by it, we cannot at present know." p. 341.

As has been observed already, "the *judgement of the great day*," to which the fallen angels are reserved "in everlasting chains under darkness," is interpreted to mean "the *day of the plague*," in which the spies, who brought back an evil report of Canaan, were destroyed.\* (See Numb. xiv. 36, 37.)

\* Many of our readers will recollect an article lately published in the *Christian Examiner*, (vol. v. p. 443.) one object of which was to show, that "judgement is something which takes place in each one's own soul;" that "there is no outward mode

8. We may note, further, the singular interpretation given in this work of many passages which speak of *salvation* and *heaven*.

“Then said one unto him, Lord, are there few that *be saved*?” (Luke xiii. 23.) This question is represented as not relating to “eternal salvation,” but to deliverance from “the destruction impending over Jerusalem.”

“Neither is there *salvation* in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must *be saved*.” (Acts iv. 12.) The salvation spoken of in this verse is said to be, not eternal salvation, but “*healing*,” or “*restoration* to soundness.”

“What must I do to *be saved*?” (Acts xvi. 30.) This question of the jailer is supposed to “refer *entirely* to his personal security with his superiors, about which he was naturally concerned, upon awaking in alarm,” and finding the doors open.\*

“If the righteous scarcely *be saved*,” &c. (1 Peter iv. 18.) The meaning of this is said to be, “If the believing Jews shall with difficulty *escape* the destruction of their city.”

“Rejoice, because your names are written *in heaven*.” (Luke x. 20.) Heaven here is thought to signify, not heaven, but “a state of peculiar *privileges* and *means*, which the disciples would not forfeit without great folly and guilt.”—In various places in this commentary, heaven is made to signify “the Jewish church;” “the whole body of believers,” the general community of Christians, &c. See pp. 428, 448.

9. There are many passages of Scripture, not falling under either of the preceding heads, the interpretation of which in the work before us is so very singular, and in several instances so ridiculous, that we cannot forbear to notice them.—Of the temptation of our Saviour, (Mat. iv. 1—11.) the following account, we are told, “has been preferred by most rational Christians.”

“This narrative imports simply, an *internal* or *mental conflict*. Jesus, emaciated in body, as from his severe and abstemious living, he may well be supposed; pondering on the late extraordinary scene (at his baptism); his thoughts, in consequence, anxiously turned to the future; his mind tends not unnaturally, under the influence of a solitude so deep, silent, and romantic, to doubt and despondence. Thus circumstanced, the obstacles and trials with which he would have to contend, and *doubts as to the evidence of his own Messiahship!!* spread themselves out in formidable array before his mind, which after the Jewish modes of thought and expression, are described by an adversary coming and making to him successive propositions. The faith and piety of Jesus, though severely exercised, surmounted these trials, and they, who were to succeed him as preachers of his religion, were taught under this parable, a lesson of constancy, and of confidence in God.” p. 7.

“The world was made by him, and the world knew him not.” (John i. 10.) The *world* that was made by Christ is represented

or form to it;” that “this spiritual judgement takes place, in a measure, and perhaps very often, in the present world;” and that “*the last day*, spoken of in the Scriptures, is *the last day of each individual's mortal life*.”

\* Consequently, the apostle directed him to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, that he might be *saved*—from the displeasure of his superiors!!



as the *new creation, new and holy creatures*, who are made such through the influence of his doctrines. But this "world *knew him not.*" Is it true, then, that those, who are new created in Christ Jesus, *do not know him!*!

It is represented in this commentary, that Christ did not "continue all night in prayer to God," (Luke vi. 12.) but only that he tarried all night "in an *oratory*;" that the "one thing needful," (Luke x. 42.) means "*one dish only* for my refreshment;" that the crowing of the cock, which aroused the back-slidden Peter, was not the crowing of a cock, but *the sound of a trumpet*," p. 132; that the declaration, "by one man's disobedience many were made sinners," (Rom. v. 19.) only means, that many were "brought into a state of *mortality*;" that the Rock in the wilderness, which the apostle says "was Christ," (1 Cor. x. 4.) was not *Christ*, but "Moses;" that "this present evil world," (Gal. i. 4.) means "the bondage of the Mosaic economy;" that "the reproach of Christ," which Moses preferred to "the treasures in Egypt," (Heb. xi. 26.) was not the reproach of *Christ*, but "of the *anointed people*;" that "the spirit of Christ," which moved the ancient prophets, (1 Pet. i. 11.) was not the spirit of *Christ*, but only a "prophetical spirit;" and that "the Lord who bought" even those that deny him, (2 Pet. ii. 1.) is not Jesus Christ, but the Father.

Several of the interpretations in the work before us, if divested of their set phraseology, and exhibited distinctly to the mind, become the merest truisms.

"Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Mat. xviii. 3.) The meaning of this, we are told, is, "Unless ye be *changed* in your views and notions, ye cannot become *my followers.*" But the being "converted," or "changed," in the sense here intended, is actually to commence following Christ. The sense put upon the passage is therefore this, 'Unless ye become the followers of Christ, ye cannot become his followers'!!

"In the beginning was the Word." (John i. 1.) "The *Word*," here, is allowed to signify *Christ*; and "by the phrase, *In the beginning*, is meant" the beginning "of the ministry of Christ." The following, then, is the sense of the passage; 'In the beginning of Christ's ministry, Christ was;' or 'Christ actually existed when his public ministry commenced'!!

"The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." (Acts ii. 47.) "The salvation in this text" is interpreted to mean, the mere "*admission*, by baptism upon faith and repentance, to the Christian society," or church. Consequently, the declaration in the passage amounts to no more than this: 'The Lord added to the church daily such as were added to the church'!!

In quoting from these Annotations, we have given what is published with approbation in the work, as the *sentiment of the work*, without specifying the different authors from whom Mr. D. has selected his explanations. We have been obliged in some instances to abbreviate, but have endeavored to give the true sense of passages, and to represent them fairly. Our object has been to *expose*, rather than *refute*, the interpretations on which we have remarked. Indeed, it would be idle to attempt refuting them. We might as well refute the theology of the Iliad, or of the sixth book of Virgil.

The impression, and the permanent effect, produced by this publication, will be different, upon different classes of readers. Some, into whose hands it may fall, will, doubtless, be *shocked* by it. As they read, they will exclaim, 'Is this then Unitarianism—with its lofty pretensions, and with all its boasted respect for the Bible! Is this the system which has been palmed upon these churches, in place of the holy religion of the Pilgrims! No atoning Saviour, no sanctifying Spirit, no soul separate from the body, no world of spirits, and no Bible of intelligible meaning; what is there left to us which is worth our keeping? And why should we adhere to a system thus empty, negative, and lifeless?'

The effect of the work upon other minds will be, to break whatever hold religion has had upon them, free them more entirely from restraint, and make them the victims of a cold and cheerless skepticism. 'If this man may put such strange and whimsical interpretations upon the Bible, another may put others equally strange, and who can determine anything about it? And why should we trouble our hearts concerning that, about which we must be in endless uncertainty? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.'

There is indeed a class, who will be pleased with this work; who will consider it an advance, as it really is, upon the speculations, or rather the *disclosures*, of *rational* Christians in this country; and who will echo back the commendations which leading Unitarians have already passed upon it: "*We have no hesitation in saying, that there is not another volume in the English language, of the same size, from which the unlearned student of this portion of the sacred writings can derive so valuable assistance in his biblical inquiries.*"\*

The religious disputes which agitate this part of the country have already come to the point, where it was long ago predicted they must come, 'Is the Bible the word of God? And, *in its plain obvious meaning*, is it to be received, or not? If these questions are to be answered in the affirmative, Orthodox Christians desire no more. But if they shall be decided in the negative, leading Unitarians will have gained their object. If the Bible is the word of God, and if all which it plainly teaches respecting

\* Christian Register.

the Father, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit, and angels, and devils, and the souls of men, and the world of spirits, and the endless rewards and punishments of the future state, is to be received as *truth*; then is Orthodoxy established. But if the Bible is to be formally rejected, or (what amounts to the same) if it is to be interpreted, much as we interpret the Greek and Latin poets, making all due allowance for its fictions, its *machinery*, of angels, demons, and spiritual beings—for the ignorance and prejudices of the writers, and their prudent accommodations to the superstitions of the times;\*—if the Bible is to be regarded and treated in this way; then—in the wreck of our precious religious institutions, our Sabbaths, our Gospel, and our everlasting hopes—Unitarianism and infidelity may prevail. A question of greater interest and importance never was submitted to this, or any people. Our hope is in the God of our fathers—that his care for the vine which he hath planted in this wilderness will be continued, and that he will not suffer it to be rooted up.

---

## SELECTIONS.

### THE EXPERIMENT TRIED; *or the Effects of Unitarian Ministrations in England.*

NEAR the beginning of the last century, more than a hundred years ago, Arianism first made its appearance among the English Dissenters, particularly the Presbyterians. It commenced with Messrs. Pierce and Hallet at Exeter, and was the occasion of the Salter's Hall controversy at London, as explained in the last number of the Spirit of the Pilgrims, p. 588. As Unitarianism in this country, at least avowed Unitarianism, is of comparatively recent origin, it has not yet had sufficient opportunity to produce its legitimate effects. But in England, *the experiment has been tried, and the result is witnessed.* And as facts are worth so much more than theories, it is proposed to make our readers *acquainted with this result.*—The following extracts are from the third and fourth volumes of Bogue and Bennett's History of Dissenters, a work which we sincerely wish might be re-printed and circulated in this country.—“The Second Period” embraced in this History, extends “from the death of Queen Anne to the accession of George III.”

“Before the conclusion of this period,” say the authors, “Arianism was not only embraced, but openly acknowledged by not a

\* Mr. D. supposes it not inconsistent with the inspiration of the apostles, that their writings contain *unfounded opinions and mistakes*; since their inspiration “secured them from error ONLY *on what belonged to the system of Christian doctrine.*” p. 322. “What if they did believe that the second coming of Christ was near at hand; or in the existence of angels, demons, and disembodied souls; or in various other superstitious notions; these do not “belong to the system of Christian doctrine.” And who can tell, without a new revelation, what does belong to it, and what not?”

few of the Presbyterian ministers. The heresy polluted some of the London pulpits: in Lancashire it was prevalent, and in the counties to the south: it gained ground also in the west, whence it first sprang. The generation of ministers, who contended so zealously for the Orthodox faith, had finished their labors, and received a dismissal from their Lord into eternal rest. Among those who succeeded them were too many who embraced the Arian creed. Those champions among the laity who, at the beginning of the controversy, stood up so firmly for the truth, had entered into the joy of their Lord. Though their children continued dissenters, too many of them did not possess the same sentiments or spirit; but with a liberal education, and little religion, the Arian opinions gratified their literary pride as being remote from the creed of the vulgar, and were less hostile to the depravity of the human heart than that which they renounced. To this unhappy change, the example and conversation of many of the younger Presbyterian ministers did but too much contribute. In one or two of the seminaries, the tutors were accused of giving countenance to the heresy among the students. In consequence of these exertions, before the end of the period, Arianism spread far and wide in the Presbyterian congregations, both among the ministers and the people. What the effects were will be specified in their proper place. Suffice it to say, that this unhappy controversy proved the grave of the Presbyterian congregations, and of those of the general Baptists. Though like the forbidden fruit, which did not produce the immediate destruction of the body, but rendered the event certain at a future time, so the effects of Arianism, though at first scarcely visible, gradually produced desolation and death. Could Pierce and Hallet rise from the tomb, and see the doleful effects of their new opinions on the congregations in Devonshire, and wherever Arianism has been espoused, 'it would chill their souls with unutterable horror.'

Again,

"During this period, error was the destroying angel of dissenting congregations. In the ordinary course of things, in proportion as dissenting ministers have departed from those religious principles which were held by the men ejected from the establishment for nonconformity, they have reduced the number of their audience. Whenever they have departed from what is called Calvinism, the congregation has evidently felt the change; it has been arrested in its growth, and, after a time, visibly decayed.

"In whatever communions *Arminianism* may have crowded places of worship, it never had this effect among dissenters; but, almost without an exception, was the first stage of the congregational decline. Arianism may be called the second stage of the disease, and where it filled the pulpit invariably emptied the pews. This was the case, not only where a part of the congregation, alarmed by the sound of heresy, fled from the polluted house to a separate society; but where no opposition was made, and all remained without a murmur in the original place. In numerous instances, the preacher, full of the wisdom of the serpent, sought by hiding the

monster from their view, to draw them over by stealth to the new theology, and unveiled his sentiments only as the people were able to bear them without a frown. Though, at last, his wishes were crowned with success, yet the decay began, and gradually consumed the growth, the strength, and the life of the society, till a large congregation was reduced to a handful. Where Socinianism found an entrance, its operations were quicker than those of the Arian creed, and more effectual; flourishing societies were reduced to a few families, which, being animated with zeal for the new opinions, or indifferent about any, chose to continue to support the modes of worship to which, from education or use, they were attached. In many places Socinianism was the abomination of desolation, and consigned what had been formerly the house of prayer and of the assemblies of the saints, an undisturbed abode to the spiders and the bats."

After producing convincing testimonies, from Unitarians themselves, as to the decrease of their congregations, the authors proceed,

"In confirmation of the opinions of these men, it was observed that the decrease was in those parts of the country where Arianism prevailed. Devonshire and its neighborhood were deeply infected. Lancashire, Cheshire, and Warwickshire drank large draughts of the intoxicating cup. The general effect was a stop to farther increase. In some congregations the decay was immediate; in others, the society became like a building in which the mortar had lost its principle of cohesion, and mouldered away. For a time it was as large as before, but its strength was gone; gradually one stone fell off after another, and every succeeding winter levelled a portion of it with the ground. In this way, many flourishing societies were destroyed."

The following extract will exhibit one *cause* of the prevalence of Arianism among the English Presbyterians, as well as its desolating effects.

"The cause of religion among the Presbyterians sustained an injury from the *intercourse between the Orthodox and erroneous*, in acts of ministerial communion. At the beginning of this period, they were all so much united in sentiments, that they could with pleasure officiate for each other. But Arianism introduced a new state of things. Where it was avowed by a minister, a separation usually took place between his congregation, and those which continued in their former sentiments. But as in most instances the new opinions were gradually imbibed, and cautiously concealed, the bonds of former friendship were not broken; and between such men and the Orthodox, intercourse in acts of worship remained. If it should be pleaded, that, by this means, the erroneous ministers were put upon their guard, and kept from an open avowal of heresy, and that their congregations had an opportunity of hearing evangelical ministers, it must be admitted on the other hand, that it was an unnatural union, and that it tended to make Arians think more favorably of themselves and their system, when they were thus acknowledged to be ministers of Christ's Gospel. It was a temptation too, to the

Orthodox, not to bring forward evangelical doctrines so fully, when they were preaching to congregations which in general did not approve them.

“Though among those who maintained the doctrine of the Trinity, there were different ideas as to the personality of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, from men wishing to be wise above what is written, it does not appear that these differences produced any material effect as to the efficacy of their preaching. The divinity of the Saviour was a firm foundation for the Christian doctrine to rest upon. But whenever the divinity of Christ was denied, and he was reduced to the rank of a creature, its benumbing influence was immediately perceived, the doctrine lost its power, and the rest of the system felt the change.

“At first, there was more religion in the congregations where Arianism was negatively preached, than those who consider only that system, would be led to expect; but it was owing to the influence of the Orthodox doctrine to which the people had formerly listened; and it was maintained by the private exercises of devotion, and by the perusal of the writings of the most eminent nonconformist divines. Though starved in the public ordinances by the meagre discourses of the Arian preachers, they were feasted in their closets by the volumes of Baxter, Owen, Flavel, Charnock, and Howe. But these Christians were gradually removed by death; and then the influence of Arianism appeared. The religious principles of those who remained, being less powerful, had a weaker hold of their minds. The exercises of secret devotion which were the delight of their fathers, though not neglected by them, did not produce the same degree of pleasure. Those books, which were considered as the classics of the Puritans in the closet, gave place to others less spiritual and evangelical, but more congenial to their taste. These increased the languor, rendered the closet less agreeable, and their visits to it either shorter, or more infrequent. The stimulus to every duty, formerly communicated by the ardor of public worship, ceased to be felt. Family worship now began to be offered but once a day; by many it was afterwards confined to the Sabbath; and with some, it fell entirely into disuse. The former strictness in the observance of the Lord’s day was broken in upon by many things which their fathers had taught them to be works neither of necessity nor mercy. The domestic regulations, which had formerly been regarded as the characteristics of a dissenting household, were gradually thrown aside. The younger people in respectable families, if not the parents, learned to play cards when they visited in the houses of the rich and gay, who now became their companions, because they moved in an equal station in society with themselves. When they were visited in their turn, they pleaded hard with the old people, and too often prevailed, to be allowed to entertain their guests in the same way. By these fashionable friends, they were introduced to assemblies and balls; and to crown all, they at length entered the doors of the theatre, and learned to frequent dramatic entertainments, like other genteel people of the same rank.

While under the influence of Arianism, some were thus running headlong into the ways of the world which lieth in wickedness, others were as unprofitably occupied in speculating about religion. Novelty was their study and delight. To turn aside a text from its natural meaning, in order to favor Arianism or Socinianism, was a mighty achievement. As this could not, in many instances, be done with a tolerably good grace, and as many passages in the apostolical writings resisted the efforts of their utmost ingenuity, they had the sagacity to discover that the epistles ought not to be considered as having the same degree of authority with the Gospels. They scarcely in the course of this period arrived at the perfection in this art which has been since attained, to reject chapters, paragraphs, and verses even in the Gospels, when they threaten to destroy a favorite system.

“But it may be said, is no exception to be made in favor of congregations in which religion flourished! An Arian congregation, under an Arian minister, where religion was in a flourishing state, perhaps cannot be named in the whole of England, since the day that James Pierce preached that doctrine within the walls of his new meeting at Exeter.”

Describing the state of things during the “third Period” of the History, extending “from the accession of George III. to the year 1808,” the authors proceed:

“Error was the grand cause of decrease in the Presbyterian congregations. Arianism, and Socinianism, to which the former period gave birth, were still in existence, and still brought forth their poisonous fruit: their progress was now becoming far more rapid than at first. In this period Arianism grew bolder and more open in the declaration of her sentiments; and Socinianism followed her example. To Dr. Priestley the Christian world is indebted for this alteration of behaviour: and both for his conduct and his counsel he deserves applause. Scorning the crafty concealment and cunning equivocation of his predecessors, he frankly told the world his creed, and warmly exhorted every other Socinian, if he would be an honest man, to follow his example. To his counsels both Socinians and Arians listened with reverence: and with the exception of a few old adepts in the art of concealing their sentiments, who wished to live and die in quiet, the rest preached what they believed, and the people saw what their preachers were. The effect of the discovery was beyond calculation both powerful and rapid. Those who had any regard for evangelical truth were filled with horror at the sight of the heretic in his native form, and bid him and his adherents an eternal adieu. Others, though not disgusted at the opinions of their teacher, growing weary of dissent, found it more agreeable to stay at home: or when at any time they went to public worship, to join in that which was established by the state. Many who drank the cup of Arianism first, and then of Socinianism to the very dregs, ceased to be members of the dissenting congregation; and with a perfect hatred of the doctrines of the church of England, pusillanimously and disingenuously bore a part in her very explicit

Trinitarian worship. By the operation of these causes, many a Presbyterian congregation dwindled from a giant into a dwarf. Aged people, who remember their respectable condition in the metropolis at the commencement of this period, must be convinced that heresy has acted like an enchantress in silently, by her fatal spells, accomplishing their destruction. They are in general now but the shadow of what they formerly were, and many of them have ceased to exist. Devonshire, the cradle of Arianism, has been the grave of the Arian dissenters; and there is not left in that populous county a twentieth part of the Presbyterians which were to be found at the time of her birth. More than twenty of their meeting houses, it is said, have been shut up; and in those which remain open, there are to be seen the skeletons only of congregations which were full and flourishing before error had banished prosperity.

“In the other counties of England where these sentiments prevailed, the effects have been the same. Like the devouring pestilence, Arianism and Socinianism have with few exceptions, carried desolation with them into every congregation where they have obtained an entrance; and some scores more of their meeting houses would have been shut up, but for *the pious benevolence of persons of a different creed in the former generation*. By *their endowments* many of the present Presbyterian ministers have been enabled to retain their office, and to preach to what deserves not the name of a congregation, but is better described by the prophet’s account of what remains after the shaking of the olive tree: ‘two or three berries on the top of the uppermost bough, four or five on the outmost fruitful branches thereof.’ So great is the change which these sentiments have produced, that perhaps there are not now in England twelve of their congregations which can boast an attendance of five hundred people; whereas, before the introduction of Arianism, they could in more than two hundred places count five hundred hearers, and in several more than double the number.”

Again,

“During the whole of this period, the Presbyterian congregations have been falling into decay, and many of them into ruin. At the end of Queen Anne’s reign, they formed at least two thirds of the whole dissenting body; at present, they perhaps do not exceed a twentieth part of the three denominations. Though their congregations, as stated in the list, bear a much larger proportion, they are in general so small, that with a few exceptions, it would require five or six of them to compose one of moderate size. But *for the endowments of pious Calvinists of old*, some scores more of them must have been shut up, and the Arian and Socinian preacher fairly starved out. If some pious London Presbyterian, who died in the year 1714, were now to rise from the dead, and be carried round to their meeting houses in the time of service, he would be filled with amazement and horror. ‘Where,’ he would say, ‘are the numerous bodies of people which used to worship here?’ On finding so few congregations, he would naturally inquire, ‘what is become of the rest.’ He would be told that they were first shut up, and then applied



to other purposes, or occupied by other denominations. If the cause was unknown to him, he might be told that Arianism and Socinianism had driven them away."

Again,

"The tendencies of the new system (Unitarianism) became every day more painfully manifest in the skeptical coldness of its disciples, and their entire conformity to the spirit and manners of the world. For with the faith, they shook off the practices of the first founders of the dissent. The morality of the Sabbath was denied, and visiting on that day grew into fashion among wide dissenters. Theatres were represented as innocent scenes of amusement, and the card table, warmly recommended by Dr. Priestley's own example, was the constant resort of those who were withdrawn from the closet and from meetings for prayer by the denial of divine influences, which alone can render prayer a reasonable service. The complete amalgamation with the world, which prevailed among the Presbyterians, formed a disgraceful exception to the general truth of the remark, that the dissenters are a religious body. But every day rendered this deduction from their original excellence of character smaller: for while the other denominations were rapidly increasing, the desolating effect of error, which has already been noticed, reduced the Presbyterians to a very small proportion of the whole. The departure of the Gospel annihilated many congregations, and left the high churchman to insult over their ruined walls, or write upon their closed doors, 'a meeting-house to let;' while the orthodox dissenter would inscribe, 'Ichabod, the glory is departed.'"

Speaking of Dr. Benson, the colleague of Lardner, our authors proceed thus:

"It is instructive though painful to remark, that while he and Dr. Lardner were writing very learned books, and gaining extensive fame, the congregation was gradually diminishing, till it scarcely was entitled to the name; and having received the deadly poison from their lips, after a precarious existence of twelve years, under Dr. Price, Mr. Radcliff, and Dr. Calder, (their successors,) it became extinct. The meeting-house was sometime afterwards opened by William Alldridge, a Calvinistic Methodist, from lady Huntingdon's college at Trevecca. The faith of the ancient non-conformists, which had sounded so clearly and so powerfully from the mouth of Mr. Cruso fourscore years before, and which had not been heard within the walls since the decease of Dr. Harris, was now heard again; and the place was filled anew with attentive and serious hearers. 'Let him that readeth understand.' As hewers of wood and drawers of water were required for the service of the temple, the writings of Lardner, Benson, and their fellows were useful for similar purposes; and for their ingenuity and learning let them have great praise, for it is due: but to officiate as ministers in the sanctuary, and lead the people to the holiest of all, by the blood of Jesus, in that new and living way which he has consecrated

through the veil of his flesh, they knew not how : it was beyond their power."

We add but another extract, which is from a biographical notice of Dr. Langford, a Presbyterian minister of London, who continued to preach the truth as it is in Jesus.

"In this man, who, like Abdiel, stood alone in adherence to the truth, may be seen the happy and important effects of soundness in the faith. While many of the congregations of the Arian and Socinian Presbyterians have been, with few exceptions, reduced to a mere skeleton of their former size, and many more of them are annihilated, Dr. Langford's faithful preaching of the truth preserved the flock. At his death, they chose an evangelical minister as his successor ; and under Mr. Clayton, who followed him, the congregation retains the ancient faith of the nonconformists, and is one of the most flourishing in London, both for numbers and piety."



EXERCISES FOR THE CLOSET. *By William Jay.*

THIS work consists of nearly two hundred short, practical comments or reflections on different portions of Scripture, and is one of the most interesting devotional performances we have yet seen. It was published in London the present year, and will shortly be re-printed in this city. We anticipate its appearance by the following extracts. Our readers will recognize in them the ingenuity, the point, the free and spirited manner of the author.

*"And shall leave me alone : and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me."*  
John xiv. 32.

"There is a relation between Christ and Christians, and a conformity founded upon it; so that what *He* says, *they* may subordina- tely adopt as their own language.

"There are cases in which they *may* be alone—and there are cases in which they *ought* to be alone—and there is one case in which they *must* be alone : and yet they are not alone, because the Father is with them.

"They *may* be alone, by the dispensations of Providence. Joseph was separated from his family, and sold into Egypt, but the Lord was with Joseph. John was banished into the isle of Patmos ; but there he had the visions of the Almighty, and was in the Spirit on the Lord's day. 'At my first answer,' says Paul, 'no man stood by me, but all *men* forsook me ; notwithstanding the *Lord* stood by me, and strengthened me.'"

"They *ought* to be alone, by voluntary solitude. Not that they are to become recluses, by abandoning their stations, and shunning intercourse with their fellow-creatures. But *occasional* and *frequent* retirement for religious purposes, is a duty—and it will be found our privilege. We shall never be less alone, than when alone. "Go forth," says God to Ezekiel, "into the field, and there will I

talk with thee." Isaac, at eventide, was meditating in the field, when the Lord brought him Rebecca. Jacob was left alone, when he "obtained power with God," and with man, and prevailed. Nathaniel was seen and encouraged under the fig tree. Peter was by himself praying upon the housetop when he received the Divine manifestation. If the twelve Patriarchs, or the twelve Apostles, lived near us, and their presence drew us off from our closets, their neighborhood would be a serious injury to us. No creature can be a substitute for God. And it is *alone* we hold the freest and fullest communion with him. It is there the secret of the Lord is with us, and he shows us his covenant. There we become acquainted with ourselves. There we shake off the influences of the world. It is good to be there."

"Men may live in a crowd, but they *must* die alone. Friends and ministers can only accompany us to the entrance of the pass. But the Christian *here*, though alone, is not alone. 'Yea,' says David, 'though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for *thou* art with me: *thy* rod and *thy* staff, they comfort me.'"

"*Take up thy bed and walk.*" John v. 8.

"Our Saviour met with this man at the pool of Bethesda; but no sooner had he pronounced the word of healing, than he orders him to take up *his bed*, and walk. He has always reasons for his conduct, though they are not always perceptible. But I think we can see four reasons for this command.

"First, it was to evince the perfection of the cure. Never could anything have been more remote from imposition, than the miracles recorded in the Gospel. Examine them. They were many—they were public—they were performed before witnesses interested in their detection, had they been false. The circumstances, too, were always corroborative. Does he raise the dead? The young man was carrying to his burial, attended with much people. Lazarus was in his grave, and had been dead four days. Does he recover the infirm and the diseased? The man, whose eyes he opened, was born blind. And this paralytic had been afflicted thirty-eight years; and in a moment he was made whole, and was seen by all going home with his bed upon his shoulders.

"Secondly, it was to teach him to be careful, and to waste nothing. The bed probably was not very valuable, but he was not to throw it away. In correspondence with this, after the miracle of the loaves and fishes, even then, when he had shown with what ease he could multiply resources, and support his creatures, he said, 'Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost.' Christians should avoid closeness and meanness, lest their good be evil spoken of; but there is another extreme they should be anxious to avoid: it is profusion—yea, negligence and carelessness. They ought not to love money; but they should know the use and worth of it; and remember that they are responsible for all they have."

"Thirdly, as a memento of his deliverance and duty. When at

home, and looking on this bed, he would say—' Ah ! there I lay, a poor enfeebled creature, and said, My strength and my hope is perished from the Lord, remembering mine affliction and my misery, the wormwood and the gall: my soul hath them still in remembrance, and is humbled within me. This I call to mind, therefore have I hope.' ”

“ Fourthly, to try his obedience. Carrying his bed was a servile work ; and it was now the Sabbath, on which day no burden was to be borne. He seemed therefore to oppose the law of Moses ; and accordingly the Pharisees were offended, and murmured. We are not to judge the Lord's commands, but to follow them.—His orders may be trying, and in obeying them we may give offence ; but we need not mind the revilings of men, while we can plead his authority.”

“ *Let him know, that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.*”  
James v. 20.

“ And can *we* convert the sinner from the error of his way ? Yes—or the language would be futile. But *how* can we do this ? Not meritoriously—this would invade the office and glory of the Lord Jesus : for He only delivers us from the wrath to come : He only saves his people from their sins. Not efficiently—this would invade the work and honor of the Holy Spirit : for we are saved by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost. There is therefore only one way in which *we* can convert a sinner ; and that is instrumentally. But this does not detract from divine agency : there is no inconsistency between agency and instrumentality. A pen is nothing without a hand to use it. An instrument always supposes and requires an agent. But is the converse of this proposition true ? Does an agent always require an instrument ? It is so with us ; but not with a Being whose will is efficiency ; and who said, Let there be light, and there was light. Yet what God is not compelled to do from weakness, he chooses to do from wisdom. He therefore works by means. We know of nothing that he does immediately. He fans us by the breeze, and warms us by the sun, and refreshes us by sleep, and sustains us by food. And as it is in nature, so it is in grace. Among the Corinthians God gave the increase, but Paul planted, and Apollos watered. Their faith came not *from* them ; but Paul and Apollos were ministers *by* whom they believed. We mean not, however, by this reference, to confine this work to ministers. James alludes not only or chiefly to them ; but to Christians at large. All may be useful here ; and in a thousand ways exert themselves to accomplish this blessed and glorious design. All cannot be Luthers, to reform countries ; or Whitfields, to preach to thousands ; or Careys, to translate the Scriptures into other tongues. But can we do nothing ? Surely some one soul is thrown in our way to whom we may be useful—a child—a servant—a relative—a neighbor.”

“*He hath done all things well.*” Mark vii. 37.

“A great commendation; but deserved. Human excellencies are rare and individual. One man does one thing well; another does another thing well—but He does *all* things well. The little men do well, is only *comparatively* well; all He does, is *absolutely* so. And this will appear, whether we consider him as the Creator—and survey the works of Nature: or as the Saviour—and contemplate the wonders of grace: or as the Governor—and examine the dispensations of his Providence.

“Whence, then, is it, that we cannot really and readily, with regard to his concern in our affairs, and especially those of a trying nature, adopt the acknowledgment, and say, He hath done all things well?”

“The reason is, we judge *atheistically*. Every unregenerate sinner lives without God in the world. But does a Christian? Is not he made to differ from others; and from himself? He is. Yet his sanctification is not complete. Something is left in him of all the old kinds of leaven; and, therefore, something of this atheism. ‘Oh, it was that unlucky accident: it was that heedless servant; it was that perfidious neighbor; it was that cruel enemy.’—No wonder *He* does not *all* things well, when He is not acknowledged as doing *anything*.

“We judge *selfishly*. We are not to view ourselves as detached individuals. We are parts of a whole; and variously connected with others: and what is not good for us personally, may be good for us relatively. Suppose a trying dispensation makes us more tender and compassionate towards our fellow-creatures and our fellow Christians; suppose a distressing experience gives us the tongue of the learned, and enables us to speak a word in season to him that is weary: suppose, as witnesses and examples of the power and excellency of the Gospel, we arouse the careless, and confirm the wavering: is there not enough here to call for resignation and praise?”

“We judge *carnally*. What is not pleasing may yet be beneficial: and natural evil may be moral good. When things are agreeable to our wishes, we never think of any difficulty in the Divine proceedings. While we have ease, and health, and friends, and success in business, we never complain of the darkness of Providence. But as soon as there is any reverse, O then we groan out, ‘His way is in the sea, his path in the deep waters, and his footsteps are not known’—as if everything was to be estimated by our accommodation and convenience—as if God acted wisely or unwisely, righteously or unrighteously, just as his doings affect us—and affect, too, not our best interests, but our present and temporal! Is it wonderful that we, who deserve stripes, should feel the rod? that we, who need correction, should meet with chastisement? Is it mysterious that the vine should be pruned! the ground ploughed! the gold tried in the fire?”

“We judge *prematurely*. You would not judge of the abilities of the limner from the unfinished sketch, but you would wait till

the canvass had received the last touches of his masterly pencil. You would not judge of the perfection of a building from the digging of the foundation, and coarse materials lying in a kind of disorder all around; especially if you had never seen the plan or the model: but you would stay till the parts were all put together in their places, and the topstone brought forth with shouting.—Let us stay till God has done. What I do, says he, thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter. Then everything will speak for itself. Then we shall see what we now believe; and for ever acknowledge, ‘He is the rock; his work is perfect; for all his ways are judgement: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he.’”

“*And I will give her her vineyards from thence,*” [i. e. from the wilderness.] Hosea ii. 15.

“What could be looked for in a wilderness, but loneliness, and mazes, and danger, and beasts of prey, and reptiles, and sand, and briars, and thorns? Who would expect to find the vineyards of Engedi there?”

“Earth is a wilderness; and God gives his people their vineyards from thence. It was not designed to be a wilderness; but, by one man, sin entered into the world; and it was said to the transgressor, ‘Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life. But to the Christian, the curse is turned into a blessing. He has not only before him a land of promise, but even now—here, he has a thousand alleviations, and succors, and even delights.

“Solitude is a wilderness; and He gives them their vineyards from thence. There is not only much to be done alone, but gained alone, and enjoyed alone. There we gain much of our best knowledge, and our richest experience. There we enjoy the freedom of prayer, and the most unreserved intercourse with God. There his secret is with them that fear him; and he shows them his Covenant. They are never less alone than when alone.

“Outward trouble is a wilderness. Many have been afraid to be brought into it—yet He has given them their vineyards from thence, and the Valley of Achor for a door of hope. They have been saved by their undoing; and enriched by their losses. Manasseh, in his affliction, sought, and found the God of his father. And David, though he was converted before, could say, It is good for me that I have been afflicted.

“The state of mind produced by conviction of sin is a wilderness. A wounded spirit who can bear? Who does not remember the surprise, the confusion of mind, the terror, the anguish, the self-despair, he once felt—and who can forget the feelings induced by a discovery of the Cross, and the joy of God’s salvation! Many are afraid when they see their relations and friends trembling at God’s word, and broken in heart at his feet.—But Christians hail it, as a token for good. They know that he gave *them their vineyards from thence.*

“The valley of the shadow of death is the last wilderness. There is much to render it uninviting and awful; and yet, when it has been actually entered, the apprehension and the gloom have fled. And this has been the case generally, even with those who were most subject to bondage by the fear of it. The place has been made glad for them. They have had an abundant entrance into the joy of their Lord. And what vineyards does He give them from THENCE!!”

“*Therefore hath thy servant found in his heart to pray this prayer unto thee.*” 2 Sam. vii. 27.

“Where did he find his inclination, and power to pray? ‘In his heart.’ The heart is everything in religion. Man judgeth according to the outward appearance; but the Lord looketh on the heart. It is a blessed thing to find it in our heart to pray—so that, while it is with many a bodily exercise only; a task which they would gladly decline; an effort forced upon them from something without—some danger, or trouble: we may do it naturally; and therefore constantly and pleasantly, from a principle in us, like a well of water, springing up into everlasting life.

“And what was the prayer he found there? It was *this*—‘Let the house of thy servant David be established before thee.’ David had a peculiar concern for his family; and, from his character, we may be assured, he wished it to be not only or principally glorious, but *good*.

“And what produced *this* prayer? ‘*Therefore*’—‘For thou, O Lord of Hosts, God of Israel, hast revealed to thy servant, saying, I will build thee an house:’ ‘*therefore* hath thy servant found in his heart to pray this prayer unto thee.’

“The certainty of a thing does not supersede the use of means in attaining it. Why should David pray for it, when God had pledged himself to do it? So some would argue: but it would be the arguing of folly. The Scripture, the wisdom of God, knows nothing of this perversion. No doctrine there leads to enthusiasm. There the means and end are connected. There activity grows out of dependence; and zeal, out of confidence. There God says, after he has promised the thing, ‘I will yet be inquired of by the house of Israel to do it for them.’ Yea, we see prayer is not only consistent with the promise, but derived from it. It is this that furnishes the matter of our petitions, and gives us all our encouragements.

“Therefore, let us be thankful for the promises. Let us search them out. Let us place them opposite all our wants. Let us plead them, and say, Remember the word unto thy servant, upon which thou hast caused him to hope. And, as *then* we can ask in faith, so we may pray with confidence: for whatsoever we ask according to his will, we know he heareth us.”

“Then answered Peter, and said unto Jesus, Lord, it is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles, one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias.” Matt. xvii. 4.

“‘Not knowing,’ we are assured, by the Holy Ghost; ‘not knowing what he said.’ For had the motion been complied with, how could our Saviour have suffered and died? But though he did not know what he said, he knew *why* he said it. Two things caused his bliss. First, the communion of saints. And here were not only John and James, but Moses and Elias; and these were not shining statues—but they spake—and spake of the Saviour’s decease. What a subject! What speakers! How delightful must have been intercourse with them!—But the second, was the presence of Jesus. And surely it cannot be a question, why it is good to be, where He is. With him we are safe; and nowhere else. He is the Source of all light and knowledge. He is the Fountain of honor and excellency. He is the Consolation of Israel. He is all and in all.

“But where is He with his people? He is with them in the *closet*. There he manifests himself to them, as he does not in the world. There they enjoy an intimacy, a freedom, an unrestrained intercourse with him, such as other company will not allow. ‘Could these beams and rafters’—said a good man, pointing to an unceiled roof, ‘speak; they would testify what hours of enjoyment I have had here, in communion with Him.’ Of the closet, therefore, they can say, It is good for us to be *here*.

“He is with them in his Temple. Where would you look for a man, but in his own house? And the Sanctuary is the place where the Lord’s honor dwelleth. In all places where I record my Name, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee. And have they not found the promise true? Have they not seen his power and glory in the Sanctuary? Of his House, therefore, they can say, It is good for us to be *here*.

“He is with them at his Table. His Cross is everything to a Christian: and here before our eyes Jesus Christ is evidently set forth crucified among us. What a sublime duty; what an exalted privilege, is the Commemoration of his Death! His flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed! It is good for us to be *here*.

“He is with them in the furnace. There the three Hebrew children found him. The flames only consumed their bands, and set them free; and they were seen walking in the midst of the fire—with the Son of God!

“He is with them in the vale of death. How much will they need him then! Then all other friends and helpers leave them. Then heart and flesh will fail them. But they will not be without him. Though they walk through the valley of the shadow of death, he is with them; his rod and his staff they comfort them: and then they have cause to say, Lord, it is good for us to be *here*.

“How much more will they be justified in saying this in heaven! There he is with them immediately. There they will see him as he



is; there, before the presence of his glory, they will possess fulness of joy, and pleasures for evermore.

“But none will be translated thither in person, whose hearts are not sent off first. None will have their residence in heaven hereafter, who have not their conversation in heaven here. None will be with the Lord for ever, but those that find it their happiness for the Lord to be with them now.”

#### NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Sermons preached in India.* By the late Right Rev. REGINALD HEBER, D. D., Lord Bishop of Calcutta. Philadelphia: E. Littell and Brother. 1829. pp. 214.

We receive this volume with much pleasure, as a remembrancer of the late accomplished and excellent Bishop of Calcutta. In addition to the addresses on his departure from England, a charge to the clergy of his diocese, and an address on confirmation delivered within “less than two hours” of his death, it contains seventeen sermons, selected from those preached by him during his residence in India. We hardly need say to our readers that the discourses of Bishop Heber are ingenious, learned, classical and eloquent; it is of more importance to know that they are decidedly *evangelical*, recognizing, applying and enforcing, throughout, the great and essential doctrines of the Gospel. We were particularly pleased with those entitled, “Christ preaching to Simmers,” “The Law and the Gospel,” “The Pharisee and Publican,” and “The Conversion of the Heathen.”—The following is from the twelfth sermon, on “the Omnipresence of the Deity.”

“This notion of God as an Almighty, All-present, All-seeing and Unseen Existence, who “is not far from any of us, and in whom we live and move and have our being,” is, unquestionably, a strange and awful subject of thought, and one which cannot be agitated in our minds without a deep and almost a painful and terrifying sense of our own weakness and dependence.

“Even to a good man, and to one who is, on good grounds, assured of the protection and favor of his Maker, this presence not to be shunned, this power not to be resisted, this awful eye for ever bent on our ways, is, at times, oppressive as well as surprising. We are lost in the meditation of such greatness. In this sea of glory our powers, our wisdom, our life, appear to sink into nothing. What is man, (we are apt to say,) that God should condescend to regard him? and what are the thoughts, the words, and works of man, that they should be able to endure the constant inspection of a Judge so wise, so great, so terrible?

“But if even good men, if even the best of men, must be thus at times affected by the sense of God’s unseen and continual presence; if they too must, at times, find the place dreadful where they thus stood before Him; how grievous must this recollection be to those who live without God in the world; who are conscious that by their daily sins they have drawn on themselves His heaviest anger, and that they have done before His face, and under the beam of His indignant eye, such actions as they would have been afraid or ashamed to have fallen into in the presence of a mere mortal bystander?

"It is a dreadful thing, when conscience reckons up her catalogue of secret guilt, to remember that every one of those crimes which were most hateful to God and to man were done with the knowledge, and in the presence, of the Judge, the severe and upright Judge of men and angels. A dreadful thing it is to say, 'Surely God was in this place, when I cast my eyes so carelessly round, and flattered myself that my uncleanness, my robbery, or my fraud, was hid in darkness and solitude. God was in this place, when I deformed His image with drunkenness, and when my mouth was filled with the words of lust and blasphemy. God was in this place, when I called on His holy name to obtain credit for my falsehood, and challenged His power to punish me if I dealt untruly with my neighbor. And God is in this place, and beholds my present hardness and impenitent heart; He knows and sees my lingering fondness for the sins which I am pretending to abandon; and He is waiting, perhaps, even now, for the conduct which I shall now adopt, the resolution which I shall now follow, to determine whether my lot shall be hereafter among the children of light, or whether His Spirit shall be withdrawn from me, (it may be,) for ever!'"

We cannot refuse another short extract, from the sermon entitled "Sin and Grace."

"Since our condition is by nature so perilous; since our passions are so strong, and our flesh so frail and prone to evil, what constant vigilance do those passions and propensities require, of which St. Paul complains so heavily! If we were shut up in the same den with a wild beast; if we were opposed to an armed enemy; if we were steering a vessel through an unknown sea, amid the dash of waves and the glimmering of breakers, we should need, I apprehend, no admonition to be watchful and diligent. Alas! my friends, our own hearts are wilder than the savage of the woods; our own hearts, uncontrolled, are more formidable than the deadliest adversary; our own hearts are more changeable and deceitful than the winds, the waves, the depths, and shallows of the ocean. Watch, then, and pray, lest ye enter into temptation. Watch and pray! Without prayer to God, 'the watchman waketh but in vain;' and without an answerable watchfulness and care for our souls, displayed in the usual tenor of our lives and actions, our idle prayers will be only an offence to God."

2. *An Epitome of the Evidences of Christianity; designed for Families, also for Sabbath Schools and Bible Classes, and adapted to youth in general.* By CYRUS MANN, Pastor of the Congregational Church in Westminster, Mass. Lancaster: Carter, Andrews and Co. 1829. pp. 144.

We had occasion in our last, p. 636, to speak of the importance of youth being well instructed in the *evidences* of Christianity. The little volume before us has since come to hand, prepared with a reference to this very object. It contains eight short discourses on the following subjects: Duty of examining the Divine authority of the Scriptures; Genuineness of the Old Testament; Genuineness of the New Testament; Authenticity of the Scriptures; Inspiration of the Scriptures.

The work is well written, in a style adapted to the taste and capacities of the young, and in the present demand for sabbath school books will receive, we doubt not, a generous patronage.

3. *Conversations on the Bible.* Written for the Massachusetts Sabbath School Union. By Erodore. 1829. pp. 112.

The object of this work is, in part, the same as that last noticed. It is designed, not only to satisfy the youthful mind as to the

inspiration of the Bible, but to help him to understand what the Bible contains. It consists of seven conversations on the following subjects: "*Divine Authority of the Bible*;" "*Natural Geography of the Scene of Scripture History*," comprising an account of the seas, rivers, deserts, mountains, and natural scenery of Palestine and the adjoining regions; "*first Period of Scripture History*," extending "from the creation to the settlement of the Jews in the land of Canaan;" "*second Period of Scripture History*," "from the settlement in Canaan to the birth of Christ;" "*third Period*," from the birth of Christ to his ascension; "*fourth Period*," comprising the labors and sufferings of the apostles; and the "Conclusion." The work contains four maps, exhibiting different views of the places described, which will help much to illustrate the geography and history of the Bible. The whole will be found instructive and interesting, and will add not a little to the facilities afforded to the youth of this age for becoming acquainted with "the Oracles of God."

4. *A Discourse delivered at Plymouth, Dec. 20, 1828, on the two hundred and eighth Anniversary of the Landing of the Pilgrim Fathers.* BY SAMUEL GREEN, Pastor of the Union Church, Essex street, Boston. Boston; Peirce and Williams. 1829. pp. 36.

This discourse presents a sketch of the religious history of New England:—of the persecutions which drove our fathers hither; of their principles, characters, labors and sufferings; of the rich spiritual blessings with which their "loss of all things" was more than compensated; of their purposes, prayers, and expectations; of the extent to which these expectations have been realized; and the manner in which they have been, in part, defeated. The author refers, as might have been expected, to the defection, in some of the churches, from the holy principles of their founders, and to the manner in which this lamented apostacy has been introduced. In treating this part of the subject, he uses "great plainness (not bitterness) of speech," the language of grief rather than reviling, such as the spirit of Paul might have dictated, when he said, "*I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart—for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh.*"—The discourse is almost entirely historical, and, with the notes, embodies much valuable information. We hope it may be extensively read.

5. *A Sermon delivered in Boston, May 26, 1829, before the Pastoral Association of Massachusetts.* BY JOHN H. CHURCH, D. D., Pastor of the Church in Pelham, N. H. Boston: Perkins and Marvin. pp. 24.

The subject of this discourse is, *Preaching Christ*. "To preach Christ truly," says the author, "is to preach him just as the Scriptures do. How then do the Scriptures present him?" 1. "As Man;" 2. "as God;" 3. "as the only Mediator;" 4. "as the second Adam;" 5. "as a propitiation through faith in his blood;" 6. "as the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth;" and 7. as "a Priest and a King on his throne."

After some general remarks by way of application, the author concludes his discourse with a serious and affectionate address to his brethren in the ministry.

"What," says he, "my brethren, do we so much need as the Spirit of Christ? It is easy to imbibe the spirit of the day, and with this spirit to take up the weapons of our warfare, and, as we think, to wield them very dexterously. But is there no danger that we shall do it as men, and not as the servants of the meek and lowly Jesus? Here, I apprehend, is no small danger. The prevalence of a wrong spirit, I most fear. For this the disciples were rebuked, when they suspected no such thing. How much we may grieve the Spirit of God, in earnestly contending for his truth! Do we not then lose more than we gain? Does not vital godliness decline, while the outer works of our holy religion are ably defended?"

All the readers of this sermon will not agree with Dr. Church in his manner of explaining the doctrine of justification; but all serious Christians will agree that it is a very plain, appropriate and instructive performance, well worthy the attention of those to whom it was delivered.

*A Sermon delivered before the Auxiliary Education Society of Norfolk County, at their Annual Meeting in the Union Society of Braintree and Weymouth, June 10, 1829.* By CALVIN PARK, D. D., Pastor of the Evangelical Church in Stoughton. Boston: T. R. Marvin, pp. 24.

This discourse is founded on Dan. xi. 32. "But the people that do know their God shall be strong and do exploits." In order that the people of God now may accomplish great things, or "do exploits," Dr. P. shows, that they must "form great designs;" they must "digest a proper system of measures to be employed in accomplishing these designs;" they must have a becoming confidence in their own powers; must have courage, fortitude, perseverance; "must be united" among themselves; and must continue instant in prayer. After a brief but pertinent illustration of each of these points, the discourse concludes with several reflections. The following is a specimen of the author's manner:

"Christians have great reason to rejoice that they are placed in such circumstances as require the accomplishment of great actions. Eminent characters are more indebted for their eminence, to uncommon occasions than to uncommon talents. This remark holds true when applied, not only to statesmen, philosophers, and poets, but to divines—to ministers of the everlasting gospel. The Apostle of the Gentiles was called to act on great occasions. He felt their importance, and realized his responsibilities. He acted up to the dignity of his station. He displayed the greatness of his soul, and the benevolence of his heart, in the exploits he accomplished for the prosperity of the church, and the glory of his Divine Master. What uninspired man ever had a more pressing occasion for performing great actions than Luther? At times the existence of the whole church was under God, depending on him alone. He perceived the magnitude of the interest he was called to sustain. He summoned up all the powers of his mind, arrayed himself in the panoply of God, and moved, "himself a host." He feared no cardinal, no pope, no emperor, nor any other being than the Lord Jesus; and by a series of mighty deeds he gained his object—he saved the church. Our illustrious Edwards lived when the cause of truth was sinking and called aloud for some champion to come forward in its defence. He heard the call, and, by the exploits of his pen, his praise is in all the churches."

## TO OUR FRIENDS AND PATRONS.

AT the close of another volume of the Spirit of the Pilgrims, a few words to our friends and patrons may not be unseasonable or impertinent. This work was instituted for a high and holy purpose. Pecuniary profit, as even a *part* of its object, never once entered the minds of its founders. They neither expected nor intended that it should be a means of enriching them. It was consecrated to *Christ and the church*, and was designed to meet the exigencies of the church, whatever these at any time might be. It was "designed to defend, explain, and promote that system of religion which was planted on this soil by the first settlers of New England, and to cherish all those great and beneficent institutions which they left as an invaluable legacy to their descendants." With what measure of ability the work has been conducted, and how far it has answered the high purpose of its founders, it does not become us to decide. We can only say, that with singleness of heart, with earnestness and diligence, we have done what we could. We have spared no expense, and have shrunk from no labor or responsibility, which the interests of the work have seemed to require. As to the amount of *good* accomplished by our labors, it is also proper that we should be silent. That they have not been without marked and manifest *effects*, we presume all around us, friends and foes, will bear us witness. Of the nature of these effects, different opinions will, of course, be formed. In our own opinion, they are of such a nature, as to afford us, not only satisfaction, but *encouragement*—to persevere in the course on which we have entered. We do not mean by this, that the character of our work will be precisely the *same* in time to come, that it has hitherto been; for circumstances may not require the same. If the enemies of our faith please to retire from the field of controversy; while they are silenced and held in check, it will not be necessary to devote so much attention to them. We may safely assign a larger portion of our pages to the more agreeable task of stating and applying truth, of inculcating the precepts and urging the motives of the gospel.

It will be seen, from what has been said, that the Spirit of the Pilgrims is to be continued. Its cessation would cause a *pean* among the impugners of our faith, and cover many of its most intelligent friends, we know, with mourning. It cannot cease, therefore, and it shall not. But it is for our friends and patrons to decide, under what circumstances it shall be continued—whether it shall go heavily and dubiously on, dragging out a feeble and precarious existence; or whether it shall proceed with vigor, and confidence, and strength. With our past subscription, we have no reason, in view of all circumstances, to be dissatisfied. The times are pressing; and we have never, except in a few instances,

employed agents to solicit subscriptions, preferring that support of this kind should be freely offered. On this account, our list of subscribers is rather select than numerous, embracing certainly the more intelligent part of the Orthodox community, but yet only a small part. We feel bound at this time to say to our friends, and especially to our *clerical* friends in the country, that *we need their co-operation, in procuring us a more extended subscription*. If the work is worth publishing, it is worth reading; and if it is to be continued, it must be supported.

It would be easy for those, on whom rests the pecuniary responsibility of this work, and if books were to be estimated by their *bulk* alone it would be wise, to dismiss their Editor, dispense with the labors of their present contributors (among whom are some of the first theologians in New England), beg such matter as they could, and borrow the rest, and so furnish to their subscribers a much cheaper publication. But the truth is, that such a publication, to stand in the place of this, and meet the object contemplated by this—would do no good—it would be worse than nothing. The Spirit of the Pilgrims must be made, in point of literary and theological ability, as respectable as possible, without regard to considerations of expense. The encouragement we have received forbids us to doubt, that a work of this character is felt to be needed, and will be vigorously sustained.

We take this opportunity of expressing our obligations to those whose communications have hitherto enriched our pages, and of soliciting their continued assistance. We solicit, also, the assistance of all, who think favorably of the work, in extending its circulation. Did we not think an *importance* attached to this request, not to us personally, but to the *cause of truth*, we would not make it. How easy would it be for most of the clergymen who patronize this work, to obtain enough subscribers among their people to receive a copy gratis; and by this means the circulation might be nearly doubled.

We only add, that the next volume will be published in the same style, and on the same terms, as those which have preceded it. Those who wish to discontinue their subscriptions are requested to give notice to the Publishers previous to the first of January, at which time the publication of the third volume will commence.



Dr. Beecher's Reply to the Christian Examiner on the Damnation of Infants, may be expected in our next.

















