



# UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH



Dar. Rm.  
BX7101  
S7  
v. 6

## LIBRARIES





*Sup*

THE

SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS,

FOR THE YEAR

1833.

VOL. VI.

**Boston:**  
PUBLISHED BY WILLIAM PEIRCE.



# INDEX.

Address, Dr. Skinner's Inaugural	84	Law, of the Moral, and of Liberty,	57
Advantages of Sabbath Schools	240	Letters, Dr. Porter's, on Reviews	125, 367, 427
Appeal in behalf of the Heathen	134	Letters, Dr. Tyler's, to the Editor of the Spirit of the Pilgrims	284
Association, Pastoral, 185; Report of the Suffolk South to the Committee of the Pastoral, 186; Do. of the Harmony do., 307; Do. of the Andover do., 310; Do. of the Old Colony do., 311; Do. of the Pilgrim do., 313; Do. of the Franklin do., 315; Do. of the Brookfield do., 318; Do. of the Hampden do.,	439	Letters, Dr. Wood's, to Dr. Beecher	19
Augustine	602	Libraries, Clerical	171
Beecher, Dr. Dr. Woods's 3d letter to	19	Merit, Doctrine of	546
Bible, a Test of Moral Character	99	Ministerial Qualifications,	268, 499
Character, the Bible a Test of	173	Moral Character, the Bible a Test of	99
Cheever, the Rev. Geo. B., his Letter to the Conductors of the Christian Examiner,	703	Moral World, God's mode of government over	505
Christian Stewardship	261	Necessary means of the greatest good, the question whether sin is,	481
Christians, Private, the duties of	578	Pastoral Association	185
Clerical Libraries	171	Porter, Dr., his Letters on Reviews	125, 367, 427
Colonization and Emancipation	332	Prayer of Faith	682
Colonization, Remarks on the controversy between the friends and the enemies of	539	Private Christians, the Duties of	578
Colonizationists and Abolitionists, Union of	396, 569	Qualifications Ministerial, for the Christian Ministry	268, 499
Crucifixion	245, 320, 388, 487, 547	Reflections on the Life and Character of Judas	215, 251
Depravity and Selfishness	623	Religious Intolerance,	556
Doctrine of Merit	546	Remarks, Introductory, to the Book of Judges	607
Doctrine of the Trinity	667	Report of the Suffolk South Association to the Committee of the Pastoral, 186, Do. of the Harmony do., 307; Do. of the Andover do., 310; Do. of the Old Colony do., 311; Do. of the Pilgrim do., 313; Do. of the Franklin do., 315; Do. of the Brookfield do., 318; Do. of the Hampden do.	439
Duties of Private Christians	578	Revivals, Dr. Porter's Letters on	125, 367, 427
Edwards, President, his Letter on Lay-Predaching	545	Sabbath Schools, the Advantages of	240
Evangelical and Liberal Systems, Comparison of	333	Selfishness and Depravity	623
Evil, Moral, the Introduction of	605	Sermons, Written	330
Example, the Force of, in the Christian Pastor	101	Sin, is it the necessary means of the greatest good?	481
Exposition	532, 599, 601, 661, 663	Steward, the Unjust	633
Faith, the Prayer of	682	Stewardship, Christian	261
Government, God's Mode of over the world	505		
Heathen, Appeal in behalf of	134		
Infidelity in the United States	204		
Intolerance, Religious	536		
Judas, Reflections on the Life and Character of	215, 251		
Judges, Remarks Introductory to the Book of	607		

Systems, the Evangelical and the Liberal, Comparison of 333  
 Taylor, Dr., his Reply to Dr. Tyler 5, 65  
 Trinity, Doctrine of, 667  
 Tyler, Dr., his Letter to the Editor of the Spirit of the Pilgrims, 234  
 Union of Colonizationists and Abolitionists 396, 569  
 United States, Infidelity in 204

INDEX OF REVIEWS.

Review of Thatcher's Lives of the Indians 41  
 Sermons by the Rev. Charles Jenkins 48  
 Conversations between two Laymen on Strict and Mixed Communion—with Dr. Griffin's Letter on Communion, and the Review of it by Professor Ripley of Newton 103, 142  
 Calmet's Dictionary of the Holy Bible, revised by Professor Robinson 118  
 The Sherburne Controversy 149  
 Memoir of Felix Neff, Pastor of the High Alps 160  
 Letters to a Young Student in the First Stage of a Liberal Education 227  
 Auto-Biography of Thomas Shephard 274  
 The Young Christian 343  
 Gurney's Remarks on the History, Authority, and Use of the Sabbath 358  
*Φρονιμα τῆ Πνευματος* ; or, The Grace and Duty of being Spiritually Minded, abridged by Dr. Porter 402  
 The Harbinger of the Millennium 408  
 Bridges's Christian ministry 518  
 Researches in Armenia 464  
 Life and Character of Miss Susan Anthony 591  
 Memoirs of American Missionaries 651

Unitarian Tract, No. 18.—  
 The Evidence necessary to establish the doctrine of the Trinity 651  
 Norton's Reasons 686

INDEX TO THE PRINCIPAL CRITICAL NOTICES.

Notice of The History of the State of Maine, from its first discovery, A. D. 1602, to its separation from Mass. in 1820 61  
 Lay-Missionary, or the Way to do Good 62  
 Letters to a Brother on Practical Subjects 63  
 Grosvenor's Sermon on the Death of the Rev. Samuel Judson 121  
 Fairchild's Sermon. The 'Gospel defended against Infidels 178  
 Professor Fisher's Obituary Address at the Funeral of Rev. Royal Washburn, 179  
 Dr. Hawes' Sermon on Rightly dividing the Word of Truth 180  
 Metcalf's Address to the Phi Phi Beta Kappa Society of Brown University 182  
 Anecdotes of Natural History 424  
 Scripture Natural History, with Sketches of Palestine ib.  
 Bible Stories for the use of Children 425  
 The Active Christian ib.  
 Lectures on the Literary History of the Bible, by Joel Hawes; on the Principle of Association, by T. H. Gallaudet; and on the Temporal Benefits of the Sabbath, by Rev. Horace Hooker 482  
 War Unreasonable and Unscriptural 485  
 Bacon's Manual for Young Church-Members 665  
 Foster's Glory of the Age ib.  
 Foster's Essays (5th ed.) 666

THE  
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. VI.

JANUARY, 1833.

NO. 1.

COMMUNICATIONS.

DR. TAYLOR'S REPLY TO DR. TYLER.

[Continued from p. 669, Vol. V.]

The next subject on which Dr. Tyler questions the consistency and orthodoxy of my views, is *the doctrine of Depravity by nature*.

The first difficulty in the mind of Dr. Tyler is, to see how "mankind come into the world with the same nature *in kind*, as that with which Adam was created, and which the child Jesus possessed;" and are still "*by nature* totally depraved, or sinners *by nature*."

Here I am compelled to exhibit, at the outset, a singular misstatement by Dr. Tyler, of the very point on which the question turns. I did admit, as he says, that "mankind come into the world with the same nature *in kind*, as that with which Adam was created." But I also said,—“If Dr. Tyler means, by the same nature, the same *in degree*, he is, as he supposes he may be, entirely mistaken.” I added also,—“The very passage which he quotes from the Christian Spectator, points out a striking difference between Adam and his posterity, viz. the higher *degree* or strength of propensity, &c. with which the latter are first called to moral action.” Now these things were said, professedly to correct Dr. Tyler's mistake in regard to my theory. He could not be ignorant of the fact; nor that I adverted to a possible difference *in the degree* of propensity, as altogether sufficient to subvert his reasoning.—What course then does Dr. Tyler adopt? Neither in his statement of the point at issue, nor in his reasonings, does he once advert to that difference between the nature of Adam, and that of his posterity, which I had supposed might exist. He undertakes to show,

that the difference in moral character between Adam and his posterity, cannot be accounted for, on what he calls my theory. How?—By disregarding the very characteristic of that theory, which subverts all his reasoning—by refusing even to notice that possible difference between the nature of Adam and that of his posterity, which would be a sufficient solution of the difference in moral character! Is this the way to exhibit the views of an opponent?

To present to Dr. Tyler then the true question,—I ask, Is it impossible that God, in consequence of the fall of Adam, should bring his posterity into existence with the same constitutional powers and properties *in kind*, which Adam possessed, but widely different *in degree*? Is it impossible, that since the fall constitutional propensities to natural good, should be so strong *in degree*, that in the first and in every instance of moral action, and in all circumstances of their existence, the interposition of divine grace excepted, the whole race should sin? On this supposition, would it not be as proper to say, *that mankind are sinners by nature*, as on the supposition of *a propagated propensity to sin itself*?—Let Dr. Tyler answer these questions.

That I may not be misapprehended on this part of the subject, I remark, that I do not affirm that difference *in the degree* of propensity to natural good *is*, but simply that it *may be*, the reason, why Adam did not sin, and why his posterity do sin. All that I feel authorized to affirm is, *that such is the nature of mankind, that in all the appropriate circumstances of their existence, they will uniformly sin*.—To say *that mankind are by nature sinners*, is, in my view, to use a popular and comprehensive form of expression, in which the word *nature* comprises both the intrinsic properties of the mind, and all those circumstances in which mankind are in common placed by their Creator as the *established* order of things, and which, in this sense, must be considered natural, or a part of nature. Hence, I suppose, that the phraseology under consideration, is not properly used to ascribe sin, *solely* and *exclusively* to the *intrinsic* properties of the mind, as if circumstances of temptation were not as necessary to sin, as a nature to be tempted. Nor is it properly used, in my view, to decide, that mankind would sin, were the Creator to place them with the same intrinsic nature *in kind*, in some other possible circumstances—especially were he to place them from the first under the supernatural influences of his Spirit. But as the comprehensive term *nature* includes both the intrinsic nature of mankind, and their appropriate circumstances or condition, and as all men

with this intrinsic nature, and in these circumstances, uniformly sin, they are properly said *to be sinners by nature*.

From this view of the subject, Dr. Tyler dissents. Not that he denies, that such is the nature of mankind, that they will uniformly sin in the appropriate circumstances of their being. But he gives a more specific import to the language in question; and maintains that 'the posterity of Adam have a different nature *in kind* from that with which Adam was created;' that "human nature (in kind) has undergone some change in consequence of the original apostasy;" that there is in mankind 'a propagated propensity to sin itself;' and that this is the cause or reason of human sinfulness.

I shall now examine the considerations alledged by Dr. Tyler, in support of this view of the subject.

He says, "And when we say, that one moral being is *by nature* sinful, and that another is *by nature* holy, we *must* mean, if we mean any thing, that *their natures* are not alike. If they are alike, then *nature* is, in *no sense*, the cause or reason why one is holy, and the other sinful." Here then the question is, what is the *true meaning* of the language, that *mankind are by nature sinners*? Not surely, what meaning Dr. Tyler may have given to this language; but what is its meaning according to the only criterion—the *usus loquendi*, the common usage of mankind, in analogous cases. In other words, what do we mean, when in the language of common life, we say of any event, consequence, or result, it is *by nature*? For example, when we say, that the motion of an unsupported stone is *by nature* toward the earth; do we mean, as Dr. Tyler's view implies, to ascribe its motion towards the earth, solely and exclusively to *the intrinsic* properties or nature of the stone? Or, do we include both its *intrinsic* properties or nature, and its circumstances in this world; and simply mean, that such is its nature, that it will move toward the earth in all the appropriate circumstances of its existence? The former is not and cannot be our meaning, unless indeed we intend to say what we know to be false. For, we know, that the stone with the same intrinsic properties or nature *in kind* which it now possesses, would in some other possible circumstances, e. g. were the Creator to place it within the sun's attraction, move from the earth and toward the sun. This single example is enough to show, that the language now under consideration, has never, as the language of common life, the *specific* import given it by Dr. Tyler; but that it means, and all that it means is, *that such is the intrinsic nature* of the thing spoken of, *that in all its appropriate circumstances, the specified consequences will follow*.

To illustrate this part of the subject, as it respects the difference in original moral character between Adam and his posterity; let us suppose that one kind of tree, which when first planted in Eden, produced only good fruit, has ever since the curse on the ground, in all the circumstances of its existence, uniformly produced bad fruit. Now it will be agreed, that to account for this difference in the fruit produced, *some* difference *in nature*, in the comprehensive import of the term, must be admitted; i. e. a difference must be supposed, either in the intrinsic properties of the tree in kind or degree; or in its appropriate and fixed condition and circumstances; or in both. All will admit, that it would be proper to say of such a tree, that it bears bad fruit *by nature*. But what would this language denote? Would it decide in what *specific* respect a change has taken place in what is thus comprehensively called *nature*? Would it decide whether this change was in the *inherent* properties of the tree itself, or in the fixed and appropriate, and therefore now the *natural*, circumstances of its existence, or in both? Plainly, the inherent properties, or intrinsic nature of the tree may be *in kind* the same as at first; and still it may be said with exact truth, and in the full import of the language, that this kind of tree bears bad fruit *by nature*. So the difference between the moral character of Adam, and that of his posterity, if we regard the *usus loquendi*, must be ascribed *to nature*, in the comprehensive import which I have given to the language. To give it the *particular* or specific meaning which Dr. Tyler gives it, is as remote from all correct usage, as it would be to give a similar specific import to similar phraseology in the case of the tree.—Such then is common usage in regard to the language under consideration;—and such of course, I may say, was the usage of the Apostle in Eph. ii. 3, when writing a plain epistle to plain men. On this decisive authority of usage then, I claim, that the language in question has not the meaning which Dr. Tyler gives it. What it means, and all that it means, is that such is the nature of mankind, that they uniformly sin, in all the appropriate circumstances of their existence; so that, contrary to the Arminian doctrine, no change in these circumstances by education, by example, by diminishing temptation, &c.—nothing without the supernatural interposition of the Divine Spirit, will prevent their sinning.

Again, Dr. Tyler says, “Adam was created in the image of God. Are all his posterity born into the world in the image of God?”\* If Dr. Tyler means the *moral* image of God, I cer-

\* Perhaps Dr. Tyler believes, that holiness was a created *constitutional property* of the soul of Adam—a property constituting, as truly, and in the same sense, a part of his

tainly deny, that the posterity of Adam are born in that image. If he means, what may be called the *constitutional* image of God, the Scriptures very explicitly assert that *men*, (not Adam merely) are made, (not propagated,) in that image; Dr. Tyler's doctrine of a constitutional propensity to sin in men, notwithstanding. Vide 1 Cor. xi. 7; James iii. 9. Gen. ix. 6.

Again, Dr. Tyler asks, on the supposition that the nature of Adam and that of his posterity were alike in kind, "why did not he sin, as soon as he commenced his moral existence?"—I answer, that the reason *may* have been, that *his nature differed*, not *in kind* but *in degree*, from that of his posterity.—He also asks, respecting the child Jesus; "If he possessed in his human nature, the same propensities that other children possess, why did not he exhibit the same moral character?"\*—I might answer as before, that his human nature *may* have differed from that of other children, not in kind, but *in degree*. Indeed, in both these cases, I might assign other sufficient reasons for the difference in moral character. In the case of Christ, we know, 'that the Spirit was not given by measure;' and in the case of Adam it *may be* true, as some have maintained, that holiness was the result of a special divine agency. In these ways, then, Dr. Tyler's questions are fully answered; and the cases shown not necessarily to imply any such difference in constitutional properties, as he supposes.

But let us now look at the peculiar character of Dr. Tyler's reasoning on this subject. His design is to prove, that the intrinsic nature of Adam's posterity differs *in kind* from that with which Adam was created; and his proof rests entirely on this

nature as a man, as did his intellect or his will. But if Dr. Tyler intends to reason on such an assumption, he is bound to prove the truth of it. If he regards it as essential to orthodoxy, he is bound to prove this also, before he denies the orthodoxy of those who differ from him on this point. Pres. Edwards, though he considered a holy disposition as concreated with Adam, beginning as soon as *humanity* began, still considered this holy disposition, in which the spiritual image of God consisted, as a very different thing from a *constitutional* property of the soul. He says, it consisted "IN DIVINE LOVE;" which is of course a mental *exercise*, and not a constitutional property of the soul.

\* I had said, "How the Saviour was tempted *in all points* like as we are, if he had *not*, and we have, a *constitutional* PROPENSITY to sin, it may be difficult for Dr. Tyler to show." Dr. Tyler however can 'see no difficulty in the case.' Nor is it strange that, with his notions of *being tempted in all points*, he can see none. He supposes that the *similarity* respects merely the *external objects* of temptation. He says, "Does the fact, that different individuals are made the objects of similar temptations, (he should have said, *tempted alike in all points*) prove that they possess the same nature?"—I answer, most undeniably. For how can a being be tempted *in all points* as others are, who has not the same *constitutional* propensities, which they have? Is not a *constitutional propensity to sin, one point* and a very *peculiar point*, in which we are tempted, according to Dr. Tyler? How then, can a being who has no such propensity be tempted *in all points* as we are? Surely Dr. Tyler must deny the truth of the declaration, that Christ was tempted *in all points* like as we are; or he must maintain that Christ had a *constitutional propensity to sin*, such as Dr. Tyler ascribes to us; or he must give up his doctrine, that we have such a propensity.

assumption, that if their *natures* were the same *in kind*, their moral characters must be the same. Indeed, all Dr. Tyler's reasoning on this part of the subject, is based on this very assumption. For, if Adam and his posterity may possess the *same natures in kind*, and their moral characters still be different, then surely difference in their *intrinsic* natures, cannot be inferred from difference in moral character. Now I ask Dr. Tyler, how he knows, or how he can prove, that two moral beings, with exactly the same intrinsic natures *in kind*, may not, under some diversity of condition and circumstances, ordered and settled by divine wisdom, *uniformly* exhibit substantial diversity of moral character? Indeed, if this be not so in some cases, how will Dr. Tyler account for the fact, that either Adam or angels sinned at all; and especially, that a whole race, who are made *after the constitutional image* of God himself, should sin? Must there have been in each of these cases, a prior created or propagated propensity to sin?

Besides, Dr. Tyler's principle is, that if the *intrinsic natures* of two beings are the same *in kind*, their moral characters must infallibly be the same; which amounts to this new and unheard of principle,—unheard of alike in the school of philosophy and of common sense,—viz. *that the same cause will produce the same, and not different effects, under all possible diversity of circumstances.* Dr. Tyler surely will admit, that the appropriate condition or circumstances, in which God first gave existence to Adam, were widely different from those, which divine wisdom appointed and fixed, as the appropriate condition and circumstances of Adam's posterity. How then can Dr. Tyler prove, though the former did not sin in the appropriate circumstances in which God at first gave him existence, that it is impossible that the latter, with the same nature *in kind*, should uniformly sin in *their* appropriate circumstances? How can Dr. Tyler prove, THAT THE SAME CAUSE WILL NOT PRODUCE DIFFERENT EFFECTS, IN DIFFERENT CIRCUMSTANCES? Is this sound philosophy? Is it the decision of common sense? Will it be pretended that the sacred writers have given their sanction to this principle? But if this principle cannot be sustained, then is the whole of Dr. Tyler's reasoning on the present topic, subverted.

But says Dr. Tyler, "When we say it is the nature of the lion to eat flesh, and the nature of the ox to eat grass, we mean that their natures are not alike." True. But this is a case, in which we have *different* effects in the *same* circumstances; which of course proves a difference in the nature of the causes. Place the lion and the ox in the *same* circumstances, the one

will eat flesh and not grass, and the other grass and not flesh. But what has this to do with proving a difference of nature between Adam and his posterity, on the ground that they acted differently in different circumstances? Had Adam himself a new and different nature, as the cause of his first sin?

On the supposition, that two beings have the same nature *in kind*, Dr. Tyler maintains, that to ascribe difference in character to *nature in any sense*, "would be to ascribe two directly opposite effects to the same cause." But I have shown, that if their *natural* condition and circumstances are so changed, that different effects uniformly follow, then *nature*, in the comprehensive sense, has been changed; and these effects are, in *the proper sense*, said to be *by nature*. Nor is this all. It is proper to ascribe different effects to the *same* cause, when placed in different circumstances.

But says Dr. Tyler, "If all mankind come into the world with the same nature (in kind) as that with which Adam was created,—then the *only* reason that they do not exhibit the same character, *must be* that they are placed in different circumstances. It cannot be owing *at all* to the nature which they possess. Consequently, it is not true, that they are by nature sinners."—I answer, first,—and I request Dr. Tyler's particular attention to this answer,—that the difference in moral character in the two cases, *may be* owing, not to a difference of nature *in kind*; but to a difference *in the degree* of constitutional propensities to natural good. If this *may be* true, Dr. Tyler's present position is wholly unauthorized.—I answer, secondly, that Dr. Tyler entirely mistakes the question at issue. The question is, not how shall we account for the fact that Adam did not sin, when all his posterity do sin; but what is the true account of the latter fact? And here it is undeniable, whatever be the reason why Adam did not sin, or why the child Jesus did not sin, or why angels did not sin,—still, if all mankind since the fall, uniformly sin, in all those circumstances which their Creator has appointed as the *natural condition* of their existence, then they are truly and properly said to be sinners *by nature*. To deny this, is to maintain that the common, universal use of language is not a *proper* use.—But says Dr. Tyler, "It cannot be owing *at all* to the nature which *they possess*." But I ask, why not? Could they sin without a nature to be tempted? Does Dr. Tyler know that they would sin, if their nature were in some other respect than in kind, different from what it is? Does he know that the propensities or principles of their nature remaining the same *in kind*, might not have been so balanced, that they would not have sinned? Why

then cannot their sin be owing *at all* to the nature which they possess?

I go further. According to the view already taken of the subject, it would be proper according to usage, and so far as the mere form of expression is concerned, to ascribe the sin of mankind to *their* nature. In the language of common life, we often ascribe a result not only to *nature*, but to *the nature of the antecedent itself*, when we mean nothing more than that such is its nature, that in its appropriate circumstances of existence, such a result will follow. Thus, should some kind of tree uniformly bear bad fruit, we should in common speech ascribe the fact to *the nature of the tree itself*. But who would mean by such language to decide that the same tree *in kind*, would not bear good fruit in another planet, or that it did not in fact bear good fruit in paradise? No one surely, who believes that the same causes may produce very different effects in different circumstances. Even if the Apostle then, in Eph. ii. 3, had ascribed the sinfulness of mankind to *their* nature, common usage would not only not authorize, but forbid the import which Dr. Tyler gives to such language. Still more objectionable is it to give this meaning to the general phrase *by nature*.

I have thus shown, that Dr. Tyler's reasoning proceeds entirely on this assumption, that if we suppose sameness of nature *in kind*, we cannot account for diversity of moral character in two moral beings, be the difference in the *degree* of their propensities to natural good, and the difference in their circumstances, what they may. Of the conclusiveness of such reasoning, which rests wholly on the assumption, *that the same causes in kind cannot produce different effects in different circumstances*, I leave the reader to judge.

The next topic is the connexion between Adam's sin and the sinfulness of his posterity. If Adam had not sinned, Dr. Tyler supposes that his posterity would have come into the world with the same nature with which Adam was created; and on the supposition, that they have now the same nature, he asks,—“What influence has the fall exerted on the posterity of Adam?”—I answer, that it *may* have been to change their nature, not *in kind*, but *in degree*. God, by creation, or if Dr. Tyler prefers it, by the law of propagating souls, could give an *increased strength* to the constitutional propensities to natural good in Adam's posterity, as easily as impart a propagated propensity to sin, to their very nature. The former may be a fixed and permanent occasion of sin in men, as well as the latter. Such then *may* be the way or mode, to say noth-

ing of other possible modes, in which our sin is *in consequence* of Adam's sin. In this way, our sin may consist wholly in our own free voluntary act—an act in which we are conscious of preferring the gratification of propensities to the inferior good, when we can and ought to govern them by preferring the supreme good; an act for which we alone are responsible, instead of *a constitutional property* of the mind, for which our Maker alone would be responsible.—Dr. Tyler asks yet again, “why I have not explained this connexion between Adam's sin and that of his posterity, so that my readers can understand it?”—I have only to say, that I can trust all my readers in this respect, except those who assume that there is *no other mode* of consequence but by a *propagated propensity*.

Having answered Dr. Tyler's questions, I must be allowed to put a question or two to Dr. Tyler, which probably he will not attempt to answer.—If Adam and the child Jesus possessed *the same nature*, how came it to pass, according to Dr. Tyler's principles, that the former sinned, and that the latter did not? Here it seems, we have two moral beings, *with the same nature*, and with such a nature too that sin on the part of either is utterly unaccountable according to Dr. Tyler, and yet one sins, and the other does not. Will Dr. Tyler account for this difference in character, without supposing a difference in their *nature*; or will he still hold a theory, which is contradicted by acknowledged facts?

Another question for Dr. Tyler to answer is this,—Why did Adam sin at all, seeing he had neither a created nor propagated propensity to sin? If no being can sin, without a constitutional propensity to sin, how came Adam to sin? If one being, as Adam, can sin and did in fact sin, without such a propensity to sin, why may not others?

I ask again—What is *a propensity to sin*? Is it an act of preference or choice? If so, how can it be a constitutional property of the mind, and be propagated from parent to child? If it is not a voluntary state or act of the mind, is it an involuntary desire or inclination toward some good, pleasure, or enjoyment, like our propensities to food and drink? If so, what good, pleasure, or enjoyment is there in the object of this propensity, viz. *sin*, or a sinful volition? Or, are there propensities which have no good, pleasure, or enjoyment for their object?—Now I put these questions to Dr. Tyler, as presenting insuperable difficulties in forming even a conception of a constitutional propensity to *sin*, as possible in the nature of things.

Once more,—Has not Dr. Tyler proved his own doctrine to be false? Dr. Tyler often represents the entire depravity of

man as consisting in *the act of the will*. He says, "When we say man is entirely depraved, we mean that he is a guilty rebel, who *voluntarily refuses* allegiance to the God who made him." If the entire depravity of man consists in this *voluntary refusal*, how does it consist also in a *propagated propensity to sin*?

Next, in respect to my *heresy* on this subject. Dr. Tyler first quotes a few passages from the famous heretic Pelagius, ("not invidiously" be it remembered) as expressing the same opinions which I have expressed.\* The first passage is, "that Adam's sin hurt nobody but himself."—If Dr. Tyler seriously believes that I entertain such an opinion as this, after what I have said to the contrary, I shall not attempt to change his belief. The next passages which he cites from this condemned heretic, are on the left. Those on the right are from Dr. Tyler.

## PELAGIUS.

## DR. TYLER.

"The good and evil by which we deserve either praise or blame, are not born with us, but ARE DONE BY US; being made capable either of virtue or vice,

"When we say that man is *entirely depraved*, we mean that he is a guilty rebel, who *voluntarily refuses* allegiance to the God who made him."

"All men are *made capable* of complying with the invitations of the Gospel. With these powers they were CREATED, and they need no new powers, &c. If he (the sinner) has power to rebel against God, he has power to submit to God. He has all the power which he needs; all indeed which he can possess."

we are born equally without the one as without the other, and before the action of man's *own will*, that alone belongs to him, which God himself has made. Sin is not the fault of nature, but of the will."

"If God were to renew his (the sinner's) heart this moment,—he would *only* be *willing* to use aright the power which he now abuses. They (sinners) are *unwilling* to break off their sins, &c. *Such is* the desperate depravity of the heart.—They are dependent on God, BECAUSE they *abuse and pervert* their free agency."

I now ask,—If Pelagius has asserted *capacity* of right and of wrong action in men, has not Dr. Tyler asserted it also? If Pelagius says that depravity, sin, or ill-desert, pertains exclusively to what is *done* by us, i. e. *to the acts of the will*, has not Dr. Tyler said this also? If the language of Pelagius implies that no change in man's *nature* as he is born is necessary, has not Dr. Tyler affirmed that no change is accomplished by renewing grace, except that which consists in *in an act of the*

\* Dr. Tyler says in his Remarks, 'that to the eleven articles of my creed, he does not object.'

will ; and that our dependence “ results *solely* from the perverseness and obstinacy of the heart ? ”—Now I do not say that these things are heresy in Dr. Tyler ; nor even Pelagianism, properly so called. I suppose Pelagius believed in common with Dr. Tyler, in the existence of God. And I doubt not, that if Dr. Tyler, or *any* of his friends should further search the writings of Pelagius, *something* might be found from which Dr. Tyler would *in fact* dissent. But if the above opinions are Pelagianism—rank heresy—how stands Dr. Tyler ?

The reader is next accosted with the enquiry, ‘ in what respect my theory differs from that of Dr. Ware ? ’ This writer in the passage cited by Dr. Tyler, speaks of man ‘ as no more *inclined* to vice than to virtue ; and of his natural affections as all of them originally *good*. ’—If Dr. Tyler believes that I hold the opinions which he understands, and intends his readers should understand, this language to express, he will be gratified to know, that while I reject his doctrine of *a constitutional propagated propensity to sin*, I fully believe, that from man’s propensities to natural good in the permanent circumstances in which he is placed, *results* a very *strong tendency* or *prone-ness* to sin ; and that in this import of the language, man is *much more inclined*, or *disposed* to sin than to holiness.—I further believe, that none of man’s natural affections are *moral-ly* good. But why say this ? Dr. Tyler knew it all before.

Again, I had spoken of ‘ the possibility, that propensities for natural good, like those which led our first parents to sin, might prove the occasion of universal sin to their posterity. ’ Dr. Tyler passes this without any attempt at refutation, except that he requests his reader to compare it with passages which he cites from “ the great champion of Arminianism, Dr. Taylor of Norwich. ”\* Now why, when this point is thus distinctly presented to Dr. Tyler—when his doctrine of *a propagated propensity to sin*, is thus demolished at a stroke by an undeniable matter of fact,—why does he fly away from it, to tell us what “ the great champion of Arminianism ” has said ? What is this, but to resort to reproach, where argument fails ? How will such an expedient set aside *the matter of fact*, that Adam sinned without a created or propagated propensity to sin ? Why does Dr. Tyler, in view of this *fact* respecting Adam, assume the utter impossibility of the same fact respecting his posterity ? What sort of reasoning is this,—to deny, that what *has been a*

\* Dr. Tyler here quotes a long passage from Pres. Edwards, the object of which is to show, ‘ that permanence in the effect, proves permanence in the cause. ’ As I have never questioned the correctness of this principle, I am not able to perceive the design of this quotation from Edwards.

fact in one instance, *can* be a fact in another, because an Arminian has said that it can be? Does Dr. Tyler wish to influence—is he willing to take the responsibility of influencing, the faith of his fellow men by such reasoning? Now I hold Dr. Tyler to this;—that he either deny and disprove the FACT in one case, or no more deny the *possibility* of it in other cases. He admits *the fact*, that Adam sinned without a *previous constitutional propensity to sin*; and on the basis of this *fact*, as furnishing an absolute demonstration of the point, I claim, *that Adam's posterity may sin without such a propensity*. Let Dr. Tyler then fairly set aside this inference, or admit that all his reasoning on this subject, has no title even to respect.

Again—I had appealed to Pres. Edwards, as denying what Dr. Tyler maintains,—denying that “there is *any thing*, by *any means* infused into human nature—any *quality* not from the *choice* of our minds, ALTERING *the natural constitution, faculties, and dispositions* of our souls;” and also as asserting ‘that the depravity of the heart is to be traced to the common natural principles of self-love, natural appetite, &c. which were in man IN INNOCENCE.’ What course does Dr. Tyler now take? He very carefully suppresses the above statements of Edwards, and brings forward other passages in which this writer affirms, ‘that mankind *are born* with a corrupt nature, and a propensity in their nature to sin.’ Dr. Tyler thus aims to make the impression, that Edwards’s view of a corrupt nature, and of a propensity to sin, coincides with his own. But I ask,—If Edwards in these passages asserts Dr. Tyler’s views, does he not contradict them in those which I cited? And why may not I alledge the latter for my purpose, as well as Dr. Tyler alledge the former for his purpose?

But a correct view of Edwards’s scheme will show, that he fell into no such contradiction, as the *mere words* now before the reader may seem to imply. It will also show the truth of my position, ‘that Edwards unequivocally denies what Dr. Tyler asserts on the present topic, and affirms, what I affirm.’ The question then is, *What was Edwards’s view of this corrupt nature, and of the manner in which mankind become the subjects of it?*

Here, that we may ascertain the *real* opinions of Edwards, it is necessary to state and keep in mind his views of the old doctrine of imputation: a doctrine long since rejected by New England divines. Edwards then held, “that Adam and his posterity were *one complex person—one moral whole—one moral person* ;”—that “by the law of union, there was a com-

munion and *co-existence* of acts and affections," so that "Adam's posterity committed the very *same sin* which Adam committed;" that "the guilt which a man has on his soul at his first existence is not a *double* guilt, but one and simple—the guilt of the sin by which THE SPECIES *rebelled* against God."—This is enough to show what original sin was in the view of Edwards, viz. free, voluntary action; the act of Adam's posterity as *one* with Adam, and 'committing the very same transgression of law;' sin consisting, *not* in a *constitutional property* of the mind, but in *the act of rebelling* against God. Such sin surely is not a propagated propensity to sin,—not a constitutional attribute of the soul.

But how, according to Edwards, does the nature of man become corrupt, or how do the posterity of Adam become the subjects of depravity of heart? In the same manner, as we shall see, in which *Adam* corrupted his nature; not by creation, nor yet by the laws of propagation. "In order to account for a sinful corruption of nature, yea, a total native depravity of heart," Edwards says, "the absence of positive good principles, and so the withholding of a special divine influence to impart and maintain those good principles, *leaving the common natural principles of self-love, natural appetite, &c.* which were in man in INNOCENCE—leaving these, I say, to themselves, *will be followed* with the corruption, yea, the total corruption of the heart, without occasion for any positive influence at all; and that it was THUS INDEED, that corruption of nature came on Adam *immediately on his fall*, and comes on all his posterity *as sinning in him* and falling with him."

Now who will pretend, that corruption of nature or depravity of heart, was in Edwards's view of it, either a created or *propagated property* of the soul? What was it in his view, but a disposition to gratify the self-same propensities which were in man *in innocence*—a disposition resulting from or "*following*" these propensities, when left to themselves?

In accordance with this view of the subject we shall see, that Pres. Edwards contradicts Dr. Tyler's statements, not less explicitly, than had this been his direct and sole object.—Dr. Tyler then maintains, that there is '*something*' in our nature, which is truly the cause or reason why all men sin.' He calls this *something*, 'a native propensity to evil *propagated* from parent to child like *other natural propensities*;' compares it to 'traits of character which run in the blood;' says that *properties of mind* are propagated '*in some way or other*'—that 'human nature has undergone some change,' &c.; that men possess '*constitutional propensities* different from those which

Adam possessed ;' and compares our nature to sin, to 'the nature of the lion to eat flesh, and to the nature of the ox to eat grass.'

Let us now hear Pres. Edwards. In answering 'the grand objection' to his doctrine as alledged by his antagonist, Edwards says, "He supposes the doctrine of original sin to imply, that *nature must be corrupted*, by some positive influence; SOMETHING, *by some means or other*, infused into the human nature; some *quality* NOT FROM THE CHOICE of our minds, but like a taint, tincture, or infection, ALTERING *the natural constitution*, faculties and *dispositions* of our souls.—Whereas, *truly our doctrine neither* IMPLIES NOR INFERS ANY SUCH THING." Could a more point-blank denial of Dr. Tyler's statements, have been given?

Edwards goes on to say, "that there is not the least need of supposing any *evil quality* infused, implanted, or inwrought into the *nature of man*, &c.; or of supposing that man is conceived or born with a *fountain of evil* in his heart, such as is any thing properly positive;"—that "as Adam's nature became corrupt without God's implanting or infusing *any evil thing* into his nature, so does the nature of his posterity"—that "the inferior principles of self-love and natural appetite, which were given only to serve, being alone and left to themselves, of course became reigning principles;"—that "man did immediately *set up himself* and the objects of his private affections, and appetites as supreme."—What then if Pres. Edwards did *in words* maintain that man is born with a corrupt nature, or a propensity in his nature to sin; are mere *sounds* to be regarded in face of the most unequivocal definitions and explanations? Surely the question is, what did Pres. Edwards mean—what was the thing intended by this language? Was it a *constitutional* property of the mind—was it *an evil quality* implanted in the soul by the laws of propagation—was it a *fountain* of evil with which man is born—was it some *quality not from the choice* of our minds, *altering* our natural constitution.—Or, was it simply and solely 'the same depravity of heart' which came on Adam immediately on his fall, which of course was neither created nor propagated—man's voluntarily setting up himself and the objects of his private affections and appetites, as supreme—a preference of these objects to God? To any who regard things rather than words, more need not be said, to show that Pres. Edwards denied what Dr. Tyler asserts, and affirmed what I affirm.

## DR. WOODS'S THIRD LETTER TO DR. BEECHER.

DEAR BROTHER,

I have just received your sermon on DEPENDENCE and FREE-AGENCY; and, according to a suggestion in your last Letter to me, I shall proceed to remark on some of the topics which it introduces.

Between your views and mine on the subject of man's *ability* and *inability*, there is not, so far as I can judge, any real disagreement. You do indeed sometimes use language different from that which I am accustomed to use. But when you come to explain your language, as you do in your second Letter, and in your Sermon just published, you show that you have a meaning which I can fully adopt. In the first place you do, what many who make much of man's ability neglect to do; that is, you clearly make the distinction between *natural* ability and inability, and *moral*. *Natural* ability you explain to be, "the intellectual and moral faculties which God has given to men, commensurate with his requirements;"—"the plenary powers of a free agent;"—"such a capacity for obedience, as creates perfect obligation to obey." You say, it is "what the law means, when it commands us to love God with all our *heart* and *soul* and *mind* and *strength*." The sinner, according to your representations, is under no *natural impossibility* to obey God; that is, it is not impossible for him to obey God in the same sense in which it is impossible for him "to create a world." To all this I fully subscribe. Here then is no room for debate. I have been acquainted with ministers who have differed widely in their language respecting human ability, and who have had much debate on the subject, and have seemed to entertain opposite opinions. But I doubt not, they would all coincide with the above statements. They would all admit that man has those intellectual and moral faculties which constitute him a moral agent, justly accountable for his actions, and under perfect obligation to obey the divine law. But all would not judge it best to give to these faculties the name of *ability*, or even of *natural ability*. In regard to the words by which the sentiment, held by them all, may most properly be expressed, there would be a difference. And would not this be the only difference? And would not any dispute on the subject be *logomachy*? Suppose a minister of Christ does not like the expression, that sinners have a *natural ability* to obey the divine law. But he admits that they have those

faculties of mind which constitute them moral and accountable beings, put them under a perfect obligation to obey, and bring on them a just condemnation for disobedience. That is, he admits all that you mean by *natural ability*, though he does not use the language. Respecting this, you and he may differ. But the moment you lay aside the particular word, *ability*, and use other words expressing exactly what you mean by this, the difference between you and him is ended. You both believe that sinners have all the powers necessary to moral agents, and that they are under perfect obligation to do what God commands; though you may perhaps attach more importance to this view of the subject, and may give it more prominence in your preaching, than he thinks proper.

The same as to *inability*. I find from your explanations, that you believe the sinner to be the subject of all the *inability*, which I have ever attributed to him. You say that man, in his unrenewed state, is "destitute of holiness and prone to evil;" that he has "an *inflexible* bias of will to evil;" "a sinfulness of heart and obliquity of will, which overrules and perverts his free agency only to purposes of evil;" that he has "an *obstinate* will, which as really and certainly demands the interposition of special divine influence, as if his inability were natural;" that "his *natural ability* never avails, either alone, or by any power of truth, or help of man, to recover him from alienation to obedience;" that "the special, renovating influence of the Spirit is *indispensable* to his salvation;" "that motives and obligation are by his obstinacy swept away;" and "that it is the work of the Holy Spirit to *convince* him of *sin*, to *enlighten* his mind, to *renew* his will, and to *persuade* and *enable* him to embrace Christ;" that "the powers requisite to free agency, which still remain in degenerate man, are wholly perverted, and *hopeless of recovery*, without the grace of God;" "that men, as sinners, are dependent on Christ for a willingness to do any thing which will save their souls." You hold it to be "a fact, that mind, once ruined, never recovers itself;" "that the disease rages on, unreclaimed by its own miseries, and only exasperated by rejected remedies;" that "the main-spring of the soul for holy action, is gone, and that divine influence is the only substitute."

You not only make these just and moving representations of the state of unregenerate man, but you expressly speak of him as having an *inability* to obey God. You make the "distinction between the *ability* of man as a free agent, and his *inability* as a sinner," and say, "it is a distinction singularly plain, obvious to popular apprehension, and sanctioned by the

common sense of all men." You fully justify the language of the Bible in ascribing to man, "inability to obey the gospel." You quote the passages which declare, that "the carnal mind *cannot* be subject to the law of God;—that they who are in the flesh *cannot* please God;" and you say, the inability spoken of means the *impossibility* of becoming holy by any philosophical culture of the natural powers, or *by any possible modification* of our depraved nature;" though you very properly take care to guard us against supposing, that the *inability* of sinners implies "an absolute natural impossibility," or has "a *passive, material* import." You say also, that "no language is *more frequent* in the common intercourse of men, than the terms, *unable, cannot*, and the like, to express slight, or determined and unchanging aversion; and that the same use of these terms pervades the Bible;" that "inability, meaning only voluntary aversion, or permanent choice or disinclination, is ascribed to God, to Christ, and to good men in as strong terms, as inability to obey the gospel is ascribed to sinners."

In regard to the above cited representations of yours, I see no ground for controversy. I am aware that, in your preaching, you are accustomed to say less frequently than many others, that sinners *cannot* believe and obey. But even if you should think it best, as some do, to go farther, and wholly to avoid expressions of that kind; still while, in other words, you attribute to the sinner every thing which I and others mean by such expressions; there would be no difference, except in *words*. In the unmeasured abundance of remarks which have lately been made on the subject of ability and inability, it has not been always remembered that the principal if not the only difference which exists among thinking and candid men, is *verbal*. If this should be kept in mind, as it ought to be, and if men who are going to dispute, would just stop to inquire, what they are going to dispute about, it would very much narrow the ground of debate, and diminish, if not remove, the occasions of strife.

Still I hold the question about *the use of particular words* to be of no small importance. Words are the usual means of conveying the thoughts of our own minds to the minds of others. If then our words are not well chosen, we may fail of communicating what we wish, and may communicate something very different; and so the gift of speech, instead of contributing to useful purposes, may become positively hurtful.

It is not my design to controvert any of the positions which you lay down on the subject of *ability* and *inability*. Putting a candid and fair construction on your language, and considering you as agreeing with those excellent authors to whom

you refer with approbation, I am satisfied, as I have before said, that there is no material difference between your opinions and mine on this subject. My remarks therefore will relate chiefly, if not wholly, to *modes of expression*; though not so much to any which you employ, as to those employed by others. There is danger, I think, of a wrong impression being made on the minds of men from the manner in which some preachers speak respecting the sinner's ability. And although there is much in what you have lately given to the public, which is well calculated to guard against this danger; I humbly conceive that still greater caution in your manner of treating the subject, would do no hurt.

I am somewhat afraid of extending my remarks farther than is necessary. But the subject is of acknowledged importance, and I will endeavour not to be a burden to your patience. My object is to show, as briefly as I can, that the language which is often employed on the subject of man's ability and inability, is subject to some serious inconveniences, both *philological* and *metaphysical*.

One of the principal inconveniences arises from the different senses of the words, and from the difficulty in many cases of knowing which of the senses is intended. The words and expressions are ambiguous. The natural inference will be, that where words have such a variety of senses, and where there is such danger of ambiguity, *there is great need of caution*. For if we do not guard against *ambiguity*, and if we leave others at a loss about the meaning of our words; we shall fail of answering the purposes of language. It would be better to be silent, than to use words which do not convey a clear, definite sense. For words, used ambiguously, occasion a thousand mistakes, and are the fruitful source of controversy and strife. Common honesty requires us to avoid ambiguity in our language; because ambiguity may lead others to believe what we regard as false; and benevolence requires it; because the falsehood which they may believe, is likely to prove injurious.

I have said that the words relating to the present subject are used in a variety of senses. To illustrate this, we will take the word, *ability*, or *power*. In the general sense, power is that which produces or is capable of producing an effect. As power resides in various things, and is productive of various effects; it is distinguished into various kinds. Effects produced in the physical world, as vegetation, thunder, earthquakes, &c., and all effects of a mechanical nature, result immediately from what we call *physical causes*, and these causes we consider as involving a *physical power*. Why? Because the effects are of

a *physical nature*. By the *physical power of man* is understood his *bodily power*, or *muscular strength*.

Let me here remark, that the word *physical* is, in good use, almost always confined to the material world, and is, accordingly, much more limited in sense, than the word *natural*; though we might suppose they would have the same sense. The word *natural* is indeed often applied to the same subjects in the same sense with *physical*; but its application does not stop here. It is used also in relation to certain faculties, affections, and actions of intelligent beings. In this case, it cannot signify that the things to which it is applied, are of a *material* or *physical* nature; but it is used to distinguish them from that which is, in the higher sense, of a *moral* nature; that is, from that which comes directly under the cognizance of the moral law, and is regarded as worthy of praise or blame.

But what is *natural ability*, or *power*, as used in relation to the present subject? It is that combination of faculties, which constitutes man a moral and accountable agent, a fit subject of law, and under perfect obligation to obey.

But how great is the perplexity which may be occasioned here by the customary manner of using words! The powers and faculties which constitute man a responsible agent, are called *natural*. But is the agent which these *natural faculties* constitute, called, as we might suppose he would be, a *natural* agent? No. He is a *moral* agent. And what is still more remarkable, some of those very faculties which make up *natural* ability or power, are still called *moral* faculties; such as the faculty of loving and hating, and especially the faculty of judging between good and evil. They are all called *natural* powers or faculties; (not *physical*;) and some of them are called *moral* faculties; and all these *natural* faculties, including those which are also *moral*, constitute what is called a *moral* agent, not a *natural* agent. But how happens it that some of the *natural* faculties are denominated *moral*, while others are not? Is it because we consider those which are denominated moral as being either conformed or not conformed to the divine law, and so worthy of praise or blame? No. Is it because those faculties which are called *moral*, though not, in themselves, either morally good or evil, do yet, *when exercised*, directly constitute moral good or evil? This may be true in some cases, but not in respect to conscience, whose exercises are not considered as either praise-worthy or blame-worthy.

To what confusion are we here exposed! We have *natural* faculties, some of which are also *moral*, and *moral* faculties which are *natural*; but our *ability*, constituted by all

these, is *natural* ability, not *moral*; and we have at the same time, and in close connection with this *natural ability*, an *inability* which is altogether *moral*. And what is very singular in our use of words, we say this inability, which is *moral* in distinction from what is *natural*,—is still *natural*, i. e. *naturally* belongs to us, or belongs to us in our *natural state*; or, in other words, we are *naturally depraved, naturally inclined to moral evil*.

Seeing, then, that the words *ability, inability, natural, and moral*, are taken in so many senses; how obvious is it that we must exercise constant care, if we would use them so as to avoid whatever would be ambiguous or obscure.

But I have a little more to say as to *moral power*. Understood in the common sense, *moral power* is that power which exerts a moral influence, or produces effects of a moral nature. Thus we say of a Whitefield or an Edwards, that he has great *moral power*; that is, power to exert a great moral influence upon others, or to produce great moral effects. We say too that wicked men have moral power. And we moreover say, that both holy men and wicked men have *natural power* to exert a *moral influence*, that is, to do good or to do hurt to their fellow men? In this case, it would certainly require some care to trace out the difference between *natural power*, and *moral power*; though the common difference between *natural ability* and *moral* is so obvious.

But what is *moral inability* in relation to the principal subject before us? Is it the want of *moral power*, in the sense above described? No. The sinner, who is the subject of *moral inability*, may still have a high degree of *moral power*. His *moral inability* consists in his strong aversion to holiness: but his *moral power* does not consist in his *love* of holiness, as we might suppose, but in his power to exert a moral influence upon others.

But why is the depravity of the sinner, or his inflexible bias to evil, called *inability*? Because it has an evident analogy to inability in other cases, and in the literal sense. Inability, in the original, literal sense, hinders a man from doing that to which his inability relates. For example: his inability to walk effectually prevents his walking. Now as the sinner's wickedness of heart, or aversion to holiness, effectually hinders him from doing what God commands, it is called *inability*. And it is called *moral inability*, because the hinderance it puts in the way is of a *moral nature*; it is *sin,—moral evil*; not a natural and innocent infirmity. But *moral ability* or power, as denoting the opposite of this, is not commonly used.

Now what a remarkable circumstance it is, that while *natural inability* and *moral inability* are opposite to each other, and utterly exclusive of each other; we still speak of moral inability as *natural* to man! Our inability to obey God is not *natural inability*; and yet it is *natural*!

The farther we proceed in examining this subject, the more deeply must we feel, that there is danger of leaving a vague, if not an erroneous impression on the minds of men, by some of the language in common use, and that the utmost care is necessary to guard against confusion. Suppose that a preacher says strongly and without qualification, that sinners are *perfectly able* to obey the Gospel; that they *can* repent and believe; that they have in themselves *complete power* to do the will of God. How can we know what he means? You show in your Sermon, and others have shown, that the terms, expressive of *ability* and *inability*, are used in different senses; and you make it appear how important the difference is, and what weighty consequences depend on our treating the subject so as to be rightly understood. But do preachers and writers always express themselves so as to be rightly understood? When they affirm that the sinner *can* do, or is in himself *perfectly able* to do all that God requires, how can it be determined whether they refer to that ability (as it is called) which consists in the combination of faculties belonging to a moral agent, or to an ability which is opposite to the *inability* which the Scriptures attribute to the sinner? If any one understands them in the former sense, his conception of the subject is right; if in the latter, he is mistaken; and his mistake may endanger his most important interests. I maintain therefore, that ministers of the Gospel, instead of treating this subject carelessly and unguardedly, as though it were impossible for them to be misunderstood,—or as though they were *willing* to be misunderstood,—ought to do all in their power in the way of caution, to prevent a wrong impression, and to convey the truth clearly and without mixture to the minds of their hearers.

If I am asked, what is to be done by ministers in order to prevent mistake, and to guide their hearers into the truth; my first answer is, let them take pains to understand the subject thoroughly themselves. Some appear to imagine that the whole subject of man's ability and moral agency, treated in the most metaphysical manner, is exceedingly easy to be understood; that it is encumbered with no difficulties; that they have a perfect comprehension of it, and can answer any questions about it with the greatest readiness, and with full confidence. Whereas, if they would go a little below the surface,

and learn to reason profoundly; if they would read Locke, and Edwards, and Tucker, and other able writers on the Will, and on Moral Agency, and bring themselves to *think*, as well as read; they would by and by come upon difficulties which would try their strength. Men find nothing hard or difficult in this and other kindred subjects, because they never take pains to go into a thorough examination. Patient inquiry, intense thought, and clear, accurate knowledge, are very apt to make men modest, and candid, and cautious; while self-confidence and rashness are the genuine offspring of ignorance.

If we have examined this subject well, and attained to a tolerable understanding of it, we have seen that the terms relating to it, are used in a great variety of senses, and that, in different parts of the same discussion, their meaning is frequently shifted. We shall find much care necessary to prevent the confusion which is apt to be occasioned in this way. And as the words employed have, by use, become capable of so many senses, we must labor in each case to make the particular sense we wish to express, obvious and definite; and this we may do. For although words, taken in their various applications, have many senses; it does not follow from this, that it must be a matter of doubt what their meaning is in any particular place. The nature of the subject may show what the meaning is; and may show it clearly. Some discriminating epithet, or the general train of thought, or some other circumstance, may show the meaning, and may show it as definitely and satisfactorily, as if words were used which have only one sense. If then we use words which have various senses, we must take special pains to use them in such a manner, as to avoid *ambiguity*:—for words, however various their senses as used on different occasions, are not ambiguous in any particular place, if it is evident from circumstances what meaning they are there intended to have.

The following are among the principal circumstances, which may give to the words *ability, power, can, &c.* a definite meaning, notwithstanding the variety of senses which they bear in the different places where they are used.

1. The meaning of these words may be made obvious and definite *by a consideration of the particular error which the preacher is aiming to confute, or the mistake he is aiming to correct.*

Take the following example. The preacher knows the plea which sinners often make either in their words or their thoughts, to excuse themselves for neglecting the duties of religion; that is, the plea of *inability*. By this plea, they attempt to palliate their guilt and justify themselves in impenitence. They cher-

ish the idea, that they are subject to an inability which frees them in a great measure, if not wholly, from their obligation to obey the divine commands. The preacher, from an anxious desire to correct so hurtful a mistake, tells them that their plea is groundless; that they have no reason thus to consider themselves as unable to do what God requires; that they are subject to no such inability; that they have all the power which is necessary; and that they are perfectly able to comply with the divine commands. Now although the words he employs are used in different senses, and although it would be difficult to determine merely from the expressions themselves, what is the sense intended; yet this may be determined from a consideration of that hurtful mistake which the preacher aims to remove from the minds of those whom he addresses. Sinners, conscious that such is the state of their own minds, might very naturally be led to put a definite construction upon the preacher's words, and a construction corresponding with his intention. The obvious meaning of his language, in these circumstances, might be this;—that sinners have no *such* inability as they suppose,—none which can furnish the least excuse for their impenitence; that they have an *ability* which is the *opposite* of the *inability* which they plead,—an ability which puts them under obligation to obey God, and takes away all excuse for disobedience. The ability spoken of would thus be understood to be what is called *natural ability*, that is, the possession of all the powers and faculties necessary to complete moral agency. The language employed by the preacher, though in itself unguarded, yet coming in contact with such a state of mind in sinners, and used professedly for such a purpose, may have a desirable effect upon them,—may be the means of taking away their false refuge, and producing in them a just sense of their guilt, and their obligation to put away their sins and obey the Gospel. And doubtless many a pious and devoted minister, who makes a free use, and what I think an unguarded and incorrect use of such expressions as those I have repeated, does it from a benevolent regard to sinners in such a state of mind, and for the purpose of producing an effect upon them so necessary to their welfare:—though I am persuaded that other language might be used, which would be better suited to answer this purpose.

But if this kind of representation may, in the case I have mentioned, have a favorable influence, it is very likely, in other cases, to have an unfavorable influence. If a minister were to speak in private to persons in just the condition I have described, or if the whole congregation addressed by him, were made

up of such persons, or if he should make it evident that he confined his remarks to such; he might perhaps use the language under consideration with comparatively little danger. But he speaks to various classes of persons, who are in a very different state from that above mentioned. And what effect is likely to be produced upon *them*?

Look at the case of those, who, in the spirit of pride and self-sufficiency, indulge the thought, that they are, of themselves, in all respects able to obey the law and the Gospel; that they are possessed of all the power of every kind which they need, and that they are in no degree dependent upon any special influence of the Holy Spirit to prepare them for heaven. The number of those who indulge such a feeling is undoubtedly great. The feeling is one which takes deep root in the carnal mind, and which it is very difficult to eradicate. What now is the portion of truth, best adapted to be useful to those who are under the influence of such a feeling?—best adapted to subdue the loftiness of their hearts, and lead them to cry for mercy? Shall they be told, in accordance with the suggestions of their own proud hearts, that they have a sufficiency of power for all the purposes of duty, and are perfectly able, of themselves, to work out their own salvation? Would not such a sentiment, inculcated upon them in such circumstances, be likely to confirm their self-confidence, and increase their spiritual blindness? Did Christ or his Apostles advance such a sentiment when they addressed themselves to persons of such a character? Far otherwise.—“No man can come unto me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him.” This was said with special reference to the self-righteous Jews.—Again; “How can ye believe, who receive honor one of another?” “The carnal mind is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.” These, among others, are truths which should be exhibited to the proud and self-sufficient,—being evidently adapted to expose the deceit and wickedness of their hearts, and to convince them that no efforts of their unsanctified nature can be pleasing to God, and that unless they are born again, they cannot see his kingdom.

Look at another class of persons, namely, those who have been seriously attentive to the subject of religion, and have had convictions of sin, and have made many efforts, such as awakened but unrenewed sinners often make, to obtain deliverance, and have at length come to the full persuasion, that they are dead in sin, and must perish forever, and that justly, unless God in his great mercy shall interpose to save them;—a state of mind similar to that of Brainerd, just before his conversion.

Shall we speak to such persons of their *ability, as moral agents*? For what purpose? All the ends to be accomplished by this, are accomplished already; for they feel their obligation to obey, and feel it deeply. They have done with all attempts to palliate their guilt, or to excuse themselves for continuing in sin. Why then should we declare to them their *ability*? Will any ability which they possess, or their consciousness of possessing it, ever avail in the least to their conversion, without the renewing of the Holy Ghost? We do not believe, nor can we make them believe, that it will; and if they should believe this, they would believe a dangerous error. Such persons need to hear, not of their ability to save themselves, but of *Christ's* ability to save them. Our message to them should be,—“Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” Christ crucified is the doctrine eminently suited to their case. They feel themselves to be sick, and should be directed to the great Physician. The Saviour should be set before them in all his glory and fulness, and they should be invited, as poor and wretched sinners, and ready to perish, to trust in him alone, and to receive from him the gift of eternal life.

I refer to one more class of persons,—to humble, devout Christians, who have been taught over and over again, that they are not sufficient of themselves for any thing spiritually good, and that all their sufficiency is of God; who trust not in their own strength, but in the strength of Christ; and who ascribe to him whatever works of piety they perform, saying as the Apostle did; “Not I, but the grace of God which was with me.” Such persons, (and their number in our congregations I trust is not small,) are far from being in a state of mind to relish the doctrine of *man's ability*, as sometimes set forth. Should the preacher tell them that they are perfectly able, of themselves, to render complete obedience to God's holy commands, and should they understand his language in the most natural and obvious sense; they might reply, that such a sentiment stands in direct opposition to their experience, their consciousness, and their prayers; and in opposition to those words of their Saviour, which they know to be true:—“*Without me ye can do nothing.*” They might say, that they daily acknowledge the weakness of their faith and love and resolution, and ask God to strengthen them; that instead of thinking themselves sufficient, as they once did, to uphold and guide themselves, they rely upon God to uphold and guide them; and that they have a growing conviction that they always, and in all respects, need the aids of divine grace, and that they should

be utterly disheartened in regard to their great work, did not their help come from the Lord.

Thus the case stands. There may be a part of a congregation in such a state of mind, that the language above recited respecting man's ability, addressed to them by a preacher, may correct a hurtful mistake, and make a salutary impression upon them. And our knowing that the preacher has persons of such a description in his view, and that he aims to correct such a mistake, would shield his language from ambiguity, and lead us to understand it in the very sense which he wishes to convey. But there are other classes of hearers, composing the greater part of common congregations, who are in widely different states of mind, and to whom such a representation of man's ability is not likely to be useful. This being the case, we ought certainly to exercise the most watchful care lest we should communicate to the minds of a large portion of our hearers a different idea from that which we ourselves entertain, and which we wish to communicate for their good. Both benevolence and honesty enjoin this care upon us.

2. A preacher or writer may prevent ambiguity and give to words, which are used in various senses, an obvious and definite sense, *either by what stands connected with the words, or what precedes them, or by the nature of the subject.*

To illustrate this, I will refer to a passage in your Sermon. (p. 11.) You speak of "the distinction between the *ability* of man *as a free agent*, and his *inability as a sinner*;" a distinction, which you say, is singularly plain and obvious. I take then the word *ability*. This word has many senses. In relation to the general subject of discussion, it has *two* senses; which you are accustomed to mark, in the common way, by the epithets *natural* and *moral*. But in this place neither of these epithets is used. You speak of "*ability*" merely. How do we know what kind of ability you mean?—We know, first, from the nature of the *subject*. It is the ability of man *as a free agent*; that is, the ability which belongs to him as a free agent, and without which he could not be a free agent. But we know your meaning still more clearly by your previous explanations. You have told us expressly what the ability is which a free and accountable agent has; that is, such powers and faculties of mind as make him a fit subject of law, and put him under obligation to obey. And this possession of intellectual and moral faculties, commensurate with the requirements of the law, you have called *natural ability*. This is the kind of ability which any attentive reader would see to be what you mean in this place. I produce this as an instance, in which

the nature of the subject and other circumstances prevent ambiguity, and show clearly which of several meanings the word is intended to have.

In the same sentence you speak of man's "*inability as a sinner.*" Here I determined the sense in the same way. It is the inability of man *as a sinner*; an inability arising from the fact of his being a sinner. This of course must be something very different from the absence of that *ability* just mentioned; for that is essential to his being a moral agent; and if that is wanting, he is not capable of either holiness or sin. But your previous explanations make it still more plain. You have told us that there is a *moral* inability, consisting in a sinful disposition, obstinacy of will, wickedness of heart; and that this is the inability to obey which belongs to the sinner. We are satisfied, then, that this is the inability of man as a sinner, of which you here mean to speak; an inability consisting in his "*inflexible bias to evil.*" The nature and circumstances of the subject make this perfectly clear. And we can have no difficulty as to the meaning of any other sentence, which represents that man, *as a free moral agent*, has an ability to obey, and an *inability, as a sinner*; in other words, that man, *as a moral agent, can* obey, and *as a sinner, cannot.*

But in some places you assert the ability, and "the full ability of every *sinner* to comply with the terms of salvation." The question naturally arises, whether you assert this of a sinner *as a sinner*. This would be the more obvious import of the expression. But this would contradict the other representation, which attributes an *inability* to man *as a sinner*. How then are we to determine the sense of the word *ability*, as here used? It is indeed easy for *me* to determine the sense you wish to convey, because I am familiarly acquainted with your views on the subject. But the expression, taken by itself, might convey a wrong sense, and might lead your readers to say:—"In one place it is represented, that man, as a free agent, has ability to obey, and an *inability as a sinner*; but in this place, that he has full *ability*, not only as a free agent, but also *as a sinner.*"

I have noticed this as a passage where you have not guarded against ambiguity so well as you generally do. But I have done it mainly for the purpose of introducing a more general remark; namely; that some preachers at the present day frequently assert that a perfect ability to obey belongs to *the sinner*;—that *he* is able to do, or can do all that God requires; while they say nothing at all to prevent their hearers from understanding them to mean that the sinner has an ability in eve-

ry sense, and that he is subject to no kind of *inability*. If this were their meaning, they would set themselves in opposition to your Sermon, and to the common sentiment of Christian ministers, and to the word of God. If this is not their meaning, they should make it appear; for it is not well that preachers should have a particular meaning in their own minds, and express a different one by their words; or, that they should leave their meaning doubtful. If any man really believes what you have affirmed and what the Scriptures affirm, respecting man's *inability* to obey the divine law,—that is, “his inability *as a sinner*,” or, what is called his *moral* inability,—and will make it evident that he believes it, and will say nothing contrary to it, I will never complain of him for asserting that man has all the powers and faculties necessary to moral agency, and complete obligation to obey. Yea, he may say with my full concurrence, that so far as the powers of moral agency are concerned, man is entirely *able* to do all that God requires; and that were it not for his wicked, obstinate disposition, there would be nothing to hinder his obedience. But for preachers continually to represent, that man has all the powers of a moral agent, and can do what God requires, while they say nothing of his *moral impotency*, or, as you express it, his “inability *as a sinner*,” is to give a very partial view of the subject, and to open the door for a pernicious error.

Permit me here to say that, in our addresses to common congregations on this as well as other subjects, it seems to me important, that we should make use of *common language*, in the common, popular sense. Any mixture here of the appropriate terms or the appropriate ideas of metaphysical science, breeds perplexity and confusion. The language of common life is the proper language of religious discourse. You say very justly, that “no language is *more frequent* in the common intercourse of men, than the terms *unable, cannot*, and the like, to express either slight, or determined and unchanging aversion; and that the same use of these terms *pervades the Bible*.” And why should it not *pervade our sermons*? When we speak of the same subject, in the same connexion, and for the same purposes, with the sacred writers, why should we not use the same kind of language? I admit that the sense of the words under consideration, as they are used in the Bible, is a secondary and figurative sense. But the nature of the subject and the circumstances of the case clearly show what the sense of the inspired writer is; so that the right impression is always made on the mind of the attentive and candid reader. The *true* sense, which is here the figurative, becomes the *obvious* sense.

The word of God cannot be mended. It is inconsistent with a becoming reverence for Scripture to attempt to mend it. It is the practice of some preachers, whenever they refer to the passages of Scripture which teach expressly that "no man *can* come to Christ, unless he is drawn of the Father;" "that the carnal mind is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed *can* be;" "that they who are in the flesh *cannot* please God;" and that those who receive honor one of another *cannot* believe;—it is, I say, the practice of some preachers, whenever they refer to such passages, to avoid the language of the Bible, and to substitute another kind of expression. Instead of saying, "no man *can* come to Christ, unless he is drawn of the Father," they say, no man ever *will* come to Christ unless he is drawn of the Father. They say that the carnal mind *is* not, neither indeed *will be* subject to the divine law; and that they who are in the flesh *will* not do what is pleasing to God, or that it is a *certainty* they will not.—They seem to be afraid to venture upon the simple and forcible language of the inspired writers. I do not think that you are exposed to so serious a charge as this. But there is here and there in your Sermon some appearance of your preferring another turn of expression, when the very language of Scripture would be exactly in place, and would express what you wish to express, more forcibly, and with greater effect, than any other. But no one can impute to you an *intention* to avoid Scripture language on this subject, seeing you not only make occasional use of it, but expressly justify it. Far be it from me to wish in the least to restrain the liberty of ministers, or to confine them to one set of expressions, even to those which are found in the Bible, or to bring them in their judgement, or taste, or their manner of preaching, to conform exactly to any one standard,—and least of all to mine. But if any man who professes to believe and to preach the word of God, feels it to be necessary to *avoid* the language which Christ and the Apostles used on the same subject on which he is speaking, and in similar circumstances; it is certainly time for him to pause, and inquire whether all is as it should be. John Newton cautions Christians against entertaining such views on the doctrines of religion, as will make any part of the Bible unwelcome to them; and suggests, that if we find ourselves inwardly displeased with any of the declarations of God's word, we have reason to suspect there is something wrong in the state of our hearts. I say the same, and with double emphasis, as to ministers; whose office brings them into the closest connexion with the word of God, and who are justly expected to cherish the deepest reverence and love for it,

and to infuse its peculiarities as to thought, expression, and spirit, into their discourses. If any of them find that, in their manner of speaking as to man's ability or inability, or any other subject, *they are getting off from the manner of the inspired writers*, and are studiously conforming to the phraseology of a particular sect or party, (which last some do so exactly, that you can quickly tell, on hearing them talk a little, to what party they belong, just as you can tell a Quaker by his peculiar costume and dialect,) if any find this to be the case with themselves, they have good reason to look about them, and inquire, who is their Lord and Master; and whose cause they are called to promote, and by what means.

You say, in varied forms of expression, that "the powers requisite to free agency," which remain in the sinner, "are wholly *perverted*, and *hopeless of recovery* without the grace of God;" that no one "*can* subdue the will, but he who commanded the light to shine out of darkness;" that the obstinacy of the sinner is inflexible, and his wicked decision "*irrecoverable*, but by the grace of God." You say too, in language very emphatic, that "the natural ability of man, which avails to create obligation, —*never avails, either alone, or by any power of truth, or help of man, to recover a sinner* from alienation to obedience;" and that there is as a real necessity for special divine influence to bring the sinner to love God, "as though his inability were natural." You take the same position on this subject with Smalley, who says, that "even better natural abilities than sinners have would not be of the least service to them," that is, in bringing them to repentance; that all the strength of men and angels, and even omnipotence itself, if sinners had the direction of it, would never make them good; and that if they only knew what hearts they have, they would despair of help from themselves, let their natural powers be ever so good."

Now if this view of the subject is correct, (and I have no doubt it is so,)—if the power or ability which sinners possess, called their *natural ability*, never avails, either alone, or by any power of truth, or help of man, to recover them; then surely *it ought never to be relied upon for this purpose*,—no, not in the least degree. If we rely upon any thing to produce an effect, to which it never did avail, and never will; our reliance is misplaced, and disappointment must ensue. And the evil of disappointment in this case must be tremendous, because of the vast importance of the interest involved, that is, the salvation of the soul.

And if man's ability, whatever it may be, never avails to his conversion, and if no reliance can be placed upon it for this pur-

pose ; then we ought to take care, in our preaching, to make a distinct and full exhibition of this truth. We ought to keep it constantly in our own view, and in the view of our hearers. The subject is indescribably important. We are engaged in the great work of turning men from their sins and bringing them to believe in Christ. But on what can we rest our hope of success ? What ground of encouragement have we ?—A most momentous inquiry !—Can we expect to convert men *merely by our own efforts* ? No. The word of God and our own experience unite in teaching, that in respect to the actual conversion of sinners, “neither is he that planteth any thing, nor he that watereth.” Can we rely upon the mere power of truth ? No. Divine truth, unaccompanied by the influence of the Spirit, always proves a savour of death unto death. Can we expect the conversion of sinners from the exercise of their intellectual and moral faculties, or the use they will make of their *ability* ? No. For we are all agreed, that “the ability which they have, *never avails to their conversion*. They must be “born again, not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man.” “It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth.”—If the case is such,—“in particular if the *ability* of sinners, however perfect in its kind or great in degree, never avails, either alone or by any power of truth, or help of man, to turn them from their sins,—and if it is so evident, that this cannot be at all relied upon for such a purpose ; then we should never, in our preaching, so speak of the ability of sinners, as to imply that we do rely upon it, or that we think it will ever have any effectual influence to bring about a saving conversion. If we treat the subject so as to imply this, we treat it incorrectly. There is no need that we should be always explaining and guarding our words, or that we should be just so exact in our expressions. But if we speak in such a manner of any ability which sinners have, as to lead them to rely upon it as what will ever avail to their renovation, or to indulge the idea, that because they have a *natural ability* to obey the Gospel, therefore they have reason to hope they shall obey ; we lead them into a great, and what may be a fatal mistake. This I know is your view of the subject. For you hold that the powers of moral agency, which constitute what is meant by *natural ability*, are all perverted, and avail only to create obligation, and to bring on the sinner a just condemnation. You hold, as is evident from many passages in your Sermon, and from frequent representations in your preaching, that there is not the least reason to expect that any sinner will repent, because he *can* repent ; that the special influence of the Spirit is as necessary

to bring a man to repent, as if he had no ability to repent. This I regard as a matter of the highest consequence. As to our particular phraseology here and there, and our mode of teaching the truth, we have our own individual rights, and must be allowed to follow our own judgement and taste. But if, when a preacher undertakes to teach sinners what they must do to be saved, he tells them that they are *perfectly able, of themselves, to repent and be'ieve*, and thus makes their *ability prominent*, as a thing which may be calculated upon to mend their case, or which will ever avail in the least to their salvation; what is this but deceiving them to their hurt? What is it but promoting *self-dependence*, instead of faith in Christ? It certainly becomes us, whose office requires us to take away from sinners every false refuge, and to teach them the way of salvation, and the only ground of their hope, to beware on this subject. If when we speak to them of the powers and faculties which they possess as moral agents, and tell them that, as moral agents, they have an ability commensurate with what God requires, we do it in such a manner as to impress their minds with a sense of their obligation to obey, and their inexcusable wickedness in not obeying; we do well. But if our preaching is such as to make the impression upon sinners, that they are in a favorable state and have a prospect of conversion, because they have a perfect *natural ability*, and that this ability is likely to help them on towards salvation; the impression is false, and the consequences may be fatal to their souls. Is it not, then, important for us frequently to inquire, whether our manner of treating this subject is in all respects safe, and well suited to teach sinners the truth, and nothing else.

There is one more caution which I think necessary; and that is, that we should never treat the subject of the ability of sinners so as to set aside, or be *understood* to set aside, the necessity of divine influence. As the special influence of the Holy Spirit is the only ground of hope that any sinners will be brought to repentance; as this influence is the only thing which can avail to their conversion; we ought clearly to hold it forth *as such*, and never to advance any thing which would imply, that any sinner can come to Christ without being drawn of the Father. To say, as we all do, that the special influence of the Spirit is necessary, absolutely necessary to the sinner's conversion, is the same as to say, that the sinner's conversion cannot be effected without it. This is the meaning of such language in common discourse. If a man says to you, I wish to execute an important work, but *your help is indispensably*

*necessary* to its execution ; you understand his meaning to be, that he *cannot* execute it *without* your help. On the other hand, if you should tell him, he is *perfectly able* to do it *of himself, without your help* ; it would be the same as if you should tell him, that *your help is not necessary*. So it is universally. To say that one thing is, in any sense, *necessary* to the accomplishment of another, is to say, that in the same sense, that other thing *cannot be accomplished without it*. It is most evidently so in regard to our present subject. If we should say, that sinners *can, of themselves, obey the Gospel*, or are *able* to obey, *independently of any special divine influence*, or *without* such influence ; we should of course be understood to teach that no special divine influence is *necessary* ; for to say that such influence is *necessary*, and yet that they can do *without it*, would be a contradiction.

I am aware it may be said, that what is meant by *natural ability* is the essential property of a moral agent, and does not at all depend on the special influence of the Spirit ; and that when we say, the sinner is able of himself, without divine influence, to render holy obedience to God, we say it of him *as a moral agent*, and that mere natural ability is meant. Still the question is, what is the natural and obvious construction which will be put upon such language ? If a preacher may say with propriety, and without danger of a wrong impression, that sinners have a perfect ability to convert themselves, *without the special influence of the Spirit* ; he may with the same propriety say, that the special influence of the Spirit is not *necessary* to the conversion of sinners. But no orthodox minister will say this. And why ? Might it not be urged, that such a declaration would be understood to relate to sinners *as moral agents*, and to mean only, that there is no *natural* necessity for the influence of the Spirit ? Yes : but the plea would be manifestly insufficient ; because the expression that the influence of the Spirit is not necessary to the conversion of sinners, does, according to the established laws of interpreting language, convey the idea, that their conversion may actually take place *without divine influence* ; or, that there is nothing in the way of their conversion, to remove which requires the influence of the Spirit. But it is agreed on all sides, that this idea is totally repugnant to the doctrines of the Gospel. I object to the other expression for the same reason. Because if any one says, without qualification, that sinners are perfectly able to convert themselves without the special influence of the Spirit ; the expression, according to the established rules of interpretation, will naturally be understood to mean, that their conversion may actually

be effected *by their own power, without the divine influence*; or, that there is no obstacle in the way of their conversion, the removal of which requires the special agency of the Spirit. In a word, I object to the expression referred to, because it obviously implies the denial of the doctrine, that the special influence of the Spirit is necessary to conversion. And I see not how any one who believes, that special divine influence is *necessary* to the conversion of sinners, can consistently assert that sinners are perfectly able to convert themselves *without it*. Let us, who are ambassadors of Christ, take care not to handle the word of God deceitfully; and let us never use any expression, though in itself it might be a favorite one, and might be thought to have some advantages,—if it would be liable to a construction not conformed to the truth. If any particular phrase becomes ambiguous;—if we find that it conveys different senses to different persons, and that the meaning which it *may* bear, and which many intelligent Christians understand it to bear, is offensive to them, and at variance with the acknowledged principles of revelation; let us give it up. Why should we retain it? There are other words and phrases which will convey with perfect clearness the sense we intend, and which will be liable to no other sense; and which will give entire satisfaction to all who love the truth. Why should we not use these plain, unambiguous and acceptable words and phrases, instead of those which are ambiguous and offensive? The Apostle Paul was a man of great decision, and a faithful advocate for the truth;—yet he was very condescending and pliable. He would refrain entirely from the use of a particular kind of food, though lawful and beneficial in itself, rather than give offence to a brother. In things indifferent he would bend any way, and become all things to all men. With all his firmness and zeal, he would very cheerfully do what was much more than for us to give up a particular phraseology, to which we have become attached, but which is unacceptable and offensive to others, and to substitute another phraseology, which we admit has the same meaning, and which is more conformed to the language of the Bible. Far, far be it from me, and from you, my brother, and from our fellow-laborers, to insist upon any particular forms of expression, especially if not found in the word of God, which would occasion disaffection, controversy, and division among Christians, when we might, by a little care, find out acceptable words, and use such language as would express our meaning fully, without any of the evils above mentioned. Far be it from us, to be accessory to these evils, either from stiffness, or party zeal, or a misguided conscience. The Christian world has been

filled with strife and bitterness by things just so insignificant, as the use of an unscriptural and offensive form of speech. But this is a day of great things. The kingdom of heaven is at hand. The zeal of Christ's ministers has a glorious object. They are laboring for the enlargement and peace of the church, and the conversion of the world; and they can very well afford to leave little things to others.

The free remarks which I have been making, have, as you have seen, related to *the use of terms*, where, according to the supposition, there is no real difference of opinion. But if there *is* a difference; and if any of those who are accustomed to speak of the sinner's ability without special divine influence, to renew his own heart and turn to God, believe that the sinner really has an ability which can avail to his conversion, or which can in the least degree be relied upon to bring him to repentance; or if they make more of the sinner's ability and free agency in the work of regeneration, than of the Holy Spirit; if they make the sufficiency of man rather than the sufficiency of Christ, prominent in their system; and if they intentionally treat the subject of the sinner's conversion so as to imply that God is not the efficient cause of the change, and that his special and sovereign influence may be dispensed with;—if these are the views which any ministers entertain, and these the modes of teaching which they adopt; then I must conclude that they have need to learn what are the first principles of the Gospel. If any man knows the desperate wickedness of the heart, and the work of the Holy Spirit; he must know that salvation is wholly of God; that he hath mercy on whom he will have mercy; and that those who are penitent and holy, are so, not as the result of their natural disposition or ability, but because they have been renewed by the Spirit of God. To ascribe regeneration to the power, the free will, or the efforts of man, or to the mere influence of truth, as its proper cause,—to ascribe it to any thing but the agency of the divine Spirit, is, in my apprehension, a fundamental error—an error which robs God of his glory, and brings fatal delusion upon the souls of men. I am happy to see that you attach as much importance as I do, to the doctrine of divine influence. For you say in your Sermon, (p. 28,) “If the doctrine of man's free agency and natural ability does set aside the necessity of a special divine influence in regeneration, it cannot be true: for if there is a doctrine of the Bible which is unquestionable and fundamental, it is that of fallen man's dependence for actual holiness on the special influence of the Spirit; and if there is a fact which every man who is saved learns experimentally, it is the certainty of his per-

dition, if Christ by his Spirit does not subdue his will, and reconcile him to God." And you say afterwards, (p. 30,) that the reclaiming of a sinful mind "furnishes occasion, probably, for the greatest display of omnipotence, ever to be witnessed by the universe."—This being our united view of the doctrine of divine influence, it cannot be thought strange, if we should deem it necessary to treat the subject with great care, and should be alarmed at any thing which can give countenance to the opposite error, just noticed, or which has the least appearance of approximating towards it. And any one who is really free from this error, and holds the orthodox doctrine of divine influence, will do an act of Christian kindness to many of his brethren, if he will so express himself, as not to distress them by false alarms.

Let me say in conclusion, that if the doctrine of man's lost and ruined condition and his utter insufficiency to recover himself to the moral image of God, and the necessity of his being renewed by the Holy Spirit, is in any measure overlooked by the ministers of Christ, or is brought into view less frequently, or is made less prominent, than its infinite importance demands; the consequences will undoubtedly be hurtful to the interests of the church. In regard to this point, I cannot express my views better than by referring to some weighty remarks in the late Report of the Synod of Geneva on the state of religion within their bounds. They mention it as one cause why religious excitements have declined, "that human instrumentality was made too prominent and too much trusted in, to the exclusion of the Spirit and power of God, and the simple exhibition of divine truth. God," they say, "having been overlooked, has overlooked us. In the effort to bless ourselves, we have lost the blessing of heaven. Attempting in our own pride and confidence to work our own deliverance, the Almighty arm has been withdrawn from us. Having lightly esteemed the influence of the Holy Ghost, we have been left without it to go on in darkness in our own chosen way." They then proceed to say:—"We must use all the instrumentality of God's appointment with vastly more diligence and constancy. But not trusting in this to save sinners, we must, above all, and more than all, acknowledge God and the power of his Spirit, as the only agent able to overcome the deep aversion of sinners to all good, and make them obedient and submissive to his will."

LEONARD WOODS.

## REVIEWS.

## THATCHER'S LIVES OF THE INDIANS.

This work forms the forty-fifth and forty-sixth numbers of Harper's Family Library. The character of that series is too generally known to require notice here. Let it suffice to say, that it is an improvement on its English prototype, at least so far as the interest of American readers is concerned; inasmuch as it includes works upon subjects peculiarly adapted to the wants of the inhabitants of this continent. We apprehend that the Lives of the Indians will not suffer by comparison with any of the preceding numbers.

At no period of our history could Mr. Thatcher's book have appeared more opportunely. At no time could the statesman, the philosopher, or the Christian, have given his attention to the present condition and future prospects of the unfortunate aborigines more fitly than at present. Thousands of them are at this moment awaiting the crisis that is to decide their fate, and praying to our God, who is also their God, to avert the awful calamities which impend over them. Thousands of unjust and avaricious men are looking forward, with eagerness, to the moment when their hands shall no longer be restrained, and when they may enjoy the spoil of their victims, undisturbed by remonstrance. A few months only have passed since several hundreds of helpless savages were swept from the earth by the strong hand of violence. As far as we can learn, they were not the aggressors; the first blood shed in the quarrel was theirs; they did but defend the inheritance of their fathers. They were savages, but they were men; they wreaked their resentment barbarously, but let it be held in mind that the light of heavenly truth had never reached them, that they had never been instructed to return good for evil, and that they did no more than follow the example of their *soi-disant* Christian neighbors. We, the inhabitants of the Eastern states, are implicated in these matters, in so far as we suffer such wrongs to be committed, having the power to prevent them. The reproach incurred by our southern and western brethren and their accomplice administration, will rest upon our memories as well as theirs. We have sent ministers of the Gospel to proclaim salvation through Christ, and him crucified, to the Indians;—they have been treated like felons for following the exam-

ple of their divine Master, and we have borne it without a murmur. Moreover, our fathers pointed out the path of iniquity in which the oppressors of the present day are walking, and so furnished them with an occasion to rebuke us and retort upon us. It is perfectly clear from Mr. Thatcher's book, that from the first settlement in North America, in 1607, to the present moment, the red men have been undergoing a regular, if not a systematic, wasting process, which neither policy, humanity, nor the precepts of Gospel revelation have interrupted for a moment. But,

Sera tamen tacitis pœna venit pedibus—

the end is not yet. Heaven, doubtless for wise purposes, suffers the work to go on, and in some States the consequences are distinctly seen. To what is the present demoralization in a Section which has bid defiance to the laws of the land and the Supreme Court, owing, if not to the increasing avarice and spirit of violence which the partition of the golden lands of the Cherokees has occasioned? As the heart of Pharaoh grew seven times harder than at first, before the vengeance of Israel's God overtook him, so it seems that something is yet wanting to fill the cup of our national iniquity. It is surely time to pause in our career, and reflect, and we know of no book that will prove a better aid to reflection, on this subject, than the one before us.

There is one source of consolation for the sons of the "pilgrim fathers" to be found in the Lives of the Indians. We learn that our ancestors had some regard for decency in their dealings with the savages, if not always for right. Though they had a charter from their king, empowering them to take possession of the soil, they did not avail themselves of it. It does not appear in what light they regarded the claim of Massachusetts to the soil; whether as a right of possession or mere occupancy; but whatever they thought of it, they at least bought it. And so they treated with the savages on all like subsequent occasions. They did not speak to their red neighbors of the king's divine right, which, it is now pretended, has passed to the *sovereignities*; nor did they tell them that their neighborhood was inconvenient, or that, having more land than they wanted, they must give up a part. For all they received, they gave a consideration; often a very small one, indeed, but still large enough to show their sense of equity, and to satisfy the savages. They effected no treaties by compulsion, they forbade no Indians to complain in their courts, and they made no laws to compel the natives to emigrate. Instead of being imprisoned and maltreated for their pious endeavors, missionaries

were encouraged to teach the Gospel, and Indians to learn. Sometimes, indeed, our ancestors took possession of lands by right of conquest, but their wars were never instigated by lust of gain. If we may trust the book under consideration, the pilgrims never expelled any tribe in order to cast lots for their possessions. We may thank Mr. Thatcher for having put it in our power so easily to rebut the charges which have so often been brought against us.

The author has shown much good feeling, and a proper sense of moral propriety, in his treatment of his subject. He does ample justice to all parties. While he admits that their precarious situation, and the excitement in which they necessarily lived, were some apology for the colonists, he allows that they attacked and exterminated the Pequods without adequate reason, and that they were wholly unjustifiable in putting their prisoners of war to death and selling them into captivity. He has a tear for the fate of the proud but honorable Miantonomo, and a frown for the crafty and selfish, though useful, Uncas. He seems to feel, as well as to understand, the difference between right and wrong. In all instances he lays down his premises clearly and fairly, and reasons upon them in an agreeable as well as philosophic manner. In a word, we have read his work attentively from beginning to end, without detecting an unsound conclusion or an expression offensive to morals or religion. It will not, we think, be thought a less valuable addition to American history, that it may safely be put into the hands of the young. We are not sorry that the author has touched lightly on the grossness of Indian manners and customs, for it would have diminished the interest which the truly noble qualities of his heroes inspire.

Mr. Thatcher, though a quite young man, and though his late years have been occupied by a professional study, is well known to the public as an able contributor to several of our best periodicals. We were prepared to expect much from his abilities, but a work like the *Lives of the Indians* is beyond our expectations. We speak not of the style,—though that is terse, nervous, and often elegant,—or of the materials, much of which has been before the world in various shapes. The matter, partaking as it does of the nature of compilation, gives little scope to invention; nevertheless, the author has found occasion for many ingenious hypotheses.

The arrangement is much to our taste. As the powerful confederacies which have at different times menaced the colonies with destruction, existed at different times, and had no connection with each other, it was impossible to give the book the form of a continu-

ous narrative. Moreover, only a few great names of Indians are known to history. The savages have no chroniclers, and the names of the great body of them must, therefore, necessarily be forgotten. The author, probably moved by these considerations, has given his book the form of biographies of distinguished individuals, each involving the history of some important period and event. Thus, continuity is given to each division of the narrative. Had he written the history of King Philip's war, he must have first gone back to the times of Massasoit, and related the whole proceedings of the first settlers, after which he must have given some account of each of the tribes of Philip's confederacy, their manners, customs, and various other minutiae, so that the thread of the main history must often have been broken, and the interest could not but have been impaired. Instead of this, he has first written the life of Massasoit; and then, that of Philip himself,—omitting out all the details that were not indispensably necessary to the integrity of the story. These are afterwards supplied in the Lives of Miantonomo, Canonchet, Uncas, and others. Each of the sketches is distinct in itself; and such are the incidents, that many of them have much the semblance of romances, though matter of veritable history. We suppose it would be unpardonable to compare them to the Lives of Plutarch; nevertheless, and at the risk of rebuke, we will say that they have given us as much pleasure as ever did the Bœotian's works. Philopœmen was not half so good a general as Little Turtle; for his troops were disciplined before he brought them into action, and we doubt strongly that he ever contended with a foe like 'Mad Anthony' Wayne. If Theseus had tried his hand on an army of American regulars and backwoodsmen, as Tecumseh did, instead of on the minotaur and other monsters, it is questionable if he would have lived to rule in Athens. We think that, their advantages, their want of education, and the ungovernable character of their followers being considered, Tecumseh, Pontiac, and Philip will not suffer by comparison with any names on the page of history. They were sagacious and far-seeing in policy; wise and eloquent in council, and bold in battle; and all this without any adventitious helps; for they owed nothing to teaching or example. Indeed, we see not but that, in other circumstances, Red Jacket might have divided the house with Pitt or Fox, and Pontiac have added as much splendor and dignity to a throne as *Louis le Grand*.

They were not of us: their names, their deeds, and their renown add nothing to the sum of our national glory. They are gone, and "who shall take their place among their people?" Nay, their very people are on the verge of annihilation. The

fires of a thousand council-hearths are out; the print of the mocasin has vanished from a thousand hills; the strong arm, and the blade it wielded, are dust alike. Those who remain, to use the language of a very distinguished chief, "can only weep for the misfortunes of their race." Their ancient possessions are now ours. We will not enter into the discussion of the question whether this result of their wars is to be regretted or not, or whether the wrong of their expulsion—for a wrong it certainly was—was permitted only with a view to an ultimate greater good. Perhaps, it is better that the land which once supported individuals should be made to maintain hundreds; perhaps savages have no right to more ground than they can actually occupy. It is certainly far pleasanter to look upon a numerous Christian population than upon a scanty horde of superstitious barbarians. Whether the change could not have been effected by milder means, and whether the barbarians could not have been awakened to a sense of the beauties of divine truth, is another question. But we owe the noble savages, whose places we have usurped, all the reparation we can make—that their memories should not be buried in the graves where their bodies moulder: we owe it to ourselves, for it should not appear that our fathers contended with unworthy foes. They were savage, they were ruthless; but they fought for freedom; and standing as we do, within sight of Bunker's Hill, we cannot blame them. Their schemes failed, but, as our author says, "none the less credit should for that reason be allowed to their motives or their efforts. They were still statesmen, though the communities over which their influence was exerted, were composed of red men, instead of white. They were still patriots, though they fought only for wild lands and wild liberty. Indeed, it is these very circumstances that make these very efforts, and especially the extraordinary degree of success which attended them, the more honorable and the more signal."

Our author rather favors, we think, a common error concerning Indian oratory. It is, he says, "generally pointed, direct, undisguised, unpolished; but forcible in expression and delivery, brilliant in flashes of imagery, and naturally animated with graphic touches of humor, pathos, and sententious declaration of high-toned principle." Similar commendations may be found in other places, from which we infer, decidedly, that Mr. Thatcher has not been personally acquainted with Indians. It was a natural mistake, that, after reading the speeches of Garangula, Tecumseh, Logan, and Red Jacket, he should suppose that Indian oratory, *generally*, resembles theirs. However, nothing can be farther from the truth. Most Indian speeches

have no one of the characteristics he ascribes to them, as we well know by the painful remembrance of no inconsiderable number. They are, *generally*, the most wearisome, impertinent trials of patience that can be imagined; and, what is worse, they are scarcely intelligible. The ordinary discourse of Indians is plain, direct to the point, like that of other people; but when a chief has a speech to make, he studies it a long while beforehand, and, when he delivers it, envelopes his meaning in a cloud of metaphor, parable, and impertinence; so as to puzzle his hearers, and often himself. The most ordinary conception, even a demand for a glass of whiskey, comes forth in a trope. Such speeches are harder to endure than a fourth-of-July or dinner-table oration. The interpreters themselves cannot always understand what they are requested to translate, or rather, make meaning out of no meaning. This abominable practice has given rise to an opinion, which has been boldly expressed by some authors, that each tribe has two languages, one for ordinary use and the other for holidays. Occasionally, a speaker appears whose natural good sense breaks through the bonds of an absurd custom, and he speaks as if all the eloquence of Greece and Rome were concentrated in him. Such a man was Garangula; such Logan is said to have been. But the general fact, that good speakers do not more abound among Indians than whites, remains unaltered. Perhaps, indeed, by 'oratory' our author means only what is emphatically such,—in other words, eloquence.

We could wish that Mr. Thatcher had furnished some notice of the Muscogeas, or Creeks, in his volumes. Their *history*, certainly, merited his pains, though their biography be not, indeed, so full as might be wished. No speech we have ever heard or read, equalled that of the celebrated Wetherford to General Jackson, after the battle of the Horse Shoe. "You may well speak so to me now," he replied to the harsh address of the general, "There was a time when I could have answered you. I have no choice now—even hope is departed. Once I could cheer my warriors to battle, but I cannot animate the dead. They can no longer hear my voice—their bones are whitening at Talladega, Tallushatches, Emuckfaw, and Tohopeka. I have not surrendered thoughtlessly. While a chance of success remained, I never left my post, or asked for peace. But my warriors are gone, and I now ask it for my nation and myself.—Those who would still hold out, can only be actuated by a mean spirit of revenge. To this they must not and shall not sacrifice the last remnant of their country." We are sorry that we have not room for the whole of this chivalrous and pathetic address.

The Creek declaration of rights, in 1739, is no less pointed and forcible. "This country," it says, "does by ancient right belong to the Creek nation, who have maintained possession of the said right against all opposers by war, and can show heaps of the bones of the enemies slain by them in defence of the said lands." (*Nota Bene*: Georgia did not *then* declare the said right a right of occupancy.)

Our author might have told, too, how M'Intosh sold the beloved homesteads of his people, in 1824, by a treaty which even those who profited by it acknowledged to be illegal. The villainy of M'Intosh, and the ignorance and avarice of the commissioners, would have furnished forth another good page. Afterwards, the tribe he had betrayed adjudged him to death, as a traitor, in solemn council, and he suffered accordingly. In the controversy that afterwards ensued between the United States, Georgia, and the Creeks, Little Prince and Hopothle-yoehola proved themselves equal in some respects to any of the chiefs Mr. Thatcher has commemorated. Any civilized people may be challenged to show abler diplomatic papers than were prepared by these two savages—but no; they were not savages—the title rather belongs to those who oppressed them. However, they could neither read, write, or speak English.

We have mentioned this matter, not as blaming Mr. Thatcher, but because we think the *Lives* will go through more than one edition, and hope he will take the hint we have thus given him, so far as consistent with his biographical plan. We should do him injustice were we to conclude without saying that it must have cost him immense labor to prepare this work. So much scattered were his materials, so many were the authorities he has been obliged to consult, and so rare are the books, to say nothing of either of his manuscript or living sources of information,—that it is matter of astonishment to us how he has been able to get them together. He has, moreover, been very careful in his selection and arrangement.

It will be seen that we have accorded these volumes much less blame than praise, and indeed, it would have been hard to have found material fault with them. The errors are very trifling, and may easily be corrected. In fine, we heartily recommend the book. Mr. Thatcher will deserve to be numbered among the benefactors of American literature, though he should never write another line. He has supplied an absolute want in the history of our country. If there is any part of his book that is better than the rest, it is, in our opinion, either the history of the Six Nations, of Pontiac, of Tecumseh, or of Red Jacket.

SERMONS BY THE LATE REV. CHARLES JENKINS, *Pastor of the third Congregational Church in Portland, Maine.* Portland: A Shirley. 1832. pp. 407.

The design of preaching the Gospel is, to increase the amount of holiness in the world. We have heard of ministers who, because the majority of their hearers had become pious, relinquished their pastoral charge. They seemed to forget, that the existing amount of holiness may be increased by the edification of Christians, as well as by the conversion of sinners. The method in which preaching conduces to its great end is, the application of divine truth to the heart. The Holy Ghost makes his revealed doctrines the food that animates, sustains, and strengthens the pious soul. How shall humility be deepened, if not by a thorough examination of the deep wickedness of the heart? How shall love to God and faith in Christ be increased, if not by clear elucidations of the lovely character of God and the sufficiency of the atonement of Christ?

If then the doctrines of the Gospel are the sword of the Spirit, and must be applied before they can be useful to the heart, it becomes a momentous question,—*how* shall they be applied? It is easy to see that the application of *truth* is different from the application of *arguments for truth*. There is a *philosophical* style of writing on religious subjects, well adapted to the study, but miserably to the pulpit. Every proposition is stated abstractly, and proved by arguments sometimes as intricate as the proposition itself. Sermons thus written may be called full of matter and solid, (heavy they indeed are) but they are not instructive to the bulk of their hearers. They may contain much truth, but not for them who are doomed to sit and sleep under their delivery. The moral sun does not shine, because there are so many misty arguments before it.

There is a *biblical* style of preaching which, in a similar manner, substitutes the exhibition of *proof* for the exhibition of *doctrine*. What truth, important in its practical tendencies, may not be established satisfactorily to a common audience, by the citation of six or eight pertinent and plain texts? Some preachers, however, must cite all the passages which are possibly relevant to their theme, and intersperse them with critical and hermeneutical remarks. They lose by this method the attention of their hearers; for attention will not be given to needless ratiocination, and they preclude the practical benefit of their subject. They exhaust their strength, not in building the house, but in preparing unnecessary pillars for its support.

Preachers ought to remember, that if they live as they should,

their own characters will recommend to many minds the statements which they make, and that to many other minds, their statements, if correct, will recommend themselves. There is a beauty in the doctrines of the Gospel, a simplicity and harmony like that of the planetary system. These qualities constitute internal evidence of the truth of the doctrines, and cause, in the popular mind, an intuitive confidence in their truth. When the preacher's simple enunciation of his proposition secures the assent of his audience, why shall he, we do not say *introduce*, but *prolong* an argument upon it? Why shall he "explain upon a thing till all men doubt it," and dilate upon objections previously unknown, and, without his suggestion, remaining unknown forever? Often does the preacher, bidding farewell to good judgement, direct his people's attention more strongly to the difficulties with which learned sinners have incumbered a truth, than he does to the truth itself; and thus he generates distrust or open disbelief, where before there had been implicit faith.

We stated that the application of divine truth to the heart is a different thing from the application of arguments for this truth. Is there no difference between preparing a medicine by chemical admixtures, and actually administering it when prepared? Argumentation, however, in its proper place, as means to an end, is indispensably important for the preacher, and it is only the excessive and inappropriate use of it which we condemn. How can truth be applied to the heart, unless it be believed by the intellect? Although an audience may be convinced that a doctrine is correct without being affected by the doctrine, they cannot be properly affected by it without being previously convinced. Argument, used as subsidiary to the practical application of doctrine, is necessary, not only for those independent, inquisitive minds, which love to doubt or to deny their teacher's assertions, but also for those who are accustomed to believe on authority. If men be *encouraged* to yield their opinions to the guidance of others, they will be the prey of cunning imposters, and will be liable to be seduced into ruinous error. Those churches are the most firmly barricadoed against heresy, which unite with appropriate feelings a thorough understanding of the reasons for their faith.

Among a large proportion of our clergy the danger is, not that there will be too much, but too little argument. To preach truth *plainly*, is, in the estimation of many, to advance the most familiar ideas in the most familiar manner; to sink the thoughts and expressions of a discourse to a level with the customary thoughts and expressions of its hearers. It is deemed

necessary that addresses to children embody none but children's thoughts, and be clothed in none but children's style. The application of truth to the heart, however, does not require such a degradation of the pulpit. To retail common-places from the preacher's throne, or to deliver as grave discourses a collection of anecdotes, is any thing, rather than "feeding the flock" over which the Holy Ghost has made ministers overseers—rather than giving "to every one his portion in due season." It is any thing, rather than a proper presentation of the majesty and spirituality of *truth*. There is in the doctrines of the Bible something that is commanding and elevating; something that rebukes sensuality, and mortifies the uninquisitive, indolent soul. If those who are daily occupied with the labor of their hands, and whose minds are engrossed in the tempting and sordid interests of time and flesh, find that the Sabbath presents to them nothing intellectual, that the sacred desk accommodates itself to their drowsiness, and that the Bible is treated by the minister as a book of trite sayings, will they feel a becoming reverence for the institutions of religion, an appropriate awe in view of the dignity and authority of religious doctrine? The attempt to make truth plain, by leanness of thought and tameness of style, gives a sad misrepresentation of the very nature of divine truth, and converts that which properly is the "wisdom and power of God" into the ignorance and weakness of men. We often hear it said, 'A preacher should be one among his people;'—how then, we ask, is he to go *before*, and lead the way? Whatever he may be, as *the man*, he should, as *the preacher*, be *above* his people, so that they may look up to him, and respect the "gracious words which come from his lips." He should not indeed overtop the comprehension of his auditors; for if a man is out of sight, he can no more be the *leader* of the throng, than if he were standing in the midst of it; but he should store the popular mind with *new* ideas, enforce doctrine with new arguments, and array his instructions in language, which, while perfectly transparent, shall give the pulpit an elevation above the shop. Hearers will be better pleased with an instructive discourse, enriched with felicitous illustration, than with a meagre harangue, so adapted to their capacities that any man or woman among them might give the same. They deem it a reflection on their understanding, for a minister to address them, as if they were incapable of continuous thought and enlarged ideas. Some men—Dr. Payson for one—have preached to seamen in the seamen's own style; but their sermons have never been so acceptable to members of the nautical profession as to landmen, who were interested with the novelty

of the nautical phrases. Sailors love to be considered *men*, and to be addressed as if they were capable of understanding the language of men. And with regard to the intelligibility of pure and chaste style, it is notorious, that although the provincialisms of one province are obscure to its neighbors, and the technical terms of one profession are jargon to other professions, yet all who speak English can understand the pure and standard English better than that which is corrupt; and even those who use a low and barbarous phraseology are better pleased with their *preacher* when he uses, if he does it skillfully, the elevated and refined.

The taste of the present day is peculiarly unfavorable to the faithful application of religious doctrines, by its demand for high excitement. The cautions which good men have given against metaphysical preaching, instead of being applied, as they ought to have been, to the irrelevant and excessive use of abstract argument, have been by some ministers applied to *all* didactic discourse, and have been perverted to justify incessant exhortation. Some have accordingly crowded their sermons with striking antitheses, bold appeals, and startling metaphors. They have aimed at effect upon the animal passions. Thunderings have been heard at the top of the mountain, lightnings have flashed, but *no law has been promulgated*. What has been the consequence? Giddiness and effervescence of feeling; impatient, blazing zeal among certain classes of the people; and among other classes disgust and contempt. Is the high religious excitement which this preaching produces, healthful? Is it *religion*? When the populace give the reins to their animal nature, and listen in a crowded house to the impassioned discourse of one whose imagination carries captive his judgement, do we see among them that humility, that meekness, that calm submission and considerate love, which are the essence of true piety? Is this inflammation of their feelings sufficiently unequivocal to compensate for the alienation of heart and loss of confidence that such preaching occasions among contemplative men? Is not the excitement as evanescent as it is high? Men may "tarry long at the wine;" but will they not at last experience the want of some solid sustenance?

It is doubtless the fact, that those preachers who devote the body of their discourses to passionate appeals, and stir up all their powers in boisterous and vehement exhortations, will soon produce satiety. The human constitution cannot be stimulated too much; it will cry for the "sincere milk," or the "strong meat." The play of the passions fatigues the soul, and unless the soul's appropriate food be administered, it becomes unable to

endure farther excitement. This style of preaching, which for a few months may please and animate a hearer, at the expiration of these months will leave him listless and stupid; his moral sensibilities worn out, his taste vitiated, his conscience blunted. It not only injures the *health* of the minister, for a man can sustain three hours of close study better than one hour of the fermenting and outpouring of feeling; it materially injures his *influence*. He is frequently betrayed into extravagancies of expression, and acquires the character of a hyperbolic writer. His hearers establish it as a principle that they must receive his remarks with deduction, and in the midst of a solemn address, where no representation can exceed the truth, there they make their allowances! and ward from their consciences many a reproof by the thought that their reprover does *not mean what he says*; that he is *excited*; and when he becomes more sober, will speak more rationally! This is indeed a degradation of pulpit oratory; a *melancholy* degradation. A vast amount of profitable truth is thrown away by the hearers among the rubbish of fanatical vagaries, and a vast amount of the preacher's strength is wasted through the general suspicion, honestly entertained, of his extravagance. We have listened to a man of common plain sense, of calm and collected address, and have seen his audience melted by his honest animadversions. The bare thought, that he uttered the dictates of his deliberate judgement, and did not calculate on leaving room for his hearers to limit and qualify his meaning, gave an influence to every word. We have watched this same audience when they listened to a gifted, fervid, bold declaimer. They were delighted and amused by his vehemence of gesticulation, and sonorous periods, and splendid imagery; they were amused! and they wondered at his power; but they did not *feel* his power; they regarded his most weighty denunciations as rhetorical; and if eloquence consists in adapting a discourse to its end, our plain man was far more eloquent than our orator. And so it is. With a soul wrought up to the highest pitch of excitement, the preacher attempts to raise his hearers to a similar height; if he will proceed calmly and gradually, he may succeed; but by violent expression and startling gesture, he breaks the thread on which his audience hang, and they fall, not to rise again, but to look up and stare, and smile at his sallies and flights. Is this the application of truth to the heart? Or is it rather a flourishing of the sword over the heart and head?

The Sermons of Mr. Jenkins we can cheerfully recommend for their freedom from the several faults to which we have advert-

ed. We discover in them no fine-spun thread of metaphysics which it were irksome for his hearers to unravel; neither do we discover those common-place remarks and hackneyed phrases which so soon cloy the attention of an auditory. There is a repleteness of original thought, and a copiousness of style which interest and instruct. Few hearers would rise from his pulpit performances without an addition to their stock of practical knowledge. The introductions to his discourses are perhaps *too rich*, and give too much promise of valuable sequels. We discover in the volume no straining after pompous periods, nor wild chace for unusual images. A sick man can read it without weariness, and a nervous man without feverish excitement. There is an accuracy of judgement and a practical good sense pervading it, which, to an excitable community, are as necessary as the ballast to a ship.

We have great reason to fear that, under the rhapsodical style of preaching on which we have commented, there are many spurious and illusive conversions. How can it be otherwise? The mind of an unlettered hearer is highly excited. Can it long endure such excitement? It will relapse. From violent agitation it will, exhausted, sink into calmness. Here is a *change*; and the expression "I have experienced a change," is with many minds tantamount to the expression, "I have been converted." Was there not frequently a *change* in king Saul? Does not the pendulum swing to the two extremes?—The hearer, perceiving that his agitation has subsided, and imagining that the subsidence is conversion, is filled with gratitude; and what sinner would not be, when he believed that a *great Governor* had given him a "*pearl of great price*." Though ingratitude is necessarily sinful, gratitude is not necessarily holy. "What shall I render unto the Lord for all his benefits *toward me*," is all that is said by the deluded pretender; while in order to make compensation for the grace which he dreams of having received, he performs cheerfully many duties. He begins to read the Bible, and to pray, and to impart of his substance to charitable objects, and to exhort sinners, and rebuke Christians, and obey the commands of his Deity with the scrupulosity and the *spirit* of the devoted Hindoo. The developements of his selfish feeling are similar to the developements of holy feeling; his Christian friends, his Pastor, are deceived; he is admitted to the visible church, and his salvation, in his own view, is made sure. But all his religion is a mere mercantile religion, so much for so much. Barter, however, has little affinity to grace. Oh how many souls have been inveigled into ruin by the plausible ap-

pearances of a selfish gratitude! irretrievably lost, by mistaking the sinking of nature after an excessive stimulation, for that peace of mind which the world can not give!

A man of that considerate, discriminating intellect which Mr. Jenkins possessed, could not but fear the consequences of the torrent of popular feeling which is sometimes set in motion by rhapsodical preachers. He endeavored to raise landmarks, by which the true and safe channel may be ascertained exactly. In his Sermons on the Character of the Unrenewed, the Results and Uses of the Fact of Human Depravity, the Repentance of Judas, and a Characteristic of true Faith, we discover many passages of sterling worth, in their application to the genuineness of conversions. We make a few extracts.

“The change” from sin to holiness “does not consist in the mere substitution of one set of motives and creeds for another. If it did, there would be nothing marvellous in the achievement of such a change. Nothing is more easy than to change the speculative views of men. A proud man of the world can readily be made a spiritually proud professor of religion. A man of naturally violent temper can easily be converted into a fiery and rash zealot of some religious party. The gay triflers that move in the world of fashion can, without any difficulty, and with scarcely any change, be made the busy retailers of religious gossip—the busy actors in the world of religious romance and dissipation. And such conversions, it is much to be feared, are remarkably numerous in this age of religious profession, of religious talk, and of religious controversy. But ah! this is not *religion*;—this is not to be *born of God*;—this is not to be *a new creature in Jesus Christ*. To make the carnal mind to love God, to love his law though it condemn him, to love his holy sovereignty, to love his methods of saving mercy,—to bring such a mind to loathe itself, to hate sin, to tread the world under foot, to pant after God, to aspire after nothing but the mind that was in Christ;—with man this is verily impossible;—and yet, nothing *short of this* is regeneration.”

The following remarks indicate the same cautious spirit, and are peculiarly valuable to those who are engaged in a religious Revival.

“The spiritual believer will not be precipitate in forming and expressing his opinion of the religious character of others.”—“He knows, that to become a child of God involves an exceedingly great alteration in the inherent bias and relish of the mind; and that to fail to become such is a greater calamity than the loss of existence. Knowing this, and loving and desiring the salvation of the souls of his fellow sinners, with trembling caution will he let the influence of his opinion go to excite or confirm a hope in the breast of one of his fellow immortals. He will think of the tremendous responsibility attached to the influence of such an opinion. It is not the cherishing of an innocent persuasion in his own bosom. It *may* be the sending of a soul to the judgement without being pardoned and renewed. It *may* be fixing the seal of perdition upon an immortal mind. It *may* be giving one a hope which will speedily terminate in everlasting despair. However reluctant therefore he may be to protract the anguish of a sinner, oppressed and burdened with a consciousness of guilt; unwilling as he may well be to destroy the hope of one who has truly submitted to the terms of salvation through Christ, he would rather do this,—oh! he would rather send every broken-hearted sinner who is liable to be directed by his decision all the way through life in hopeless sorrow, than be the occasion of encouraging one in a hope that must prove ruinous.” pp. 236, 237.

The volume of Mr. Jenkins, we think, exhibits a happy specimen of the *proper use of the imagination* in popular sermons. His taste being delicate and correct, his reason being steady and sound, the fancy could not but be chastened. In his Discourse "On Spring," and in that preached on occasion of the memorable avalanche at the White Hills, in August, 1826, we see that his imaginative powers were active, and yet by severe discipline sobered. There are in these, and indeed in all his sermons, an occasional nervousness of style, a felicitous mode of quotation from the Scriptures, a pungency of appeal, and a train of original judicious remark, which commend them alike to the "man of feeling" and "to the man of thought," and invite, as few sermons do, to repeated perusals.

We are much pleased with the brevity of our Author's discourses. Dr. Pope, speaking of Barrow his intimate personal friend, says, "I can find no fault to allege against his character but this, he is a little too long in his sermons." Brevity is indeed the "soul of pulpit-eloquence," as well as of "wit." Very few hearers will attend diligently to a *protracted* theological discussion; and the few who do attend, are so exhausted at its close that their sensibilities will not be successfully touched by the final appeal. Much greater impression would be produced, if the introduction and argument of a discourse were accurately adapted to the simple object of making the soul impressible; of uncasing it so that it may be penetrated by the sword of the Spirit. But unless the preparatory parts are brief, the soul will doubly shield itself against the direct contact with truth; and when the sword smites, it smites not the heart itself, but the steel that covers it. Nor should the *application* of a discourse be protracted. Men are jealous of prolonged appeals to their sensitive nature, and suspect the preacher of a design to display, ostentatiously, the power which he has obtained over them. Besides, "tears dry fast," and he who speaks a passion into existence by a few words, will kill the same passion by a few more. After the attention is aroused and obstacles are removed, then let the subject of discourse be applied to the heart, and produce its own effect. This is the mode of our author. No attempts does he make to influence the feelings by interjections and exclamations; nor does he beg from his hearers a good effect of his discourse by those common, pitiful expressions, "Oh do feel this subject!" "Be persuaded to feel it!" If a preacher's subject, when applied to the heart, does not elicit the appropriate feelings, they will not be elicited by his simple petition; and if they are not called forth by a *brief* appeal, they will seldom be by a *long* one. The blow

must be struck at the precise time ; and if it have no effect on the iron when just taken from the fire, will it have any effect on the cooled and hardened metal ? It is in consequence of the brevity of our author's discourses, that they leave their reader desirous of reading more ; and instead of fatiguing him with repetitions, are constantly alluring him from one topic to another until he has finished the volume. Unless we mistake the character of Christians in ordinary life, they will feel a fresh interest at the conclusion of almost every discourse, and their pleasure in the perusal of the volume will, from beginning to end, regularly increase.

We might mention some faults in the rhetorical and perhaps in the theological character of these sermons ; but there is so much more to applaud than to condemn, that criticism is quite disarmed. Those who best knew their lamented author, most deeply feel, that in losing him, the church lost qualities of which she had none to spare,—important at all times, but peculiarly so, at *these* in which we live. In the midst of much innovation, we needed his steadfastness in the faith ; in the midst of much enthusiasm, we needed his deliberation and prudence ; in the midst of much that is visionary and delusive, we needed his perspicacity, his discrimination, his faithfulness in reproof. An independent thinker like him, one who stood on a stable foundation, at an equal remove from inoperative Orthodoxy on the one hand, and feverish excitement on the other, when he fell, must have fallen like a pillar in the temple of our God. And he *has* fallen ; a great man in Israel. He has been removed from the pulpit, that he may speak to us from the grave. “ Even so, Father ! for so it seemed good in thy sight.” He, and Payson, and Rice, and Cornelius, being dead, yet speak. “ Hear ye the rod, and who hath appointed it.” “ Who-so heareth, let him understand.”

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## OF THE MORAL LAW AND OF LIBERTY.

A friend has sent us the following Article, translated from the "Fragmens Philosophiques" of Professor Cousin. We are not certain that we understand all the speculations of the learned Professor, or that we should entirely coincide with them if we did understand them. Our readers will be interested to learn something of his manner, and he throws out some important truths, especially in his concluding maxims.

The moral Law is addressed to the free will alone. The moral world is that of liberty. In the free determination, in the act deliberated and willed, is the spiritual world. Now we do not exist but by the continual action of the will and of liberty. The spiritual world is then already, in respect to us, upon this earth. We live in the bosom of two worlds,—on the borders of two empires, of which we are the mysterious union. To enter Heaven, it is not necessary to pass through the darkness of the tomb. Heaven is already in the heart of the free, good man; *et coelum et virtus*, says Lucan. I am a citizen of the invisible kingdom of active and free intelligences. But what is that determination of my will, which discloses to my apprehension this invisible world? Enquire of consciousness. Analyse your own acts and feelings in the discharge of duty, and Heaven will reveal itself to you in your own heart. It is not by reasonings that we acquire the conviction of a spiritual world; it is by a free act of virtue, which is always accompanied by an act of faith in moral beauty, and a revelation to the inner sense, of God and of Heaven.

The sensible world acts upon me, and becomes the occasion of my volition. My volition, in its turn, occasions a change in the sensible world. This is ordinary human life; in which the will manifests itself only in consequence of changes in the outward and sensible world, and, by such changes, the results of its own actings. But resolve that your will shall find the reason of its actings in itself alone, and you are already issuing from slavery; your life has begun to purify and elevate itself. Take one step farther; resolve that the will shall contain itself within itself; that it shall act without outward manifestation; that its free determinations shall not go beyond the inner sanctuary; resolve not to demonstrate your volition by sensible effects; and you are at once free from the enslavement of the senses, of the material world; your life is altogether spiritual; you have attained the source of true activity; you are already invested with the holy, the pure, the divine; you have an inward perception of the divine life, which

unfolds itself in your own. Thus to extricate one's self from every sensible condition; to will without regard to the consequence of our volition, independently of all antecedent and of all consequent; to fold back one's determinations upon themselves; this is true liberty, the beginning of eternity. Men may speak of liberty, of holiness, of purity; but he uses words without meaning, who is not himself set free. Christianity tells us, no man can attain the consciousness of eternal life, but by renouncing the world, and all its ends. Then faith in the Eternal takes up its abode within us. In the beautiful metaphor of the Gospel, we must die, and be born again, to enter the kingdom of Heaven.

Philosophy gives us the same view of the soul. How can that man, whose will is bound by the world of sense, believe in holiness and another life? Men believe an eternity or disbelieve it, through prejudice. The reform of philosophy must be preceded by the reform of the life. The light of intellect is but darkness, without the light of virtue.

The indefinite and eternal *will* reveals itself to us in our conscience, in the supreme command, *live righteously*; and the human, individual *will* coincides and blends with the infinite will, in freely obeying its injunction. God has brought himself down to man, in the law of duty; man elevates himself to God, by inward submission to this law. Here is the great mystery of eternity disclosing itself to humanity, and of humanity "clothed upon" with eternity. Man is wholly within this mystery. Morality then is the source of all truth, and the true light dwells in the darkness of the free, voluntary active energy.

Here is a law of conscience indisputable, and at the same time simple and indivisible: *Do good, without regard to consequences, i. e. will the good.* Since this command has no earthly, visible, material object, applicable to the needs of this life, and the sensible world; it follows that it has no end, no purpose, or an end, a purpose invisible, which has relation to a world other than ours, where the exterior results of our volitions are of no account, and our volitions themselves are all in all.

If there is no invisible world, where account is made of all our good volitions, what end does virtue answer in this world?

1. Is it necessary to the mechanism of the Universe.
2. Is its end the civilization of the world?
3. Is it the amelioration of the condition of man, in respect of local and physical conveniences?
4. Is it the peace of the world?
5. In fine, is it the highest moral development of the human race, as a condition of its highest general perfection, and greatest happiness?

For all these purposes, there was no need of virtue. God might have made us machines, without liberty. He would then have witnessed as fair a spectacle as now, had he desired our happiness

only. But it will be said, He desires a happiness produced by ourselves. But this will never be. Universal happiness, produced by man, is a chimera. Besides, to attain this end, it was not necessary for God to endow us with conscience, and impose the moral law. Self-love alone might attain it. Give greater strength to self-love, or heighten my natural sympathies, and I shall impart as much or more of good to others than by the single sentiments of duty.

It is of high importance, to have the following maxims always in mind.

1. The consequences of an action, whatever they may be, render it neither morally good or bad, the intention only does this. Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as a moral action. Intentions alone are moral.

2. That an intention should be morally good, it must be disinterested.

3. All intentions are interested, which involve a return upon ourselves. Thus, to do an act for the sake of honor or pleasure, whether sensual or intellectual, for the sake of recompense on earth, or even in heaven, this precludes the moral.

4. The actions which result from the impulse of organization, are indifferent. Thus, the man who, impelled by an irresistible feeling of pity and sympathy, lavishes his own life to save his fellow, is not in this act, a moral being.

5. He only is a moral being who, after having weighed an action, and found it right, performs it,—only because he believes he ought to perform it, and for this reason only, that it is just.

---

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

1. *The Hopefulness of Efforts for the Promotion of Peace: A Discourse pronounced in the Centre Church in Hartford, at the Celebration of the Anniversary of the Hartford County Peace Society.* By LEONARD BACON, Pastor of the first Church in New Haven. Hartford: Philemon Canfield. 1832. pp. 26.

The great obstacle against which Peace Societies have to struggle, is, not opposition, but *indifference* and *neglect*. "They are not persecuted; they are not resisted; they are not denounced as conspiring against state or church, or the liberties of the people; but they are *neglected*—neglected by the good, as well as the bad; neglected by the churches, and by ministers of the Gospel; neglected by those who befriend every other Christian enterprize, and wish well to this."—These Societies seem to be neglected, under the im-

pression that the object of them, however desirable and important, is unattainable, and that effort in such a cause is wasted. "An indefinite but powerful feeling prevails every where, that though war is an evil of immeasurable magnitude, and though the object of Peace Societies is therefore an object worthy of the highest effort, still, there is something Quixotic in the enterprise, inasmuch as war must continue to be the only adjustment of difficulties among nations, and the only hope of the oppressed, till, by some miraculous change, a new order of things shall be introduced, and a new sort of human beings inhabit the earth." Accordingly, it is a principal object of the eloquent Discourse before us, to combat this error, and show "the *hopefulness* of efforts for the promotion of Peace." This is done, by remarking, first, on "the progress of *popular influence* over governments"—an influence which, for various reasons, must ever operate as a check upon the spirit of war; and, secondly, on "the extension of Christianity, and the contemporaneous and corresponding developement of the Christian spirit." Mr. Bacon also adverts to the 'more sure word of prophecy.' "The word of God holds up its prophetic light, like a broad column of celestial fire, to illuminate our path, and to show us, in the future, the beautiful and blessed vision of a renovated world, in which the trappings of the warrior, and the garments which he has rolled in blood, shall have been consumed and forgotten, and violence and wasting shall be heard no more."

Having occasion to speak of the spirit manifested by the Cherokee Indians, under the indignities and depredations of their haughty aggressors, Mr. B., in a note, pays the following merited tribute to the imprisoned Missionary, Worcester.

"Samuel A. Worcester, one of the missionaries now confined in the penitentiary of the state of Georgia, is a man with whom it is my privilege to have had an intimate acquaintance. Considering the ignominy and the revilings, as well as the physical hardships which he suffers in the cause of righteousness and freedom, I feel myself bound, on every fit occasion, to offer my solemn testimony to the public in his behalf. He is not, what many who join in the anti-missionary clamor suppose him to be, an ignorant, rude, and flaming fanatic, but a man of superior native talent, delicate and honorable sensibilities, finished liberal and professional education, and cool, deliberate intelligent, yet devoted piety. I have had the happiness of seeing many admirable examples of Christian character; but a man more invariably and minutely conscientious than this man, less capable of any undue influence from the example and opinions of others, or in a higher degree exempt from every bias of selfishness and passion, I have never known. It was not an erratic genius which carried him to his work among the Indians; few men have more of the plain, practical common sense of New England. It was not any inability to find employment in some more lucrative, and, according to this world's judgement, more honorable station; the great respectability of his connections, as well as the vigor of his own talents, precludes such a supposition; had he given himself to science or to learning, he might have adorned a university. It was the humble and self-denying desire of doing good, which made him a missionary. When the government of Georgia commanded him to abandon his peaceful work, or to take the oath of allegiance as their subject, he looked to see by what authority they spake; and, convinced that they had no just jurisdiction over his person, or over the territory on which he resided, he calmly and clearly informed them of the views on which he should act. The correspondence between him and Gov. Gilmer, on that occasion, (see *Missionary Herald* for 1831, pp. 248—251.) will sufficiently show

which of the two is the most of a man; and—without designing to disparage the knightly breeding of His Excellency, I venture to add, it will show which of the two is the most truly a gentleman. Having fully stated what he should do, he quietly pursued his course in the spirit of one whom neither threats nor violence could intimidate. Like the great Apostle who asserted his privileges as a Roman citizen, he meekly insisted on his rights as an American. Like the Apostle appealing to Cesar, he put himself under the protection of the laws and courts of the nation. Whether he was right in regarding the jurisdiction attempted to be set up over the Cherokee territory as an usurpation, and therefore refusing to take the prescribed oath of allegiance, we have now no occasion to inquire; the most august tribunal of the nation, from which there is no appeal in this world but to violence, has decided that question.

“Such is one of the men whom the proud chivalry of Georgia is not ashamed to shut up with the vilest criminals in a noisome prison, and to hold there in open defiance of the constitution of the United States. But he has carried with him what all the gold which his oppressors hope for cannot purchase, a cheerful and happy mind. And as the lions in their den crouched before the prophet of God; so in the prison where this man and his companion in tribulation are permitted, like Paul and Silas, to pray and sing praises to their Lord, men more degraded than the untamed beasts, have bowed before the majesty of virtue, and at the presence of injured, yet uncomplaining Godliness, the lion has ‘put on the nature of the lamb.’”

---

2. *Religious Liberty: A Discourse delivered in the Congregational Church at Hanson, on the fourth of July, 1832.* By F. FREEMAN, Pastor of the third Church in Plymouth. Plymouth: Benjamin Drew. pp. 32.

Mr. Freeman describes Religious Liberty as “the unmolested right of a spirit of *free inquiry* ;” “the freedom of *choice* in our religious views ;” “the free and candid *expression* of our views ;” “the freedom of following the dictates of conscience, and choosing one’s own *mode* and *place* of worship, and *religious teacher* ;” and “the right of *defending* our views of truth by argument, and extending them by moral suasion.” Such is the liberty which our Orthodox brethren in New England generally inculcate, and for which they are obliged, in some places, to contend. For, as Mr. F. remarks, there are many among us, who are bitterly opposed to Orthodoxy, who yet know not, and will not inquire, what it is; and many talk flippantly of ‘liberal views,’ and have learned to pronounce the words ‘free inquiry,’ who notwithstanding shut out every ray of light that might possibly enter their minds; and many, who do in some degree investigate, have not the moral courage to follow the dictates of their consciences, but sell their religious liberty, or rather offer it in sacrifice, to propitiate the smiles of religious intolerance; and many more, not only refuse to come to the light themselves, but forcibly prevent ‘those under *their authority*’ from coming,—so that their wives and daughters have little more freedom on that great subject, which, of all others, lies nearest to their hearts, than though they were the inmates of a Turkish *harem*.

We are happy to receive from our brethren discourses like the one before us. The public will learn, ere long, who are, and who are not, the true and consistent friends and advocates of religious freedom.

---

3. *The History of the State of Maine from its first discovery, A. D. 1602, to the Separation, A. D. 1820, inclusive.* By WILLIAM D. WILLIAMSON. Two vols. 8mo. Hallowell: Glazier, Masters & Co. 1832.

Mr. Williamson has performed a work which, in his own words, “has been

long and much desired," and for which he merits the thanks of every citizen of Maine. Indeed, this history makes an important addition to the general history of our country. The early events in the settlement of Maine have heretofore been involved in much obscurity. Facts were on record in abundance, but they were scattered, and beyond the reach of most of the inhabitants. The author is known to have had this subject before him for fifteen or twenty years, during which time he has been diligent and faithful in the collection of facts—"from the libraries of the capitol at Washington, the Boston Athenæum, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences," from public documents, and "from letters of a hundred and fifty correspondents." To take such a mass of materials, and from them to select and arrange a convenient history, containing neither too much nor too little, required industry, discernment, and a well directed taste. These attributes, we are happy to say, the work before us in general exhibits. There are passages—stories and legends of the Indian tribes and the intercommunion of the whites with them—of thrilling interest; too much, alas! like all true representations of the transactions of the early settlers with the natives—confidence, hospitality, and generous forbearance on the one part, and cupidity and treachery on the other, and lastly, mutual retaliations and savage and exterminating wars. Our limits forbid an extended notice of this work, but we can cheerfully recommend it to our readers and fellow citizens. We will add a short extract from the author's last page, showing what Maine may be.

"The Divine pencil has drawn for us the outlines of an extensive Commonwealth. A vast domain of nature still remains uncultivated; and attainments in literary and moral refinement are yet in the outer court of perfectability. In the march of intellect, therefore, let science and practical skill put to experiment what may serve to develop the resources of matter, mind, and nature, and the effects must produce models—a thousand for one. Let the temple, founded in our father's virtues and cemented by their blood, be finished, furnished, and fortified in a style not less superior than the superstructure itself—and so we and ours may fulfil the destiny appointed us, of making strong and solid the pillars of our country's greatness."

---

4. *The Lay Missionary, or the Way to do Good.* Boston: Peirce & Parker, New York:—H. C. Sleight. 1832. pp. 81.

This book is rather peculiar in its character. Its general object seems to be to promote spirituality of heart and life, with fidelity in the discharge of duty, in Christians. In order to this, therefore, it follows the Christian through a number of the various relations of life, and endeavors, by presenting before him a character such as he should be, to excite him to greater watchfulness, diligence and exertion.—The particular characters under which the Christian is brought to view, are those of the Sufferer—the Child—the Wife and Mother—the Farmer—the Merchant—the Traveller—the Sailor—the Lawyer—the Physician—the Teacher and the Pastor.

Of course, the book is adapted to all classes in society. We can say also, if we may judge others by ourselves, that few, as we believe, can read it without feeling at once reproved and admonished, and thereby excited to greater conscientiousness and simplicity of regard to God and the salvation of souls in the discharge of duty.

As a specimen of the manner in which the different topics are treated, take the following under the head of the "Christian Traveller."

"In the mean time the stage rolls on, over hill and dale. A *rut* in the road, which they have just jostled over, has awoke a sleeper in the corner, who now begins to rouse from his nap, and look about him to see where we are. He is a medical gentleman, wearied with his late watchings; but having seized at last upon a refreshing sleep, he wakes up bright and active, and ready to use his powers for good. An animated conversation soon rises again. Every passenger is an eager listener. The information imparted by the medical gentleman is useful to all. *Topics. Sleep—its nature—in what quantities necessary—in what injurious. Food—what kind best adapted to our nature. The intemperance of the day in eating as well as drinking. Pleasant anecdote, illustrative of temperance and a long life. Temperance societies—their wonderful progress—the sad miseries they are intended to arrest and relieve.*—To all of which, the good physician frankly gives his warm approbation. He speaks of the intemperate man, not with abhorrence, but with heartfelt pity. "He is a complete and willing *slave*," says he, "to his sad passion. He is a *willing* slave, for he might break away—but it is a dreadful struggle, and I pity him from my very soul; for it must be done; or I fully believe that he will perish." Yon red faced man, in the opposite corner, hears all this, and, as it is accompanied by an inward prayer from the speaker, we hope he does not hear in vain."

---

5. *Memoir of Florence Kidder, who died in Medford, Mass., April, 1832, aged eleven years.* Boston: Peirce and Parker. New York:—H. C. Sleight. 1832. pp. 71.

This little book contains the history of an interesting child, daughter of Mr. Thompson and Mrs. Mary A. Kidder. It is made up of several Chapters and Letters, detailing in brief the character of Florence, and exhibiting in an interesting manner, as it advances, the power of religion. It is adapted especially, we think, to benefit the young, while it can hardly be read without advantage by any serious person. None can read it without perceiving how religion, even in a child, can sweeten the temper, control the heart, and govern the life. It belongs to the same general class of religious juvenile biographies with Mary Lothrop and Nathan W. Dickerman, and every parent who has yet a rising family around him, will find it worthy of his attention, and of a place in the children's library.

---

6. *Letters to a Brother on Practical Subjects. By a Clergyman.* Lowell: Brooks Shattuck & Co. Boston:—Peirce and Parker. pp. 106.

From the introduction to these Letters, it would seem as though the author designed them specially for children and youth, or that his brother was quite young when he wrote them. However this may be, and though we agree that they are adapted to the young; we think them no less adapted to those of mature age. Or, if there be any class in particular to whose circumstances they would seem to be more particularly appropriate, it is that class of young men, from 16 or 18 years of age up to 25 or 30, who, though not prepared to cast off religion, are yet not prepared to embrace it. Indeed, they have been the persons most before our minds in looking over the pages of this little book. Not excluding others, or any, to them, therefore, we would earnestly recommend it.

The character of the book is wholly religious, and the plan of the author, is first, to convince of sin and condemnation; next to point out the inefficacy of repentance, without atonement, and the impossibility of atonement by any other than the Lord Jesus Christ as "*God manifest in the flesh*;" and then to press compliance with the conditions of salvation.

These general views are presented in a clear and perspicuous light, and, for the most part, are happily illustrated. As we passed along, we thought the author less happy in the fifth Letter; but on reading the sixth and seventh, we found our interest revived, and more than revived: and we closed the eighth and last, with great satisfaction.

Appended to the Letters are several original hymns, with two selected; all which are very well, being adapted to the general subject of the Letters and suitable to be read in connexion with them.

As a specimen of the author's manner, we select the following paragraph, on the subject of faith, from his seventh Letter.

"You see, my dear brother, that the *heart* must be interested, or faith is not genuine. You are required to believe in Christ as your only Saviour and to receive Him as the object of your supreme affection. Love to the world is inconsistent with such an affection for Christ. Unless you have thus received Christ, your speculative faith is utterly vain. He will be satisfied only with your heart—your whole heart. You must so commit yourself to Him as to feel yourself wholly at his disposal—ready to be guided by Him and to follow Him wherever He leads the way. This is the only way in which you can give practical evidence of living faith."

---

7. *Twenty-Third Annual Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; October, 1832.* Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1832. pp. 192.

The Reports of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions have been wont to be valuable documents, but for interesting and important matter no one which has hitherto appeared, has been more so than this, which we here notice. Besides the usual topics embraced in similar documents, it contains an appendix embracing the *act of the incorporation* of the Board, and the *laws and regulations* by which its various, complicated and extended business is regulated and managed. By these it may be seen what its object is, and how it seeks to accomplish it; and any one, we think, who will interest himself to look over the Report, cannot fail to be impressed with the greatness, grandeur and unspeakable importance of the missionary enterprise. Besides the act of incorporation and the laws and regulations of the Board, the appendix contains their memorial also, in relation to the Indians, with the reply of the Secretary of War, the Mandate of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the memorial of the Prudential Committee in relation to refunding the value of the Missionary buildings and improvements in the Choctaw nation. There are other things of interest, but these we must pass. We can only say that, as it is always desirable that the reports of our public bodies should be generally circulated, so we hope this Report in particular may be universally read and considered.

THE  
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. VI.

FEBRUARY, 1833.

NO. 2.

---

---

COMMUNICATIONS.

---

DR. TAYLOR'S REPLY TO DR. TYLER.

[Concluded from p. 18.]

The next subject is the doctrine of *irresistible grace*. Under this name, I have denied the doctrine, "that the sinner, under the renewing influence of the Divine Spirit, resists that influence, until it becomes a *natural impossibility* for him to resist it any longer." Dr. Tyler supposes, that this is not the doctrine of *irresistible grace*. I think otherwise. Indeed, I know that this doctrine has often been taught. Even Dr. Tyler, though in some of his remarks he seems to deny it, does also maintain *substantially* this very doctrine. I had said, "that in *all cases* the grace of God may be resisted by man as a free moral agent, and that when it becomes effectual to conversion, it is unresisted." These are "the positions," to which Dr. Tyler objects. Of course, Dr. Tyler must hold, that when the grace of God becomes effectual to conversion, it is *not unresisted*, but *resisted*; and that *in some cases*, it cannot be successfully resisted by man, as a free moral agent. What is this, but maintaining that sinners resist the influence of the Spirit in conversion, and resist it, until it becomes naturally impossible to resist it any longer?

Further—Dr. Tyler, quoting again the statement "that *in all cases*, the grace of God may be resisted by man as a free moral agent," says—"Consequently, it is *in the power* of every sinner, if he should be so inclined, to render it impossible for God to convert him. Who then can tell, that another sinner ever will be converted?" This is virtually saying, that it is *not* in the power of every sinner, if he should be so inclined, to render it impossible for God to convert him; in other words, that God

can exert an influence on the mind of sinners in their conversion, which it is *naturally impossible* for them to resist. It is also virtually saying, that unless we believe that God will in fact exert such an influence, no one can tell that another sinner will ever be converted. Now this is the doctrine of *irresistible grace* in its fullest form and strongest import; for what influence is more absolutely *irresistible*, than that which sinners have *no natural power* to resist? That this is the very doctrine which Dr. Dwight denies, is equally manifest. He says, "But that he (the Spirit of God) *will* exert a regenerating agency on the human mind, which man has not *a natural power* to resist, or which man could not resist if he would, is far from being satisfactorily evident to me. Indeed, I am ready to question, whether this very language does not lead the mind to views which are *radically* erroneous." He further says, "That it is an *unresisted* agency IN ALL CASES, is *unquestionable*; that it is *irresistible* in any, does not appear." Ought not Dr. Tyler, before he further impugns my orthodoxy on this point, first to settle this question in regard to Dr. Dwight?

But says Dr. Tyler, on the supposition that sinners can, as moral agents, resist the grace of God *in all cases*, "who then can tell that another sinner will ever be converted?"—I answer, every one who has read and believes the Bible. But Dr. Tyler means, if he means any thing to his purpose, that unless we can infer *a priori*, i. e. merely from the nature of the subject, or merely from the nature of moral agency and the power of God, that he can convert sinners, there is *no proof* that he can.—I have before had occasion to point out Dr. Tyler's error in representing me as denying that there is *any* evidence, that God can convert sinners, even from the word of God, when I have only said, that this cannot be proved by *a priori* reasoning. I now call on Dr. Tyler to prove by *this kind of reasoning*, that God can convert another sinner. How shall Dr. Tyler do this? Why, if at all, by proving that a being who *can* sin, *cannot* sin. The position for Dr. Tyler to prove is, *that a moral agent remaining such, will not sin*. But to prove this from the *nature of the case*, Dr. Tyler must prove, that under some possible preventing influence, the moral agent *cannot* sin. For if he *can* sin under every such influence, then, for aught Dr. Tyler can show to the contrary, by *a priori* reasoning, he *will* sin. Before, then, Dr. Tyler can prove *a priori*, that such beings will not all continue in sin, he must prove that under the supposed influence they *cannot*, i. e. he must prove that beings who *can* sin, *cannot* sin.

Now, it is to no purpose for Dr. Tyler to say, that the *Scriptures* teach, that God can convert sinners. Dr. Tyler must know, that I have never denied this. The question is, can Dr. Tyler prove this by *a priori* reasoning, or from the nature of the subject? Let him fairly and manfully address himself to the real point of the difficulty as above presented. Until he does this, let him not think that reflecting minds will not see the fallacy of his reasoning.

I cannot leave this topic, without attempting to show Dr. Tyler an incongruity into which his mind seems to me almost constantly to fall, in regard to the sinner's ability. No man, not even Pelagius, goes further in asserting the sinner's complete power to right or wrong moral action, than Dr. Tyler, when the question before his mind respects the sinner's *obligation* to right action. But no sooner is the subject changed,—no sooner does it respect the mode of accounting for the universality of sin, than Dr. Tyler becomes the zealous advocate of a propagated constitutional propensity to sin—an inherent property of man's very nature, which amounts to an utter disqualification—an absolute natural inability for right moral action. More especially, when the power of the sinner is distinctly recognized in connexion with the doctrine of divine influence, then, as the only safeguard of this important truth, he is, as we have seen, eager and unqualified in maintaining a natural impossibility on the part of the sinner, to resist the grace of God. When a mere natural possibility of this is asserted, Dr. Tyler, who, on other occasions assures us, that 'the sinner has all the power he can possess,' asks in devout consternation, "Who can tell that another sinner will ever be converted?" He thus rests all his hopes of the future conversion of sinners on the fact, that God *can*, and of course, that he *will*, use an influence for this purpose, which it shall be naturally impossible for them to resist. And now, what is this, but to deny in every such case, the sinner's moral agency altogether? For what kind of moral agency is that which does not include *the power* to resist the grace of God and continue in sin? If this power is 'overcome,' in such a sense, that the sinner cannot resist the grace, through *a natural impossibility*, what is this but converting the soul by physical compulsion—what but crushing and destroying moral agency in the very act of securing moral action—what but the absurd achievement of making the sinner willing against his will?

In my letter to Dr. Hawes, I said, that "*when* grace becomes effectual, it is unresisted." Now, as I claimed, Dr. Tyler changed the import of this passage, by representing me as saying,

“that the sinner ceases to resist *before* the grace of God converts him.” In reply to this representation, I asked, “how will Dr. Tyler show that *cotemporaneousness* is the same thing as *priority*?” Without even noticing this reply, and therefore, without attempting to vindicate himself in thus changing the import of my statement, he appeals again to what I had said in the Christian Spectator. Now suppose what we may, respecting what I said in the Spectator, how is Dr. Tyler justified in charging me with saying, in my letter to Dr. Hawes, what I did *not* say?

But how stands the case, in regard to the passages in the Spectator? Dr. Tyler put a construction or meaning on these passages, which I had already disclaimed. This he did, as I have claimed, in defiance of all usage, and of abundant definitions and explanations of my language to the contrary. On this ground, I said, “If I am right in this, then Dr. Tyler *perverts* my language. If I am not, still Dr. Tyler has been *assured*, that I reject *the meaning* which he imputes to me. Who then would expect Dr. Tyler to quote the language again, and still persist in giving it that meaning? Is not this charging opinions on me, which he *knows* I do not maintain? He can now take which side of the alternative he pleases; and, take which he will, he has charged me with holding opinions, with decisive evidence before him, that I do not hold them.”

What course then does Dr. Tyler take? He insists that he has not perverted my language—that ‘it will not admit of any other meaning, than that which he gives it.’ Be it so. On this point then, we differ. But it is the *only* point in the case on which we do differ. Dr. Tyler was assured, that if the language must have the meaning he gives it, it is as remote from expressing truth, *in my view*, as it is in his own. He knew, of course, that the meaning charged on my language was not my real meaning; and all he can say is, that my *words* express, in *his* opinion, a different meaning from that which he knew I intended to express. Dr. Tyler, therefore, charges me with holding opinions which he knows I do not hold!

But what are these opinions? The first is, that “before God will interpose to renew the sinner’s heart, he must give up his idols—he *must submit to divine authority*, and cease to be a rebel.” The other is, “that the reason, why the sinner prefers the world to God is, that he has *mistaken* the true way of securing his highest happiness.”—Now Dr. Tyler asks “when and where I have explained the passages (on which he founds these charges) and attempted to show that they will

admit of a different construction from that which he puts upon them?" I answer, most abundantly in the original articles in the Christian Spectator, and especially in the Review of Dr. Tyler's Strictures in that work for 1830. I attempted to show that the very passages in question have not the meaning which Dr. Tyler gives them. [Vide Spect. 1830, p. 186, and p. 168.]

In respect to the first of the above charges, the case was this:—Dr. Tyler charged me, as he now does, with maintaining 'that the heart of the sinner is changed *antecedent* to regeneration.' In this charge Dr. Tyler *avowedly* used the word *regeneration* in its restricted import, i. e. to denote the act of *loving God*, in distinction from the act of *renouncing the world*, or *ceasing to hate God*; in other words, the act of *putting on the new man*, as distinguished from the act of *putting off the old man*. To Dr. Tyler's question, then, "When is the heart of the sinner changed, if not when he ceases to be supremely selfish?" I answered, *when he loves God*; in other words, when *old things* are passed away, and all things become *new*; when the heart of stone is taken away, and *the heart of flesh*, (which is *as necessary to a change of heart*, as taking away the heart of stone) is given. In addition to this explanation, I adverted to the error of Dr. Tyler, as based on the assumption, that the complex change in regeneration, consisting in renouncing selfishness, and taking God for our portion, cannot be properly spoken of, *in its parts*; and this too, with texts of Scripture in which it is done directly before him. I went further still; and justified the statement, that the sinner ceases to rebel *in the order of nature* before the heart is changed, i. e. *before* the act of *loving God* takes place, on the authority of Dr. Tyler himself. He had said, that "the sinner *now* loves what *BEFORE* he hated;" amounting plainly to the statement, which Dr. Tyler censures, viz. that the sinner *ceases* to hate *before* he loves.—Now the simple question is, whether, in this explanation, I have not shown, that Dr. Tyler was entirely mistaken, in saying that I represented the sinner as "*submitting to divine authority*," *before* his heart is changed, i. e. *before* he loves God?

But Dr. Tyler repeats his former objections to what I have said, just as if they had never been refuted, and without noticing the refutation. Thus he asks, "what is the character of the man after he has ceased to resist, (he should have said, ceased to rebel, or put off the old man) and *before* he has become reconciled to God;" i. e. *before* he loves God, or puts on the new man? I answer, as before, that there is *no interval* in the case, during which *character* can be predicated of the man.

When the sinner is performing the essential specific mental acts which constitute the complex act of duty, in that rapid succession in *the order of nature* which precludes the order of time, and which is as rapid as the nature and the laws of mind render possible, it is the height of absurdity, to ask about his *character, during* such performance. *The sinner surely does not hate God, in the very act of loving him.* Dr. Tyler himself maintains, 'that the sinner *now* loves what *before* he hated.' Let Dr. Tyler then tell us, what is the *character* of the man *after* he ceases to hate, and *before* he loves God.

But says Dr. Tyler, "Our Lord has decided this point. *He that is not for me is against me.*" I might here refer to explanations already given. But I will simply ask Dr. Tyler, whether he supposes, that our Lord in this passage intended to teach that the sinner, *after* he ceases to hate God, and *before* he loves him, is not for God, but against him? Dr. Tyler admits, 'that man must *perceive* the excellence of God *before* he can love God.' On Dr. Tyler's principle of interpreting language, if I had said, that the sun existed *before* it shone, he would wish to know, in what state the sun was *after* it existed, and *before* it shone!—Why does Dr. Tyler refuse to recognize the distinction between *the order of nature* and *the order of time*, which all usage, and *his own* usage fully sanctions?

Again, Dr. Tyler says, 'If there is *no time* between the *suspension* of the selfish principle, (I hope the reader will here refer to what I have said on this topic in this work, vol. v. p. 440,) and a change of heart, there is *no time* in which sinners use the means of regeneration; and if there is *no time* in which they use them, then it is certain, that they never use them.' I answer,—and this I have distinctly said before,—that if the word *regeneration* be used to denote *the complex act*, there are no acts which can be properly called using the means of regeneration. All the acts which precede *the complex act*, are only *abusing or perverting* these means. But if the word *regeneration* be used, as many theologians have used it, to denote simply the final act of the heart or will, i. e. the simple act of loving God, then there are acts *preliminary in the order of nature* to this, which may be called using the means of regeneration. Now if these acts and the act of love take place in *an indivisible moment of time*, as I have said, how is it, as Dr. Tyler says, that there is *no time* in which they take place? Is there *any time* in which *the simple act of love* takes place? If Dr. Tyler says no, then I reply, that it *never* takes place. If he says yes, then I answer, in that self same *time* the sin-

ner thinks of God, &c., i. e. uses the means of regeneration.

Once more, I had said, that every being, in choosing between different objects, "considers from which the greatest happiness may be derived, and as in this respect he judges, or estimates their relative value, so he chooses or prefers the one or the other as his chief good." Dr. Tyler represents this as equivalent in import to saying, that the reason of the sinner's wrong choice is *a mere mistake* in judgement, and that of course, nothing is necessary to his conversion but light to correct his mistake.

Here then I remark, that the language of the above statement, *taken by itself*, is ambiguous. So would have been the statement, "that the will is as the greatest *apparent* good;" or indeed any other phrase, which might be used to denote the state of mind intended. What therefore is meant by such statements, should be decided, not merely by the words used, but by other considerations. Some of these considerations, which ought to have prevented Dr. Tyler from putting the construction on my language, which makes me say, that the sinner chooses the world *by a mere mistake*, are the following:—First: My language will *admit* of a different import from that which Dr. Tyler gives it; for merely to speak of a judgement or estimate, is not saying that it is not a judgement or estimate *perverted* by passion, in a case in which there is the knowledge of truth. Secondly: In the same paragraph, I spoke of the sinner as made to *see*, &c. that there is higher good in God than in any other object. Thirdly: I spoke of the sinner with great frequency, as having the requisite *knowledge* of truth and duty—of his heart as opposing *the dictates of his understanding*, and resisting by perversion what *he knew* to be the dictates of everlasting truth. Fourthly: The whole discussion proceeded on the ground, that *the influence of the Spirit of God* is necessary to secure the effect of *known* truth on the mind. Fifthly: Dr. Tyler, in his *Strictures*, stated the same objection which he now states, asking 'whether all that is necessary to the regeneration of the sinner is not a conviction of the understanding, that he has mistaken the true way of securing his happiness?'—To this I replied, in the *Review*, that 'by the conviction of the understanding is here meant, the dictate of reason,—what reason declares to be best, &c.;—that such a dictate of reason is quite a different matter from things *appearing now most agreeable*;' and stated explicitly, that '*this mind's view*,' as Edwards calls it, or appearing agreeable to the mind, is that *which determines the will*, in opposition to one's *better judgement* or enlightened reason;'—that 'man

acts in opposition to known duty, and that his depravity consists, *not in a mistake* of judgement.' [Vide Chris. Spect. 1830, p. 168.] And yet Dr. Tyler asks "what I have said, to show that it is not a fair construction of my language," that the sinner makes a wrong choice *only by mistake?*

I confess, that the pertinacity of Dr. Tyler on this part of the subject, is unexpected. He rests his vindication entirely on what I had said in the Spectator; telling us, 'that he has quoted my language *verbatim*,'—'that *many* think as he does,'—'that he has fully demonstrated the point,' and refers to his Vindication, p. 36, &c. To all this, it were easy to reply, that if he quoted my language correctly, he wholly disregarded the definitions and explanations which were designed to prevent his perversions of it; that if many think as he does, many also think as I do,—that for him to *say*, he has demonstrated the point, is not itself demonstration; and that it were as logical for me to refer to the Christian Spectator, as for him to refer to his Vindication.—Be this, however, as it may, Dr. Tyler has charged, and persists in charging, opinions upon me, which I had unequivocally disclaimed; as if it were no concern of his, whether I intended to express such opinions or not. Making the very worst of the case, I have used language inadvertently and unskillfully, (of this the reader can judge,) and this is enough, in Dr. Tyler's view, to justify him in charging opinions on me, which he knows I never intended to express; and in this way, charging me also with subverting the Gospel of Christ.

The next subject on which Dr. Tyler questions the consistency and orthodoxy of my views, is *the doctrine of Election*.

I shall first examine Dr. Tyler's reasoning on the question of my *consistency*.—Here he repeats what he had said before,—'that if God prefers, *all things considered*, holiness to sin in all instances—he will do all in his power to bring *all men* to repentance.' To this I replied, that the above preference, "does not necessarily imply, that God will do all in his power to bring *all men* to repentance. Because a father prefers that a child should obey his command to attend school, rather than disobey it, does it follow that he chooses, in the given instance, *to secure* his attendance, as he might, by changing a wise plan of government? Here then Dr. Tyler may see, how God may prefer holiness to sin in every instance, *without doing or choosing to do*, all in his power, to bring *all men* to repentance. Such an *interposition* might be inconsistent with other interests of his universal kingdom."

Now how does Dr. Tyler meet this view of the subject? By

mis-stating in many instances, as before, the very points on which the question turns. Thus he represents me as maintaining, 'that God chooses, *all things considered*, that all men should repent,'—'that all men should become holy.' He says, "If God chooses, *all things considered*, that all men should repent, he will do all in his power to bring all to repentance." Be it so—but then Dr. Tyler here furnishes his own premises. My position is widely diverse from Dr. Tyler's substitute. It is, that God chooses, *all things considered*, that all men should become holy **RATHER** *than continue in sin, under the present system*. Does it then follow from this preference, if it were in the power of God to bring all men to repentance by *changing* the present system, that he would do it? Would a parent, because he preferred obedience to disobedience in every case under a wise plan of government, depart from that plan to secure obedience in one instance, when, by so doing, he would occasion disobedience in all other instances? How then does Dr. Tyler know—how can he prove, that *the change* in the present system requisite to bring *all men* to repentance, would not occasion more sin in God's universal kingdom, than it would prevent? If Dr. Tyler does not know this,—if he cannot prove it,—then his *inference* does not follow from any thing which I have said; but *solely* from premises of his own creation. It may still be true, that the reason why God does not bring all men to repentance is,—not that he does not prefer, *all things considered*, that all men should repent *rather than* continue in sin *under the present system*,—not that it is not in the power of God to bring all men to repentance by *changing* the present system;—but that *to change* the system, as he must for this purpose, would occasion more sin in the universe, than it would prevent:

The foregoing argument of Dr. Tyler is a just specimen of much of his reasoning on the present topic. It rests wholly, either on substituting his own incorrect statements for my positions, or on inferences derived from such statements. Thus, my position is, *that God prefers, all things considered, that all men should become holy*, **RATHER THAN** *continue in sin UNDER THE PRESENT SYSTEM*. For this, Dr. Tyler substitutes his own unqualified statement, 'that God chooses, *all things considered*, that all men should become holy.'—Hence he goes on to infer, 'that if it were in the power of God, he would bring all men to repentance;' and then asks 'how, according to *this view* of the subject, there can be any such thing as election?' But *whose* 'view of the subject' is *this*?—Not mine; but one which Dr. Tyler, without the least warrant,—

even when his error had been plainly pointed out to him, persists *in substituting for mine.*

On these premises of his own creation, Dr. Tyler proceeds thus:—"If God does choose, all things considered, that all men should become holy and be saved, how is it possible, that he should choose, *all things considered*, that only *a part* should become holy and be saved?" Here again for the premises we have Dr. Tyler's *substitution*. My position is, that God chooses, *al' things considered*, that all men should become holy and be saved, RATHER THAN *continue in sin, under the present system.* It is then easy to see, how God may still choose, *all things considered*, that only *a part* should become holy,—he may choose this, rather than to change the present best system, to secure the holiness of the other part. How often must this statement be repeated, that Dr. Tyler may regard it, in his representation of my views?

Dr. Tyler goes on to say, "If God does, *all things considered*, prefer holiness to sin *in every instance*, and if the reason that he does not secure holiness in every *instance*, (i. e. in this world) is, that *he has not power to do it*; then God doth not have mercy on whom he *will*, but on whom he *can*." But who has authorized Dr. Tyler to assume, that the reason that God does not secure holiness in every instance among men, is, *that he has not power to do it*? If he says that it is a legitimate inference from what I have said, I have just shown the contrary, as I had done before. Nor is this all. I have, in all my reasonings on this subject, proceeded on the ground, not only that God could secure universal holiness in *this world*, even to the end of it, but that he could have prevented any particular sin *individually and abstractly* considered, that *ever* has taken place, or that ever will take place in any world; and have only supposed that to prevent *all sin finally and forever*, it might have been necessary not to adopt a moral system; and that to prevent any sin which takes place, might involve *a change* in the appointed system of influence, which would result in more sin than it would prevent. And yet Dr. Tyler persists in representing it to be even "a part of my theory," that 'God would make all men holy if he could?' Such *mistakes in such circumstances*, I think, need some explanation.

But Dr. Tyler seems to be aware, that in this reasoning, he has not come to the point after all. For, as we shall see, he finds himself obliged to meet the question on the ground where I had placed it. In reply to my statement, 'that the requisite interposition to bring *all men* to repentance, might be inconsistent with other interests of God's universal kingdom,'—Dr.

Tyler says,—“Be it so. Then God does not prefer, *all things considered*, holiness to sin in every instance; for in the case supposed, he does prefer in view of the interests of his universal kingdom, to leave a sinner in impenitence, whom he might bring to repentance. Consequently, he does prefer, *all things considered*, in this instance, sin to holiness.” I answer, that this is not preferring, *all things considered*, sin to holiness in this instance, but simply preferring sin *under the present system, to changing* this system for the purpose of securing holiness. Here we have come to the turning point of the present question. Let it be carefully examined. I say then, that it is simply a case in which God prefers sin *under the present system*, to making a change in this system which would be injurious to higher interests. If the sinner then should repent *under the present system*, i. e. without any change in the system, these higher interests would in no respect be impaired. His continued sin, therefore, *under the present system*, is in no respect necessary to secure these higher interests. All that is necessary to this is, that *the present system be not changed*. His sin, *under the present system*, is in no respect preferable to his repentance *under the present system*. God therefore, according to the supposition, leaves him in impenitence, not because his impenitence is *in any respect* preferable to his repentance *under the present system*; but *solely* because, *not to leave* him in impenitence, would involve a change in the present system, which *change* would be injurious to higher interests. This surely is not preferring sin to holiness *under the present system*; but simply preferring sin under the present system, to a change in the system for the purpose of securing holiness. Here, if I mistake not, it is easy to see how Dr. Tyler is led into this error. Thus, it is true, in the case supposed, that while God does not prefer sin to *holiness* under the present system, he does prefer sin under *the present system*, to securing holiness under *another* system. These preferences, so obviously distinct and diverse, Dr. Tyler confounds.

Again; Dr. Tyler supposes another case;—one in which God does not exert a regenerating influence, as he might do, to bring a sinner to repentance; and says, “there is *one thing considered*, which leads him to prefer sin to holiness in this instance, viz. rather than exert a regenerating influence, as he might do, he prefers that the sinner should remain impenitent; which is the same as to say, that, *all things considered*, he prefers that he should remain a sinner instead of becoming holy.” The question is, whether God prefers, *all things considered*, sin to holiness in any instance in which sin takes

place, i. e. *under the present system*? Now the case supposed by Dr. Tyler is clearly not such a case. It is a case in which God prefers sin, not to holiness in any respect whatever, *under the present system*; but in which he prefers sin under the present system, *to holiness under another system*, i. e. to holiness under a regenerating influence *not included* in the present system. The case therefore does not imply that God prefers, in view of *any consideration whatever*, that the sinner should remain a sinner, instead of becoming holy under the *present system*.

I had said,—“Because a father prefers, that a child should obey his command to attend school rather than disobey it, does it follow, that he chooses in the given instance, to secure his attendance as he might, by changing a wise plan of government?”—Dr. Tyler answers—“If he does not secure his attendance *as he might*, it is certain that he does not prefer, *all things considered*, that he should attend; for there is *one consideration* which leads him to prefer that he should not attend, viz. rather than secure his attendance, *as he might*, by changing a wise plan of government, he prefers that he should not attend.”—Now in this case, the reader will notice that Dr. Tyler fully concedes all that I have been contending for in *one* respect; viz. that God really and truly prefers or purposes sin, *all things considered*; i. e. purposes its existence under the present system, rather than to *change* the system to secure holiness. This is *the decree* of God, that sin shall exist. The only question then is this,—whether the father, as a sincere and honest lawgiver, would not likewise prefer, all things considered, that the child should attend school *rather* than not attend, under his present plan of government? If not, why not? Let the reason be given—let any possible consideration be specified, why the father would not prefer obedience to disobedience under his *present* wise plan of government? All that Dr. Tyler can say is, that the father would prefer disobedience under the present best plan, to obedience under *a change* in this plan; i. e. to obedience under another and a bad system. This I admit and maintain. Still the question comes back on Dr. Tyler,—would not the father prefer, *all things considered*, that the child should obey rather than disobey under the *present* plan of government? And, to put this question at rest, suppose the child should *in fact obey* under the present plan, would the father be crossed in any preference of disobedience to obedience? Could he, as an honest lawgiver, say to the child, ‘I regret your obedience, for, notwithstanding my unqualified command, I preferred, *all things considered*, your disobe-

ence to obedience in this very instance? Or would he say, 'I rejoice in your obedience to my will,—I was sincere in my requirement,—and, *all things considered*, I greatly preferred your obedience to your disobedience in this very instance?'—Let any parent—let Dr. Tyler,—let any child, answer this question.

Again; Dr. Tyler, in his Remarks, had said, that on the hypothesis which I had stated, 'there could be no election,'—'that God does not make one to differ from another,'—and that 'he does not have mercy on whom he will have mercy.' To this I made the following reply:—"Suppose a father can wisely do more to secure the repentance of one child, than he can wisely do to secure the repentance of another; suppose that a higher degree of influence in one case would be safe and even salutary in respect to the conduct of his other children, while in the other case, it would, in this respect, prove fatal; suppose him, for these reasons, to use the higher influence with the design to secure the obedience of one child, and to use it with success; is not this election—is not this making one to differ from another—is not this having mercy on whom he will have mercy, and doing more for one than for another, and with good reason too?"—"I answer, yes," says Dr. Tyler. "But," he proceeds, "this is altogether inconsistent with the theory of Dr. Taylor." Here then the question is reduced to a single point. Dr. Tyler concedes, that the above supposition illustrates the doctrine of Election. If then this supposition is not inconsistent with my theory, my theory is not inconsistent with the doctrine of Election. What then is the inconsistency supposed by Dr. Tyler, between the above supposition and my theory? He says: "If it be admitted that the parent might, by any degree of influence which he could exert, bring the other child to repentance, who is left in impenitence, then he does not prefer, *all things considered*, the penitence to the impenitence of the child supposed;" i. e. under the influence actually employed to bring him to repentance.—To make the case plain, beyond mistake—a father can use some extraordinary influence with two offending children, say A and B, which would be effectual to bring both to repentance. This peculiar influence he can use with A without diminishing the obedience of his other children, while to use it with B would occasion the disobedience of all the rest. Now the simple question between Dr. Tyler and myself is this—whether the father may not use this influence with A, and not use it with B, and still prefer that B. should repent rather than remain impenitent, under the influence *actually* used to bring him to repentance?

I ask then, what possible reason can be imagined why the parent should not have this preference? The impenitence of B is not, in itself considered, better than his repentance. No change in the system of influence, which would be injurious to the conduct of other children, is involved in his repentance *under the present system*. No possible interest can be injured by his repentance under this system; while by his repentance, his own well-being would be secured, and the command of the parent obeyed—not to say the happiness of all increased. Since therefore there is no possible reason for the opposite preference in the case, and decisive reasons for this, the father must prefer, *all things considered*, the repentance of B to his impenitence under the influence actually appointed and used to bring him to repentance. Thus the inconsistency alledged by Dr. Tyler vanishes. The father can prefer, *all things considered*, the repentance of B to his impenitence under the influence actually used to bring him to repentance; and at the same time, choose to use the supposed effectual influence with A and not with B.—To the question, ‘whether this is election—whether this is making one to differ from another—whether this is having mercy on whom he will have mercy?’—Dr. Tyler answers, “YES.” I trust then the controversy on this topic is ended.

Once more; In respect to my Arminianism on the subject of Election. Here, again, all that is necessary is to correct Dr. Tyler's *mistakes*.—His first mistake is, in saying that I represented his charge of *inconsistency* as based *solely* on what a Reviewer in the Spectator had said. Whereas, I said this simply of his charge of *Arminianism*. If the reader will turn to Dr. Tyler's Remarks, vol. v. p. 335, he will see, that Dr. Tyler confined *this* charge *exclusively* to what that writer had said.—Again, Dr. Tyler asks, as if I admitted the fact, “Would it then be inconsistent with the wisdom of God to save more (of the human race) than will be saved, if he were able to do it?”—I answer, that it *might be*; since the change in the appointed system of influence, requisite for the purpose, might interfere with higher interests in God's universal kingdom.—Dr. Tyler asks again, “Is it not a part of Dr. Taylor's theory, that it would be wise in God to make *all men* holy, if he could?” I answer, No. What I have said is, that it *may be* true, that God would have secured universal holiness in his *moral kingdom*, if he could. Dr. Tyler seems not to advert to the difference between this world and the universe; or at least, not to see, that what *may be* true in respect to the one, is not of course true in respect to the other. Dr. Tyler goes on in describing my views thus,—“All whom God foresaw would submit un-

der *this influence*, (meaning the highest possible) he determined to save; those who he foresaw would not submit, he reprobated." This is *the view* which Dr. Tyler has substituted for mine, and of which he says, "it differs not materially from the Arminian view of the subject;" i. e. Dr. Tyler fabricates opinions for me at his pleasure, and calls them Arminianism!

Dr. Tyler next professes to tell us what Arminianism is on this subject. He says, "The Arminians admit that God has adopted the best system of means which infinite wisdom could devise to bring sinners to repentance, and that he has determined to save all with whom these means shall prove successful. They admit also, that God foresaw who, under these means, would comply with the terms of pardon, and who would not: and that he fixed upon this system of means, with these results full in view."—Now Dr. Tyler does not say, that one of these *admissions* is false; nor that one of them is denied by any Calvinist. What does he do? Why, he says, "If this be *all* that is meant by the doctrine of Election, then every Arminian holds this doctrine." Now, what an insinuation is this! I ask Dr. Tyler whether I have ever said, directly or indirectly, that "this is *all* that is *meant* by the doctrine of Election?" Does not Dr. Tyler know, that both the Reviewer in the Spectator and myself, as strenuously maintain, as he does, that God's purpose of Election, is an Election *unto holiness*,—a purpose to secure *the condition* of salvation in the hearts of the elect; and that my original statement was, that all who are renewed by the Holy Ghost, are elected or chosen of God from eternity, *that they should be holy*," &c.? Has Dr. Tyler forgotten that he himself has said of my statement of this doctrine, that it is "FULL AND SATISFACTORY." Why then does Dr. Tyler insinuate, or rather virtually assert, that certain *admissions* of the Arminians,—no one of which he ventures to deny—and in which nothing is either affirmed or denied respecting the doctrine of Election, is *all*,—that I MEAN by this doctrine! What ought to be said of such an expedient to convince the Christian community that I am an Arminian, I am at a loss to decide.

"But," says Dr. Tyler, "it is Arminianism to maintain, that the reason why God elected one individual in preference to another, is the foresight of the faith and obedience of that individual." Dr. Tyler is here evidently speaking of an election *to final salvation*. Without deciding then whether he has here given us a correct account of the *distinctive peculiarity* of Arminianism, (we have only his naked assertion that it is;) I

would ask Dr. Tyler, whether he believes that God would have determined *to save* those whom he has determined *to save*, if he had *not* foreseen their faith and obedience; and whether he does not believe, that it was infallibly certain, that God, foreseeing their faith and obedience, would determine *to save* them? If so, I ask again, whether God's foresight of the faith and obedience of those whom he determined to save, was not in some sense of the word, *the reason* of his determining to save them?—Be this however as it may, I have explicitly stated my belief in the doctrine of God's purpose to secure *the holiness* of a part of mankind;—to bring to repentance some and not others. This is the doctrine, which, under the name of Election, I understand Calvinists to maintain, and Arminians to deny. With my statement of this doctrine, as sound Orthodoxy, Dr. Tyler has expressed his unqualified satisfaction. The sole question then is, whether I have said any thing which is inconsistent with this statement, and which amounts to Arminianism? What Dr. Tyler, says to show that I have, consists wholly in repeating those mis-statements of my views, which I have perhaps already sufficiently exposed. I shall but briefly notice some of them in their present application. He says, "To suppose God to purpose to *bring to repentance* certain individuals, is to suppose him to purpose what, according to Dr. Taylor's theory, 'may involve a palpable self-contradiction.'" Dr. Tyler, to have rendered this statement *correct*, should have added, 'for aught that can be proved to the contrary by *a priori* reasoning.' To expose the unsoundness of my opponents' conclusions, I have had occasion to show, that they cannot prove by *a priori* reasoning, or by reasoning, as they often do, *merely from the nature of the subject*, that God could have prevented all sin in a moral system. Hence, at every turn, Dr. Tyler represents me as maintaining, that God cannot bring *all men* to repentance, and that even in view of the known fact of his purpose to bring some to repentance, we must *admit*, that there *may be* a contradiction in supposing him able to accomplish this purpose. I have sufficiently shown the incorrectness of this representation of my views, and that what Dr. Tyler calls my theory, involves nothing inconsistent with the power of God to bring not only his elect, but *all men* to repentance. In this respect then I maintain nothing inconsistent with the doctrine of Election.

Dr. Tyler's next and last attempt on this topic consists in reasoning on his own obviously false assumption, that God's foreknowledge is inconsistent with man's moral agency. I had said, 'that in all cases, the grace of God may be resisted by

man as a free moral agent.' On this, Dr. Tyler asks, "How does God know that those individuals (whom he has purposed to bring to repentance) will not resist his grace, and thus render their conversion impossible in the nature of things?" Now it is perfectly plain from his language, that Dr. Tyler rightly understands *the possibility* spoken of, to be *a natural possibility*. It is then *a natural possibility* of man's resisting the grace of God—in other words, it is the fact of *man's moral agency*, which Dr. Tyler here affirms to be *inconsistent* with God's knowing, that those whom he has purposed to bring to repentance will not resist his grace. And truly, if God's foreknowledge and man's moral agency are inconsistent, as Dr. Tyler here affirms, then am I inconsistent with myself, in maintaining both. But if Dr. Tyler can make out no *other* inconsistency than this between my theory and my creed, I shall confidently conclude that his attempt is 'an utter failure.'

Concerning the reasons why God has purposed to bring one part of the human race to repentance, or chosen a part *that they should be holy*, I have said nothing beyond the general fact, that it is 'according to the good pleasure of his will.' I have indeed said, that the reason why he permits some to go on in their iniquity, is not that he prefers their sin to holiness as the necessary means of the greatest good; but that the reason *may be*, that the change in his appointed system of influence requisite to bring them to repentance, would interfere with other interests of his universal kingdom.—If then God can, consistently with the general interests of the universe, use a special influence, to bring some to repentance and not others; if he foresaw this from eternity, and actually determined to use this influence, with some and not with others; and thus to secure the repentance of the former and not of the latter, is not this Election? What more does Dr. Tyler believe to be essential to this doctrine?—In *the fact*, that God, 'of his own good pleasure,' has purposed to bring a part of mankind to repentance, Dr. Tyler and myself are fully agreed. We are further agreed *in the fact*, that God has purposed to leave another part whom he might bring to repentance, to go on in their iniquity. In what then do we differ? Not, let it be remarked, in respect to *these facts*; but simply in respect to *the reason* of the *latter fact*. And what is the precise difference here? It is that I deny *the reason* of this purpose to be, that their sin is the necessary means of the greatest good; and without assigning any *actual* reason for this purpose of God, maintain, that the reason *may be*, that the change in the appointed system of influence, requisite to bring more to repentance, would occasion

more sin in the universe than it would prevent. Dr. Tyler on the other hand maintains, that God purposes all existing sin as the necessary means of the greatest good, and as such, preferable, on the whole, to holiness in its stead.

In his concluding remarks, Dr. Tyler disclaims all unkind intentions towards me; attempts to justify himself in calling in question the correctness of my opinions; and strongly insinuates that I indulge "alienation of feeling," and deal in "angry personal crimination." It happens, however, that Dr. Tyler's *mistakes* in these matters, are not less striking, than in argumentative discussion. I was indeed apprehensive, lest the exhibition which I was compelled to give of the course adopted by Dr. Tyler, should be thought to involve something on his part not quite honorable in intention. In my Reply therefore, I expressly and fully acquitted Dr. Tyler "of wilful misrepresentation and criminal design;" affirming also, that I considered him "as honest in his errors as any man living."—To his making my views the subject of public discussion, I am not aware that I have made or felt the least objection; while, instead of indulging 'alienation of feeling,' or resorting to 'angry personal crimination,' I expressed the most "entire good will" toward Dr. Tyler. I repeat the expression of these sentiments toward him; with the assurance that I regard his numerous errors and mistakes in this discussion, as entirely the result of other causes than the want of 'respect or affection toward me as a Christian brother.'

But whatever be the causes of Dr. Tyler's *mistakes*; or however kind he may have been in his intentions toward me, or however zealous 'to defend the truth of God,'—his errors are errors still—the *facts* are not changed.

Some of these are the following. He has publicly charged me, 'as a teacher in theology,' with being engaged 'in a gradual undermining process,' 'leading my pupils to renounce some of the *fundamental* doctrines of the Gospel,' and 'introducing the GREAT ERRORS which have *infested* the Christian Church, and which have usually *crept in unawares*;' with having 'disturbed the peace of the New England Churches'—'impugned THE FAITH of the Pilgrims,'—and of departing from the Orthodox of New England, by an agreement with Pelagius, with a distinguished Unitarian writer, and with 'the great champion of Arminianism.'—These things Dr. Tyler has done, while he has been obliged to confess without qualification, *my soundness in the faith*, and to confine all his objections and all his terrors to my *theories*, i. e. to *mere suppositions*, made to obviate objections to our common FAITH.

These *theories*—these mere *suppositions*, have been professedly the *sôle* ground of his severe accusations, when diversity of opinion on these points has long been known to exist among the Orthodox ministry, and among Professors of the same theological seminaries;\* and when, also, they have been considered as wholly insufficient to impair confidence or justify reproach. Another *material fact*, as I have shown, is, that I have advanced no *theory* whatever in the import maintained by Dr. Tyler, which is either *peculiar* or *anti-orthodox*. The amount therefore of all that can be pretended is, that I have denied or questioned some of the *theories* of Dr. Tyler and a few other men, while in these very matters, I accord more fully with the great majority of the Orthodox clergy, than does Dr. Tyler himself.

The course taken by Dr. Tyler to accomplish his object is not less objectionable. His object has been to convict my theories and my creed of inconsistency; while to every attempt to accomplish it, he has given plausibility, either by substituting very different positions of his own for mine; by misquoting my language; by begging the main question in debate; by utterly disregarding the plain import of many of my statements; or by groundlessly charging opinions on me, which I had publicly disclaimed. In all this, however, I impute no unkind intention to Dr. Tyler. I regard these things as *mistakes*—*unintentional errors*,—things done by Dr. Tyler, in his own conviction, “from an imperious sense of duty”—done ‘to defend the truth of God.’ Such however are THE FACTS.

Dr. Tyler asks, “On whom does the responsibility rest of having disturbed the peace of the New England Churches? Does not Dr. Taylor know that previous to the publication of his peculiar views, it was a time of great peace and quietness in the Churches?”—Were Dr. Tyler not entirely ignorant of the facts on this part of the subject, he would never have asked these questions. Charges of false doctrine and of concealing my real opinions—even the cry of heresy in the forms of Arminianism, Unitarianism, Pelagianism, afterwards echoed by Dr. Woods, and now re-echoed by Dr. Tyler, rung through the land, long before the publications referred to. Myself and my friends were compelled to the course we have taken, in defence of our character and standing in the community. The

\* I need only refer the reader to the opinions of Prof. Stuart, as expressed in his late Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, respecting *the main points* in discussion between Dr. Tyler and myself; particularly to Rom. iii. 7, 8, and to his comment and *Excursus* on the 5th chapter. Let the reader consult these parts of Prof. Stuart's able Commentary, and then say, wherein does ‘the New Haven Theology’ differ from ‘the Andover Theology?’

assault thus originating in suspicion, (for as yet we had published nothing) has been persisted in till now; and still we have stood in the simple attitude of self-defence. We have indeed again and again attempted to arrest the progress of this controversy; and to allay the agitation and alarm so causelessly excited by others. We have scrupulously avoided all personality and invective. We have called no man heretic, Unitarian, Pelagian, or Arminian. If then the peace of the churches has been disturbed, the responsibility does not rest with us. It is the *apprehension of HERESY creeping in unawares*, which, by sounding its note of alarm and denunciation, has disturbed the peace of the churches. And who has sounded this note—and *professed* to sound it 'from a sense of duty,'—aye, and to sound it only about *theories*? Will Dr. Tyler say that he has attempted and designed to produce no alarm and agitation in the churches, in view of all the evils he has predicted? And yet he complains of 'the injustice of being charged' with doing the very thing, which he professes himself *in conscience* bound to do!

Fitted, then, as I think the course adopted by Dr. Tyler has been, to injure myself and many of the most useful ministers of the Gospel, and to produce division and alienation among ministers and churches, I still esteem him conscientious, notwithstanding his errors and mistakes. These, freely as I have been obliged to speak of them, are not a sufficient, and still less the actual, cause of any unkind feeling on my part towards Dr. Tyler. To number him still on my list of friends, and to show him the respect and affection due to a Christian brother and Christian minister, cannot be more acceptable to him than it will be grateful to me.

N. W. TAYLOR.

---

THE ELEMENTS OF POWER IN PUBLIC SPEAKING. AN ADDRESS, DELIVERED JANUARY 1, 1833, AT HIS INAUGURATION AS BARTLET PROFESSOR OF SACRED RHETORIC IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY AT ANDOVER. BY THOMAS H. SKINNER.

The structure and inward workings of the human mind are wonderful; and so are the MEANS by which that mind mainly reveals itself. The Psalmist deemed his *tongue* the glory of his frame.

The *power* of speech, its instrumental efficiency both to evil and good, is also wonderful. "So is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature, and it is set on fire of hell." How fearful an instrument of evil. It is true also, on the other hand, that the chief good which has been done in this world, has been accomplished by means of the tongue of man.

Man has exerted vast power with the pen; but the power of speech excels beyond measure that of mere writing. However deeply we may be impressed by reading an oration, for instance, of Demosthenes, if we but imagine ourselves in the auditory to whom he pronounced it, we at once become sensible, that the effect of its mere perusal is comparatively as nothing. The sermons of Whitefield, as read, have no uncommon efficiency; as spoken by himself, such specimens of persuasive power have scarcely been known among men since the days of inspiration.

The power of speech, however, like all other human endowments, is of different degrees in different persons. One man rises in an assembly and opens his mouth but to infuse lethargy or disgust; another man, on the same subject, and the same side, speaks in sentences of electricity and flame, and keeps his hearers filled with the intensest emotion.

It is, we know, chiefly by means of human speech, that God maintains and advances his holy kingdom among men. The laws of his empire; the facts, principles, and wide relations and bearings of the Gospel; in short, all the moral truths which he employs in saving men, or glorifying himself on the earth; are by this means, more than every other, unfolded and enforced. It is principally through public speaking by human organs, that God has purposed to deliver his creation from the bondage of corruption, and make all things new in the civil and religious state of man.

The *laws* of speech—the principles by which it is governed in its just and efficient use, are the same in sacred, as in common application. Its success indeed, here, depends on preternatural influence; no unaided tongue of man or angel can win a ruined soul to holiness and God; but divine co-operation is wisely lent, always, to what has a direct tendency in favor of, not adverse to, the good pursued. It is powerful, and not tame and lifeless speaking, that the Holy Spirit ordinarily makes most effectual in reclaiming men from the paths of sin and destruction. The most successful pulpit-speakers are not those whose discourses are uninteresting, desultory, prolix, repetitious; but those who, in their pulpit-performances, observe

most carefully the laws, according to which, power in public speaking, universally displays itself.

I undertake, on this occasion, to exhibit, very briefly, THE ELEMENTS OF POWER IN PUBLIC SPEAKING. These are partly inherent in the structure of the discourse itself; and partly extrinsic or accidental to it, relating to those auxiliary circumstances which contribute to ensure a discourse attention and efficiency. I shall not, however, follow this method in specifying them, but mention one thing after another, in the order which the end aimed at in this exercise may seem to require.

*The subject of a powerful discourse must be important.*

An ingenious tongue, exerting itself on a trivial theme, may amuse light-hearted hearers; but no such theme stirs the deep emotions of that mind which is wielding the lightning and thunder of true eloquence. To discourse of trifles, with whatever wit or labor, is, after all, to make a nugatory and empty discourse.

He who would speak with power, *should take truth, not error, for his subject.* Truth, if it relate to a matter of importance, is itself power. It is the law, the food, the strength, the life, of mind. The mind, therefore, which is much conversant with truth, becomes, itself, refreshed, invigorated, enlarged, and thus better qualified to do truth worthy homage, by attempts to illustrate it. To commune deeply with truth, is to acquire power; to speak of truth after long and deep communion with it, is ordinarily to exert great power upon others. I need not stay long, to show what advantages for speaking powerfully, truth gives to its advocate, over him who has the side of error to defend. How often, amidst a distracting diversity of opinions and arguments, has the mere statement of the truth, from judicious lips, proved at once decisive, and put all debate and all doubt to rest. A day will come, when, in respect to those matters which have more divided mankind than all others, the only matters of importance comparatively—I mean the principles and ways of the divine government—one judgment will be formed by all rational beings; when conviction of the rectitude of that government, shall perfectly pervade the intelligent universe. Now, this conviction will not be the direct effect of force, or physical omnipotence; it will be only the result of a just exhibition and illustration of truth. Let men who would exert much power in discourse, always speak on matters of importance, and in speaking of such matters, always take the side of truth.

The subject of discourse *should be one of personal concern to the hearers.* It is almost impossible for a speaker to be

deeply interested himself by what interests no other person ; and no man can speak powerfully of what does not excite strong feeling in his own mind. Power in utterance, is the result of power in intellectual conception and emotion. Now the mere impression that what is about to be discoursed of, is what will of itself awaken grateful feeling in the auditory, tends to stir up the speaker's spirit into intense exertion ; and nothing more assists in the delivery of a discourse, than to see such feeling in the hearers' countenances and behaviour. How hapless, then, that person's self-imposed task, who attempts to speak with power on a subject in which mankind take no interest.

Now, men are interested most, by what most nearly concerns them personally. Minds indeed of a certain class, will be interested by instructive discourse, however remotely related to their individual well-being. To such minds, truth, in its most abstract forms, and in all its kinds, is inestimably precious, as involving, to their enlightened and comprehensive view, relations and results of infinite moment. But even as to them, subjects of direct personal concern are commonly most attractive ; and there are few so in love with philosophical abstractions, but that they would withdraw their ear from any voice that ever gave utterance to such refinements, in order to attend to a ploughman's recital of some recently occurrent household disaster. The generality of men, certainly, give little heed to any thing which has not a connexion more or less close, with their own private state. With the multitude, the welfare of man has scarcely a thought ; that of country may, at certain times especially, be less disregarded ; that of party or neighborhood may excite lively feeling ; but that of family or of self, is the theme of absorbing interest. A lecture on political economy is dull, compared to a debate on some point of party-politics ; but, except in very rare cases, such a debate, on however important a topic, and with whatever eloquence sustained, has feeble influence over one, whom a pending law-suit invites into court.

Now, if this be so, what speakers, it may be thought, should be as powerful in discourse as preachers of the Gospel ? A legitimate inference, it would seem, yet not in accordance with experience. The subjects of preaching, it is certain, concern all mankind alike ; and concern them infinitely more than all things else. Compared to these subjects, riches, life, the affairs of nations, and of the great globe itself through its whole duration, are less than nothing ; but two causes operate to enfeeble discourse on these themes of amazing interest. One is, that mankind, under the power of sensuality, are dead to their concern

in these awful matters ; and the other is, that preachers themselves have, too commonly, almost no feeling or faith, in respect to these tremendous things. When, as at a remarkable effusion of the Spirit of grace, the ministers of the word speak, and the people hear, under some just impressions of the reality of unseen things, then is there demonstration given of the rule, that the power of discourse depends much on the personal concern which the hearers have in its subject.

It greatly heightens power, let me next observe, when the subject is not only of general interest to the hearers, but when it is *adapted particularly, to classes, circumstances, and seasons.* It is this, above all extrinsic things, which gives a discourse pungency, that it be spoken pertinently to present wants and demands. A word which rebukes a man in crime, or which comforts a man in trouble, or which saves a perishing man, is a word of power, though spoken with stammering lips. Let a discourse which a man has been hearing for an hour with unconcern, pass out of a general to a specific application to his own sin or sorrow, and all the feelings of his mind at once are stirred. Many a speech has been deemed, and rightly deemed, of wonderful power, not because it was intrinsically well wrought, or because it was very well pronounced, but because the speaker was wise in suiting his subject to the peculiar state and needs of his hearers. To be particular and pertinent in the adaptation of subjects to persons and occasions, should never be forgotten by him who would be always an efficient speaker.

It is essential, also, *that the speaker understand well the subject of his discourse.* He who speaks of what he does not understand, speaks with no confidence in his own utterances, or with an unwarranted confidence ; and, in either case, his discourse will want the characteristics of true power. For assumed confidence always betrays itself, and to waver or faint in one's own judgment is to beget faintness, or something yet worse, in those to whom that judgment is expressed. Distinct apprehensions, enlarged and comprehensive views of the extended and various bearings and connexions of things, and firm convictions of truth, are indispensable to strong feeling and strong modes of expression. Without such inward furniture for speaking, a man, in discourse, can be expected to exhibit nothing in just proportion and symmetry. His statements, if not false, will be defective or extravagant ; in different parts of his discourse he will be inconsistent with himself, or at least not make his self-consistency sufficiently apparent ; and, in short, almost nothing will be spoken just as it should be. The

consequence must inevitably be, that intelligent hearers will be moved with commiseration, or contempt, or grief; and hearers of no class, receive vivid impressions of the exact truth. Knowledge does not always make a man powerful in speech, but ignorance makes him impotent.

A powerful speaker expresses *what is strictly his own and not another's mind on the subject in hand*. Expression is always comparatively feeble, if not theatrical, when it is mere repetition of the thoughts of others. Where thoughts are borrowed and held only in memory, however excellent they may be in themselves, as they are no legitimate part of the mind's own strength and life, they are apt to want something of nature, something of fitness and honesty, in the manner in which the mind gives them forth. A man with a memory vastly capacious, and richly furnished with facts and other men's thoughts, may make a surprising display of knowledge, of some sort; but yet, he who tells the simple convictions and feelings of an intelligent and disciplined mind, without one quotation or learned allusion, is by far the more instructive, interesting, and efficient speaker. Learning of all kinds should be diligently cultivated by the public speaker. No one has more need, or can make a better use of it; but his object in seeking it, should not be to supersede the necessity of judging and forming opinions, and pursuing deep and thorough investigations, of and for himself, but rather to feed and fan his own intellectual fire, and prepare his mind to be more and more vigorous and enterprising, in self-sustained, independent action. Indeed, the mere accumulation of what others have said and thought, is not true learning, which properly consists in the perfect digestion and incorporation of the ideas of things into one's own intellectual structure; and the difference in expression, between the one and the other of these, is almost as the difference between an automatic and a natural articulation; or the draining of a stagnant pool, by artificial means, and the spontaneous outpouring of a living and redundant fountain.

A man who would speak with power, *should have unity in his discourse*. The parts of his performance, however numerous, should belong to but one subject, and constitute one complete whole; neither wanting nor superabounding in any thing. Digressions and graceful intermissions of earnestness, designed for relief, or as a foil to what should have peculiar prominence and force, are not only admissible, but often a very high excellence; but whatever has a tendency to divide attention, however good in itself, is injudicious, unnatural, and enfeebles the discourse: and the more interesting and excellent

this is in itself, the greater on the whole, the injury. Nothing is more inexcusable in a public speech, than want of unity. It shows that the speaker is without an object, or is not in earnest. For who seeks earnestly to accomplish an object by conversation with his fellow, who does not strive to keep his attention fixed on the object as strongly and unremittingly as possible?

This suggests another observation. A man who would speak with efficiency and success, *should always intend to accomplish some definite and specific end, by his discourse.* He should have but one subject, and cleave to that subject throughout, and aim, in all and by all, to accomplish a certain predeterminate object. A man, without a fixed purpose of pursuit, is apt to think, to study, to live, to do every thing, in vain. And he, most probably, will *speak* to no purpose, who has no purpose in view, in speaking. And the *degree* of efficiency in speaking, depends greatly on the *nature* of the purpose; if the end pursued be small, the power will be small, and the power will probably be great, if the end be great, and be earnestly pursued. How differently does he speak, who earnestly pleads for his country's honor, or for the life of a fellow-creature, or for the salvation of the human soul from everlasting death, from him who has no other object than to please men, or merely to meet a professional call.

And here I may, perhaps, be permitted to ask, whether the exceedingly faint impression commonly made by preaching, be not fairly resolvable into the cause now adverted to? Is it strange that preachers accomplish nothing definitely, who *aim* to accomplish nothing? If speakers at the bar, or in our national councils, should seek to carry no point by their speeches, they probably would carry none; and their speeches might be as feeble as are too many of our sermons. Why should a preacher of the Gospel ever rise to address an assembly, without proposing to himself to gain some certain end; and engaging all his powers of argument and persuasion in the attainment of his object; and resolving that he will not willingly desist until he does attain it? What a different affair, in effect, would preaching become, if it should henceforth assume the character which such a course would give it? I see no sufficient reason why it should not assume it. The designs of preaching are specific, are known, and are incomparably greater than any ever proposed to be accomplished by other kinds of discourse. It is as practicable to give definiteness of purpose to preaching, as to a speech in court. Definiteness may be as requisite for success in the one case, as in the other. It will

serve as much in one case as the other, to excite and concentrate mental energy, to produce unity and earnestness, to suggest glowing thoughts and burning expressions, to make discourse, in short, natural and pleasant to the speaker, and powerful and efficient upon the hearers. Surely, it is neither necessary nor expedient, neither philosophical nor scriptural, that preaching should be ever more as general, as commonplace, as perfunctory, as void of object, as it too commonly is, and has been, almost throughout Christendom.

*Natural and simple METHOD is greatly tributary to power in public speaking.* Two points should be prominent in the speaker's aim, to say just the things which ought to be said, and to say them *in their proper place*. The best things, spoken out of place, may almost escape attention; and common things, spoken fitly and in place, may be of overpowering interest. A house, built without regard to method, of materials however costly, and at whatever expense of treasure and strength, would, after all, be without utility, without beauty, an object of disagreeable appearance, and, to habitable purposes, no house. Method is no less essential to the excellence and force of a public speech. All things here should be just so collocated and disposed, as nature, fitness, utility, demands. Then will one part add strength to another; progress in speaking will be progress in strength; strength to the last will be cumulative; and proof of this will be afforded by the interest of the hearers being not only sustained, but increasingly deepened, quite to the end of the discourse.

It is therefore impossible for a speaker to be too regardful of method. But by method is not to be understood, a formal, and much less a numerical, division into heads. Judgment and taste will discern whether this be or be not expedient. Sometimes the brief and skilful enumeration of heads, besides assisting memory, is exceedingly lively and pungent; and sometimes the effect of enumeration is the perfection of weariness. In general, as the joints in a good building, or in the human frame, are not left jagged and unfinished, but are gracefully turned, and in some parts concealed, or elegantly polished, so I think there should be much smoothness and finish in the junctures and transitions of a speech intended for the public ear. A method so propounded as to draw attention to itself and for its own sake, defeats the end of method, and is a general detriment to the discourse. Powerful speaking demands method, but demands it only in subserviency to itself; and should make any thing or nothing of it, in display, as may make that subserviency most perfect.

Another matter of high importance is *STYLE*. Style is not natural, if it do not vary, somewhat, according to the nature of its subject, and the peculiarities of the speaker's constitutional and acquired character. But with such variety, there are certain attributes of style, always indispensable to power in speaking. To speak with power, for instance, is to speak with *plainness*, and such plainness as will not only express the meaning so that it may be understood, but so that it cannot be misunderstood; for what power is there in an utterance, the very sense of which is uncertain to the hearer? To plainness, moreover, must be added *simplicity*; because a meaning may be obvious, when yet it is so expressed as to have attention seduced from itself, to some vain word or ostentatious image in the sentence. Verbose and florid speeches are seldom of much efficacy; or if they have strength, they would have had more, had their superfluities of vanity been laid aside. But from plainness and simplicity, *purity* should not be disjoined; since, in speech, as in every thing else, the truest and best sort of power has no dwelling with coarseness and vulgarity. The end of all legitimate public speaking is the elevation and refinement of man. Of preaching, pre-eminently, this is the end. Its object is to raise man, in all his faculties, tastes, feelings, and pursuits, to a height of purity and refinement absolutely perfect. A grovelling and vulgar style of discourse is unfavorable to this object. If it were duly remembered by preachers, that the essence of the Gospel is purity, dignity, greatness, perfect and unmeasurable, they would see the revolting incongruity of ever associating it with vulgarity in any form; and that so far as vulgarity has influence in preaching, it is to thwart, not advance, the cause in which they labor.—But the style of a powerful public speaker is *animated*, as well as plain, simple, and pure. There is life and spirit and pathos in his words; and he deals gracefully and naturally in allusions, analogies and images. Who has not remarked how it adorns and enlivens and invigorates discourse, to inweave into it tastefully, sprightly similitudes and figures? The highest order of public speakers, those who keep the attention of auditories enchained, and “on the tip of their persuasive tongue carry all arguments,” are men of rich invention, and fertile fancy, and deep sympathies; and these all appear in the style in which they express themselves.

The power of a speech also depends, in a great degree, *on the manner of its delivery*. This, we know, was anciently held of paramount importance, and very justly. The best speech ever written by man, pronounced without proper feeling

and action, might make almost no impression; a speech, on the other hand, of but inferior merit, pronounced as it should be, or as a Whitefield, especially if it were his own, would pronounce it, might have surprising efficiency. The *manner of uttering a thing*, indeed, is often the decisive reason of its being believed or disbelieved; attended to promptly, or utterly disregarded. A man tells you, for example, of some sudden disaster which has just occurred in your family, but he does it so unfeelingly, so unnaturally, that you deem him, perhaps, a trifler or insane; another person has such a manner of giving you the information, that you doubt it no more than if you were an eye-witness; and accordingly hasten away to the scene of the calamity. It is so in respect to public speaking. He who discourses of great affairs, without seriousness of spirit and appearance, may speak weighty things, but his manner of speaking them, shows that they have no just influence on his own mind, and prevents their good effect on the minds of his hearers. If a speaker would inspire joy into his hearers, he must speak to them with gladness of heart and a rejoicing voice; if he would make them weep, he must first weep himself. This is a maxim of ancient wisdom, and it is according to nature. If, before a man speaks, his eye glow with delight, or be suffused by silent grief, he is irresistibly eloquent, even with a mute tongue; but when he does open his lips, it is "to make the weeper smile, the laugher weep." How radical then the mistake, to make but little of *manner* in the business of public speaking. Just articulation, just emphasis and cadence, just modulation of the voice, just gesture and pauses—these things, indeed, however agreeable and graceful, are, apart from those kindlings of the soul of which they should be the result and the expression, comparatively matters of small importance; but, prompted animated and controlled by those kindlings, they are the chief servitors of eloquence, and among the rarest and most excellent of human attainments.

I add but one thing more to this analysis of our subject. It relates to *the influence of a man's character on his success in public speaking*. That a public speaker should be a man of a good character, is an old observation; but it deserves to be perpetually and vividly kept in mind. There is in a bad man's commendations of truth, as Solomon strikingly sets forth, a grievous incongruity, felt by every one, like to what a cripple experiences in attempting to walk on his unequal legs. It shocks us instinctively as a most iniquitous and pernicious evil. Besides, as an ill reputation is apt to hinder credit in a man's testimony, so, on a like principle, it tends to impair the power

of a speaker's discourse on his hearers. Such is the connexion between truth and virtue, that an enemy to the latter is esteemed no real friend of the former, and, therefore, insincere in its advocacy; and if he openly despises his own announcements, they will not, at least as coming from him, command much respect from others. Is he a man of great powers of mind? His practical disbelief is, on that account, a greater disparagement of the truths he enforces with his tongue. Are his arguments strong, and his exhortations vehement? But they are more than neutralized by the reflection, that if he be truly in earnest, he is but the more loudly declaring his own shame, the more zealously making his own destruction sure. Hence, how well is it, that "unto the wicked, God saith, what hast thou to do, to declare my statutes? or that thou shouldst take my covenant in thy mouth?" If such a man will speak, let him speak for falsehood, not for truth; for the father of lies, not for the Holy One. What a tendency, on the other hand, has a good name, to secure a speaker attention, and give effect to what he says? How does his pure character, his well known love and practice of moral excellence, his bright example, point the sentences of wisdom which so well befit his lips, and fasten them in men's understandings, "as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies." Pre-eminently is this so, when the speaker is a holy man of God, and the things spoken by him are the everlasting truths of the Gospel. But I need not stay to show, how fitness here, between character and vocation, gives power and efficiency and success to the latter. It is illustrated by examples in the knowledge of every one: it is what we all understand by experience.

But it is not only by having popular confidence and respect, that a speaker finds advantage from moral purity in himself. He is assisted by that purity, *both in furnishing himself for his work, and in the actual discharge of it.* As truth is in order to virtue, so virtue is the best lover and the most exact discernor of truth. None, indeed, but a virtuous mind can well understand truth. Hence, moral evil, in Scripture, is every where called darkness, ignorance, folly, madness; and understanding is identified with holiness. No scribe, therefore, is well instructed unto the kingdom of God, in whom the spirit of holiness, the only true spirit of illumination, does not dwell. It is not the deep-searching and far-reaching processes of natural intellect, but spirituality of purpose, and heavenliness of feeling, which attain to just views of the beauty, and excellency, and greatness of divine things. And the preacher who best understands his appropriate subjects of discourse, is he, who, while he

applies all the energies of his being in the meditation of those subjects, keeps himself in the glowing exercise of love to God, and is constantly crying out in spirit, "Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law."

But we have seen how important is *manner* in public speaking. Now, a just manner, especially in preaching, is not to be acquired from teachers of elocution, who, by all their rules of art, can only give a cold negative correctness. It is the mighty workings of an inward life, that produce good action, the expression of those deep workings. These are the true parent of natural utterance and gesticulation. The preacher who comes into an assembly, with all the powers of his nature pervaded and filled by the theme on which he is to address them, and with pure and burning affection for their souls, and under a sense of a present God who sustains his mind in holy composure by the influences of the Spirit, and lifts it up above the fear of man and all selfish aims and respects—he it is, other things being equal, who best exemplifies the principles of a just elocution, and gives the truest specimen of the eloquence of manner. But it is not a knowledge of rhetorical rules; it is heavenliness of mind, and communion with God, and very holy living, in addition to fit discipline and constitutional properties; which thus furnish him for powerful action in the pulpit. Those preachers who have exerted the best sort of power in the pulpit, and in the highest degrees, were among the most virtuous and holy and spiritual of mankind.

These are what appear to me to constitute the chief elements of power in public speaking. They are not all indispensable to considerable degrees of power; nor have they all been exemplified by but very few speakers in any or every age. A speaker, exemplifying them all in a high degree, becomes the wonder of the times, and holds a prominent place in the memory, and regard, and admiration of all men. They were never exemplified perfectly by more than one individual, of whom it is written, that "never man spake like that man." He stands alone among all public speakers, shining them all out of view, as the sun does the lesser lights of heaven. But though there may be powerful speaking in the absence of some of those things which have been enumerated as essential to the highest degree of power, or where some of them exist very defectively; and though no one may hope for absolute perfection in this great gift, more than in any thing else; yet as we ought to aspire to perfection even here, and should account ourselves bound to make progress until we attain to it; it may be useful to have as clear and vivid impressions as possible of the scale and the standard of perfection in public speaking.

I conclude with three remarks.

*The faculty of speaking in public is improvable by culture.* I do not suppose that all men are capable of becoming, by any culture, efficient public speakers. Some appear to want the physical elements of a speaker; and improvement is impracticable, where there is nothing to be improved. A distinction has been made, as to the way of their production, between an orator and a poet; the one it has been said is formed by art, the other is born; but the truth is, that both the orator and the poet can attain to high eminence in their respective kinds of excellence, only by the concurrence of birth and art. No man becomes a powerful speaker by mere culture, independently of native advantages; but where these advantages are not wanting, the influence of culture on public speaking is decisive, and proportionate, ordinarily, to the degree in which it is bestowed.

To what particulars attention should be directed, or how occupied, it were venturesome to state without deep reflection, and much care, and specific reference to different cases and circumstances. But let any one consider the things which tend to power in speaking, and he will find that there is not one of those things in which advancement may not be hoped for by the faithful use of appropriate means.

Indeed, not only may advantages be improved, but obstacles may be overcome. One of the most eloquent tongues that ever thrilled the ear of man, was that of a stammerer, who, besides his constitutional impediment, had to encounter the disadvantages of a very neglected and imperfect education. He contended against these great difficulties. His application was unwearied, and how splendid was his success? By the use of his tongue, he rose to the highest eminence of civil power, became the glory of his country and his age, and is, at this day, the admiration of the civilized world.

*The business of a successful public speaker is exceedingly laborious.* This clearly follows from the view which has been taken of our subject. Power in speaking, according to that view, is not the result of mere natural animation, or natural genius, however great. A genius for eloquence gives mighty advantages to a speaker, but it does not supersede the necessity of great and continued exertion. The business of choosing, adapting, and analyzing subjects of discourse; of arranging, composing, cementing, and applying discourse itself; and of so living, and so disciplining the mind and heart, as to keep one's self in the necessary mood and tone of mind, if I may so speak, for the just enunciation and delivery of discourse—this is work to be no otherwise done by any man, than by laborious and in-

defatigable application. And genius will prove hurtful, in proportion to the degree in which it is possessed, if in indolent reliance on itself, it despises application, as needed only by persons of inferior gifts. Let no one suppose that any thing will ever make it idle work to speak well in public. Occasions and circumstances may rouse the mind into mighty action, and the result may be surprising displays of eloquence, without much specific effort at preparation; but life is not made up of occasions of extraordinary excitement. Let all persons who design to be public speakers, and to be efficient and successful ones, bid adieu to sensual indulgence, resist all temptations to mental sloth, and make a covenant with Labor, as their portion and supreme pleasure under the sun.

Finally, it seems quite obvious, from what has been said, that *instruction and discipline*, employed to strengthen and improve the faculty of public speaking, in candidates for the sacred office, *should constitute no unimportant part of their previous education*. Public speaking we justly account the chief business of men, who, by vocation, are *preachers*. There are, indeed, in the ministry, men of high attainments, great force of character, and extensive usefulness, who, in their own persons, do comparatively little, by means of public speaking; but let not the examples of these men, however illustrious, on some accounts, lead us to a mis-judgment, or abate our sense of the paramount excellence, dignity, and influence, of the more appropriate work of the ministers of Jesus Christ. That work, if Scripture has not misled us, is unquestionably public speaking. This, as I have before said, is the grand means appointed by God, for the maintenance and advancement of his glorious cause in this world. And there is wisdom in the appointment. Speech is one of the noblest of human gifts—an engine of greater power than any other which mortals have ever exercised.

Is this gift improvable by culture? The small share of attention which is usually given to it, leaves room, it should seem, for the raising of this question, but the true answer to it is, *no human faculty is more improvable*. The conclusion is irresistible, that no faculty should be more assiduously and perseveringly cultivated in candidates for the ministry. Time, treasure, ease, all earthly delights, should be counted by them nothing, as the price of their learning to speak in an efficient and successful manner.

I feel, my respected friends, GUARDIANS AND PROFESSORS OF THIS SACRED INSTITUTION, that it becomes me to say these things tremblingly on the present occasion. The department

which I have been called to occupy here, I deem, as my remarks imply, of great importance. I am wholly inexperienced in the business of it, and, while I attempt to teach, must myself be a learner. I cannot, of course, boldly commit myself, in this untried sort of labor, without either a measure of self-confidence which would promise unhappy results; or an humble reliance on the gracious presence and assistance of God. With such reliance, if I am not deceived, I have ventured to engage in the important work which has been assigned to me in this place.

I know, my revered friends, that I shall greatly need your indulgence. But you do not forget, either, that I am a frail and sinful man; or what my manner of life, and my engrossing concern in other work, have heretofore been. You will, of course, regard me as a learner; and if you see me willing and industrious to learn, I cannot doubt, but that you will bear with many imperfections, and wait for progress, and encourage endeavor, and for Zion's sake and this Institution's sake, make affectionate mention of me at the throne of heavenly mercy.

MY YOUNGER BRETHREN, whose pursuits in this province of sacred learning I am to endeavor to assist, let me earnestly solicit of you, also, a constant remembrance of me in prayer. I wish you to bear it in mind, that I am entering on an untried sphere of effort, and that if I render you valuable assistance, it must be by means of an application of mind and heart, on my part, not less diligent than will be needful on yours. I am, in respect to self-indulgence, to have no advantage—I want none—over you. I am rejoiced, not distressed, at the recollection that necessity is laid upon me to make vigorous exertion. Pray for me, dear brethren, that my strength may not fail, and that I may have no confidence in an arm of flesh.

Meanwhile, forget not that prayer and labor are your sole means of success. You have an object in view which deserves exertion, and which also demands it. Whatever facilities you may have for acquiring the ability to speak with power, you cannot reasonably hope to acquire it, without much and continued application. Such application you will not, you cannot withhold, if you keep two things in mind; that the tongue of man is his chief engine of power; and that you are to exercise your tongues for no earthly purposes, but for objects as far above the greatest things of earth, as the soul is more important than the body; the bliss of eternity than that of a moment; or the glory of God than the meanest sensual gratification.

THE BIBLE, A TEST OF MORAL CHARACTER.

The Bible is the Statute Book of a moral kingdom, and contains an exhibition of the character and government of God. It presents the Supreme Being, an Omnipotent, wise and holy Sovereign, sitting on the throne. Man is his subject, placed in circumstances the most favorable to render a cheerful and prompt obedience. Here he is to pass a brief probation, and then enter on a state of endless retribution. In this government, there is no change. Individual rights are inviolably preserved. The innocent never suffer, and the impenitent guilty never escape, punishment. Here is no injustice,—no act, that is not dictated by the highest reason. The happiness of the subject, and the glory of the sovereign, are inseparably connected.

With such a government, no reasonable subject can find fault. Separate it from human action, and there is not a rational being in the world, that will complain of it? Lost spirits would eulogize it, did they not feel the weight of its *tremendous power*.

But no sooner is what is thus beautiful in theory brought to bear on the conscience and the heart, than it fills the world with rebellion. All ages, characters and ranks break out into open revolt. In the *abstract*, no one can find any fault in it; but in the *application*, it is insufferable. Human nature will not submit to it.

Here then comes up the test,—the Bible as revealing the character and government of God. Every one busies himself to find out where lies the grand difficulty,—how a system, that appears so beautiful in *theory*, should seem to be nothing but injustice and oppression in *practice*.

*One*, disowning revelation altogether, turns over the volume of nature, and inspects carefully every page. He discovers that there has been an *eternal succession*; or that the world is the offspring of *chance*. Consequently, there is no *First Cause*.

*Another*, admitting that there is a God, reads over the Statute Book, but finds it full of contradictions and absurdities. He cannot imagine how the prophets could foretel future events, or Joshua stop the sun, or Moses pass through the Red Sea on dry land, while Pharaoh and his hosts were swallowed up. Or, he cannot find room enough in the ark to contain all the animals, nor water enough *any where* to drown the world. Consequently, the Bible is a deception. There is a God;—but he takes no cognizance of human actions.—A king, but no moral government.

A *third*, admitting the Bible to be from God, reads over the laws it contains, and at first is satisfied with them. His heart approves them all. But he comes to the penal code, and here he finds a difficulty. To this section his heart will not submit.—What! man denounced as a rebel and threatened with eternal punishment? It is inconsistent with divine goodness.—It is unreasonable and cruel,—the doctrine of devils! Consequently, Sheol is the grave, and Gehenna, the valley of Hinnom. “The worm that never dies,” lived but thirty years, and “the fire that is never quenched,” went out eighteen centuries ago.

This granted; or in other words, man’s accountability destroyed, and justice struck from the constellation of the divine attributes; and his heart does not rebel against the wreck that remains. It perfectly accords with what he would have the divine government to be. Therefore this must be what the Bible teaches.

*Another* reads the sacred volume; and he does not object to a moral government; nor to penal sanctions. But he finds the great difficulty at another point.—Three cannot be one; nor one, three. This, he avers, contradicts both reason and philosophy, though the subject itself may lie beyond the reach of all analogy and philosophical investigation. But why does he stop to cavil at a doctrine, which angels around the throne do not understand? The reason is obvious. Admit this as a truth of revelation, and what follows? The atonement, man’s entire depravity, the necessity of a change of heart and salvation by grace,—the very doctrines, which his soul hates. Strike out these doctrines from the book of God, and he would not care whether three made one, or ten, or forty.

Thus does every man assume his own feelings as the standard of rectitude; and according to them he modifies the divine government;—or rather each one frames a government to suit himself. One will have it that there is no God, i. e. he does not *want* any such being to exist in the universe. Another has no objections to a God, if he does not assume the character of a moral governor. Another permits even the existence of moral laws; but they must be without penal sanctions. To any other than these, his heart will not submit. Another cannot bear the thought of human depravity. Doctrines that even approach it, he views with suspicion. He lays hold on fallen man and elevates him to the neighborhood of angels, dresses him out in robes of innocence, and then talks of his purity and divinity.

But there is a great mistake in this mode of investigation. The divine government is what it appears to be. It is not lib-

erty at a distance, and despotism at hand. It is not harmonious and beautiful in theory; and all that is vile and oppressive in application. "The law is holy and the commandment holy, just and good."

But the grand difficulty lies in the *heart*. That is the source of all those contradictory creeds and discordant opinions, which now deluge the moral world. It is not because the Bible is not a plain book, and the divine laws reasonable; but because man is a wilful rebel. The sun is right; but the dial is wrong.—It has never been adjusted to the pole. Let a man look into the heart, and he will readily see the reason, why the government of God produces such restiveness, murmuring and rebellion. He who does this, finds no occasion to blot out or modify what the Bible reveals. It is what it ought to be. It honors God,—it meets the wants of man and promotes the happiness of the universe.

M.

---

FORCE OF EXAMPLE IN THE CHRISTIAN PASTOR.

"Christiani pastoris mores optima sunt ejus doctrinæ explicatio."

It is universally allowed, that uniformity of life and manners is the best comment on the precepts and doctrines of the clergy. The powers of oratory—the finest flowers of rhetoric, lose their influence, unless accompanied with the still small voice of good example. This gives weight and efficacy to every precept, and with irresistible force, commands, at the same time that it engages. The beauty of holiness is more powerful than a thousand arguments. "Dum tacet, clamat."

"What weight and authority" (as a certain writer justly remarks) "does it add to the instructions of the clergy, whilst the audience have it to say—the minister—the preacher is a worthy man;" that he does not enter into the pulpit, as an actor upon the stage to personate a feigned character, and forget his real one; to utter sentiments, or represent passions not his own. Such should be the character of every minister. He should be able to paint the several virtues in their just proportions and amiable colors from living and beautiful originals in his own breast.—He warmly recommends, because he warmly cherishes them. He exclaims against the contrary vices, with an honest indignation, and becoming boldness, because he *detests*, and is *conscious* that he detests, them. He *himself feels* what he speaks

—hath an inward and vital sense of the truths he delivers, and therefore makes *others feel* them too. He speaks *from* his own heart, and *to* the hearts and consciences of his hearers, and *therefore he prevails*.

Pulpit oratory may be exceedingly *useful*, as well as ornamental, when accompanied with the one thing needful, a *good example*; but in comparison with that, it is as *nothing*. Without *that*, eloquence is but “as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal”—warmth, as artifice; and address, as ostentation. The effect of oratory is transient; its impression vanishes, as the animal spirits subside; but a well regulated and exemplary life, is a continual sermon, and often tends more to convince the thoughtless and reclaim the vicious, than the most powerful eloquence or the most pathetic persuasion. The apostle does not admonish Timothy to “take heed unto his doctrine only, but also to *himself*.”

Precept and example must go hand in hand. The one must elucidate the other, and give it life and vigor. Every inadvertency, every little slip, every indiscretion, derogates from the authority, and lessens the influence of the man of God.

The ambassador of Christ, conscious of the importance of the vocation wherewith he is called, should engage in *no other* pursuits, but those calculated to advance the cause of the Redeemer. He should apply all his care and attention to that *one* great concern which cometh upon him daily—*the care of the church*,—having no ambitious views, aspiring at no power, but that of gaining a conquest over himself and of being able to present the truth in a powerful and persuasive manner.

One of the greatest of the apostles, hath said, “Who is sufficient for these things?” If so, certainly nothing ought to interfere, or stand in competition with this momentous concern.—Disengaged from all meaner pursuits—regardless of all lower advantages, that tend to obstruct his great design of glorifying God, let him study to preserve himself blameless in all things, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed rightly dividing the word of truth, and proving an ensample to the flock.

REVIEWS.

---

CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN TWO LAYMEN ON STRICT AND MIXED COMMUNION, *in which the principal arguments in favor of the latter practice are stated, as nearly as possible in the words of its most powerful advocate, the Rev. Robert Hall.* By J. G. FULLER. *With Dr. Griffin's Letter on Communion, and the review of it by Professor Ripley of Newton.* Boston: Lincoln & Edmands, 1831. pp. 321.

“There is a class of Christians,” says the lamented Robert Hall, “pretty widely diffused through these realms, who deny the validity of infant baptism, considering it as a human invention not countenanced by the Scriptures, nor by the practice of the first and purest ages. Besides their denial of the right of infants to baptism, they also contend for the exclusive validity of immersion in that ordinance, in distinction from the sprinkling or pouring of water.” In consequence of their peculiar sentiments on these subjects, this class of Christians have, for the most part, confined their communion to persons of their own persuasion, considering those of other denominations as unbaptized. Their practice in this respect has been termed *close or strict communion*; while the opposite practice is styled *free, open, or mixed communion*.

It is the design of the work before us to vindicate the practice of *close communion*. It is our design, in what follows, to offer some considerations in opposition to this practice. We would premise, however, that we entirely agree with our brethren, the strict or Calvinistic Baptists, in the sentiment, that none but *professed believers in Christ*—who give credible evidence of having been *regenerated* by the influences of the Holy Spirit—are entitled to communion at the sacred supper. Those only who give evidence of being *the children of God* are entitled to a seat at their Father's table. Those only who are prepared to enjoy *real, spiritual communion* with Christ and his people, are entitled to receive the emblems of such communion. “The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?”\*

\* Hence, in advocating what is sometimes called *open communion*, we cannot perceive that we justly expose ourselves to the charge of *latitudinarianism*;—a charge usually urged in this connexion, and which is urged, in the work before us, in opposition even to Mr. Hall. See pp. 153, 154.

But while we are thus confident in the persuasion that the sacrament of the supper is the *exclusive* property of those who give evidence of having been born of God, we are equally confident that it is the property of *all* of this character; and that to withhold it, as many do, from multitudes whom they acknowledge to be true Christians, is a proceeding which, however pure and kind may be their intentions, they are wholly unable to justify.

1. The practice of close communion we regard, in the first place, as *unscriptural*.—There were differences of opinion in the apostolical churches, and some of them of as great importance as those now agitated between Baptists and Pedobaptists. Such, for instance, was the question respecting the obligation of practising circumcision, and observing the Jewish law. Yet neither party was tolerated in excluding or denouncing the other. So far from this they were expressly exhorted to *receive one another*, on the ground of both being supposed to belong to Christ. “Wherefore *receive ye one another*, as Christ also received us, to the glory of God.” Rom. xv: 7. “Him that is weak in faith”—or whom ye esteem weak, he not being able to see things in the same light with yourselves—“*receive ye*, but not to doubtful disputations.” ‘Who art thou that judgest *another man’s servant*, in respect to such matters? He is a *servant of Christ*; he is *in the faith*; he is conscientious in his opinion, as you are in yours; and why do you judge him? To his own Master he standeth or falleth. Let us not therefore judge one another any more.’ See Rom xiii: 1—13.

It will be said, we are aware, that the Apostle is here speaking of things *indifferent*; things not to be compared with the modern questions respecting baptism. But what are we to understand by ‘things indifferent,’ as this phraseology is here used? Not things of no importance, or about which the Apostle had formed no opinion; but things which he regarded as *unnecessary to Christian character, and to final salvation*;—as the questions respecting baptism confessedly are. Paul certainly had formed an opinion in regard to the matters referred to in the above quotations, and he did consider them as of very considerable importance—important enough frequently to occupy his thoughts and his pen; but as he did not think them essential to Christian character, he was decided in affirming that they ought to be no bar in the way of Christian fellowship and communion.

It will be said, again, that those to whom the Apostle wrote were all baptized persons, members of the church; and consequently his directions to them are no evidence of the manner

in which he would decide questions relating to baptism.—It might be difficult to prove, that *all* those to whom directions are given in the Epistles of Paul had been baptized in any way,—and especially, that they had all been immersed.\* But suppose they had been : it is still true, confessedly so, that the modern questions respecting baptism are unessential to Christian character and a hope of heaven, and consequently that they rest on the same *general* ground with the questions agitated in the days of Paul. It could not be expected that the directions of the Apostles would meet all the particular cases which might occur in the church, from that period to the end of the world. They laid down general principles, and applied them to cases immediately in hand ; but left it to the wisdom of other ages further to use and apply them, as there might be occasion.

Nothing is more certain from the New Testament, than that the church of Christ is *one body*. “As we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office, so we, being many, are *one body in Christ*, and every one members one of another.” Rom. xii : 4, 5. And this is true, not only of the *real, spiritual* church of Christ, but equally so of the *visible* church. For what is the visible church ? It is the real church bodied forth, *made visible*, by a credible profession of godliness ; so that if Christ’s spiritual church is one, his visible church must be equally so ; and if the former may with propriety be represented as *his body*, the latter is his *visible body*. “By one Spirit are we all baptized into *one body*.” “Now ye are the *body of Christ*, and members in particular.” 1 Cor. xii : 13, 27. To divide the church of Christ, therefore, is to divide *his body*. To separate a portion of the acknowledged members of his church, and refuse to hold communion with them, is, as Mr. Baxter expresses it, to “separate the members of Christ’s Body, and tear his flesh, and break his bones.” This, it hardly need be said, is as *unscriptural*, as it is unnatural. “*Is Christ divided ?*”

The Scriptures represent the human family as belonging to *two* general classes, believers and unbelievers, saints and sinners ; and to those of the former class—*all* who give evidence of belonging to the number of God’s children, they uniformly appropriate the privileges of his children. These are the members of his family, and entitled, as such, to the provisions of his house. Hence, to make a separation between persons of

\* We hope our brethren of the *close communion* will not seriously attempt to monopolize the *Epistles*,—if they do the sacrament of the supper ; as, whatever may be thought of our claim to the latter, we must insist on retaining some interest in the former.

this character, and exclude a part of them from the table of their Lord, is a proceeding, not only unknown to the Scriptures, but manifestly *contrary* to the general spirit and current of the sacred writings.

It is evidently the will of Christ, as revealed in the Scriptures, that his followers should be *one*. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which *shall believe on me through their word*,—that *they all may be one* ; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one* in us," John xvii: 20, 21. Hence, those Christians may be sure that they best perform the will of Christ, who strive most earnestly and successfully to prevent divisions, and promote unity and peace among his true followers. But how shall this important object be best promoted? By drawing lines of separation between the disciples of Christ, and excluding a part of them from their Master's table? Or by bearing with one another's mistakes and infirmities, in things unessential to Christian character, and receiving one another, even as Christ has received them?

In every view we can take of the subject, we are constrained to regard what is commonly called *close communion* as unscriptural. It was entirely unknown in the first age of the church. The Apostles seem not to have contemplated such a thing as possible. Of course, they did not expressly prohibit it; and yet they established principles which, by a fair and general application, go decidedly to condemn it.

2. The practice of close communion is contrary to that of the church *in the ages succeeding the Apostles*. There were differences of opinion among the primitive believers in regard to points not deemed essential; but these were not suffered to break the unity of the church.—Such was the dispute about the time and manner of celebrating Easter. This may be deemed a trifling matter to Christians of the present age; but in primitive times, it was a question of high interest and importance. And when Victor, one of the bishops of Rome, undertook to excommunicate his Eastern brethren, because they would not yield to his opinion on the subject, he was rebuked for so unchristian a procedure, and obliged to retrace his steps. Says Irenæus, writing to him, "The Presbyters who before ruled the church which you now govern, neither observed themselves, nor permitted their people to observe, the day which is kept by the Asiatic Christians; nevertheless, while they did not observe that day, they maintained peace with the other Presbyters who did; and never were any on account of this diversity cast out of the church; but the Presbyters who preced-

ed you, and did not keep the day, *sent the Eucharist to those who did.* And when blessed Polycarp went on a journey to Rome, in the time of Anicetus, and they had some little difference about other matters, they immediately dropped it for the sake of peace, and would by no means cherish contention on this head. Anicetus could not, indeed, persuade Polycarp to relinquish his observance as having always kept it with John, the disciple of the Lord, and the other Apostles with whom he had been conversant. Nor did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to adopt it, as he pleaded for the necessity of retaining the custom of the Presbyters who had gone before him. Yet, while things were in this state, *they held communion with each other.* And in the church, Anicetus, from pure respect, *yielded to Polycarp the dispensation of the Eucharist,* and they amicably separated from each other, and the peace of the whole church was preserved, both by those who kept the day, and those who did not.\*

Another dispute with which the church in those times was agitated, related to the validity of certain baptisms, and was not altogether unlike modern questions touching the same subject. Many doubted concerning the baptisms administered by heretics, and whether it was proper to receive persons so baptized into the Catholic church, without a repetition of the ordinance. But neither was this matter, for a considerable time at least, permitted to interrupt the fellowship of the church. "Many things," says an excellent man, writing to a celebrated Cyprian at this period—"many things vary according to the diversity of place and people; but nevertheless, *these variations have at no time infringed the peace and unity of the Catholic church.*"†

There were differences of opinion among the primitive Christians in regard to the subject of *church government.* Originally, the church was governed by Presbyters, the words Presbyter and Bishop designating the same office. But in the course of a few centuries, Episcopal government was introduced, and the primitive order of things was changed. In proof of this, the following quotation from Jerome is decisive. "*A Presbyter is the same as a bishop;* and before there were, by instigation of the devil, dissensions in religion, and it was said among the people, *I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas,* the churches were governed by *the joint counsel of the Presbyters.* But *afterwards,* when every one accounted those

\* Euseb. Ecc. Hist. Lib. vi. Cap. 24.

† Cypriani Opera, Part ii. p. 220. See also Murdock's Mosheim, Vol. i. p. 226.

whom he baptized as belonging to himself, and not to Christ, it was decreed, throughout the whole world, that one, chosen from among the Presbyters, *should be put over the rest*, and that the whole care of the church should be committed to him, and the seeds of schism be taken away.”—Again this learned father says, after having quoted and commented on several passages of Scripture in proof of the same point, “Among the ancients, *Presbyters and Bishops were the very same*. But by degrees, (*paulatim*) that the plants of dissensions might be plucked up, the whole concern was devolved upon an individual. As the Presbyters, therefore, know that, by *the custom of the church*, they are subjected to him who is set over them, so let the Bishops know, that they are greater than Presbyters, *more by custom*, than by any real appointment of Christ.”\*

Such is the language of one who lived within a few centuries of the Apostles, testifying to the changes which had taken place in the government of the church. Yet these changes, and the differences of opinion and discussions which must necessarily have grown out of them, did not produce, and were not thought sufficient to warrant *separate communions*. Those who were the most strenuous in opposition to the prevailing innovations were entirely averse, as Jerome tells us in another place, to “cutting asunder the harmony of brotherly union.”

Our Baptist brethren believe that, in the times of the Apostles, infant baptism was unknown; but that in a few centuries, it was introduced, and prevailed, and became almost or altogether universal,—so that in the age of Augustine, the learned and acute Pelagius was constrained to declare, that he “never heard of any, not even the most impious heretic, who denied baptism to infants.”† It is natural to suppose that so great an innovation (if an innovation it be,) must have led to differences of opinion and disputes; and yet we ask—not for the evidence of such disputes (this would be out of place here)—but for the evidence that these disputes, if they did exist, were suffered to break the unity of the church. Where were the churches which, on account of this alleged innovation, *withdrew from their brethren, and refused to have communion with them at the table of the Lord?* Suffice it to say, that we have no trace of any such churches in ancient times, and no reason to believe that any existed; and this fact, were there no other, ought, as it seems to us, to satisfy the abettors of close communion, that they have departed from the example of the primitive Christians.

\* *Hironeymi Opera*, Tom. vi. p. 16<sup>o</sup>.

† See Wall's *Hist. of In. Baptism*, Vol. i. p. 62.

It is claimed, too, by our Baptist brethren, that there were many of their sentiments previous to the reformation from Popery, but that they mingled promiscuously with the other pious dissenters, and were closely concealed from the eyes of their persecutors. Thus it is said by Benedict, in his history of the Baptists, that "before the rise of Luther and Calvin, there lay concealed in almost all the countries of Europe, particularly in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland, and Germany, many persons who adhered tenaciously to the doctrine which the Waldenses, Wickliffites, and Hussites had maintained. These concealed Christians," he adds, "we have good reasons for believing, were MOSTLY Baptists." And Crosby says that, previous to the year 1633, the Baptists in England "had been *intermixed with other Protestant Dissenters without distinction*, and shared with the Puritans in the persecutions of those times."\* Here are express admissions on the part of learned Baptist historians that, previous to the reformation, *their brethren were 'intermixed with other dissenters,'* and of course that close communion was unknown.

3. The practice of close communion necessarily leads those who adopt it into *various and palpable inconsistencies*.—It would seem from their principles, that what are commonly called Pedobaptist churches are not, in any proper sense, churches of Christ. Baptism, says the author of the work before us, is "the divinely appointed mode of entrance into the visible church;" and Pedobaptists have not been baptized. Of course, they have not so much as *entered* the visible church; and hence their associations in covenant cannot with any propriety be denominated churches. If the premises are admitted, the conclusion would seem to be inevitable. And yet most of the close-communicants with whom we are acquainted admit that the Pedobaptist churches are churches of Christ; and that their ministers are ministers of Christ.† Indeed, the ministers of the two denominations freely associate as ministers of Christ, in religious meetings, Ecclesiastical councils, an exchange of services, &c.

But then again, if the Pedobaptist churches *are* churches of Christ, why not commune with them as such? And why not admit their members at least to occasional communion? Why present the strange anomaly of acknowledged church members, who cannot be received to an ordinance of the church;

\* See Benedict's Hist. of the Baptists, Vol. i. pp. 138, 197.

† See an article in the Boston Recorder of May 25, 1822, adopted by an extensive union of Baptists and Pedobaptists, in which the churches of the two denominations are recognized as Churches of Christ, and their ministers as ministers of Christ, qualified to perform ministerial acts.

and of those who are admitted to fellowship in every other mode, as members of Christ's church and ministers of his kingdom, who are not admitted to a seat at his table?

In reply to what is here urged, it is insisted by Mr. Fuller in the work before us, (p. 106—110) that the office of a gospel minister does not belong to the *church relation*, or at least is not peculiar to it, so that a person may consistently be received as a preacher of the gospel, who is not regarded as a church member. But is the gentleman serious in this matter? And if he is, are the Baptists of our own country prepared to adopt his views? It would be doing them great injustice to suppose it. In licensing a man to preach the gospel, and especially in ordaining him, no people would be more likely than they to inquire into his *church relation and standing*; nor can we believe they would admit one, on any account into their pulpits, to declare to them the truth of God, who they did not suppose was a member of the church of Christ.

It has been said by some, that as the Lord's supper is a *positive institution*, it rests on different ground from that of other religious services, in which unbaptized persons may consistently unite. But we would ask, in reply, whether the *gospel ministry* is not a positive institution; and one of as great importance, and demanding as high qualifications, as the Lord's supper? Indeed, does it not demand much higher qualifications? How many thousands are there in the churches, worthy partakers of the Lord's supper, whom no one would think qualified to preach the gospel?—We would inquire, too, whether the Apostle did not consider preaching as a more important work, than even *administering* ordinances? The latter could be done by ordinary helpers; but "Christ," says he, "sent *me*, not to baptize, but to *preach the gospel*." 1 Cor. i: 17.

The advocates of close communion are willing to admit, that many Pedobaptists are *real Christians*. But if they are real Christians, they are in the number of God's *children* and have a right to sit at their Father's table. If they are real Christians, they have *spiritual* communion with Christ and his people, and ought to be permitted to have visible communion. God communes with them, if they are real Christians; and why should any of the professing people of God be more strict in their communion, than he is? If Pedobaptists are real Christians, they are among those who feed upon Christ *by faith*; and why are they not permitted to feed upon the appointed *emblems* of his body and blood? They are partakers *really and spiritually*; and why should they not be sacramentally? If Pedobaptists are real Christians, they are heirs of heaven, and will shortly be

received to heaven ; and why should it be made more difficult to obtain a seat at certain sacramental tables here on earth, than to procure admission to the marriage supper of the Lamb above ? Heaven is certainly the great object and end of the Christian's pilgrimage, and earthly ordinances are but the means of obtaining it ; and why should it be made more difficult to secure the means than the end ? Why should the Lord's table be barred against the approach of those, to whom the gate of heaven is open ?

The advocates of close communion are not a little embarrassed with the question, whether it is right for Pedobaptists to celebrate the Lord's supper in their own churches. As this ordinance is a positive divine institution, it must be *the same* under all circumstances ; so that if it is right for Pedobaptists to celebrate it in one place, it is right in another ; or if it is wrong in one place, it is wrong (other things being equal) in another. Hence, if it is wrong for them to celebrate the supper in connexion with Baptists, it is wrong, and no less a profanation of the ordinance, for them to celebrate it by themselves. Accordingly, when pressed with the argument in this direction, our brethren commonly speak out, and declare it to be ' a departure from the traditions of the Apostles, and a pouring contempt on one of the positive institutions of Christ,' for us to come to the communion in the manner we do.\* Yet, on the other hand, they appear to manifest no great uneasiness at the continuance of this alledged profanation ; will consent to preach our sacramental lectures ; and by their conduct seem to say, that if we will only keep at a distance from them, and celebrate the ordinance by ourselves, they are satisfied. Indeed, the author of the work before us expressly says, that " on their own principles, Pedobaptists *do right* in partaking of the Lord's supper." p. 32.

It affords us no pleasure to urge these inconsistencies upon our brethren of the strict communion ; but as their practice necessarily involves them, and many more, it is important that they should be able to appreciate some of the difficulties with which, in the judgment of others, their system is encumbered.

4. We object again to the practice of close communion, that it is *an interruption of mutual charity, and a hindrance to Christian love.* It leads those who adopt it to judge the hearts of their brethren, and impugn their motives, as they would not do, were it not for the difficulties with which they feel themselves pressed in relation to this subject. Although they are willing to admit, as already stated, that many Pedobaptists are pious persons—some of them eminently so—yet when they

\* See Andrews's *Strictures*, &c. p. 40.

come to apologize for not admitting them to the Lord's table on the ground of their alleged mistakes in regard to baptism, they almost uniformly assail their motives. Thus in the work before us, the excellent Baxter is charged with "avowing his conviction of one system, and acting on another," p. 134; and Pedobaptists generally are said to live in *voluntary* error, which is to live in allowed sin, p. 126. Even Professor Ripley, with all his candor (and in general he is very candid) cannot help insinuating, that many are prevented from adopting Baptist principles, because they "fear to examine;" or "hastily think themselves incompetent to form an opinion;" or are under the influence of prejudice from various quarters;" or are deterred by "the inconveniences attending the adoption of such sentiments." p. 295. Now we are far from saying that no person was ever kept back from becoming a Baptist or a Pedobaptist by considerations like these; but we suppose they are as likely to operate one way as the other, and that it is not very charitable, in either party, to attribute the alleged mistakes of the other to the influence of such motives.

The principles of close communion tend to interrupt charity, as they lead those who embrace them, and have sufficient hardihood of consistency to carry them out, to wage a war of extermination upon other sects. The consistent close-communicant regards the entire mass of the members of Pedobaptist churches as unbaptized, and consequently as disqualified for Christian communion, and he is prompted by what he thinks a zeal for God to do what he can to diminish their number. If he can seduce a sheep from the fold of his Pedobaptist neighbor, he thinks it so much gained to the cause of truth; and he will feel strong inducements, under such circumstances, to draw away as many as possible. We do not say that our ministerial brethren of the strict communion actually pursue the course here described; *far from it*. A great majority of them at the present day are under the influence of so many counteracting principles, that they would not consent, on any account, to violate the courtesies of Christian intercourse, or entrench upon the duties or the rights of others. But we are endeavoring to exhibit the legitimate tendency of close communion, when carried into full and consistent operation; and it cannot be thought strange that those who practice it should be regarded often with suspicion, and that a sad interruption to the overflowings of Christian love should be the consequence.

The principles of close communion are a hindrance to the exercise of Christian love, as they tend to foster pride in those who embrace them, under the idea of having done more than

others, and of possessing superior qualifications; and to wound the feelings of Pedobaptists, under the impression of being set aside as disqualified for the communion of saints. These principles also lead to disputes and separations, which too often terminate in excited feelings, alienation and enmity. Christians forget that they are engaged in a common cause, and have a common interest, and fail to afford each other that sympathy and support which circumstances demand, and the laws of Christ require. They fail to bear one another's burthens, and to co-operate as they ought in prayers and labors to promote the religion of the Saviour.

It is evidence of the truth of what is here stated, that when religion is revived in a community, and Baptists and Pedobaptists are accustomed to meet together, till their love is enkindled and their hearts are warmed, the attachment of the former to close communion almost uniformly diminishes. The hearts of numbers who had previously practised it are pained; and not a few indignantly reject it. So often have we witnessed scenes of this nature, that we think we cannot be mistaken in regard to them.

It is a remarkable fact, too, that Missionaries, who have left their native country in the belief of the principles of close communion, have not unfrequently renounced them, after laboring for a time among the heathen. This was the case with Mr. Hough, of the American Baptist mission in Burmah. It was the case with the celebrated William Ward, so long a Missionary in Bengal. It was the case too, with the excellent Mr. Chater, of the Baptist mission in Ceylon. Christian Missionaries among the heathen are in a favorable situation to feel the influence of Christian love, and the strength of those ties which ought to bind the hearts of Christians together; and if the principles of close communion are no *hindrance* to the exercise of love and charity, in what way are the facts on this subject to be accounted for?

Of the same general bearing is the fact, that close communion is not unfrequently renounced in *sickness*, and in *near views of death*.\* We are far from attaching an undue impor-

\* "In S. B. lived a man of the Baptist church, who for many years had not called in question the correctness of that article of the Baptist faith which excludes acknowledged Christians from communion. When sick, as there was no church of the same faith in the place, a minister of the Congregational order was sent for. After conversation and prayer suited to the sick, the love of God so filled the soul, as to break over all sectarian bounds. The tongue of the sick was loosed, to expatiate upon that charity which limits its complacency only by the want of evidence of genuine piety. After much self-examination and deep regret, for not walking in love with those whom Christ receives to his fellowship, and expressing a lively hope that this and all other sins were forgiven, the eyes were closed in death." See Boston Recorder, March 1, 1823.

"In Roxbury, Vt., A. D. 1821, Mr. R., an aged member of the Baptist church, when

tance or authority to what is said or done on beds of sickness; but Christian love often flows purer and rises higher at such times than before—so high as to break over sectarian barriers, and embrace with full affection all who bear the image of the Saviour.

5. We object to the principles of close communion that, under the consistent operation of them, there will often occur cases of *real hardship*.—Those who have been born of God and truly love him, usually set a high value upon their seasons of sacramental communion. They love to sit down with their fellow disciples at the table of their Lord, lean upon his breast at supper, and feed upon the memorials of his body and blood. But circumstances may be supposed, and are likely often to occur, in which individuals may be deprived of this privilege for years, perhaps during the greater part of their lives, unless they are admitted to communion in the Baptist churches. Here is a pious, devoted mother, a member of a Pedobaptist church, whose lot divine Providence has cast where she can have Christian intercourse only with Baptists. And her intercourse with them is in general pleasant. She listens to their preachers, and is instructed and edified. She meets with them in the praying circle, and her heart is warmed. She co-operates with them in works of faith and labors of love, and in promoting various objects of Christian benevolence. Her affections mingle with theirs, and theirs with hers, and they are spiritually of one heart and soul. But when the table of the Lord is spread, and she asks permission to approach, she is grieved to find herself excluded. ‘And why,’ she asks, ‘Am I excluded? Do I not give you satisfactory evidence of being a child of God—of being one with you in spirit—of being one with whom the Saviour communes? And why can I not have communion with you?’—‘Why, dear sister,’ it is replied, ‘*you have not been baptized.*’—‘But I have been baptized,’ she rejoins. ‘I have given myself up to God in baptism, according to his appointment, and in that manner which I think most agreeable to his will.’—‘Ah, but you are mistaken on that subject; we know you are; you must renounce your pretended baptism, and go with

on his death-bed, sent for a member of the Congregational church to visit him. He had been decidedly against communing with Pedobaptists; but after a little conversation, when his neighbor was about to return, he told him that he had something more to say. He tarried; and the sick man told him that he had a desire to commune with him and his brethren before he left the world. There was no minister in the place, and to appearance he could not live till they could obtain one. His anxiety, however was so great, that a part of the Congregational church was collected, one of the deacons consecrated the elements, he partook with them, and soon after died.—It is easier for Christians to reject each other in life, than when they are entering into the immediate presence of God, and going to join the general assembly above.” [Brooks’s Reply, p. 58.]

us into the water, and then we can receive you.'—'Renounce my baptism,' she exclaims! 'I can never do that. It was the most sacred action of my life. I might almost as well renounce my Saviour.'—'Well, sister, we are sorry for you; but unless you can comply with *our terms*, we cannot receive you.' And so this child of God, because she will not do violence to her conscience, and renounce what she deems the most sacred act of her life, is driven away from her Father's table; and this, too, under circumstances in which it is known that she can have communion with no other church, but must pass her life, and perhaps end her days, and never more have the privilege of coming to the sacramental board. And is there no hardship in all this? Is there nothing revolting to the pious heart?\*" And let it not be thought that this is wholly an imaginary case. It is drawn from the life. There are many such instances now in existence. And if the principles of close communion were more widely diffused, they would be proportionally multiplied. Can these principles, then, be in accordance with the gospel? Can they be a part of that religion which says expressly to its professors, when differing on points not essential to salvation, "Receive ye one another, as Christ also received us. Who art thou that judgest another man's servant?"

But instances like that above described are not the only cases of hardship growing out of close communion. There are others of a different character. It is a fact, that no inconsiderable proportion of the members of the Baptist churches are opposed to close communion; their consciences are pained with it, and their souls are in bondage on account of it. Mr. Hall, says, "It frequently happens that the constitution of a church continues to sanction strict communion, while the sentiments of a *vast majority* of its members are decidedly in favor of a contrary system." In another place he expresses the opinion that a *majority* of the present Baptists are in favor of open communion. Works, Vol. i. pp. 396, 401. A Baptist minister of our own country also says, "It is not known by the close communion Baptists how many there are of their own denomination who believe, in their hearts, in open communion. I was surprised, after divulging my sentiments, to find so many who entertained the same belief—some of them for years." Brooks's

\* There is reason to believe, that the operation of the principles of close communion is often as painful to those who exclude, as to those who are excluded. A brother in the ministry (not a Baptist) who had acted upon these principles, and had excluded a female under circumstances not altogether unlike those above detailed, writes, "She put her kerchief to her eyes, and turned away, struggling with anguish, and the tears streaming down her cheeks. How did my heart smite me! I went home exclaiming to myself, '*Can this be right? Is it possible that such is the law of the Redeemer's house?*'" Mason's Plea &c. p. 7.

Essay, p. 22. This testimony is in accordance with our own observations. We are ourselves acquainted with not a few individuals, members of Baptist churches, who freely acknowledge that they are not satisfied with close communion—that they believe it unscriptural—and that they would abandon it at once, were it not for displeasing some of their brethren.—But is it no hardship for a Christian to live in this way—habitually trifling with his conscience, and conniving at that which he thinks is wrong, from a fear of giving offence to his brethren? Is such a state of mind favorable to Christian enjoyment? Is this the liberty wherewith Christ makes his people free?

6. We object to the practice of close communion, that it is upheld and continued, in part at least, from *sectarian motives*. We should not feel warranted in making this assertion, however clearly facts might seem to justify it, were it not that the truth of it is acknowledged. In the work before us, Mr. F. says, “The tendency of mixed communion is to annihilate, *as such*, all the Baptist churches in Christendom.” And he asks, “Do you wish to promote the dissolution and ruin of *the Baptist denomination, as such*? If you do not, take heed to your ways.” pp. 24, 25. Thus close communion is confessedly to be retained, because its continuance is deemed necessary to the existence of a sect. One of the lines of separation between the members of Christ’s mystical body would be gradually worn out and disappear, were it not for close communion; and therefore the practice must be vigorously maintained.

In reply to this we have only to say, that we have no fears for the denomination to which we belong, in consequence of a free and fraternal intercourse with other denominations of real Christians. If we cannot mingle freely with brethren of other names, who agree with us in holding the Head, and look candidly and closely into their peculiarities, and suffer them to look into ours, without losing our existence as a sect, *then we desire to lose it*. The sooner we incur the loss, the better.—The time has come, when Christians must think less about their particular sects, their denominations “*as such*,” and more about the general interests of truth and the kingdom of Christ. And it is objection enough to any practice in the church, that it requires to be sustained by fomenting a sectarian spirit.

7. We object again to close communion, that it *is opposed to the spirit of the age*, and operates in various ways to retard the progress of Christ’s kingdom. The age in which we live is one of peculiar interest. The Christian world is awaking from its slumbers to unwonted efforts; and Satan is coming out in great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time.

The people of God are beginning to move and operate together; and the enemies of truth and righteousness are doing the same. On every hand, lines are drawing, and sides are taking, preparatory to the conflict of the last days. The aspect of the times obviously demands the utmost practicable union among Christians, and that every thing tending to obstruct this union should be speedily taken out of the way. One of these obstructions, unquestionably, is close communion. This tends, as we have seen, to break the unity of the church, to interrupt mutual charity, to hinder the exercise of Christian love. It divides the affections, and insulates and weakens the efforts of those, who ought to love as brethren, and to go hand in hand to their appropriate work. It leads those often to waste their strength upon each other, whose united strength ought to be directed against a common enemy. It causes those to interfere and contend with each other, between whom there should be no strife, except who shall be most fervent in love, and most zealous in efforts for promoting the Redeemer's kingdom.

An incalculable amount of time, labor, and money, which is now expended for sectarian purposes, might be directed to the common interests of Christianity, were it not for close communion. In how many places in the United States, where there are now two or three societies, all feeble, struggling for existence, and aided perhaps by public charity, might there be one strong, efficient society, able to support itself and to assist others, if those who regard each other as real Christians could only consent to commune together at the table of the Lord? We wish our brethren of the close communion to take this subject into serious consideration, and inquire whether—wherever there are now two or three societies and meeting houses where, but for their principles, there need be but one—the whole of this needless expense is not justly chargeable to their account;—and whether—wherever there are now two or three ministers stationed where, but for close communion, there need be but one—nearly the whole of this superfluous labor, which might be expended in building up the wastes of Zion, is not now lost to the general cause of Christ?\*

On the whole, we have no doubt that the principles of close communion are wrong;—that they are contrary to the Scriptures, and to the practice of the church in the purest times;

\* Evangelical Baptists and Pedobaptists have found already that they can worship together with mutual satisfaction; and if they could but *commune together at the table of the Lord*, they might be associated, wherever there should be occasion, in the same congregation; the Pastor might be of either denomination, according to the wishes of the majority; and nothing would be wanting in such an establishment, but a spirit of forbearance, accommodation and love—a zeal *for God*, and not for a sect—to promote its prosperity and peace.

that they tend to involve those who hold them in great inconsistencies ; and are, in various ways, of injurious influence to the cause of Christ. We say this, not to reproach any of our Baptist brethren or to give them pain ; but to bring them, if possible, to consideration, and to devising ways and means by which the evil in question may be removed. There can be no doubt that many of them are conscientious and sincere. They are those with whom, so far as permitted, we can take sweet counsel now ; and with whom, were it not for close communion, our fellowship might be complete. The obvious tendency of things, at present, is to remove this difficulty ; and we have no doubt that, previous to the Millennium, it will be taken entirely out of the way ; but *how shall this be done ?* How shall the grand obstacle in the way of free and open communion be removed ?

It will be seen that this is a point on which it does not become us to dictate—perhaps not to advise ; and yet (if we may be permitted) we should like to offer a few remarks.

[To be continued.]

CALMETS' DICTIONARY OF THE HOLY BIBLE. *Revised with large additions.* By EDWARD ROBINSON, *Professor Extraordinary in the Theological Seminary, Andover.* Boston : Crocker & Brewster. 1832. pp. 1003.

Within a few years past the labors of learned and pious men have been employed to a wonderful degree in the elucidation of the sacred volume. Their zeal and industry have been such that one would think we were just emerging from another bondage of the conscience and of free inquiry under the Papal yoke. The Reformers hardly did more in comparison of the necessities of the time in which they lived to diffuse a knowledge of the Bible, than has been done within a short period to explain and illustrate its contents. Standing in a public theological library and considering how small a portion of the volumes which have been written to illustrate the Bible are gathered together even in such a collection, we are filled with amazement at the single Book which has employed so many minds, and called forth so vast an amount of thought and research. At the same time we are made to feel that after all which has been written, no expositor, commentator, or even

translator of modern times, could do less than prefix to his book the candid sentence of the Ecclesiastes at the opening of his own golden lines: *Is there any thing whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been already of old time before us.*

As men go into an ancient forest, and hew down from the vast variety of trees such as are needful for the endless application of nature to art, by land and sea, there have been those of late who have done the same work amongst the productions of the older scholars. Many a tall cedar has fallen, and the fir trees also which have done nothing but afford the stork a house, have yielded their stately pride, and are no longer the admiration of the ignorant, nor nestling places for the sequestered enjoyment of antiquarians. All kinds of implements of knowledge are hewn out of their solid contents, such as Bible Dictionaries, Golden Treasuries, Pleasing Expositors, Teachers' Guides, Helps to Religious Improvement, and, in a word, Bible Class and Sunday School Libraries. It is seldom that a month passes without the announcement of a "New Work: ——— Abridged, and adapted to the use of families, or the older classes in the Sabbath School;"—with the *disinterested* counsel from the Editor that no teacher or head of a family should neglect to avail himself of the wonderful assistance afforded by this new and improved edition!

But, as Haman said of his prosperity,—when we have looked at such a show of 'helps,' we have often cried, All this avail-eth us nothing so long as old Calmet sitteth in the unavailable form of four quarto volumes, and marked after a bookseller's black art, "c d e," or "asking price, \$25." The title of the book prefixed to this article, enables us to say to the old Father with great exultation, "The hewer is come up against thee!"

Indeed we have often wondered why some oriental scholar did not undertake such an enterprize. Calmet's great Dictionary of the Bible is a compend, or (to use a larger word for such a 'great' book) an Encyclopædia of Bible illustration and history. We never consulted it without finding some clue to the explanation of a difficult passage. One grand excellency of Calmet is, his inexhaustible fund of pleasantry, (the real French *naïveté*) by which he enlivens the driest details, and the most prolonged investigation. He is very keen at times upon previous and cotemporary writers whom he happens to find 'tripping'; but then he generally makes up with them by telling them a story, or confessing that he is himself a man. In one respect he affords a complete illustration of the character of the French:—we mean, in his credulous love of the wonderful; for some of

his narratives are hardly exceeded, either in their unaccountable or interesting nature, by the 'Arabian Nights' Entertainment.' Hence it requires judgment, formed upon a good acquaintance with oriental literature, manners and customs, to decide how far some of his stories are worthy of credit. Those who are qualified to judge have said that his authority in matters where great accuracy is concerned, should be received with care. But this, even if it be true, is only a verification of the declaration of the Poet, '*Non omnia possumus omnes,*' or, in prose, 'We must not expect perfection in any man.' Had Calmet been an accurate, dry chronologer, disposed by the cast of his mind to minuteness of investigation rather than to general research, he would not have fulfilled the great purpose for which he was employed, viz. to supply the mechanics of the spiritual temple with 'cedar trees, and fir trees, and algum trees out of Lebanon.' But now, his work is an immense collection of material, and those whose talents are of a more analytical turn, can reject all that is superfluous, and still retain every thing in him which is essential.

A sufficient testimony to the excellency of this great Dictionary of the Bible is, that it has been translated into the Latin, Dutch, Italian and Spanish languages. But while it has remained in such a cumbersome and expensive shape, its usefulness has been greatly limited. We have not seen proposals for any work with such gratification, as those for the publication of 'Calmet abridged,' and, which was equally gratifying, by Prof. Robinson. His extensive knowledge has enabled him to correct many of the mistakes, and his good judgment, to prune the redundancies of the original work. But it was very singular, after being accustomed to the old Father's tales, and wit, and repartee to perceive how entirely his character had changed under the American editor, from that of a lively, entertaining Frenchman, to that of a staid, matter-of-fact New Englander. In the present edition, he comes before us like a volatile man in Court, whose spirits are curbed, and his countenance sobered by the impression that now he must speak 'the truth and nothing but the truth.' Some will undoubtedly wish that more of the original peculiarity of the author had been preserved. We say then, let them pay for it, in the price of the whole great work; but for ourselves we are quite content to find nothing in this new edition which does not bear directly upon the illustration of the several topics. To have retained much that was diverting, would have been inconsistent with the object of the publishers, viz. to furnish families, teachers, and private Christians with a cheap, compendious, yet comprehensive

assistant in the study of the Bible. This object has been fully accomplished so far as the character of the work is concerned; and we now recommend it, without qualification, to all who are engaged in studying the Bible. Without entering into a minute description of the excellencies of this edition, it will be enough to say that having taken a copy of the work to examine, we found every thing in it that was necessary to assist in preparing for the Bible class, without referring to the larger edition;—and this, without our further examination would have satisfied us that our high expectations on seeing the proposals and the name of the editor, were entirely fulfilled.

This book is one which, to those who are studying the Bible, it will be expensive not to purchase. We all know how many books of Manners and Customs, Geography, Travels, and Maps, have in times past been necessary in this sacred and delightful study. These are to a great extent superseded by this edition of Calmet, containing, as it does in very convenient form and arrangement, most if not all which is necessary for the common reader of the Bible. Indeed, there is only one thing wanting to make it all which we could desire, viz. ‘*An Index of the passages of Scripture illustrated in the book.*’ Such an index would make it a *Commentary* on the Bible, directing the reader to the explication of hard texts, of which there are but few, in the Old Testament, at least, which are not directly or indirectly illustrated by Calmet. We should be glad to see such an improvement made in the next edition, which, if we are not mistaken, will soon be called for by the present rapid sale of the work.

---

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

1. *The Believer Victorious: A Sermon occasioned by the death of the Rev. Samuel Judson, late pastor of the first Ecclesiastical Society in Uxbridge, Mass. and preached in the meeting house of that Society, on Nov. 18, the Sabbath after his interment.* By DAVID A. GROSVENOR, Pastor of the Evangelical Congregational Society in Uxbridge. Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1833. pp. 22.

The text on which this sermon is founded is just such an one as any person acquainted with Mr. Judson would naturally suppose the preacher might select for the occasion—2 Tim. iv; 6, 7. “For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight;

I have finished my course ; I have kept the faith : henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day."

Our readers might be interested with an outline of the discourse, but assuring them in general of its propriety and excellence, we think it more important to preserve the biography it contains of the respected and beloved minister of Christ whose death occasioned its delivery.

" Mr. Judson was born of pious and respectable parents, in the town of Woodbury, Conn. in the year 1767. He was graduated, at Yale College, in the [year] 1790, and settled over this people in the ministry, in the year 1792. His history and character, from the period of his settlement in this place, are too well known to this community, to require remark.

" You are all acquainted with those amiable traits of character, which he possessed, and which secured him so large a share of esteem in the domestic circle, and in the pastoral relation. Mr. Judson was especially endeared to the members of his own family. He possessed a kind disposition and a benevolent heart. They eminently qualified him, for those assiduous attentions, which he showed, in sickness and in health. Although possessed of uninterrupted health himself, till the last year of his life, he was ever forward to sympathize with others. He ministered to their wants as one experimentally taught. His value in the bosom of his own family, can be duly estimated, by those only, who were privileged to share his devotedness to their interests. His unceasing solicitude for their welfare, has embalmed his memory in their hearts, as a most devoted husband and father.

" It was forty years the 18th of last month, since the beloved man was ordained over this church and people. The peace and tranquillity which the church and society enjoyed, under his ministrations, and the degree of esteem in which he was held among you, evince his faithfulness, as a shepherd and bishop of souls. With his manner of life and walk, you are familiar. You know his deep and continued solicitude for this dear flock, over which he was set. Impressed with the reality of the great truths of revelation, it was his unceasing concern, that those, to whom he ministered, ' might feel them too.' He may be strictly said, I apprehend, to have sought, " not yours but you "

" Next to his own household and the flock over which he was constituted pastor, the deceased was strongly attached to the cause of benevolence. To the various important branches of benevolent effort that exist in the country, he contributed liberally, without predilection for any one in particular. The cause of learning and education received his decided support. He loved the cause of missions, and was forward to sympathize with such as had literally left all for the perishing heathen. Mr. Judson, for some time previous to his death, was an honorable [honorary ?] member, of the Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and also of the Board of the American Education Society.

" The disease, which carried him, from perfect health to the grave, commenced about a year since, but did not show itself in its distinctive character, until much later. Its progress, during its last stages, was regular and rapid. While it undermined and prostrated his vigorous constitution, it did not impair the intellectual faculties, nor deprive him of the consolations of religion. On the contrary, his faith and hope seemed to be invigorated with the decay of health. Some weeks previous to his decease, he resigned all hope of returning health, and commenced a more particular preparation for his departure. And with what composure he did it, those most intimate with him can best testify.

" A few days before his death, when he had already entered upon the last week of his life, he said to a friend : " Though I feel the body sinking, the soul is sustained."

' God is my supporter and my hope.  
My help forever near.'

“In Christ, is an infinite fulness. I trust he is my portion, and I want no other. He is the rock of ages. On him, is my hope founded. ‘Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, whose hope the Lord is, when flesh and heart shall fail, he shall be the strength of my hope and my portion forever.’”

\* \* \* \* \*

“To a member of the church he said: ‘Christ is all and in all: here is my rest. He has finished the work of Redemption—made atonement for transgression, and sends down his Spirit to carry on the work of grace.’ In reply to an assurance of the prayers and affection of the church he said: ‘I feel a strong attachment to all the disciples of Christ. Love is the grand principle of the Gospel—good will to all beings, and complacency in God and Christians. It is this that unites the hearts of all good men on the earth, and will unite them, forever, in Heaven. And ‘now I have finished my course.’ I have done with the world; Christ is my foundation and head. My joy,—my confidence—my hope. I find in him all that I need, as a poor, perishing sinner.”

“On mentioning to him, the evening previous to his death, that we thought he had but little time to remain with us, he cheerfully replied; ‘*Very little;*’ and that he would soon be with Paul and Peter, of whom we had just been conversing, he said: ‘*Very soon I shall,*’ and then repeated a hymn commencing,

‘What sinners value I resign.’

“I then said to him, I regretted that he could bear no better report to his Lord and Master, of us who were likely to remain,—to which he replied: ‘Trust in the Lord, trust in the Lord and you have nothing to fear.’ When about to unite in prayer for the last time, in which he intelligently joined with others, he was asked, as usual, if he had any particular petition to urge. After a moment’s pause, leaving himself entirely out of view, he replied: ‘Pray that my death may be sanctified to yourselves—to the church and to ——,’ naming a particular friend for whom he had felt a deep solicitude.

“Early the next morning, after a restless night, it was evident that an unseen hand was conducting him down the dark valley. From that time, he gradually and peacefully sunk away to rest, until a quarter before 12 o’clock, on the morning of the Sabbath, when he literally and we trust spiritually fell asleep in Jesus, and ascended on high.

“Throughout all his decline, there was a meekness of spirit, and a patience in suffering, that were truly amiable:—a calmness that was unruffled:—a steady contemplation of divine things, and a sustained spirit that spring only from God.

“Thus has terminated the life and labors of one, in whom we all had an interest, and with whom, we must soon stand in the judgment. He has gone to the world of spirits, and his works do follow him. His record is on high, and his praise is in the churches. Farewell, shade of the blest.”

“We ask no flowers to deck thy tomb,  
In purer light, thy name shall bloom,  
When every flower of earth is dead,  
And all that bloom below are fled.”

---

2. *Address of the Trustees of the New-England Institution for the Education of the Blind to the Public.* Boston: Carter, Hendee and Co. 1833. pp. 20.

We have been much interested in this address, on account both of the nature of the subject and the number and variety of the facts it contains.

Till of late, the education of the blind has not, in this country, awakened much attention. As it was with the deaf mutes, before the establishment of

asylums for them, so it has been with the blind;—their condition has been thought hopeless.

But the star of hope has at length risen to bless them. Having been remembered for some years in other countries, they are now beginning to be more thought of in this country. An institution has been formed for their relief. The light of the sun, it is true, it cannot impart; but it can the light of knowledge. As appears from the report of its Trustees, it is already in successful operation, and proposes to educate and prepare the blind for usefulness and enjoyment in life.

The address contains “remarks on the blind; on the light in which they have been held, and the manner in which they have always been treated by their fellow men.” There are, too, useful suggestions as to the manner in which the blind should be treated by friends, &c. From the Report of Dr. S. G. Howe, the Superintendent of the Institution, who has visited similar institutions in Europe, it contains also some account of those institutions, pointing out their excellencies and defects. Besides this, accompanying the address, is a Map of New England, and the Lord’s Prayer in raised characters, made tangible and sensible to the touch. Also a Lithographic Fac-Simile of the hand-writing of Mr. Trencheri, a blind teacher in the institution.

Many of the facts presented in the address, will be new to most readers, and not a little interesting. Among them, we have noted the proportion of the blind to the seeing, and the variation of the amount of blindness according to the variation of climate, soil, &c. It appears that in high latitudes blindness is less common than in low, and that it prevails most in the torrid zone, or in those parts of the temperate zones bordering on the torrid. The proportion is from 1 in 300 to 1 in 1000; and so far as investigation has been made, is greatest in Egypt and least in Denmark. Investigation has not been made in the United States, but the address states that there are in this country not less, probably, than 8000 who cannot see.

Among the objects pointed out in the address, towards which the attention of the blind may be successfully called by way of education, there are mentioned *music, mathematics* and *languages*. Of the handiwork to which they may be trained, mention is made of the making of *baskets, mats, mattresses, &c.*—Music is the most eligible where there is a taste for it. There have been instances of great success, also, in the study of mathematics, and some blind men have become admirable teachers. For the blind, indeed, they are always to be preferred. The New England institution has two, one a teacher in science and literature, the other a mechanic, the former from Paris, and the latter from Edinburgh.

We had intended to give a fuller view of this address, but for want of room, we must close, by recommending it to our readers with the hope that having read it they will remember with livelier interest the unfortunate class of persons for whose benefit the New England institution has been established. It was incorporated four years ago, but has been in operation but about five months, and is now inviting attention and looking for patronage.

THE  
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. VI.

MARCH, 1833.

NO. 3.

---

---

COMMUNICATIONS.

---

DR. PORTER'S LETTERS ON REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

NO. V.

*To the Committee of the Revival Association in the Theological Seminary, Andover.*

GENTLEMEN,

Some *general results* of the revivals I have been describing, are now to be mentioned.

The *cases of apostacy*, which occur among hopeful subjects of renewing grace, always constitute an interesting topic of enquiry in narratives of revivals. These cases are lamentable indeed, if we regard only the individuals who thus apostatize; but beyond comparison more lamentable still, if we take into view the consequences to the cause of religion generally. Hence, in estimating the character of a past revival, the most judicious Ministers and Christians, have thought proper to ask, "What proportion of its professed subjects have fallen away?" Such an enquiry is reasonable, because it enters fundamentally into the principles of that revival, and the methods in which it was conducted.

In reviewing the glorious work of God, of which I have undertaken to give you some account, the fact is to be stated, to the honor of divine grace, and as a just testimony to the wisdom and fidelity of those who were the chief instruments in promoting this work, that the *cases of apostacy were very few*. The Rev. Dr. Hyde, of Lee, in referring to a revival, which prevailed among his people sixteen years before, men-

tions one hundred and ten who united with the church, among whom there were afterwards a few apostacies; but in the narrative of two subsequent revivals, he states no instance of this sort. Excepting the above case, all these narratives, while they have special respect to this point, and while they extend to a compass of many hundred miles, and were generally written after a lapse of time sufficient for a full developement of character, in the professed converts, yet mention but *three instances of apostacy*, among the thousands that were added to the church. Besides these, a few others are referred to, as having entertained hopes, who fell away, without having made a profession of religion.

Now, on the supposition that there were more cases of defection, and even many more than are included in this statement, still I presume that the real fact, as to the small number of such defections, is without a parallel in the history of the church. But results so unusual did not take place without the influence of causes adequate to account for them. Before these revivals, the prevalent strain of preaching, for a considerable period, had been such as to promote sound, doctrinal knowledge in the churches. In all the means too, which were employed for carrying forward these revivals, ministers proceeded with their eyes fixed on certain things, which were then universally regarded as the mistakes of good men, in similar seasons of divine influence that were past. It was perfectly well remembered what an overwhelming tide,—partly of sectarian acrimony, and partly of unhallowed prejudice against all evangelical religion, came in upon the church, from the grievous indiscretions of Davenport and others about 1740. It was remembered that the fanatical excesses of that period were followed by a dire reaction, in which, for a third of a century, special divine influence was withdrawn from the land. These facts, after the modern period of revivals commenced, made ministers cautious in their management. There were, indeed, occasional indiscretions. During a powerful work of grace, which prevailed in my childhood, a zealous preacher, at the close of a public lecture, called on all impenitent sinners, “who would then make up their minds to be on the Lord’s side,” to rise and declare that purpose by speaking aloud. Scores of hearts in the assembly were ready to burst with deep anxiety, but the incongruity of such a proposal; in the regular worship of God, was instinctively and generally felt. After a dead silence of a few moments, five or six men rose, and made the declaration which was desired. I was old enough to observe them all as they spoke; but among the blessed fruits of that work, not one of

these was numbered, and some of them soon became open infidels. But one other instance like this occurred within my knowledge, till I became a preacher myself, and not one, in all the revivals during my pastoral life.

The *small number of apostacies* attending these revivals, I must now add, was owing to the ample instructions given by ministers, as to the evidences of grace, and the incessant warnings on the dangers of self-deception. As this is a point of much practical importance, I shall here give some extracts, as a specimen of the manner in which ministers were accustomed to treat these subjects.

The Rev. Asahel Hooker, at the close of a revival among his people, says of the hopeful converts, "They have generally conducted hitherto as well as could reasonably be expected. It is hoped that their religion will not be as the early cloud, and the morning dew that passeth away. But it is greatly to be feared that all will not persevere,—that some will be found with a lamp of profession, but no oil in their lamp. 'Many will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not ate and drank in thy presence?' to whom he will say, 'Depart from me, I never knew you.'" Again he says, "Whether all those who appear to have set out, and to run well for the present, will hold on their way, and obtain the prize of their high calling, must be finally known by the event. If some, of whom the best hopes have been entertained, should make shipwreck of the faith, return again to folly, and thus evince that they were never cleansed from their filthiness, it will determine no characters but their own. Some may have deceived both themselves and others, and their last state may be worse than the first."

The Rev. Jeremiah Hallock, in the same spirit, says, "When I find Peter, an Apostle, deceived in Simon Magus, and hear him, when speaking of the faith of Silvanus, using the cautious language, 'a faithful brother, as I suppose,' it makes me tremble for fear how we shall hold out. We cannot tell what shall be on the morrow, and man is ignorant of the heart. Hence my desire is, that all whom I have alluded to in the above narration, will remember that this is not an hour of boasting, but of putting on the harness; and that it still remains to be proved from their fruits, whether they have true religion or not."

It were easy to fill pages with similar quotations, but I will add only one more, from Rev. Joseph Washburn. "I would remark further, with respect to those whose experiences have been now related, and all who entertain a hope, and have been

respected in this narrative, that, after all, it is very possible they may be deceived. We speak of them as hopeful converts, and we are bound in charity to do so, while they do not contradict their professions by their external deportment. But the Lord trieth the hearts. Whether their relief from distress, and present hopes are the consequence of a renewed, humble heart, or of their being left to blindness and self-deception, must be decided by their conduct, and by the light of the great day. As yet we have not been pained with any instances of special apostasy; but it is not improbable that among so many, some may prove to be stony ground hearers. May God, who alone is able, keep them from falling, and strengthen, establish, settle them, that they be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel; and that they may adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things."

The above extracts are sufficient to show what was the general habit of ministers in warning their hearers against that presumptuous confidence, which is the prolific origin of apostacies, in revivals. A zeal perhaps equally sincere with theirs, but more impetuous, may censure the course they pursued, as cautions to an extreme. I cannot view this censure as just, while I regard the solid fruits of a revival as consisting in the addition to the church of 'such as shall be saved;' not such as will become apostates and reprobates.

Among the happy fruits of these revivals, *the decided tone of practical piety* which they produced, ought to be mentioned.

It was a common thing that the hopeful converts exhibited a strong desire for *improvement in religious knowledge*. The time which had been employed by the young in scenes of frivolous amusement, and by the more advanced in idle conversation, was devoted to the study of the Bible, and other useful books, and to attendance on meetings designed especially to promote their advancement in intellectual and spiritual knowledge. Under this impulse of religious feeling, the progress actually made by many, in a correct understanding of Christian doctrines, was greater in one month, than it had been during their whole lives. As to the people of my own charge, I cannot speak on this subject, without recollections of the most intense interest. From the beginning of my ministry, my attention had been directed towards one standing obstacle to the preacher's success, namely, that the greater proportion of his hearers come to the sanctuary, expecting to be *merely passive* under his preaching. They calculate to understand and feel, only so far as he *compels* them to understand and feel. It would be out of place to dwell on this point, except to mention

one of the measures adopted, to transform this class of persons from *passive* into *active* hearers of the Gospel. This was a meeting of the young people, once in two weeks, at which each one was at liberty to give in a written composition, on some important subject, previously assigned, and on which it was my usage previously to preach. When this anticipated sermon was delivered, the aspect of the whole assembly was that of *eager listening*, to the discussion of a subject, on which one or more in a large proportion of the families was expecting to write, in preparation for the public meeting. It must suffice to add, (for there is no room for details,) that the youthful converts trained in this manner, rapidly outstripped, in religious knowledge, the older members of the church. Indeed, they surpassed in their attainments, the most sanguine hopes that I had entertained. The habit of active, intelligent attention to preaching, which thus became established in the congregation, particularly the younger part of it, was a subject of special remark to ministers, who occasionally preached in my pulpit.

Wherever these revivals prevailed, they were attended by a manifest increase in the *religious observance of the Sabbath*, and the *duties of family religion*.

The narrative from Killingly, Conn. says, that previous to this season, "public worship was greatly neglected by many whole families, but now we see them flocking to hear the word of God, on the Sabbath, and at other seasons. In our public meetings the solemnity is like going to the judgment. While there were formerly but very few who called upon the name of the Lord, in family prayer, now almost *whole neighborhoods* have engaged in this duty; so that if one were to pass among them, at certain seasons, he would be constrained to say,—Surely God is in this place;—parents devoting themselves, their little ones, and all that they have, to the Lord." It was a common testimony of these narratives, that the attention given to family religion was much greater, some of them say "ten times greater," than it had formerly been.

Another memorable fruit of these revivals was seen in the *harmony that existed among Christians*. I have adverted to two important causes which operated to produce this harmony,—first, the thorough system of doctrinal preaching, which prevailed, and by which the churches were prepared to embrace those views of evangelical truth which were correct, without falling into angry collision about them, during a revival. And, secondly, the happy, I might say, perhaps, unexampled agreement of ministers among themselves, as to the proper means of conducting these revivals.

In the great outpouring of the Spirit, under the preaching of Whitefield and his associates, families and churches were rent asunder with violent divisions. Wrath, bitterness, and evil speaking, were too prevalent among the professed friends of religion, and even among ministers. But as God in his mercy would have it, in the revivals of 1800, &c. things were in a state totally different. Ministers had but one heart and soul. All drank into one spirit, preached one Gospel, and cast their influence into one common stock; each laboring in his own sphere, and still aiming to encourage the heart, and strengthen the hands of his brethren, in every possible way. Nor did this seem to be any other than a matter of course. I did not dream of heartburnings and clashing influence among ministers, in revivals too, till I lived to witness these things amid other scenes than those where my happy lot was originally cast. It would be a testimony to the sanctifying power of the Gospel, at once unquestionable and delightful, if I should *enumerate the instances* in which stubborn, and protracted, and apparently incurable divisions in school-districts, parishes, and towns, and what is ordinarily the most hopeless form of dissension, the acrimony of political strife, were hushed into tranquillity by a revival of religion. It is enough to say that contentions, involving individuals, and families, and extending often to entire communities,—threatening most disastrous consequences, were quietly submerged in the great concerns of the soul and eternity. In many instances, those who had been, for years, arrayed against each other, in the ranks of opposing parties, bowed together before the heart-subduing influence of the Gospel, sat down together as brethren at the table of their common Lord, and found his banner over them to be love.

Another conspicuous trait in the influence of these revivals, was, that they *taught ministers humility*. Those whose labors were most signally blest for the conversion of sinners, were the same men who took the lowest place before God in prayer, ascribing all the success of their ministrations to Him. Scarcely was a sermon heard, or an address to the throne of grace, which did not distinctly recognize the sentiment of Paul,—“Neither he that planteth is any thing, nor he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase.” One of the most eminent ministers of that period\* said to me, “I never fully understood the Apostle’s comparison of ministers to “earthen vessels,” till I saw, in a revival, the utter inefficacy of my own preaching to save a single soul, without divine influence.” Another of them†

\* Rev. Asahel Hooker.

† Rev. Jeremiah Hallock.

said, "There is joy and hope in God ; and I desire to be thankful to him, that he has allowed me to stand and behold his glorious work ; though I must confess that I never felt so useless since I entered on the ministry. God hath wrought ; and to his name be all the glory." It was in mercy to the churches, that the predominant influence in the management of these revivals, was among men of this spirit ;—men who were not disposed to overrate their own instrumentality, and who were qualified to estimate with candor the labors of their brethren. Rash, heady, censorious ministers, if there were such, had no opportunity to become conspicuous. Indeed, during all these wonderful displays of divine mercy, over so great an extent of country, and for so long a period, I never heard of a single vainglorious preacher, thrusting himself into the sphere of regular pastors, and assuming before their people, to be more skilful than they in converting sinners. That man is but little qualified to be a teacher in the church, in seasons of special divine influence, who has not himself been taught *humility*,—the first lesson of the Gospel.

These revivals illustrate at once, the indispensable *necessity of means*, and the *sovereignty of divine grace*. As to the first part of this statement, all theories may well be superseded by the simple evidence of facts. What is this evidence ? When the Spirit of God comes among a people, by his awakening influences, look at the solemn assemblages which throng the sanctuary and the conference room. Look at the unwonted earnestness with which old and young search the Scriptures. Plainly the whole aspect of a congregation, is decisive testimony at such a season, that some strong impulse is moving them to special attendance on means ; and this impulse is unquestionably from the Holy Spirit. Hence the individuals who, in such a time, remain in heedless unconcern about their own salvation, so as to neglect and despise the regular means of grace, bear the stamp of reprobation on their foreheads, and their case, while remaining as they are, is universally regarded as hopeless. Not a single instance appears, in all these narratives, of any person who was apparently converted to God, without a previous, solemn excitement to attend on the means of salvation.

But while this is the *ordinary method* in which sinners are converted, no promises of regenerating grace are made to the unregenerate. There is no certain connexion between the sanctification of any unholy man, and attendance on means, as he *does attend on them* ; because the promises of the Gospel are made to nothing short of repentance. As the subject of

those exercises which usually precede a spiritual renovation, his case may be very hopeful, compared with others around him; but all is dreadful uncertainty as to the result. From the most promising stage of such exercises, multitudes have relapsed into a state of deadly apathy or infidelity. Among awakened sinners, God in his sovereignty renews some to eternal life, while he leaves others to perish in their voluntary rejection of the Gospel. Among unawakened sinners, too, the same sovereignty is exercised. Of this, the narratives, to which I have so often referred, furnish most conclusive evidence. The Rev. Jedidiah Bushnell, in reference to a work of grace in Otsego County, said:—"The Angel of God's presence evidently went before the preaching of the Gospel. Only the reading of a text of Scripture, or some sentence from a preacher, would have more effect upon an audience, than whole labored discourses in time of religious declension. God held the work in his own hand. Creatures prayed and used means, but God wrought the salvation; to his name be all the glory."

The Rev. Doct. S. Shepard said of the same work in Lenox: "The immediate hand of omnipotence was strikingly displayed in it. It was preceded by no providential occurrences that were uncommon. Religious instruction was no other now than it had been. The Apostle knew what he said, when he spoke these memorable words, 'We have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us.'"

The Rev. Mr. Hallock said: "Dreadful experience proves that men are indeed morally dead. Their hearts are harder than rocks, deader than adders, and more stubborn than the sturdiest oaks. That which will break down the rocks, and tear up the oaks, will have no effect on the carnal mind. As means did not begin this work of themselves, so neither did they carry it on. But as this was the work of the omnipotent Spirit, so the effects produced, proclaimed its sovereign, divine author. One was taken here, and another there,—often where we should least expect it. I have seen some, under the most awakening judgments, as thoughtless as ever,—others in full health and prosperity pricked in the heart."

The Rev. Mr. Hooker said: "It is the evident design of Providence to confound all attempts, which should be made by philosophy and human reason, to account for the effects wrought, without ascribing them to God, as the marvellous work of his Spirit and grace. The effects were not only such, in themselves, as made it impossible to account for them, by any of the known principles of human nature, or the influence of natural

causes; but such a diversity in the antecedent *characters, habits, and circumstances* of the subjects, renders this still farther impossible."

The history of these revivals shows that the genuine tendency of such seasons is to *render Christians grateful, watchful, and fervent in spirit*. Many, doubtless, must be viewed as sincere Christians, who are not *consistent* Christians. The wise and the foolish slumber together, while the bridegroom tarries. But when the Redeemer comes in the triumphs of his grace, to visit his churches, then his true followers are seen waking from their apathy, and going forth to welcome the King of Zion, with an energy, and earnestness, and ardor of affection, greatly surpassing their first love. Then, too, it is seen that the highest fervor of experimental religion, instead of being forced only among the weak and illiterate, is often associated with intellectual strength, of the first order. As a proof that such fervor may be entirely distinct from fanatical excitement, I would gladly insert here two letters, which passed between Judge Reeve, of Connecticut, and Judge Boudinot, of New Jersey, both in the full maturity of their powers, and well entitled to the high rank which they held, even among the educated men of their time. But my limits allow me only to give a few extracts from the reply of the latter, to some enquiries from the former, it being a time of revival in the places where they severally resided. These extracts; while they rebuke the languor of lukewarm Christians, give a testimony, (*incidental* indeed, and therefore the more valuable,) respecting the judicious order maintained in the church at Newark, to which the writer belonged.

"Although a large number gave sufficient evidence of a real change of heart, before December, yet none of them came forward;—as great strictness and caution are observed with us. On the first Sabbath in March, the Lord's supper was administered again. Of those who had been previously propounded, ninety-seven appeared and joined the church. It was one of the most solemn days I ever experienced. The house was crowded; at least two thousand people were in it, and upwards of five hundred communicants. Twenty-two adults and eight infants were baptized. We expect at least one hundred more will join the church on the first Sabbath in June; there are at least as many more under convictions; and, blessed be God, we have no reason to think that the work has ceased. Surely this is wonder and love indeed, beyond degree; wonder without end to angels, and love without bounds to men. How should the praises of this adorable Messiah live upon each believing

heart, and ascend from every redeemed tongue ! The believer's very silence, as well as his voice, should praise him ; and when his tongue is not heard, his life should be more than eloquent, and declare by the most convincing argument, the glories of the great Immanuel. Let Christians, as prisoners of hope, fly to their strong hold. Blessed be God, there is a covert from the storm ; and though his wrath is shaking and will shake our guilty globe, his people are safe in that covert. Let us then say from the heart, Come, Lord Jesus !—come quickly, let what will become of our worthless names. Whether we meet in this world or not, I trust and hope that, through the sovereign, unmerited love of our glorious head, we shall meet each other, washed in his blood, and clothed in his righteousness, in that place of rest prepared for his people, where it is blessedness enough to know that we shall be like him."

No reader of this letter, I presume, will wish me to apologize for the length of this extract, which brings to view two such laymen, of the last generation, amid the severe pressure of official engagements, corresponding about a revival. Venerable Christian friends ! they *have met* in their eternal rest above, and *know*, by actual fruition, the blessedness of being like Christ. I hope that I may add, without offence to any one, that the value of such papers, as permanent statistics of the church, to be read by survivors, is very different from that of ephemeral letters, written by young men and women, purporting to be accounts of revivals, and too often published, by Christian Editors, under the head of religious intelligence.

All that now remains, Gentlemen, to complete the plan which I proposed to adopt in these letters, is to make some *general remarks*, in view of the facts which have been stated. This I shall do, with leave of Providence, at a convenient opportunity. In the mean time I remain very affectionately yours,

E. PORTER.

*Charleston, (S. C.) December, 1832.*

---

APPEAL IN BEHALF OF THE HEATHEN.

Among the many reasons why we should be more actively engaged in promoting the great cause of human redemption, the writer of this paper would present the following : in doing

which he addresses himself particularly to professing Christians.

1. *The heathen need the Gospel.* This, by those who have any acquaintance with facts, and any faith in the Bible, will not be denied. They need the Gospel to enlighten, comfort, and save them. Without it, they are every where deplorably ignorant. They grope in a midnight of moral and intellectual darkness. They know little or nothing of God, their duty, or their destiny. True, his eternal power and Godhead are known by his works. But the heathen, debased by sin and clouded in mind, see them not. Nor do they know any thing distinctly of the everlasting future. To them, it is all a blank, dreary waste. The grave is a place of impenetrable darkness. Not the feeblest ray of hope relieves its horrid gloom. They lay their friends into it, they sink into it themselves, without the smallest idea of "the resurrection and the life." Being in such circumstances, and yet possessed of immortal minds, they are intensely wretched. They *are* wretched, even in this life. Vice corrupts and defiles them. Passion rages, and destroys their souls. Their love is hatred. Friend murders friend. They worship their gods with the groans of self-inflicted torture, and the effusions of human blood.

But temporal misery is not all. The heathen are exposed to eternal misery. This is the chief consideration. Dying as they are, they perish forever. We do not say it is impossible, in every instance, for a pagan to be saved. If saved, however, it must be through Christ. The pagan must be born again, and lead, according to the light possessed, a life of purity, and of obedience to the will of God. And what is the character and conduct of unevangelized nations? What has it always been? Read the first chapter of Romans; read the authentic accounts which are almost daily spread before the Christian community. All bear the same testimony. It is full and decisive. The heathen are unholy. They are immersed in the depths of moral pollution. They are without God and without hope in the world. They outrage the voice of conscience, and the light and law of nature. What is the inference? That they are admitted to heaven? Nothing shall ever enter there that defileth. The inference is, that with this character they go down to the world of woe. Many, I am sensible, recoil from this conclusion, and say it cannot be. They pretend to a great deal of sympathy and good will for the heathen, not doubting that the same Being who is the author of their existence, will take care of them and make them happy. Professions of this sort may, at first sight, appear kind and benevolent, but they are, in truth, far otherwise. Such views freeze up the current

of charity; and those who entertain them, care not for the heathen, after all; but leave them to go on in darkness, and perish in their sins. And what is the fact, as decisively attested by observation and conspicuously recorded in the book of God? It is, that the heathen are vicious, and on the brink of perdition. If we have any bowels of compassion, let us steadily look at this truth, in all its appalling dimensions, until we are moved to mighty effort in behalf of a sinking world. Let the case be contemplated as it is, not with a treacherous, sentimental kindness, but with the eye and the heart of a living, operative faith.

2. *Those who have the Gospel, are under obligation to send it to those who have it not.* This is a very important position, and the truth of it is not sufficiently felt. Some are apt to think, that it is enough if they take care of themselves. "Charity begins at home." If they do any thing for those abroad, it is a gratuity for which they deserve praise; and if they fail to do any thing for the destitute and perishing, it is very well; they incur no blame. Now this is not the true state of the case. The Lord Jesus Christ did not leave the matter in this way. He had too much compassion for the heathen, to do this. He knew, if left to the mere impulse of a gratuitous benevolence, the work of saving a lost world, would never be done. He, therefore, bound his people, by the strong cords of obligation, and imposed the pressing demands of absolute and imperative duty.

In the first place, there is the obligation of the Saviour's example. We are bound to follow him. The maxim which he acted upon was not, to leave others to take care of themselves, but to care for them. Accordingly, he did care for the world. In the depths of its apostacy, he undertook the work and the office of becoming its Redeemer. He devoted himself to its salvation. He died to redeem it. Christians cannot, indeed, do the same, in all respects, which Christ did. But there are points, on which they can imitate him; and what, as our pattern, he has done, imposes on us the most reasonable and weighty obligation to follow him in his spirit of self-denial and self-sacrifice. It is an obligation which every heart that loves Christ will delight to acknowledge and discharge.

Our Lord, having completed his work of labor and suffering, issued for the obedience of his followers the sublime injunction, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." Here we have, in the second place, the obligation of a command, reasonable and gracious—a command uttered as one of the last things of the departing Saviour, to be regarded

in all future time, as comprehending and enforcing the enterprize dearest to his heart. How is it possible, then, to avoid the obligation of this most prominent injunction of our Lord? It is the great statute of his kingdom of benevolence. It is only stating, in another and more practical shape, the fundamental requisition,—‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself.’ In my view, a mighty emphasis rests upon the injunction before us, and it is very unsafe to disregard it. There is a law requiring repentance. The man who lives in perpetual, and final disobedience of that law, perishes. Yet his disobedience affects primarily and chiefly himself. But the person, who disregards the law requiring him to diffuse the Gospel, may occasion the eternal perdition of a great number of his fellow-men. And is he innocent? Can he with impunity violate his obligations in this momentous respect? He is exceedingly guilty, and if saved at all, it will be as by fire.

There are many precepts of Christ, which impose the obligation to spread the light and blessings of salvation. One reads thus: “Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.” Suppose the case were reversed, that we were buried in the darkness and miseries of paganism, while those now in that condition were enjoying, as we are, the glorious light of the Sun of Righteousness. Suppose we had just light enough to reveal the wretchedness of our ruin, and the worth of a redeeming Gospel. What should we desire our more favored fellow-men to do for us? Should we not desire, with the utmost intensity of emotion, that they would speedily extend to us the light of salvation? Should we not conclude that they ought to do it? Nay, if they refused to make the efforts and sacrifices, which they might make, if content to go to heaven themselves, they could look coldly on, and see us sink to the second death, without moving a finger to rescue us, what should we think of them? Now, just what we, in these circumstances, should desire them to do for us, we are bound, in our circumstances, to do for them. We have the Gospel, and they have it not. We most grossly violate our obligations, therefore, if we do not strive to extend it speedily to the destitute and perishing.

3. *The Church is abundantly able to send the Gospel to the heathen.* God never imposes an obligation, where there is a manifest deficiency of ability or of means to meet it. And how is the fact in the case before us? The ability is even excessive. Our strength and resources are abundant. Consider what the church did at the outset,—when she was small, feeble

and poor—when circumstances were unfavorable—when superstitions were deep, powerful, and apparently impregnable. The little band of despised disciples went to work in the name of their Master, and nobly persevered. They devoted every thing earthly to the enterprize of saving a world sunk in the perdition of sin; and what was the result? In a few years the doctrine of Christ was proclaimed throughout the greater part of the then known world. It pervaded the Roman empire. It dissipated the darkness of idolatry. It carried light and joy to millions who were without God and without hope.

But a question here arises of high practical importance. If the early Christians, with all their peculiar disadvantages, accomplished so much, what might not be achieved at the present day, if the church would only bring, with united and unreserved devotedness, her strength and resources to the blessed work. Instead of hundreds, she numbers millions in her communion. Talents, wealth, and influence are embraced within her pale. Nothing is wanting but the right spirit—the true missionary spirit. The sun of the present century need not set, before the Sun of Righteousness shall have arisen to meridian height, and poured his healing beams upon every desolate tract of the apostacy. Only let the church do what she can—what she *easily* can—let her consecrate her vast energies to Christ, and concentrate and press them upon this grand achievement of mercy, and some now living may live to see the complete introduction of millennial glory. At least, some of our children may join in that chorus of praise, which will be commensurate with all the dwellings of man.

4. To be convinced that this is not idle, unmeaning rhapsody, and as a further reason in favor of effort, consider *the strong probabilities and encouragements in the case, pointing to this result*. The chief encouragement is the promise and oath of God. 'As truly as I live, says Jehovah, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord. And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it. On such annunciations of prophetic truth, (and the Bible is full of them) we may delightfully rest; encouraged by them, we may devotedly work; confident that we are doing the will of the Lord, and that our labor shall not be in vain in the Lord. Though every other cause should fail, this never can. Other kingdoms and nations may be shattered, and annihilated; but the kingdom of Christ, this kingdom of love and holiness, will stand, and grow stronger and spread wide, until it embraces in

one universal brotherhood all the families of man. The work is going on even now with the most delightful success. We are encouraged to proceed by what has been effected. We are assured by thorough experiment, that the work can be achieved. We know that triumphant success will ultimately ensue. This is so obvious, that it requires scarcely any faith to believe it. Men of God—men who count not their lives dear unto them—men warmed with a Saviour's love, are now laboring for the salvation of the lost, at more than five hundred different sections of the wide wastes of idolatry. In many of these sections, the temples of a bloody superstition have crumbled and fallen. Nowhere will they be able permanently to withstand the aggressive action of truth. The whole system will sink, and upon its ruin will be built the temple of God's love and praise. Thousands of the dark heathen have been regenerated by the Spirit of God. Thousands of others are inquiring, with deep solemnity, the way of life. Prayer is heard. No sacrifice is lost—not the smallest, if made in the sincerity of the Gospel. An impulse has been given by a hand from heaven, and the wheels of this car of salvation will move on. There are hearts that will keep fast to this work of love, till they cease to beat. And there will be more coming up to the help of the Lord. Though some may not choose to participate in the sublime undertaking, others will. Multitudes will esteem it a pleasure and a privilege to share in this benevolent service, and an honor, to be co-workers with God in this most glorious of all his works.

Some may be ready to ask, In what way may we contribute to the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom? I shall mention but two methods. One is, by prayer for the effusion of the Holy Spirit, and the blessing of God upon missionary efforts. It must be felt deeply, that, do all we can, we must look to God for his Spirit to achieve the work of regeneration. None will be born again, except those who are born of the Spirit. Preachers may be sent every where, faithful and powerful as Paul; but if the Holy Ghost do not attend their ministrations, not a heart will be subdued. Prayer, then, is indispensably needed. The Spirit is given in answer to prayer. It will not be extensively given, unless strong and believing supplication is extensively offered. Every thing will fail, without the mighty, struggling importunities of prevailing intercession. How important, how interesting then, is the Monthly Concert. What praying heart does not love the Monthly Concert? Ever remember and hallow it, ye who feel for a ruined world, by the offered incense of your most fervent desires.

Another way to assist in evangelizing the heathen is by pecuniary contributions. The Gospel cannot be sent to distant nations without expense. Money is required, and solicited, and when given, is well used, and to the last mite accounted for. And what a blessed way to use money,—to consecrate it to Christ, and send it abroad on errands of salvation. The individual, who has resources, may be virtually preaching the Gospel to the needy and perishing in both hemispheres. He may be indirectly instrumental in leading a great number of pagan sinners to the cross and to heaven. All may do something to this end. The poorest have a mite. Whatever it may be in the Christian's power to give, let him joyfully give it. If any refuse, let them remember the appalling inference the Spirit of God makes from their conduct. "He that hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?" How can we be Christians, if we refuse to make any temporal sacrifices for the eternal well-being of the dying heathen? Have we a particle of the Spirit of the Lord Jesus, if we can stand unmoved, and see the souls of our fellow-men pour like an unceasing deluge, into a dark, lost eternity? Just look at this thing. By a trifling sacrifice we may save others from the enduring of everlasting death. By parting with a portion of what God may have given us, we may be the means of placing some poor, blind, miserable, guilty descendants of the apostacy in an inheritance of glory.

Who, now, in view of facts and considerations like these, can shut up his heart and his hands with the grasp of a tenacious selfishness, and say his property is his own, and he has a right to keep it. It is not his own, and he has not a right to keep it. God gave it to him. He has made him a steward. He expects him to do good with his possessions, whilst he retains them. If he obstinately refuses, God will take them away at his pleasure, and punish him for his avarice.

That man is pitiably poor, who has not learned the precious art of a benevolent use of his treasures. On the other hand, the man is truly rich, who generously gives of what God has given him, to bless and save his fellow-men. In this way, he derives a most refreshing happiness from his property. The very act of parting with it to promote the cause of Him, who, though rich, for our sakes became poor, rejoices his heart more than double the amount of unexpected acquisition. None will dispute this, who remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Yes, the man is rich in the best sense of the phrase, who does not trust

in uncertain riches, but in the living God; who does good; who is rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; who lays up in store for himself a good foundation against the time to come, that he may lay hold on eternal life. He is rich in prosperity, rich in adversity, in poverty, in death, in eternity. O! how rich, whose revenue is a revenue of souls, saved through his offerings and instrumentality, coming up through the gates of blessedness, each one another gem in the crown of his rejoicing. It is better to take this course of large, open beneficence, and live and give to do good, glorify God and save men, than to indulge in narrow selfishness, go undone to the judgment, and sink down to hell.

We have frequently extended to us, Christian brethren, the privilege of aiding the missionary enterprize. The Lord Jesus Christ, the great Author and Head of this enterprize expects us to aid it, nor are we at liberty to withhold our aid. We cannot, without treachery to his cause, without a flinty insensibility to his love. What is emphatically wanted, is, that every Christian should feel the weight of personal responsibility, and realize that *his* prayers, efforts, and contributions cannot possibly be dispensed with. If any abandon the work, because they think it will go on without their aid, they are no better before God, than they would be, if all the world should follow their example, and the entire enterprize fail in consequence.

What a question is now before the Christian world. It is, whether the eight or ten hundred millions, who will be on probation at the commencement of the next century, shall enjoy the cheering light, and the unspeakable privileges of Christianity, and the bright hopes of glory through the cross, or come forward in moral debasement, the inhabitants of darkness, the victims of superstition, the slaves of beastly vice, the candidates of eternal woe. This mighty question is distinctly before the present generation of Christians. The prayers and doings of the present generation will decide it. What we, as individuals, do, or forbear to do, will help decide it. Before that time, our course will be run, our bodies mouldering in the grave, and our souls in eternity, reaping the reward of the deeds done in the body.

## REVIEWS.

CONVERSATIONS BETWEEN TWO LAYMEN ON STRICT AND MIXED COMMUNION, *in which the principal arguments in favor of the latter practice are stated, as nearly as possible in the words of its most powerful advocate, the Rev. Robert Hall.* By J. G. FULLER. *With Dr. Griffin's Letter on Communion, and the review of it by Professor Ripley of Newton.* Boston: Lincoln & Edmonds, 1831. pp. 321.

[Concluded from p. 113.]

The grand difficulty in the way of open communion, as hinted at the commencement of this article, is a difference of opinion respecting baptism. Our brethren insist—on the ground of the Apostolical communion and practice, the significance of the two ordinances, and the general suffrage of the church—that baptism is necessary, previous to communion. They also insist, that the members of our churches have not been baptized. Consequently they infer, as they think conclusively, that these members cannot with propriety be admitted to the table of the Lord.\* The question now is, *How shall this objection be obviated? How shall the difficulty be removed?*

We see no probability that this difficulty will be soon removed by a general change of sentiment in our churches, and by our members becoming Baptists. There *has been* an expectation of this sort among Baptists—perhaps there is still; but we see no prospect of its speedy accomplishment. The difference of opinion between us and them has long been a subject of solicitude and study; and for ourselves we can truly say, that the more we consider of it, the more we are convinced we shall never be Baptists. And so far as we know, our own experience on this head is conformable to that of our brethren gener-

\* We have called the difficulty, as above stated, the *grand* difficulty; but with many of the advocates of close communion it seems not to be the only one. There are those who insist that we must be not only immersed, but immersed by one who has been himself immersed; and more than this, we must pledge ourselves to have no communion with those who have not been qualified in the same way. But close-communicionists of this stamp may (we trust without offence) be denominated *ultras*. They would not have communed with Roger Williams himself. They would have *excommunicated* such Baptists as John Bunyan, and William Ward, and Robert Hall. Indeed, according to their principles, it is not likely that there is now a Baptist in America (without excepting themselves even) who is suitably qualified for sacramental communion; as it is not likely there is an individual, who, if his baptism were traced back, would not find the succession originating in one who had not himself been *canonically* immersed.

ally. The relative strength and position of the two denominations, and the progress which each is making from year to year, also satisfy us, and we think may satisfy any one, that no general changes are to be expected.

Besides; if our denomination is ever to become Baptist, it is scarcely possible that the change should be effected under the present system of operations. Entirely separate, as we now are, in our public worship and ordinances, and under the influence of a variety of causes tending to foment and perpetuate sectarian prejudices, how can it be expected that either party should make any great approaches towards the other? We agree entirely with Mr. Hall, that if the peculiarities of the Baptist denomination are *true*—if they will bear the test of examination—and if those who hold them are desirous to promote them; their past policy has been a miserable one, and it is high time they were pursuing a more liberal course. Instead of holding themselves so entirely separate, and keeping their brethren at a distance, they should seek the fellowship of other denominations *who agree with them in holding the Head*, and mingle with them as freely and fraternally as possible. In this way they may disarm prejudice, invite candid examination and discussion, and *if the truth is with them*, it will be likely to prevail. For ourselves, we earnestly desire to pursue a course such as this, and are perfectly willing to risk the fate of our Pedobaptist peculiarities on the issue of it. If these peculiarities are not founded in truth, the sooner we become convinced of it the better; and we sincerely desire that not only ourselves, but the whole Pedobaptist community, may be placed in circumstances to look at the subject without prejudice, and give it as thorough an examination as possible.

‘But how shall we admit you to communion,’ it is asked, ‘so long as we regard you as unbaptized?’—If our brethren are in earnest in proposing this question, we are very willing to confer with them on the subject. And we would with due deference inquire, why we may not be admitted, at least to occasional communion, on the ground proposed by Mr. Hall. Allowing that baptism should, as a general thing, precede the supper, is the connexion between the two institutions of such a nature, that the order of them may, under no circumstances, be changed? If the baptism of John was not Christian baptism, as was held by the ancients,\* and is now conceded by the most intelligent

\* Origen says, “Christ himself was baptized by John, not with that baptism which is in Christ, but with that which is *in the law*.” Comment on Rom. vi. Chrysostom says, “It (the Baptism of John) was as it were a bridge which, from the baptism of the Jews, made a way to that of the Saviour. It was superior to the first, but inferior to the second.” Homil. 24.

Baptists,\* is it not certain that the Apostles had not received Christian Baptism, at the time of the first celebration of the Lord's Supper? And if it be said that their's was an extraordinary case, will it not be lawful to follow their example, at least in extraordinary cases? There is a natural order in which most of the duties incumbent on us should be attended to; but it does not follow usually, because the first in a series has been neglected, that the remainder cannot be performed. For instance, it is according to the established order in our public worship, that singing should precede the principal prayer, and the prayer the sermon; but because a person is not present to unite in the singing, may he not unite in the prayer? Or because he is not present to unite in the prayer, may he not listen to the sermon? It is Christ's direction that those who are capable of instruction should be taught before they are baptized. But suppose a minister of the Gospel is requested to baptize a believer who he is satisfied knows four times as much as himself; must he pause and go through the formality of teaching such an one, before he ventures to administer the ordinance? So if, from misapprehension or any other cause not affecting his religious character, a sincere Christian has not received baptism, and yet desires to be admitted to the Lord's Table, who shall say that he may not come? Because he has been prevented from obeying one command of Christ, who shall prohibit him from obeying another?—But on this branch of the subject it is not necessary to enlarge. The works of Mr. Hall are before the public, in which every thing which need be said in support of this theory is urged with a surpassing eloquence.

To our brethren of the strict communion we will venture to suggest another way in which the difficulties between us may be consistently got over. Let them cease to judge another man's servant, and leave him to stand or fall to his own Master. We are not conscious of neglecting or trifling with the ordinance of baptism, more than they. We profess to hold it in as high estimation as they do. We observe it according to the dictates of our own consciences—according, as we think, to the institution and will of Christ. We find great satisfaction in the ordinance, and believe that our Saviour approves and blesses us in it. And now, brethren, why can you not meet us on this ground? Unless you are infallible, you cannot *know* we are wrong, any more than we know you are. And why can you not consent to say, 'If you love and prize the ordinance of bap-

\* See Carson and Cox on Baptism, p. 234.

tism as you understand it, and really think that you observe it according to the institution of Christ, then enjoy your own opinion. It is not within our province to judge you. We think indeed that you are mistaken; but the mistake is yours, not ours; and as it is not of a nature to prevent us from loving and embracing you as Christians, it shall not longer interrupt our Christian communion. Here, brethren, is the table of our common Lord. Come and partake of it if you choose; and if you have mistaken the nature of the previous ordinance, you must settle it with Christ, and not with us.'—With an invitation such as this, Pedobaptists would be perfectly satisfied. If they are in error, they do not wish their brethren to be partakers with them in the error. If they have in any thing mistaken the will of Christ, they choose to assume the responsibility themselves, and to refer the matter directly to him.

It may be inquired here, whether Pedobaptists would not act on the same principle with those of the strict communion, and exclude from the Lord's Table, under all circumstances, those whom they regarded as unbaptized? And if we may be allowed to speak in the name of our brethren, we answer confidently, no. Were a person to request communion with us, who professed to love and prize the ordinance of baptism; who sincerely thought he had been baptized; and who gave evidence of being prepared to enjoy spiritual communion with Christ; we should certainly admit him, although *we* might regard his baptism as a nullity. And such cases not unfrequently occur at the present time in our churches. Some of our brethren consider the baptisms which were formerly administered on the ground of the half-way covenant as invalid; and more have the same opinion in regard to the baptisms of Catholics and Unitarians. But should a pious, godly professor of religion, who had been baptized in either of these ways, and was satisfied with what had been done, request to come to the Lord's Table with us, we should certainly admit him, whatever opinion we might entertain respecting the validity of his baptism. If *he* was seriously and conscientiously satisfied on the subject, we should not undertake to judge betwixt him and his Master, but should leave the question of his baptism to be determined at a higher tribunal.

But it will be inquired again by those on the other side, 'As we regard baptism, both in the order of nature and by divine appointment, as pre-requisite to communion, and regard Pedobaptists, however sincere they may be, as unbaptized; how can we receive them to communion, without becoming partakers of their sin?' And to this question we reply by asking an-

other, Are you sure that Pedobaptists *commit sin* in coming to the Lord's Table, even on supposition that they have misapprehended the nature of baptism? They have received what they most seriously believe to be Christian baptism, and feel under solemn obligations to come to the Lord's table in remembrance of him. And now what shall they do? Can you in conscience affirm that it will be sinful for them to come? On the contrary, as they view the subject, will it not be sinful for them to stay away?—But we hardly need ask questions such as these, as the more recent and intelligent advocates of close communion have already decided them. Mr. Fuller says expressly, “On their own principles, they (Pedobaptists) *do right* in partaking of the Lord's Supper, though in our opinion unbaptized; *their* conviction, and not *ours*, being their proper directory.” p. 32. Mr. Kinghorn, in his reply to Hall, takes the same ground. Now this is all which need be said in the case. If Pedobaptists were admitted to the Lord's table with Baptists, they would come “on their own principles,” and in compliance with their own convictions of duty; and consequently, as Mr. F. says, they would “do right”—they would not sin—and their brethren, in admitting them, need be in no fear of becoming partakers in other men's sins.

But say our Baptist friends again, ‘Should we not, by such a procedure, at least give countenance to what we conceive to be an error?’ And we answer, *Not necessarily*. It being known at the time that you do not coincide in opinion on the subject of Baptism with your Pedobaptist brother, but merely consent that he shall come to the table with you—on his own principles and responsibility, and in compliance with his own convictions of duty—because you believe he is one who has communion with the Saviour; we do not perceive that you would be yielding any sinful or dangerous countenance to what you believe to be his errors. And we would with deference inquire, whether you do not come to the same conclusion, in regard to most other unessential points of difference? Some of your brethren believe the seventh day of the week to be the Christian Sabbath, to be observed according to the fourth commandment. Others believe that there is no weekly Sabbath under the new dispensation, but that (except from considerations of custom and expediency) every day should be regarded alike. Others still believe, that if God has called a person to preach the Gospel, he will give him the requisite qualifications, and that the whole system of educating young men for the ministry, is needless, if not pernicious. Now would you refuse communion to these several classes of persons, however pious

they might seem to be, and however unquestionable the validity of their baptism, for fear of giving countenance to their errors? We hope not. We presume not. Because, your own views on these subjects being known and understood, you would not necessarily give any countenance to their errors. It would be seen, that you merely tolerated the persons, because you believed they belonged to Christ, while you disapproved and rejected what you conceived to be their errors, and prayed that they might be instructed in the way of the Lord more perfectly. And on the same ground, why may you not receive the pious Pedobaptist, without giving any improper countenance to his supposed errors? On no subject are your views more fully understood, than on that of baptism; and the only inference which could justly be drawn from the fact of your receiving the Pedobaptist would be, that you were willing to have communion with him, because you believed he belonged to Christ, at the same time that you deplored what you deemed his errors, and prayed that he might be instructed in the way of the Lord more perfectly. And we leave it to your own consciences to decide, whether such an inference would be disgraceful to you as Christians, or dishonorable to religion, or of dangerous consequence to the church of Christ.

In conclusion, we can assure our Baptist readers, that we have pressed this subject upon their consideration, not from motives of personal or sectarian interest, but solely from a regard to the cause of religion, and the general interests of Christ's kingdom. We dwell among our own people, and have no expectation that we shall ever have occasion to ask or receive communion with a Baptist church,—though we would gladly do it, should the occasion be presented. And when we look at the Pedobaptist churches, and consider their increase, their numbers, and strength; we feel under no apprehension of their *relatively* suffering from a continuance of the present system. We have no doubt that they can live separate from the Baptists, as well as the Baptists can while separate from them. And we have no doubt that both denominations can live, and act, and do some good, with a brazen wall towering between them from earth to heaven. But we as little doubt, that both denominations might live a great deal better, and act more efficiently, and accomplish more in the cause of Christ, if this brazen wall could be demolished; or at least if pass-ways could be opened through it, so that there might be occasional communication one way and the other. What God has joined together seems now to be unwarrantably put asunder. The body of Christ is divided and dismembered. Those who ought to have

a common interest, have separate interests. Those between whom there ought to be the best understanding, and a spirit of mutual accommodation and sympathy, are often seen interfering with each other's plans, and running in each other's way. Those who ought to put forth their united strength 'against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places,' are too often found turning away from the common enemy, and wasting their energies one upon another. God has indeed been very gracious to us in pouring out his Spirit upon our churches; but often, in the midst of a revival of religion, a sectarian spirit shows itself, and the Comforter is grieved away.

Christian brethren on both sides, these things ought not so to be. And the period, as it seems to us, has arrived, when they cannot so continue but a little longer. We are obviously living in the near approach of the Millennium,—in the last days, when a tremendous conflict is to be expected between the friends and the enemies of God. Things are manifestly preparing, not only in our own country, but in Europe, and in heathen lands, for such a conflict. In our present divided state, are we prepared to meet it? And is it not high time that effectual measures were taken, to bring down the mountains, and raise the vallies, and thus prepare the way of the Lord? If we longer neglect to take such measures ourselves, God may be expected in righteous judgment to take them for us. He may so heat the furnace of his providence, as to melt down all our minor distinctions. He may draw a band of fire around his church, till its members come to feel and act as one body.

As Evangelical Baptists and Pedobaptists seem not likely to agree at present in regard to one of the special ordinances of the Gospel, but do agree in regard to the nature and obligations of the other, we can see no good reason why they should not, occasionally at least, partake of the latter ordinance together. In this way they would wipe off much of the reproach which now attaches to them, and manifest to the world that, notwithstanding remaining differences, they did feel, and were resolved to act, as the disciples of a common Saviour. We know, indeed, if this point were gained, that much wisdom and grace would still be needed, in order to secure and perpetuate peace. For combustible materials would remain on both sides, in the midst of which discordant spirits might scatter their firebrands, and easily blow them to a flame. But Christian love might overcome all difficulties, and quench the latent sparks of contention before they were kindled. By the removal of close communion, one source of contention in the church would be

dried up, and one effectual step would be taken towards a complete and final union. The parties, by being brought into more intimate relations, would be in a better situation to dispose of remaining differences; and the Saviour, who prayed so fervently while on earth for the peace of his followers, might be expected to approve, and bestow his blessing.

A word further in relation to the volume before us, and we have done. The greater part of it is from the pen of Mr. J. G. Fuller, son of the late Rev. Andrew Fuller, and a member of the church recently under the care of the lamented Robert Hall. It seems from this circumstance, that Mr. Fuller is not a close-communicationist of the *straitest sect*—such as abound in some parts of the United States.—The discussion is carried on in the form of a dialogue, and claims to be *specially fair*, because the advocate for open communion is introduced “as using *the very language and arguments of Mr. Hall.*” It may appear, however, on a little reflection, that scarcely any method could be more *unfair*; as nothing is easier than to select particular passages from a connected discourse, and reply to them in a manner which may seem plausible, while yet the grand argument of the discourse—its *bones and sinews*—are left unbroken.

---

THE GRACE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST: *A Discourse preached at Sherburne, Mass. March 21, 1830.* By AMOS CLARKE. Boston: Press of the Independent Messenger. 1832. pp. 15.

A MORE EXCELLENT WAY: *A Sermon preached in the Evangelical Church in Sherburne, on Sabbath, June 24, 1832, designed as an Examination of a Sermon by Rev. Amos Clarke, entitled The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.* By SAMUEL LEE. Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1832. pp. 24.

A LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE REV. SAMUEL LEE, *Minister of the Evangelical Church in Sherburne.* By AMOS CLARKE, *Minister of the First Parish and Church in Sherburne.* Cambridge: E. W. Metcalf & Co. 1832. pp. 30.

A LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE REV. AMOS CLARKE, *Minister of the First Parish and Church in Sherburne.*

By SAMUEL LEE, *Pastor of the Evangelical Church in Sherburne.* Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1832. pp. 28.

One can scarcely live a day, without being witness to the fact, that the charge of guilt is often made to rest on the innocent. Men charge others with the very things of which themselves are most guilty. The world is full of such examples. Men are loud in their denunciations of the "mote" that is in their brother's eye, while, at the same time, a "beam" is in their own eye.

These thoughts have been suggested by the recent controversy at Sherburne. It seems that within two or three years there has been a secession of the Orthodox in that place from the Unitarians. The former clergyman was the Rev. Mr. Townsend. He, it appears, was both nominally and really, an Orthodox man. He was understood to be so, in the main, both by his people and by the churches in that vicinity; and, according to Mr. Lee's statement,—a statement made, we believe, on the authority of written documents which Mr. Townsend left behind him—he was not only understood to believe, but did in fact believe, "in the great doctrines of Orthodoxy, viz. total depravity, or the entire destitution of holiness previous to regeneration; instantaneous regeneration;—that the Holy Spirit (to use his own words) is 'the great agent in producing this change;'—'personal and unconditional election;' and (in the last years of his ministry) the supreme divinity of Christ." At least, it appears that he was so far Orthodox, that some of his hearers, (who are now connected with the Unitarian society,) "when subjected to the pressure of his sentiments from the pulpit, were arrayed against him as a party for effecting his dismissal." [Mr. Lee's Letter, p. 14.]

In the course of Divine Providence, Mr. Townsend's health failed, and Mr. Clarke, the present Unitarian clergyman, was invited to preach as a temporary supply. After preaching some months, it became evident that Mr. T. would not be able to resume his labors again, and the people, (Mr. T. being absent at the South on account of his health,) began to think of settling another man. Some thought of Mr. Clarke as the proper man; others dissented, and, among other reasons for their dissent, urged their belief that Mr. C. was a Unitarian. The charge of Unitarianism, if we mistake not, was denied by Mr. C.'s friends if not by him, and both, we believe, agreed in regarding it an injurious and unauthorized insinuation. The result was, a request from some of the parishioners, that he would "*preach his sentiments,*" so that they might know

whether he was or was not a Unitarian; and this after he had been preaching among them some six months or more.\* Mr. C. did according to request. This sermon which is now printed, and which was the commencement of the controversy, is the same, we believe, that was preached on that occasion. As might be expected from the character of the sermon, the people were still unable to determine *definitely* what his opinions were, though more than ever satisfied of his Unitarianism. The final result was a secession of the Orthodox; the formation of a new society; the settlement of Mr. C. over the Unitarian society, and soon after, the settlement of Mr. Lee over the Evangelical church and society.

It was not, however, as yet, fully admitted that Mr. C. was a Unitarian. For the first few months after his settlement especially, we believe the charge of his being a Unitarian, was generally treated by his friends as a slander, and not unfrequently retorted upon those who made it, with the declaration that he was as Orthodox as Mr. Lee, or Mr. Townsend. Indeed, it would seem that up to the very time at which Mr. C. printed the sermon which occasioned the present controversy, the effort had been studiously made, to persuade his people and Mr. Lee's also, that there was no essential difference between the sentiments of the two. For some reason, we will not stop to inquire what, Mr. C. and his friends have been extremely unwilling to be called Unitarians. The name seems to have been a terror to them, and the constant effort has been, to make it appear that Mr. Lee and Mr. C. were substantially agreed.

At length, some two years after it was preached, (singular delay!) the sermon, entitled "The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ," is published, and "circulated extensively," as Mr. Lee informs us, "through both the congregations of the town," with the understanding that it was "an expression of the sentiments of its author." Mr. Lee is thus furnished with a convenient opportunity of showing that "there was an *essential difference*" between his creed and Mr. C.'s—"such a difference, that if the one preaches *the* Gospel, the other preaches *another* Gospel." This he accordingly attempts to do, and, as we think, does effectually do, in a sermon, designed as a "review" of Mr. C.'s, from the "same text, and, so far as" was "practicable, the same division of subject." Mr. Lee justifies himself in this attempt by the fact to which we have just adverted, viz. the efforts made, to induce the belief that he and Mr. C. did not materially differ. "It is known," he says, speaking of Mr. C.'s

\* Preached six months, and yet left his people in the dark as to his sentiments! Did Christ, did Paul preach in this manner?

sermon, "its author claims to be considered as not differing in his views very materially from myself: and that the impression is very general, especially among his own congregation, that he does not." "All have heard it again and again asserted, that my religious belief differs not materially from that of its author. Its author has himself expressed an opinion to this effect."

In this state of things, therefore, it became Mr. Lee's imperious duty to improve the opportunity presented, and show, as he has done, that there is a heaven-wide difference between his belief and Mr. C.'s. It was a duty he owed to himself, to Mr. C., to the members of their respective congregations, and to God. Mr. Lee evidently felt it to be so. And the whole tenor of what he has written shows that he spoke in the sincerity of his soul and in solemn earnest, when he said, in the commencement of his sermon, "The expression of sentiment I am now about to make, has become to me a *duty*, without having performed which, I should be afraid to die and go to the presence of my Judge." The manner and success with which Mr. L. has discharged this duty, will appear in the sequel.

The text of each sermon is 2 Cor. viii. 9:—"For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich:" and the plan of each is to consider, first, the person of whose grace the Apostle speaks—Jesus Christ: secondly, the persons on whom this grace was bestowed—the "sinful children of Adam:" thirdly, the proof of this grace—he became poor: and lastly, its good fruits and happy effects—that ye might be rich.

In respect to the first particular, the person of whose grace the Apostle speaks, Mr. C. tells us "it was the Lord Jesus Christ." But who or what the Lord Jesus Christ was, whether a man, or an angel, or a super-angelic being, he tells us *not a word*. He does indeed say, (Sermon, pp. 4, 5,) that he "proceeded forth and came from God, and was rich;" and that he "not only *existed* before the foundations of the earth were laid," but "was also *rich*." Now though it may be fair to *infer* from this, as Mr. Lee (Sermon, p. 6,) does, that Mr. C. believes Christ to be "a super-angelic being, existing before the foundations of the world were laid," still it is solely a matter of inference. Mr. C. himself tells us not a word, in his sermon, explicitly to this effect. He tells us that Christ "proceeded forth and came from God,"—and "existed before" [he came on earth;] but this is only telling what Christ *did*, not what he *was*. The question to be answered here is, Who *was* this

Christ that thus proceeded forth, &c. ? Was he a man, or an angel, or what ? These questions Mr. C. has left unanswered. Nor does he throw any farther light on this point, when he goes on to say that Christ "was rich." For the questions still come up, What kind of a being *was* this Christ, who was rich ? Was he a man, or an angel, or what ? And here again we are left as much in the dark as before. Each reader is left to guess out for himself who or what this being was.

We know that Mr. C., in his letter (p. 19) designed as a reply to Mr. Lee's sermon, notwithstanding Mr. L.'s express declaration that he (Mr. C.) believed Christ to be "a super-angelic being," still throws out the suspicion, that Mr. L., in saying that he himself believed Christ to be "a proper man" as well as God, had but resorted to a "*device*" (!) designed "to leave the impression on some minds," that he, (Mr. C.,) inasmuch as he did not believe Christ to be God, did therefore "believe him to be *only* 'a proper man.'" And he seems to throw out this charitable (?) suspicion by way of complaint, as if Mr. Lee were doing him an injury in supposing that he believed Christ to be nothing but "a proper man."\* And yet neither in his letter or sermon do we find that he tells us explicitly *what more* than this he believes him to be. He says that he is not God, and intimates that he is something more than "a proper man." But what more ? Where has he told us ? It is true he informs us that Christ not only proceeded forth," &c., but was also "rich"—and that his being rich consisted in the fact, that "he possessed the love of his Father in heaven ; the fellowship and communion of angels ; power to control the operations of nature ; a knowledge of the secret thoughts of men, and of the hidden things of God ; and unerring wisdom." (Sermon, p. 7.) He speaks too (Sermon, pp. 9, 10) of Christ, as "the only begotten ;" as being "in glory with the Father ;" as "exalted far

\* In respect to this point, we are utterly at a loss how to account for the unfairness of Mr. C. Mr. Lee had stated in the very outset, (Sermon, p. 6,) that Mr. C. considered Christ "*a superangelic being*, existing before the foundations of the world were laid, and so exalted as to be entitled to the homage of angels as well as men." Now we ask, did Mr. C. read Mr. L.'s sermon ? If so, then he must have read the express declaration of his, that he supposed Mr. C. to believe that Christ was a super-angelic being, &c. Why, then, in face of this express declaration, and with no reason for doing it, except that Mr. Lee had said that he himself believed Christ to be "a real and proper man" as well as God, why does Mr. C. charge him with resorting to a "*device*" designed to deceive the people and make them think that he believed Christ to be "*only* a proper man ?" Did he do this ignorantly ? How could he ? Mr. Lee's express declaration that he (Mr. C.) considered Christ super-angelic, &c. was before him. Why then did he charge Mr. Lee with a trick—a "*device* ?" Is this the charity that thinketh no evil ? We are constrained to say that Mr. C. knew better than to suppose that Mr. L. had any such device in mind ; and that the "*device*," if there be any lies with Mr. C. and not with Mr. L., and we are farther constrained to throw Mr. C.'s impeachment of character back upon himself, and say of him as he has of Mr. Lee, "*whether this device*," to impeach Mr. L.'s character, "*will succeed any better than its predecessors, time must determine.*"

above all principality," &c. ; as "appointed heir of all things;" as "the brightness of his (the Father's) glory," &c. ; as "Lord of Lords;" as "accustomed to receive homage of angels;" as "appointed the final Judge of the world," &c.

But in all this we are not told what kind of a being Christ is. The question still returns, what kind of a being *is* this, who is thus appointed final judge—receives the homage of angels, is called Lord of Lords, &c.? Is he God? No, answers Mr. C. Is he mere man? No, answers Mr. C.—Very well, what is he? Angel? Super-angelic? Angelic and human? Super-angelic and human? Which? Mr. C. is silent.\*

Such is Mr. C.'s account of the person whose grace is spoken of. He was some sort of a being,—what, we are not told,—“who proceeded forth and came from God, and who was rich.”

Mr. Lee does not attempt to refute this indefinite and flimsy account of the person of the Lord Jesus Christ, but proceeds at once to state his own views, in contrast; in doing which, instead of telling merely what Christ *did*, or what he *had*, he states explicitly what, in his opinion, he *was*, viz. (1.) “Man—a real and proper man, possessing a human body and human soul,” and (2.) truly and really “God.” This he conclusively shows to be the correct and scriptural view of the subject.

The second topic, in each discourse, is “the persons on whom this grace was bestowed.” These are “the sinful children of men.” Mr. C.'s description of these is as loose and indefinite as his account of the person of Christ. Some parts of

\* Perhaps Mr. C. will say in reply to this, that he has only used the language of the Scriptures themselves in making out his description, and that they therefore do not tell us what Christ was any more than does he. This however will not subserve his purpose. For Mr. C. must know that in *other* passages, if not in those quoted by him, the Scriptures do tell us what Christ was. “The Word was with God and the Word *was* God,”—“And the Word was made flesh,” &c. In these and various other passages, we are told explicitly that Christ *was* human and divine. Besides, the very passages quoted by Mr. C., as they stand in the Bible, do also teach us, by way of *inference*, what Christ was in one respect, viz. that he was God. For we know not what less than Deity that being can be, who is “Lord of Lords;” is “accustomed to receive the homage of angels;” and is to act as final Judge. We cannot conceive, who less than an omniscient being, can so scan the heart as to be able to act as final Judge; nor what being other than the God of heaven is worthy of the homage of heaven's angelic hosts; nor who else has a right to the title “Lord of Lords;” and hence it is, that when the Bible says these things of Christ, we at once *infer* that Christ is, as Paul says, (Rom. ix. 5,) “over all, God blessed forever.” But Mr. C. has cut us off from making such an inference as this from the language of the Scriptures when used by him. For he has told us explicitly that Christ was not God. If then we may not make this inference from the language, we ask Mr. C. to tell us what inference we may make. Shall we infer that he was nothing more than a man? No, answers Mr. C. What then shall we infer that he was? Mr. C. is silent. He quotes text after text—tells his readers they do not teach that Christ was God; nor that he was a *mere* man, and then leaves them to guess what they do teach! “If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?” “If the blind lead the blind, *both* shall fall into the ditch.”

it are applicable only to the Christian. Others seem more appropriate to the impenitent sinner. And yet all are thrown together as parts of one description, with nothing to apprise the reader that the whole is not equally applicable to every man. We nowhere see the broad line of distinction between the penitent and impenitent, the righteous and the wicked, which is so prominent in the Scriptures. Mr. L. on the other hand, is explicit, and tells us, in a word, what he considers these "sinful children" to be. They are not, in their original character, half saint and half sinner, neither one thing nor another, but are all of one positive character. "The moral character of all men, previous to their conversion," says Mr. Lee, "is entirely sinful." Not "that all which belongs to man is sinful,"—e. g. "a healthy constitution;" neither that "one man is not worse than another;" nor that "each is as bad as he can be." In a word, Mr. C. represents men as imperfectly holy—Mr. Lee, as having no holiness, but, previous to regeneration, as positively sinful. "Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart is only evil continually."

The third topic, is "the evidence of this grace." This Mr. C. makes to consist in the fact that Christ "became poor." This part of Mr. C.'s discourse, as Mr. Lee says, is "somewhat unintelligible." It can have no meaning at all, except on the supposition that Mr. C. uses the term grace, in a sense entirely different from his previous use of it, viz. as meaning a "*disposition* to confer favors." In this sense, Christ's becoming poor might be considered as an evidence of his grace; but in no other. But as Christ's "disposition to confer favors" is a topic foreign to what precedes and follows, and inasmuch as it would be absurd to speak of this disposition as the grace conferred on "the sinful children of men," Mr. Lee passes over this division, remarking that "here was the place in which to mention what was *done* by the Lord Jesus, when on his errand of mercy to our world"—in other words, to preach, if he believed it, the doctrine of atonement. In all this, Mr. Lee is evidently correct, and therefore, following his example, we will proceed to notice the fourth topic of the discourses, viz. "the happy fruits and the benefit of this grace; that ye through his poverty might be rich." Here, in explaining the sense in which we are made rich by the poverty of Christ, Mr. C. says, we are made rich in knowledge, power, and virtue. Mr. Lee, on the other hand, while he admits that Christ's example and instructions were eminently fitted to make us rich in all of these respects, maintains "that the design of Christ's mission to this world was not simply to carry into effect a system of reforming

influences," but to make an atonement for sin, on the ground of which, "*when reformed,*" men could "be pardoned, and thus escape the penalty of a violated law." "Whom God hath set forth to be a-propitiation (propitiatory or atoning sacrifice) through faith in his BLOOD."

We have now passed over the prominent topics of discussion in the two discourses. It will be seen at once, that the one virtually denies, while the other maintains, the *Divinity of Christ, entire depravity, atonement,* and, by way of inference, *instantaneous regeneration.* This is most conclusively shown by Mr. Lee. He thus establishes his position, "that there is an *essential difference* between his creed and Mr. C.'s—so essential "that if the one preaches *the* Gospel, the other preaches *another* Gospel;" and is warranted in making the unqualified declaration, "*If he is right, I am fatally wrong. If I am right, he is fatally wrong.*"

Such is an outline of the discussion as carried on in the two sermons. And here, though we do not intend to become a party in the matter, it may not be amiss to notice, in a word, the manner in which Mr. C. mangles the meaning of the text. We have already seen that the riches he attributes to Christ, are, (1.) such only as he actually possessed *after* he became poor, and (2.) such as he could not lay aside, in order to become poor, without becoming poor in power, poor in knowledge, poor in wisdom, poor in virtue, &c.—in other words, without becoming *powerless, ignorant, foolish, vicious.*

But not to dwell on this. The Apostle informs us, that Christ "became poor." Why? For what purpose? *That we, through his poverty, might be rich.* Mr. Clarke, also, in the third general division of his discourse, informs us that Christ became poor. Why? For what purpose? *That he (Christ) through, or by, his poverty might give us "the evidence of" his "grace."* The Apostle thinks he became poor, to make us rich. Mr. Clarke, that he did so, as an "evidence of his grace." Suppose we paraphrase the text according to the meaning which Mr. C. has given it in his discourse. It will then read thus. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich" in power, knowledge, wisdom, virtue, &c., "yet for your sakes he became poor" in power, knowledge, wisdom, and virtue, and did so as an evidence of his disposition to confer favors, "that ye, through his poverty," or by this evidence of his gracious disposition, "might be rich" in power, knowledge, and virtue. Did the Apostle write such frigid nonsense as this?

But to return. Soon after the publication of Mr. L.'s ser-

mon, Mr. C. publishes a letter addressed to Mr. Lee, and designed as a reply to the sermon. In this letter he proposes to Mr. Lee (1.) to come and endeavor to convince him of his errors, and (2.) if he fails of convincing him, that they "invite the whole town to assemble together," that Mr. L. "may point out and explain to them the dangerous errors into which" he supposes Mr. C. to "have fallen," and that Mr. C. "may state the reasons why they appear to" him "not to be errors." "This 'method of urging upon his hearers the language of warning and entreaty,'" Mr. C. thinks, "will be much less tedious, much more fair and honorable, and much more consistent with the Christian character, and far less suspicious, than" for Mr. L. "to send" his "warnings and entreaties through the press; or for" him, "or members of" his "church, to endeavor to accomplish this object by distributing tracts, or creeping into houses, and preaching to women and children." (!) [Letter, p. 28.)

This proposition, we understand, was cheerfully and promptly acceded to by Mr. Lee. He went to Mr. C. and endeavored to convince him. Failing in this, he accedes to the proposition of inviting "the whole town to assemble," and listen to a discussion of the points of difference. Some time was spent in agreeing upon the manner in which the discussion should be conducted. At length, Mr. C. having prescribed his own terms, Mr. Lee assents to them, though decidedly disadvantageous to him, and is expecting the discussion to go forward.

In this state of things, inasmuch as there were some things in Mr. C.'s letter which deserved an answer, but which it would not be proper to notice in a discussion of the character proposed, Mr. L. commenced writing a brief reply which he designed to publish. It commenced with the following sentences.

"The proposal, that I would unite with you in inviting the inhabitants of this town to listen to a discussion from the pulpit of some of the points of difference in our religious belief, I do most cheerfully accept. And I do it under a conviction that such a discussion, if conducted in the spirit of the Gospel, will be profitable both to us and to our hearers. And I am ready, also, to comply with your terms as to the manner of conducting the discussion, viz. that I apprise you beforehand of the point to be discussed, and that we both exhibit our views of it at the same meeting. I am sensible that this places me, or rather, I should say, the cause I advocate, at great disadvantage; giving you, as it does, the opportunity to make, each time, the last impression upon the audience. The method,

that to me seems most equitable, is that we should *alternate*.” —“ Still, as I have said, I am willing that the discussion should be conducted in the manner you have proposed.”

Mr. Clark, then, it seems, will not abide by his own proposition to invite the people together unless Mr. Lee will consent to give him the sole privilege of speaking last, on the topics in debate. He will not allow Mr. Lee to stand on the same footing and have the same privilege with himself, (that of speaking last one half of the time) but he must needs monopolize this privilege to himself, or else refuse to fulfil his own proposition. Was ever any thing more unfair ?

But this is not the worst of the case. Mr. L. is not to be frightened from a defence of the truth, even though his antagonist insists upon having him at most dishonourable odds in making that defence. He accedes to the terms proposed. And what next ? He receives a letter from his opponent saying—“ I am satisfied, upon mature reflection, that the object of our proposed meeting can be accomplished at *one*\* meeting. I expect you will state distinctly the errors, which I am *preaching* from *Sabbath to Sabbath*, which you believe to be ruinous to the souls of my hearers, and restrict yourself to *these*. It appears to me that one hour will be sufficient for this purpose.”— And that there might be no mistake in the case, Mr. Lee is again informed at the close of the letter, that his “ attention is to be *confined* to those errors which” Mr. C. is “ *preaching* from *Sabbath to Sabbath*.” But when has Mr. L. ever heard Mr. C. preach on the Sabbath ; and how can he therefore know what errors Mr. C. is preaching, except as he learns them from his printed sermon and letter ? But these must not be once named, for Mr. L. “ must *bear in mind* that his attention is to be *confined* to those errors,” and those only, which Mr. C. is “ *preaching* from *Sabbath to Sabbath* :” and “ *one* meeting,” nay, “ *one hour* will be sufficient” for the discussion of these ! And further, by way of climax, all this is the result of “ MATURE REFLECTION ! !”

Was there ever a more lame and shameful retreat than this ? The proposition for a public discussion is his own. The terms on which it is to be conducted are his own, and yet for some reason (doubtless a substantial one) the boasted spirit of free inquiry and bold and thorough investigation must be restricted to the limits of “ one meeting,” of “ one hour.” Well might Mr. L. consider this “ as a refusal to enter upon the discussion

\* It was understood by both parties, that the discussion was to be continued one evening each week, for at least six successive weeks.

contemplated." For ourselves we do not remember of having ever met (we must call things by their right names) with such a pitiful "get off" as this. And to our minds it carries the evidence of demonstration, that Mr. C. is CONSCIOUS OF HIS ERRORS AND AFRAID OF FREE AND HONORABLE DISCUSSION. It betrays a mind that has but little confidence in the truth of its own opinions, and therefore dreads and shrinks away from the light and power of sober argument. While on the other hand, the willingness of Mr. L. to enter on the proposed discussion at such disadvantage, evinces a consciousness of truth. It shows a mind firm in the conviction that its opinions are everlasting truth, and that for them therefore there is nothing to fear, but every thing to hope from discussion and argument.

Being thus cut off from the proposed discussion, Mr. Lee at once published a letter in reply to Mr. C.'s, which, like his sermon, bears the marks of having been written in view of the judgment. On a review of it, Mr. L. says to Mr. C., "I can discover nothing which, were I to give directions from my dying pillow, I should wish to have erased."

Of the merits of the letter, we would only say, that it is a conclusive reply to Mr. C., and is written so much to the purpose, that, like the sermon, it produced "no small stir" among the people at Sherburne. We believe Mr. C.'s friends have had a society meeting to see what shall be done with the obnoxious Mr. L. In the mean time, Mr. L.'s people have been praying that God would bless the discussion to the salvation of those whom they believe to be in fatal error.

Such is the history and outline of this controversy up to the present time. Whether it is to be continued or not, we cannot say. Be this as it may, we regard it as one of some considerable importance, not merely to the town of Sherburne, but to all the towns in that vicinity. It is on this account that we have felt justified in giving it such an extended notice. We hope that our notice will serve to awaken public attention to it, particularly in that region. Mr. L.'s sermon ought to be *studied* by every one. It is rich in instruction, and shows most clearly the utter incorrectness of Unitarian sentiments on the points discussed. It contains, too, as we shall show in a subsequent number, a very happy and striking exhibition of the doctrine of atonement.

A MEMOIR OF FELIX NEFF, *Pastor of the High Alps.*  
 By WILLIAM STEPHEN GILLY, M. A., *Prebendary of  
 Durham, &c. From the London Edition, with Notes.*  
 Boston : 1832.

We have risen from the perusal of this little work with so much satisfaction, that we cannot refrain from recommending it to our readers as a delightful piece of Christian and pastoral biography. It is pervaded by an excellent spirit, and cannot fail of suggesting many lessons of piety and practical wisdom. It is full of interesting incidents, and has nearly all the charms of a romance. It is the history of a man marked with strong and noble traits of character;—with a mind highly gifted by nature, and a heart deeply humble by divine grace; peculiarly active, yet fond of meditation; enthusiastic, but prudent and cautious; mild, yet firm; meek and unassuming, yet energetic, enterprising, and patient of toil and suffering; fitted for the pursuits of learning, and the sweet charities of domestic life, yet exiling himself from them all to spend his days among a people not half civilized, and amid the glens, and rocks, and snows, and ever-menacing avalanches of the High Alps. His ministry was a continual sacrifice, a daily crucifixion of his feelings as a man of intellect, taste and social refinement. His career was very brief, but crowned with efforts in the cause of Christ sufficient to fill many years of ordinary men. He was cut down in all the freshness of his first love for his work, in the very morn of his usefulness among the long-neglected mountaineers of the High Alps; but he left behind him many proofs of his fidelity and success that deserve to be put on record for the admonition and encouragement of those who are toiling, or expect ere long to toil, for the salvation of men. Few can follow his footsteps; but his spirit of entire devotedness, of high enterprize, and disinterested, untiring zeal, may and should be caught by every minister, and every disciple of Him who had not where to lay his head, yet continually went about doing good. We are glad to see the example of such men as Oberlin and Neff, Gilpin and Herbert, Payson and Brainerd drawn out from their obscurity, and held up before the whole Christian world to show what every preacher of the Gospel ought to be, and what glorious results may be expected, by the promised blessing of God, from the humble labors of a devoted, self-denying, and self-sacrificing minister of Christ.

This little book contains much to entertain and instruct every Christian reader. The strongly-marked character of Neff; the striking incidents in his life; the brevity of his career; the

tenderness and triumph of its close ; the fruit of his labors, and the many testimonies of his fidelity and worth left behind him among his Alpine flock ; the graphic description of that people, and their rude and romantic country, with a preliminary sketch of their sufferings century after century for their steadfast attachment to the faith once delivered to the saints ; all conspire to give the work a peculiar interest.

Mr. Gilly seems to have been well qualified for his task. He had travelled over the High Alps ; and his familiarity with the field of Neff's labors enabled him to give us minute and vivid descriptions of Alpine scenery. He had conversed with his former flock, and received from their lips many testimonies to his character, and many anecdotes of his life. He also gleaned facts from a notice of Neff published at Geneva soon after his death, and had access to his private journal which had been sent to one of his patrons in England.

The life of Neff is preceded by a learned and valuable Introduction containing a general description of the scene of his labors, and a brief sketch of the inhabitants whom Mr. Gilly supposes to be the descendants of those who never bowed to the supremacy of Rome. The curious reader may regret that he did not give more at large his reasons for this opinion ; but after having had opportunity to examine libraries rich in information on subjects like this, he says :—

“ The more I have read, the more I have felt convinced that the secluded glens of Piemont are not the only retreats, where the *descendants of primitive Christians* may be found. Under this term I mean to speak of persons who have inherited a Christianity, which the Church of Rome has not transmitted to them, and who, from father to son, have essentially preserved the mode of faith, and the form of discipline, which were received, when the Gospel was first planted in their land. I have discovered ample reason to believe, that there is scarcely a mountain region in our quarter of the globe, which is poor, and uninviting, and difficult of access, where the primitive faith, as it was preached by the earliest messengers of the truth, did not linger for many ages, after the Romish Hierarchy had established itself in the richer countries, and in the plains ; and moreover, that there are still many mountain districts, where the population has continued Christian, from generation to generation, to the present hour ; Christian, in non-conformity with the church usurping the appellation, Catholic. It was their obscurity and non-intercourse with the world, during the period of almost general submission to the Romish yoke, which preserved them from corruption. Traces of such churches in the Alps, in the Pyrenees, and in the Appennines, are clearly discernible in the Canons of Councils and in the writings of most of the Romish annalists and controversialists of France, Spain, and Italy, up to the great epoch of Papal supremacy in the eleventh century ; and the light, which modern researches are casting every year upon the history of nations, helps us to perceive, that the chain, which connects the Primitive and the Protestant Churches, is unbroken in various places, where it was supposed to have been dissevered. There are very few readers, who do not imagine that every vestige of the Albigensians was swept from the earth, during the crusades of Simon de Montford, and that the ancient churches of Provence and Dauphine, which formed the stock, on which the Reformed congrega-

tions of the south of France were grafted in the sixteenth century, were utterly cut down, root and branch, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. This, however, was not the case : some few remnants were spared ; and families in the remote valleys of the Pyrenees, and of the Alps, have been permitted to experience the promise of the Redeemer, "where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." These have preserved the pure knowledge which their forefathers transmitted to them, and the scriptural greeting "Aquila and Priscilla salute you in the Lord, with the Church which is in their house," has oftentimes been passing from one secluded spot to another, when all were supposed to have been dragooned into the service of the Mass. And not only so, but in some few instances, whole *communes*, or parishes, have refused to submit, even outwardly, to the exactions of Romish usurpation."

Neff had himself formed the design of writing a history of his Alpine charge "in which," he said, "I shall not only give a detailed account of their present condition, but trace their origin up to the remotest antiquity." From a paper which he sent to some of his friends in England, we take a few extracts to show his views on this point, the nature of his charge, and some of the difficulties that lay in his way.

"In those dark times, when the Dragon, of whom St. John speaks, made war with the remnant of the seed, which kept the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ, some of those, who escaped from the edge of the sword, found a place of refuge among the mountains. It was then that the most rugged valleys of the French department of the High Alps, were peopled by the remains of those primitive Christians, who, after the example of Moses, when he preferred the reproach of Christ to the riches of Egypt, changed their fertile plains for a frightful wilderness. But fanaticism still pursued them, and neither their poverty, nor their innocence, nor the glaciers and precipices among which they dwelt, entirely protected them ; and the caverns which served them for churches, were often washed with their blood. Previously to the Reformation, the Valley of Fressinière was the only place in France where they could maintain their ground, and even here, they were driven from the more productive lands, and were forced to retreat to the very foot of the glacier, where they built the village of Domailleuse. This village, constructed like an eagle's nest, upon the side of a mountain, was the citadel where a small portion that was left established itself, and where the race has continued, without any mixture with strangers, to the present day. Others took up their dwelling at the bottom of a deep glen, called La Combe, a rocky abyss, to which there is no exit, where the horizon is so bounded, that for six months of the year, the rays of the sun never penetrate. These hamlets, exposed to avalanches, and the falling of rocks, and buried under snow half the year, consist of hovels, of which some are without chimneys and glazed windows, and others have nothing but a miserable kitchen and a stable, which is seldom cleaned out more than once a year, and where the inhabitants spend the greater part of the winter with their cattle, for the sake of the warmth. The rocks, by which they are enclosed, are so barren, and the climate is so severe, that there is no knowing how these poor Alpines, with all their simplicity and temperance, contrive to subsist. Their few sterile fields hang over precipices, and are covered, in places, with enormous blocks of granite, which roll every year from the cliffs above. Some seasons even rye will not ripen there. The pasturages are, many of them, inaccessible to cattle, and scarcely safe for sheep. Such wretched soil cannot be expected to yield any thing more than what will barely sustain life, and pay the taxes, which, owing to the unfeeling negligence of the inspectors, are too often levied without proper consideration for

the unproductiveness of the land. The clothing of these poor creatures is made of coarse wool, which they dress and weave themselves. Their principal food is unsifted rye; this they bake into cakes in the autumn so as to last the whole year."

Neff, born in 1798, and brought up in a village near Geneva by his widowed mother, gave early proofs of a mind cast in a peculiar and promising mould. His mother was his first teacher; and from the village pastor he received some instruction in Latin, and a few branches of science. While engaged in the service of a florist-gardener, he published, at the age of sixteen, a treatise on the culture of trees that showed the bent, acuteness, and discrimination of his mind. In 1815 he entered the military service of Geneva; but after remaining in the service several years, and being promoted to office, he was thought too religious for such employment, and advised to quit the army, and prepare himself for the ministry. After many internal struggles, he did so, and was received as a *probationer* in 1819.

"There is a practice in the Protestant churches of Switzerland and France which is extremely beneficial to candidates for ordination. The theological student, after having passed certain examinations, is received as a *proposant* into the confidence of some of those who exercise the pastoral office, and is employed as a lay-helper, or catechist in their parishes. This custom is as old as the Christian Church, it was the usage of the primitive churches, and cannot but be of the greatest improvement to the probationer. He is acting under the eye of an experienced minister; he has an example and a teacher before him to regulate his actions and opinions; he is trying his own strength, and feeling his way, and assuring himself of his preference and fitness for the sacred work, before the irrevocable step is taken. It is not too late to retire, if he finds himself in any degree unequal to the arduous charge.

"These probationers are not permitted to put their hands to the ark, and to perform services which are strictly sacerdotal, but they instruct the young, and visit the sick, and even preach from the pulpit, at the discretion of the pastor, in whose parish they are thus making their advance towards the ministry."

His probationary labors Neff commenced in the vicinity of Geneva, and continued them for two years in the cantons of Neufchatel, Berne, and the Pays de Vaud. Thence he went to Grenoble and Mens in France, where he labored four years or more with great success as a *catechist*, or assistant to the regular pastor; when, finding difficulties in the way of his being licensed in France or Geneva to preach, he went to England in the spring of 1823, and received licensure from an association of dissenting ministers in London. On his return to the scene of his recent labors, he was met with very strong demonstrations of attachment from his late catechumens.

"The reception which the Protestants of Mens gave to their former catechist, on his re-appearing among them, would have been felt like a triumphal

entrance to any but a person of his gentle and unassuming spirit. They left their shops and their husbandry work to meet him. They crowded round him, some half stifled him in their embraces, others kissed his hand, others wept with joy, and all signified the sincerity of their affection and respect. When he called upon his acquaintances in the villages, similar testimonies of veneration were displayed.

“At St. Jean d’Heran he was obliged to repress the outbursting of delight with which he was welcomed. His approach had been announced by somebody who ran before to give the joyful intelligence, “he is coming,” and on drawing near the village, he saw the bottom of the little hill, on which it stands, full of people, who were waiting to greet him. With his usual prudence and good sense, he foresaw that an unfavorable construction might be put upon these public indications of esteem, and he begged one of his friends to go forward, and to request that the honest villagers would return to their houses, where he would visit them successively, and receive their cordial assurances of affection. For eight days, previously to his arrival, the inhabitants of St. Jean d’Heran had been anxiously expecting him, and its population had turned out more than once to hail his approach.”

His mode of treating his catechumens may be conceived of from the following sketch, selected from many of a similar kind in his journal.

“‘You will, perhaps, remember,’ said he, in a letter to one of his friends, ‘that in the notice of my first lecture at Mens, I spoke of a daughter of my host, named Emily, one of my catechumens, as being very intelligent, but at the same time extremely devoted to the pleasures of the world. She used to be at every frivolous amusement. Upon one occasion, having understood that she meant to perform a part in a comedy, I signified my displeasure so plainly, that she gave up her design; but I perceived that it was sorely against her real inclination. While she regularly attended all our private and public services, and particularly our evening meetings, her whole heart was with the world. Her lips only gave confession of the truth. Things were in this state with her when she heard my sermon on Good Friday. She was struck by these words, which I repeated more than once:—‘Go to Golgotha, and there you will see how odious sin is to God!’ For the first time she understood, in the sufferings of our Lord, the terrible demands of the holy law of God. In the bitterness and anguish of her soul she shed many tears during the service, and her heart was on fire when she left the church. During the whole of the day her uneasiness increased, though she did all she could to give another turn to her thoughts. She cursed the hour when she had asked God to give her a knowledge of her heart. She continued in this state without disclosing her feelings to any body till the Tuesday morning afterwards. It was in vain that I endeavored to find an opportunity of speaking to her. She avoided me. Her parents and friends tortured themselves to divine the cause of her disquietude. At last, on the Tuesday morning, I made her search for some passages in my Testament, and in turning over the leaves she found the text on which I had preached, Matt. v. 20. ‘It is too true,’ said she, ‘that our righteousness does not surpass that of the Scribes and Pharisees: it is even less than theirs.’

“‘And St. Paul says,’ I rejoined, ‘that no flesh shall be justified by the works of the law.’

“Upon this she made many objections to the doctrine, not being able to understand how we are excited to good works by it.

“I then read her the passage in St. Paul’s Epistle to Titus, and I reminded her of the example of true Christians who are rich in good works, although they do not attribute any merit to them. I explained to her the motives of love and gratitude, which incline them to obedience, and to a renoucement of the world.

“‘Do you think,’ added I, ‘that they, who have such sentiments as these, can find any pleasure in the things of the world?’

“‘No,’ said she, ‘but I do.’

“I then endeavored to make her perceive how the consideration of the truths of the Gospel ought to make us serious.

“‘It does not make me serious!’ she exclaimed, bursting into tears.

“‘I return thanks to God for the disposition in which I now find you, for those who weep shall be comforted. Be of good cheer, there is a Comforter. He, whom Jesus Christ promised to his disciples, will be sent to you also.’

“‘His disciples did his will, but as for me, I do it not, and I have never done it.’

“‘His disciples did not only do his will, they believed.’

“‘Yes, and I do not believe.’

“‘They did not believe as much as they ought, for Jesus reproached them with not having faith as big as a grain of mustard seed. But they did as you ought to do: they asked the Lord to increase their faith.’

“‘But they, at that time, had a little, and I have none at all.’

“Here her tears burst forth again, and all that I said appeared to have no effect upon her. She continued all day in such a melancholy mood as to alarm her parents. She could scarcely utter a word; she avoided company, and ate scarcely any thing.

“The next morning she told me that she was in the same frame of mind, and when I urged her to tell me what it was which so afflicted her, she exclaimed, sobbing, ‘I am too proud, I never can be saved.’ I assured her that I was rejoiced to find that she had attained this knowledge of her own heart, and then I opened before her all the treasures of the mercy of God in Jesus Christ. But she persevered in objecting the excess of her pride and vanity. She could not believe in the glad tidings, she could not believe that her prayers would be heard.

“‘Poor Emily, you are very unhappy at present, but your sadness shall be turned into joy. The Lord will comfort you.’

“‘But if I should die in this condition?’

“‘Be not afraid; I am as sure as I am of my own existence, that God does not light the candle and take the broom, to leave a piece of silver in the dust. He will finish the work which he has begun in you. He will call you to himself, after he has purified you.’

“It was in vain that I endeavored to console her by such discourse as this; I could not succeed, and I left her with these words:—‘My dear Emily, I am very sorry to have to quit you at this moment, but I leave you in the hands of the Lord, who will comfort you better than I can. Go to him with perfect confidence. I recommend you to acquaint your mother with the cause of your distress, in order to remove any unpleasant suspicion.’ I then parted with her, and went to La Mure, where I preached at one o’clock, and in the evening I slept at La Baume, near the Drac, where I held a numerous meeting in the house of the mayor of the commune. All the inhabitants of this little village are protestants; and not one of them staid at home, even mothers attended with children at the breast, for in the memory of man, there had never been any preaching performed in this place, which is very remote from any road, and has no church near it. The next morning I set out at a very early hour, the mayor accompanied me as far as the Drac, and I ascended the mountain towards St. Jean d’Heran, to visit a sick person. He was a wicked old man, who had all his life boasted of his irreligion, but the fear of death had softened him. I found him in full possession of his intellect, although he was very near his end. I read to him, and I explained to him the parable of the laborers in the vineyard, and dwelt upon those who were hired at the eleventh hour. He listened, and then made some objections. He did not appear to be persuaded. I prayed with him, and then took my leave, after having addressed him with great earnestness, and I hope with affection. I do not know whether the Lord, who came five or six hours afterwards, found him clothed with the white garment, or naked. I also visited another sick person, whom I found much better disposed, and then re-

turned to Mens, to receive my catechumens. In the course of my excursion I did not forget Emily. At one time I felt rejoiced, and blessed God for his dispensation of mercy to her. At another time I was afraid lest this sudden awakening should produce bad effects, especially if her anguish of mind should continue, and affect her health, which is but feeble even now.

“In the midst of these reflections I arrived at home, fearing to find Emily in her bed, and her parents miserable, but I found her full of joy. ‘Oh how happy I am,’ she exclaimed, the moment she saw me. ‘You have not left me in the hands of a severe judge. How gracious the Lord has been! Oh! he is rightly called the Saviour:—but what agony! what sufferings! Oh! what he must have suffered! He who drank the cup of bitterness even to the dregs. Now I understand what he meant to say, when he exclaimed, ‘My soul is full of heaviness, even unto death.’ I should never have done, if I were to endeavor to transcribe all the expressions of gratitude and admiration, which poured from her mouth: from that mouth, which heretofore had been full of the attractions of the world. Not only was her language new, but her air and aspect were changed. The vain and self-important deportment had now given way to modesty and sweetness. It was no longer the same Emily. My first movement was naturally to bless the Father of mercies and the Saviour of sinners.”

The people at Mens were extremely desirous of retaining Neff as their pastor; but Providence, designing him for a wider and more difficult sphere of usefulness, threw obstacles in his way; and, near the close of the year 1823, he entered the field of his labors as Pastor of the High Alps. His parish extended in one direction more than eighty miles, and in another nearly sixty. Over this wide extent was his flock scattered among the cliffs, and in the deep ravines of the High Alps; and, though provided with a parsonage for his residence, he was continually passing, summer and winter, from hamlet to hamlet, and spent nearly all his time in the humble and dirty abodes of his people.

“We find him, not only preaching, and performing public service, in every village between Dormilleuse and the frontier Alps, where there was a church, but gathering the young people about him, classing them, and instructing them in the first elements of Christianity; making lists of those who had not yet appeared at the Lord’s table, and preparing them for that solemn ordinance; visiting from house to house; putting families in a train to pursue devotional exercises by themselves; inspiring them with the love of pious conversation and reading; and performing all those little offices of kind attention, and pastoral duty, which have the sure effect of endearing a parochial clergyman to his flock, by proving that he takes a real and affectionate concern in all that interests them.”

Neff had every thing to do for his poor Alpines; and we shall here give some curious instances of his care for the temporal as well as spiritual interests of his flock.

“His first attempt was to impart an idea of domestic convenience. Chimneys and windows to their hovels were luxuries to which few of them had aspired, till he showed them how easy it was to make a passage for the smoke, and admittance for the light and air. He next convinced them that warmth might be obtained more healthily, than by pigging together for six or seven

months in stables, from which the muck of the cattle was removed but once during the year. For their coarse and unwholesome food, he had, indeed, no substitute; because the sterility of the soil would produce no other; but he pointed out a mode of tillage, by which they increased the quantity; and in cases of illness, where they had no conception of applying the simplest remedies, he pointed out the comfort which a sick person may derive from light and warm soups and ptisans, and other soothing assistance. So ignorant were they of what was hurtful or beneficial in acute disorders, that wine and brandy were not unusual prescriptions in the height of a raging fever.

“Strange enough, and still more characteristic of savage life, the women, till Neff taught the men better manners, were treated with so much disregard, that they never sat at table with their husbands or brothers, but stood behind them, and received morsels from their hands with obeisance and profound reverence.”

“From the first he made it his study to conciliate the affections and confidence of the peasants, by employing all his attainments for their improvement, and by showing them that there were many things, in which his general knowledge might be rendered serviceable to them. He not only did not hesitate, but he sought occasions, to put his hand to the tool of the mechanic and artisan, and to the husbandman’s implement, and thus to drill the peasantry into better management, and to instruct them in the best mode of adding to their stock of conveniences and comfort. We have already seen him working with the masons and carpenters, to give the last air of architectural beauty to the new church of Violins, and now I will exhibit him in the character of an agriculturist, introducing an improved method of irrigation, and a system of sowing and planting, which doubled the quantity of production.

“One of the principal resources of the valley of Fressinière, is the breeding and pasturage of cattle. But the winter is so long, and the tracts of land capable of producing fodder are so scanty, that every blade of grass that can be raised, and made into hay, is a very treasure. A dry summer often left them unprovided with hay, and compelled the poor creatures to part with their stock at an inadequate price. Neff’s eye perceived that a direction might be given to the streams in one part, which would improve the ground in another, and furnish the proprietors with constant means of keeping the grass fresh and moist. But he found the utmost difficulty in explaining the simplest principles of hydraulics, and in persuading his ignorant listeners that the water might be made to rise and fall, and might be dammed up and distributed, accordingly as it might be required for use. The imaginary expense stared them in the face like certain ruin; and the labor appalled them, as being perfectly insuperable. When their pastor first advised them to construct the canals necessary for the purpose, they absolutely refused to attempt it, and he was obliged to tell them, that they were equally deaf to temporal and spiritual counsel. Pointing to the rushing waters, which were capable of being diverted from their course to the parched and sterile soil, which he wished to see improved, he exclaimed, ‘You make as little use of those ample streams, as you do of the water of life. God has vouchsafed to offer you both in abundance, but your pastures, like your hearts, are languishing with drought!’

“In the spring of 1825, there had been so little snow, that there was every appearance of the soil yielding even less than its usual scanty increase: its wonted supply of moisture had failed. Neff took advantage of the state of the season, and once more pressed them to adopt his mode of irrigation. But still the reluctance and the excuses were the same. If the canals and aqueducts were made, they would soon get out of order: if one proprietor adopted them, another would not: the next neighbor would not permit them to cross his land, and one opponent of the measure might stop the whole proceeding: but if all should agree, and the work were to be brought to a happy conclusion, an avalanche, or a crumbling mass of granite would soon crush or interrupt the constructions, and reduce them to their old condition. In vain did the pastor endeavor to convince them of the weakness of these arguments, particularly of the last: they might as well refuse to plant and sow,

or to build houses, for nothing was safe from avalanches. Finding that he could not prevail, when he addressed them in a body, he took them separately, and asked, 'Will you consent if your neighbor will? Will you put your shoulder to the work, if the occupiers of the next property will join you?' They were ashamed to refuse, when they were thus personally appealed to, and an unwilling acquiescence was thus gradually obtained. But then arose another and more formidable objection. 'Suppose the aqueducts are completed, and the water flows, will the distribution be equal? Will not my neighbor get more of the water than I shall? How do I know that he will not exhaust the supply, before my land has had a drop?' Neff was too ready at expedients to be easily foiled. He proposed that there should be a committee, and an arbiter, to determine what share of the public benefit each occupier should enjoy, and how long, and on what days, and at what hours, the stream should be permitted to pour its waters into the different sections and branches of its courses.

"At length all preliminaries were settled, and the work was to be done. The line was marked out, and the proprietors consented that the main channel should cross and recross their lands accordingly as it should be required. But again there was some demur. The people would only labor at that part of the construction which was to irrigate their own ground. 'Be it so,' said Neff, 'only let us make a beginning.' He saw that he could easily bring them to good humor and compliance, if he could only once set them on. Every thing having been arranged, the working party, consisting of forty, met at day-break, and, with their pastor at their head, proceeded to examine the remains of an ancient aqueduct, which it was thought might be rendered in some degree available to their purpose, if they could so far make out its line as to follow its direction. Some few traces were discernible, but the sight of them seemed to dishearten rather than encourage the conscripts.

"'We shall be three days,' said one, 'before we can complete this part of our work!'

"'It will take us not less than six,' said another, 'ten,' said a third.

"'Not quite so many,' said the pastor, mildly, and with his benevolent smile.

"Neff divided his troop into little detachments, of five or six, with a commander at the head of each, and taking upon himself the direction in chief, he allotted a distinct proportion of the work to each. Presently all were busy, some digging and excavating, others clearing away; the pastor himself was at one time plying his pickaxe, and another time moving from place to place, and superintending the progress of others. At ten o'clock the party expressed a desire to discontinue their labor and go home to their breakfast. But this would not do for their chief. He foresaw that there would be stragglers, and perhaps deserters, if they should once lose sight of each other: therefore, still setting them the example, he sent for his own breakfast, continued at his work, and persuaded the rest to do the same.

"It was a toilsome undertaking. In some places they had to elevate the floor of the main channel to the height of eight feet, and in others to lower it as much. In the course of the first day's labor, it was necessary to carry the construction across the rocky beds of three or four torrents, and often when the work appeared to be effectually done, Neff detected a default in the level, or in the inclination of the water course, which obliged him to insist upon their going over it again. At four o'clock the volunteers were rewarded by seeing the first fruits of their labors: one line of aqueduct was completed; the dam was raised, and the water rushed into the nearest meadow amidst the joyful shouts of workmen and spectators. The next day some cross cuts were made, and proprietors, who were supposed to be secretly hostile and incredulous, saw the works carried over their ground without offering any opposition to the measure, for who could indulge his obstinate or dogged humor, when the benevolent stranger, the warm-hearted minister, was toiling in the sweat of his brow to achieve a public good, which never could be of the least advantage to himself? It was the good shepherd, not taking the fleece, but exhausting his own strength, and wearing himself out for the

sheep. On the third, and on the following days, small transverse lines were formed, and a long channel was made across the face of the mountain, to supply three village fountains with water. This last was a very formidable enterprise. It was necessary to undermine the rock, to blast it, and to construct a passage for the stream in granite of the very hardest kind. 'I had never done any thing like it before,' is the pastor's note upon this achievement, 'but it was necessary to assume an air of scientific confidence, and to give my orders like an experienced engineer.'

"The work was brought to a most prosperous issue, and the pastor was thenceforward a sovereign, who reigned so triumphantly and absolutely, that his word was law."

The life of Neff is full of interesting and instructive anecdotes from which we extract only that of the young shepherdess Mariette.

"One day Neff met, at Palons, a little shepherdess, of twelve or thirteen years of age, whose air and language struck him with surprise. In answer to his inquiries about her, he was told that her name was Mariette Guyon, and that she lived in the adjacent hamlet of Punayer with her grandfather and grandmother, who were Roman Catholics; that she had expressed great anxiety to be instructed in the true principles of the Gospel, and that they could not attribute this desire merely to human influence, and to the persuasions of Protestant acquaintances, for she was not permitted to associate with Protestants. He asked the child if she could read? She burst into tears, and said, "Oh! if they would only let me come here to the Sunday-school, I should soon learn, but they tell me that I already know too much." The pastor's interest was further excited, by learning that what little she knew of the difference between the religion of the two churches was picked up by accident, and by stealthy conversations with the converts of the neighborhood.

"After this short interview with the poor girl, he remained some time without hearing any thing more of her. In the interval, she was deprived of all regular means of improvement, but her zeal made her find out a very ingenious expedient. She often kept her flock near a very rocky path which descended to the valley of Fressinière, and when she saw a peasant pass, she would accost him in her *patois*, and ask, "Where do you come from?" If he named a Catholic village, she said no more, and let him pass on. If he came from a Protestant hamlet, she approached him, and put questions to him, and if he displayed any zeal, and knowledge of the Gospel, she would keep him as long as he would good-naturedly remain, and treasure up all that she heard from his lips. At other times she would make friends with Protestant children, who were watching their sheep or goats near her, and would beg them to bring their Testaments, and read and translate to her. This went on until she saw that she was watched by some of the Roman Catholics, and was obliged to be more cautious. During the long and rigorous winter, which followed after Neff first saw her, the mountains were buried in snow, and the people could not go out of their villages, therefore Mariette had no intercourse with those whose conversation she so much desired to cultivate. Notwithstanding, her faith was strengthened and her mind enlightened, and on the return of spring she positively refused to go to mass. In vain did they attempt to force her by ill-usage. Her father was then appealed to, and first tried rigorous means, and then persuasion, to engage her to declare from whence she obtained what he called "these new ideas." She persisted in declaring that God alone had first put these things in her heart, and expressed herself with so much meekness and solemnity, in explanation of the motives by which she was actuated, that her father felt constrained to say to those who urged him to exert his authority. "Who am I, to oppose myself to God?" But he left her still under the care of her

grandfather and grandmother, who continued to ill-treat her, although without success.

“The pastor shall now tell the continuation of the story himself. “Some time after I had learnt all these particulars, I was going to Palons, accompanied by a young man, and Madeleine Pellegrine, a most humble and zealous disciple of Jesus Christ. Whilst stopping near the bridge and cascade of Rimasse, which precipitates itself into a deep abyss, we saw a flock of lambs, which appeared to be hastily driven towards us by a young shepherdess. It was Mariette, who had recognised us from a distance, and who ran up to us breathless with joy. She expressed in language which it is impossible to describe, how happy she was at meeting me. I requested Madeleine to watch the flock while I conversed with Mariette. She thanked me with affectionate earnestness for the visit I had made to her father in her behalf. She spoke of what she had suffered for the Gospel, in a manner so Christian and so touching, that I could hardly believe my ears, knowing that the poor child did not know even the letters of the alphabet. ‘It is this,’ she said, ‘that gives me pain; the evil spirit tempts me, by insinuating that I resist in vain, and that I am too young and feeble to persevere: but when I suffer most, then the good God supports me, and I fear nothing. They want me to make the sign of the cross; they wish to drag me to mass, and because I refuse, they beat me; and when they have beaten me for the name of Jesus Christ, and see that I do not cry, but rejoice in his name, then they become furious, and beat me still more; but were they to kill me, I would not cry, since the good God strengthens me.’ She uttered many things equally affecting. When she left me, she went to join another young shepherdess, a Protestant, with whom she oftentimes kept her flock, and who attended Sunday-school for both of them, for she repeated to Mariette verses from the Psalms, and passages from the New Testament, which she had learnt there. A short time afterwards I held a reunion near Punayer, which Mariette attended; it was the first time she had ever been present at Protestant worship. She blessed God, who had inspired her with the courage to do so, and appeared most attentive to the sermon and the prayers, which were in French, though most probably she was unable to comprehend more than a small part of the service, not understanding any language but the mountain *patois*. Not daring to return to Punayer, after this, she went to her father, and confessed to him all that had occurred: he received her kindly, and took her back to her grandfather and grandmother, and strenuously forbade them to ill-treat her for her religious opinions. This was something gained, but not sufficient for her; she earnestly entreated him to allow her to attend the public worship; her constant prayer during the week was, that God would dispose her father to grant her permission. Her prayers were heard, and the Sunday following we had the joy of seeing her come to the temple at Violins, a long way from her home. She was received with every demonstration of joy, and a poor man of Minsas, who had married an aunt of her’s, promised to take her to his own house, if they would trust her with him, during the winter, and that he would teach her to read, and instruct her more perfectly in the truths of the Gospel.”

“Mariette’s perseverance triumphed over the prejudices of her family. She was permitted to receive instruction, and to attend the public services of the Protestant Church, and her singular history having reached the ears of some friends at Mens, they begged her father to be allowed to take charge of her, and her education was conducted under auspices which gives us every reason to believe, that she is now a bright ornament of the community, whose faith she thus embraced from the strongest conviction of its purity.”

Such instances must have cheered the devoted pastor amid his toils; and the cordiality with which he was every where received, is a simple, but striking comment on his character and usefulness.

“It was not on Sunday only, that he went the round of his churches, but he was ever visiting now one quarter, and then another; and happy did they esteem themselves at whose table he sat down, and under whose roof he lodged for the night. When his arrival was expected in certain hamlets, whose rotation to be visited was supposed to be coming round, it was beautiful to see the cottages send forth their inhabitants, to watch the coming of the beloved minister. “Come, take your dinner with us.”—“Let me prepare your supper.”—“Permit me to give up my bed to you,”—were re-echoed from many a voice, and though there was nothing in the repast which denoted a feast-day, yet never was festival observed with greater rejoicing than by those, whose rye-bread and pottage were shared by the pastor Neff. Sometimes, when the old people of one cabin were standing at their doors, and straining their eyes to catch the first view of their “guide to heaven,” the youngsters of another were perched on the summit of a rock, and stealing a prospect which would afford them an earlier sight of him, and give them the opportunity of offering the first invitation. It was on these occasions, that he obtained a perfect knowledge of the people, questioning them about such of their domestic concerns as he might be supposed to take an interest in, as well as about their spiritual condition, and finding where he could be useful both as a secular adviser and a religious counsellor. “Could all their children read? Did they understand what they read? Did they offer up morning and evening prayers? Had they any wants that he could relieve? Any doubts that he could remove? Any afflictions wherein he could be a comforter?”

But we cannot follow the Pastor of the High Alps through his whole career. It was short, but rich in its fruits. His excessive labors soon shattered his frame, and obliged him in 1827 to retire from the scene of his toils, and leave his beloved Alpines to see them no more. All expedients to restore his health proved unavailing; and in the spring of 1829, he died, in the triumphs of faith, leaving behind him a name not soon to be forgotten by his Alpine charge, and an example worthy to be studied by every minister and disciple of Christ.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

---

### CLERICAL LIBRARIES.

[We know not to whom we are indebted for this article on Clerical libraries, but feel inclined to insert it as affording a hint for consideration; and we see not why what it proposes may not be entitled to attention. As to form and manner, the plan, as here presented, is not of course to be considered as matured. It presents the thing in general only, leaving it for each district in which libraries shall be established, to form its own rules and regulations, as may best suit convenience. We know not that any thing of the kind pro-

posed, *strictly clerical*, has been attempted; but if we mistake not, a similar library for purposes of general knowledge, was commenced a few years since in one of the interior counties of Massachusetts, and has been successful. We do not see, therefore, why the plan here proposed might not succeed very well, and great good result from it.]

The establishment of libraries has always been thought conducive to learning; but an improvement might be made in the plan of them, which would render them more extensively useful. A reform has of late been commenced. Libraries have been established for mechanics, and for those of other professions. In some populous cities they have been open to all the public,—though this is true only of Europe. Such is the liberal spirit of the age; and we may hope that all the advantages of learning will be much more widely diffused. Ministers are an important part of the community in a literary view; and the most generous provision has been made for their education, up to the time of their entering on the active duties of their office. But then, however desirous they may be to pursue their studies, and though better qualified than ever to make a good use of rare and valuable books, they are deprived of the libraries to which they once had access. I propose, therefore, that libraries should be formed in central towns of regions containing from 50,000 to 100,000 inhabitants. These libraries shall contain valuable, extensive, and rare theological works, including the whole range of the appropriate studies of ministers. They shall be formed by donations, and by the payment of a small yearly sum by those who use the books. The books may be taken out of the library to the minister's home, to be kept for three, six, or twelve months, or longer, as his studies require, and the character of the book, and the state of the library will allow. I will now offer some reasons in favor of such libraries.

1. *The libraries now existing do not meet the wants of ministers.* College libraries accommodate only the students, the professors, and perhaps the ministers of the place. Small libraries in towns do not in any way supply them with the books they need; and the more extensive libraries of populous towns are a very imperfect supply, even to the ministers of those towns; and they are no assistance to ministers in the surrounding country.

2. *The books might, without inconvenience, be procured from the libraries.* Want of easy access to a central library would be an objection, if the books were of an ephemeral character, and would be read through in a week, or could not be kept from a library longer. But here, where the books are of a description to be retained six months or a year, the objection has but little weight.

*Books grow out of date.* Let them be used therefore. Let not the moth riot on the precious leaves, which might pour a light richer than sunshine upon an immortal mind.

3. *Ministers cannot buy books when they need them.* I have felt a pain at my heart in looking at the meager collections of some beloved brethren in the ministry. It is grievous to see the inestimable years of vigorous manhood spent in the neglect of studies that elevate the mind, and fit the minister to shine in his little orbit with increasing lustre. The minister of Christ must not suffer such evil without lamentation, and earnest efforts to supply his wants. Among other things he sends for, let him remember "especially the parchments."

4. *It is economical to have public libraries.* One public library well endowed, would supply fifty ministers, and would answer the purpose of fifty libraries. There are some books a clergyman always needs on his shelves, or writing desk; but there are others, which he wants perhaps only once in two or three years, when he has a particular subject to study. A public library would be as good as a private one for this purpose. It would be economical on another account also. Many books cannot always be purchased; and not being common books, in ordinary demand, they cannot be easily sold. The money expended upon them is so much money sunk in a minister's property. They will not sell for one half, perhaps not for one quarter their cost; and when they are sold, they are lost to the community, by getting into hands that can make no use of them.

5. *Public clerical libraries will facilitate the acquisition of knowledge.* Time is precious; and the moments spent by students should not be wasted in passing over ground already trodden by others. If any point has been ascertained by Michaelis, Rosenmueller, Gesenius, Schleusner, or Wahl, by a month, or a year's study, it is a waste of labor, to go through that month, or year's study, when an hour's examination of what these authors have written, would inform me, and would enable me to make further attainments. Much invaluable time is lost by poor books; and therefore professional men should have access to extensive collections, that in the least possible time, they may arrive at the conclusions they seek.

C. C.

---

THE SABBATH A TEST OF CHARACTER.

Some ministers of the Gospel think it inexpedient to discuss the claims of the Sabbath during a revival of religion. In a time of declension, they forget it; and, when the Spirit of God is descending in its power, they avoid the subject, through fear of its diverting the minds of their people from the great and all-absorbing concerns of eternity.

I respect the motives of such ministers; but are they not altogether wrong in their judgment? Will the neglect, or timid avoidance of such a subject as that of the Sabbath, tend to promote the conversion of sinners, and insure the permanent prosperity of religion? Will the discussion of its claims, or the enforcement of its duties, lead men to forget God, and their own souls? Will it abate the Christian's love to his Saviour, chill the fervor of his devotions, or quench the ardor of his zeal for the salvation of those who are perishing in sin? Will it banish conviction from the awakened sinner, and make him cease from his anxious inquiries after the one thing needful? Will it tend to lull the careless into still deeper slumbers, and sear their conscience against all the applications of divine truth?

I might answer these questions by relating instances in which the discussion of this subject has been the means of hopefully converting the Sabbath-breaker to God, and even of commencing revivals of religion; but a very little reflection must be sufficient to show the importance of urging the claims of the Sabbath as *a test of character and an instrument of conviction.*

The grand point at issue between impenitent sinners and their Maker, is, whether he shall reign as sovereign over all his creatures; and it is not material what truth or duty is employed to show them how unwilling they are to bow in filial submission to his authority. Men are convicted of sin, however, not by vague and barren generalities, but by some specific charge brought home to their own case with a particularity from which conscience cannot escape. What extorted from David the confessions found in the fifty-first Psalm? The memory of a particular transgression. What made Peter weep so bitterly? The denial of his Master; and surely that alone was enough to fill and engross his whole soul. How came three thousand on the day of Pentecost to be pricked in their hearts?—By a shower of arrows thrown at random? No; but by the specific, tremendous charge, so powerfully enforced upon their consciences by Peter, of having crucified the Lord of life and glory.

Now the Sabbath is one of the most specific and efficacious tests we can employ, to try a man's loyalty to God. Convict him here, and you prepare the way for thorough conviction respecting all his other transgressions. Settle this point in his controversy with God, and you settle the whole controversy forever. The Gordian knot is cut at a blow. The principle of rebellion is given up, and the rebel transformed into a loyal and obedient subject. The great fountain of godly sorrow, of holy obedience, is opened; and its pure, life-giving waters will gush forth, and flow on forever.

Will the discussion of such a subject divert the minds of men from the vitalities of religion?—The Sabbath not connected with the cause of Christ! It is the sheet-anchor of its safety; the main-spring in every system of means employed for the salvation

of mankind.—The Sabbath interfere with revivals! Blot out the Sabbath, and not another revival would ever visit our world. Spread through the community an increased attention to this sacred day, and you promote, in the same degree, the prosperity of pure and undefiled religion. It is the great channel through which God has been pouring upon our land such copious streams of divine influence; and, unless the Sabbath is rescued from its growing profanations, these seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, will ere long cease, and leave us, like the exiles in Babylon, to hang our harps on the willow, and mourn over those desolations of Zion, which must inevitably follow the general neglect of this holy day.—The Sabbath neutralize the influence of divine truth on the sinner's conscience! It is the grand medium through which the Gospel brings its truths, and motives, and means of grace, to operate on his mind. It applies a touch-stone to his heart. It holds a mirror up to his whole character. It is a burning glass that collects the rays of divine truth into a point, and pours their concentrated light and heat upon his conscience.—The Sabbath retard the Christian's progress! What would he do without a Sabbath? Would he grow in grace himself, or promote the spiritual improvement of his brethren, or do much for the conversion of sinners around him, or for the spread of the Gospel through the world?—Does the Sabbath furnish no test of the Christian's character? Enforce its high authority; urge its broad and strict demands; explain its holy duties; reprove its multifarious violations; and would you not apply a searching test to our churches? Would you not disturb the conscience of many a baptized Sabbath-breaker? Thoroughly-reform the professed disciples of Christ on this point; and would you not prepare the way for such a general, powerful, and lasting revival of religion, as the world has never yet witnessed?

No subject, perhaps, is better calculated than the Sabbath to elicit the latent rebellion of the human heart against the authority of God. Depravity generally attempts either to reject the Bible as a revelation from heaven, or to explain away its offensive truths, or to disregard its commands, and brave the wrath of Jehovah. We may observe a similar development and progress on the subject of the Sabbath. Many try hard to prove it a human institution, binding on no man's conscience; others would fain consider it a mere holiday of rest and recreation, a season appropriated, by a God of spotless purity, to sensual indulgencies; while others, unable to deny its divine origin and authority, yet resist its claims, and set at defiance the fearful and everlasting sanctions of its Almighty Lawgiver.

Here is the rebel unmasked. But shall we connive at his ingenious evasions, or bold resistance of divine authority? Shall we not rather press upon him the claims of the Sabbath as a test of his character in the sight of God, and a means of bringing him to a just sense of his sins? Is his conscience seared and insensible?

No; his efforts at evasion and resistance, prove him conscious of his guilt, and aware of his danger. Can his conscience sleep? What! sleep under the roll of those thunders which proclaimed of old the law of the Sabbath from Sinai quaking beneath the terrors of an incumbent God? Had he committed theft, or murder, every week of his life, could his conscience sleep? But the Sabbath-breaker is as truly an offender against the Lord of the Sabbath, as if he had every week imbrued his hands in human blood. Is his conscience then asleep? Alas! it cannot always sleep. The trumpet of the last day will wake it up, to sleep no more forever, and call the habitual transgressor of the Fourth Command to an account as strict as that of the sinner who has disobeyed any other precept of the Bible.—Let the preacher then urge the specific charge of violating God's day of holy rest; and will he not be likely to rouse the Sabbath-breaker's conscience, and impress him with such a sense of his guilt as may lead him, penitent and believing, to "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world?"<sup>23</sup>

Here is the particularity which ministers of the Gospel should ever use in order to convict their hearers. Conviction commences with a view of some particular sin; and the preacher, if he would awaken remorse in my bosom, must lay some *specific* charge at the door of my conscience. His abstract dissertations on the totality of human sinfulness, I cannot apply to my own case very easily, if at all; but let him charge me with habitual forgetfulness of God, with utter ingratitude for his favors, or daily neglect of prayer; and there is a speciality in the charge that brings it home to my heart with concentrated and irresistible power. He does not leave me afloat on a sea of generalities; he chains me to a particular thing, and forces me, whether I will or not, to make a personal application. He does not merely brandish a sword with its scabbard on, or with silk wound around the point. No; he wields it naked, and aims his blow at *me in particular*. Such a preacher, like the old Romans, puts the grappling-irons upon me, and forces my heart into close contact with the truths of the Gospel. So Peter preached; so Paul preached; so our Saviour himself preached; and he that would "turn many to righteousness," must "go, and do likewise."

RAMAR,

---

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *The Auto-biography of Thomas Shepherd, the celebrated Minister of Cambridge, N. E. With additional notices of his life and character.* By NEHEMIAH ADAMS, Pastor of the First Church in connexion with the Shepard Society, Cambridge. Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1832. pp. 129.

Of this little work, we hope soon to present our readers with a review. Without stopping, therefore, to notice in particular its contents, we shall only say in general here, that a fairer specimen of the genuine spirit of the Pilgrims, has rarely if ever been given to the public, since the days in which the Pilgrims lived; and every lover of that spirit, not to say every lover of antiquity, whatever he may be in other respects, will find a rich treat in the perusal of this ancestral relic.

2. *Φρόνημα τῷ Πνεύματος; or, the Grace and Duty of being Spiritually Minded, declared and practically improved.* By JOHN OWEN, D. D. Abridged, by EBENEZER PORTER, D. D. President of the Theological Seminary, Andover. Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1833. pp. 211.

This work has always been valuable in its original dress, but will be found to be doubly so, as now abridged by Dr. Porter. It deserves to be possessed, and used habitually as a closet manual, by every one who would entertain a good hope through grace, or grow in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. No one can read it and not feel sifted and effectually tried. We hope it may have a wide and rapid circulation.

3. *Researches of the Rev. E. Smith and Rev. H. G. O. Dwight in Armenia, including a journey through Asia Minor, and into Georgia and Persia, with a visit to the Nestorian and Chaldean Christians of Oormiah and Salmas, in two volumes.* By ELI SMITH, Missionary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. New York: Jonathan Leavitt.

The publication of these volumes, affords another proof, that missionaries are not, as some enemies of missions have sometimes represented, uneducated, bigoted enthusiasts, but enlightened, enterprising, liberal philanthropists. Messrs. Smith and Dwight are not the first missionaries who have conferred a favor on the intelligent reading part of the community, by adding to the general stock of information respecting different portions of the human family; but none perhaps have brought to view a portion more interesting, or, in this country, less known. On this account, particularly, most readers will find much in these researches to interest and instruct them. The authorship devolved on Mr. Smith, but in other respects, both may be considered responsible for the work. Great attention has manifestly been paid to accuracy and precision, both in collecting and presenting information, and the reader may rely with confidence on the views and statements with which he is presented. The volumes contain between 300 and 400 pages each, in large du-

odecimo; and accompanying them is a Map prepared by Mr. Smith, which presents a view of the route pursued in the journey and the principal places visited.

---

4. *The Gospel defended against Infidels. A Sermon preached in Holliston, Mass., October 31, 1832, at the Installation of the Rev. Elijah Demond.* By J. H. FAIRCHILD, Pastor of the Evangelical Congregational Church in South Boston. Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1833. pp. 31.

The text on which this sermon is founded is Philippians i. 17—"I am set for the defence of the Gospel." And the preacher's object, as he announces it, is, "to prove that the gospel is, in fact, what it professes to be, a revelation from God." Understanding by gospel, the "scriptures at large," arguments in proof of the position, are adduced from the consideration of the purity of their precepts—their sublimity—their harmony—and the doctrines and facts which they contain. These topics comprise the body of the discourse, and are discussed in an easy, popular manner. Some reflections follow in view of the discussion; and to the whole is added an Address by the Rev. Jacob Ide of Medway, in which are inculcated the obligations of a people—to be willing that their minister should do his duty—to attend constantly on his ministry—to receive the gospel which he preaches—to be at peace among themselves—not to demand too much of their minister—and to assist and encourage him in his work.—The address is full of weighty remark and sound practical wisdom, such as it would be well if every Evangelical religious society might not only hear, but faithfully regard and practise.

Under the first head Mr. Ide observes:

"One of the greatest obstacles to a minister's usefulness at the present day, and one of the greatest trials, which he is called to endure, is an unwillingness on the part of his people, that he should do his duty. Though, in their professions on this subject, every people desire a man of independence and fidelity; yet there are comparatively few, that will cheerfully endure a full development of these important traits of character. It is one thing for a people to say they desire their minister to be independent and faithful, and another, patiently to hear him "declare all the counsel of God." The very men, who will say all this in general terms, and repeat it as often as they have occasion to speak on the subject, will frequently object to a full exhibition of divine truth, and show strong symptoms of displeasure under the admonitions and reproof which the word of God administers.

"It is, brethren, your minister's duty to preach the whole truth, whether you believe it or not, to correct your belief by the word of God, and not to measure the degree of truth which he will deliver, by the boundaries of your belief. He is your instructor—you have *chosen* him as your instructor, and voluntarily placed yourselves under his instruction, and here, before God and this great assembly, made him solemnly *cov*, that he will instruct you faithfully. Now we entreat you to be willing, that he should obey the dictates of his conscience. Do not embarrass him, by frowns, or threats, or any other symptoms of displeasure; but encourage him always to speak freely all that God has put into his heart. Remember that it is truth, and nothing but truth, that can do you good. And if any of you are in an unrenewed state, as doubtless many of you are, it is painful, disagreeable truths only which can be the means of improving your condition. To refuse to hear what is painful to reflect upon, and disagreeable to your unholy feelings, is

like a patient refusing to take the only medicine that can cure him, because it agrees not with his palate.

“Do not be angry, because you find yourselves reproved for your faults. Your minister is by office a reprove. It is an indispensable part of his duty to administer reproof to those who need it. And shall I hesitate to say that you need reproof? You will always need it, as long as you remain in the flesh. Instead, therefore, of being offended at your minister for his rebukes, and seeking revenge upon him for his faithfulness, take them patiently, and make them instrumental of your reform. Let him, and the world know that you have sense enough to perceive, and candor enough to acknowledge, and principle enough to forsake your faults, when plainly and affectionately pointed out to you. For a man to be angry with a servant of God, because he has faithfully reprov'd him for his faults, is not to make the best, but the worst of his condition. It would be not only more pleasing to God, but honorable in the eyes of men, if he would thank his reprove for his fidelity, and give him evidence of his willingness to do right, by an immediate and thorough reformation. However trying your minister's fidelity may be to your feelings, my friends, we entreat you to be always willing that he should do his duty.”

Again on the subject of peace he observes :

“This is essential to your own comfort, and the comfort of your minister. It is also essential to your own improvement and the usefulness of your minister. Contention in a religious society is a source of peculiar unhappiness; because it is seen and felt to be peculiarly inconsistent with the nature and design of such an association. A minister cannot be happy with his people, while they are in a state of contention: He knows that they are not happy in each other. He knows that they are not in a state favorable to the reception of divine truth. He knows that God generally withholds the influence of his Spirit from a people, in a state of contention. He knows also that it is next to impossible to keep out of the fire himself, when his people are contending. However impartial he may be in his feelings, and however prudent in his intercourse with the contending parties, it is little less than miraculous, if one or both of them, do not consider him, as favoring their opponents. In this state of things, they look upon him with a jealous eye, and give but a divided attention, and half their hearts, to his most important instructions. Be peculiarly cautious, then, my friends, against the rise of a contentious spirit. “If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men,” especially with each other. But if you *must* contend about your personal, or municipal, or political transactions, be sure and not carry your contentions into your religious concerns. And above all things, take care that you do not involve your minister in any of these contests. Let there be, at least, one man among you, who may be considered as a friend to you all, and in whom all may confide. And let there be, at least, one place, at which all contentions shall cease, and all assemble, to listen “to the gospel of peace.”

---

5. *Obituary Address at the funeral of the Rev. Royal Washburn, pastor of the First Church and Parish, Amherst, Mass.* By N. W. FISKE. Amherst: J. S. & C. Adams. 1833. pp. 44.

The merit of an address, especially on a funeral occasion, is ever to be looked for in the simplicity and pertinence of the thoughts themselves which compose it, and in the delicacy, tenderness and skill with which they are presented; and in both these respects, the Christian reader will be more than satisfied with this address of Professor Fiske. To one acquainted, though but slightly, with the author or the lamented Washburn, the interest might be expected to be heightend; but unless large deductions are to be made on

this account, we envy not the man his taste, or state of moral and religious feeling, who can read this address and not have his heart repeatedly melted. It presents a combination of select pious thought and interesting biographical sketches of religious character, not often—perhaps we may say rarely—to be met—such a combination, at least, as stamps it with more than common value.

The Scripture on which the address is founded, is Ps. cxvi. 15—"Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints:" and from this, glancing at the fact, that all, even saints, must die, and calling attention to the circumstance; that the death of saints, however obscure, is not only noticed by the Lord, but is peculiarly interesting to Him, Mr. Fiske proceeds to present some reasons, why their death is thus precious; as, that "they are the objects of everlasting love, chosen in the counsels of eternity, and given to Christ, never to be plucked from his hands"—that "their death is the moment of their transition from a state of suffering and temptation to a state of confirmed holiness and peace"—that "it introduces them to higher duty in the service of God"—and that it "generally illustrates the riches of his grace and the value of the gospel."

On these several topics Professor Fiske remarks briefly, but with much beauty and true Christian pathos, while he passes to the "life, ministry, and character" of Mr. Washburn; which make up the main body of the address. Appended are some "Fragments" from the Letters and Journal of Mr. Washburn, illustrating his state of mind in his sickness and his views of things in the near prospect of eternity. "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace."

Mr. Washburn was born at Royalton, Vt., Dec. 6th, 1797, and was the son of the Rev. Azel Washburn and Sarah Skinner Washburn. He became hopefully pious, and made a profession of religion, when about 13 years of age. After a little time, he lived without much evidence to himself that he possessed religion, till he was about 17 years of age; when he became the subject of an experience still more distinct and satisfactory. From this time he was perseveringly engaged to obtain an education, with a view to the Christian ministry.—His classical education he received at the Vermont University in Burlington, and his theological, at the Theological Institution in Andover. He was ordained at Amherst, Jan. 4th, 1826, and died Jan. 1st, 1833, having just entered the 36th year of his age. "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord from henceforth."

---

6. *Rightly dividing the Word of Truth. A Sermon preached Dec. 27, 1832, at the Ordination of the Rev. Cornelius C. Vanarsdalen, as Pastor of the South Church and Society in Hartford, Conn.* By JOEL HAWES, D. D. Hartford: D. F. Robinson. 1833. pp. 23.

This sermon is a fair specimen of the author's usual style and manner, and will compare advantageously with almost any occasional discourse he has published. Particularly have we been gratified with the deep, unaffected seriousness which pervades it. The text is 2 Tim. ii. 15. "Rightly dividing the word of truth." And while describing what it is rightly to divide the word of truth, and why it should be thus divided by the Christian preacher,

which are the two principal points in the discourse, the author appears to have been much impressed with a sense of the solemnity and responsibility of the sacred office, and must have been listened to by the audience in general, and especially by the pastor elect with no little interest and sensibility. We were reminded, in reading the discourse, of the sermon delivered at the preacher's own ordination, which is one of the most serious and solemn ordination sermons we remember ever to have read. From some passages in the sermon, it would seem as though the author had pretty fully in view the particular state of theological sentiment in the country; though in reference to parties, he casts no reflections and professes no partialities, but treats his subject as one of those great and radical subjects whose prominent relations must ever be the same, whatever may be the theories and speculations of different men on minor points. Rightly to divide the word of truth, according to Dr. Hawes, is, to exhibit it in due order and proportion—in a wise adaptation to the various characters and circumstances of hearers—and in accordance with the spirit of the times in which we live; and it should be so divided, he says, because to divide it in this manner, is the only way in which the Christian preacher can instruct himself—or his people—expect permanently to interest his hearers—accomplish among them the great design of his mission,—or be prepared to die in peace and give up his account with joy.—We could wish every ordination sermon might be as well adapted to do good as this of Dr. Hawes.

As specimens of the discourse, we select the following. Speaking of the necessity of the preacher's rightly dividing the word of truth in order to instruct himself, and of his failure to do this as the cause of his becoming feeble and inactive, he observes :

“This is the reason, why many a young man, who enters the ministry with high promise of usefulness, sadly disappoints the hopes that were entertained of him, and becomes an inefficient, powerless dispenser of God's truth. It is only when the preacher instructs himself that he can instruct the people; and he can instruct himself only by repairing to the pure fountains of truth and drawing from them, by patient thought and study, those supplies of divine knowledge which he needs for the proper discharge of his duties. If he so divides the word of truth as to discover its foundations and its mutual relations and connections; if he dwells amidst the glorious realities of God's revelation, sets forth the great doctrines of his word, explains, illustrates and confirms them by sound argument, tracing out their consistency with one another and with all other truth; showing their harmony with the principles of the human mind and their adaptation to the character and wants of man, bringing them home to the heart and conscience, and following them out in all their interesting consequences and bearings on the soul's eternal destiny—the minister who studies and uses the word of truth in this manner will never want for a word in season; he will be daily growing strong in the Lord and in the power of his might; his mental resources will know no exhaustion or decay; if interesting in the commencement of his ministry, he will become more and more so, every year, and his people will never be tired of hearing him, because they will be always hearing from him something new, instructive, and useful.”

Again. Speaking of the necessity of a preacher's rightly dividing the word of truth in order to instruct his people, he says :

“A sermon made up of orthodox words, however musically combined, or

elegantly delivered, has no power to enlighten the mind or impress the heart. It is a mere crackling of thorns on a cold hearth, affording neither light nor warmth. But when a minister of the Gospel shows himself an able and skilful expounder of God's word; when he unfolds the counsels of the Most High, shows the reasons of his requirements, and in the light and power of truth addresses himself plainly and directly to the understanding and conscience of his hearers, his discourse cannot fail to be fraught with warm and weighty instruction, fitted to move the affections and mould the soul for heaven; and that, because it is conversant with the deep springs of action in the soul, with the infinite realities of God's kingdom, with the sanctions of eternity and the powers of the world to come. Such a preacher, in comparison with the mere declaimer, resembles the angel of the Apocalypse who was seen standing in the sun! He speaks only to diffuse light and heat around him; and his addresses, derived from the eternal source of truth and aimed at the great point of imparting instruction, respecting God and duty, and heaven and hell, fall with weight and solemnity on the conscience, and are fitted to build up the people in knowledge and holiness."

7. *An Address to the Phi Beta Kappa Society of Brown University, delivered 5th September, 1832.* By THEOPHON METCALF. Boston: Lilly, Wait, Colman & Holden. 1833. pp. 28.

As announced in the first paragraph, the purpose of Mr. Metcalf in this address, was, to present to the Society before which he had the honor to appear, "a few suggestions," as he terms them, "respecting the influence of popular opinion, taste, and feeling, on the character and pursuits of men of talents and learning." And, as the subject opens in discussion, he proceeds in a strain of just, and what may be considered on the whole rather lofty and learned satire, on the fawning, time-serving spirit of too many, especially in the walks of authorship, political elevation and professional duty—not excepting some even of sacred calling.

At first, the object of the orator, although announced, is not so perfectly apparent as could be wished. Or rather, it is not so perfectly apparent as could be wished, how what is presented bears on what was proposed. At least, such, we should think, must have been the fact as to a great part of his under-graduate hearers. But, as he advances, he becomes luminous, and at times even powerful: illustrations are seen to have pertinence and point, and the conclusion brings out the duty, and not only the duty, but the wisdom of a manly, independent course of integrity and uprightness.

Whether all would sympathize with Mr. Metcalf, as to the extent and degree to which the weakness he censures prevails, we cannot say; but that there is something of it, and that he has presented his thoughts on the subject in a style and manner worthy of himself and of the occasion on which they were delivered, none, we think, will doubt.

Mr. Metcalf's "suggestions" are worthy of consideration, and will not, we hope, be lost upon those for whom they were designed.

Mr. Metcalf says he believes "it may be truly asserted, that no literary work ever obtained enduring fame, which was prepared solely, or even chiefly, with a view to immediate applause, and without reference to the universality of the principles of criticism." And he substantiates the remark by reference to some prominent examples in English literature and in the history of our own politics.

The following paragraph we can hardly withhold from our readers, presuming that many of them will readily understand who the venerable individual is, to whom it refers.

“It might occur, one would think, to the discretion of all men, and especially clerical men, that the only way, in which lasting respect can ever be acquired, is in the pursuit of worthy ends by worthy means. Indeed, as a matter of immediate popularity, a clergyman would find his account in the bold and faithful discharge of his sacerdotal functions, without anxious regard to applause or censure. I need not refer to Massillon and Oberlin, and other honored dead, in proof of this suggestion. But I cannot resist the impulse which inclines me to allude to an eminent living divine, personally known to many of you, whose plain and unshrinking enforcement of his own views of truth; whose fearless reprehension of wickedness, in high places and in low; and whose entire devotion, for more than fifty years, to the duties of his profession, have secured for him a most extensive and reverent respect, no less sincere and profound in the many who reject his peculiar opinions, than in the few who adopt them.—I desire to be grateful that in the place of my nativity, such an example of clerical dignity, fidelity, and contempt of the popularity ‘which is run after,’ was constantly before my youthful eyes; and that such an example of ‘the popularity which follows’ is still before the eyes of the public.”

We also present one of the closing paragraphs.

“The present aspect and tendency of the civilized world would justify—on a proper occasion—a protracted discussion of the topic which I have thus briefly and disjointedly brought to your attention. A new era is said to have commenced. The watchmen announce the dawn of a political millennium; and glorious things are spoken of the approaching reign of popular opinion, and the triumph of popular rights. To every philanthropist, skepticism on this subject must be exceedingly painful. But I have yet to learn that the voice of the people, however loud and unanimous, can make and alter truth, or change the nature of man or of the obligations and responsibilities which his Maker has imposed on him. Notwithstanding the popular suffrage and the decrees of the church, in the seventeenth century, and their controlling effect on the professions and conduct of Galileo—the sun did not then revolve round the earth: But at an earlier date, his light was withdrawn from the acting of a tragedy, which was clamorously demanded by ‘all the people.’”

---

8. *The Mother's Magazine*. Edited by Mrs. A. G. WHITTLESEY. Published monthly. Utica: William Williams. 1833. pp. 18. Price—\$1 a year, in advance.

We have long felt a lively interest in the object of this publication, and we cannot but rejoice that the proposition has at length been made, to publish a *Mother's Magazine*. None, we think, who understand the philosophy of human nature as to early impressions, or are acquainted with the biography of not a few who have been most eminent for personal excellence and public usefulness, will doubt the propriety, or wisdom, or importance of such a periodical. We sincerely hope and ardently desire, that the many gifted, virtuous, and pious ladies of our country, will turn their attention to the objects contemplated in the Magazine, and by their contributions to its pages, make it as rich and valuable as possible; nor, if they do, can we doubt the success of the work. From the assurances given, and from some acquaintance with the Editor, we cannot doubt that, so far as she is concerned, it will be well sustained and ably conducted. It opens with a Prospectus over a signature well known to the reading part of the community, especially

those who turn their eye to "the poet's corner," and who there, after having been gratified and delighted through a number of stanzas, have so often come to—L. H. S.

A single article from the January number, with which the work commences, expresses so perfectly our own views and feelings, that we cannot but insert it.

"To the Editor of the Mother's Magazine.

"It is, with me, a matter of unspeakable surprise, that the field of usefulness, which you are beginning to cultivate, has so long remained untouched. For every thing else, we have our magazines. Even the raising of cattle and corn, is deemed of sufficient moment to call for periodicals devoted to those interests. Is the training of immortal beings a minor object? Yet the mother, with a train of responsibilities upon her, which stretch over the vastness of eternity, has been supposed, it would seem, to need no such assistance.

"In my opinion, your first and last difficulty will be to awaken a sense of maternal responsibility. Without this, nothing can be done. To every mother is given, in solemn charge, the disposal of *intelligence* and *immortality*. She, beyond any and every other acting cause, stamps its enduring characteristics, upon the mind and heart of her child. Is this a trivial responsibility? In my apprehension, it needs a prudence and wisdom, such as few mothers have. It is an art, not inherited, not innate, attainable only by diligent research. To govern her child, a mother should know well the principles of the infant mind. Especially should she understand the science of its affections and passions. It is an instrument of inconceivable delicacy; easily unstrung, broken, and ruined. And yet to this task, deserving the utmost preparation, many a mother comes utterly untutored. Were she going to set up for a milliner, for *that* she must have served a due apprenticeship. But the mere training of her offspring, on which hangs the issues of two worlds, *that* any body can do, and do without the trouble of preparation. In my apprehension, months and years of study and attention, should precede the entrance upon a station so full of responsibility. But can mothers be made to feel this responsibility? It will be a new era in the history of our race, when they are thus aroused. But really it is painful to contemplate the inconsistency of so many, who are practising this consummate ignorance upon many hundred thousands of the rising generation. Go abroad in this city; see what multitudes of embryo immortals are germinating, like noxious weeds, amid the ignorance, and folly, and vice, under whose polluting guardianship they are thrown. Go over the length and breadth of our land, and every where, the evidence will stare you in the face, that a mother's magazine is greatly needed.

"We have generally considered, that the efforts of infant and Sabbath schools promised the greatest good to the rising generation, because they commenced so early. I would go back still further. I would begin with the mothers; for every body knows that the best directed labors of the Sabbath school avail but little, unless sustained by a mother's care at home. You will then be casting salt into the fountain, instead of the streams.

"I know of no better service that you can render your generation, than to arouse the attention of mothers. First get them to feel their responsibility, then they will try to qualify themselves for their station. I believe it to be a fact of nearly universal application, that a hundred fold more pains are taken to study economy, house-keeping, making puddings, and mending stockings, than is bestowed on what, after all, is the most material attribute of a mother—the talent to train up her children. I do not wonder that so many children are ruined. A quack may be expected to kill half his patients, and spoil the constitution of the rest.

"I hope your magazine will succeed. I think it must. Its importance is so manifest, that it must command patronage and attention. If it does not, I shall feel that the evil is even greater than I had feared, and is, in fact, incurable. Yours, sincerely,

H. P. O."

THE  
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. VI.

APRIL, 1833.

NO. 4.

---

---

COMMUNICATIONS.

PASTORAL ASSOCIATION.

[The following Resolution was adopted by the Pastoral Association, at their meeting in Boston, May, 1832—to wit:—]

“Deeply sensible of the necessity of continued and powerful revivals of religion, to sustain and replenish our churches, bless our country, and save the souls of men; acknowledging our unspeakable obligations to the Great Head of the Church, for the numerous revivals of the last year; and impressed with the importance, by a free and fraternal interchange of views, of making ourselves acquainted with the most effectual means of promoting revivals, and the best method of conducting them, and of giving a permanent influence to the Gospel of Christ:

“Therefore, resolved, That a committee of seven be appointed, to correspond with the ministerial associations in the state, on this interesting subject; obtain an expression of the views of ministers, and the results of their experience; embody a statement of the same, and cause it to be published, as soon as may be, in the Spirit of the Pilgrims, or in such other manner as they may think proper.”

[The following ministers were chosen, as the committee, namely, Rev. Dr. Woods, Rev. Dr. Beecher, Rev. Mr. Ide, Rev. Dr. Osgood, Rev. Mr. Fiske, Rev. Dr. Hyde, and Rev. Mr. Storrs. In pursuance of the above resolution of the Pastoral Association, the Committee proposed to each of the evangelical associations of ministers in Massachusetts, the following inquiries; soliciting returns as soon as might be convenient, viz.]

1. What recent Revivals of Religion have taken place within the limits of your Association?
2. What have been the characteristics and the fruits of those revivals?
3. By what means have they been promoted? What are the doctrines, and the mode of preaching, which have apparently been most successful?
4. What estimate have you been led to form of the utility of Protracted Meetings? And, in your opinion, how should they be conducted, and what cautions respecting them should be observed, in order to secure them against abuse, and render them most conducive to the interests of the church?

5. Are there any errors in doctrine, or irregularities in practice, against which, it appears to you specially important to guard the churches at the present day?

6. What, in your view, ought ministers and Christians to do, in order to secure the continuance and increase of the special operations of the Holy Spirit, and render the influence of the Gospel general and permanent?

[How many of the Associations have made returns, we do not know; but such as have not, we hope will make them without delay. In the mean time, we publish the following, just received from the Committee, to which we earnestly invite the attention of Ministers and Churches.]

---

REPORT OF THE SUFFOLK SOUTH ASSOCIATION.

---

I. REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

1. *What is a revival?* Every kind of excitement about things of a religious nature, is not entitled to the name of a revival. As animal and social beings, we are liable to be excited on any subject which may affect our interest, or happiness. We hear of military conflict and civil revolution. We see the community divided into parties about public men and measures, acts of legislation and candidates for office. And what should hinder that the great things, pertaining to God and eternity, should sometimes absorb the soul, and awaken intense feeling, while there is little sorrow for sin, or practical obedience? The people of Israel, on the bank of the Red Sea, made promises which their subsequent conduct did not well sustain; and when trembling at the foot of Sinai, they said, "All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do." There were many, who followed in the retinue of Christ, at one time wishing to proclaim him king, and at another, shouting hosanna to the Son of David, whose love was of a very doubtful character. If a concourse of people weep around the grave of a friend, why may they not weep when their own death, or some kindred topic, is urged in the discourse of the living preacher? The thronged assemblage, the shades of night, plaintive strains of music, solemn appeals to the passions, may contribute to such a result.

Nor is a special zeal about the visible forms and ordinances of religion, entitled to the name of a revival. Jehu boasted of his zeal for the Lord of hosts, when he exterminated the idolatrous house of Ahab, to render more secure his own seat on the throne of Israel. Saul of Tarsus, when a persecutor of the disciples, exhibited much zeal. Sectarians often exhibit a high

degree of zeal. Loud talk and violent measures about the external forms of religion, even a profuse liberality to support the dignity of the church, or to introduce a particular creed or mode of worship, give no decisive evidence of genuine love.

Nor is a multiplication of religious meetings entitled to the name of a revival. This appears well; but fair appearances, like the flowers of spring, often disappoint expectation. A disposition to attend religious meetings may be the result of education, or a temporary sympathy, or a selfish wish to merit heaven by works. For the same reasons, any disposition in a people to crowd into the visible church, and attend on its peculiar ordinances, is no satisfactory evidence of increasing piety. In all cases, we must inquire into the motives, and endeavor to trace out the moral temper of the heart.

The question returns:—What is a revival? It is a special visitation of the Holy Spirit in any place, giving efficacy to the word and ordinances of the Gospel, in the edification of saints and in the conversion of sinners,—so that public morals are reformed,—works of piety and benevolence are promoted,—God is honored,—and souls are stamped with a heavenly seal. This accords with the official work of the Spirit in the economy of human redemption,—teaching the ignorant, convincing the obdurate, consoling the humble, and sanctifying the penitent. Some of the ordinary features of a revival are such as these:

*A spirit of inquiry* is apparent among the people. Levity yields to reflection, and scenes of festivity and mirth to sober and rational pursuits. They read the Bible with more frequency and serious thought. They visit the sanctuary with more punctuality and reverence. They resort to the teachers of religion, to guide them in the ways of peace and truth. They no longer despise the catechism, the humble tract, and the place of social prayer. They contemplate God in his being and attributes, in his decrees and works. They contemplate their own soul in its nature and destiny, in its moral and ultimate prospects. They contemplate the interests and objects of the invisible world in their near approach and incomprehensible magnitude. The eye and the ear are open to the knowledge of truth, and the dormant powers of thought are excited to vigorous action. The great question is asked, What shall we do to be saved?

*A deep conviction of sin* is apparent among the people in a time of religious revival. Such conviction is indispensable, or the inquiry will not be urged respecting the possibility or terms

of salvation. And such conviction is the natural consequence of serious reflection. When the prodigal came to himself, he was impressed with his folly and guilt. Any people who come to a true knowledge of themselves, are constrained to confess the holiness of the law in their condemnation. It is of little importance what may be the incidental and immediate means of conviction, as the application of the law by the Spirit to the conscience and the heart, is always the primary cause. One is impressed with the fact that he is a lost sinner, in some hour of retirement; another, when in the great congregation;—one is suddenly overwhelmed, another is gradually impressed;—one suffers domestic bereavement, another is affected by the conversion or exhortation of a friend;—one is alarmed by the thunder of Sinai, another is subdued by the voice of mercy from Zion. They all agree in this, that they have offended a holy God, whom they were under the highest obligation to honor and serve. They all agree in this, that if they were treated on the principles of strict justice, their condemnation is sure. Hence,

*A penitential sorrow for sin* is another feature of a genuine revival. Some kind of regret is nearly inevitable. We possess an instinctive dread of suffering. The culprit, when detected and led away to punishment, cannot conceal his inward conflict of shame and remorse. Convicted sinners often struggle with their convictions, and endeavor to banish anxiety by hardening the heart. But in a genuine revival of religion, under the illuminating and convincing energy of the Spirit, there is much godly sorrow for sin. This consists, not in unavailing grief for the event itself, but in self-abasement and self-condemnation, in an honest acknowledgment of the holiness of the divine law and in a penitent confession of personal and aggravated guilt. The sincerity of this repentance is evinced in a reform of vicious habits, in a reparation of injuries, in a mutual confession of faults, and in a new devotion to God in works of piety and duty. The happy effects of such repentance are often apparent in the improved state of society, and command the notice of the transient observer. When controversies are adjusted and jealousies allayed,—when the proud become humble, the fraudulent honest, the intemperate sober, and the profane prayerful,—the change is visible. They, who cease to do evil, cannot fail to learn to do well.

*Habitual prayer* is another ordinary feature of a revival. Worldly men cast off fear and restrain prayer; but when the love of God is shed abroad in the heart, it is a spirit of grace

and supplication. Prayer is easy and grateful, and not a burden or a task. The closet is visited for communion with the Father of spirits. The family is daily assembled to read his word and unite in his worship. The erection of the domestic altar in prayerless families is often a striking indication of the progress of a revival. Little assemblages for prayer, as in the twilight of the morning and at other hours, are common and well attended. And the church on the Sabbath exhibits a new appearance in the greater number, solemnity, and deep attention of the people.

*A cordial trust in Christ* is another feature of a revival of religion. Evangelical views of his nature and offices are readily embraced by those who are thoroughly convinced of sin, and find themselves exposed to perdition. It is not found necessary to dwell with unusual frequency or special argumentation on his deity or atoning sacrifice. When these are presented in a plain and scriptural light, penitent inquirers readily repose unlimited confidence in him, and commit their souls to his divine care, as the Gentile converts did, in the days of the Apostles. They at once apprehend and joyfully embrace the scheme of salvation revealed in the Gospel. They see Christ to be the end of the law for righteousness to the believer,—its demands answered and its authority sustained; while the penitent, in himself condemned and lost, is freely pardoned. They behold with admiring gratitude, “the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” It is surprising, often, to see how easily persons, who were embarrassed by the prejudices of a false education, begin to adore and praise the Saviour, and find peace to their souls through faith in his vicarious sufferings and gracious intercession. They bow with devout reverence, and begin the celestial strain, “Unto him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion forever and ever.”

*Practical piety*, or a persevering obedience to the holy law of God, is the last feature of a religious revival, which will now be noticed. This is the test of character. “By their fruits ye shall know them.” From the abundance or overflowing of the heart, we speak and act. It is impossible that our affections and purposes should not appear in the visible habits and conduct of life. We may be hypocrites in particular instances, but a universal hypocrisy cannot be maintained. A character will be formed and exhibited. A great increase of practical piety, therefore, is a uniform feature of a true revival of religion. The name of God is spoken with reverence, his

dominion is acknowledged, his day is sanctified, his worship is observed, his word is read, and his precepts are obeyed. All works of charity, which tend to glorify God, or improve the condition of man, receive a new impulse. This obedience, which flows from a regenerate heart, is not fitful and temporary, but enlightened and persevering. The obligations of duty do not vary with time and circumstances, but are eternal as our intelligent nature and the moral government of God.

Such are some of the features of a revival of religion, in distinction from a temporary excitement of sympathy, or a simple attendance on the external forms of religion. If the subjects of such a work of grace are many, intelligent, and devout, while there is joy in heaven among the angels in view of their repentance, the church on earth should participate in the joy. The reality of such revivals of religion, both in ancient and modern times, is a matter of authentic and well attested history. We might as well deny political changes in the history of the world, as moral. With us, a frequent revival of religion is a matter of observation and experience. We see no valid objection to the thing itself. It is a needful work, and ought to be esteemed a precious blessing from the ascended Saviour. All valid objections, which were ever made to a revival of religion, rest not against the thing itself, which is the perfect work of the Spirit, but against some measures, or attendant circumstances, which wholly originate in human weakness, or folly. We should beware how we think, or speak lightly of the work of the Spirit, lest we incur the guilt of the unpardonable sin. And let us not ascribe to the work of the Spirit the imperfections of men. Religion has often been exposed to the contempt of the unbelieving, by the rashness, or folly, of its professed friends: and thus a stone of stumbling has unhappily been cast in the pathway of ruin. How cautious ought we to be, lest we deface the beauty of a divine work, by rendering the imperfect instrumentality of man too prominent.

A revival of religion is represented in the Bible under strong and glowing imagery. It is set forth by the return of spring, after the chills and tempests of winter,—by showers of rain, with attendant fruitfulness and plenty, after the prevalence of famine,—and by a resurrection to life, after being long subjected to the power of death. It is represented that under the Messiah's reign, human diseases will be removed, and long life be a general blessing,—that brute animals will lose their savage nature,—and that peace and abundance will be universal.

2. *Have any recent revivals taken place within this As-*

sociation? This Association embraces ten churches, five in the city of Boston, and five in its southern vicinage. Seven of these have been organized within a few years. Our history is chiefly limited to a short period. Heavy pecuniary sacrifices, and the alienation of friends excepted, it has been a time of signal prosperity and mercy. To leave the churches and altars where our fathers worshipped,—to relinquish our just claims to ecclesiastical funds, and to be at the expense of erecting new buildings for our accommodation in the service of God, are oppressive trials, which can be best appreciated by experience. A conscious sense of fidelity to Christ, and some tokens of his approbation are a present reward.

The Park Street Church continues destitute of a Pastor,\* and a history of the gracious work of the Spirit within its limits cannot now be presented. It has been highly distinguished for enterprise and liberality. And such has been the increase of its number, that while it has sent out little colonies to assist in the establishment of five or six other churches, it still enumerates more than four hundred members.

The Union Church has been highly favored by the Head of the Church. A spirit of harmony and prayer has been nearly uninterrupted. Two or three periods of reviving have been distinctly marked. It has been instrumental in introducing the two revivals with which the city has been favored in the last ten years. As its beloved pastor is exhausted with his labors, a particular notice of the measures adopted and the various success attending them cannot now be given. It contains more than four hundred members.

The Pine Street and South Boston Churches have been established within a few years, and are regularly advancing in number and strength. They shared in the blessings of the late revival in 1831, and give fair promise of enlargement and usefulness. Each of them has about one hundred and fifty members.

The Mariners' Church was lately established for the special benefit of those, "who go down to the sea in ships, that do business in great waters." It is well attended on the Sabbath, and exerts a salutary influence on the moral habits and general character of seamen. As a light-house on the border of the ocean, we trust it will guide many mariners on the perilous voyage of life to the haven of final rest. Bibles and tracts are distributed. Some instances of hopeful conversion have occurred.

\* The Rev. J. H. Linsley has been installed pastor of the Park Street Church since this Report was written.

The evangelical churches in Brighton and Walpole have been organized within five years, consisting of individuals who withdrew from the Arminian or Unitarian Parishes in those towns. The pecuniary sacrifice was heavy. But they have been comforted and enlarged, beyond expectation. There is a favorable change in the moral habits of the adjacent population. The late revival, both in Brighton and Walpole, was a signal work of the Spirit. After much reflection and prayer, a series of meetings was held in each of these churches, on four successive days, for the ministration of the word and ordinances. Within the space of a few weeks, fifty in each of these societies exhibited evidences of deep repentance for sin and submission to God.

The Second Church in Needham is one of the few in this Association, which have come down from the days of the fathers, without convulsion, or contamination. Its retirement may have favored its purity. It has received moderate accessions from time to time. In the autumn of the last year, there was a special seriousness among the young people, and twenty have united themselves to the church in a public profession of repentance and faith.

The South Church in Dedham was apparently weakened, but actually strengthened, by the secession of those who could not bear sound doctrine. A small Universalist Society was established. The church has since been more harmonious and efficient. It was blessed with a special revival during the last winter, when fifty, in a judgment of charity, were brought to a cordial reconciliation with God,—thirty of whom are now visible members of the church.

The First Church in Dedham, is the only one which remains to be noticed. This ancient church has shared largely in the public sympathy. It was established in 1638, and was the fourteenth, in the order of time, among the churches of the Pilgrims, after their landing on the rock at Plymouth. Its five Pastors, whose ministry embraces a period of one hundred and sixty-six years, were able and godly men, who lived and died within its bosom. Its sixth is now the President of Middlebury College, Vt. It shared in the early dew of divine grace on the plantations of New England, and especially in the memorable revival of 1742. There have been times of merciful visitation within a few years, as in 1821, 1827, and 1831, in which about two hundred persons, on a profession of their repentance and faith, were admitted to the church.

3. *Characteristics and fruits of these revivals.* In the short space of five years, one thousand individuals in this small

Association, have been admitted to the churches, giving credible evidence of personal piety. These were mostly recent converts. A large proportion of them were under twenty-five years of age; and thus a pledge is secured, that the influence of the Gospel will be extended down to the next generation.

“The fruits of the Spirit are love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.” These graces and virtues of the Christian character, so far as we are aware, are illustrated, in some good degree, in the life and conduct of the subjects of this work. Instances of apostasy are extremely rare. This might be presumed, as the revival was wholly a rational work, that is, in accordance with the principles of our nature and the dictates of common sense. There was no overwhelming excitement, no loud weeping, no exclamation, no fainting, or other physical derangement. The meetings were never protracted to a late hour in the evening, nor interrupted by any disorder. The spirits of the prophets were in subjection to the prophets. Women never expressed a wish to exhort or pray in public meetings.

A period of revival in any church was usually preceded by a spirit of prayer, by much self-examination, and by an increased attendance on the word and ordinances. The Bible, Sabbath, and sanctuary were more valued. The style of conversation among Christians was more spiritual and heavenly. Public preaching became more searching and faithful. The general deportment of the people was usually more thoughtful and sober. The slanders and cavils of infidelity were suspended. God drew near in majesty and grace, to revive his people and to subdue his enemies.

In most instances, the work has extended through several months, and in some through one or two years; but in small and compact societies, it has been chiefly limited to a few weeks.

Respecting the practical effects of these revivals, we are constrained to say, that they are genuine and salutary. Indeed, it is too late an age of the church, in which to speak of the work of the Spirit and the influence of the Gospel on man, by way of apology, or doubtful commendation. We witness a greater dread of sin, and a more holy reverence-toward God. Families, once worldly or profane, are daily assembled for prayer, and children are instructed in the first principles of divine truth. The reformation in respect to temperance extends with every revival. Works of charity are patronized. Contributions are immediately increased in amount. They who find the Bible a treasure, desire to give it to others; and they who have found the Saviour precious, wish to bring all men to see his excel-

lenc, and to taste his love. A healthful state of public morals and indications of general prosperity, follow in the train. Industry supplants idleness, justice excludes dishonesty, and a thrifty economy takes the place of a vicious waste. Nor have we been subjected in these churches, to the incidental evils of which we have heard or read in former years and other places; such as extreme listlessness after high excitement, rude assaults from opposers, or instances of fixed melancholy, of mental aberration, or of suicide. So far as we recollect, the adversary of souls has not been allowed to take advantage of human infirmity in such ways, and thus cast a reproach on the cause of Christ.

*4. Doctrines, style of preaching, and other means to promote revivals.*

The members of this Association agree in their views of religious doctrine. They are not given to sectarianism, or innovation. They cordially adhere to that system of truth, which has been set forth in the Catechisms and Confessions of the Protestant Churches, and which was taught by the Pilgrims of New England. They honestly believe in the total depravity of unregenerate man, and the consequent necessity of regeneration by the special agency of the Holy Spirit, and of a free forgiveness through the vicarious sufferings of a divine Saviour. They honestly believe that impenitent sinners deserve endless punishment, and need to be warned to flee from the wrath to come. Hence the perfection of the divine character and law, the eternal decrees of God respecting his created world, the apostasy of man, the deity, humanity, and expiatory death of Christ, the personality and official work of the Spirit, the nature and necessity of experimental religion, the salvation of the righteous and the perdition of the wicked, are subjects of frequent argument and solemn appeal.

The style of preaching is doctrinal rather than declamatory, and addressed to the understanding and conscience, rather than the passions. Men are considered as rational and voluntary beings, who need first to be instructed in duty and truth, and then to be admonished to cultivate affections and perform works correspondent to such instruction. Sermons are mostly written with care, and delivered with notes.

Other means employed are such as are usually approved for the purposes of religious instruction and impression. Such are the Sabbath School and the Bible Class, the distribution of Bibles and Tracts, personal conversation, pastoral visitation from house to house, meetings for Christian conference and prayer, and days of fasting and prayer in the churches. On

special occasions, we approve of meetings for devotional services, at an early hour in the morning; and when the state of religious feeling among a people will justify it, we recommend a weekly meeting for personal inquiry and conversation with all who are convinced of their danger and guilt as sinners. This last kind of meeting assists a pastor to be acquainted with the history of each mind at a most interesting period, and gives him an opportunity to answer questions, to resolve doubts, and to accommodate his counsels to the present state of each individual. A discreet and prayerful management of this meeting will try the pastor's wisdom and fidelity. Meetings of this kind are such as Baxter held with the families of his people at his own house, (he being unable to visit them,) during his most successful ministry at Kidderminster.

Whatever may be our care and perseverance in the application of means, we profess our entire dependence on the sovereign grace of God, and humbly cast ourselves before his throne in prayer. We say with the Apostle, (1 Cor. iii. 6, 7,) "I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase: so then neither is he that planteth any thing, neither is he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase."

Such is a notice of some of the recent revivals in this Association, with their characteristics and fruits, and the means employed to promote them.

## II. SPECIAL AND SUCCESSIVE MEETINGS.

Meetings for religious worship, held in succession for several days, are undoubtedly entitled to approbation. They are well suited to our social nature, and God has often set his seal to them; and when accompanied with humble and importunate prayer, with a plain and faithful exhibition of divine truth, and with a vigilant guard against the arts of human device, they may become eminently useful. They have been useful in our circle, to some extent, not on account of the presentation of new truths, but that the great truths of revelation, blessed in every age of the world to the conversion of souls, have been presented in a vivid manner and with longer continuance. This, we apprehend, is the true reason why a series of religious meetings has usually resulted in the hopeful conversion of many souls.

If this opinion be correct, it is easy to see how such meetings should be conducted. The state of the church, and the circumstances of the people should be accurately observed before the meeting is appointed,—a spirit of humble prayer should be cherished,—no dependence should be placed on eloquent preachers, but every eye should be directed to the sovereign grace of

God. Then let the truth be preached in a plain and faithful manner, and we may expect that the Holy Spirit will descend, and converts be multiplied.

The utility of a frequent repetition of these meetings is very doubtful. They exhaust the time and strength of ministers,—they promote a kind of religious gossiping,—they cherish habits of dissipated thought, periodical fervor, fastidious taste and undue confidence in means; while their novelty, which has added to their influence, must soon wear away. However it may be wise, after long intervals, to repeat them, they are not to be considered as the permanent means of salvation. It is the regular ministration of Christian ordinances by the stated Pastor, without the imposing grandeur, the parade, the bustle and excitement of public occasions, which God has appointed to nourish men to life eternal.

### III. ANY PREVAILING ERRORS IN DOCTRINE OR IRREGULARITIES IN PRACTICE.

It is well known that this portion of the church has been infected for many years with errors classed under the popular names of Unitarianism and Universalism. These still remain among us, but are no longer embraced by those who form a constituent part of our churches, and are therefore comparatively harmless. Infidelity has made its appearance, and we fear that some young men in our congregations have been led away. But these are not all the errors of the present day. There are points advanced by men, who are esteemed orthodox, which have given us some alarm. The sentiments to which we allude, pertain principally to the moral character of man, the nature and evidence of vital religion, and the influences of the Holy Spirit in effecting regeneration. We have understood the Scriptures as representing man in his natural state totally depraved, possessing no holiness whatever, and nothing that can originate it. We have feared that in pressing human ability, this main difficulty has been overlooked, and an impression has been conveyed to common hearers, whether designed or not, that they are in every sense as competent to obey as they would have been if they had never fallen. Hence their deep depravity, in consequence of which they need the life-giving grace of the Spirit to sanctify and save them, is in a great measure hidden from their sight. As directly connected with this sentiment, sinners are urged to consecrate themselves immediately to God, a duty which we all readily admit, but the influence of the Spirit in producing this consecration, though seldom denied, and generally denominated special and sovereign, appears to be

represented as little more than that upholding and superintending providence by which we live and move and speak, or at most, as little more than a light held up to render truth more vivid and motives more powerful. Thus, the energy which quickens the soul, is attributed to the word of God, or to human agency in some form, more than to the power which raised Christ from the dead, and quickened the Ephesians who had been dead in trespasses and sins.

These erroneous views of depravity and of the agency of the Spirit in conversion, lead into an error respecting the nature of vital religion. Fearing to infringe on human liberty, and with an honest intention, no doubt, to throw all blame on the sinner, ministers tell men that they have full ability to serve God, while the absolute necessity of a special divine influence to move them, however admitted in speculation, is studiously kept out of sight in preaching. The natural consequence is, that they are led to believe, that if they resolve to serve God with such a heart as they have, and obtain any thing like peace of mind in religious duty, they are Christians. Hence the state of their hearts is overlooked, and a false standard of religion is established.

There are several practices, too, against which we think the churches should be cautioned. The temporary settlement, and frequent dismissal of ministers, we consider an evil. We have noticed, with much pain, the encroachments on the Sabbath by traffic, and by assemblages, political and literary, on Saturday evening, attended sometimes by the members of our churches. We have remarked that it is becoming common in some of our churches, to appoint "meetings for inquiry," where some general addresses are made without any personal conversation with individuals, and all who attend are reported as "anxious inquirers." "An inquirer," according to the settled usage of the churches, describes a person under pungent conviction for sin; but in such a case, it is applied to one who is willing to come into a mixed assemblage for religious counsel and exhortation. Hence it is not strange that many are reported as inquirers who were never seriously convinced of sin, and that among many nominal inquirers, few hopeful converts can be found, at the end of a year. We have had occasion to observe in other cases where persons were awakened and conversed with, that the address was of a quieting kind, and, instead of probing their wicked hearts deep, and urging them to make thorough work, and indulge no hope without a strict scrutiny, they were exhorted to look away from themselves, and engage at once in the Christian race, as heirs of glory.

Hasty admission to the church, particularly of young persons, is another practice attended with serious evils and promising little good.

Another irregular practice, which has obtained to some extent in the churches, is an undervaluing the ordinance of Infant Baptism. Parents, instead of being urged to present their children in baptism as a duty, are simply reminded of it as a privilege which they may enjoy or neglect at pleasure. Some congregational ministers have even maintained that baptism administered in infancy might properly be repeated in adult years to satisfy the scruples of any, and so little is thought of the ordinance in some churches, that no record is kept of the names of those baptized, whether children or adults.

IV. THE PRESENT DUTY OF MINISTERS AND CHURCHES IN ORDER TO SECURE THE SPECIAL AND CONTINUED OPERATIONS OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, AND TO RENDER THE INFLUENCE OF THE GOSPEL GENERAL AND PERMANENT.

This topic of inquiry is so extensive in its nature that a definite answer cannot well be given. Our immediate duty may vary from day to day, and from hour to hour. All truth must be believed, and all duty performed. We must be in our appropriate places, and engaged in our appropriate works,—cultivating holy affections, embracing and defending correct principles,—pure in speech, beneficent and useful in action. In general, we must be like the one hundred and twenty holy men and women at Jerusalem, from the day of Christ's ascension to the Pentecost. We must understand the import of the promise respecting the Spirit, and believe in its sure accomplishment: we must be in a state of expectation, of faith and hope: we must feel our absolute dependence on spiritual aid for ourselves and others: we must dwell much on the greatness of the blessing, and the endless consequences of its being granted, or withheld, in respect to the salvation, or perdition, of immortal beings: we must be humble, sincere, and persevering in our prayers,—striving, like Jacob with the Angel of the Covenant, as if unwilling to be denied,—and yet placing unlimited trust in the sovereign wisdom and benevolence of God: and in all this, there must be concert and harmony,—we must often assemble together with one accord,—our prayers and alms must ascend up together, as a memorial before God: and we must continue in works of piety and acts of devotion, until the Spirit come down in his mighty power and rich grace, to convince and subdue, enlighten and console.

More particularly,—1. *We must acknowledge the personal honors and offices of the Spirit.* If we consider the Spirit

only a divine agency, or influence, we divest him of his personal dignity, deny his official honors, and neglect to ascribe to him the praise of his works. Wherever his being is concealed, or denied, and his official authority is rejected, the Spirit is dishonored, and may well show his disapprobation. Much in the same manner is he dishonored, where his personal agency is declared, or believed, to be unnecessary in the regeneration of sinners, or the sanctification of saints,—where it is thought there is no moral glory, and no sovereign grace, in forming vessels of wrath into vessels of mercy,—where no admiration is expressed, and no thanks are rendered, for such a work,—and much more, where it is made the subject of scandal, and is called enthusiasm, or melancholy. We confess ourselves alarmed, too, when good people, in their discourse and prayers, habitually contemplate the Spirit only as a divine influence, when public benedictions are often pronounced without any acknowledgment of his personality, and when such efficacy is ascribed to truth as applied by human reasoning and eloquence, as to render his blessed agency needless:—we confess ourselves alarmed, lest he should leave ministers to their self-sufficiency, and the churches to their pride, sinners unconvinced, and believers unedified, until our Zion become as mount Gilboa, on which there was neither rain nor dew. In coming to God in any act of worship, we must believe that he is, and that he will regard our humble attempts to serve him; so in seeking to obtain the blessings of the Spirit, we must first acknowledge his deity and personality, and then his powerful and gracious work in the accomplishment of man's redemption.

2. *We must cultivate a filial sense of dependence, which will dispose us to seek to the Spirit for guidance and blessing.* If the Bible had been silent, it might be presumed, that we should learn our dependence, by the results of our own experience. If we do not feel the need, shall we seek for superior aid? If we are wise and strong, shall we implore wisdom and strength? And will our Teacher be satisfied, when we care not for his instructions? Will our Guide accompany us, when we are indifferent to his attendance? Will the Comforter be pleased, when we disclaim any want of his consolation? If then we desire the Spirit to dwell with us, to illumine our path, to console our hearts and to succeed our labors, we must cultivate an habitual sense of our dependence.

3. *We must not grieve, or resist, the Spirit by false principles or depraved habits, by unbelief or hardness of heart.* We must be holy and blameless. We must wash our hands in innocence, search our habitations for the accursed

thing, and institute a rigid discipline in the churches. The work of preparation must doubtless begin in those, who are the subjects of his gracious strivings, before it can be expected to extend to the infidel and the obdurate. The general diffusion of correct knowledge, and a thorough reform in the external habits of a people, must surely be considered as favorable indications of a work of mercy upon the heart, which shall prepare its subjects to share in the holy services and joys of heaven. Without some such preparation in removing things offensive and in correcting things false, it would not usually be consistent for the Spirit to visit any people, as they would not welcome his approach, nor honor his official work.

4. *We must give more prominence to the cross of Christ in the ministrations of the pulpit, and in the labors of the Christian press.* The experiment has been tried. Neither philosophy, nor the science of morality has any such power to move the human soul, as the simple narrative of the great Immanuel's death, and the momentous facts which it involves. The Gospel is a most efficient instrument to civilize barbarous nations, to refine vulgar manners, to reform licentious habits, to elevate gross minds, to subdue depraved passions, to break hard hearts, and to improve the whole condition of human society.

We must exhibit the adorable attributes of Christ, his offices and works, and his claims to our worship, obedience and trust. We must dwell on his condescension and love, his almighty power and exalted reign.

As the types of the Jewish dispensation, and the writings of the prophets centre in Christ, so must the ministrations of the Christian sanctuary, do him honor. As the Spirit takes of the things of Christ, and shows them to men; so these must be the burden of our ministry, or our efforts will not coincide with the official work of the Spirit, and will therefore be ineffectual to the conversion and salvation of sinners. He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, and through faith in his name the penitent may share in all the blessings of his kingdom.

5. *We must be much in prayer for this richest gift of our exalted Saviour.* This is inculcated for two reasons:—The one is, that prayer puts us into a state of mind to receive and improve the blessing,—turning our eye to God, and impressing us with a sense of dependence and unworthiness,—abasing our pride, and inspiring with humility. The other reason is, that prayer is the instituted condition on which the blessing is offered. “Ask that ye may receive.” “If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit

to them that ask him." We can have no reasonable expectation of such blessings, without humble and penitential, frequent and persevering prayers. A fitful, transient devotion, perhaps never introduces a revival. It must be a pure and steady flame, —the effectual, fervent prayer of the righteous, which availeth much. In this, concert is very desirable and promising. "If two of you shall agree on earth, as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father, which is in heaven." If a fourth, or a tenth part of a church in any place, should be cordially united in this concert, with what strength of hope, might they plead the fulfilment of the promise.

Finally, *We must persevere in a diligent application of the ordinary means of instruction and grace, which have been divinely instituted and approved.* This part of our duty might have been named first. Its importance and obligation cannot be overrated. Miracles are suspended, as the Christian dispensation is fully introduced. We are endued with intellectual and voluntary powers, and are the proper subjects of a moral government. Obedience requires industrious and persevering action. Success or reward, whether in this world or another, is made to depend on our own efforts. As the husbandman does not expect to gather a harvest, where he has not cultivated the soil and sown the good seed; so parents or ministers may in vain expect to witness the fruits of the Spirit amid ignorance, and error, and vice.

Instruction and example are the great means of moral power, which will here be noticed. Holy truth and holy living must be the instruments to renovate the world. These embrace the whole system of education, the visible ordinances of religion, and a practical illustration of Christian precepts in life and conduct.

Instruction should begin at an early period of our rational existence. If children are devoted to God when eight days old, as was so sacredly required under the former dispensation, and made the subjects of daily prayer; it will be found that a moral discipline may be early established, and that moral impressions may be made long before they understand the import of words. The infant, primary, and Sabbath schools will next claim attention. To these must be added the selection of little books, catechizing, the worship of the family in accomodation to their capacity, the observance of the Sabbath, the reading of the Bible, the choice of their company and the like. With adults, public preaching is entitled to that high rank, which God has given it. In accordance with this design, the weekly Sabbath was ordained, and the church instituted. Personal

conversation, intelligent and persuasive, may have the next place. The distribution of Bibles, religious books and tracts, and the writing of affectionate and faithful letters among kindred and friends, are not to be forgotten.

Holy living is the other great means of moral power. Precept will avail little without a correspondent example. We regard the actions more than the speech of men. Hence, holy living is a grand and necessary means in the conversion of the world. To reform others, we must begin with ourselves. To introduce a revival of religion, we must show its gracious and powerful influence already commenced in our own affections and conduct. To bring down the blessing of the Spirit upon our friends or the community, we must possess them ourselves, and illustrate their value.

As a universal fact, if we desire to secure spiritual blessings, we must persevere in a diligent application of the means of instruction and grace, divinely ordained and approved. "In the morning sow thy seed, and in the evening withhold not thine hand; for thou knowest not whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good." Let us not look with solicitude at the passing clouds, or be appalled by the stupidity and errors of the times. God has spoken, and we must obey. He will not bless our indolence or wilful neglect of duty. The means are ours to employ, the sovereign blessing is his to bestow. And has he not said, "Bring ye all the tithes into the store-house, that there may be meat in mine house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it."

If Christians of the present age wish to do much to perpetuate the influence of the Gospel, and introduce the millennial state of the church, they may take the glass of prophecy, look down the tract of future centuries, and dwell on the unfolding mysteries of Providence and the increasing glory of the Messiah's kingdom, until their hearts kindle with a new flame. They must then set to themselves a higher standard, aspire to greater holiness, and exercise more self-denial, courage and enterprise. They must have more of the zeal of the Apostles, the fortitude of the martyrs, and the liberal charity of the primitive believers. They must not retire into obscurity, but be willing to sacrifice private feeling to public interest. They must not live for themselves, but live for the world. They must preach and pray, write and act for the benefit of all future generations. How noble the design, how exalted the motive, how sublime the prospect!

The whole system of education, from the primary school to the University, must be divested of its worldly character, and must have a constant bearing on the moral interests and immortal prospects of men. The periodical press must no longer be desecrated to the diffusion of error and vice, but its mighty energy subserve the cause of useful knowledge and genuine piety. The pulpit must send forth a louder sound, and the light of divine truth be made to flash with more vivid and convincing power on the public mind. Every church must be enlarged, and every waste place must be built up. Every missionary station must be extended, and these radiant points in pagan lands must be greatly multiplied. Revivals must be more frequent, pure, and extensive.

The benevolent institutions of this age are, without dispute, destined to enlargement and perpetuity. The translation of the Bible will go on: the press will continue its operation: schools will be established: the living preacher will visit islands and districts of country, now unknown to Christian nations.

When the hearts of the fathers are turned to their children,—when holiness to the Lord is inscribed on the possessions and pursuits of his visible people,—when the means of divine knowledge become universal,—when incense and a pure offering begin to ascend from every family and tribe of the earth,—then we may expect that the Sun of Righteousness will shine upon the nations with brighter beams, and the showers of divine grace descend in richer abundance. Then will war, and violence, and oppression cease,—the calamities, which one generation entails on another, will be greatly abated, and the ordinary occasions of poverty, sickness, and premature death be removed. The fabric of paganism will be demolished, the errors of a nominal Christianity be corrected, and the temptations to vice be done away. All our children will be taught of God, and adopted, as sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. And the voice in heaven will be heard, saying, “The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign forever and ever.”

---

## INFIDELITY IN THE UNITED STATES.

It is a fact, with which some of our readers may be acquainted, that there exist in the United States two distinct classes of Infidels; one comprising the followers of Thomas Paine, the other, those of Robert Owen. Of each of these classes, it will be the object of this paper to give some brief account.

1. *The Paine class.*

The opinions of this extensive class of Infidels may be best expressed in Paine's own words:—"I believe," says he, "in one God, and no more; and I hope for happiness beyond this life. I believe in the equality of man, and I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy, and endeavoring to make our fellow-creatures happy. I do not believe in the creed professed by the Jewish Church, by the Roman Church, by the Greek Church, by the Turkish Church, by the Protestant Church, nor by any Church that I know of. My own mind is my own church."—"Each of these churches shows certain books which they call Revelation, or the word of God. The Jews say, that their word of God was given to Moses by God, face to face: the Christians, that their word of God came by divine inspiration: and the Turks, that their word of God was brought by an Angel from Heaven. Each of these churches accuses the others of unbelief; and for my own part, I disbelieve them all."—"The *creation of the world* is the word of God, and the only word which he could give."

Paine pretends, however, that he would not treat with even the slightest disrespect the real character of Jesus Christ. "He was," says he, "a virtuous and an amiable man; the morality which he preached and practised was of the most benevolent kind; and though similar systems of morality had been preached by Confucius, and by some of the Greek Philosophers many years before, [and has been] by the Quakers since, and by many good men in all ages, it has not been exceeded by any."

According to Paine's distinct acknowledgement, Christ was not the author of—what he [Paine] calls—the "lies" that are told in the New Testament about his birth, incarnation, miracles, and ascension; but was the teacher of many very important truths; such as the probability that the soul is immortal, and that the future state will be one of just retribution; and the great importance of correct moral demeanor in this life, for the attainment of pure joy in the next.

Such, in general, were Paine's sentiments and opinions, and the single mad purpose of his life, besides serving himself, was, to oppose Christianity. As was the leader, such too are his fol-

lowers ; and such, with some slight modifications, more or less, to suit particular individuals, are the principles of this class of Infidels, throughout the country.

2. *The Owen class.*

The father of the second class of American Infidels is Robert Owen, for many years a highly respectable Scotch manufacturer. Of Mr. Owen, as he appeared fifteen years ago, a reviewer of his system in Blackwood's Magazine, thus speaks : "We have great respect for the man, inasmuch as he exhibits no ordinary intellectual power, and is always distinguished by an amiable moral spirit." The Edinburgh Review, also, declares "that it is impossible to contemplate his distinguished labors and perfect benevolence, without feeling personally attached to this amiable enthusiast." "He is, unquestionably," says the Christian Observer, of London, "a man of much finesse, prudence, and caution, kind and affectionate in his feelings, and, withal, a most excellent disciplinarian."

Such was the notice he attracted in the commencement of his career, and the community in general were evidently impressed in his favor. Undoubtedly, we ought, however, to ascribe his success in Britain, to his superior talents for the government of dependants, rather than to the feasibility and excellence of his system. The opinion that he possesses an extensive reach of mind, especially on the subject of Political Economy, which, more than almost any other, requires capaciousness of intellect and patience of investigation, is refuted abundantly by his Utopian schemes and chimerical theories.

In the year 1812, Mr. Owen became connected with the mills of New Lanark, Scotland, the proprietors of which resided in London, and were religious men. He soon published a work, entitled "A New View of Society, or Essays on the formation of human character, preparatory to the developement of a plan for gradually ameliorating the condition of mankind ;" succeeding which were several others ; as, "Observations on the Effects of the Manufacturing System," two "Memorials in behalf of the Working Classes, presented to the Governments of Europe and America," three Political Tracts, and various printed Speeches. In his tracts, he advocates the division of the community into parallelograms, the possession of property in common, and some other principles which will be noticed in the sequel. These doctrines had been advocated before by Spinoza, Hobbes, Godwin, and the author of "The Loves of the Triangles ;" but now they were embodied and presented together, to a community, too, than which no one was ever better prepared by the distresses of poverty, and the vexations of com-

mercial laws, to receive such a concentrated mass of folly. Accordingly, they were welcomed. And, considering the artful adaptation of his scheme to the feelings of a restive populace, and the caution by which its objectionable features were concealed from observation, we are not at all surprised that the name of Owen now became celebrated; and that a spirit of inquiry into the merits of his system was extensively awakened throughout England and Scotland. Pretending to have carried his plans into execution in the establishment at New Lanark, and the excellent discipline and cheerful obedience prevailing in that establishment being proverbial, he was hailed as a benefactor, and the popular acclamation was decidedly in his favor. Hence, in 1819, an attempt was made in Parliament to appoint a Committee for the investigation of his plans, with a view to their general introduction.

Some, however, saw through the false glare of his pretensions. The *Christian Observer* of 1817 had reviewed his system, and fully shown that it was an attempt, however adroitly concealed from the public, to undermine the Church of Christ. Suspicions had been thus excited, and a state of watchfulness induced, which proved, in the hour of trial, an effectual barrier against any parliamentary resolve in favor of his schemes. In 1819, the *Observer* again noticed him, and proved that his New Lanark establishment owed all its symmetry and beauty of discipline, to Mr. Owen's personal character, and to the Christian religion, which, in opposition to his will, was required, by the London proprietors, to be taught with peculiar fidelity. In 1821, Mr. Owen's system was reviewed in *Blackwood's Magazine*, and the errors of his political economy candidly developed. Before this, also, his theories had been discussed in a most masterly manner, in 1819, by the *Edinburgh Reviewers*.

From these various expositions of his errors, the community, large assemblies of which had previously passed the most complimentary resolutions in his favor, and seven-tenths of which were, as Mr. Owen supposed, in heart with him, began now to look on his machinations with distrust. In 1823, he attempted, in violation of the injunctions of his proprietors, to discontinue the religious services at the Mills, and to introduce some portions of his own plan. At this unexpected intrusion, he was unanimously expelled from his office, as Superintendent. Now therefore, he emigrated to America.

Soon after his emigration, there was instituted, at New York, a "Society for establishing communities;" in pursuance of which, in 1824, a community, conducted on Infidel principles, and consisting of about fifty individuals, including fifteen heads

of families, removed to Jackson River ; where, having purchased about 1300 acres of land, they attempted to reduce to practice some of Mr. Owen's theories. In the same year, a similar community was established at Vashoba, in the western district of Tennessee ; and, in 1825, at New Harmony, Posey County, Indiana. In 1828, the Infidels commenced at New York, the publication of the *Free Inquirer* ; and, at the expiration of four years from that time, they employed in their service twenty different periodicals. They commenced, too, the publication of cheap popular Tracts, in the circulation of which, they displayed a zeal and perseverance which may well excite Christians to imitation in a better cause. They re-published, also, and industriously circulated, Paine's *Theological Works*, Volney's *Ruins*, *The Elements of Modern Materialism*, and the revolting productions of Sir Richard Carlisle. They instituted courses of public lectures and debates ; appointed itinerating lecturers, and, in some of our large cities, held regular meetings on the Sabbath. In the Hall of Science in New York, they assembled three times every Lord's day ; attended in the morning to a chemical lecture, in the afternoon to one on anatomy or physiology, and in the evening to a phillipic against the Christian religion. There have been seen sometimes at a lecture of some popular Infidel at New York, 2000 hearers. Infidel clubs have been regularly formed in more than forty of our towns and cities,—they have been attended by from fifty to two or three hundred individuals, and been the scene of much profane debate and blasphemous mirth.

After this brief sketch of the history, we will now briefly state some of the principles of the New School of Infidels.

(1.) They believe that we have no evidence of the existence of God. With them, the testimony of our external senses, and our internal sense, or consciousness, are the only source of knowledge. Consequently, whatever lies without the jurisdiction of sight, smell, taste, hearing, feeling, and consciousness, lies without the pale of our inquiry. As rational beings, therefore, we are compelled, according to them, to confine our attention to the developement of natural laws, by chemical, astronomical, and such like investigations. To extend a thought beyond this earth, is to enter a region of mysticism and never-ending doubt. What can we say of the origin of the Universe ? We are conscious of nothing. Send out the five senses on ever so vigorous a chase after information ; we can taste nothing, hear nothing, see nothing, smell nothing, and touch nothing. Of course, we can know nothing. We give up the track, and although we may *dream* that the Universe was created, or is

eternal, or the result of chance, we cannot, in our *wakeful* moments, predicate any thing respecting it.

The system, then, of this Infidel School is not *Atheism*, but *Skepticism*; not the denial of the existence of God, but the denial of our knowledge of his existence. "We may, indeed," remarks one of the school, "safely assert that a being of attributes so contradictory as the Jewish Jehovah, or the Orthodox Deity of later times, cannot exist; but we can predicate nothing affirmatively, or negatively, regarding the existence of a thousand beings superior to man. Therefore," says he, "should it so happen, that there will be a judgment, and I be called to it, and should a Christian on that day rise up, and accuse me of Infidelity; I will say to my Judge in defence of my character, —I knew thee not on earth, for thou didst conceal thy existence from me. I thought not of thee, nor of this day of Judgment. I thought only of the earth and of my fellow mortals. The time, which others employed in imagining thine attributes, I spent in improving the talents thou hadst given me. I spoke of that which I knew; I never spoke of thee, for I knew thee not. To thee I appeal from this my accuser. And the Judge," he says, "will reply to him,—Thou hast well spoken—I placed thee on earth, not to dream of my being, but to enjoy thy own. Thou hast well done. I made thee a man, that thou mightest give and receive happiness among thy fellows, not that thou shouldest imagine the ways and wishes of gods. Even as thou condemnest not the worm, that has crawled beneath thy feet, because it knew thee not, so neither do I condemn thy worldly ignorance of me."

(2.) On the same principle of the origin of our ideas, the modern school of Infidels do not believe in the immateriality, or the future existence of the human soul. "*The immateriality of a soul!*—We know," say they, "nothing about it. It is, perhaps, possible, that there is a spiritual soul, and it is possible, on the contrary, that all our souls are, by the gradual incorporation of our food into our bodies, the very cabbages and cucumbers which we once ate. They may all be spindled in form, small in size, and black in color. Our mental operations furnish not an intimation to the contrary:—(and truly, as far as their Infidel Tracts are concerned, we should be in a quandary whether they were not right.) "We have, moreover, no media of proof, that we shall exist hereafter; and it is idle to distress our souls with dismal forebodings of future evil, and to amuse our imaginations with vagaries of a judgment, a heaven, and a hell."

(3.) This class of Infidels inculcate the necessity of human

actions, and our consequent freedom from a law distinctively moral. Some of them have cautiously evaded a decisive avowal of this doctrine. Yet Robert Owen, who may be justly considered the "*primus inter pares*" of the class, has fully declared it. He pronounces the notion that man can form his own character "a hydra of human calamity," "an immolation of every principle of rationality," a "monster which has hitherto effectually guarded every avenue that can lead to true benevolence and active kindness." As man is chained down by iron necessity to the influence of circumstance, the idea of desert, in Owen's opinion, is a chimera, and punishment for crime, a cruelty, outrageous as it is unnatural. Accordingly, it is his belief, that the whole penal code should be annulled, and a new combination of circumstances be instituted, which, in their operation on the wheels of the heart, will necessitate it to as strict and regular virtue as the clock exercises in its obedience to weights, and the action of the pendulum. He proposes, indeed, to form a moral railway, by which the necessity of punishment, as a propelling power, may be removed, and the mental carriage, by its own gravity, find that "*facilis descensus*"—*virtutis et boni!* He, of course, would join in the licentious exclamation of Godwin, "Give us liberty, but no constitution; for constitution and laws, no less than catechisms and creeds, tend to enslave men."

(4.) This class of Infidels hold the bald proposition, that utility is the criterion of virtue; the very fallacy which was introduced by Epicurus, and first corrupted the Greeks, and then the Romans, finding both comparatively virtuous, and leaving them treacherous and profligate. It is recorded of Fabricius, that when he heard this doctrine advocated at Pyrrhus' table, he wished that all the enemies of Rome would advocate the same. It is, however, with peculiar licentiousness advocated by the Infidels of New York, and is stated by one of their leading writers in the following terms:—"Every thing is virtuous, which promotes human happiness,—every thing vicious, which counteracts it." Has any one, then, a doubt relative to his duty? Let him only ask himself what will secure to him the greatest pleasure. The gratification of will, and the performance of duty are identical.

(5.) Another position advanced by our Infidels is, that commerce should be destroyed, and property be equalized among the whole community; that there should be no rich, no poor; but that all should labor in a common cause, deposit the results of their labor in a common store-house, and derive thence, according to their individual necessities, their articles of mainte-

nance. It is designed that the whole community be divided into districts, that the inhabitants of each district live together, as one family, protected by one government, feeding at one board, and thus breathing one spirit. This equalization of property is to be effected by a grand national auction, at which the various shares, into which the country is divided, shall be sold to the individual who will give the highest amount of labor. This is called Agrarianism, in allusion to the celebrated Roman law, originally proposed by Consul Spurius Cassius Vitellinus, and, after much altercation, enacted by Tiberius Gracchus; which distributed among the Roman citizens all the lands of their subjugated enemies. The plan is advocated by nearly all the Infidels,—though with regard to the *time* of executing it, there is—as might be expected—some little disagreement; some being clamorous for an immediate equalization; while others recommend a delay of—fifty or—a hundred years.

The reasons for this measure, are, *first*, that the right of individuals to monopoly of property, so far from an indefeasible right, is an infraction of a law of our natures, by which all men, as they have an equality of mental power and political privilege, should also have an equality of property: *secondly*, that an equal distribution, by removing the envy, vexations, and disappointments of competitors for wealth, and the frauds of oppression practised on the poor, will augment the sum of human happiness. The measure, of course, involves the destruction of commerce, which is, says R. Owen, “the bane of society.” So long as the laborer disposes of the product of his labor for money, which is the representative of wealth, in contradistinction from wealth itself, so long will a competition exist among different trades or communities, and this competition causes a diminution of prices, and this diminution of prices, pecuniary loss, and subsequently abject poverty. The competition will also cause the invention of labor-saving machinery, and thus overstock the markets, and by preventing the circulation of true wealth, stagnate business. As the country daily increases, so does this competition, and the disproportion between the agricultural and manufacturing articles, so that we shall soon arrive at the deplorable state in which the British manufacturers now groan away the day, and weep out the night. But on the paradoxical theory of Sismondi that wealth is poverty: or, in Owen’s language, that “when a community is, to a certain extent, over-supplied with the necessaries of life, they know not how to prevent their members starving for want of these necessaries; the only remedy for national poverty, is the Agrarianism, and community system of the Infidel school.

(6.) Another principle of the Infidels, based on similar reasons with the preceding, is that of State Guardianship, or National Education. When the community is divided into districts for mutual labor, all the children in each district should be supported by the state, not by the parent, should be taken from the parent's care at the age of two years or under, and educated at a public school, which in its various compartments, shall receive children of all ages. This school should be supported by a tax upon each parent, of a prescribed sum for each child; by the manual labor of such scholars as are sufficiently advanced to wield a mechanical or agricultural instrument; and, under the present contracted system of government, by a tax on property. By such a system of universal education, as by a levelling iron, all inequalities in society will be removed; the rough places be made smooth; the crooked, straight; the low, exalted; and, what is more gratifying, the high, depressed. The whole system of favoriteism will be abolished: the father will lose his silly fondness for his child, which is all artificial and pernicious; and that philosophical indifference between the mother and her offspring, which prevails so happily among the old and experienced catamounts, wolves, and tigers, will also be extended to men, and we shall be filled with a liberal, diffusive, and impartial benevolence.

In addition to these principles, the Infidels suppose that our laws, instead of being buried under the rubbish of an obscure, intricate phraseology, should be newly written—brought out into clear space and full light; that our whole banking system should be abolished, and our learned professions discountenanced; that every mark, indeed, of distinction, between high and low, rich and poor, be effaced. They not only contend with vehemence against the monopoly of property, but also against the monopoly of wives; denouncing, with rancour, the existing customs of society in relation to the institution of marriage, and complaining of the law on that subject, as if contrary to the nature of man and the welfare of nations. It is true, they contend against many usurpations of the rich, and many practices of society, which all acknowledge are not right. But their objections against immoral and corrupting pursuits, are based on premises equally baneful; nor do they oppose even the lottery system, without discovering the principle of their opposition to be a mere corrosive envy of all who are above them, and a correspondent restive spirit of resistance to whatever is sanctioned by authority. Actuated by so fell a purpose, they wantonly and indiscriminately condemn the various efforts of Christians to meliorate the condition of man, by the establishment of lite-

rary institutions, by the study of classical authors, and by all Sabbath schools, Bible and Tract Associations. They blacken with scandal the character of John Quincy Adams, for his respectful mention of the Scriptures in one of his addresses; heap encomiums on the Quakers, for their neglect of many divine institutions; give a fraternal embrace to Dr. Channing and his associates, for their attachment to spiritual inborn freedom; and a severe castigation to Washington Irving, for his—to them—unaccountable chasteness of sentiment; to Dr. Payson, for his heavenly-mindedness; and to Dr. Beecher, for his zeal in revivals. They denounce the influences of the Spirit as mere visions, and revivals of religion as “frenzied fits” and “hysteria.” The oppressions of the poor, and the miseries of society, they ascribe to the influence of religion; and, by their insidious representations, persuade not a few ignorant and unfortunate men that the Bible is the Pandora’s box of all disquietudes. Some of their Tracts are ingeniously adapted to fill the credulous minds of the populace with dark suspicions of a concerted union between the priests and the government. One of them contains several mock sermons, designed to inflame the rage of the American populace against Christianity, as subversive of true liberty, and even the principles of our Revolution. The text of the first sermon, is Rom. xiii. 1, 2; the doctrine deduced from which is, that God, in the language of Scripture, commands “every one to be subject to the higher powers, whatever may be the character of those powers; for “there is,” says the text, “no power but of God, and whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.” “Now ye have heard,” says the sermonizer, “that the nation of the Americans rebelled against the king whom God had ordained over them; and that certain men of Belial,—Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, and others with them, took counsel together, disobeying the Bible, and saying,—‘Who is this king, that we should hearken to his voice? We will not have this king to reign over us.’ And ye have heard, that in the day of battle, the wicked prevailed, and the anointed of the Lord (even King George) was discomfited before his enemies. And now ye know that their pride is waxed high, and their spirits are haughty within them. But be ye not like unto them. ‘Pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall.’ That ungodly nation—even the Americans—‘resisted the power;’ contrary to the command of the Bible, they ‘resisted the ordinance of God.’ ‘They shall receive to themselves damnation.’ God will bring them into judgment for every disloyal word they have said, and

for every rebel blow they have struck against his ordained Ruler. When Washington, and Jefferson, and Franklin, and the others with them, shall stand before the throne of judgment, then shall a voice from thence proclaim, 'I spake to you, and ye would not listen: I commanded, and ye would not obey: depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire.' Then shall they begin to say, 'Lord, when didst thou speak, and we did not listen? and when didst thou command, and we did not obey?' But he will answer and say unto them, 'Forasmuch as ye did it not unto him whom I had ordained to rule over you, ye did it not unto me.'" The preacher ends with a tender exhortation to obey our rulers, be they right or wrong; to consider their yoke God's yoke, and to bear it patiently, resist not evil of any kind, and, above all things, never fight for liberty, life, or honor.

The reader will easily perceive the manner in which a particular class of minds may be embittered against religion by covert representations so dishonest, and, to enlightened men, so shallow. In other parts of this Tract, an attempt is made to produce the same impression which Hume labored to produce,—an impression that Christianity is founded on faith, not on reason.

The *third* sermon is from the text—"Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat." The preacher exhorts his hearers, 'in obedience to the general current of Scripture, to beware of knowledge;' 'to submit not to investigation;' 'to be babes in Christ all their lives long;' 'not to do as Thomas did—insist on *evidence* before belief; for Thomas's faith, founded on evidence, received no credit; but, on the contrary, "blessed are they, who have not seen, and yet have believed."—He exhorts his hearers 'not to *inquire*—for "free inquiry" is infidelity;' 'not to dispute with Infidels, for "the children of this world are wiser than the children of light," and Infidels will, in debate, obtain the victory over Christians.' All these ironical prescriptions are in the peroration solemnly enforced by the most melting, and at the same time, terrible denunciations, of the wrath which the Scriptures denounce against the ungodly.

The Tracts of which we are speaking, twelve of which we have been doomed to handle, ungloved, are interspersed with malicious insinuations, not only against some of our most pious and orthodox ministers, but also against the great Head of the Church. The same is true of the periodicals. Although the Saviour is often admitted to be an "amiable philosopher and reformer, who dared to rebuke the vices of his age," "far too wise and too gentle to have conceived the scheme now attached

to his name ;” he is yet sometimes represented in the *Free Enquirer*, as “a miracle-monger,” “a magician,” “an encourager of intemperance,” as “wanting in filial affection,” and as “strolling about, afraid of being seen.” In consonance with such profligate ideas, the abettors of this new infidelity exhort every man to banish religious feeling altogether ; to look on the ground as he walks, and not to gaze on the stars, lest he plunge into an unseen morass, or tread on a hidden scorpion ; to “mind the earth, while he lives on the earth,” and defer the thought of heaven, until he sees that there is one. In short, there is nothing sacred, nothing honorable, nothing exalted, nothing useful, nothing delicate,—no, not decent even, which these “reformers’ do not dilapidate with indiscriminate ferocity ; and, had they arms as strong as their hearts are black, they would sweep, as with a Sirocco, through the whole length and breadth of our land,—every hall of political science, and every seat of legal justice, the crowded marts, the still retreats of home, the groves of the Academy, and the whole Garden of God.

Our readers have, doubtless, made their own reflections during the progress of our remarks. Particularly, they cannot but have noticed the resemblance which exists between infidelity and other systems of error. We do not deny that there are differences, for the engines of the great adversary must be adapted to the different objects which he attacks. Men of high intellectual character, must have a strongly intellectual system ; men of delicate sensibilities, a refined one ; men of coarser mould, and undisciplined mind, a system glaring with absurdities, and openly licentious. Still, the spirit of all is the same. Among the different races of men—the white, the yellow, and the black, all have the same general features of body, and the same sort of soul. We have often spoken of heresies which have been introduced into our community by the most dishonest concealment of their cardinal principles. It has been by the same process, that Owen and his disciples have endeavored, as long as possible, to secure the countenance of respectable citizens. They succeeded by it, at first, in gaining some ascendancy among the Working-men of New York, and for many months they identified, in popular estimation, their own infidel cause with the cause of a party which embraced in its folds many intelligent and pious individuals. We have often spoken of denominations, which claimed for themselves all that was enlightened and “liberal,” and even “rational,” and which denounced the system of truth as “narrow” and “exclusive.” But no one can read the infidel publications of the day, without seeing inscribed on them, too, “We are the men, and wisdom

will die with *us* ; there is no expansion of mind, save with those who have shaken off the trammels of religious bigotry, and have refused to wear the yoke which the Priesthood impose." Revivals of religion are the principal object of attack, at the present day, among the anti-evangelical Christians, and so they are also among Infidels ; and the men who are most frequently vilified in some of our sectarian publications, are the same, who, in the same manner, are vilified in the publications of the Skeptics. The moral influence, too, of infidelity, is of the same generic character with that of lax theology. The main-spring of the moral man is broken alike by both. Sanction is taken from law, and odiousness from sin ; true penitence is discouraged, and faith in the merits of another, is reprobated as "foolishness." We might point to a father in a neighboring state, whose four sons began to learn the ways of infidelity, and to forsake, at the same time, the path of sobriety and virtue, and who have now all commented on the character of their belief by an ignominious death. But we need no multiplication of instances, to prove that the atmosphere of a lazaretto will dry up the fountains of life. We simply request that every man of heretical tendencies, especially if he lays claim to superior intelligence, will reflect on the strong alliance there is between the most polished and the most revolting errors ; and that he will candidly consider whether that system must not be true, which arrays against itself all the vicious propensities and the wayward inclinations of men, and stands breasting a torrent of worldliness, vanity, and pride, and having done all this,—"stands."

---

REFLECTIONS ON THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF JUDAS.

In the annals of the church or of the world, there does not exist a name which occupies a blacker place on the page of infamy, than that of Judas. I need not be very particular in going over with his history. Every one knows that in an early part of our Lord's ministry he was called to be one of his disciples. Notwithstanding he was always a consummate hypocrite, and was under the complete dominion of covetousness, it does not appear that his sincerity was suspected by his fellow disciples, or that he was inferior to them in his preaching, or, in the main, in his apparent zeal for the honor of his Master.

On a certain occasion, when our Lord was at Bethany, Mary, a warmly-attached and devoted friend, came to him, and as an expression of her affectionate regard, poured a box of very precious ointment on his head, as he sat at meat. This was the very thing to waken the ruling passion of Judas; and, contriving to conceal his covetousness under the cloak of economy, he had the hardihood to ask that most unkind question, "To what purpose is this waste?" Such a question never could have proceeded from the lips of one who had not already the heart of a traitor; and this was the introduction to that memorable scene of perfidy and cruelty, which stamped him as the prince of traitors. Jesus, with his accustomed kindness, vindicated the woman against this vile insinuation of prodigality; and this wakened in the breast of Judas another passion, not less hateful than the other, viz. revenge; and under the influence of this, he was now quickly prepared for that desperate act which has brought upon his memory the curses of every succeeding age. Forthwith he went about plotting for his Master's death. With a heart kindling with revenge on the one hand, and with avarice on the other, he went to the chief priests and elders, literally set up his Lord for sale; and for thirty pieces of silver, actually bargained him into their hands. This done, he returned, and with abominable impudence, sat down at the table with the Master whom he had betrayed; and eat with him and his fellow disciples the passover, as if there were nothing in his heart but kindness and good will. But his Master had an eye that ran through that guise of friendship, and beheld the traitor; an eye that darted like a flame of fire into his inmost soul, and laid bare that whole plan, the execution of which, was to involve his own death. He at first, without designating the traitor, declared to his disciples the heart-rending fact, that one of them should betray him; and then, to relieve them from the distressing apprehensions which this intelligence occasioned, (each one, except Judas, fearing lest he was the individual referred to,) he pointed directly at the wretch who was to perpetrate the deed. Judas, yet more enraged by this discovery, went immediately to the chief priests, and procured from them a company of armed men, with a view to apprehend him. Jesus, mean while, well knowing what awaited him, had retired into a garden—a place, it would seem, to which he had often retired—for secret devotion; with a view to fortify himself, by communion with his Father, for the scenes which were just opening upon him. And there, in that retired and consecrated spot—in the hour of darkness, in the hour of prayer, in the hour of awful anguish, was he assaulted by a ruffian band,

with Judas at their head. The wretch dared to prostitute a token of affection as a signal for making the attack; and forthwith, when he had kissed his Master, the mob fell at their work, and seized him, as if he had been a thief or a robber. Jesus was carried off in fiend-like triumph, to be tried by the Jewish council; the result of which, as every one knows, was condemnation. And now the traitor, also, is having a trial—not before the Jewish Sanhedrim, but at a different and far more impartial tribunal—the bar of his own conscience. His trial, too, issues in condemnation; and the sentence is more than he can bear. Suddenly, away he flies, and in an agony of desperation, seeks relief by committing suicide;—*and we know something of him beyond that*: we may say of him, with confidence, what the Bible warrants us to say of no other human being, that he certainly went down to the abyss of despair—“to his own place.”

From the history of Judas we may derive many useful reflections.

1. We may learn *the mixed character of the visible church*. Judas, from the beginning, was a bad man. He came into the family of our Lord, from no other than mere selfish considerations. He never had a particle of love to the Saviour, or regard for his cause, otherwise than he may have supposed he could render it subservient to his own aggrandizement. Whether he always knew that he was capable of the malignant treachery of which he was finally guilty, or whether circumstances developed that in his character which surprized even himself, it is not easy to determine; but it is certain that he was always a hypocrite: probably there never was a moment, from the time that he came into the family of our Lord, that he was not ripe for any plot, however malignant, which promised to minister to his ruling passion.

Now what happened to the church when it consisted of only a few individuals, has been true of it in every stage of the progress of its enlargement: it has embosomed a greater or less amount of hypocrisy. There always have been, and we have reason to believe always will be, those joining themselves to the number of God's people, from mere worldly considerations; persons who could take into their hands the memorials of their Saviour's death, when they had a spirit which, if opportunity were given to it, would lead them to imbrue their hands in his blood. Though the omniscient Saviour knew, from the beginning, what was in the heart of Judas, yet, inasmuch as his external conduct, for aught that appears, was exemplary, he still suffered him to retain a place in his family. And though

a church may suspect that individuals in her communion are hollow-hearted, and have even the spirit of Judas, yet, unless that spirit comes out in visible and palpable actions, she has no right to exclude them from her privileges. If he who searches the heart, could tolerate in his church a Judas, while yet he did not openly transgress, most undoubtedly we, who have no other standard by which to judge than the external conduct, ought, while that remains unexceptionable, charitably to presume that it is in accordance with the feelings of the heart. It were wrong to tolerate gross sin in any professor of religion; and the church which does it, exposes herself to the displeasure of her Master; but it were as truly wrong to circulate evil reports, or indulge evil surmisings concerning those of whom charity may hope that they are in the main influenced by the temper of the Gospel.

But there is another and probably much larger class in the church, who must fall under the general name of hypocrites, who do not deliberately intend to practice deception, but are self-deceived. Some of these have come in by the urgent solicitations of friends, who, they imagine, can judge better of their duty than they can themselves. Others have mistaken the nature of the evidence of Christian character, and have supposed themselves Christians when they are not, in consequence of judging by a wrong standard. And others still have come in prematurely, bringing with them no better character than that of the stony ground hearers. In this way, the number of the self-deceived, no doubt, becomes very great; and it admits not of question, that when the church is in her purest state, she embosoms multitudes who are training up, amidst all her privileges, for perdition.

I know how natural a feeling of self-security is to those who have obtained a standing in the visible church; especially to those who know nothing of the power of religion. Insensible as they are to covenant vows and obligations, they do not forget that they have assumed them; thus enrolling themselves among the visible followers of Christ. They come regularly to the table of the Lord, to celebrate a distinctive Christian ordinance. They are associated with the people of God in those things which point directly to their peculiar character. They are acknowledged as Christians by the church, and, for aught they know, by the world; though the world are eagle-eyed to discern the evidence that they are professors, and nothing more. All these considerations conspire to keep them easy in the conviction, that their title to heaven is sure. There *are* cases in which professing Christians are manifestly converted, after they

have spent years of formality and impenitence in the church; but in the vast majority of cases, I doubt not, that he who enters the church a self-deceiver, continues so until he is startled by the frightful glare of everlasting burnings.

Here then is a most solemn admonition to those who profess to be the disciples of Christ, to rest on no sandy foundation. Does conscience sometimes suggest that all is not right within, and that you have not that heavenly mind which constitutes the qualification for heavenly glory? Beware how you stifle this impression by a recurrence to the fact, that you are a professor of religion. Rather yield to the impression that you *may* be deceived; and derive from it a new argument to do your utmost to make your calling and election sure. And, rely on it, when you have reached that point that you *can* resist such an impression, that you *can* fold your arms and compose yourself to a state of spiritual slumber merely on the ground that you are a professor, you have reached a point of appalling danger;—a point at which, if you remain long, you render it almost certain that you are self-deceived.

2. In the character of Judas we may contemplate *a degrading vice, putting on the garb of two estimable virtues*. The vice to which I refer was unbounded, insatiable avarice; the virtues were prudence and charity. When Mary anointed her Master, in token of her affectionate regard, Judas objected, not on the ground that he was himself indifferent to the honor of Jesus, but on the more plausible ground of his regard for the poor. "Wherefore," he asks, "is this waste?" and immediately suggests that the ointment should have been sold, and the avails of it applied to purposes of charity. But the truth was, Judas all this time had a heart of rock. He cared not for the poor, but would have ground them to the dust, if he might thereby have subserved his own covetous designs. Nevertheless, this furnished him a most convenient and plausible pretext for the indulgence of his ruling passion. If he could do this, and yet pass it off under the attractive names of economy and charity, he wanted nothing more.

Happy had it been for the church, if Judas had furnished the last example of this hypocritical spirit. But who does not know that even in our own day, when there is so much that is exciting to a spirit of Christian liberality, the claims of real charity are often set aside by some apology which is neither more consistent nor more honest than was the objection offered by Judas. No doubt it is the duty of every man first to provide for his own family; for inspiration hath declared that he who neglects to do this, "has denied the faith and is worse than an

infidel:" but who can be ignorant that this plea serves the purpose of multitudes who give away nothing, and yet hoard up their thousands? Go to them and present the cause of the widow and the orphan; or the cause of millions ready to perish for lack of the bread of life; and you are pointed instantly to a large and expensive family, as putting in requisition their best efforts for their support; and not improbably the difficulty of the times may be pleaded, and possibly, too, that most convenient, but unscriptural maxim, that "charity begins at home." In other cases, the utility or practicability of the object will be called in question, and other objects will be spoken of as having superior claims, when the melancholy fact is, that other applicants are treated in reference to those very objects in precisely the same manner. Now, I ask, whether this is not the very spirit which Judas manifested, when he objected to the offering which Mary made to her Master? He did not choose to state the real ground of his objection; for then his conduct would have received its proper name, and his character would have been seen in its real odiousness; but he put on the cloak of economy, and assumed the lying look of charity; and thus endeavored to pass off what was really odious for what was noble and praiseworthy. Let the reader judge whether in this very particular, there are not multitudes who really walk in the steps of Judas.

But this is by no means the only case in which vices the most odious and degrading choose to put on the angel form of virtues to which they have really not the least alliance. Who does not know that even in our own land, which boasts of its intelligence and its virtue, foul, deliberate murder often shields itself under the cloak of honor, and the murderer is suffered to go at large with impunity; nay, even boasting of his blood-stained laurels, when he ought to be imprisoned, and tried, and hung up between the heavens and the earth? Who does not know, that under the cover of zeal for the glory of God, there have been in every age scenes of fanaticism, scenes of cruelty, I may say, scenes of horror, which have sent religion and even humanity away to weep in secret places? And to speak of what is less gross and revolting, how common is it for the levities of a professed follower of Christ, which make the cause of his Master bleed at every pore, to be passed off under the name of good nature, and Christian cheerfulness; and how common, on the other hand, for a cold and gloomy and unsocial spirit to be identified with deep religious seriousness, and devotedness to Christ! In short, there is no error in human conduct that loves to assume the responsibility of standing forth before the world in

its naked deformity. There is a principle in human nature—I mean the moral sense—which does not leave men at their option whether to disapprove of vice or not, when it comes out without disguise; and the only way in which men can make themselves easy under their own vicious conduct, or preserve their characters from disgrace in view of the world, is to call it by some name which it does not deserve, and make themselves and others believe that the name is not mis-applied.

You see, then, the vast importance of calling things by their right names; for an error on this subject is sure to lead, in a greater or less degree, to self-deception. I exhort you to practise all the Christian virtues without a single exception: but take care that in every instance it is the genuine virtue, and not some vice that has stolen its garb, or assumed its name. Be charitable; but let not your charity be a mere ostentatious offering to your own self-complacency. Be prudent; but let not your prudence freeze up your heart, or clench your hand against the calls of benevolence. Be zealous; but let not your zeal be a destructive fire kindled by a spark from beneath, but a holy flame lighted from off the altar of God. Be cheerful; but take care that under that pretence you do not rush into the levities of the world. Be serious, and earnest, and devoted; but mistake not for these qualities any thing that is austere, or morose, or unsocial. In short, whatsoever things are lovely and praiseworthy, and of good report, not only think of, but practise; and be sure that you practise the very things, and not their counterfeits.

3. In the history of Judas, *we have an awful exemplification of the depravity of the heart.* There was in his conduct a complication of avarice, of hypocrisy, of treachery, of cruelty, which must forever render his character detestable in the eyes of every intelligent being. And what greatly aggravated his guilt was, the circumstance that all this was directed towards his benefactor and master; towards the most pure and benevolent being who ever visited this earth; and withal, towards Him who came to die that sinners might live. There are those who will have it that mankind are not all depraved, certainly not greatly depraved; but there are none, who have any respect for their own characters, who will attempt to set up a defence for Judas; who will not readily acknowledge, however it may be with others, that *he* was a monster of wickedness.

It cannot be denied, that Judas furnished an example of great and aggravated crime; and that he committed a sin which never has been committed in the same form by any other human being. Nevertheless, we are by no means warranted to

say or to believe, that Judas was the greatest sinner that ever walked this earth. If there are no others who have ever betrayed, or had the opportunity to betray the adorable person of Christ into the hands of the Jews, there are multitudes who have betrayed and still betray his cause, and who show clearly enough by their conduct, that if they could reach his person, that would not be secure. And, notwithstanding they have never had the privilege of seeing his face or enjoying his society, as Judas did, yet they have had, in some respects, greater privileges than he: they have the will of Christ revealed to them in his word; and they have his Spirit offered them for their illumination and guidance; and they may commune with him as really and as profitably, as if they had immediate access to his person. And who will venture to say, that when they, with all the obligations and vows of professed discipleship resting upon them, act in contempt of these vows and obligations, and deliberately stab the cause of Him to whom they have promised before earth and heaven to be devoted,—who, I ask, will venture to say, that in the eye of Heaven, they may not accumulate upon themselves as fearful a load of guilt, as did the man who betrayed his Lord in the garden with a kiss?

But there is something to be learned from this example which looks beyond individual cases of aggravated crime; something which respects human nature itself. The fair and obvious deduction from this history is, that the heart of man, of every man, is, by nature, desperately wicked. Do you ask whether this statement does not need to be qualified; whether it is possible that the amiable, the refined, the engaging, the tender hearted, previous to conversion, must fall under the awful censure of being entirely alienated from God, and of bearing upon them, to the eye of Omniscience, the marks of the curse? I answer, no qualification to this statement can be admitted: the doctrine is true, in all its length and breadth, that *that which is born of the flesh is flesh*; no matter how much it may be moulded and polished by education, until it is new created by the Holy Spirit, it has in itself the elements of an eternal death. It must always remain true that the carnal mind, let it be found wherever or in whomsoever it may, is enmity against God; is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.

If then you would form the most perfect idea of the depravity of the heart, I would not advise you to limit your views, or even to contemplate chiefly, those instances of daring and flagrant crime which outlaw their perpetrators from society, and for which the law demands either their liberty or their life;—no, I

would advise you to enter into your secret chambers, and commune with your own heart; and if you do this honestly, faithfully, and with an earnest desire to know the worst of your case, I venture to say, that the result will be a conviction that there is at least one heart which fully answers to the Bible description of human depravity. And if you have no such impression already, believe me, it is because you are a stranger to the business of self-communion. I have seen the man (and doubtless many of you have known similar instances) whose whole deportment had been amiable and unexceptionable, and who was strongly entrenched in a habit of self-righteousness, when he came under the awakening influences of the Holy Spirit, declaring that his iniquities pressed him down to the earth, and scarcely venturing to lift his eyes to heaven. I have seen such a man turn pale with horror in view of what he saw of his own heart, and declare with agonizing earnestness that the mercy of God could not cover such enormous guilt, and that he must inevitably sink down beneath it into the gulf of despair; when I knew that the time had been, that if he had been pressed with the necessity of regeneration, he would have doubted and cavilled, on the ground that he saw nothing in his own heart on which to predicate the necessity or the reality of such a change.

Does any one ask, if the awful crime of Judas in betraying his Lord was only the legitimate operation of that principle of depravity which reigns in every unrenewed heart, why then are not all men as bad as Judas? I answer, it is because they are subject to the restraining grace of God. Let the restraints which God in his providence imposes upon the depravity of the heart once be removed, and I care not how much of native amiableness there may have been, you will see the standard of rebellion against God lifted high, and the evil passions of the soul coming forth in the madness of rage and desperation. Yes, I venture to say, that that very man who contemptuously denies the doctrine of depravity as a libel upon human nature, and adduces his own experience as proof of it, has that in his heart, which, if it could pass under his eye, would completely cure him of his skepticism. And I am sure that the day will come when he *will* be cured of it; either by waking up to timely conviction and repentance, or by opening his eyes upon his ruin, when the case admits of no remedy, in the world of torment.

Where then is there hope for the sinner? I answer, in the sovereign influences of God's Holy Spirit, and no where else. If the spiritual malady under which man labors was less deep,—

if it had not its hold in the very seat of thought and feeling and action,—if it did not originate with man's existence, grow with his growth, and strengthen with his strength, why then, perhaps, some agency might be relied on for effecting a cure, short of that which is absolutely divine; but as it is, rely on it, unless *God works*, the sinner will never be saved. Ministers may preach ever so eloquently, and pray ever so fervently, and converse ever so faithfully; and experience proves—the Bible proves, that it will all be to no purpose, unless God put forth his almighty energy. The sinner must indeed work out his salvation; but God must work within him, both to will and to do.

4. The history of Judas strikingly shows *the strength of the besetting sin, or of the ruling passion*. In his case, as we have seen, the passion which prevailed above all others, was covetousness—the love of money: and to the operation of this, we may refer, either directly or indirectly, every action that is attributed to him. Wherefore was it that he objected to the affectionate expression of Mary towards her Lord, in pouring the ointment upon his head? It was that he wished the ointment to be sold, and to appropriate the avails of it in some way to himself. Wherefore was it that he formed the horrid purpose of betraying his Master; that he went to the Jews and covenanted with them to deliver him up; that he actually headed the murderous rabble that apprehended him in the garden, and led him off to the high priest's palace? Ah, it was the prospect of getting the thirty pieces of silver, that enchained his heart, and made the crime of murder appear to him as lighter than nothing. And when goaded by his conscience until he could sustain the anguish no longer, he went out and hanged himself;—this too was all to be referred to the love of money; for it was this that led him to the act which set conscience against him, until he was thrown into that state of desperation which made him choose strangling rather than life. In short, every thing that he did, every thing that he suffered, was to be traced to the operation of this ruling passion.

Nor is this a solitary or a peculiar case. What was the ruling passion of that wonderful man whose name was so lately a terror among the nations, and who was at last exiled to a far distant speck of land on the wide ocean? Undoubtedly, it was ambition—the glory of earthly conquest. Now if you read the history of his life, you will find that this passion came out every where, and in every thing. It was this that brought his wonderful powers into exercise in framing so many malignant plans for subjugating his fellow-men. It was this that made him re-

gardless of the rights of nations ; that made him fearless of all personal danger ; that made his eye rest with delight on burning cities ; and made the groans of the dying fall like music upon his ear ; and enable him to forget, amid the danger of arms and the shouts of victory, that he was filling the world with an ocean of blood. If, in estimating his character, you leave out of view his ruling passion, his whole conduct is a mystery ; but his boundless ambition furnishes a solution of every thing that he did ; of every thing that he suffered ; of the cruelty and the glory of his career on the one hand, and the deep degradation in which it terminated on the other.—And you may take the case of any other man, distinguished in the annals of crime, and you will discover, that to some one passion he has made himself a slave, and has sacrificed every thing. Nay, you may look around you, or, what may be more satisfactory still, you may refer to your own experience, and you will find that the ruling propensity controls your whole conduct, and gives a complexion to your whole character. Perhaps you may never have thought of inquiring what your ruling passion is ; much less of observing its prodigious influence ; but both these are points fairly within your reach. Perhaps it is with some of you as it was with Judas,—the love of money. If you observe your feelings and your conduct, you will find that they take their complexion from this ; and that most of the evils into which you run are somehow or other connected with the desire to be rich. Or, is the love of learning, or the love of influence, or the love of pleasure, or the love of ease, your ruling passion ? In each of these cases, the train of your thoughts, the current of your desires, the course of your actions, will be determined accordingly. In most persons, there is some one passion or propensity which greatly preponderates above the rest ; and in some, as in the particular cases already referred to, it is so powerful as to break through all restraints, and subordinate every influence which it can command, to the accomplishment of its purposes. To mention here only a single case ;—how the ruling passion of the drunkard operates, to make him regardless of character, of fortune, of friends, of health, of life, of his immortal soul ! Who has not seen him plunge into the abyss of destruction in obedience to this damning appetite, when there was every consideration that could be drawn, both from the present and the future, to make him pause, and retreat, and reform, and live ?

If such is the strength of the ruling passion, there is a lesson to be learned from it, both by the good and the bad. Sinners should learn how strong are the cords of iniquity by which they

suffer themselves to be bound. You flatter yourselves, perhaps, that you are voluntary in your wickedness, and therefore you can desist from it whenever you will; and hence you resolve that repentance and reformation shall be the work of a future day. But you greatly mistake, if you imagine that your evil habits—habits which have grown with the growth and strengthened with the strength,—are so pliable as to yield to the force of a mere volition. That ruling passion which subordinates to its ends every other passion, and which is the central point of all action in the world within you, has a degree of strength which you have never imagined belonged to it; and though you are guilty in indulging it, you will never break its power without aid from on high. It is here especially that the depravity of your nature centres; and to this point ought your efforts to be especially directed. Seek the aid of the Spirit of God without delay; and co-operate with him in delivering yourself from this wretched, spiritual thralldom. Rely on it, it will be a fearful thing to find yourself, on your death bed, with the ruling sinful propensity of your nature in its full strength. I dare not say that it *cannot* be broken even then; for we have no right to fix a limit to God's sovereign grace; but I *may* say, with my eye upon God's word, and upon the whole record of human experience, that there is every probability, that he that is then filthy will be filthy still.

And there is an important lesson here, too, for professing Christians;—each one of you has a besetting sin. Admit that the power of sin has been broken in your hearts, and that you are delivered from its habitual dominion, as you certainly have been, if you have a good hope through grace, still you are, in a greater or less degree, the subject of depravity: and there is some one natural passion, or propensity, in which your depravity operates more than in any other. At that point, then, place a double guard. If you find yourself easily tempted by the wealth of the world, or its honors, or its levities, or any of its empty fascinations, there oppose the most resolute resistance; and in this way, while you will gradually gain the victory over your besetting sin, your whole character will rise, beautiful and lovely, towards the perfection of holiness.

[To be continued.]

---

## REVIEWS.

LETTERS TO A YOUNG STUDENT IN THE FIRST STAGE OF A LIBERAL EDUCATION. Boston: Perkins & Marvin. 1832. pp. 174.

Loud and frequent complaint of the quackery of what is called a "liberal education," has been justly made, by the friends of sound learning and of the literary honor of our country. Professors in our schools of theology and medicine and law, have long deplored the unripe and partial scholarship, of the great mass of students who resort to them. Now and then, an individual mind of a peculiar original constitution, or that has enjoyed peculiar facilities for developement, may be found possessed of something that may be called *mental discipline*; but in very many cases the teacher in these higher schools, has the sad fate of finding that his pupils, 'when for the time they ought to be teachers, have need that one teach them again which be the *first principles*; and are become such as have need of milk and not of strong meat.

Visit one of our theological seminaries,—(for we wish to speak of these particularly, though our remarks will apply with equal force to schools of medicine and law,)—inspect narrowly the mental character of its students,—test their habits of analysis and association,—examine them in the details even of language and of science;—and it will be found that a very large proportion of them, have no practical power of abstraction, or combination, above many plain and sensible men, in ordinary life:—that they associate almost entirely according to local and arbitrary laws;—nay more, (and what is the more unpardonable, as being the result of sheer indolence,) that their knowledge of *particulars* even, is exceedingly meagre. Professor Stuart has feelingly, and in sufficiently glowing colors, set forth the deficiency of students in a knowledge of Greek;\* but his exposé might, with equal reason, have been extended to everything else, relating to a complete and thorough education. Indeed, if the fact be so in regard to *language*, which any one of ordinary capacity may learn, and which makes comparatively small demands on the higher faculties, which are called into exercise in Mathematics and Philosophy, *a fortiori*,

\* See Biblical Repository, No. 6.

what must be the fact in relation to these last? And it is just *here*, in respect to the analytical and discursive faculties, that the glaring deficiency of public education is seen. A very large proportion of students have no habits of philosophical analysis; they make no distinction between casual and fixed relations, they do not investigate the “doctrines of things;” a few *facts*, loosely and chaotically thrown together in their minds, constitute the sum of their knowledge; and these they associate as arbitrarily, as Mrs. Quickly in the play,—“Thou didst swear to me on a parcel gilt goblet, sitting in my dolphin chamber, at the round table, by a sea-coal fire, on Wednesday in Whitsun week, when the prince broke thy head for likening him to a singing man of Windsor, &c.”

Our picture may, perhaps, be highly drawn; but we speak advisedly, when we give it as our opinion, that one half of our *educated* men, would find themselves sadly pushed in an argument, with many a man of no *learning*, but possessed of plain *common-sense*; unless, forsooth, they should take refuge behind the *hard names* of science, and entrench themselves in *learned gibberish*.

But seriously, the cause of learning and the church, is suffering on these accounts. Our colleges send out too many, who are neither *scholars*, nor *students*. Many young men go to them, not so much to lay a foundation, broad and deep, for future acquisition and eminence, as to obtain a *parchment*, purporting to be an *admittatur*, “*PRO MERITIS*,” to all the *immunities* and *privileges* and *honors* of the degree of Bachelor of Arts; but which is, in reality, a mere “trick of the trade,” and the *reward*, as much of him who does not know how to decline “*penna*,” or is ignorant of the first law of simple suggestion, as of the man who has mastered the sublimest theorems of fluxions, or “soared, with Plato, to the empyreal sphere.”

We do not mean, in these remarks, to criminate the gentlemen who have the management of these institutions. Many of them have long felt, and lamented these evils, and have labored, in various ways, to provide a remedy. They have appealed to their pupils;—have portrayed before them the pleasantness and peace of the paths of *wisdom*;—but their advice has been unheeded;—the young men having never tasted the fruits of thorough study, unaccustomed to patient analysis, bound in the chains of indolence, and as the natural consequence, like the sluggard, “wiser in their own conceit than seven men that can render a reason,” have disregarded all their admonitions, and vainly imagined that they had found “a more

excellent way." If a young man has begun wrong, and entered college without a thorough acquaintance with the elements of science, the leopard may as well put off his spots, as he who has been thus accustomed to do every thing ill, learn to do it well.

The guardians and instructors of our colleges have endeavored, too, to raise the standard of education, by increasing the requirements for admission to college. Their catalogues present a formidable array of studies *preparatory* for admission; and we do not doubt that they *mean* what they *say*, and contemplate a rigid enforcement of these requisitions.

But what, after all, is the practical effect of this elevated standard? A young man presents himself for admission to college. He has *gone over* the preparatory course of study. He is able to stumble along through the passages given him to construe in Virgil and Cicero, but is utterly ignorant of their *scope* and *meaning*—just able to seize here and there upon a few words that bear some resemblance to English words, and to guess out the rest;—and as it respects grammatical forms, sufficiently versed in the declensions and conjugations to decline a noun, or verb, when he has been informed to what class it belongs.—He is thus examined. The college is poor, dependant on its students for support. The professors would be glad to take an independent stand, but if they reject him, some other college will receive him. Perhaps his advantages have been meagre, or he was embarrassed at the examination. He will improve. May have done so. They conclude to receive him on *trial*; intending, *honestly*, if at the end of the first term he be not found to have made sufficient progress, to advise him to wait a year. The end of the term comes, and he is still in the rear. But it is a very delicate matter to *degrade* a young man. He would feel the disgrace very sensibly; perhaps take offence and leave the college. Besides, he is a moral, perhaps a religious young man. He will do good, though he be not a great scholar. He is recommended to study, during his winter's vacation. He returns in the spring; but is just where he was, or has made very trifling advance. He enters, however, and goes on with his class; though instead of going thoroughly, he is now hurried over the new and more difficult parts of the "course," for which his previous training has but poorly prepared him, and so is suffered to be carried through college by the mere force of gravity.

This is no picture of fancy. It is what takes place every year in every college in the land. Said a gentleman to the writer a few months since, "I attended as *examiner* at the

last semi-annual examination of — College, and we found quite a number in the junior and senior classes, who could not have stood an examination to enter college: but prescription and public sentiment would not permit us to degrade them.”

We ask then again, What is the practical effect of the bulletins and manifestoes annually published in the catalogues of our colleges? They do indeed in some cases operate “*in terrorem*,” to stimulate an indolent student; but farther than this, they have very little influence—and young students now generally understand, that to have *read over* the preparatory studies, however cursorily, is sufficient to secure their admission to college.

Thorough reform, then, in the character of collegiate education, is utterly impracticable, on the part of the instructors of colleges. If they try moral suasion, they do but charm in the ears of deaf adders who will not listen, charm they never so wisely. If they rise in their demands for admission, they cannot get students—till a healthier public sentiment shall sustain them in an independent position. All the efforts of professors in college to effect a radical reform in the mental habits of students who have been permitted to proceed thus far in a wrong course, whether by exhortation, or discipline, or in any other way, if not perfectly nugatory, must at least fall far short of the desired end. Quintilian was right when he said, “*natura tenacissimi sumus eorum quæ rudibus annis percipimus; et hæc ipsa magis pertinaciter hærent, quæ deteriora sunt.*” The remedy does not reach the source of the evil; the hurt is but slightly healed by it.

Appeals like Professor Stuart’s to the instructors of colleges, if they stop there, are of no avail. It is morally impossible for a professor in college, be he ever so skilful, or faithful, to break up all the wonted habits of the student of some three or four years standing. If he were to “bray him in a mortar with a pestle,” his wrong habits would not depart from him. He has been accustomed to think that the mere reading of his classics, so far as to make out a tolerable sense, is all that is necessary. The ability to *read over* a whole book of Virgil or Homer at a single exercise, is in his estimation the perfection of scholarship. So far from having been led to the exercise of the higher criticism, the examination of the beauties of style, of the nicer shades of thought, and felicitous arrangement of sentiment in his author, he has not ever been taught to analyze a single sentence, nor is he able to assign any reason for the choice, or arrangement of a single word. And yet he can boast of having read this and that author, and imagines that he has ex-

hausted all their fulness and beauty. Vain, we repeat it, is the effort to *reform* such a mind. There needs a new *creation*.

What then is to be done? We have taken, it is true, an extreme case. All students are not so deficient as our remarks, if taken in an unqualified manner, might imply. But such cases, and those too insulated, or rare, do exist in our best colleges. And the great majority of students fall very far short of the standard to which they might attain. The looseness and desultoriness of mind we have described, is far more general than is commonly supposed. Mingle in the throng of theological students, as they leave the lecture room, and listen to their remarks upon the lecture. "That was a striking anecdote," says one: "I wish the Dr. would spice his lectures with more illustration," says another; "he is usually dull," "he is not practical enough." These, and such like remarks, are almost the only ones you will hear, while you may see here and there a silent, thoughtful student, whose intellect has been fed with the profound views and reasonings of the lecturer, retiring from the crowd, disdaining to waste his "breathing thoughts" upon the superficialness and inanity around him.

What then, we repeat it, can be done? We answer, lay the axe at the root of the tree. Take the student at the beginning of his course. When he first opens his Latin-grammar and declines "penna." Teach him *principles*. Learn him to *think* and *reason*. He will not be slow to appreciate the benefit and the pleasure of it himself. Proceed upon this plan. When he commences his Virgil and Cicero, unfold to him their beauties. Teach him to appreciate the terseness and strength of the language. Make him *feel* that *thorough study* is its own reward. Lay open to him the high objects of study. Disabuse him of the false impression, so common to the minds of young students, that much *knowledge* is necessarily wisdom. Make him to understand that—"non refert multa, sed multum"—it matters not how *many things*, but how *much*, he knows. Do this in the outset. Let him read an hundred lines of Virgil in a thorough, radical way, and he will feel himself a satisfaction, a confidence of knowledge, which he would not exchange for the superficial perusal of the whole Æneid.

With such views we are prepared to welcome any effort which promises to remedy, in any measure, the evils of which we complain. It is with peculiar pleasure, then, that we notice the little volume whose title stands at the beginning of this article. We hope that it has already attracted the notice of most of our readers. To such of them as have read it, it need no commendation of ours. For such as have not, we subjoin some

brief analysis of it, interspersing such remarks as may be suggested by its topics.

It is addressed to a *Young Student, in the first stage* of a liberal education. This circumstance, as would naturally be inferred from what we have said above, gives it its chief excellence. It begins at the right end. Dr. Miller's Letters to theological students,—sound, judicious, practical and minute though they be, for reasons suggested above, do not meet the exigency of the case. There was needed a book, which should be to students at our academies, what Dr. Miller's book is, to those for whom it was designed. And such an one, the Author of the "Letters to a Young Student," has produced. It is written in a chaste, simple, and perspicuous style, and evinces, on every page of it, by the particularity of its details, and its perfect adaptation to the circumstances and wants of those to whom it is addressed, that its author was master of his subject, and every way qualified to write a book for young men in these circumstances, having had experience in them himself.

The book is eminently a *practical* one. It comes home to the "business and bosoms" of students, with a directness of appeal, and a consciousness of the soundness of its principles, which cannot fail, we think, to find a corresponding echo in the breast of every candid young man, who peruses it. We were particularly struck with this characteristic of the book, on comparing its table of contents with that of a book entitled "Letters to a Young Gentleman commencing his education," published a few years ago by a distinguished living author. One letter of the latter book, is on the "Low state of Philosophy;" another on "Brown's theory of cause and effect;" another "on the question whether Moses was the writer of the several books of the Pentateuch," and the others on subjects equally intelligible and edifying to a *young gentleman, just commencing* his education.

We surely need not say that our author has avoided all such transcendental things.—His first letter is introductory, and composed of "general remarks on the formation of character"—setting forth, in a simple and convincing form, the high objects of an education, the importance of a right beginning, the necessity of fixed principles, good habits, &c.—The second letter is on *health*, a subject that can never be agitated too much, or too early, in relation to a sedentary life. Would that we could transcribe with a pen of iron every precept of this letter, on the heart of every student, young and old, in this country. When will students learn that there is an education of the body, as important as that of the mind, and which can

no more be neglected without a sacrifice of comfort and usefulness, and oftentimes of life itself? Alas! this truth is often learned too late;—and a broken constitution, shattered nervous system, and a sad predisposition to disease, are the fruits of the *first* years of the student's course.

The next two letters are on the subject of "Intellectual habits." Then follow two on "Moral habits;" and one more on "College life," closes the volume.

In our previous remarks, we have alluded to the want of something in the early stages of study, calculated to educate (educō—i. e. to *draw out*) the mind. Our author's hints on all the various points which go to form the student's mental character, on his personal habits, on *system*, patient investigation, thorough analysis, &c., are the suggestions of a mind deeply imbued with sound philosophy, and accustomed to close and accurate observation. And we are fully persuaded that no young man can ponder and practise the precepts he has given, and not make a *wiser* man. He will learn that every thing, his books, his intercourse, his walks, all the circumstances and relations in which he finds himself, are to be laid under contribution, to the developement and strengthening of his intellect. He will, in the very outset, acquire a habit of analysis, of "patient thought," more invaluable to him, than the richest stores of acquisition. He will come, at a very early period of his course, to take large and comprehensive views of the ends and means of education, and learn to subject his partialities for some favorite science, or pursuit, to the higher object of mental symmetry and completeness. Nothing is more common than for students to conclude, "*a priori*," that mathematics, or languages, or natural science, will be of no use to them. In every such case their feelings practise a delusion upon their better judgment. The secret of their error is, that they do not *love* these studies. They do not love them, because they have never thoroughly understood, even their elements. Let the student, in the first instance, in the practice of the excellent rules of our author, lay a good foundation, and be thoroughly indoctrinated in the elementary principles of science; and nothing will be dull, or uninteresting to him.

The minutiae of Latin and Greek philology, and the theorems of Conic Sections, will have, for him, as many attractions, as ever his once favorite hobbies would have had. It is the happiness of a well-disciplined mind, to be able to apply itself to any important subject, with alacrity and vigor. To such a mind, "*labor ipse voluptas est*;" and the more abstruse and difficult the subject of investigation, the higher the enjoyment

it experiences in the effort. A student trained up under the full influence of the principles of our author, will never, we are confident, join in the "hue and cry" against "the prescribed course of study." He will bow with deference to the wisdom and experience that have marked out this course. He will give due prominence to every part of it, satisfied of its symmetry and completeness, and having felt in his own experience, the "*commune vinculum*," of the sciences and the indispensable necessity of acquaintance with each to the complete development of his faculties.

Such a student will be no literary dyspeptic, craving the most highly seasoned viands, and yet not able thoroughly to digest the simplest and plainest food; but a man of a well-toned and vigorous system, to whom new facts are not an useless and cumbrous lumber, referable to no principle, and contributing neither to expand nor invigorate the mind, but the materials of productive thought, and the means of future acquisition. Trace the course of such an one up through the various stages of his progress, and we see him, not panting and fainting in the race, disheartened by the difficulties which accumulate at every step, and forced at last to take up with the pitiable salvo, that he has "*no genius*" for this and the other branch of study,—but urging his way, with undaunted and accelerated step, through every difficulty, exulting in the very trials of his course, and turning them into the occasions and the means of increased strength and zeal. "*Vires acquirit eundo*;" he craves no "royal road;" but finds, or makes, a way for himself.

When we think of such an one, and compare his course with that of the miserable drivellers that so often pass under the name of students, we must confess our spirit is stirred within us. But when we reflect on what wrong principles young men are started in their course, and what misdirection is given to their efforts, *honestly* and *unwittingly*, we are constrained to *pity*, not to blame them. Nor is it strange that their primary teachers should mistake the right direction.

A ready memory, and the ability to repeat striking facts and sentiments, is, in a young mind, much more brilliant, than any powers of thought and combination, which boys usually possess. Memory then is cultivated; this faculty alone is sought to be developed; and the young man by the time he comes to commence his preparation for college, is thoroughly imbued with the opinion, that the perfection of genius is, to possess a retentive memory and ready wit. Nothing can tend more directly to correct this mistaken apprehension in the minds, both of teachers and pupils, than a close adherence to

such a system of mental regimen as is contemplated in the plan of our author. We regard the principles which lie at the bottom of his rules on "Intellectual habits," as the true philosophy of education, which needs only to be made known, to command the universal assent and approbation of men of sound and candid minds.

Having said so much on the subject of *mental* discipline, we have space merely to glance at the infinitely more important subject of *moral* culture. Indeed, it is only in its relations to this better part of education, that we would ever speak of the improvement of the intellect. And we shall not be deemed heretical, if we give it as our sober opinion, that much of the superficial piety that is found in our public-institutions and seminaries, may be traced directly to the loose mental habits of students. Coleridge has an aphorism which has often seemed to us to contain the secret of the mushroom piety of many students. "In the state of perfection," says he, in his *Aids to Reflection*, "perhaps all other faculties may be swallowed up in love, or superseded by immediate vision; but it is on the wings of the CHERUBIM, i. e. (according to the interpretation of the ancient Hebrew doctors,) the *intellectual* powers and energies, that we must first be borne up to the 'pure empyrean.' It must be seraphs, and not the hearts of imperfect mortals, that can burn unfuelled and self-fed." A mind trained to vigorous action and effort, is the best substratum for vigorous piety. He who thinks intensely and independently on science, will, if pious, have profound and thorough views in religion. There is a mutual action between the intellect and the heart; and as "one hour of solitude passed in sincere and earnest prayer," (to borrow another of Coleridge's burning thoughts) "or, the conflict with, and conquest over a single passion, or *subtle bosom sin*, will teach us more of thought, will more effectually awaken the *faculty* and form the *habit* of reflection than a year's study in the schools, without them;" so, on the other hand, the perfect mastery of a theorem of Euclid will give a tone and vigor to the exercises of a pious mind, which weeks of vapid appeals to mere feeling and sympathy would never produce.

The little volume before us, then, cannot but promote a healthy and vigorous piety, by reason of the increased tone it will impart to the whole mental constitution of the student. But it will exert a more direct and powerful influence still. In these days of excitement and action, the tendency of inexperienced minds is to attach undue importance to sudden and violent impulses, and to overlook the necessity of persevering vigi-

lance, and constant self-superintendence. Contemplative piety is, we fear, far too much neglected by students. They forget that the education of the heart is as much a matter of philosophy, as the training of the intellect; that as much patient thought, and diligent study, and fixed resolution, and systematic discipline are requisite for the former work, as for the latter. It is no Sabbath-day's irksome retirement, nor occasional attendance at a protracted meeting which will "bring under the body," and develope and invigorate the principle of the spiritual life. Leviathan is not so tamed. Daily retirement and prayer, unremitted watchfulness and diligent keeping of the heart, are the only conditions of spiritual growth. A piety that has grown up under other influences than those of the showers and dews and sunshine, which are its usual and appointed means of developement, must want that firmness of fibre and texture, which only can secure strength and permanence.

It is the dictate of sound philosophy, that a man's mental character, at any particular moment, is but the embodied result of all his previous mental exercises. And so of his religious character, which is in fact but a part of this same mental constitution. The state of the man's heart *now*, is just what all the antecedent influences and habits and exercises of it, have conspired to make it. Nor do the regenerating, and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit, break up this chain of cause and effect. Even in the most marked and sudden transformation of character, where there is most evidently a "new creation," the consequences of this eternal and immutable law of sequences, are perceived in all their power. The man of dissolute life, the worldling, or profane, does not find it an easy matter, even by the assistance of the Holy Spirit, to resist and overcome the power of his inrooted habit. When years even have passed away, and he has succeeded, in a great measure, in repressing its power, it sometimes, upon the recurrence of temptation, wakes up to a freshness and energy, of which its unhappy subject had been long unconscious.

Of how much importance, then, that an engine of so vast a power as habit, should have all its energies enlisted in favor of spiritual improvement. Let a young man form systematic habits of devotion and self-examination; let him subject his heart to such a rigid discipline as our author contemplates in his practical rules, and he cannot fail, if he have the "root of the matter in him," to make attainments in piety, while yet in his preparatory course, which might put to the blush, the irregular and fitful *pietism* of many a student in theology.

On the subject of these early attainments in piety, our author's remarks are so pertinent, and accord so entirely with our own views, that we give them at length. We quote them as a fair specimen of our author's style and manner, though the body of his book is of a more *business-like* and *practical* character.

"Beware of the delusive notion, *that some future time will be more convenient for entire devotion to God.* The pernicious influence of such a notion on Christian character, is seen in every walk of life. All Christians will acknowledge that they ought now to live for God alone. But how to do this they find not. There are, at present, great difficulties in the way of entire devotion to God. Their circumstances are unfavorable to the cultivation of ardent devotional feeling. But they hope their situation will be better soon. They are looking forward to a future period, when they confidently expect to find it much more easy to be eminently devoted Christians. They hope to have more leisure, or to be free from some strong temptations which now harass them, or to enjoy better religious privileges, or, in some other respect, to possess greater facilities for the cultivation of piety. Well, the anticipated time arrives. And it may be, the anticipated change of circumstances takes place. They have more leisure. They are delivered from some temptations, to which they had been exposed. They possess better religious privileges. But leisure hours may steal away the heart from God, as well as busy ones. And when one temptation passes away, some other usually takes its place. And the best religious privileges will not make it easy to "crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts." They find it difficult still to give up the whole heart to God. But still they cling to their old delusion. They again look forward to some future time, as the happy period when difficulties will all vanish away, and they shall become what the word of God requires them to be. Alas, how many go through life in this way, always

---

"about to live,  
For ever on the brink of being born."

And yet they "die the same." If saved at all, they are saved "as by fire." Perhaps a student is in peculiar danger of falling into such a course. His circumstances undergo some change, at every transition from one stage of study to another. And as he is constantly looking forward to some such transition, it is not strange that a deceitful heart should lead him to neglect present effort, in the hope that a change of circumstances will soon render high Christian attainments more easy.

Such, I doubt not, is the course of many a Christian stu-

dent—if *Christian* he may be called, who is so unlike his divine Master. At the academy he is pressed with study. He wishes to fit himself for college in as short a time as possible. His classical exercises seem to him to demand all his time, and all his strength. He can find but little leisure for the peculiar duties of religion,—but little time to read his Bible—to search his heart—to pray—to labor for the conversion of sinners around him. He acknowledges his worldliness. He even affects to lament it. But he hardly knows how he can do better just now. He lives, however, in hopes of better times. When he enters college, he doubts not he shall be a more devoted Christian. He will then, he hopes, have more leisure. He will not be required to accomplish the most he can possibly do in the studies of his class; but his daily task will be assigned. And he confidently expects to find ample time for the culture of his own heart, and for offices of Christian faithfulness to those around him. He soothes his conscience with many a bright picture of the excellent life he then will lead.—Well, the years of his academical course pass by. He enters college. But, alas! though circumstances have changed, his heart remains the same. He loves the world still. And even here the way of Christian virtue is difficult. Business presses upon him. Temptations cluster around him. Ambition woos and wins his heart. And he is now still more inclined than ever, to defer the work of entire self-denial to a more convenient season. But that convenient season, he thinks, is surely not far distant. He designs to become a minister of the gospel. And in the theological seminary, he confidently expects to find a happy retreat from temptation, and such facilities for the culture of pious feeling, that even his cold heart will be warmed, and his sluggish spirit roused. His companions will all be pious men—his studies sacred—his object holy. How can he fail there to make high Christian attainments?—At length his college days are ended. Crowned with those academic laurels which fired his vain heart with ambition, and stole his affections from God; he goes to the theological seminary. But even there he finds, that worldliness still cleaves to his spirit. The chains of sinful habit have become too strong to be easily broken. He finds it quite possible to be surrounded by pious men, and yet live far estranged from God—to study the “letter” of the divine word, and yet fail to catch the “Spirit” which “maketh alive.” He is, perhaps, a close student. He becomes skilled in all the minutiae of sacred philology, and in every department of theological science. And he maintains the form of godliness; but he has very little of its power.—And can he still quiet his

conscience in present worldliness, with the vain hope, that some future change of circumstances will bring him near to God? It is even so. "I am busied now," he says to himself, "with abstruse philological matters, and the subtleties of polemic theology. My companions are all pious men. There are no impenitent sinners in close connection with me, to excite feelings of holy compassion in my soul—to present their awakening claims to my prayers and my efforts. When I enter the ministry, the sense of its high responsibilities, and the sympathies of the pastoral relation, cannot fail to raise high the tone of pious feeling in my heart."—Deluded man! He takes upon him the holy office of the ministry. And he maintains perhaps a fair reputation. But he is still a "half-way Christian."

The habit of shrinking from present self-denial, in the hope of finding entire devotion to God more convenient hereafter, has become so confirmed, that it seems almost impossible to break it. It goes with him to the grave. And if he sink not at last to the final abode of the hypocrite, he is, indeed, "scarcely saved."

Let me now say to you, my dear young friend, "now is the accepted time" for entire devotion to God. You may be tempted now; but so it will always be. Your present temptations may pass away, but others will come in their stead. It may be difficult now to keep near to God. But difficult it will always be, till the "flesh" ceaseth to "lust against the spirit," and the world," and the "god of this world," to tempt you. Beware, then, of saying, I cannot be a devoted Christian now, but I hope to become one hereafter. Would you know what will be your character at college, or in the theological seminary, or in the Christian ministry, just ask yourself, what am I now?—what habits am I now forming? These habits will abide with you, it may be, till your dying day. Give then, your whole soul to the Saviour now. And form such habits as you would be willing to carry with you into college,—the theological seminary—the Christian ministry—aye, and even to the judgment-seat."—pp. 110—116.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## THE ADVANTAGES OF SABBATH SCHOOLS.

[As the season comes round in which renewed and increased exertions are called for in behalf of Sabbath Schools, we hope the following may prove timely and useful.]

We come to a consideration of this subject, fully convinced that its importance has never yet been sufficiently felt, and that the experience of one or two generations, will prove Sabbath Schools to be one of the most powerful means of benefitting the human race.

In the present exhibition of the advantages of Sabbath Schools, we will follow the light of prospective reasoning, without reference to any facts which experience may have shown. These advantages may be set forth, 1st, *in the character of the Sabbath School pupils*; 2d, *in the character of Sabbath School teachers*; and 3d, *in the nature of the truths taught in these schools, and the circumstances under which those truths are communicated.*

I. *The character of Sabbath scholars.* Both religion and philosophy show us the advantages resulting from the youthful age of the pupils in Sabbath Schools. It is a rule of our holy religion, laid upon parents, to train up their children up in the way wherein they ought to walk through life. The obligation of this rule is not only felt in the heart which has been sanctified, but it is an element of the natural heart, placed there at creation, by the same God who afterwards inspired the wise man by whom it was written in Scripture. But while the duty is felt, few place sufficient reliance on the positive promise, connected with its performance. There are reasons to be found in all human hearts for this want of reliance upon the truth of this declaration. Were it to be felt as sensibly, and believed as strongly, as our present existence, what a tremendous weight of responsibility would it bring upon every parent! How would it make every one concerned in the business of education, sensible that on his efforts hung, inevitably, the future character of his pupil! How would it teach us all to gather good and holy influences around the child: to remove from him all precepts and examples of evil, and to watch over him with unslumbering anxiety, as a pledge committed to us, and to be accounted for by us, in the great day of the Lord! From this accumulation of care, labor, and responsibility, our evil natures lead us to shrink, and we become exceedingly ingenious in removing from our shoulders the burden. Now Sabbath Schools, in view of this Scripture, possess vast advantages for moulding the youthful character into forms of good, and sending their pupils forward

in the way they should go in this life, to the life that is to come.

In the light of philosophy these advantages may be seen as clearly as in the light of Scripture. In childhood *the conscience possesses great sensibility and power*. Its office is to report impressions of right and wrong, and thus to act as a check on our passions and appetites. It is vastly affected, however, by the training and education it receives; and if neglected or abused, becomes weaker and weaker, and nearly loses, at last, both its excitability, and its power of warning. If early nurtured and cultivated, its strength is increased. Habitual obedience to its dictates not only keeps it alive, but increases its guiding power. As by being often violated, it becomes blunted and deadened; so the oftener it is awakened and obeyed, the more susceptible are we to its impressions, and the more confirmed in our habits of obedience.

Of these facts relating to conscience, Sabbath Schools avail themselves, and they ought to be appreciated as of inestimable value.

Again. In childhood *the mind is not hardened by long-formed habits of evil thinking or acting*. We cannot sufficiently bless God for the powerful auxiliary to the performance of duty, which he has given us in the force of habit. Nor can we guard, with too great caution and zeal, from perversion to evil purposes, this instrument which our heavenly Parent has given us for good. A habit of any kind is with difficulty overcome;—it is a new-formed nature. But when made coincident with our original carnal and perverse natures, its energy is tremendously augmented. Sabbath Schools possess the advantage of anticipating this good or evil, and of turning this principle to great account in education. They avail themselves of the early disposition to imitate, and to form habits, and give such direction to these tendencies as may make them truly blessed. In this respect, they may be said to snatch from the author of evil, the instrument which he purloined from the armory of heaven, and turned against our race. Solomon had seen the force of this acquired nature, and calculated wisely on its power over human action, when he made the declaration before alluded to. He saw the need of giving a very early bent to the mind, even in its leaf and twig, so that the branch and tree might be inclined to good. He had experienced the iron obstinacy of our wicked natures, when cased in the invulnerable armor of habit. Experience is now, every day, showing in domestic circles, the truth of his assertion, and enforcing it by examples of both gladness and sorrow.

And thirdly, philosophy coincides with religion, in exhibiting the advantages of Sunday Schools, by showing us that in childhood the heart is filled with warm affections, reaching out for objects on which to fix themselves, and which, by the blessing of the Holy Spirit, education may turn to pure and holy things. It

is delightful to contemplate the affections of the young ; their rich abundance ; their unsuspectingness ; how warmly they gush out ; how guilelessly they centre on an object ;—how tenaciously and fondly they cling to it. But the fact that they so rapidly assume the complexion of those objects, on which they are allowed to pour themselves out, shows the infinite importance of securing them in behalf of truth and virtue ; and the advantages of Sabbath Schools in accomplishing this object, are most manifest. We do not pretend to say that aught but the Holy Spirit can sanctify the heart. But we do say that his customary operations are by means, and that this principle of human nature, may, by Sabbath School instruction, be made one of the most efficient means used by that blessed Spirit.

II. The character of the teachers of Sabbath Schools shows us that great advantages must result from these institutions.

What are the teachers, and who are they ? Are they hirelings, performing a task for selfish purposes ? No. Theirs are unbought labors in the field of benevolence. They are the disciples of Jesus Christ, coming to their work in the spirit of love,—love to God, and love to men. Their purpose is to benefit, to the greatest possible amount, their pupils. They act under the impulse of motives which are gathered from both time and eternity. They know and feel that they are forming brothers and sisters, husbands and wives, and parents and citizens, for this world ; and fixing the destiny of souls that can never die in the world to come ; and can their zeal be cold, their efforts small, their success doubtful ? Does not reason teach us even on mere human principles, that they, who act from such motives, and under such responsibilities, will advance vastly farther on the road to success, than they who are carried forward by the mere efforts of cold and calculating self-interest ? The Bible declares this also. Nor is this coincidence between the light of nature and revelation a solitary one. In every case where human reason acts unrestrained by prejudice and passion, coincidence exists so far as reason can reach. The Bible goes, however, far beyond human sagacity, in all cases ; and in the present instance, it assures us that efforts made under such circumstances, are certain to secure God's blessings, not only for those who labor, but for the object of their exertions. It tells us that our Father in heaven, from whom cometh every good gift, is delighted to behold the creatures of his hands engaged in the same benevolent work, in which he is himself engaged ; and that his hand is extended to aid their efforts, and bless them to their full desire. Can the advantages of such teaching be doubted ?

The instruction is given with many prayers, which, like sweet incense, come up before the Lord, and find favor. So that by a triple cord—the three-fold cord of untiring zeal, disinterested exertion, and believing prayer, are temporal and immortal benefits

secured to this teaching. And this glorious combination of encouraging circumstances ought to give us full faith in the expected advantages of these institutions.

III. We now pass to a consideration of the advantages which may be expected from the nature of the truths taught in Sabbath Schools, and some further circumstances under which they are inculcated.

The instructions of the Sabbath School are wonderfully fitted to affect the youthful heart. They are from the word of God, and teaching from the word of God, comes home to the feelings of a child like no other instruction. It excites his interest, and wins his affections beyond every thing else. In all story or song, there is nothing found like the Bible,—so simple in pathos, so engrossing in interest, so elevating in influence. The whole relation of God's doings towards the children of men; the creation of the world, the entrance of sin into paradise; the patriarchal history; the wanderings, settlement, elevation to power, and the decline of God's chosen people; the coming of Messiah, and his character and life, are listened to as no human production ever was; while they impress themselves most deeply on the memory, and enter more completely into the heart of the child than any thing else ever does or can. The influence upon conduct, exercised by the heart, is very powerful, whether it be in deterring from evil, or encouraging to good;—and we can readily calculate the advantages to character, both individual and general, that must be produced by a system of education which engages the affections in behalf of virtue.

But not only is that Scripture truth which forms the principal part of Sabbath School instruction, engaging in manner and pleasing in incident; it is also important in principle, and advantages must follow from its inculcation in this respect. It teaches the way to eternal life; and, although its lessons may not be blessed at once to the conversion of the soul, yet is it the most common and powerful agent of the blessed Spirit in producing that effect. Moreover, an early acquaintance with the Bible, as observation and experience have both shown, is the most certain protection against skepticism and infidelity, even though conversion should not take place. That feeling of awe, with which the Sabbath scholar is accustomed to regard the word of God, together with the influence which its maxims never altogether fail to exert over his actions, is the greatest defence to a yet unsanctified mind, against the attack of the scoffer and unbeliever. Such are the truths of the Bible, that, being received into the young heart, before the devices of Satan and the growth of sin have hardened it and blinded its moral vision, they in a great measure forestal the evil which might otherwise be lodged there; so that the internal convictions of a mind once effectually imbued with them, become, as it were, a part of its elemental character, against

which the enemies of truth, and even a wicked life may long labor in vain. It is to be hoped, too, that conversion may take place immediately; and this, more than it has been, should be the object of Sabbath School instruction, namely, not only the fortification of the mind against temptation and the preparation of it for conversion in coming years, but its immediate conversion now while young.

Connected with the inculcation of Scripture truths is one circumstance, with the mention of which, this brief view of the advantages of Sabbath Schools, will be closed. The day of instruction is the holy Sabbath;—God's own chosen day. The toil, and care, and bustle of the world, are banished from recollection, and a calm is spread over the mind which fits it for the reception of truth. Even the youngest scholar feels solemn, amid the general solemnity and stillness around him; as the bells toll forth their music, and as the prayer of his teacher ascends to that God whose house he is in, and whose day it is. The effect of such seemingly small things, is immense, in predisposing the mind to the reception of profitable instruction, and should, by no means, be forgotten. From the school-room the pupils go to the congregation, composed of their parents and older friends, and again hear the truths of the Bible taught, to the solemn and attentive audience. Thus every circumstance seems calculated for effect,—salutary, holy effect. We know not how a scheme of instruction could have been devised more perfect in its adaptation to produce the desired results, than that of Sabbath Schools. Without examining the testimony which experience has borne to the advantages that they have produced; without recounting the thousands who have been converted by their means; or the extraordinary effect they have had in a few years on the moral tone of society; or the wonderful rapidity which has marked their increase and extension; but looking merely at the character of their pupils, and of their teachers; the benevolent zeal which originated and carries them onward; the nature of the instruction, and the peculiar circumstances of solemnity under which it is given, we are ready to repeat the assertion with which we commenced, that the advantages which have resulted, and must result, from these schools, is altogether beyond present estimation.

---

We had hoped to publish in this number another miscellaneous article or two and several notices of recent publications, but for want of room they are necessarily omitted.

THE  
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. VI.

MAY, 1833.

NO. 5.

---

---

COMMUNICATIONS.

---

[The following is the first of several articles on the same subject, which an esteemed friend and correspondent proposes to furnish in successive numbers for our pages. Of the interest, with which it will be read, we need not speak,—nor need we of its promise.]

THE CRUCIFIXION.

NO. I.

If there is one subject, which, to a person of Christian sensibility affords matter of inexhaustible interest, it is the subject of our Saviour's death. Angels "desire to look into it," glorified saints delight in learning about it, and the church on earth strive to "know nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified." There are, however, some circumstances, which, to many even good men, make the subject less interesting and less profitable than it might be. The principal of these circumstances are,—first, familiarity with the words of the sacred narration;—secondly, a passiveness and listlessness in the mode of reading them;—and thirdly, a want of chronological, geographical and historical knowledge concerning the events narrated. But these obstacles may be easily removed, and it is one design of the writer in this and the following papers, to attempt their removal.

It is not at all strange, that a person, who from childhood has been familiar with the evangelical notices of the crucifixion, should find the sacred words now so monotonous, as to make little impression upon him. But by a change of the words and by writing the history in his own style, he may gain a fresh and deep impression. Though he cannot equal the

phraseology of the Evangelists, yet the bare circumstance of giving to their thoughts a new dress, will impart to them a novelty, such as the face of nature receives from a sudden fall of snow, or the first verdure of spring.

One effect of our familiarity with the sacred expressions is, the passive and listless state of mind with which we now read them. This inactivity also results from another cause. We imagine that we are thoroughly acquainted with all the incidents which the Bible relates concerning the crucifixion, and therefore that we have nothing to learn. But we may easily expel this deceptive idea, and may give a quickening impulse to our minds, by collating the four evangelical descriptions of this subject, and by gathering together into one history of our own, the substance of the four distinct and different histories which we have so often read separately. No one can thus collate the accounts of the fall of Peter, or the fate of Judas, or any important event attending the Saviour's death, without finding new facts, which, but for his diligent comparison, he never would have discovered; and without collecting a new history from the materials which had lain scattered, and many of them unobserved, in the condensed sacred histories. "Nothing more to learn about the crucifixion"? Let the man, who thus rests contented, undertake to determine the order of the tragical occurrences connected with this event, and he will find not only a mass of new information which will astonish and invigorate him, but also an amount of difficulty which will perplex and humble him, and dispose, as well as teach him, to read with an active, inquiring, and penetrating mind. When we read the single narration of Matthew with no effect, but with an indolent willingness to receive any idea which happens to come into our minds, we may expect to think that we are reading the same thing over and over, and to sigh for more freshness and life. But when we keep our eyes open upon the collateral narrations, and strive to detect and to reconcile the apparent disagreements, we shall then receive a mental elasticity and incitement, which will add a double interest to our reading, and a double profit to our souls.

There is also a way of operating upon our own faculties, by which we may break up the monotonous and careless habit of reading, which we condemn. Hess has well described it in his beautiful "*Geschichte der drey letzten Lebensjahre Jesu.*" "I always find," he says,\* "that the Evangelical History makes the strongest impression upon my mind, when I try to make

myself think that I am reading it for the *first time in my life*. The fact that many find in the history so little which is elevating and entertaining, arises very naturally from this one circumstance among others, that they cannot fasten their minds upon the history as upon a new one, and bring themselves as for the first time to the work of reading a story, which has been known to them from early youth."

Of all the obstacles, however, which lessen our interest in the evangelical account of the crucifixion, the greatest is our ignorance of the chronological, geographical and historical facts connected with it. Geography and chronology have been termed "the two eyes of history," and the history of the customs and the places alluded to by the Evangelists, is essential to a clear and operative understanding of their accounts. We must have, what Lord Kaimes calls, an "ideal presence" of the scenes described, or we shall not be adequately affected by the description. In order to enter into the spirit of the four Evangelists, we must see, as vividly as if with our bodily eyes, the situation of Palestine, and of its inhabitants; we must feel its breezes fanning our faces, and hear its rivers rushing down its hills. We cannot be too particular in our ideas of the face of that delightful country; the appearance of its sky and its soil, the temperature of its atmosphere, and the location of its cities and villages. We shall be surprised at the increased significance which is given to the sacred narrations by our plain and distinct images of the sacred scenes.

This branch of knowledge is the more important, because it has been encumbered with so much that is visionary. Authorities upon it are as unsound as they are numerous, and the readers of the Bible are exposed not only to a want of correct ideas, but also to the admission of the most improbable conjectures. It is therefore proposed to introduce into the ensuing numbers, from authorities which are judicious and can be depended upon, such chronological, geographical, and historical details as may elucidate the sacred record; and to devote the remainder of the present paper to such general statements as may be most necessary to impart vividness to our ideas of the crucifixion.

"Chronologists," says Jahn,\* "are agreed that our common era, which was first used by Dyonisius, in the year 526 after Christ, and introduced into the Western Church by the Pope in the year 532, places the birth of Christ some years too late, but it is not yet determined whether the difference is two, three,

\* Hebrew Commonwealth, § 122. p. 412.

four, five, or even eight years." The more general opinion, however, is, that there is an error of four years, and that Christ was born in the year 4000 A. M.; that our vulgar era commenced in the year 4004 A. M., and that the crucifixion occurred in the year 37 of our Lord's life, and 4036 of the creation. Still, it will not be expedient for us to deviate, from the chronology of Archbishop Usher, which, though incorrect, is generally received, and which assigns the death of Christ to the year 33, instead of 37, and of course determines the present year to be 1833, instead of 1837. At this time, Tiberias Nero had been reigning at Rome, as successor to Augustus, about seventeen years; Pontius Pilate had been Procurator of Judea, as successor of Valerius Gratus, about seven years; and Joseph Caiaphus had been high priest of the Jews, as successor to Simon, about seven years.

As it is impossible for us to determine precisely the *year* of the crucifixion, it is equally impossible to determine the calendar *day*. The feast of the Passover was on the 15th of the month Nisan—the crucifixion was on the day before the feast—the month Nisan commenced with the first appearance of the new moon in our April; so that the crucifixion took place on the 14th day after the April new moon. But on what day of the month the new moon appeared, we are ignorant. The common opinion is,\* that the 3d of April was the day of the crucifixion, and the 5th of April the day of the resurrection, and the 14th of May the time of the ascension.† By this chronology the observances in the Catholic church are regulated. But it assumes against evidence that we know the year of the Saviour's death, and also that the month Nisan commenced with the new moon in March, instead of that in April. That the new moon in March was in later days regarded by the Jews as the commencement of the month Nisan is evident from the the Rabbins; but that it was not so regarded in the time of Christ and previously, is evident, not only from Josephus, but also from the whole current of Scriptural chronology.‡ As the evidence preponderates decidedly in favor of that system, which refers the commencement of Nisan, or Abib, to the *latter* part of our April,|| we must conclude it probable that the crucifixion occurred in the beginning of May, and the ascension about the middle of June. We cannot obtain greater particularity of

\* See Chronological Table at the end of Calmet's Dictionary, by Robinson, p. 983: also art. Chronology in the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, p. 273.

† See art. Jerusalem in Worcester's Gazetteer; also the Chronological tables in Calmet's Dictionary and Edinburgh Encyclopedia.

‡ See on this subject, Jahn's Archeology, § 103, of the Months and the Year.

|| See art. "Months" in Calmet's Dictionary, edited by Robinson.

date than this, without previously determining the precise year of the memorable events, and making an astronomical calculation of the lunar changes in that year.

We will now devote a few pages to the Geography and Natural History of the Holy Land.

Palestine is situated in the south-western extremity of Asia. Its boundaries varied at different times; but, in its greatest extent, it had Syria on the north, Syria and Arabia Deserta on the east, Arabia on the south, and the Mediterranean Sea on the west. Its extreme length was about 180 miles, its extreme breadth about 80, and its greatest number of inhabitants was about 3,000,000.\* It is described in many passages of the Old Testament, as a land of mountains, and this, as a general description, is sufficiently accurate. From Lebanon in the northern extremity of the land, came forth two parallel chains of mountains, running from north to south, one on each side of the Jordan, and stretching out into many different branches. Here and there are the chains broken by plains and spacious vallies; and, after they have traversed the whole extent of Palestine, "they both unite with the mountains of Horeb and Sinai. As you go from Joppa," on the shore of the Mediterranean, "to the interior, the whole region is diversified with hills and the richest and most beautiful vales.—In the *southern* part of the country, the hills are of middling height, are uneven, and of irregular form. The hills nearest to Jerusalem are composed in great measure of chalk-stone, which is very much like the flint-stone, and has a white color, or rather, fades into a whitish yellow. Farther still in the interior, towards the Dead Sea, the hills are of a looser species of the chalk or lime rock, which is partly white and partly grey, through the substance of which are scattered in separate strata, red glistening stones. Near Jericho, the hills are barren and unfruitful, and the vales are desert, without buildings, without plants, full of quartz stones.—In the *northern* half of the country, the mountains present a more pleasing appearance; they are not so high as those in the southern half, are more like hills, and are covered with plants and trees. The vales are productive and frequently abound with gardens of fruit. The interior of the whole country presents an extended, in great part, fruitful valley. Through this valley the Jordan, the only important

\* The size of Palestine then, appears to be less than that of Massachusetts. That its number of inhabitants has been estimated much greater, I do not deny. Very little dependence can be placed on the ancient enrolments of citizens. Rosenmuller says, that the land of Canaan *could* not well contain more than 3,000,000 inhabitants. See pp. 243—247 of his *Alterthumskund*, vol. 2, part 1.

stream in Palestine, flows; and then loses itself in the great Salt Sea, at the southern extremity of the land. The *western* declivities of the hills, towards the Mediterranean, contain many ample fields, which are, however, by no means so fertile as the fields near the Jordan. The western part of the country is almost altogether without a river, and in summer without even a brook; but in winter one finds some streams from the woods. Yet even in this part, the soil is black and rich, and brings forth an abundance of corn and vegetables, when the winter rains do not fail.\*

This is the face of the land now; but before the inhabitants were bowed down under the yoke of the oppressor, when they furrowed their fields and planted their vines, the soil was doubtless far more prolific than now, and the scenery more charming. Then, doubtless, it was the land of beauty, as well as of interest; of attractions for the richness of its soil, as well as for the grandeur of the events which transpired upon it.

As the surface of the country was very uneven and unequally exposed to the sea, it may readily be perceived that the temperature of the climate differed in different sections. Josephus remarks, that at Jericho, in the southern part of the land, "the winter was so moderate, and the air so mild and pleasant, that the inhabitants clothed themselves in linen garments, on the very day when it was snowing in other parts of Judea. Van der Vyeburg and Heyman, when at Jericho, found the heat very troublesome, and heard that, on the year before their visit, the heat, at the festival of Easter, which occurred in March, had proved fatal there to many persons. On the contrary, at Safet in Galilee, which is not many miles north of Jericho, but which has a much greater elevation, these travellers found the air fresh and cold; and though in the surrounding countries the heat was intense, it was felt here scarcely at all.† Many difficulties in our scriptural reading may be removed, by considering this unevenness of temperature in the climate of Palestine.

As the country lay between latitudes  $31^{\circ}$  and  $33^{\circ} 35'$ , the inhabitants must have been far more sensible to cold than in the more northern latitudes. Travellers from the north of Europe even, have found that they needed less clothing in their own countries, than in Palestine; for, though they did not find the mercury in Palestine to fall below 40 or 46 degrees dur-

\* Rosenmulleri Alterthumskund, vol. 2, pp. 98—100, part 1. I have preferred to translate the words of this distinguished writer, rather than give my own opinion on a subject so variously represented by different men.

† Rosenmulleri Alterthumskund, Vol. 2, Part 1, Pages 223, 224.

ing the severest months, yet they had become so tender, by residing on these sunny plains, as to shudder at such moderate cold. On a summer's day, the atmosphere is generally clear and the heaven unclouded; and the inhabitants suffer much from the intenseness of the heat, especially in those parts where all the brooks are dried, and water is scarce. But after the sun has gone down, such a heavy dew falls, powerful almost as rain, that often men are as badly affected by the cold "drops of the night," as by the "drought of summer."

It is interesting to inquire, what was the state of the season during the memorable months of April, May and June, 1800 years ago. In the middle of February the winter begins to relent, and between this time and the end of March, the thermometer rises from 44 degrees to about 60. March is the forerunner of spring; the latter rains however do not cease falling until the middle of April; then is the season delightful, the sky very clear, the air pure, the heat generally from 60 to 65 degrees of Fahrenheit. During the week of the crucifixion, the temperature was probably from 70 to 74 degrees; summer had just dawned; "the pastures were clothed with flocks; the valleys were covered with corn." The almond and the orange trees were loaded with their ripe fruits: the rice and wheat and barley were just ready to be gathered. As the Saviour was journeying around the country, during the weeks *before* his crucifixion, he beheld in March the fig tree putting forth her figs, and the apple and palm trees blossoming; in April the grass waving high in the fields, and the corn just ripening. As he went from place to place *after* his crucifixion, the apples and figs and dates were hanging ripe on the trees, and the harvest-men were busy by day in gathering into their barns, and by night were resting themselves on the tops of their houses. He walked about under a bright sun, and amid the heat of the day enjoyed the refreshing breezes of the west.

[To be continued.]

---

REFLECTIONS ON THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF JUDAS.

Concluded from page 226.

5. In the fifth place, the history of Judas shows us *the wonderful energy of conscience*.—It does not appear from the

narrative, that he had been the subject of great remorse during the time that he was forming the murderous plan ; though from what passed afterwards, it is probable that he *had* many twinges of compunction at every stage of his horrid work ; but if it *were* so, he contrived to resist and overpower it. Be that as it might, it is certain that conscience awoke to the faithful discharge of his office, as soon as the deed was done. It forced itself upon her view in all its blackness, and all its malignity ; and the never-dying worm gnawed so fiercely, that the agony seemed intolerable ; and forthwith he went out and hung himself. "I have betrayed innocent blood," said he ; and the voice of that blood, though it was not yet shed, seemed to cry to heaven for vengeance against him ; and he hurried down to hell, because he dared not to stay upon the earth. The thirty pieces of silver which had been counted out to him, and the sound of which doubtless was music to his ear, now weighed like a mountain upon his soul ; and he felt like Cain, and with no less reason than he, that his burden was greater than he could bear.

Who needs be told that what Judas suffered on this occasion, was substantially the same which has been the lot of many other wicked men ? Wherein was the case of Belshazzar, or Herod, or Francis Spira, or Newport, different in its general features from that of Judas ? Be it that they were not actually driven to suicide ; yet terror and trembling took hold on them, and made them feel, in spite of all their efforts to the contrary, as if they were then standing in the presence of the Eternal Judge, with all their guilt upon their head. And how large a part of the cases of suicide which occur, do you imagine, are to be referred directly to the operation of conscience ? The individuals have done that, it may be in all the darkness of midnight, which will not bear to be brought within the light of conscience ; and when it really comes up to recollection, and stares them in the face, though it may be known to no other being, there is a tumult created in the soul which they cannot endure ; and hence in the anguish of desperation, they betake themselves to the halter or the pistol. In many instances, I am aware, in which this tremendous catastrophe occurs, there is little or nothing known in respect to the cause, and some conjecture one thing, and some another ; but I doubt not that in not a small number of these cases, if we knew all, we should see that it had its origin in a guilty conscience. And there are facts enough which are acknowledged and unquestionable, to show that there is an energy in conscience, which is capable

of rendering life a burden, arming the sinner for that most unnatural crime, self-destruction.

I can suppose that there may be some who scarcely know how to credit this statement, on the ground that it is not conformed to their own experience ; for though they have been going on in a course of sin, and are not altogether strangers to the power of conscience, yet they have experienced nothing like the horror to which I have here referred. It may be so ; doubtless it *is* so ; and in this respect your case is not peculiar ; for it is possible for the conscience to sleep, though it is not possible for it to die. There are instances in which it has seemed, during a course of crime, to be entirely without sensibility ; and it has suddenly waked up, like a giant from his slumbers, and filled the whole soul with consternation and agony. It is not long since an individual, in telling me the story of his life, lent his testimony to this truth, in a way which I can never forget. He told me of a crime of fearful magnitude, of which he had been guilty, and to which he had sacrificed his character ;—a crime which could not be committed without deliberation and forethought ; and he remarked, that in all his previous reflection on the subject, he had thought of nothing but how he could most successfully accomplish it ; the fact that it would expose him to the displeasure of God, had not even come into mind ; but when he marched up to the guilty act, and really set himself about it, a chill of horror stole over him ; and “from that hour to the present,” said he, “I have never had a moment’s rest, nor do I expect to, on this side the grave.” The god of this world blinded his eyes to the turpitude of the act, as long as was necessary to secure the performance of it ; and then he removed the film, and let conscience begin its work, and let the soul abandon itself to the horrid anticipation of eternal torment. In all these cases, rely on it, the devil looks well to his own cause ; he cares not how profoundly conscience slumbers, when the sinner is tempted to the commission of crime ; and he cares as little how fierce and bitter are its accusations when the deed is done, provided only they may not lead him to repentance.

I repeat then, sinner ; vain is the idea that you have nothing to fear from conscience, because it has given you little trouble hitherto. You cannot annihilate it, or change its character ; for it makes part of your moral nature. You may indeed succeed, by long resistance to its suggestions, in bringing upon it a lethargy which will last to your dying day ; but I tell you, it is there in your bosom notwithstanding ; and sooner or later it will assert its dignity and authority, and will visit upon you

a shower of curses, in retribution for the contempt which you have offered it. But though you cannot annihilate your conscience, there is one thing which you may do; you may pacify it, through the blood of Jesus, and even make it the minister of consolation. You may have your sins forgiven, through the efficacy of his atonement; and conscience, instead of directing your eye downward to the dungeons of despair, may point with benign aspect toward the world of light and the crown of glory. This you *may* do; and happy, thrice happy are ye, who actually do it.

6. We may learn from the history of Judas an important lesson *in respect to the nature of repentance*. It is expressly declared that he repented; confessed his guilt; acknowledged the innocency of Jesus; and restored the reward of his iniquity: nevertheless, it is declared that he was a son of perdition. It is an important question, in what respects his repentance was defective.

It was defective as it respected the principle. The inspired historian says, "When he saw that he was *condemned*, he repented," &c. It has been supposed that Judas, in the expectation which commonly prevailed among the disciples that our Lord would set up a temporal kingdom, thought it possible that he might escape out of their hands, as he had done in a miraculous way from the hands of his enemies, on some former occasions; but finding that he was not only taken, but actually condemned, and seeing the awful consequences of his conduct staring him in the face, he repented now that he had done the deed. He repented, you observe, not of the deed itself, in which the sin essentially consisted, but of the consequences which he saw were likely to result from it, and which his conscience admonished him would be of a burdensome nature. As repentance consists in sorrow for sin, in itself considered, and as the repentance of Judas had respect to the *effects* of it, it was manifestly defective in respect to its principle.

It was defective also, as it was not accompanied by hope in God's mercy, and faith in the Saviour. There is no true repentance without both these exercises. Conviction, if it continue, will ripen into despair, unless the mind fasten upon the glorious hope set before it in the gospel. Judas, when he found that his entreaties for the release of Jesus would avail nothing, instead of confiding in the merits of the Saviour for forgiveness, and casting himself on divine mercy, resigned himself up to absolute despair, and completed the climax both of his guilt and ruin, by taking his own life.

Now it scarcely admits of question, that there is much that

passes among men for repentance, which can stand the Bible test no better than would that of Judas. And I would that every one of you, who reads these pages, would inquire diligently into your own personal experience in reference to this matter. Many of you believe that you have exercised genuine repentance for sin; and in view of that repentance you dare to hope that you shall ere long go to be the inhabitants of a holy heaven. But inquire what you have repented of. When you have thought of your sins, and of the fearful and eternal consequences which sin, unrepented of, must entail upon you, have you repented merely in view of those consequences; and have you thought little or nothing of the evil nature of sin, and of its intrinsic odiousness, as an offence committed against the character, the government, the grace of God? And though you may have broken off external sins, and may sometimes struggle against certain sins of the heart, yet would you gladly cherish these, provided you could be sure the indulgence of them would not land you in hell? Then rely on it, your repentance is no better than was that of Judas. It lacks the great principle of evangelical repentance; it has in it nothing of godly sorrow for sin; it is nothing better than the repentance which the criminal feels, when the gallows and all the apparatus of death are just before him, and the thought of suffering the awful sentence of the law, drinks up his spirits, while yet he cares as little for the honor of the lawgiver, as when he committed the crime which has brought him into these fearful circumstances.

You learn, moreover, from the case of Judas, what a wide difference there is between despair and repentance. I know how strongly the sinner, in these circumstances, enlists the sympathies of his fellow creatures, and how Christians are ready to weep, when they trace in his countenance the lines of despair. And it is right that it should be so; for there is not a greater calamity, short of absolute reprobation, that befalls an individual on this side the world of wo; nevertheless, it ought not to be forgotten, that in this calamity there is a sin, a sin of most appalling magnitude. Suppose it do not lead, as in the case of Judas, to self-destruction; still it is a sin of deepest dye against the mercy of God, and the atonement of Christ, and the boundless riches of divine grace as displayed in the whole work of redemption. It is the essence of unbelief: it is more, it is practically giving the lie to all the overtures and promises of mercy contained in the Bible. Let the sinner then beware how he sinks under the power of this tremendous evil. Let him remember, that however aggravated may have been his

guilt, before yielding to it, it is greatly increased afterwards; and there is too much reason to fear that he may find at last, that in the act of yielding to it, he sealed his own eternal condemnation.

Are you convinced, then, of guilt? Beware of these two evils: on the one hand, take heed that you do not mistake the nature of repentance, and substitute an exercise that is merely selfish for one that has a proper respect to the evil nature of sin, and to the holy character of God. On the other hand, take heed that you do not lose sight of the mercy of God, and the atonement of Christ, and sink down into a state of despair, under an impression that your guilt is too great to be forgiven. You may indeed safely believe that your sins are as great as they appear to be; but with this awful conviction, you are to look to the mercy of God in a Redeemer to keep you from sinking; nay, you are to look to him, and rise above your fears, and indulge the sweet hope of forgiveness, even the hope of attaining to an immortal crown. Here, and only here, there is relief, and hope, and salvation; but look whithersoever else you will, or do whatever else you may, as God's word is true, you perish.

7. From the history of Judas we are furnished with conclusive evidence that *the gospel is no fable*.

It must be acknowledged on all hands, that Judas had the best possible opportunity to know whether our Lord was what he professed to be; for he had been a member of his family; had been privileged to hold daily and familiar intercourse with him; had not only witnessed his miracles, but knew all that any of the disciples did in respect to the economy of his mission. If therefore his miracles had been merely pretended, or his religion an imposture, it were impossible but that Judas must have known it; and if he had been in any such secret, the circumstances in which he placed himself by betraying his Lord, must certainly have brought it out. If he had known that Jesus was an impostor, most gladly and triumphantly would he have revealed the fact in justification of his own conduct. But nothing of this kind is even attempted. On the contrary, he pointedly condemns himself for what he has done, gives his testimony to the innocence of Jesus, and hangs himself, because he cannot bear the lashes of his own conscience. No stronger testimony than this to the truth of Christianity could be desired. It is, indeed, the testimony of a wicked man and of a traitor; but in the present case that very circumstance gives to the testimony its greatest weight.

Nor was Judas the only wicked man who has rendered a

tribute to the truth and excellence of the gospel. This is done by every hypocrite;—every man who strives to pass with the world for a Christian, when his heart is full of evil affections and evil purposes. For in assuming the Christian garb, he does that which he believes will commend him to the favor of his fellow men; and if he did not consider Christianity as good in itself, and if he did not believe that it is regarded so by others, he could have no motive even to appear to be a Christian. And the same thing substantially occurs, when men, even the worst of men, attempt to revile religion, and to pour contempt upon the character of its professors; and instead of coming forth fairly and honestly, and calling things by their right names, they ridicule the Christian virtues under some opprobrious epithet; calling piety fanaticism, or charity ostentation, or a regard to the dictates of conscience, meanness or timidity. The reason of this is, that these wicked men know that virtue, religion, Christianity, and every thing of which it is composed, is in itself good; and that men are constituted in such a manner that they cannot think otherwise, even if they desire to do so; and the only way in which they can accomplish their purpose is by distorting, and misrepresenting, and misnaming the genuine quality. Many a man in this way, when he thinks not of it, and when he is laboring to the utmost to bring the blessed gospel into contempt, is really furnishing a weighty argument in its favor.

But there is another way in which wicked men lend their testimony to the truth of the gospel: it is by the acknowledgments which they often make in sickness, and especially in the near prospect of death. When I hear a man revile Christianity, I choose, if possible, to suspend my opinion as to his honesty in doing it, until I can learn what passes upon his death bed; for experience has proved that there is many a man who in health will manifest a perfect contempt of the gospel, who cannot realize the approach of a dangerous illness, without being well nigh distracted with apprehension and terror. But a few years ago, I saw a man sitting before me, from Sabbath to Sabbath, who often discovered in his countenance the very insolence of error. He professed, indeed, to believe in Christianity; but it was one of those corrupt forms of it, which recognize none of its peculiarities,—which deny that the soul is in danger on the one hand, and furnish no adequate provision for its escape on the other. And when the terrors and glories of the true gospel were spread before him, often have I witnessed a cold frown of disapprobation, or an affected smile of contempt. But all this, you will observe, was in the days of vig-

orous health and of high prosperity. At length, there came over his cheek an ominous flush which told his friends that he was sinking under an insidious disease; and *they* saw, while *he* was yet gay and sportive, the symptoms of approaching dissolution. They told him of their apprehensions, but he did not believe it; and the reason was, he could not let go of this world, much less endure the thoughts of going into another. But even *his* skepticism on this subject at length yielded, and he felt that he must die; and then all his infidelity (for what he professed was no better) had gone to the winds, and he believed that there was an eternal hell, and wished and longed and prayed, and besought others to pray, that he might receive mercy from an Almighty Saviour. As soon as he saw that he must die, he was in theory an orthodox Christian; no more infidelity had he then, than his Christian mother who was pouring out her supplications at his bedside; and he warned his companions not to reject the gospel as he had done; for in doing so they would cut themselves off from consolation, when they needed it most. When the spirit fled, there seemed to be a pressure of awful apprehension on the mind of every spectator, which no one dared to utter—which no one could have uttered if he had dared.

I mention this instance, not as a solitary, or an uncommon one of its kind, but because it is one of several which have fallen under my own observation. Such instances almost every minister of the gospel, no doubt, has to encounter. And every one of them is a testimony to the truth and excellence of the gospel which cannot be set aside. The man to whom I have referred was an infidel as long as he could be; but when he came to be brought nearly in contact with the actual reality of death, all his infidel dreams were broken up, and he acknowledged that he felt that to be true, which before he had contended against as false, and even ridiculed as foolish and fanatical. In these circumstances, surely, he could have no motive to belie his honest convictions; and he could not have been mistaken in the forebodings of his own conscience, or in his need of forgiveness or salvation. And forgiveness and salvation are the very blessings which the gospel proffers.

The confessions of men who have rejected the gospel in the hour of death, furnish indeed but a small part of the evidence of its truth; nevertheless, this is a species of evidence which is well fitted to come home to the bosoms of the unreflecting, and which is too important to be passed lightly over by any of us.—But perhaps no one who will read this, has a doubt, in respect to the claims which the gospel makes to divinity. You

assent to the truth of Christianity without hesitation. But have you reflected seriously how much is implied in this assent? It implies an acknowledgement on your part, (i. e. if you are still impenitent) that you are at this moment condemned to experience the wrath of God; that any hour you live, that wrath is liable to take effect upon your soul; that the Son of God has died on the cross to purchase for you a pardon; and yet that you live in the constant rejection of that pardon, notwithstanding all the love, and the grace, and the blood, which have been concerned in procuring for you the offer. Now then, I ask, dare you, as rational beings, thus trifle with Christianity? Dare you walk about on this earth, as if you were innocent? Dare you sport and trifle, as if there were no sentence of condemnation hanging over you, and not a cloud setting over your prospects, when the real fault is, that you are condemned; that you are liable to sin eternally; that you are rejecting an offered Saviour; and that you yourself fully acknowledge all this, in acknowledging that the religion of the Bible came down from heaven? I speak on this subject as to wise men: judge what I say.

S. Once more: We are taught by the history which we have been contemplating, *how delusive is the hope of the universalist.*

Take the character of Judas as it was in the last moments of his life; and see whether you can discern in it any thing better than the elements of eternal torment. It is the very nature of sin to produce misery; just as truly as it belongs to a fountain to send forth a stream. Judas, at the moment of his entrance into eternity, was a sinner; and therefore must have had that in him which would produce suffering. Moreover, it is the tendency of conscience, when testifying of sin, to give pain;—pain as we have already seen in this world, which sometimes brings with it complete desperation. Judas died in the full possession of a conscience, a conscience already awake, and which had begun, on this side the grave, to awaken the keenest agonies. A polluted nature and a guilty conscience, then, the two great sources of misery, Judas certainly had at the moment when he committed the fatal deed; and as there is nothing in death to change the character of the soul, being a mere change of physical existence, we may say with confidence that he had them, after the deed was done. Leaving out of view, then, the justice of God, which requires that sin *should* be punished in the future world, we may confidently infer from the fact before us that it *is* punished; and that it is punished too with tremendous severity.

“Yes,” you say, “you admit there is a hell; but deny that it is an eternal hell.” What meaneth, then, that aw-

ful declaration of the Saviour, that "it had been good for that man if he had never been born? If Judas, at the most distant point in eternity which your imaginations can reach, were to be restored to the purity and bliss of heaven, and then, as a glorified immortal, were to run an everlasting round of ages amidst the glories and hallelujahs of the redeemed, rely on it he would be the gainer for having had an existence: the time would come, when he would have enjoyed ten thousand times more than he had suffered. Even the Bible does not—cannot, contain a more conclusive argument than this for the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked.

But do you say that this doctrine is so dreadful that you cannot believe it? I answer, you have only to persevere in this very course, and you will learn its truth at no distant period, by the most appalling experience. The question is not, what you may wish to be true; nor what you may be led to conclude is true, from any general notions you may have of God, independently of his word; but it is simply this, "What saith the law and the testimony?" And that says that the wicked shall go away into eternal punishment; and that the smoke of their torment shall ascend up forever and ever. You may indeed fashion your faith according to your wishes on this subject, and you may disbelieve the eternal suffering of the sinner, because (if the doctrine be true) it throws a darkness that can be felt upon your own path; but after all, I warn you that that doctrine is in the Bible; and that he who wrote it there, is as faithful to his threatenings, as to his promises.

Yes, dying sinner, yet unreconciled to God—I repeat, the Bible tells you of an eternal hell; and it tells you that you are exposed to it; and it tells you how you may escape it. Do you turn a deaf ear to the warning, and still cling to the old delusion, that this doctrine is too dreadful to be true; and that there is too much mercy in God to give up any of his creatures to such a tremendous doom; and do you resolve that you will hold fast the hope that if you are punished at all, the punishment will not be extreme, either in duration or degree? Then pardon me, if for once, I undertake to prophesy concerning your future doom. I predict that that dread slumber into which you have put your conscience, by so often doing violence to its suggestions, will last, with perhaps very temporary interruptions, to your dying day. I predict that there will be something in the clustering indications of approaching death, that will make you begin to question whether you have been wise in acting upon the supposition that there is no eternal hell. I predict that, when death actually takes you in hand, and brings you to the door of the pit, you will have put away from you

the last doubt, that you are entering that dreary abode for eternity. And, as one wo in that dark abyss rises after another in an eternal storm, as one vial of Jehovah's wrath is poured out after another, as long as Jehovah himself shall exist; as the dark caverns of hell echo and re-echo with an everlasting wailing; I predict that you will be there to share it all; and that you will look back, millions of ages hence, to this very warning, and curse the folly which led you to disbelieve that there was an eternal hell!

---

CHRISTIAN STEWARDSHIP.

I introduce the general subject of Christian Stewardship, with peculiar interest. May the writer, and the reader, both be guided by the Spirit of God.

The thought of many seems to be, that, while in other matters duty is a very definite thing, here it is altogether indefinite. The subject must indeed be discoursed upon, but only at random. It must be urged upon Christians, but rather in the way of rhapsody. And, then, they must be left to guess at duty as they can, and each do what, on the whole, seems right in his own eyes.

It is admitted that the subject is beset with difficulties. But whence do these difficulties arise? more, it is believed, from the earthly spirit which pervades the church, and a mistaken sentiment as to the *object and purposes of life*, than from any intrinsic subtlety appertaining to the subject itself.

I may not, indeed, even hope to draw the lines of truth and duty through the whole of this important subject; but if I may only provoke the more successful efforts of others, something will be gained.

We usually associate all our ideas of charity with the gratuitous use of property. But a man may make a gratuitous use of his time, his learning, or his influence, as really as of his property. This brings up a wider view of the subject; and it is this wider view, that I would now take. My theme is christian charity in general, as it relates to the use of whatever comes within the range of our stewardship.

I begin with this position;—*all that we have of time, of property, of intellect, of learning, or of influence, belongs, in the highest possible sense of proprietorship, to the Lord Jesus Christ.*

To whom do universal nature, and universal being belong, if not to their Creator,—to Him, without whom they had not existed? The whole, and all the parts of that whole, whether mind or matter—whose are they? The nature of the case, reason, and conscience, force upon us the three-fold conviction that they are the Lord's. The Scriptures seal that conviction;—"The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein." "The sea is his, and he made it; and his hand formed the dry land." "The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts." "If I were hungry, I would not tell thee, for the world is mine." "What hast thou, that thou didst not receive?" Accordingly, when men withhold from God any thing which his service requires, he charges them with robbery. "Ye are cursed with a curse; for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation." And when they ask "*wherein*;" his reply is, "in tithes and offerings."—When the Israelites brought their contributions to the building of the temple, David uttered the same sentiment,—“who am I, and what is my people, that we should be able to offer so willingly after this sort? For all things come of thee, and of thine own have we given thee. O Lord, our God, all this store which we have prepared, to build thee an house for thy holy name, cometh of thine hand, and is all thine own.”—To the same purpose, is that devout ascription so pertinent for all to use, "For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: to whom be glory forever, amen."

I pass to a second position, which is this:—*all that we have, of time, of property, of intellect, of learning, of influence, is to be used in strict and implicit obedience to the will of the Lord Jesus Christ.*

Where is the document, in the book of nature or of revelation, which shows that he has put any part of his creation out of his hands? To whom has he yielded aught thereof, so that it is no longer under requisition to serve his designs? If to no one, then is his will *first law*, as to the use we may make of ourselves and of every thing we have. So says the moral sense of every man. Accordingly, Christ is represented under the character of a nobleman, and we as his servants, to whom he entrusts his goods, to be kept and used for him. "He said, therefore, a certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return. And he called his servants, and delivered them ten pounds, and said occupy till I come." This nobleman evidently considered the pounds as his, not only at the time he committed them to his servants, but as continuing to be his; so that with pro-

priety he might call for them on his return, as he did, and for the use made of them. The servants, therefore, were strictly stewards, and never any thing more than stewards. Here, then, as before, we have the concurrent testimony of the nature of the case, reason, conscience, and the Scripture. They press us with the conviction, that we *are but stewards*—that we, and all we have, are to be held implicitly subject to the will of the Lord Jesus Christ.

I come to a third position:—*It is the will of the Lord Jesus Christ that whatever we have of time, property, intellect, learning, influence—any or all of these, should be so used as to produce the greatest possible good*;—in other words, should be made to produce effects of the best kind that can be produced by it, and to the greatest possible extent.” For the correctness of this position, I make my appeal, first, to the known character of the Lord Jesus Christ,—secondly, to the whole tenor of revelation considered as expressive of his will,—Thirdly to the understanding and moral sense of every man.—What kind of effects, will you say God would have you produce—bad, or good? If you say good, (as I know indeed you do,) I ask, to what extent? Would he have the good the greatest possible;—or would he prefer a smaller measure of it, although the means of producing the greater, were already provided? There is nothing ambiguous or doubtful here. The answer of every conscience is clear and decided.

These three positions are entitled to be considered as axioms in morals; and it is safe to conclude there will be no difference of opinion respecting them. Let them rest, therefore, as first principles, having the entire consent of truth, while we go on to some further examination and conclusions.

There is supposable good, which it is the desire of the Lord Jesus Christ should be produced. That it might be produced, he created this world and peopled it. For the production of it, he now holds the world, with all its resources—intellectual, moral, and physical, under constant and unchanging requisition. He has let go his hold of nothing. For the attainment of this good, therefore, we are to employ whatever he commits to our stewardship. And when we make an appropriation of ourselves, or of aught we have, for other purposes than the good in question, we sin,—our hands are sacrilegious.

The inquiry now arises, what is the good in question? On this point, with as many as believe in the government of God, there will be no clashing of opinion. It is not temporal enjoyment, sensual pleasure and gratification, nor any thing

confined and limited to the relations of the present life. It is holiness—*moral resemblance to God and union with him, and the wellbeing springing eternally therefrom.* That this is more important to every intelligent moral being, than all things besides, will not be questioned. That this is what the heart of the Lord Jesus Christ is fully set upon, is as conspicuous as the glory he left in heaven, or the cross he bore on earth.

Here then is the good in question ;—Recovery from sin, and restoration to holiness, among the children of our race. This is the sublime result Christ would secure. He wills that the entire resources of earth and time be appropriated to secure it. For this he made them. To this end, therefore, we are to direct our single aim in the use we make of every thing under our stewardship. All that we have of time, property, intellect, learning, influence, is to be used first, last, and wholly, with a view to realize this result, *on the broad scale of the world.*

Let us now look into this great practical concern a little more minutely. We have before us this conclusion,—that recovery from sin, and restoration to holiness among the children of men, is the grand object at which we are to aim ;—that to this we are to appropriate, in the most effectual manner possible, every thing within the range of our stewardship. Can we go back from this conclusion, except we go back from the gospel ? Let us see, then, how it will apply in practice.

That we may cultivate holiness in ourselves and others, and bring forth moral resemblance to God, the process of *life and action* must be sustained. A measure, therefore, of time, thought, property, &c., must be appropriated to the preservation of life and health. Also to produce and cultivate holiness, there must be *knowledge*. Something, therefore, must be applied to the acquisition of learning. And, furthermore, to the production of holiness there must be *the means of grace*. Consequently a portion of our time, property, &c. must be employed to furnish these means. These three things—the means of life and health, the means of mental cultivation, and the means of grace, constitute what are otherwise and may properly be called our wants,—wants that are actual and real, and not factitious—not such as are imaginary, or as arise from fashion or habit. These must be supplied, that the purposes of our being may be answered. And that the purposes of our being may be answered, they must be no more than supplied. Where they are, there is a perverted use of the things under our stewardship. We lessen our ability to sub-

serve the interests of holiness, by misapplying the means we have of doing it.

I come, then, to the very interesting, important, and perhaps difficult inquiry,—what, in the gospel sense, is a proper provision for these wants? That it is all a man can possess himself of, in every practicable way, and through the whole of life, no one will pretend. If, then, a proper provision for our wants is not to be limited by our ability to possess, by what is it to be limited? I answer, by considerations derived from the known purposes of our being, and from the instructions of the Bible. What do we need, best to subserve the design of the Lord Jesus Christ in our creation;—what does the Bible teach us that we need?

As to the *kind* of provision necessary, nature itself, in the general, decides. So too, in the general, nature decides the *amount*, for the time present. The difficulty, then, so far as there is any, relates to the particular point of provision for *future* wants. And here, if I mistake not, the matter goes very far towards deciding itself. And the more I reflect upon it, the more am I constrained to think it tends to a right decision:—I mean, a decision, which, if practically applied, would fit us best to answer the purposes of our being;—would best harmonize with the spirit and current instructions of the Bible.

I say, then, we cannot make provisions for our *present* wants, which shall not involve a measure of provision for the *future*. Your suit of clothes is a provision for the future. So is your carriage, your house, your shop, your farm, your trade, your stock in business, your profession. Yet all these are indispensable, in the several places, to the supply of the *present* wants. Of necessity, then, there must be, for the supply of the present, a sort of stock, or capital,—consisting of ability to labor, a trade, a farm, a store, a profession—any, or all of these together,—out of which present supply can be drawn. And, if it is now inquired, to what extent this stock, or capital, may be enlarged, the answer is, to such an extent that the current income of it, when properly worked in all its parts, shall be sufficient to meet current wants from year to year. Of course, where there is more of one kind of stock, there will be less of another. And as it is more or less productive, the amount must vary;—the whole capital being to be limited, not by its nominal valuation, but by its productiveness—its current income. This, as a general rule, it is believed is dictated, both by a proper view of the purposes to be answered by our being, and by the general tenor of Scrip-

ture teaching. And to treasure up, beyond this, substance of any kind, merely to hold it in reserve for the possibilities of an uncertain future, is probably, after all our thoughts of justifying it, without warrant, save in those maxims of worldly prudence, which have lost sight, alike of the God of the Bible, and the God of providence.

Here, however, let me say, that in applying this rule, every individual should act with discretion, and a regard to circumstances in several respects. As modifications of the rule, I have three remarks to offer.

First, regard should be had to the contingency of all, or any part, of the stock from which present supply is derived. For example;—one man's income, sufficient to meet his current wants, may arise principally from his trade,—another's, from his profession,—another's, from his real estate. Here are different degrees of contingency. The mechanic or the professional man dies, and this income ceases. The income of the real estate survives its owner. This circumstance should doubtless be regarded

Secondly, foreseen changes in the *measure* of a family's current wants, is a matter entitled to be regarded. Example:—such may be the number, ages, or circumstances of a man's children or dependants, as to indicate, with a high degree of certainty, that a few years will materially change the measure of his wants. Such a case calls for discretion. Our danger, however, will be, that we bend the rule too far, rather than not far enough.

Thirdly, regard should be had to the place a man occupies, or the branch of business he is in. Some kinds of business, if undertaken at all, require the investment of more capital than would be necessary merely to produce an income sufficient to meet present wants. May the Christian undertake such business? I answer, yes;—But it must be with this view, sacredly observed,—that the extra capital, in itself and in its income, is the Lord's, and is to stand for the promotion of holiness. And it must be done only on this principle, that the current income from year to year, will be worth more, to the treasury of the Lord and the cause of holiness, than the present use of the whole. Just as a committee, or society, with liberty so to do, might take funds out of the sacred treasury, and invest them in some peculiarly productive capital, because the continued income would in the end subserve the interests of holiness, more largely than the immediate application of the capital itself. *The greatest ultimate amount—the greatest sum total, of influence in favor of holiness, is THE AIM, to which every thing is to be surrendered.*

With these modifications,—and let it be carefully observed that each of them involves a general principle,—I turn again to the rule. We are to hold something that is available—call it property, consisting of time, health, estate, trade, profession, influence—any or all of these united, to such an amount that the current income of it, when properly improved, will be sufficient to meet current wants. We come, then, to this conclusion;—All that Christians possess above this amount, is a surplus fund now in the hands of the church. It consists of time, ability to labor in the vineyard of Christ, property, intellect, learning, influence,—the whole amount of which is to be regarded as sacredly due to the cause of holiness. This surplus fund is the true and proper measure of the present ability of the church to promote that cause. And of this fund of ability, no man can take any part, and appropriate it to himself, without losing his innocence. If Gabriel should do it, his hands would be stained with sacrilege. It would be robbing Christ's kingdom, of *the means he has provided for its advancement*, and appropriating them to the purposes of an individual interest, set up in distinction from his.

Who, then, is prepared to be on the Lord's side?—Who is prepared, in the spirit of earlier and better days, to do his duty? This fund, in all its parts—as well the time, the influence, the strength to labor, as the property, must be faithfully applied, if Christians would stand guiltless. Nor must it be applied with reluctant hands. God loveth the cheerful giver. It must be applied without grudging, as were the offerings of the Israelites to the building of the temple. It must be forthcoming, as fast as with a discreet economy it can be expended. They, whose charge it is to devise measures for spreading the gospel, must be at liberty to feel that this whole fund of time and means is actually at their disposal, and to be handed over as fast as they can mature plans for judiciously applying it.

If such is the actual ability, which, at this moment, the church is possessed of, and under obligation to put forth, as fast as room can be made for it;—then pause a moment and see—how far short is actual performance, of actual means and ability!—yea, how the actual power of the church transcends its own estimate of that power! Let us pray, that on this subject our sons and our daughters may prophecy,—that our young men may see visions, and our old men dream dreams,—that on his servants, and on his handmaidens, God will pour out his spirit, and that the eyes of them that see may not be dim. Look not only at the church collectively, but at families. What a power there is in the hands of individuals,—

of the extent of which, they never had one serious thought!—of their duty to employ which, they never felt one serious conviction! Yet, there are men among us, whose ability to give enlargement to the king of holiness, surpasses that of the great Apostle of the Gentiles,—abating simply his inspiration and his miracles. They have the means and opportunity of bringing more to pass than he possibly could. Start not at such a thought. Put his spirit within them; let them feel its yearnings—impelling them to high and holy enterprise, and how would they come out upon the world. By educating pious youth for the ministry, and supporting missionaries, they might occupy, each a hundred pulpits. By means of the press, each might speak a thousand languages, with ten thousand different tongues. By the present facility of communication, they might draw the corners of the earth within their reach. Taking advantage of concurrent sentiment and concurrent operations, they might immeasurably increase their power, and the amplitude of their results. In a word, you have only to teach them, like Paul, to contemplate *men* and *things*, as they stand related to *eternity* rather than *time*,—you have only to fill them as he was filled with the love of Christ, and to make them determined, as he was determined, to know nothing, save Jesus Christ and him crucified; and their greater ability to give enlargement to the kingdom of Christ, would soon be tested by its fruits. M.

---

#### MINISTERIAL QUALIFICATIONS.

The purity and prosperity of religion, have always been in proportion to the intelligence and piety of Christian ministers; while its corruption and decline have uniformly been preceded by a failure of ministerial qualifications. It is also true, that a season of unprecedented prosperity in the church, is the most favorable opportunity for the introduction of many opinions and practices, which ultimately contribute, to impair the dignity, the purity and the usefulness of the ministerial character.

Both in view of the prosperity of the church and the peculiar dangers which now threaten its peace and purity, nothing can be more important, or more desirable, than an intelligent, pious and discreet ministry: and it should be the united effort of all the friends of religion, to raise the standard of ministerial

qualifications, and to watch with peculiar jealousy every thing which tends to sink it.

Many circumstances must combine to constitute ministerial excellence: neither talents, education, nor piety, separately considered, are sufficient. It must be a combination of all these, accompanied with knowledge of human nature, to form a character suited to the delicate and responsible duties of the ministry. If the example of Scott and Fuller were to be followed, or the advice of Edwards regarded, no remarks on this subject, would, at this time, be required. But we perceive, if we mistake not, in some parts of the country, a growing disposition to undervalue many of those qualifications which have long been regarded by the wisest and best men of our country, and of the world, as essential to the usefulness and respectability of the ministry. At the same time, there is an expressed desire, arising, we doubt not, from benevolent feelings, to supply the lamentable deficiency in the number of ministers, by adopting a more expeditious method of introducing young men to its labors, than that of a thorough and systematic course of study: and from the success, which has at times attended the ministrations of uneducated men, the desire is felt and manifested, too, by many, to rush hastily into the labors of the ministry, without maturely considering, whether they have the qualifications and peculiar traits of character, which have secured success to those, whose example they would presume to imitate. This course demands the most serious consideration, before it shall be adopted; for once adopted, its evils, if such shall be found to arise, will not be easily removed. It would be easy for us, to increase the number of our ministers, as rapidly, as some other denominations; but what should we gain by it? We should lose the sublime elevation, which we now hold, and one half of our usefulness would be destroyed. And we are not free from the apprehension, that we may be in danger of exchanging places with those who have so long decried the necessity and value of a learned and experienced ministry, while we have been seeking to secure it, as the most permanent and endeared legacy to the church and the world.

This desire to increase the number of our ministers, by the admission of unqualified men to its labors, will unquestionably defeat the very object in view. Was it our sole object to fill any profession in life, to do so, we would make that profession as respectable and influential as possible. The number of ministers holds an intimate relation to the character and spirit of the ministry. Let ministers be intelligent and active, their influence permanent and valuable, and their services will be

demand'd, and their character respected. Talent and education is influence; and influence rightly directed is usefulness. But let our clergy be uneducated, or imperfectly prepared for the complicated and arduous duties of their office, and they will soon become itinerant, if not wholly out of employment: thus they will rather discourage others from entering the ministry, and degrade the sacred office itself, than supply the existing deficiency themselves.

The question may arise, have not some uneducated ministers been useful? Certainly, and no doubt they would have been much more so, if they had been better educated in Biblical and theological knowledge. That ignorance contributes, in any sense, either to devotion or usefulness, cannot be admitted; and yet this seems to be the strong impression of many, who will borrow authority from the Scripture declaration, "Hath not God chosen the weak things of this world, to confound the things that are mighty?" overlooking alike the perversion of this passage and the general instructions of the Bible on this subject.

The question will occur, are not some uneducated men more useful, than many who are thoroughly educated? We answer, yes; and nothing is lost or gained by the admission—still, we would maintain, that education never of itself makes any man less useful, nor does the absence of it render any man more so.

The minds of some, we are aware, specially at the present day, will still inquire, are there not *some men*, whom education would have injured? Are they not as they *now* are, better fitted for *their* place in the field, than if they had been thoroughly educated? As an unqualified negative would not satisfy such, we shall place the burden of proof on the arm of the inquirer: Show us, if you can, that their usefulness would not have been greatly increased by additional acquisitions in literature and science, as well as in Biblical and theological learning. This cannot be done. The contrary, very few will question. And we would ask, too, do not many gross errors, as well as some melancholy consequences, at times, result from their want of a more liberal education? We would start the inquiry, with abundant assurance, that facts warrant its suggestion.

There is a strong persuasion in the minds of many, of the value of a certain class of uneducated preachers, from the wide range of influence which they have at times secured, and from the apparent blessing which has attended their labors; but it should be remembered, that we are incompetent judges of the amount of a man's usefulness. The immediate

and visible effects of his labors are by no means a safe criterion. He may be reaping in triumph and joy a redundant harvest, where others, before him have ploughed and sowed in tears, and despairing of success, have died. We would ask, is the glory his? His is the least of the labor, and if honor belongs to the instrument in the hand of the great Agent, his is the least of the honor. And while we may be estimating the present and apparent usefulness of men, we may not be capable of perceiving subsequent and remote evils, which a more expanded view, more experience and more acquaintance with intellectual and moral causes, might have enabled them to have foreseen and prevented. As to usefulness, or want of usefulness, it is possible, that the record of heaven will disclose a result vastly different from the opinions and testimony of men. We cheerfully allow, that there are a few men, highly gifted of God, of powerful minds, bold and lofty in conception, rich in resources of illustration, capable of originating thought in a moment, where others might study days, and fall far below the same region of intellection still. To such men we give all due honor. But here let us be cautious. There are *few such* men; and if we would not sully their lustre, and ruin their reputation, let us leave them where God has placed them, as exceptions to the common class of men, and who are to travel in a solitary, though a splendid orbit. That every man can make such a minister is not to be admitted, and they, who with unfurnished minds, attempt it, must fall and fail, disgracing themselves and detracting from the merits of those, they strive to imitate, as well as wound the cause they unadvisedly attempt to advance. We say there are few such men, and their peculiarities are not for our imitation. Whitfield, was one of those splendid luminaries, that visits our hemisphere, but once in a thousand years. When young men, without his mind and knowledge of God and mankind, attempt to be Whitfields, they must fail, and fail, too, with vast injury to the church.

If such men as we have mentioned are essential to the cause of religion, we would not detract from their usefulness; but we would increase it and encourage them with all our heart in the appropriate sphere of their duty; and if it be their appropriate sphere, to pass as itinerant preachers through the churches, they should be of all men most wise and discreet; for they are generally sought for in seasons and places of unusual excitement, when impressions are easily and deeply drawn; and if they err, even in trifles, they leave serious and permanent injury. Their errors, are more easily caught

and imitated, than their excellencies. An ordinary mind may seize the first, while an intellect of superior mould may be required for the latter.

We cannot close this article, without alluding to the opinion of others on this subject. President Edwards, saw the advantages of a well qualified ministry, in the numerous and valuable revivals of religion which followed their pious labors; and he has paid an affectionate tribute to the co-operation of other pious and judicious agents in these memorable seasons of divine grace. He saw, too, the evils resulting from an uneducated and inexperienced ministry, and while he spoke of such with peculiar tenderness and delicacy, he deeply deplored the result of their indiscretion, and has left us the most salutary admonitions and the wisest counsel which can be found out of the record of inspiration. And it would seem that he was guided by unerring wisdom, to record the evils attending an inexperienced and indiscreet ministry, and injudicious management and measures in revivals of religion, as lessons of salutary caution to every future age of the church. It was in view of these things, that he said, "A minister is set to be a light to men's souls, by teaching or doctrine: and if he be a shining light in this respect, the light of his doctrine must be *bright and full*; it must be pure without mixture of darkness, and therefore he must be sound in the faith, not one that is of a reprobate mind; in doctrine he must show uncorruptness, otherwise his light will be darkness." "He must be one who *is able to teach*, not one that is *raw, ignorant and unlearned*, and but little versed in the things that he is to teach to others: Not a novice, or one that is *unskillful* in the word of righteousness; he must be one, that is *well studied in divinity*, well acquainted with the written word of God, mighty in the Scriptures and able to instruct and convince gainsayers." The same author adds, "In order to his being a shining light, his doctrine must be *full*; he must not only be *able* to teach, but *apt* to teach, and faithful and careful to declare the whole counsel of God, and not to keep back anything, that may be profitable to his hearers; and *in order to this Ministers should be diligent in their studies.*"

In his work, on the Revival in New-England, very much is said on ministerial qualifications, in an incidental way, and no one who is familiar with that work, can doubt, that it was written, in part at least, with reference to certain evils, which, at that time, arose in the churches, in connexion with the labors of men who were destitute of what were then regarded

*Ministerial qualifications.* President Edwards, in this inestimable treatise, speaks of such with peculiar tenderness, and advises others not to be uncharitable or prejudiced against the revival on account of their youth and imprudences. And while he declares, that God may and sometimes does bless their imperfections to the salvation of men, he regards this as by no means, sanctioning their conduct. Taking the writings of President Edwards and his example in the most laborious part of his ministry, we say, without hesitation, that no man valued more highly and recommended more earnestly high intellectual attainments in ministers of the Gospel. The opinions and example of the early ministers of this country were in accordance with his; and to this day, we are reaping the benefits, not only of their piety, but of the numerous and combined excellencies of their Ministerial character. There is not one department of our government; not one section of our church, but what feels the influence of their minds; and while their memory and the results of their labors live, we trust, that no judicious minister of the Gospel can undervalue thorough and systematic education in this important department of intellectual and moral influence; nor consent to relinquish one qualification of this most important office. We cannot but believe that the great body of the New England Clergy now prize ministerial qualifications as highly as did their revered predecessors.

The views of the Presbyterian Church are in accordance with those already expressed. We find in their Confession of Faith, in the chapter, entitled, "On Licensing Candidates to preach the Gospel," that "it is recommended, that the candidate be required to produce a diploma of Bachelor of Arts, from some College or University, or at least authentic testimonials of having gone through a regular course of learning." "Because it is highly reproachful to religion, and dangerous to the church, to entrust the holy ministry, to weak and ignorant men; the Presbytery *shall* try each candidate as to his knowledge of the Latin language and the original languages in which the Holy Scriptures were written. They *shall* also examine him on the Arts and Sciences; on Theology, Natural and Revealed; on Ecclesiastical History, the Sacraments, and Church Government. He *shall* be required to read a Latin Exegesis—a Critical Exercise—a Lecture and a Popular Sermon; and it is recommended that no candidate, except in extraordinary cases, be licensed, unless after having completed the usual course of Academical studies, he shall have studied Divinity at least two years." This period being considered too short,

the Seminaries in connexion with the Presbyterian Church, have established a course of three years study. Other denominations have expressed similar views, as to ministerial qualifications and made similar regulations.—These opinions and regulations are obviously sustained by public sentiment. And shall not this united opinion have powerful influence upon us, fortified as it is with the declaration of the Bible, that the preacher must speak things that he knows, and testify the things that he has seen, and not be a blind leader of the blind; a scribe well instructed in things that pertain to the kingdom of God; one that brings forth out of his treasure things new and old?—If in view of all this, any young man, can set his face toward the ministry, without the expenditure of years in securing the requisite qualifications, he must have no ordinary share of confidence in himself, as well as inadequate conceptions of the nature and duties of that office to which he aspires.—We rejoice, that with us there are but few of this description. E.

---

## REVIEWS.

---

THE AUTO-BIOGRAPHY OF THOMAS SHEPARD; *with Additional Notices of his Life and Character*, by NEHEMIAH ADAMS, *Pastor of the First Church in connexion with the Shepard Society, Cambridge.* Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1832. pp. 129.

The opinion that recent observation is most correct, and that the evidence of history is continually weakened by time, is confuted by all experience. No event stands alone; all the great features of history are combinations; and parts of the composition are continually emerging from the waves of seeming oblivion, to finish the defective image, and complete our conception of the whole. We survey past time as a traveller sails over the bay, where some great battle has been fought; the bodies are continually rising, as if to tell the secrets of the past, and new wrecks are discovered beneath the waves, as new proofs producing new impressions of the carnage of the dreadful day, when victory and defeat elated and humbled the pride

of man. The truth is, in historical affairs, we see more with the eye of reason than the bodily eye. A man shall be present at some great battle, (Waterloo, for example,) and see as far as one witness can see amidst confusion and smoke the evolutions of the day. But he is only *one* witness; it is only a part which he sees; he is disturbed by the excitement of the awful scene; and he will have a far less correct conception of the event, than the man, who ten years afterwards, sits down coolly in his closet, compares the different accounts, sees causes in their effects, and beholds the event by an enlightened mental perception.—We recommend these remarks to those, who have found so much difficulty in seeing Christianity through the perspective of eighteen hundred years. Past events are not like a light-house, which fades on the sailor's eye, as he surveys it over his stern, while ploughing out into the boundless ocean; but they are like a planet rising with a brighter and purer light until it reaches the meridian. Pamphlets and private memoirs are continually coming up which throw light on the times of Cromwell. It is so with respect to the character of Buonaparte. There was a time when the murder of Capt. Wright and the massacre of Jaffa were considered as entitled to equal credit. Now, probably no one believes the first of these stories, and no one doubts the last.—Our fathers are dead, and the shades of almost two centuries have settled over their sepulchres; but behold! there arises a relict to paint their manners and even their very wits with all the freshness of original existence.

The first sensation we experienced in reading this little volume, was a feeling of wonder that it never had been permitted to see the light before. It has long been in the hands of authors, writing men, who have profited by its information; and no doubt must have been pleased with its author's spirit. Was it that its charming simplicity was thought ill calculated to please a vitiated age, or was it, that some writers supposed that their own reflected representations of puritan manners would be more vivid and satisfying than this original picture? The latter supposition is impossible. We feel thankful that a kind providence has watched over the frail manuscript, and we tender our best thanks to the judicious editor, who has given this volume to the public. He has certainly judged right, in retaining the authography, the contractions and all the peculiarities of his venerable author. We have nothing to censure except the omissions, which, after long deliberation, he says, he concluded to make. What they were, or how powerful the reasons were for withholding any part of the work from the pub-

lic, not having seen the manuscript, we are not competent to say. We confess, for ourselves, if there was not some very strong objection, we should like to have seen Shepard just as he was. If there was a fantastic wrinkle in his cloak, let him wear it, for it marks the man.

There is, we believe, an original pattern after which most nations shape their character, and in which they place their reputation and glory. If the pattern be good, it is well to have it called from the dust and cobwebs which are gathering over it, and placed in broad view to the public contemplation. Israel of old rejoiced in believing in the Unity of God; Athens in her philosophers and poets; Sparta in her discipline and apothegms; and Rome in her illustrious warriors. The glory of a nation is the character, which her original genius took, (what gave it that direction it is superfluous to inquire,) and in that track, if innocent, they should follow, as the subsequent waters must always replenish the channel, and roll in it, which the first rivulet has made. England will never forget her Bacon and Newton; and New-England never her clergy, her Sabbaths, her fasts and thanksgivings; her sober manners, her stern spirit of self-denial, her orthodoxy and her God. Her character, we hope, will rise on as firm a basis as her rocky mountains; and every subsequent builder remember the first foundation, and give the building a compactness and consistency suitable to the great design. Our fathers, we may begin to ask,—*where are they?* and *the prophets*, we find, do *not live forever*. But their spirit, we trust, will be as firm as our iron soil, and as permanent as the blessing of our God.

This work is a scrap; and, considered apart from all connexions as a mere work of talent and genius, not a very important scrap. It will certainly disgust by its simplicity those, who can relish nothing but the over-charged biography of the present day. It has no attempts at fine writing; no far-fetched metaphors. Its charm is the charm of sincerity; and every paragraph is an effusion of the heart. It is the relict of a departed saint. It is the brick of an ancient edifice, bearing the mystic characters which transport us back to the seasons and times, when other manners reigned and other saints lived and prayed. We seem to go back and converse with the pious author, in an hour when he makes his most confidential communications. We remember, when Lafayette visited this country, the peculiar impressions, which the event made on our heart. We had been accustomed to read of the heroes of the revolution; to consider its events as passages long gone by; and its actors as personages, whom we should never see in this

world, but in the light of history and in the greatness of their deeds. Even Fayette, from the habit of association, seemed to be among the dead, since those were dead with whom he associated while living. It was with peculiar feelings we saw him returning as it were from the tomb, to present us a specimen of the living agents of days long past. It is with similar sensations, on a more tender subject, that we survey this little book. It is the better part of Shepard speaking to us from the tomb; or rather not speaking from the tomb; but rising to walk with us as if still alive.

This work is a beautiful illustration of the spirit with which our Pilgrim fathers left their native land. There has been so much declamation on this point, and it is so natural for all nations to look back on their ancestors with an exaggerated estimation, that sometimes the suspicion has flitted across our minds, whether we were not also deceived; whether the Pilgrims were such gigantic heroes and saints, as their admiring posterity have been disposed to make them; and whether they did not at least derive part of their lustre from the darkness to which they were opposed, and the circumstances with which they were surrounded, rather than from their own independent worth. Particularly, we have always harbored a suspicion whether in their zealous opposition to a religion entirely political and secular, they did not overlook the influence of grace on the heart; in a word, whether they were the clear and spiritual Christians, which, since the days of Edwards and Whitefield, have been considered as composing the real church. This suspicion has been somewhat increased by certain passages in the books of that day; particularly the following in Mather's *Magnalia*, Book V. chap. xvii: "The first churches of New England began only with a profession of assent and consent unto the confession of faith and the covenant of communion. Afterwards, they that sought for the communion, were but privately examined about a work of grace in their souls, by the elders, and then publicly propounded unto the congregation, only that so, if there were any scandal in their lives, it might be objected and considered." Their ideas also of the connexion of baptized children with the church, were confused and indefinite; and many perhaps found their way to the Lord's table, who never found the Lord in their heart. We are pretty sure, that both Luther and Calvin, intent on the great controversies which divided them from the Roman church, were not so careful to examine into the state of the heart in those who professed religion, as is necessary to preserve in them the forms and the power of godliness. It was great slackness in discipline, with-

out a corresponding strictness in examining such as are admitted to the church, which produced the commotions which expelled Calvin from Geneva. All these things considered, we have sometimes harbored the suspicion, whether our puritan fathers were not more careful to prove the correctness of the faith of their followers, than to see the power of that faith in changing their hearts. We are happy to find, from this book, that some of them felt and portrayed, by a vivid delineation, the power of religion on their own souls. Mr. Shepard was the subject of experimental religion. His faith consisted not in an orthodox creed, but in the power of the Holy Spirit on his own soul. Like all converted men from the days of Paul to the present hour, he *he was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived and he died.* We shall not transcribe the account of his religious exercises while at college, because we would do nothing to diminish the pleasure with which every religious reader must peruse it in the book. It is a beautiful illustration that true religion is the same in every age. There is no love to Christ without conviction of sin; no conviction of sin without a knowledge of the law; and no true acquaintance with any of these things, until a man is taught by his own experience. The secret of all Shepard's perseverance and success was, that he was taught of God.

It is strong confirmation of the truth of real religion, considered as an exercise of the heart, that in all ages its operations are the same. The same views of truth produced essentially the same impressions on the soul. We find Augustine in his confessions, lamenting his sins, driven off from his self-righteousness, and taking shelter under the cross of Christ. It is remarkable that his speculations and his experience always kept pace with each other; and he became an orthodox believer as soon as he had an orthodox heart. We find the same process of experience, the same heart-work in Owen, in Baxter, in Bunyan, in Whitefield, in Edwards, as in Shepard; men who were born in different ages; had different instructors; and were educated in different churches. Now here is a remarkable phenomenon in the history of human nature; here are witnesses of different characters and different temperaments; all of them habituated to self-inspection; who rise up from different quarters and bear the same testimony to the power of inward religion. This fact has the same relation to a correct interpretation of the Bible, that a star has to a telescope, or light to the eye. It is impossible to understand the main truths of Christianity without seeing their action on the heart. The worms of the ground might as well undertake to comprehend the worth and pur-

poses of a tree by crawling around its roots, and never seeing its blossoms or its fruits, as for a man to comprehend the gospel without feeling its sanctified action on his own soul. The truth is, every man refers moral principles to his own ideal world within; he goes to the Bible for letters and words, but to his own breast for impressions and images; and in the play between these opposite regions truth will be lost, unless the world within correspond to the world without. We mean here exactly what Paul means, when he says,—*The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.*

We would most earnestly entreat all ministers of the gospel and private men, who are conscious to themselves of no such inward impressions to which to refer the declarations of the Bible as are described in the life of Shepard, to pause and peruse the following reflections.—The Scriptures certainly seem to speak of a radical change; this is the most natural import of the language of Christ and his Apostles. Nature is certainly bad enough to need it; and even the most callous, in the hours of reflection, are dissatisfied with themselves.—We all naturally tremble at the thought of appearing before God. But in addition to all this, we find a cloud of witnesses who come forward and say they have felt it; they were distressed for their sins, and they passed from a course of selfishness and sensuality to the love of God. Their whole life answered thereto. These are the martyrs; and self-denying sufferers; these are the pilgrims, who renounced their homes, crossed the waters, and made the wilderness blossom like the rose. These are the men who have built up the nobler virtues on the deeper feelings of the heart. The argument is cumulative, and every part of the system tallies. It is like the analytic and synthetic proof, in chemistry—the strongest proof possible. What can a man say? Observation and Scripture both combine to show that, *except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.*

This book is a curious illustration of the history of the times. Indeed, biography as Lord Bacon has observed, is, in some respects, a more faithful memorial of past transactions than professed history. By preserving some trifling incident, some fugitive speech, it often lets us into the character of the chief men; and lays open the springs of events. We have sometimes been jealous whether partial representations and party feelings have not misrepresented the antagonists of the puritans; whether there were not some softening circum-

stances, which seduced the Episcopal party into their oppressive course; whether our fathers, opposed in their favorite speculations and goaded by oppression, did not use the black brush too much in painting their adversaries; and we have sometimes been tempted to relieve our pity and indignation by the saving maxim that there were probably faults on both sides. This little volume throws light on this perplexity. It is amusing to see how exactly the character of Laud, in his treatment of our author, tallies with what Clarendon has said of him. Perhaps there are few persons, who have been transmitted to posterity with so just a delineation. Friends and foes; churchmen and puritans; public documents and private diaries have all said enough to communicate to us the most exact representation of his character. We can seem to see him, a little dapper man, wrapt up in his canonicals towering in the pride of place; insolent from authority; incapable of the least opposition; now choking one of his own dependants with his lawn sleeves; now throwing up his cap because some poor puritan preacher is condemned to have his nose slit; now sanctifying a church; while he is suppressing the very genius of religion, bowing to the communion table, while he is opposing the religion of Jesus and endeavoring to impart that holiness to bread and wine and wood and stone, which he would be glad to exterminate from the heart of man; sometimes falling into passion with a courtier, who wittily plays on his temper; and sometimes pitching his sanctity against Archy the king's fool, to whom in point of abilities, he was undoubtedly inferior; in short, a hateful compound of cruelty, oppression, pride and insolence; and all this covered over by the cloak of a religion, which was, after all, his greatest crime. There can be no mistake here. Every biography and pamphlet we take up of that period corroborates this representation of his character. The apologies of Clarendon and the exhibitions of his own diary are more fatal to his memory than any of the reproaches of the suffering puritans. Indeed, we are no believers in the doctrine of historical scepticism, which has sometimes been taught, as if, in the conflicts of party and the misrepresentations of opposing sects, truths must be lost. We believe on the contrary, that every public man finally finds his level. Not only actions but motives are at length pretty clearly seen. A few bigots may be found, who doubt whether, in the moral arithmetic, two and two make four. But these are exceptions. The ocean becomes settled, and every impartial eye can see the pebbles at the bottom.

We shall insert a short extract of Shepard's account of his

treatment by Laud, as it is an exquisite morsel to shew the character of the men and the times, the irritability and pride of the prelate, and the meekness of the humble preacher of Christ.

“ Dec. 16, 1630, I was inhibited from preaching in the Diocese of London by DR. LAUD, Bishop of that Diocese. As soon as I came in the morning about 8 of the clock, falling into a fit of rage he asked me what degree I had taken in the University. I answered, I was master of Arts. He asked me of what Colledge, I answered of Emanuel. He asked me how long I had lived in his Diocese? I answered 3 years and upwards. He asked who maintained me all this while, charging me to deal plainly with him, adding withal that he had been more cheated and equivocated with by some of my malignant faction than ever man was by Jesuit. At the speaking of which words he looked as though blood would have gushed out of his face, and did shake as if he had been haunted with an ague fit,—to my apprehension, by reason of his extreme malice and secret venome. I desired him to excuse me. He fell then to threaten me and withal to bitter railing, calling me all to nought, saying—“ You prating coxcomb, do you think all the learning is in your brain?” He pronounced his sentence thus. I charge you that you neither preach, read, marry, bury, or exercise any ministerial functions in any part of my Diocese; for if you do, and I hear of it, I’ll be upon your back and follow you wherever you go, in any part of this kingdom, and so everlastingly disenable you. I besought him not to deal so in behalf of a poore town,—here he stoppt me in what I was going to say—“ a poor town! You have made a company of seditious factious bedlams. And what do you prate to me of a poor town?” I prayed him to suffer me to catechise on the Sabbath days, in the afternoon. He replied, “ spare your breath, I’ll have no such fellows prate in my Diocese. Get you gone! And make your complaints to whom you will!” So away I went—and blessed be God that I may go to HIM.”

We have in this book a specimen of the first clergy of New England. Shepard was but a single star in a noble and bright constellation, men, who formed the soul and spirit of this community. He seems to have walked in great harmony with his brethren; and, though a strict Calvinist, he took the right side, when those principles seemed to be strutting up into antinomianism. When the opinions of Mrs. Hutchinson were distinctly the contrary, Shepard was a firm friend to the Orthodox faith. It has always seemed to us, that this event has not received all the explanation it is capable of. Although antinomianism is a natural offshoot of high Calvinism; a spurious sucker round that venerable tree, yet it never appeared to us, that the chief difficulties respecting Mrs. Hutchinson originated in religion. Winthrop was Governor; a man whose fortune as well as his abilities and virtues, pointed him out as the fit person for a lasting rule in the Colony. While he was in the bloom of his reputation, universally venerated and obeyed, young Vane and Mrs. Hutchinson came over, the one in 1635, and the other the following year. The father of Vane was secretary of state in England; and all the colony were delighted to have the son and heir of so noble a personage come among them. His deportment was grave; he was

a professor of religion in its strictest form ; and these things with his youth, caused a party to be immediately formed in his favor. He was elevated to the highest office, even the gubernatorial chair. Respecting his abilities, what shall we say ? Hume pronounces him a fool of an author ; writing nothing but mystics ; and Sir John Mackintosh equals him to Lord Bacon. But let him stand where he may (and doubtless the truth lies somewhere between these extremes) it is not very probable that Winthrop could be very well pleased to see himself superseded in the affections of the people, by a boy,—who, whatever were his abilities, could neither have the judgment nor experience of his accomplished competitor. This we think appears in the Journal of Winthrop, though he is very cool and cautious, and on the whole an upright man. Parties were formed ; and Winthrop, among all the thinkers, was sure to regain his influence and perhaps resume the chair of state. This Vane probably anticipated ; and his resource was to form another party, suitable to his genius, on more refined principles of religion. Mrs. Hutchinson was his instrument ; and she derived all her importance from being the ball bandid between these antagonist powers. Mr. Cotton supported her, and Mrs. Cotton was the friend of Vane.—It was almost wholly a political dispute ; and this we say, because some have been disposed to amuse themselves at the absurdity of our fathers in distracting themselves and the country about splitting hairs and forming shadowy distinctions in religion. Perhaps there was some absurdity in the case ; but it is an absurdity which has cleaved, we apprehend, to all political transactions, from the time when Joab sent the wise woman to David, down to the day when Sir Henry Vane used Mrs. Hutchinson for his stalking horse, or Mr. Van Buren wrote his last incomprehensible letter.

Perhaps it may be asked how it was possible that the churches of New England composed of the very bolted wheat of the mother country, and watched over and wept for by such pastors as Shepard, should so early and at last so entirely depart from the faith and purity on which they were first settled. We apprehend that seeds of declension were very early sown. There was one fatal mistake ; very natural to be sure to good men in their situation ; but which made all their strictness and jealousy of the Church ;—all their battlements, to become as so many lodgements for any enemy, who was at last to overwhelm them. This was the opinion of Mr. Cotton, which unhappily prevailed, that none but Church members should be voters or capable of offices of trust and power.

This immediately filled the church with hypocrites and designing men; people, who would make any profession for the sake of gratifying their darling ambition.—We think there was a perceptible difference between the second generation and the first; and a still greater difference between the third and second.—Religion, instead of that free and unconstrained air, which it ought to wear, and which it always will wear when it is an unforced emanation of the heart; soon put on all the tight-lacing and artificial folds of a human dress. Men were orthodox because they *must* be so; they were moral because it was popular; and the form of godliness remained when the power was lost. The Church soon become a soil in which every heresy might be sown. To this add the corrupting influence of prosperity and foreign war, and we cannot wonder that even Puritanism on its own ground stood degenerate. The change was gradual. But when we bring the two extremities together how great the contrast! Where they had poverty and virtue; we have opulence and crime; where they preached the Gospel, we have Unitarianism; where they saw the sanctuary, we behold the theatre and the ball-room; where they beheld a church, venerated and enjoying its rights; we behold the very furniture of the communion table pilfered by those, who deny the existence of churches, and are preparing to pronounce the sacrament a sensual indulgence; where they saw the majestic form of truth; we behold a Gospel without a cross; a Saviour without a crown; a tomb without a resurrection; a Bible without inspiration, and a God without justice. *How is the gold become dim! How is the most fine gold changed! the stones of the sanctuary are poured out in the top of every street.*

We tender our thanks to Mr. Adams for the service he has done in presenting to the Churches this interesting volume. We earnestly hope the very judicious remarks he has appended to it, will tend to bring the principles of its pious author into notice; and attract the sympathy and prayers of all hearts, which beat with his spirit, to the spot where he once labored and prayed. It must be a satisfaction to the Editor of this volume to know, that he stands on the spot where Shepard once preached and prayed; but infinitely greater must be the satisfaction of endeavoring to support the same cause, to which Shepard gave his life and soul.—Though times are changed; though he cannot look to an adjacent seminary, one devoted to Christ and his Church, for sympathy and support; though the spirit of Laud without an honest avowal of it, has since passed into a lax creed; and can use the rod of persecution with the sickening cant of liberality in its

mouth ; yet let him remember that there are still hearts who sympathize with him ; and hands that are still lifted up in prayer, for his success in the Spirit of the Pilgrims, to the Pilgrim's God.

---

[The character of the following Letter will be best understood from the perusal of it. Suffice it here to say, that it proposes not to continue and advance the controversy between its author and his opponent, but only to correct misrepresentations ; otherwise we should not publish it. Indeed, we had intended to publish nothing more of this controversy, and we accordingly so declared ourselves in a note to our friends and patrons, accompanying our January number. Inasmuch, however, as the views of Dr. Taylor have been thrice\* exhibited, and Dr. Tyler's but twice ;—as Dr. Tyler complains of misrepresentations which he wishes to correct ; and as Dr. Taylor has occupied more than twice the number of pages occupied by Dr. Tyler ; we have concluded, on the whole, to insert his Letter following in the miscellaneous department of the present number : and with this *we have done with the controversy*. If our brethren wish to carry it on, they have a perfect right to do it, but they must seek some other vehicle of communication with the public, besides our pages.]

DR. TYLER'S LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE SPIRIT OF  
THE PILGRIMS.

MR EDITOR :

In the prospectus accompanying the first number of the present volume of your work, I noticed the following statement. "Several months ago, at the earnest solicitation of a number of its contributors and patrons, its pages were opened to a discussion between different classes of persons professing the orthodox faith, but differing in some respects ; and something of this description has been inserted in most of its numbers since ; but the discussions have not been acceptable to many readers, and after the conclusion of the next number of what is now in progress, this species of matter, so far as strictly controversial, will be excluded."

If any thing which has proceeded from my pen, has given *just* occasion for dissatisfaction to any portion of the Christian

\* It ought to be said that Dr. Taylor's letter to Dr. Hawes in our number for March, 1832, was inserted not at his request or that of any of his friends, but as an article in which it was supposed our readers generally, whether they approved or not, would feel some interest, and which they would wish to preserve.

community, I most sincerely regret it, and shall be glad to do any thing in my power to make reparation. What I have written, I wrote from an imperious sense of duty, and I have had the happiness to know, that it has met with the approbation of *many* of your readers; and very strong desires have been expressed to me by some of the most influential friends and supporters of your work, that I would prolong the discussion. But under present circumstances, it is with extreme reluctance that I ask the favor of occupying another page. There are two or three considerations, however, which, I am persuaded, cannot fail to convince both you and your readers, that I am entitled to some further indulgence.

*In the first place*—Dr. Taylor has occupied nearly twice the number of pages in the Spirit of the Pilgrims that I have done. On what principle is he entitled to this double privilege?

*Secondly*—Since the publication of my last communication, a Review of my Remarks, of forty pages, has appeared in the Christian Spectator, in which I am charged with having advanced opinions, which not only lead to the worst of heresies, but which involve the most horrid blasphemy. Immediately after this Review appeared, I inquired of the Editor, if I might reply to it in the Spectator, and was given to understand that no reply would be admitted, unless it was “a short letter of a page or two,” to be accompanied by as many notes and comments as he might see fit to append to it.

*Thirdly*—Both in the Review just mentioned, and in Dr. Taylor's last reply to me, my views on several points, are entirely misrepresented, and I stand charged before the public with maintaining opinions which I not only disbelieve, but reject with abhorrence.

In view of these facts, I submit the question to you, whether I am not entitled to a further hearing.

But as some of your readers have expressed a desire that the controversy might not be prolonged, I will waive, for the present, any further discussion of the points at issue between Dr. Taylor and myself, and only ask the privilege of correcting some of the misrepresentations to which I have alluded.

I. My views of the divine permission of sin, are entirely misrepresented. I am represented as maintaining that “sin is a good thing”—“good in itself”—“the only real good to man”—that “to sin is the very end of man's creation, the highest end of his being, the chief end of man”—and that when men sin “they do the very best thing they can do.”

That this is a fair representation of my views, cannot surely

be believed by any one who has read what I have published with attention and candor. So far from having maintained what is here imputed to me, I have maintained directly the contrary—that sin is an evil, infinitely hateful—that it tends to evil, and evil only; and if I have maintained that it is the means or occasion of good, I have maintained that it is so, only by being overruled and counteracted in its tendencies. In this sense only have I maintained that it is *the necessary means of the greatest good*,—a position on which so many changes have been rung by Dr. Taylor and the Christian Spectator. I explained in my first communication, the sense in which I adopted this position. I said, “If the existence of sin is not, on the whole, for the best, and *in this sense*, the necessary means of the greatest good, God would not have foreordained its existence.” And does the position that sin is, on the whole, for the best, imply that sin is good *in itself*? Does it imply any more than that God will so overrule the sin which exists, and counteract its tendencies, as to bring to pass a greater amount of good, than would be realized if sin had not existed? That this is all which I intended to express by the position, Dr. Taylor has been fully apprized; for I stated explicitly in my last communication, that in the sense which he attached to the position, I did not adopt it, nor was it maintained by any of the orthodox; for he might be challenged to show that any orthodox writer has maintained that sin is the means of good in any other sense, than as it is overruled and counteracted in its tendencies. Still, strange as it may seem, Dr. Taylor persists in representing me as maintaining that “sin is not an evil”—and that when men sin, “they do the very best thing they can do;” and says he is “not to be stultified into the admission” that this is a misrepresentation.

The Reviewer in the Christian Spectator, goes so far as to say, that I have “asserted that sin is a good thing.” When and where have I asserted this? Will the Reviewer be so good as to quote this assertion with reference to book and page. That I have asserted this in express terms will not be pretended. The most that will be said in vindication of this charge, is, that I have asserted that *sin is the necessary means of the greatest good*, and that this implies, in the opinion of the Reviewer, that sin is a good thing. On the same ground he might charge me with having asserted that “God is the responsible author of sin”—that “man is doomed to sin by a natural and fatal necessity”—that he is “naturally unable to avoid sin and become holy, and therefore is not a moral agent”—that “the terms of salvation, and the exhibition of motives to comply with them,

are a delusive mockery"—that "the true and only reason why sinners are lost, is *not* that *they* do not act, but that *God* does not"—that "regeneration by the Holy Spirit is unnecessary"—that "in respect to any capacity for happiness from the objects of right affection, man, as he is constituted by his Maker, is like a stone or a corpse"—that "the divine lawgiver is a deceiver"—that God "is a criminal tempter"—that in no respect is "Satan more truly criminal as a tempter than, God is"—that "if he [Satan,] does it [tempts] to secure the final and endless ruin of others, so does God"—that we ought "to praise God for all the sin which we and others have ever committed"—that we ought "to take pleasure in other men's sins, and do what we can to forward the commission of them"—that "to sin and be damned to all eternity is the result and the sole result in respect to the greater part of mankind, designed, preferred and purposed by their Maker"—that "those who are finally lost, are doomed exclusively to sin and everlasting burnings, that the smoke of their torment may endear heaven to the saved"—that "celestial spirits, if they utter truth in their songs, praise God not that he vindicates his law and sustains his throne by the punishment of beings who have violated every will of his; but for exactly fulfilling the sole purpose of their creation: they praise God for that *peculiar* delight, those higher and *exquisite* raptures, which they could enjoy only by means of the agonies of others in everlasting fire"—that "the worst kind of moral action is the best"—and that "mankind are bound to believe that they shall please and glorify God more by sin, than by obedience, and therefore to act accordingly;"—for he insists that all these things are involved in the positions which I have maintained. But is it lawful to charge a writer with having *asserted* things which he has not asserted, merely because in our opinion they necessarily follow from other things which he has asserted? Has not Dr. Taylor said, "It is confessedly unauthorized to charge opinions upon any man on the ground of mere inference"? How much more unauthorized must it be, to charge a man with having *asserted* what he not only has not affirmed, but has repeatedly and explicitly denied.

That I have denied that sin is a good thing, the Reviewer admits. He says, "If Dr. Tyler should say, that he utterly denies that sin is a good thing, we answer, that we are fully aware of this, and regard it as a peculiarly grateful fact. But then Dr. Tyler also **ASSERTS THAT SIN IS A GOOD THING**—and is a man to be allowed without correction, to say that which is not true half of the time, because he says that, which is true the other half?" pp. 485, 486. I shall not allow my-

self to comment on passages like this. The candid reader will know how to appreciate them.

In regard to the position that *sin is the necessary means of the greatest good*, I wish here to say, that it is not a position of my coining, nor one which I ever should have coined. It was, I believe, first brought into use by Dr. Taylor himself.\* He said in the note to his *Concio ad Clerum*, that it is 'a common assumption, that *sin is the necessary means of the greatest good.*' Supposing that he meant to give a fair representation of the "common" notions which prevail in relation to the divine permission of sin, I understood him to use this language to denote the same as the following position: that God will overrule all the sin which exists, and so counteract its tendencies, as to bring to pass a greater amount of good, than would have been realized, if sin had never existed.† In this sense I adopted the position, and in no other; and in no other sense have I ever vindicated it. In any other sense, I have utterly disclaimed it. If this is not the sense in which Dr. Taylor meant to be understood;—if he meant by the position that "sin is a good thing"—"good in itself"—and that when men sin, "they do the best thing they can do;"—then he has entirely misrepresented the views of his brethren, by saying that this is a "common assumption;" for no orthodox divine has ever maintained such a position.

In reply to my remark, that none of the orthodox maintain the theory that *sin is the necessary means of the greatest good*, if that theory is to be understood in the sense given to it by Dr. Taylor, he says, "That is, if Dr. Tyler and others have contradicted themselves, they have not maintained that

\* I will not say that this form of expression was never used by any writer, before it was brought forward by Dr. Taylor; but I do not recollect ever to have seen it.

† That I had reason to suppose that this is the sense in which Dr. Taylor originally used this language, will appear by the following extract from the *Christian Spectator* for Sept. 1830. In the Review of Bellamy on the permission of sin, it is said, "In ascribing to Dr. Bellamy, the theory, that *sin is the necessary means of the greatest good*, it is but just to remark, that he proposes it often in the form of a mere hypothesis, or as what may be true. Thus he says, 'it is easy to see how there may be more holiness and happiness in the angelic world, than if sin and misery had been forever unknown.' In other instances, however, he adopts the form of positive assertion. He states too, that 'if God had pleased, he could have hindered the existence of sin.' And this, he supposes, might have been done in perfect consistency with free-agency. It is obvious therefore, that Dr. Bellamy, in part of his reasoning, proceeds on the supposition, that *sin is the necessary means of the greatest good.*" p. 531. That Dr. Bellamy has affirmed, in so many words, that *sin is the necessary means of the greatest good*, will not be pretended. Yet the Reviewer ascribes to him this theory. And why? Because he maintains, that "if God had pleased, he could have hindered the existence of sin;" and that there may be eternally more holiness and happiness in the angelic world, than if sin and misery had been forever unknown." Now it will not be denied, that the views of Bellamy on this subject, have been adopted by the orthodox of New England generally.

*sin is the necessary means of the greatest good*, the matter of fact to the contrary notwithstanding." Now I appeal to Dr. Taylor, whether this is a fair and candid statement. How have I contradicted myself? I explained the sense in which I adopted the position, and is it contradicting myself to say, that I do not adopt it in a different sense? I have no wish to vindicate this particular phraseology. I never considered it a happy form of expression. It is the language in which Dr. Taylor has chosen to exhibit the views of his brethren. What I maintain, is, that if it means, what he now says it means, it entirely misrepresents them, and Dr. Taylor is in duty bound to correct the misrepresentation.

Dr. Taylor says, "If Dr. Tyler will explicitly declare, that all he means when he asserts that *sin is the necessary means of the greatest good*, is, not that it is the means of as great good as holiness would be in its stead, but simply that God counteracts its evil tendencies to such an extent, and causes so much good to follow it, that in this way he glorifies himself, though not more than he would be glorified, by the universal obedience of his subjects, his statement will have my hearty concurrence. Whatever objections I might have to the language of his theory," &c. And who, let me ask, is the author of this language? Does it become Dr. Taylor to find fault with the language of this theory, when that language is his own? Dr. Taylor constantly assumes the fact that this is the "common" language of those whose views he is opposing; whereas, so far as I know, it was never employed by any of the orthodox to express their views, till it was first introduced by Dr. Taylor. It certainly was not in "common" use. The state of the case is this. Dr. Taylor has given a representation of the views of his brethren in his own language. Some of them have adopted this language in *a certain sense*. In commenting on their views, he gives to the language a different sense, and insists that it must be understood in this sense, and in no other; and charges upon them the opinions which the language thus interpreted, conveys. They say to him we reject this meaning. We never adopted the language in this sense; and if it must be thus interpreted, we disclaim it altogether. He then charges them with contradicting themselves, - and using language very improperly!

The course which Dr. Taylor and the Christian Spectator have taken in relation to this subject, is truly astonishing. They seem determined to fasten upon their brethren the stigma of maintaining, that "sin is a good thing"—that "in every act of sin, we have done the very best thing we could do"—

and consequently, that we ought "to praise God for all the sins which we and others have ever committed"—and "to take pleasure in other men's, and to do whatever we can to forward the commission of them." And why is this, when they must be conscious, that these views are rejected by their brethren with abhorrence ?

But let us return to the statement with which Dr. Taylor says he should be satisfied. And here permit me to ask, why is he so anxious to *limit* the good which God can effect by overruling sin and counteracting its evil tendencies ? That God can "bring good out of evil" to some extent, Dr. Taylor admits. And why not admit that he can do this to any extent he pleases ? *Is any thing too hard for the Lord ?* Is there any thing revolting in the thought, that God should *entirely* defeat the designs of his enemies, and make their wrath to praise him, and so overrule all their wickedness as to make it subserve his benevolent designs ? This is the position which I maintain. I believe that *the wrath of man shalt praise God*, and that *the remainder of wrath he will restrain* ; that is, that God will overrule all the sin that ever has existed, or that ever will exist, in such a manner as to get glory to himself ;—and that all the sin which he sees could not be thus overruled, he will restrain, or prevent. I believe, that as in the case of Joseph's brethren, when they meant evil, *God meant it unto good* ; so in every other case, when sinners mean evil, God means it unto good ; and that he will so overrule all sin, and "bring good out of the evil, by counteracting its evil tendencies and other interpositions," as eventually to bring to pass a greater amount of good, than would have been realized if all had remained holy. Is this "a revolting dogma ?" Is it a doctrine involving such blasphemy, and leading to such disastrous consequences, as is represented by Dr. Taylor and the Reviewer ?

Since sin does exist, and does tend to infinite evil ; must it not be the desire of every benevolent being, that, if possible, it may be so overruled and counteracted, as not to be, on the whole, a detriment to the universe ? And is there any thing dishonorable to God in the supposition that he can, and that he will thus overrule it ?

The Reviewer in the Christian Spectator, says, "This is the peculiarity of Dr. Taylor's system—He suggests as the possible alternative presented to the divine mind, the existence of sin on the one hand, and on the other, the non-existence of the best system." p. 467. This, however, so far from being the peculiarity of Dr. Taylor's system, is the very system which he

opposes—the system of those whom he represents as holding that sin is the necessary means of the greatest good. They maintain that God chose the present system, because notwithstanding the evil which it contains, it is the *best* system—*entirely, absolutely the best*—the best *practicable*, and the best *conceivable*. Consequently, according to them, the actual alternative presented to the divine mind, was the existence of sin, on the one hand, and the non-existence of the best system on the other. But according to Dr. Taylor's theory, the present is not the best system; for it supposes that the system would be better if sin and misery did not exist. According to him, the present system is very imperfect, and very different from what God, all things considered, prefers it should be. He would much prefer a different system if he could bring it to pass; but as that is impossible, he has adopted the present system.

The Reviewer proceeds, “God, according to this hypothesis, adopted the best moral system, preferring that every subject should obey rather than disobey his law, and yet knowing that sin would exist under this system, he preferred its existence, rather than not adopt the system.” But how can Dr. Taylor or the Reviewer say, that God adopted the best moral system, when they strenuously maintain that a different moral system, (*viz.* one of perfect holiness,) would be infinitely better than the one which he has adopted!

But the Reviewer doubtless means that God has adopted the best practicable system—a system which will result in as much good as he is able to bring to pass; but infinitely less than he would be glad to bring to pass, if he could. The real point of difference, therefore, between Dr. Taylor and his opponents, is, *whether the Almighty is able to do what he would be glad to do*—which seems to me very much like the question, whether he is indeed the Almighty, and whether his *counsel shall stand, and he will do all his pleasure*—a point which seems to be settled, if his own word may be taken in evidence.

The Reviewer says, “The doctrine that sin is the necessary means of the greatest good, is maintained by all Supralapsarian Calvinists and especially by those who in this country are called Hopkinsians—when, therefore, we speak of the theory of Dr. Tyler, we intend the theory or scheme which involves the theory that *sin is the necessary means of the greatest good*, of which Dr. Tyler is the advocate.” p. 465. The design of this statement is sufficiently obvious. Dr. Taylor also says, “I have denied or questioned some of the

theories of Dr. Tyler and a FEW OTHER MEN, while in these very matters I accord more fully with the *great majority* of the orthodox clergy, than does Dr. Tyler himself." p. 83.

In what sense I am the advocate of the theory, that *sin is the necessary means of the greatest good*, has been already explained. I maintain that God will overrule the existence of sin for good, and thus bring to pass a greater amount of good than if sin had not existed. But this sentiment is not peculiar to the high Hopkinsians, or Supralapsarian Calvinists; but has been maintained by all who believe that God could have prevented the existence of sin in a moral universe. It is indeed impossible to admit one of these sentiments and reject the other, without impeaching the benevolence of God. If God could have prevented all sin in the moral universe, and if he saw that a universe of perfect holiness would be, on the whole, better than one comprising sin and its miseries; why did he not prevent the existence of sin? I ask in the language of Dr. Taylor, "must not infinite benevolence accomplish all the good it can?" Since, then, sin does exist, if we admit that God could have prevented it and secured universal holiness, we must conclude that he permitted it because he saw that it was best, on the whole, that it should exist; in other words, because he saw that he could overrule it for good.

Now, I ask, what Calvinistic divine, either Supralapsarian, or Sublapsarian, has ever maintained the theory that God could not have prevented the existence of sin in a moral universe; or who has undertaken to account for the existence of sin on this supposition? That this is the theory adopted by those who deny the doctrine of foreordination, is well known to all who are acquainted with the controversies on this subject. But I ask what writer, claiming to be a Calvinist, (excepting Dr. Taylor and his associates) has ever taken this ground?

As I am represented as differing on this point from "the great majority of the orthodox clergy;" I beg leave to introduce in this place, a few extracts from some of the theological writers of New England.

President Edwards—"Objectors may say, God cannot always prevent men's sins, unless he act contrary to the free nature of the subject, or without destroying men's liberty. But will they deny that an omnipotent and infinitely wise God could possibly invent and set before men such strong motives to obedience, and have kept them before them in such a manner, as should have influenced all mankind to continue in their obedience, as the elect angels have done, without destroying their liberty?"

*Decrees and Election, Sec. 19.*

"Sin may be an evil thing, and yet that there should be such a disposal and permission that it should come to pass may be a good thing."

*Treatise on the Will. p. 339.*

"God does not will sin as sin, or for the sake of any thing evil; though it be his pleasure so to order things, that He permitting, sin will come to pass; for the sake of the GREAT GOOD THAT BY HIS DISPOSAL, SHALL BE THE CONSEQUENCE." Id. p. 343.

Dr. Bellamy. "We agree, that if God had pleased, he could have hindered the existence of sin, and caused misery to be forever unknown in his dominions, with as much ease as to have suffered things to take their present course." Works. Vol. II. p. 126.

"For the doctrine of the wisdom of God in the permission of sin, supposes sin in itself, and in all its natural tendencies, to be infinitely evil, infinitely contrary to the honor of God, and good of the system. For herein consists the wisdom of God in the affair, not in bringing good out of good, but in bringing infinite good out of infinite evil, and never suffering one sin to happen in all his dominions, but which, notwithstanding its infinitely evil nature and tendency, infinite wisdom can and will overrule to greater good on the whole." Id. p. 145.

"Now since it is a plain fact, that sin and misery do take place in the system; methinks that every one who is a friend to God and to the system, should rejoice with all his heart to hear, that *the seed of the woman will bruise the serpent's head*, bring glory to God, and good to the system, out of all the evil, that ever has taken place, or ever will; (and the more good the better;) and so completely disappoint the devil." Id. p. 171.

Dr. Hopkins—"Moral evil is, in itself considered, in its own nature and tendency, most odious, hurtful and undesirable; but in the hands of Omnipotence, infinite wisdom and goodness, it may be introduced into the most perfect plan and system, and so disposed, and *counteracted in its nature and tendency*, as to be a necessary part of it, in order to render it most complete and desirable." System. Vol. I. p. 114.

Dr. Dwight—"That God could not prevent the existence of sin, cannot be maintained. He has prevented it in the *Angels who kept their first estate*. He prevented it in the person of Christ; who in his human nature knew no sin. He has promised that he will prevent it, and he will therefore certainly prevent it in the *spirits of just men made perfect* in the heavens. Should it be said, that these things by their own voluntary agency, and without any interference, or influence on the part of God, continue in a state of holiness; I answer; this supposition affects not the point at all; for God plainly could have created every moral agent with exactly the same attributes, and placed them in exactly the same circumstances, with those several virtuous beings who persist in holiness. Whatever we suppose to be the means, by which they are preserved from sin, those very means he certainly could have used, to *preserve in the same effectual manner ALL OTHERS*."

*System of Theol.* Vol. I. pp. 244, 245.

"It will not be denied, that God is both able and disposed to plan a PERFECT SYSTEM OF GOOD. It follows, therefore, that he certainly has planned such a system. Whatever accords not with his pleasure upon the whole, accords not with this system; this being the thing, which is agreeable to his pleasure; but must be defective or superfluous; out of place, or out of time; aside from, or contrary to, the perfection of the system. Consequently, if the actions of voluntary beings be not, upon the whole, accordant with the pleasure of God, he was not only unassured of the accomplishment of the end, which he proposed in creating and governing the universe; but he entered upon this great work without knowing that it would be accomplished; and was originally certain that the PERFECT GOOD, which he proposed, would never exist." Id. p. 239.

Dr. Strong—"Human incapacity to bring the greatest possible good out much evil—much sin—and much misery, is no argument that an infinite God cannot do it.

*Benevolence and Misery*, p. 15.

"We ought to have such confidence in the wisdom and goodness of God,

when he tells us some creatures shall be always miserable under punishment, as to believe, that the eternal happiness of every creature and the greatest happiness of the whole, are incompatible; and cannot come together into that plan or scheme of existence and government, which are the best possible. Id. 120.

Dr. Beecher.—“God loves holiness, and abhors sin, and *was able to prevent its existence*. He could have forbore to create whom he foresaw would rebel, or *he was able to keep them from falling*. But he did not do it. Abhorring evil with all his heart, and *able to keep it out of his dominions*, he permitted it to enter.”

*Sermon at the Funeral of Obookiah.* p. 5.

Dr. Payson.—“Why God should permit angels or men to fall, we cannot tell. That he did permit them to fall is certain; because had he thought proper, *he could doubtless have prevented their apostacy*.” *Sermons.* p. 43.

Christian Spectator.—“Now, it is possible, that many things, which in themselves are right, would not be for the best, on the whole; and on the other hand, that many things are, on the whole, for the best, which in themselves are wrong. I say this is possible;—nay, it is certain. The wars and bloodshed, the despotism and bondage, the subtilty and dishonesty, the folly and sin which overspread the earth, though in themselves wrong, are on the whole for the best.” Vol. I. p. 447.\*

Will Dr. Taylor, or the Reviewer, affirm, that all these writers whom I have quoted, and all who adopt their views are Supralapsarian Calvinists, or high Hopkinsians? Or will Dr. Taylor take it upon him to assert, that their views are adopted only by myself “AND A FEW OTHER MEN,” while they are rejected by “the *great majority* of the orthodox clergy?”

Again—I am represented as maintaining that God is reduced to the necessity of choosing between two evils, and that he is not perfectly happy. These positions I attempted to show, are involved in the theory of Dr. Taylor. This he does not deny; but he insists that they are equally involved in the theory which I maintain. He says “Dr. Tyler himself reduces the great God to the necessity of choosing between two evils.” He asks also, “Will Dr. Tyler deny, that sin is truly contrary to the divine will—that God is exceedingly displeased with it? Let Dr. Tyler then show how God can be exceedingly displeased with it, and yet be perfectly happy.” I reply, that although God views sin as an evil in itself, and is exceedingly displeased with it, yet in view of the good which he can bring to pass by overruling it, and counteracting its evil tendencies, it is his pleasure that it should exist. And if the system is on the whole the best system; if it will result in a greater amount of good than any other system of which the divine mind could conceive; then God must contemplate it with perfect and infinite satisfaction; and it is impossible to

\* The reader is requested to consult the whole article from which this extract is taken, that he may see the difference between the views inculcated by the Christian Spectator in 1819, and those inculcated in the same work in 1832.

conceive that he could be more happy than he now is. According to this supposition, he was not reduced to the necessity of choosing between two evils ; for the system which he has chosen, taken as a whole, is, (to adopt the language of Dr. Dwight) "a perfect system of good." But according to the theory of Dr. Taylor, the present system is very imperfect—a system which will issue in infinitely less good than a system of perfect holiness. It is a system of course, on which God must look with everlasting regret. If all his creatures would obey his law, he would be more happy than he now is : and consequently he is not now perfectly happy. This Dr. Taylor admits. He says, "It is admitted that what men have done to impair the blessedness of God by sin, has not failed of its results in the actual diminution of his blessedness, compared with what it had been, had they obeyed his perfect law." p. 693.

Again, I am represented as having attempted "to explore the counsels of God," and "to solve the difficulties" which relate to the divine permission of sin. Dr. Taylor says, "Dr. Tyler, Dr. Woods and others, are the men who speculate and theorize, and profess to fathom these high counsels of God." He also quotes a passage from Dr. Dwight as applicable to me, in which he compares "the attempts to solve the difficulties of this subject to those of an emmet, which from the top of his mole hill should undertake to survey the world around him, and propose plans for the improvement of the human race."

Now is this a fair representation ? Have I said, or intimated, that there is no mystery attending the divine permission of sin ? Far from it. I have gone no farther in accounting for the existence of sin, than Dr. Dwight, whose cautions on this subject, Dr. Taylor seems to think are so peculiarly applicable to me. Dr. Dwight, as we have seen, maintained as fully as I have done, that God could have prevented sin, and secured universal holiness in his moral kingdom. He also maintained that God has planned a *perfect* system of good, and that the actions of voluntary beings, will all be made to conspire to the accomplishment of this plan. Consequently he did maintain, that God permitted sin, because he saw it to be, on the whole, best that it should exist. This is as far as I have gone. What are the *particular* reasons why sin is permitted—in what ways God will overrule it for good—or why he could not have secured as much good by preventing, as by permitting sin—I have not undertaken to show. The Reviewer in the Christian Spectator, does indeed represent me as maintaining, that "those who are lost, are doomed exclusively

to sin and everlasting burnings, that the smoke of their torment may endear heaven to the saved, and result in joys, which otherwise they could never know! Celestial spirits, if they utter truth in their songs, praise God—not that he vindicates his law and sustains his throne by the punishment of beings who have violated any will of his—but for exactly fulfilling the sole purpose of their creation; they praise God for that *peculiar* delight—those *higher and exquisite raptures*, which they could enjoy only by means of the agonies of others in everlasting fire!—Dr. Tyler will have it, that a benevolent God could not be satisfied with the perfect holiness and perfect happiness of all his moral creatures; but to raise to some higher conceivable perfection the happiness of those who are saved,—they must owe it in no stinted measure to the eternal agonies of the damned! Such is God—such is heaven, according to this theory.” pp. 478, 479.

This caricature reminded me of the “Great central gallows” of Dr. Channing;—and permit me to say, that while it seems to have been drawn for a similar purpose, it contains a no less palpable and gross misrepresentation. I ask the Reviewer, if, when he penned this paragraph, and other similar paragraphs in this Review, he realized what he was doing? I ask him with what feelings he can contemplate the use which is made of these representations, by the enemies of evangelical truth?

I have not, as I said, undertaken to show, how God will bring good out of all the evil which exists. That he can bring good out of evil to some extent, Dr. Taylor admits. That he can do it to any extent he pleases, I infer from the perfections of his character, and from the declarations of his word. That sin exists is certain. That God is a benevolent being, none will deny. That “infinite benevolence must accomplish all the good it can,” is a position of Dr. Taylor’s. That Almighty power *can* accomplish all the good it desires, is a position to my mind, equally plain. Indeed, what do we mean when we say, God is Almighty, unless we mean that he can do whatsoever he pleases? If then, it is, on the whole, his pleasure that all his creatures should be holy, he would never have suffered sin to come into being. Thus far, the subject, to my mind, is plain. Farther than this I do not go. I maintain with Dr. Dwight, that God can plan, and carry into effect “A PERFECT SYSTEM OF GOOD; and that “it can not be proved that the existence of sin, will in the end be a detriment to the universe;”—and here I leave it.

II. My views on the subject of depravity, are entirely mis-

represented. Both Dr. Taylor and the Reviewer represent me as maintaining that depravity is a physical attribute—that “the very constitution of the mind is depraved”—that depravity is “an inherent property of man’s very nature, which amounts to an utter disqualification—an absolute natural inability for right moral action”—and that man “is led to disobey rather than obey God, by the same cause, or the operation of the same physical law of his being, as that by which the lion is led to feed on flesh and not on grass.”

Now what have I said to justify this representation ?

I have maintained, it is true, that the nature of man since the fall, differs as *really* from his nature before that event, as the nature of the lion differs from the nature of the ox. But is this maintaining that they differ in the same sense ? When the prophet says, *Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots ; then may ye also do good, who are accustomed to do evil*—does he affirm, that sinners are unable to do good in the same sense that the Ethiopian is unable to change his skin, and the leopard his spots ? And when Dr. Taylor said in his *Concio ad Clerum*, “We say that the lion by nature eats flesh—the ox by nature eats grass—the tree by nature bears bad fruit”—and when he added, “We mean by this, that the nature of the thing is such, that uniformly, in all its circumstances, it will be the cause or occasion of that which we assert ; that the lion, for example, is of such a nature, that he will eat flesh—so when the Apostle asserts, that mankind are by nature sinners, he must mean, that such is their nature,” &c.—Does the Reviewer suppose, that Dr. Taylor meant to affirm that the nature of a moral being, is the same as that of a lion, or an ox, or a tree ? Why, then, is such a construction put upon my language ?

I have maintained that mankind possess a native, hereditary propensity to evil ; but I have not undertaken to tell in what this propensity consists ; nor do I pretend to be able to tell. That there are natural propensities, nobody doubts ; yet who can explain them ? Who can tell what it is in the nature of man, which lays the foundation of that affection which all parents feel for their children, and which we denominate natural affection ? Why is one man *naturally* mild, gentle, kind, patient—and another *naturally* peevish, fretful, morose, irascible ? That such distinctions exist, and that they have their foundation in the natures of different individuals, nobody questions ; yet who can explain it ?

Dr. Taylor seems to suppose that a natural propensity to evil, “amounts to an utter disqualification—an absolute natural

inability for right moral action." But is it so? Has not the drunkard a propensity to drink? And has he ceased to be a moral agent, and is he doomed to drunkenness by "a natural and fatal necessity?" That wicked men have propensities to various kinds of sinful conduct, cannot be denied. But who ever supposed that these propensities imply the destruction of moral agency, and "amount to a natural inability for right moral action?" Why then, should it be supposed that if mankind come into the world with a propensity to evil, they are "doomed to sin by a natural and fatal necessity?" Dr. Taylor may be assured that I hold to no natural propensity to evil, which involves such a consequence. While I maintain that all men are *naturally* inclined to evil, I maintain that they are laid under no natural necessity to sin, but are as free and voluntary in every act of sin, as Adam was in his first transgression.

Again—I have maintained, that human nature is not what it would have been if sin had never existed, but has undergone some change in consequence of the apostacy. But what this change is, I have not undertaken to tell:—much less have I affirmed that it is a change in the physical structure of the mind. Adam was *naturally* inclined to obey God. His posterity without exception, are *naturally* inclined to disobey him. This is plain matter of fact; and it is the truth of this fact, which we affirm when we say, that mankind possess a natural bias, or propensity to evil.

The Reviewer says, "We suppose Dr. Tyler to believe, that this propensity to sin, is itself sinful, or as another writer affirms, is 'the essence of all sin.'" That I have affirmed this, or any thing which necessarily implies it, I presume the Reviewer will not pretend. On what ground, then, is this sentiment imputed to me? Simply on the ground that it has been believed by others. Whether this is just, or candid, I submit to the conscience of the Reviewer.

Had the Reviewer interpreted my language, as the Reviewer of Norton's Views of Calvinism, in the Christian Spectator for April, 1823, interpreted the language of Edwards, he would not have given this representation of my views. Edwards mentioned as explicitly as I have done, that mankind possess a native hereditary propensity to sin. Yet the writer\* of the article just referred to, says,

"Whether this tendency, disposition, proneness, &c. be a voluntary or involuntary state of mind, whether the subject be accountable for it or not, he [Edwards] does not decide."——"If President Edwards pronounces this an evil, depraved propensity, he is careful to tell us in what sense it is evil,

\* This writer, it is well known, was Dr. Taylor himself.

viz: as it tends to that moral evil by which the subject becomes odious in the sight of God, and liable as such to be condemned. Thus he does not assert that this propensity is in itself sinful, and deserving of punishment, but simply that it tends to, or is followed by those moral acts, by which the subject becomes ill-deserving."

Now why is this construction put upon the language of Edwards, and such a different construction put upon mine, especially when all which I have affirmed is, that mankind come into the world with a propensity to evil, without affirming as Edwards has done, that this is "a very evil, depraved and pernicious propensity?" Surely, if Edwards has not affirmed, that this propensity is itself sinful, much less have I affirmed this. But says Dr. Taylor, "What if Pres. Edwards did in words maintain that man is born with a corrupt nature, or a propensity in his nature to sin—the question is, what did Pres. Edwards mean?" Very well—and what if I have maintained that man is born with a propensity in his nature to sin—the question is, what is my meaning? And what right, let me ask, had Dr. Taylor to give to my language a meaning entirely different from that which he gives to the same language, in the writings of Edwards? But says Dr. Taylor, "If Edwards in these passages, asserts Dr. Tyler's views, does he not contradict them in those which I cited?" I answer, no. When or where have I affirmed that there is "any evil quality *infused, implanted, or wrought* into the nature of men by any positive cause or influence whatever, either from God or the creature; or that man is conceived and born with a *fountain of evil* in his heart, such as is any thing properly positive?"

According to Edwards, "When God made man at first, he implanted in him two kinds of principles. There was an inferior kind, which may be called natural, being the principles of mere human nature; such as self-love, with those natural appetites and passions which belong to the nature of men, in which his love to his own liberty, honor and pleasure were exercised; these when alone, and left to themselves, are what the Scriptures sometimes call flesh. Besides these, there were superior principles, that were spiritual, holy and divine, summarily comprehended in divine love; wherein consisted the spiritual image of God, and man's righteousness and true holiness; which are called in Scripture, the divine nature. These principles may in some sense be called supernatural, being (however concreated or connate, yet) such as are above those principles, that are essentially implied in, or inseparably connected with mere human nature.——When man sinned, and broke God's covenant, and fell under his curse, these superior principles left his heart.——The inferior principles of self-love and natural appetite, which were given only to serve, being alone, and left to themselves, of course became ruling principles; having no superior principles to regulate or control them, they became absolute masters of the heart. The immediate consequence of which was, a fatal catastrophe, a turning of all things upside down, and the succession of a state of the most odious and dreadful confusion. Man did immediately set up himself, and the objects of his private affection as supreme, and so they took the place of God."—*Treatise on Original Sin*, pp. 317—319.

Now Edwards maintains that the posterity of Adam come into the world destitute of those superior principles with which Adam was created, and that this constitutes the propensity to sin, of which he speaks. He says :

“As God withdrew spiritual communion and his vital gracious influence from the common Head, so he withholds the same from all the members, as they come into existence; whereby they come into the world mere flesh, and entirely under the government of natural and inferior principles.” Id. p. 320.

Now I ask, what have I said inconsistent with this? I have maintained that mankind come into the world with a propensity to evil. But I have not undertaken to tell in what this propensity consists. Consequently, I have not said that it does not consist in the very thing in which Edwards says it does consist.

Again—I have maintained that the nature of man is not what it would have been, if sin had not existed, but has undergone some change in consequence of the original apostacy. This also was a doctrine of Edwards, as appears from the foregoing extracts. According to him, the superior principles which were implanted in man at his creation, and in which “consisted the spiritual image of God,” constituted originally a part of his nature, as much as self-love, natural appetite, &c. for they were “concreted or connate.”\* But mankind now come into the world destitute of these superior principles; and this, according to Edwards, is the change which the nature of man has undergone in consequence of the original apostacy. Now I ask, what have I said, which is inconsistent with this view of the subject?

The reader can now judge of the correctness of Dr. Taylor's representation, when he says, “Pres. Edwards contradicts Dr. Tyler's statements, no less explicitly than if it had been his direct object.” So far is this from being true, in my own apprehension, that I am not conscious of having made a statement on this subject, which is not in accordance with the statements of Edwards. Have I maintained that mankind come into the world with a propensity to sin?—so did Edwards.—Have I maintained that this propensity is hereditary, transmitted in some way or other, from parent to child?—So did Edwards. He says, “In this place (Job xv : 14—16,) we are not only told how wicked man's heart is, but also, how men come by such wickedness, even by being of the race of mankind *by ordinary generation.*” He says also, “Without doubt David has respect to this same way of derivation of wickedness of

\* Will Dr. Taylor subscribe to this view of the original character of man ?

heart, when he says, Ps. li: 5. *Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.*—Have I maintained that mankind do not come into the world with the same nature as that with which Adam was created? This also, as we have seen, was maintained by Edwards. He maintained that Adam was created with holy principles, and with no propensity to sin; and that his posterity come into the world, destitute of holy principles, and with a propensity to sin. Every position, therefore, taken by me on this subject, which has been controverted by Dr. Taylor and the Reviewer, is in accordance with the views maintained by Edwards.

Again—I am represented as maintaining, that a constitutional propensity to sin, is necessary to render it possible for man to sin. Thus the Reviewer says, “According to Dr. Tyler, man cannot sin without a constitutional propensity to sin.” And Dr. Taylor asks, “If no being can sin, without a constitutional propensity so sin, how came Adam to sin?” But where have I said or intimated, that no being can sin, without a constitutional propensity to sin! What I have said is, that “unless there is in man, a native bias, or tendency to sin, I see not that there is any real connexion between the sin of Adam and that of his posterity. Nor do I see that our nature is in any sense the cause or reason of our sinning.” Is this maintaining, that a natural propensity to sin, is necessary to render it possible for man to sin! That Adam sinned without any natural propensity to sin, is admitted. But Adam was not a sinner *by nature*. Nor was his sin in consequence of the sin of a progenitor. But the Scriptures teach us that there is a real connexion between the sin of Adam and that of his posterity, and that we are all *by nature* sinners. The question, therefore, which it became Dr. Taylor and the Reviewer to meet, was not, whether man can sin, without a natural propensity to evil—but how it can be truly said, that our sin is in consequence of the sin of Adam, and that our nature is the cause or reason of our sinning, if we come into the world with the same nature as that with which Adam was created? If the posterity of Adam, do not possess any more natural bias, or propensity to evil, than he possessed, why may it not be as truly said, that he was a sinner *by nature*, as that they are sinners *by nature*? But instead of meeting this question, they represent me as teaching the position that man cannot sin without a constitutional propensity to sin. Whereas the position which I have taken, is, that “if all mankind come into the world with the same nature as that with which Adam was created, and which the child Jesus possessed; then the *only* reason that they do not exhibit the same charac-

ter, must be that they are placed in DIFFERENT CIRCUMSTANCES.”

In this connexion, I wish the reader to notice the following representation of Dr. Taylor :

“ I had spoken of the possibility that natural propensities for good, like those which led our first parents to sin, might prove the occasion of universal sin to their posterity. Dr. Tyler passes this without any attempt at refutation, except that he requests his reader to compare it with passages which he cites from the great champion of Arminianism, Dr. Taylor of Norwich.—What is this but to resort to reproach when argument fails !” p. 15.

Now let it be remembered, that in connexion with my quotation from Dr. Taylor of Norwich, I quoted Edwards' reply. Of this reply, Dr. Taylor is careful to take no notice. Dr. Taylor proceeds :

“ How will such an expedient set aside *the matter of fact*, that Adam sinned without a created or propagated propensity to sin ? Why does Dr. Tyler, in view of this *fact* respecting Adam, assume the utter impossibility of the same fact respecting his posterity ?”

I have not attempted to set aside this matter of fact ; nor have I denied, as Dr. Taylor represents, that the posterity of Adam might sin, without a natural propensity to sin. But here is a universal fact to be accounted for. If mankind are naturally no more inclined to evil than to good, how comes it to pass, that all, without exception, begin to sin as soon as they are capable of sinning ? Is it said, all are moral agents, and therefore can sin ? It may also be said, all are moral agents, and therefore can be holy—and why do not some at least become holy ? Why is it, that all the children of Adam, without a single exception, agree to pervert their moral agency ? Is there no reason for this ? Or is it sufficient to say, as Dr. Taylor does, that “ Adam sinned without any previous propensity to sin, and therefore Adam's posterity may sin, without a propensity to sin.” This, as I showed, is the precise ground which was taken by Dr. John Taylor of Norwich, and which was refuted by Edwards. The correctness of my statement is not denied, although for making it, I am accused of resorting to reproach when argument fails. But would it not be well for Dr. Taylor to answer the reasoning of Edwards, before he sounds his note of triumph.

There are other misrepresentations, which I intended to notice—particularly the representation of my views respecting the doctrine of regeneration. Dr. Taylor represents me as maintaining “ that the sinner under the renewing influence of the divine spirit, resists that influence, until it becomes a natural impossibility for him to resist it any longer,”—and that God converts the soul “ by physical compulsion”—by “ crushing and

destroying moral agency, in the very act of securing moral action,"—and by "making the sinner willing against his will."

So far from having maintained these views, I have explicitly disclaimed them. The position which I have maintained, is, that the sinner resists, till by the influence of the Spirit, his obstinacy is overcome, and he *voluntarily submits*, and that the resistance of the sinner is never so great, as to render it impossible for God to bring him thus voluntarily to submit." Is this maintaining that the soul is converted by "physical compulsion"? If the sinner *voluntarily submits*, is his moral agency *crushed and destroyed*, and is he made willing *against his will*? But I cannot dwell on this point, owing to the length to which my remarks have been already protracted.

For the same reason, I must pass over with only a slight notice, the unfounded charges which are brought against me, of misrepresenting the views of Dr. Taylor—of misquoting his language—of imputing to him sentiments which he has publicly disclaimed—of re-echoing the charge of heresy—of coining positions for him *ad libitum*—and of substituting for his, positions of my own. These and similar charges abound in the communications of Dr. Taylor. That the reader may have some idea of the occasion which has been given for these charges, I will refer to one case only, as a specimen. It occurs in the discussion of the doctrine of Election.

Dr. Taylor says,

"The foregoing argument of Dr. Tyler, is a just specimen of much of his reasoning on the present topic. It rests wholly either on *substituting* his own incorrect statements for my positions, or on inferences derived from such statements. Thus my position is, that GOD PREFERS, ALL THINGS CONSIDERED, THAT ALL MEN SHOULD BECOME HOLY, RATHER THAN CONTINUE IN SIN UNDER THE PRESENT SYSTEM. For this, Dr. Tyler substitutes his own unqualified statement, that God chooses, all things considered, that all men should become holy.—Hence he goes on to infer, that if it were in the power of God, he would bring all men to repentance; and then asks, how, according to this view of the subject, there can be any such thing as election? But whose view of the subject is this? Not mine; but one which Dr. Tyler, without the least warrant—even when his error had been pointed out to him, persists in *substituting* for mine." pp. 73, 74.

The reader will notice what Dr. Taylor here says, is his position, viz: that GOD PREFERS ALL THINGS CONSIDERED, THAT ALL MEN SHOULD BECOME HOLY, RATHER THAN CONTINUE IN SIN UNDER THE PRESENT SYSTEM. This position, I am charged with having omitted, and with having substituted one of mine own in its place. Now let it be remembered that this position of Dr. Taylor's, in the form, at least, in which it is here stated, is entirely a new one, and has never before appeared on his pages. The position on which

my comments were founded, was, that GOD, ALL THINGS CONSIDERED, PREFERS HOLINESS TO SIN IN ALL INSTANCES IN WHICH THE LATTER TAKES PLACE." These are the very words of Dr. Taylor; and on this position, all my reasoning was based. I said,

"If it be true, that "God, *all things considered*, prefers holiness to sin in all instances in which the latter takes place," then it must be his choice, *all things considered*, that all men should become holy and be saved; and his infinite benevolence will prompt him to do all in his power to bring all men to repentance. What then becomes of the doctrine of election? *Who maketh thee to differ?* Not God, surely; for if he prefers, *all things considered*, holiness to sin in *every instance*, he will, of course, do all in his power to make every individual holy. It cannot be true, that he *hath mercy on whom he will have mercy*; for he would have mercy on all if he could.—If he prefers, *all things considered*, holiness to sin in *every instance*, he would secure the existence of holiness in *every instance*, if it were in his power. Consequently, in *every instance* in which sin exists, it is beyond the power of God to secure holiness in its stead.—Take a particular case—the sin of Adam, for instance, in eating the forbidden fruit. Why did not God prevent this sin and secure holiness in its stead? It must have been, because he could not do it, or because he did not choose to do it. If he did not choose to do it, then he did not prefer, *all things considered*, holiness to sin in this instance; for if this had been his preference, he would have prevented the sin, and secured the holiness. To say that God chooses not to secure, that which he, on the whole, prefers, and which he is able to secure, is a manifest contradiction. According to Dr. Taylor's theory, therefore, the only reason that holiness does not exist in the room of sin in *every instance* in which sin now exists, is that God is unable to prevent the sin and secure the holiness. Consequently the only reason that any individual sinner is not converted, is, that God is unable to convert him. He desires, *all things considered*, that every individual should become holy and be saved; and most certainly, if it were in his power, he would bring to pass that which he on the whole desires. But according to this view of the subject, how is it possible, there should be any such thing as election?" pp. 556, 557.

The reader will perceive that *all* my reasoning on this topic, is based, not on any position of my own, but on the position of Dr. Taylor, quoted verbatim in his own language. And how does Dr. Taylor meet this reasoning? Or rather how does he evade it? Why, by shifting his ground, and taking a new position;\* and then charging me with "misstating the very points on which the question turns," and with "substituting (my) own incorrect statements, for (his) positions"!!

The reader can now judge, how much confidence is to be reposed in the charges of unfairness, misrepresentation, misquotation, &c. with which Dr. Taylor's communications abound.

\* If Dr. Taylor should say, that although the position which he has now brought forward, was not before formally stated, yet it was implied in some part of his reasoning;—I answer—This, if it be true, does not justify his charge against me. My reasoning, as I have shown, rests not on any *substituted* position of my own, but on the position formally announced and explicitly stated by Dr. Taylor himself. If he has maintained other positions inconsistent with this, the fault is his, and not mine.

One remark more and I have done. Dr. Taylor repeatedly intimates that the points on which he and his associates differ from their brethren, are of trifling consequence, as they relate solely to "theories i. e. mere suppositions made to obviate objections to our common faith." He seems to think me very unreasonable that I should attach so much importance to these theories, and feel so much solicitude in regard to their tendency. "It is" says Dr. Taylor, "the apprehension of heresy creeping in unawares, which by sounding its note of alarm and denunciation, has disturbed the peace of the churches. And who has sounded this note—and proposed to sound it from a sense of duty—aye, and to sound it only about *theories*?"

Let the reader just look over the Review of my Remarks in the Christian Spectator, and then decide who has sounded the loudest note of alarm about *theories*. I have, it is true, expressed the opinion that some of the positions advanced by the brethren at New Haven, are erroneous and of dangerous tendency. But when have I ever given such a representation of their views as they have given of mine in the Christian Spectator? When have I ever said that nothing but their inconsistency saves them from being "THE VERY WORST OF HERETICS?" When have I said that their theories "if carried out into their legitimate consequences, lead to UNIVERSALISM, TO INFIDELITY AND TO ATHEISM?" When have I represented their theories as involving the positions that "God is the responsible author of sin"—that "man is doomed to sin by natural and fatal necessity"—that "sin is a good thing" and "the only real good to man as a moral being"—that "the terms of salvation, and the exhibition of motives to comply with them, are a delusive mockery"—that "the divine lawgiver is a deceiver"—that "God is a criminal tempter"—that in no respect is "Satan more truly criminal as a tempter than God is"—that "evil intention in Satan, is as truly good and right as benevolent intention is in God"—that "we have in every act of sin, done the very best thing we could do"—that "God made a large part of mankind on purpose to damn them"—and that "to sin and be damned to eternity is the result and the sole result in respect to the greater part of mankind, designed, preferred and purposed by their maker?" These are only a few of the dreadful consequences which are charged upon my theories by the conductors of the Christian Spectator. Who, then, I ask again, has sounded the loudest note of alarm about *theories*? And let it be remembered, the theories which I have maintained, and which are thus

impugned, are the very theories maintained by Edwards, Belamy, Dwight, and the Orthodox of New England generally. Such then are representations which the conductors of the *Christian Spectator* have given of the views of their brethren; and yet strange as it may seem, they consider themselves slandered by the least intimation, that they have departed in any material point, from the faith of the New England Churches.

One of two things is true. Dr. Taylor and his associates do differ from the standard Orthodox writers of New-England, or they do not. If they do, then, their professions of agreement with these writers, are not true. If they do not, how has it happened, that they have not yet been able to make it appear to the Christian public? And moreover which are we to believe in regard to their boasted improvements in theological science?

With these inquiries I drop the controversy, for the present, with undiminished regard for the best good and increased usefulness of Dr. Taylor and his associates, praying that they and their opponents may yet see eye to eye, and be established in the faith once delivered to the saints. B. TYLER.

---

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—We hope some of our correspondents who may have expected to see, ere this, some articles we have from their pen, will have patience. They shall have a place by and by. Our correspondent who sent us an article lately in successive sheets, is informed that the one containing the conclusion, if sent, has not been received. We hope it is not lost, or if it is, that the writer will furnish another.

---

ERRATA.—For “strutting up” on page 281, read shooting up.

In the first extract from Dr. Dwight, page 293, for “things” in the sentence, “Should it be said that these things—read beings.

THE  
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. VI.

JUNE, 1833.

NO. 6.

---

---

COMMUNICATIONS.

---

[In our number for April, we published the Report of the Suffolk South Association, in answer to certain inquiries of the Committee of the Pastoral Association: See pp. 185, 186.—The following Reports from other Associations, which we have since received, we are requested to publish together.]

REPORT OF THE HARMONY ASSOCIATION.

*To the Committee of the Pastoral Association. Rev. Dr. Woods,  
Chairman.*

BRETHREN:

Without repeating your questions, we reply to them in their order.

1. We have reason to bless God, that the eleven churches which are within our bounds, have all enjoyed a special season of refreshing from the divine presence, within the last fifteen months.

2. These revivals have generally been of short continuance, especially where they were the result of Protracted meetings.—Professors were first led to feel their leanness, and in some measure aroused to a sense of the responsibility lying upon them.—Sinners, as they became anxious, generally manifested deep solicitude, and a painful sense of guilt and danger for a short time, but found relief, and indulged hope sooner than in former revivals.—Between 500 and 600 have been added to our churches, as the fruits of these revivals, and we know of nothing in their deportment to distinguish them from the subjects of former revivals.—The proportion of males has been greater than usual.—In some instances, violent opposition was

manifested, and the dismissal of one minister was probably hastened by it.

3. Generally by means of Protracted meetings, in connexion with the ordinary use of means; though in one or two instances a revival had evidently commenced prior to such meetings in the place. Where this was the case, the revival was more powerful, of longer continuance, and the fruits more abundant.

The preaching in all our Protracted meetings, being almost entirely by members of the Association, who had previously engaged to sustain the meetings, God assisting them, was what we consider strictly evangelical, interspersed with prayers and direct appeals to the understanding, the heart and the conscience. Inquirers were separated from others, particularly addressed and personally conversed with. Ministers endeavored to drive sinners from all their false refuges, and to bring them to an immediate decision upon the subject of religion, and to an unconditional surrender of themselves to God. They were not backward in exhibiting the sovereignty of God,—the purity, extent and unbending justice of the divine law,—the self-ruined condition of men, their entire alienation of heart from their Maker, and their dependance on the renewing and sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit—God's readiness to grant his Spirit in answer to the prayers of his children, and to pardon the penitent through the efficacy of a Saviour's blood,—God's determination to punish forever the finally incorrigible, and to reward with everlasting blessedness all who comply with the conditions of mercy.—Sinners were taught, that nothing but their own perverse rejection of the terms of mercy, would prevent their salvation, and that nothing but the Spirit of God, operating through the medium of divine truth, would make them willing to accept.

As it was our design to exhibit the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, in some due proportions, it would be difficult to say *which*, if any *one*, produced the best effect. We conceive it to have been the combined influence of all these, which wrought effectually upon the minds of men; though, in some instances, *one*, and in some *another*, was the more apparent in its benign influence.

4. We think favorably of Protracted meetings in promoting the interest of the Redeemer's kingdom. But our want of experience does not enable us to speak with confidence as to the utility of often repeating them in the same place. We feel that there is danger of producing a fastidious taste among the people, and of rendering the more ordinary use of the means

of grace less effectual. Like powerful remedies for bodily maladies, they should be used with caution. Care should be taken to let the truth of God search the heart, and the mere circumstances of the occasion should have no other influence than to direct the attention to divine truth. If such meetings are repeated (and we think the experiment ought to be made,) reference should doubtless be had to the state of the people and their feelings upon the subject. We should not think it expedient to have such meetings succeed each other in the same vicinity, so often as they did the last year in this, and perhaps in other sections of the country. And after such a meeting has been holden in any place, the incumbent minister needs the aid of others for weeks, to carry forward the work to the best advantage. Some caution may be needful also, both at the time of meeting and subsequently, not to throw the incumbent into the back-ground in view of his people, if he be in any good degree what a minister ought to be, devoted to his work. The members of the church ought to be made to feel that heavy responsibilities lie upon them, and that it is their duty to sustain their pastor, and by their active exertions aid him in carrying forward the work. But the management of such meetings must doubtless be regulated in some good degree by the circumstances of the people among whom they are holden, or rather, as those circumstances indicate at the time. The same measures are not in all respects to be pursued at all times. Wisdom is especially in these meetings, profitable to direct.

5. We do not know of any new *errors in doctrine* among us; though there are increased efforts to promote Unitarianism and Universalism, and in some instances there appears to be more indifference upon the subject of Infant Baptism. The *irregularities in practice*, which are prevalent, we think would generally be corrected by a deeper tone of piety and a more careful attention to the Holy Scriptures.

6. "To secure the continuance and increase of the special operations of the Holy Spirit, and to render the influence of the gospel general and permanent," we know not what ministers and Christians *can do* more than to cherish in their own breasts a lively sense of the value of the soul, of the danger of its being lost, and of their obligation to Him who laid down his life to redeem it; and under a sense of their responsibilities go forward in the diligent use of all the means which God has appointed for promoting the salvation of men; and this they ought to do, carefully seeking and improving opportunities for

doing good, while they look to God for his blessing upon all their efforts, realizing, that without him they can do nothing.

Respectfully yours, &c.

DAVID HOLMAN, *Moderator.*

MINER G. PRATT, *Scribe.*

Ward, Sept. 20, 1832.

---

REPORT OF THE ANDOVER ASSOCIATION.

Burlington, Oct. 3, 1832.

REV. AND DEAR SIR:

Your communication of June 25th, as Chairman of the Pastoral Association, to the Andover Association, was presented at their meeting in September, at Reading. A committee of three was immediately appointed to draught an answer. At the meeting of the Association yesterday, at Woburn, the Report of this Committee was read, and with some amendments, accepted: and the following copy, by direction of the Association, I transmit to you.

Yours, very respectfully,

SAMUEL SEWALL.

REV. LEONARD WOODS, D. D.

“Answers to the questions proposed by Pastoral Association.

“1. There have been precious revivals of religion, to a greater or less extent, in most or all of our churches the past year.

“2. They have been attended with few if any irregularities; with a general and deep solemnity; pungent conviction of sin and danger,—and followed with speedy conversion. Their *fruits* have been generally such as we could wish, and answer to what we know of revivals in time past.

“3. The churches, generally, in anticipation of Protracted meetings, from which they expected great and glorious results, were stirred up to more abundant prayer, watchfulness and exhortation to duty; and when the meetings were in progress, were much devoted to the work; and the doctrines of the gospel, which are known by the terms, *doctrines of grace*, were constantly, directly and pungently preached.

“4. Judging from the past, (and we have but little experience of them,) we must speak favorably of Protracted meetings. They should be conducted with great solemnity, devotedness, prayer, and much preaching. Caution should be used, that they be not too *frequent*; but as often as the church is pre-

pared, as in answer 3d, to engage in them. But they should *never* be considered as *indispensable* to a work of grace, or *supersede* the ordinary means of grace. Here the Christian community cannot be too guarded.

“5. There has been in some instances, too much overlooking the efficiency of the Holy Spirit ; and we fear, in some others, too much overlooking the obligations and agency of man, in the work of conversion and salvation. In our opinion, both these great doctrines should be clearly exhibited and constantly pressed. Also there is too much of a disposition, in order to accommodate persons who are scrupulous concerning Infant Baptism, both to *re-baptize*, and to admit into our churches, such as disbelieve the divine authority for infant baptism. There seems to be a letting down to an extent which gives alarm to some, of the strict doctrine and practice of the fathers of New England.

“6. A more lively and feeling sense of their entire *dependence* on God for all desired good ; a more humble, deep, and permanent *reliance* on the influences of his Holy Spirit, to work all good in us and for us : careful, at the same time, to *prove* their strong and unwavering faith in God, by a *life* of self-denial, holiness, and self-consecration to the cause of truth and righteousness ; ‘works of faith, and labors of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ.’”

A true copy of the original Report on file.

SAMUEL SEWELL, *Scribe of Adv. Asso.*

REPORT OF THE OLD COLONY ASSOCIATION.

*Rochester, Nov. 20, 1832.*

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

To yours of June 24, to the Old Colony Association, we would reply ; that we cordially reciprocate the views of the Pastoral association, adopted in their meeting of May last ; and feel our obligation to co-operate in so desirable an object. To the questions of the committee we shall reply, in their order.

To the 1st, we say :—There have been several revivals of religion, within a few years. In 1830–31, some of our churches were considerably refreshed, and none of them left without tokens of divine favor.—To the 2nd, we reply :—By evangelical truth—doctrines usually called, doctrines of grace—*unaided*, though not entirely *unaccompanied* with schemes of hu-

man invention. We know of nothing in the mode of preaching which has rendered it peculiarly successful.—To the 3rd:—The fruits have been, apparently, the same, as in former years;—nothing distinctive in the recent converts to excite peculiar *hopes* or fears.—To the 4th, respecting the utility of Protracted meetings:—We can say but little, from experience. The revival of '30-'31, began before we had any knowledge of them, and closed without any, except in two places. In these places, the meetings were solemn and interesting; but, followed with no marked results. As we are not prepared to form an estimate of meetings of this kind from actual observation; we give our opinion with caution, and deference to those who have had better advantages. It will be admitted that the grand object of Protracted meetings, like that of all other christian efforts, should be to diffuse gospel light as strongly—as permanently—as extensively as possible. It is a question with us, whether this can be more effectually done by concentrating the rays, from time to time, on particular sections; or by dividing the light, that although *less* brilliant, it may be *more* regular, uniform and abiding. While we have no doubt that much good has been done by Protracted meetings; we are not quite certain, but that *more* good might have been done, in each case, by the same amount of labor in a dozen parishes.—Respecting the last part of the question,—“How should they be observed, &c” :—We say, that the object of the meetings should be to communicate truth in a plain, distinguishing manner, calculated to enlighten the understanding, awaken the conscience and affect the heart and practice.—The cautions we would give, are:—Let not the protracted meeting assume the office of the Holy Spirit. Let not the success of the protracted meetings in *all* cases, be predicated from the success in *some* cases. Many circumstances may have conspired to produce good results, at one time,—at one place, which do not exist at all times—at all places; or if they did, there might be counteracting circumstances, which would prevent good results. There is a general fondness for novelty, which needs a *check* rather than a *spur*.—Finally:—Let all things be done decently and in order, and we doubt not that *extraordinary* as well as *ordinary* means will be blessed of God, and made conducive to the interests of the church.

To the 5th, we say, that there are several doctrines, of recent origin, which appear to be erroneous; but, whether we understand, or *can* understand them, is at present doubtful. We would caution the churches, however, against *denying* the special influences of the Holy Spirit—*depending* on hu-

man efforts, to get up revivals of religion—*waiting* till after regeneration without attempting to do what God requires—or, *engaging* in a preparatory work, before regeneration.

To the 6th, we say, 1. That fervent, persevering prayer must be offered. And it must be such prayer, as turns away from all human devices, new or old, and relies entirely on the agency of the Almighty Spirit.—2. There must be a continuance and increase of effort. Religion must have the supremacy in the heart and life—the example must be such as to recommend the holy truths which are taught in public, and from house to house.—3. The *natural* channels must be followed, and less reliance placed on those, which are *artificial*. The *continued* and *increased* operation of the Spirit, cannot be expected without continued and increased human instrumentality. Hot beds and green houses cannot overspread a large territory with constant verdure and beauty.—On the whole:—The high duty and privilege of embracing the gospel, at the command of our exalted Redeemer, should be inculcated on *all*, as at all times binding. There must not be, in the church, alternate faith and unbelief—alternate service and neglect—alternate reception and rejection of the Spirit; but a constant, uniform, increased pressure.

By order of Association,

SAM'L. NOTT, *Moderator*.

Rev. L. Woods, D. D. Chairman of Committee.

#### REPORT OF THE PILGRIM ASSOCIATION.

*To the Rev. Leonard Woods, &c. Committee of the Pastoral Association of Massachusetts.*

BELoved BRETHREN,

The Pilgrim Association in answering the inquiries presented to us by the Committee of the Pastoral Association, would bless God, that we are able to report, that revivals of greater or less extent, have been recently enjoyed throughout our limits; and that all our churches have been increased, as we believe, with the increase of God. We are happy in being able to state generally, that the character of the work has been still, solemn, and gradual. No efforts have been made to produce excitement. The churches with which we are connected, have manifested a desirable spirit. They have carefully watched, and unitedly prayed to be preserved from

enthusiasm, and every evil work, while enjoying "the day of God's power." There are few, if any, of the hopeful subjects of the work, who do not furnish desirable evidence of a work of grace. The fruits which they bear are the fruits of righteousness: and impressions favorable to the cause of truth have been made upon the minds of those who are still living "without God, and without hope in the world." There is also a desirable state of harmony in all our societies. The mode of preaching employed, and which God has blessed to the awakening and conversion of sinners, has been the plain and affectionate preaching of "*the word*." The doctrines of grace have been clearly maintained, such as the entire moral depravity of man;—the necessity of regeneration, by the special agency of the Holy Spirit;—the doctrine of Election, with other doctrines connected with them. The *practical application* of these truths we deem of great importance.

The other means employed have been—meetings for conference and prayer;—visiting from house to house by the Pastor, and some of the lay brethren appointed to this service;—the Conference of churches;—and Protracted meetings. From our own observation and experience, we are led to conclude, that the utility of these meetings will be greater or less according to the state of the church and people where they are held. There must be something like a preparation on the part of the church to make such meetings desirable. If the church come up to the work, Protracted meetings may be of great good in drawing off the attention of men from the world, and fixing it upon eternal scenes. There can be no doubt, that God has blessed these efforts, and that many rejoice in hope, who, but for these meetings, had now been the enemies of God. The manner of conducting these meetings should not be *far different* from that of conducting meetings on the Sabbath, or any other religious meetings. The great object is to present truth to the mind, that it may be there fixed, and press heavily upon conscience. More time should be spent in prayer and religious conference than at other times, because there is more time for such services. Unless there is something out of the usual course of things,—some circumstances which call loudly for the measure, it may be questioned whether more than one Protracted meeting in a year will be useful in any church. Great care should be taken, that no one exercise be so long continued, as to fatigue and dissatisfy the hearers. Care should also be taken that so much time be not spent in religious meetings, as to occasion the neglect of other religious duties, and to give the impression, that religion

consists in being at meeting. We have observed no reason to caution against too great excitement in Protracted meetings.

There are no *new errors*, or *irregularities*, within our bounds, which demand special attention, and which we consider it important to unfold, and against which we would raise a warning voice before the churches. The good old way in which our Pilgrim Fathers walked, and the system of truth which they embraced, is substantially that which distinguishes our churches, and adorns their members.

That the special operations of the Holy Spirit may be granted, both Ministers and Christians, should pray more, be more humble, more like little children, and let their light shine with a clearer and brighter flame. They should make their religion more apparent in their conversation, exertions, and general character; that while ministers preach the truths of the gospel plainly and zealously, and Christians profess to receive the truth, its sanctified effects may be made to appear in their lives. It should be made more their single, and undivided aim to please God, *to live for eternity*. Let the truth of God be properly preached, affectionately received, and faithfully obeyed, and will the special operations of the Holy Spirit be withheld? Will it not rather be said, "Who are these that flee for refuge, and lay hold upon the hope set before them? Behold, what hath God wrought?"

By order and in behalf of the Pilgrim Association,  
FREEMAN P. HOWLAND, Scribe.

*Plymouth, Dec. 22d, 1832.*

---

FRANKLIN ASSOCIATION.

*Conway, Feb. 11, 1833.*

TO THE REV. DR. WOODS, &c.

The Franklin Association reports as follows:—

With the exception of two or three, each of the seventeen churches connected with this Association, has been favored with special attention to religion within two years.—Number of hopeful conversions, [in each] from 8 to 120.

The characteristics and fruits of these revivals, have been—stillness, clearness and strength of conviction for sin—with an unusual degree of exemption from animal excitement.—The progress of the mind from conviction to hope has been more rapid than in many revivals of former years. The

period of conversion has extended somewhat more than in former revivals, into childhood on the one hand, and old age on the other. In some prominent cases an entire revolution has been effected in theological opinions, (we mean in turning from error) and a full proportion of the subjects are from the more active and influential class of the community. The number of *male*, though not equal to the number of *female* subjects, bears a greater proportion to it than in former years.—The obvious effects of these revivals have been to promote self-denial, awaken benevolent feelings, and prompt to personal effort. Among the fruits of these revivals may be mentioned a good degree of consistency and completeness of Christian character.

Protracted meetings have been held in all our Parishes, which have differed from the ordinary devotions of the Sabbath only in the following respects ;—prayer meetings have preceded the exercises ; the anxious have been requested to *retire* to appropriate rooms, to be personally conversed with—and in some cases toward the close of the meeting,—the afternoon has been devoted to addresses, and to a more familiar and direct exhibition of truth by the *minister* ; but in *no cases* have anxious seats been provided, nor have the impenitent (with a single exception) been called to perform any special act preparatory to repentance, in the presence of the congregation ; and we may say in general, that we have been happily exempt from those *doubtful measures* which have been supposed to effect the purity of the Church in other places.—The doctrines preached were those usually denominated the *doctrines of Grace*.—In regard to the *mode of preaching* most successful among us, while there has been some little variety in different preachers, there has been, we are happy to say, an improved method in most. Truth has been presented in a more plain, simple, and direct manner, peculiarly exempt from *theorizing*, and confined to the representations of the Bible, accompanied with a good degree of Christian tenderness and feeling.

We esteem Protracted Meetings as highly useful : with us God has evidently owned and blest them. Nor have we experienced from them those unhappy reactions which have been felt in other places ; and we see not, at present, any peculiar need of changing our mode of conducting them. With regard to *cautions* :—we would say—that while the *doctrines* should be clearly and simply presented, there should be a full *acknowledgment* of, and a *manifest* reliance upon, the *special* influences of the Holy Ghost. While the commands of

God to immediate repentance should be urgently pressed upon the sinner, he should be plainly and honestly told the true obstacle to his salvation. We cannot but regard as *positively hurtful* all those measures the tendency of which is to *lower down* the special work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration; as though conversion to God was as easily effected as any mere change of resolution, which leaves untouched the moral state of the heart. With regard to the *frequency* of these meetings, we feel it impossible to establish any general rule. The repetition of them is a question extremely difficult in the present state of the measure. In the providence of God, facts may yet be developed respecting them, which will form the basis of some general rule upon the subject. At present, the repetition of them must be decided in each individual case by past results and present circumstances.

We have seen and deplored in many parts of the community, a growing tendency to overlook the special influences of the Holy Spirit and to place an undue reliance upon human efforts and ability. Intimately connected with this, there are advanced, we think, those views of the depravity of man and of his moral agency, which attribute to him a competency in the great work not warranted in the Sacred Scriptures.—While we regret to see a disposition any where manifested to carry these points beyond the sanction of the Bible, we also greatly lament the differences that exist among Evangelical Christians. We are sorry that there should be any ground for these differences, and we should regret still more to have them magnified.—In regard to errors in practice, it has appeared to us very desirable that the churches should be universally guarded against the practice of *hasty admission of members*,—that Christian females, to whom the Bible has opened a very interesting and appropriate field of effort, should not transcend their scriptural sphere—and that sinners should not be urged to any public committal of themselves as a measure almost immediately connected with conversion. We wish also to express our disapprobation of all ostentatious display, either in first announcing protracted meetings, or in the performance of the services of them, and especially of all extravagance and coloring in what is said, or written, about the success and results of them.

To secure the continuance and increase of the special influences of the Holy Spirit,—we would suggest the propriety of more attention to the distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel,—to increased fidelity in church discipline,—and most of all—that the members of the churches should maintain the high

and distinctive character so much spoken of in the New Testament, and maintain it in such a degree that sinners every where and at all times may have a practical exhibition of the power of godliness. This, united with a spirit of prayer for the special influence of the Spirit, will, we think, secure for the gospel, a general and permanent influence, without the necessity of resorting to modes of presenting truth and to measures for impressing it, which, to say the least, are of doubtful authority and influence.

In behalf of the Association,

DANIEL CROSBY,

THEOPHILUS PACKARD, Jr.

*Committee.*

---

BROOKFIELD ASSOCIATION.

1. Revivals of religion have taken place,—principally in 1831,—in all our Congregations, seventeen in number, with two exceptions only, one of which had no pastor.

2. The characteristics were deep solemnity—deep but short conviction of sin, rapidity of progress and short continuance : The fruits were, the accession of more than 500 members to our churches, whose lives have generally borne witness to their faith.

3. The means by which they have been promoted are,—Frequent meetings for public religious instruction and prayer, in promiscuous assembly,—meetings of anxious enquirers for particular conversation, direction and prayer,—together with protracted meetings and frequent parochial visits. The doctrines preached, were the doctrines of grace,—the plain truths of the gospel pressed home upon the conscience with earnestness, in view of God's dread authority, the evil of sin, the sufficiency of Christ, and the duty of immediate submission to the King of Zion.

4. Protracted meetings, in many instances, have unquestionably been useful, and may be useful again. It is far from being our opinion, that a Protracted meeting, or any human device whatever, will ensure a revival of religion. Such an opinion is not supported either by observation or by any inherent efficacy discoverable in such a measure.

A Protracted meeting should be conducted with the strictest order and decorum, like a religious meeting on the Sab-

bath, and all its exercises be performed within seasonable hours. To justify the appointment of such a meeting there must be a preparation particularly in the church—such a preparation as will dispose them to sustain it by their attendance, influence and prayers. Caution is necessary lest they be so frequent as to lose their influence and lead people to undervalue the divinely appointed means of grace—lest they be appointed precipitately without proper consultation, and without the full and hearty concurrence of the church in view of evident indications of God's gracious presence—lest there be more dependance by ministers, Christians and people upon these extraordinary measures to convert sinners, than upon the energies of God's spirit—and finally, lest more be done to excite animal feeling than to instruct the understanding, convince the conscience and humble the sinner at the foot of sovereign grace.

5. The errors against which it appears specially important to guard the churches at the present day, are: 1st. That the sinner's opposition to divine truth is owing to a misconception of it, and that he need only to understand the truth in order to love it,—the error being in the head and not in the heart. 2. That regeneration is the effect of moral suasion, and not of the special influence of the Holy Spirit.—In short, the error of Arminianism *substantially*, though somewhat in a new dress.

Though there may be irregularities in practice among the churches in some sections of our country, still we are not aware that they exist within our own limits, or that they are an evil against which *our* churches have special reason to guard at present.

6. In order to secure the continuance and increase of the special operations of the Holy Spirit, and to render the influence of the gospel general and permanent, ministers must be settled and grounded in the truth—maintain a stricter discipline in the churches—walk together in love, keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace—be more watchful and exemplary, walking humbly with God—give themselves unto prayer under a deeper and more abiding sense of entire dependance upon the great Head of the church to receive his own words and give his work success. It is unnecessary that ministers, preach any *new* doctrine, or the churches adopt any *new* measures in order to ensure the prosperity of Zion, if ministers taking heed to themselves, but faithfully preach Christ, warning every man in all wisdom; and the church-

es but walk in all the ordinances and the commandments of the Lord blameless.

By order of Assosiation,  
THOMAS SNELL, *Moderator.*

---

THE CRUCIFIXION

NO. II.

It is important to inquire, whether the places with which tradition connects the interesting scenes of our Lord's ministry, are the identical places where those scenes occurred. It is doubtless true, that the superstition of the modern inhabitants of Palestine, has led them to reverence many external objects which are indebted for their sacredness entirely to conjecture. Their avarice has united with their superstition; and has led them, for the paltry gains which they may procure from ignorant men, to multiply imaginary relics, and to rehearse a thousand unfounded traditions. They pretend to exhibit the linen garment in which the Saviour was wrapped, the stone on which he was embalmed, the lance which pierced his side, the sponge on which the vinegar was poured, and the identical wood which composed his cross. All this is delusion. But because there is much of mere fable in their traditionary lore, shall we, with Dr. Clarke, suppose that there is little or nothing besides? There is no need of running into universal scepticism on this subject, because some have plunged into unlimited credulity. The popular opinion in Palestine, on the locality of minor objects, may be wrong; but some credence must be given to the existing traditions which respect the more important objects. On what principle of human nature could the Jews forget the site of their ancient temple, or the dwelling place of their ancient kings? How could the early Christians forget the place\* where their "Lord was crucified," or the garden where he became so "exceeding sorrowful"? Besides, these scenes were commemorated in the earliest ages by monuments which defied

\* Dr. Clarke and Dr. Richardson deny that the present Mount Calvary is the spot of the crucifixion, (see Robinson's *Calmet*, Art. Calvary,) so also Jahn, (see *Archæology* § 336.) True, the present Calvary is *within* the walls of the city, whereas the Saviour was crucified *without* the gate; and there is now but little appearance of a mount or hill at the hallowed spot. Yet the probability is, that the "high place is made low" by the ravages of time and men, and that the wall of the city has been extended beyond the ancient northern boundary, rather than that the uniform tradition of 1800 years in reference to so prominent a spot, is unfounded.

the oblivious influence of time, and guided the otherwise treacherous memory. When Titus Vespasian razed Jerusalem and obliterated many of its particular marks, he could not erase the general features of the city, nor disturb the relative position of its principal sites. Amid the confusion into which he threw the sacred streets, it was easy to determine where a public edifice, and above all where a noted hill or dale once was. In addition to this, A. D. 129, Ælius Adrian, that he might blot out the recollection of the sacred scenes, reared a statue of Venus in the garden of the Saviour's burial, an image of Jupiter on the place of the crucifixion, and a temple to Adonis in Bethlehem where Christ was born. The Emperor might have been unable to determine the *precise* spots, where the interesting events occurred; but he could scarcely fail to have discovered the *vicinity* of the spots; and he perpetuated their memory by the very means which he employed for burying them in oblivion. Constantine, in A. D. 326, ordered the statue of Venus to be removed, and a magnificent temple to be reared in its place. Helena, the mother of Constantine, visited Palestine in person, and supplanted the temple to Adonis by a Christian temple. She also erected edifices to her Saviour on Mount Olivet, at Nazareth, and many other consecrated grounds.\* In this manner were interesting localities determined for succeeding generations with a precision, not perfect by any means, but as great as the vicissitudes of time allowed.

With regard to the continued sameness of the natural scenery of Palestine, our confidence is greater than with regard to the scenes of specific historical incidents. The dilapidations of contending armies have indeed defaced the country, still its general characteristics remain unaltered. "The hills still stand round about Jerusalem, as they did in the days of David and of Solomon. The dew falls on Hermon, the cedars grow on Libanus, and Kishon, that ancient river, draws its stream from Taber, as in the times of old. The sea of Galilee still presents the same natural accompaniments, the fig-tree springs up by the the way-side, the sycamore spreads its branches, and the vines and olives still climb the sides of the mountains. The desolation which covered the cities of the plain, is not less striking at the present hour, than when Moses with an inspired pen recorded the judgement of God; the swellings of Jordarn are not less regular in their rise than when the Hebrews first approached its banks; and he, who

\* See "M. Car. Ortlob Dissertatio de Sepulchro Christi ad Mat. 27 : 60," on pages 254, 255 of *Thesaurus Theologico Philologicus. Pars Secunda.*

goes down from Jerusalem to Jericho, still incurs the greatest hazard of falling among thieves.”\*

Nothing can be more interesting than to visit the beloved land,

“ Over whose acres walked those blessed feet,  
Which, eighteen hundred years ago, were nailed,  
For our advantage, to the bitter cross,”

and especially to step on those places, where, we have probable evidence for believing, occurred the sublimest events which history ever recorded. “What my feelings were,” says Chateaubriand, “upon entering the church of the Holy Sepulchre, I really cannot tell. So many reflections rushed at once upon my mind, that I was unable to dwell upon any particular idea. I continued nearly half an hour upon my knees.—I had just beheld the monuments of Greece, and my mind was still profoundly impressed with their grandeur; but how far inferior were the sentiments which they excited to those I felt at the sight of the places commemorated in the Gospel!† As we ponder on the affecting history, we ought to fix our eyes upon the map of the consecrated places, and in our imaginations go along with Jesus from scene to scene, over the brook and up the mountain, into the garden, and through the bustling streets. How solemn and how heart-thrilling to put our feet upon the footsteps of our Saviour, as he walked along the “dolorous way” from the house of Pilate to the cross, as he wandered about with downcast eye in the garden, or wound his course through the olive trees and almond trees, and running vines on the sides and summits of Olivet. It was well said of Calvary, and in one sense it may be well said of all that consecrated land; it is “the centre, the grand magnet of the Christian church; from it proceed life and salvation; to it all hearts end, all eyes are directed.”

---

#### COLONIZATION AND EMANCIPATION.

[The following is but a part of a more extended article, which we have received as a review of the Sixteenth Report of the American Colonization Society, African Repository, Colonizationist and Journal of Freedom; and the First Annual Report of the New England Anti-Slavery Society, Abolitionist and Liberator. This will account for its appearing in the style and manner of a Review, although under the head of Communications. The

\* Palestine, by Rev. M. Russel, L. L. D. page 26.

† Travels in Greece, Palestine, Egypt, &c. Vol. 2, p. 22.

whole article would be quite too long for insertion in our present number. We presume the author, as he desired the article might appear this month, will excuse the rare liberty we take in this instance.]

For several months past we have thought it desirable to present our readers with an exhibition of the objects and proceedings of the two societies whose official Reports are placed at the head of this article, and also to express such views in relation to the whole subject of Colonization and Slavery, as its importance, and existing circumstances seem to require.

We have never doubted, that if a colony, or colonies could prosper on the coast of Africa, great blessings might be conferred upon that continent, through such a channel. But the question has been, what will be the influence of attempting such an enterprize, upon the poor slave? Will not the removal of the free blacks, increase the value of his labor—cause him to be tasked more severely—raise his market value—encourage the domestic traffic—and lessen the chances of his acquiring knowledge? Will it not serve to weaken the motives which naturally urge slaves to seek, and masters to give their freedom, and thus render universal emancipation more hopeless?

Several circumstances have served to render these questions the more serious. Some of the first movements towards the formation of the Colonization Society, were made in a slave-holding community. Some of the first movers were slave-holders. A majority of the first officers and managers were appointed from slave-holding states. The constitution makes no provision for the abolition of slavery. It expressly declares that the object to which the attention of the Society shall be *exclusively* directed is, 'to promote and execute a plan for colonizing (with their consent) the free people of color residing in our country, in Africa, or such other place as Congress shall deem most expedient.' It does indeed contemplate a provision not only for those already free, but also 'for those who may hereafter become so.' But some who were active in forming the Society, were careful to tell the planters that the Society would 'not interfere with their rights'—that it was 'not an abolition society.' Some went so far as to say that it 'would prove one of the greatest securities to enable the master to keep in possession his own property.\* And though the expectation has been abundantly declared by those who have expressed the above sentiments, that the successful operations of the Society *will tend to the voluntary emancipation of the slaves*, and the first, second and third Annual Reports of the Colonization So-

\* Speech of John Randolph.

ciety, show that the managers cherished this opinion; yet, it is not strange, that to a mind strongly prejudiced, an occasional declaration of an *individual contrary opinion*, even if given for no other purpose than to quell southern jealousy and opposition, should be nearly sufficient to destroy the force of a solemn declaration of the Board of Managers, to the contrary.

Such are some of the circumstances which, to our minds, have cast a shade of doubt over the scheme of African Colonization, and doubtless similar difficulties have prevented many from examining critically its history and tendency, and from aiding in its advancement. Perhaps it will yet appear, however, that the obstacles which have checked the progress of the cause, were wisely designed by an overruling Providence. Had there been no doubts, obstacles or opposition, too large a number might have been early sent to the colony, and the popularity of the enterprize might have proved its ruin. Such a colony could not safely have at first a very rapid growth. In order to sustain and direct their civil and religious institutions, the people must be prepared by experiment and a course of self-discipline, and only when this shall have been done, will a rapid increase of population be either safe or desirable. The progress of the colony and of public sentiment in favor of the Society, has certainly been more rapid than a view of the difficulties which at first surrounded the whole subject, could have permitted the early friends of the enterprize to hope for. Obstacles have been *numerous* and *various*. Many thought the scheme visionary. They believed the colored people to be an inferior race, incapable of being elevated to the rank and dignity of freemen in any country; and the idea of sending them to Africa for intellectual and moral improvement, and above all to civilize and christianize a barbarous continent, was easily turned to ridicule and derision. It was said, moreover, that they could not endure the African climate—they could not be governed and protected—they would be destroyed and kidnapped, and sold into slavery, or would become slave-dealers themselves. Some objected, for the same reason that they oppose other benevolent enterprizes; simply because it asked their charities. Some were willing that the colored race should remain in ignorance, as if they saw

“The doom of slavery stamped upon their face.”

Many at the north have neglected the Society, from the fear that their southern brethren would look upon northern efforts as officious interference. Others, because they have supposed it

a southern scheme for perpetuating slavery, or have thought it designed only to benefit the south, and that it therefore concerned only that section of the country.

Many at the south have neglected or opposed the Society, from the impression that it was a northern device to interfere with the system of slavery, to rob them of what they considered their *property*, and what was so defined by law, and guaranteed by the constitution. Some believed the society, or at least its northern friends, would countenance such measures as were fitted to produce insurrection among the colored people in the slave States, and endanger the peace and lives of the whites. Doubtless one of the prominent causes of hostility to the Society in the southern States, has been in the erroneous impression, that inflammatory publications which have sometimes appeared in New England, and circulated at the south, were approved and patronized by the friends of Colonization.

A portion of the colored people have by various means been prejudiced against the Society. Soon after its formation, it was publicly stated that 'an effort had been unfortunately made to prejudice the minds of the free people of color against the institution which had its origin, it was believed, in an honest desire to promote their happiness. A suggestion had been made, which the Society disclaimed by the terms of its constitution, that they were to be *constrained* to migrate to the country which might be selected for the seat of the colony. *No suspicion*, it was stated, *could be more unfounded.*'\*

Such '*suggestions*' have not been confined to the *early* opposers of the Society. Persevering efforts have been made to excite hostility; and then, in turn, this hostility itself has been urged as a reason for opposing it.

This cause, like every other good one, has had the misfortune to have some bad arguments used in its behalf, and to be patronized by some from wrong motives. This has given opposers occasion to raise some plausible objections, and thus to embolden its enemies, and check the ardor of its friends.

The necessary preparatory measures could not be matured in a moment. No emigrants were sent out till 1820, and every circumstance which occasioned delay, gave plausibility to the charge that the Society was inefficient, and could accomplish nothing. When these emigrants went out, they "were compelled, by a variety of untoward circumstances, to make a temporary establishment on the low unhealthy Island of Sherbro. Here they were detained some time, endeavoring to pur-

\* Speech of the President at the first Annual Meeting.

chase land, and were attacked by fatal diseases which carried off three agents, and more than twenty of the colonists."\* In 1821 a small addition was made to their number, but their prospects were dark and cheerless, till an extensive territory was purchased on the coast, embracing the cape and harbor now called Monrovia, and the colonists removed to that place.

Mr. Ashmun, accompanied by additional emigrants, went out to the Colony in 1822, but found that the Colonial Agent, suffering with disease, and unable to endure the labors of his station, had sailed for the United States; leaving the colonists defenceless and disheartened. They had suffered much from sickness; and the want of medical aid, of comfortable dwellings and necessary attention, rendered their condition and prospects truly discouraging. To add to their sufferings, it was soon discovered that a plot was concerted, and a combination forming for their destruction, by the treacherous natives; who, with fair professions, had sold the territory and encouraged its settlement. Mr. Ashmun and the little band of colonists, finding that no arguments or entreaties could prevent an attack, and that they must either 'fight or die,' had but just made the best preparation for defence they could, before the colony was attacked by a furious band, supposed to amount to 700 or 800 native Africans, whose 'tender mercies had become cruel' by long participation in the slave trade. With bravery and skill altogether unaccountable, the few men who were able to bear arms defended the colony, and drove away their assailants. It was not long, however, before they were again attacked by a much larger number, rendered doubly furious by the former defeat. The colonists were again victorious, as it were by a miracle, and a permanent peace was secured.

It was not till 1824 that a regular form of government was adopted, and the colony could be said to be fairly established; and all the sufferings of the colonists up to that period, added to the embarrassments of the Society. Some would accuse the managers of wantonly sporting with human life; or at best, of trying visionary experiments, which must occasion unwarrantable exposure and suffering. Even to this day, there are those who object to the Colonization Society, for waging a "destructive war," as it has been called, "upon the peaceful natives of Africa;" and because, in purchasing the territory, ardent spirit was one of the articles of traffic, and the efforts of the board have not succeeded in stopping the sale of it in the colony, some seem to find a peculiar delight in ridiculing the So-

\* M. Carey.

ciety for attempting "to civilize Africa with powder and bullets and rum."

Such is a brief view of some of the obstacles which the Colonization Society has met with. They have, however, for the most part, been overcome; and the Society, in spite of all opposition and every obstacle, is accomplishing, as fast, we believe, as could be expected, the great ultimate object it has ever had in view, universal emancipation. A colony has been established, and by its rapid growth and prosperity, has both demonstrated that the scheme is practicable, and raised up a host of friends. About 300 emigrants have removed to the colony, more than *one fourth* of whom went out during the last year. More than 700 of the emigrants are said to have been slaves, liberated for this purpose. *Two hundred and forty seven* of this class, were sent out during the last year, and *one hundred and eighty-four*, near the close of 1831. Not far from 300 Africans have been re-captured from slave-ships, and located near the colony, where they are making rapid advances from barbarism towards the condition of civilized men.

The soil and production of the extensive territory owned by the Society, render it capable of sustaining a large population, and its commercial advantages are more than equal to its agricultural. During one year, fifty-nine vessels visited the port of Monrovia, and the exports during the same period, consisting chiefly of camwood, ivory, palm-oil, tortoise shell and gold, amounted to \$125,549, nearly or quite as large a sum as had then been expended by the Colonization Society. The colony is becoming favorably known to tribes far distant from the coast, and "Mandingo traders and others have visited it from the borders of Foola Jallo."\* Three flourishing villages now exist, with their schools and churches, beside the settlements of the re-captured Africans, and preparations are making for others. The cause of education is receiving increased attention, and the moral and religious state of the colony is spoken of in favorable terms by those who visit it from this and other countries.

The way seems to be prepared for a rapid increase of the population if necessary funds can be provided. The managers express the opinion that thousands might be introduced with safety in one year, provided temporary buildings should be constructed, and provision made for their support during a few months after their arrival, and that \$200,000 might be well expended† before the close of the year in removing emigrants,

\* Sixteenth Report, p. 6.

† *ib.* p. 10.

and preparing the way for larger numbers to succeed them. The Colonial Agent declares: "Only give me due notice, and send out building materials, and I care not how many you transport; they must and shall be provided for." \* \* "You can have no idea of the favorable impression we have made on the natives of the country; they are constantly sending messages, requesting us to settle at different points on the coast, from Cape Mount to Trade Town (about 140 miles,) and means only are wanting to enable us to occupy the coast between these two points."

It is doubtless implied in the statement of the Agent respecting emigrants, that a good proportion of them, at least, are to be such as will make good citizens. Much must depend on this. A portion of the companies which arrived in the colony during the last year, were such as to occasion complaints from the Agent. This subject will doubtless receive proper attention.

While the evidences of prosperity in the colony demonstrate the practicability of the enterprize, and render it popular, they also subject it to some danger. If we mistake not, its growing popularity for a few years past, has done the cause some injury. The Legislatures of more than half the States, and the public bodies of nearly all the different denominations of Christians, have passed resolutions in its favor; and it would seem that multitudes take it for granted, that the resolutions, and a liberal supply of good wishes, will carry forward the enterprize, without any thing further. It has for a time been so popular, that almost any thing in the style of declamation, would pass for *substantial argument* in its favor, and visionary expectations of its success have to some extent been entertained, which must occasion more or less reaction: We cannot resist the conviction that ministers and editors in New-England have relied too much upon its popularity, and consequently have neglected to examine thoroughly all its bearings and make their hearers and readers familiar with its operations.

Some have doubtless been disposed to rely upon the Society to do *all* that is necessary for the colored people in this country, forgetting that it was formed to accomplish a *specific object*, "to which its attention is to be EXCLUSIVELY directed." We have no doubt that the successful operations of the Colonization Society have a tendency to benefit the colored people who remain in this country; but we protest against the idea that it is doing all that is necessary for their improvement. This is not its sphere of operation; and other efforts should be made to

afford the free colored people means of education, and facilities for becoming useful and respectable citizens.

We are equally confident that the operations of the Society are exerting a powerful and an *increasing* influence in favor of voluntary emancipation. This opinion is not hastily formed, or rashly expressed. It is the sober conviction resulting from an examination of the history of the Society, and of arguments for and against it. But while cherishing this view, and yielding a cordial support to the cause of Colonization, we would hail with joy any other scheme which by *proper means* should hasten the peaceful liberation of all the slaves in this country and throughout the world. Believing that no man has a moral right to hold man as property, we cannot doubt that slavery, as it exists in this country, is a curse to all who feel its influence. It is not our present object to enquire whether it be a greater curse to the slave, the master or the nation; or to the free blacks in this country, or the African race throughout the world; nor shall we stop to enumerate the reasons which lead us to believe that slavery will one day (and that not far distant) be done away. We believe that influences have for several years been operating, which will not cease, but will become more and more active, till changes shall be wrought in public sentiment, which will render it impossible for enlightened men to hold their fellows in bondage. We are not ignorant or unmindful of the existence of other views in the community, and we had intended to make several remarks on the measures of the Anti-Slavery Society, and on what seems to us to be the injurious tendency of these measures; but since writing the above a pamphlet has appeared,\* which enters more fully into the measures and tendency of both the Colonization and the Anti-Slavery Societies, than the necessary limits of this article will admit.

[Thus far the author of the article. It need only be added as what must be the warm desire of every friend of colonization and emancipation, that the cause should be remembered as it deserves, on the approaching anniversary of our national independence.—The "Remarks" referred to, are worthy of attention, both for the facts they contain, and the spirit with which they are communicated.]

\* Remarks on African Colonization, and the Abolition of Slavery, in two parts, by a Citizen of New England. Windsor Vt. Published by Richards & Tracy. pp. 48.

## WRITTEN SERMONS.

Any question touching the manner of public teaching, is of vital importance to every minister of the gospel; and none more so, perhaps, than whether with written or unwritten sermons. In advocating the use of written sermons, I do not mean that a man should preach with eyes fixed and muscles unmoved, save in turning over leaves; but that, after having written his sermon in full, he should deliver it *memoriter*, or prepare it in a fair, legible character, and make it so familiar before he enters the pulpit, as that he will be unembarrassed in his delivery, and be enabled to direct his message to the congregation. Nor would I be understood as urging exclusiveness—as implying that a pastor should never address his hearers *extempore*; nor that a man of natural extemporaneous parts, should always be compelled to write: but that sermons should generally be written.

1. *The good of the preacher requires it.*

A peculiar natural talent is as necessary for the orator as the poet. As one not naturally a poet, can only rise to respectability as a writer by confining himself to prose; so while a man cannot acquire a natural talent for oratory, he can learn to compose with correctness, perspicuity, and vivacity, and to read, not only in a proper and inoffensive, but an affecting, rousing manner. If in this way, as some aver, there is not so much excellence, yet a *good* pulpit delivery, where nature has withheld her gifts, is far easier to be *acquired*. But there is more excellence.

It leads to more mental discipline. The writer of sermons is more thorough in investigation, systematic in thinking, and logical in reasoning. He is made a more connected, biblical logician.

It makes the Sabbath duties easier. Who is not almost exhausted by the effort of speaking and anxiety of being a messenger from God to man? If to this is added presenting the argument, forming and arranging the sentences, and expressing the words, the mind will hardly recover from its overburdened excitement before the next Lord's day.

It prevents indolence. This is often a besetting sin, even with the herald of salvation. It whispers—"trust the Lord and speak without preparation." Said the pious and learned Baxter, "I use notes as much as any man, when I take pains; and as little as any man, when I am lazy, or have not time to

prepare." If a sermon is to be written, there is no alternative, laziness must be overcome—the work must be done.

2. *The good of the people requires written sermons.*

However much a preacher may pen his thoughts on other subjects, unless he writes his *sermons*, he is in danger of becoming merely hortatory in matter, loose in argument, excursive in fancy, exuberant in words, drawling and hesitating or hurried in manner. With words there must be ideas. With fluency of utterance there must be solidity of thought. The why and wherefore must precede the exhortation; and the whole be pronounced in an impressive, solemn manner, or it will not rouse up the hearers to that vigorous, persevering action necessary to secure salvation. True, there have been Whitfields and Richmonds, but they were giants in the land. Few possess the imagination, the intellectual furniture, the mental discipline, the faith, the zeal, the fluent speech, the native eloquence of these men.

Written sermons will train up Christians to be doctrinal, as well as practical—thinking and knowing, as well as acting. Although there may not be so much excitement of the animal feelings on the Sabbath, yet there is a more connected, cool exhibition of divine truth, which leads them to act from principle. The truth comes to them unobstructed by irrelevant and oft-repeated phrases, thrown in like so many connecting links to prevent an utter cessation of speech—it comes enlightening the mind, purifying the taste, awakening the conscience, persuading the heart, establishing the faith.

And then, like the fountain whence it is drawn, it ceases not when once its vivifying influence has been felt:—it benefits generations yet unborn:—it lives and speaks when its author is silent in the grave. Who does not rejoice that Saurin, and Barrow, and Burder, and Edwards, and Dwight, and Payson communicated their messages through the medium of written discourses?—"But another might have penned their thoughts as they flowed forth in words that burned." So thought the reporters of Whitfield's sermons: but the *eloquence* of Whitfield is not there. Would an author embody himself in his sermons, he must himself prepare them for the press.

3. *The dignity of the pulpit requires written sermons.*

Unlike the Grecian and Roman orators, unlike senators and lawyers, the object of the preacher is, not to put down an antagonist—not to produce a momentary excitement and determine the assembly in his favor, but to elucidate a subject of revelation, to make a lasting impression, to instruct as well as arouse, to win both the intellect and the depraved heart, not to himself,

but to Jesus Christ. His work is with the immortal soul upon the things of eternity. The unsanctified heart seeks every occasion to evade the authority with which his message is clothed. While, then, he is not deficient in *energy* and *warmth*, he must have nothing *low* and *disgusting*, nor even trifling or common place. Although by written sermons gravity may be in danger of falling into a dull, uniform solemnity, it is not in danger of becoming declamatory, theatrical and light. Although the pathos may be less vehement, (which is by no means necessary,) it is more solemn. Where the people are enlightened, and the superstitious notion of immediate inspiration is rejected, so momentous are the subjects of divine truth, a carefully premeditated discourse is necessary to inspire the hearers with confidence, and to fall upon their consciences with weight.

4. *The history of the pulpit favors written sermons.*

In those denominations and those countries where unwritten sermons are common, either the people are not elevated in intellect, or they are loose and vague in their religious opinions, or they are easily excited and as easily relapse into a death-like apathy. The reverse of this may be found among the French Protestants, the English Puritans, the Scotch Presbyterians.

While among individuals who have excelled as preachers, one Richmond or Whitfield can be mentioned; many on the other hand might be named, like Milner, Newton, Hall, Massillon, Edwards, Davies and Payson.

In surveying different sections of our own country, and the labors of different living preachers, let theory establish what it may, the *fact* is undeniable, that where ministers are in the general habit of writing their sermons, there is found, though less of passionate excitement, more stability of Christian character—a more steadily onward movement of the church.

I would say then, in the language of another,

‘ However loud the momentary praise  
Of ignorance, with empty fervor charm'd;  
Better read every sentence word for word,  
Than wander in a desultory strain—  
A chaos dark, irregular, and wild—  
Where the same thought and language oft revolves,  
And re-revolves to tire sagacious minds.  
But never to your notes be so enchained,  
As to repress some instantaneous thought,  
That may, like lightning, dart upon the soul,  
And blaze in strength and majesty divine.’

## COMPARISON OF THE EVANGELICAL AND LIBERAL SYSTEMS.

My object in the following pages is to compare these two systems of religion, not with the Bible, but with each other; and not for the purpose of determining directly which is true, but with a view to test the character of each in respect to *sublimity*, and *moral grandeur*, and the power of exerting a deep and thrilling *interest* in minds subjected to its influence.

1. The two systems may be compared, in the first place, in the views exhibited by each respecting the *natural state and character of man*.—Liberal Christianity represents man, not as a fallen, but as an erring being. He begins his moral existence right, and except that he wanders occasionally, more or less, he continues it in the same way. It is his duty, so far as he has wandered, to repent—a duty which he is well able to perform, and which many, in the unaided exercise of their powers, actually do perform. Those who repent are, of course, forgiven. They are forgiven on *the ground* of their *repentance*. There is no remaining obstacle in the way of their forgiveness. Those who do not here repent must be unhappy, longer or shorter, more or less, according to the nature and aggravation of their offences. They must be subjected to a painful but salutary discipline, till at length their hearts melt, and till, in the tears of penitence, their guilt is wasted away.—Such is the representation of the *liberal* system in regard to the natural state and character of our race; and much credit is claimed for it on the ground of its simplicity, and its adaptedness to the common apprehensions of men. But what is there in the views here exhibited that is *moving*, *affecting*, or deeply and solemnly *interesting*? What is there calculated to arouse the sensibilities, and to melt and break the obdurate heart?

The teachings of Evangelical Christianity in regard to the character and state of man are very different. These are mortifying indeed, to human pride, but to all who understand them, they are clothed with an awful interest and power. They represent man, in the outset, as *fallen—entirely fallen*. He begins to sin as soon as he begins to act; and he continues to sin, without cessation or intermission,—so that his heart is represented as *full of evil*, and in his flesh there dwelleth *no good thing*. Nor is his sinful character his misfortune merely; it is his crime. He has been voluntary in

forming it, and for every part of it he is personally responsible and guilty. It is his *duty* to repent of his sins; but then it is certain that, of himself, he never will repent. His habits of sin are so strong, that he never will overcome them. His love of sin is so inveterate, that he never will consent to give it up.—And even if he should repent, repentance will not cancel the debt he has contracted. Repentance will not satisfy the demands of law and justice against him. Here then he lies, fallen, guilty, ruined, lost. He has fallen by his own hands, and in himself is without help or hope. The penalty of the law hangs suspended over him, and this penalty is nothing less than eternal death—an eternal banishment from God and from all good, to regions of unutterable despair and woe.

In these circumstances, what can he do? To conceal aught is impossible, and it is impossible to escape. The stains of guilt are upon all his character, and the pall of death covers all his prospects. If he casts his eye backward, there is naught but the remembrance of past pride, selfishness, worldliness and sin; or if forward, there is a fearful looking for of judgment, and no deliverer.

Such is the natural character and state of man, as held by evangelical Christians; and who will say that the view given is not most exciting and appalling? Who will say that it does not possess a subduing interest, a terrible grandeur, beyond almost every other subject? A whole race in ruins; brought under the curse of God's law, and exposed to the pains of eternal death, by their own sin; with no means of deliverance in their power, and no heart to use any, even were they provided;—what moral spectacle can be presented more fearfully, awfully affecting than this! What spectacle presented to the benevolent universe has ever excited so intense an interest!

2. Let us next compare the two systems under consideration in regard to the *remedial provisions* they respectively make for the natural state and character of man.

As the liberal system represents man as but partially sinful—as entitled to forgiveness on the mere ground of repentance—and as well able, of himself, to repent; he obviously needs no remedy, unless it be instruction and encouragement. With the mere light of nature he is in no great danger,—though it may be better for him to be more particularly instructed, on some points, by the voice of revelation. Accordingly, the amount of the remedy provided is, not properly a Saviour, but a divinely commissioned human instructor, a teacher sent from God, to set before men their duty, and by

his teaching, example, and sufferings, to win them to the performance of it.—Here again is claimed a beautiful simplicity of plan, and one well adapted to the circumstances and wants of those for whom it is provided. And according to the liberal view of the circumstances and wants of men, perhaps it may be sufficiently adapted.

But not so, according to the *evangelical* view. This represents man as totally guilty and thoroughly lost—without any disposition to repent, or any possibility of pardon on the ground of repentance, even if he should repent—under the desolating curse of a broken law, and with nothing before him but a fearful looking for of judgment. In circumstances such as these, mere instruction and encouragement would be but mockery. The fallen, ruined sinner needs something more. He needs, first of all, an *atonement*, on the ground of which God may be just, and yet the justifier of the repenting, returning soul. And then he needs an *influence*, strong enough to subdue the enmity of his heart, and bring him humbly to rest on the atonement provided. And according to the *evangelical* system, the whole of this stupendous provision is actually made. This represents all Heaven as interested, excited, moved, in regard to the impending destiny of guilty man. It represents the Eternal Father as so loving a world of sinners, as to be willing to send his Son to be the propitiation for their sins. It represents the Eternal Son as consenting to come down on this errand of mercy, and to lay the foundation of the sinner's hope in his own tears, and agonies, and blood. Indeed, it represents him as being already come. Having been pointed out and predicted by inspired bards and seers—having been prefigured by shadows and bloody rites, all along under the former dispensation; in the fullness of time, the Son of God assumed our nature, took our flesh, bore our sorrows, and made full and final expiation for our sins. On the ground of this expiation, terms of life have been proposed; invitations have been given; ordinances have been instituted; and the whole process of means has been put in operation. On the same ground, the Holy Spirit has come into our world, to give efficacy to means, and apply the blood of Jesus. He has come into these regions of apostacy and death, to enlighten the dark mind, arouse the stupid conscience, break the obdurate heart, bow the stubborn will, and bring rebellious creatures to the obedience of faith. Holy angels, too, have consented to engage in this stupendous work, and have actually become ministering spirits, sent forth to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation. Meanwhile the great Redeemer,

having finished his work of humiliation, has ascended up on high, where he ever liveth to prepare mansions, and to make intercession for his beloved people.

Such is a summary of the provision which the evangelical system represents as made, for the deliverance and salvation of lost sinners. And is it not a glorious provision! Is it not a grand, a sublime, a most stupendous provision! No wonder the angels desire to look into these things. No wonder the upper worlds are all interested in them, and that they excite the profoundest and most delightful musings of celestial minds.

The fall and ruin of our race are indeed total and awful;—but the remedy provided is fully adequate to meet our necessities. It meets them at every point. If our guilt is great, great is our Saviour. If our hearts are hard, and our love of sin strong; strong is our Sanctifier. If our discouragements are many, so are our promises. If the enemies of our peace are numerous and powerful, those that be for us are more and stronger than those that be against us. If the legions of hell are enlisted to oppose us, all heaven is on our side, and sustained by such an alliance, we may go forward from conquering to conquer. In view of an interest such as this, pervading all heaven, and all invisible worlds; in view of a provision so stupendous and glorious for the salvation of sinful worms; no wonder the seraphic spirit of Paul so often took fire, and that he was led to exclaim, in the ardor of his soul, “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!”

3. Let us once more compare the two systems which have been mentioned, in the representations they respectively make as to *the consequences* of accepting or rejecting the provision of the gospel.

With the views inculcated in the liberal system respecting the natural character and state of man, and the provision made for his better instruction and edification, it cannot be supposed that the consequences depending on his immediately listening to these instructions should be the most urgent or important. If he follows the directions of the inspired teacher, whatever sins he has committed will be forgiven, and he will be restored to peace;—not to so great peace as though he had not sinned, but to as much as is consistent with a remembrance of his sins. But if he turns away from the inspired teacher, and does not hear and obey his instructions, he must remain in comparative darkness and suffering till he

does obey. And if he refuses to obey till life ends, he must be subjected to discipline in the other world, till repentance and reformation are effected.

Such are the consequences, on the liberal system, of listening, or not, to the instructions of heaven. Let us compare them, for a moment, with the representations of the evangelical system in regard to the same subject. This, we have seen already, exhibits the natural man as fallen, and in himself ruined. But it exhibits all heaven as moved and interested for him;—the Father as willing to give up the Son, and the Son as willing to give up himself, to make expiation for human transgression;—the Spirit as freely consenting to be our sanctifier, and the holy angels as cheerfully undertaking to be ministering servants to the necessities of fallen men. As a part of this stupendous provision, easy offers are made to our race; the kindest invitations and entreaties are given; the most persuasive motives are urged. And all these are made to bear on a single point, upon which every thing is represented as turning,—*the present, voluntary compliance of men with the offers of mercy*. If they yield now, every thing is gained. Their souls are renewed by the power of the Holy Spirit; their sins are washed away in atoning blood; they are made a part of the spiritual family of God; will be sustained and strengthened to the end of their course; and will be raised hereafter to an equality with angels in the realms of bliss. But if they refuse compliance till life ends, then all is finally and forever lost. The terms of mercy are withdrawn, and all their past privileges—the slighted blood of Jesus, the resisted strivings of the Holy Spirit, the rejected means and influences of the gospel—can only rise up in judgment to condemn them. They must go down forever, under the vastly accumulated guilt, not only of breaking the law of God, but of treading under foot his Son, and doing despite to the Spirit of his grace.

Such are the unspeakably momentous consequences, represented in the evangelical system as *hanging on the sinner's choice*—as depending on his present reception or rejection of the conditions of the gospel, and while the fearful question is at issue, all heaven and hell are represented as looking intently on, and waiting the result. God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and holy angels, are looking on, and are doing all that for the salvation of the sinner which can consistently be done; while the spirits of darkness are looking on, and are exerting their whole influence to draw him with them down to death.

And now what an amazing representation is this? As to its truth or falsehood I do not now inquire; but is it not moving, affecting, transporting, sublime, beyond any thing that can be conceived or expressed? Is it not calculated, beyond every thing, to arrest attention, to excite feeling, to move and subdue the relentless heart?

1. From the comparison which has been instituted between the evangelical and liberal systems, it appears that they are *widely different*, the one from the other.—There are those, indeed, who think otherwise. The two systems are represented by some as approaching very near to each other—as differing only in speculative and unessential points. And there are some who endeavor to blend these two systems; preaching sometimes the one, and sometimes the other, and sometimes different parts of both. But those who understand the subject, on *both sides*, know and admit, that the difference between the two systems is immense, extending to all essential points, and rendering it impossible that both should be, or should contain, the truth as it is in Jesus. And so the subject is represented in the comparison which has here been made. The difference between the two systems, obviously, is not speculative and unessential, but *vital* and *radical*. It reaches to every thing pertaining to a system of religion, affecting, modifying, changing all. It reaches to what man is, and to what he must be; to what has been done for him, and to what he must do for himself, in order to be saved. It reaches to all the springs of action, and the foundations of hope in such a manner, that if the one system is true, the other cannot be; if one constitutes the gospel of Jesus, the other is but an airy delusion.

The difference between these two systems of religion is, at present, one of great practical importance. Persons are often placed in circumstances where they are under a necessity of deciding between them, and of lending their influence to promote either the one or the other. And they ought to consider, at such times, how solemnly they are situated, and what momentous consequences are depending on the decisions they form. Both the systems which are before them cannot be true. Both cannot be safe for the soul. If the one is according to the Bible, the other is against it. If the one leads upward to the realms of bliss; the other leads downward to despair and woe.

I do not undertake to decide here, which of these systems is true, and which false, or to direct the inquirer as to the conclusion to which he ought to come. I would only remind

him that it is not a matter of indifference to which he does come—that the interests of his soul, and of other souls connected with him, are at stake—and that the question to be determined is, in all probability, one of the most momentous, that will ever come before him on this side the grave.

2. It appears, from what has been said, that each of the two systems which have been compared may be consistent with itself. Admit certain first principles, and each follows very naturally and consistently. Admit, for example, that man is by nature what the liberal system represents him to be, and he needs no other remedy than what this system provides. And if the remedy provided be what this system represents, then the present reception or rejection of it cannot involve consequences of sufficient moment very deeply to affect any person. But on supposition that man is naturally what the evangelical system represents; he obviously needs a very different application; and on his reception or rejection of this application, consequences infinite and unutterable must depend.

In order to see the subject thus presented in its true light, let us suppose the different parts of the two systems transferred, so that the one may come into the place of the other. Suppose man to be, not a fallen, but only an erring being, with nothing in the way of his forgiveness but the lack of repentance, and with no difficulty in the way of his repenting, which he may not easily overcome,—so that he is in no great danger as he is, and only needs some additional light and motives in order to his complete salvation;—and were we now to see all heaven interested for him; the Father moved to send the Son to die for him; the Son consenting to come down for this painful purpose; the Holy Spirit issuing forth to renew and sanctify him; and holy angels becoming his ministering servants;—should we see all this stupendous display of feeling and provision; we could hardly help imagining that here was ‘much ado about nothing’—that there was no occasion for all this interest, effort, and sacrifice—that every thing which was needed might have been accomplished with much less expense.

Suppose, on the other hand, that man is, (what the evangelical system represents him to be) a fallen, guilty, ruined creature; holden for a debt which he can never pay, and exposed to a punishment from which there is no escape; with no disposition to repent, and no possibility of pardon even if he does repent; with nothing behind him but mountains of incurred guilt, and nothing before him but a fearful looking for of judgment;—suppose him placed in such a situation, with

his eyes all open to see it, and his heart alive to feel it;— and tell him now that God loves him, and has sent an inspired messenger to teach him, and set before him a good example; and he will say at once ‘Why, this is to mock me! What can a mere teacher do with a heart such as mine! What can he do with the guilt I have already incurred! What can he do with the worm that is gnawing within me; and with the dreadful sentence which hangs impending over me; and with the devouring flames already kindled to consume me! No, tell me not of an inspired teacher! Mock me not with a provision such as this! He can do nothing for me that I need, and why should I hear of him more?’

The foundation of the two different systems of religion is laid in the different views given by each respecting the natural state and character of man: Those who adopt the liberal view on this subject, will be likely to adopt it on every other. But those who adopt the evangelical view in regard to this great subject, and open, not only their eyes, but their *heart* to it, will scarcely fail of being led into all necessary truth. Their dreadful fall, and guilt, and ruin will show them their need of an Almighty Saviour and an Almighty Sanctifier, and will lead them to flee for refuge to the hope that is set before them.—It is easy to cure men of their errors on most religious subjects, if we can but make them acquainted with their true character and state. For the moment they see this, they will see what they need; and they will then be satisfied with nothing less than the full provision of the gospel.

3. From the comparison which has been instituted between the two different systems of religion, it is easy to account for their different *effects*.

It has been a standing complaint of the liberal system, both among friends and foes, that it fails to excite a deep, a general, and an abiding interest. Dr. Priestly uttered this complaint many years ago, and it has been reiterated by liberalists on the other side of the water, from his days to the present. And not without sufficient reason: for it is a well known fact, that their preaching has scattered some of the best Dissenting congregations, and emptied not a few of the oldest and largest Dissenting meeting houses in the mother country. The same complaint is also heard on this side of the water. With the exception of a few of the more distinguished preachers, those who hold and teach the liberal doctrines are known to excite but little interest on the subject of religion. They may excite interest on other subjects, and subjects of importance to the community; but on the subject of

religion, they are known to excite but little interest. And why should they? The difficulty is not in the men—not at all; but in the system which they preach. What is there in this system, taken by itself and standing upon its own merits, calculated to excite a thrilling and an abiding interest? Look into every part of it—the views it exhibits of the natural state and character of man, the provision made for him, and the consequences of embracing or rejecting this provision—and see if there is any thing calculated to excite much joy or grief, hope or fear, or deep emotions of any kind. See if there is any thing so wonderful as to draw the attention of heaven, and excite the angels to desire to look into it;—any thing so mysterious and unfathomable, as to call forth an exclamation like that of the Apostle, “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!”

The effects of the evangelical system, where it is faithfully exhibited and urged, are also manifest. They are manifest in the concessions, not to say the *accusations*, of its opposers. In the sudden awakenings and conversions which accompany it; in flowing tears and grief of heart for sin; in terrors and distresses in prospect of impending judgment; in high hopes and joys, and abounding consolations; in revivals of religion, affecting whole communities, and shaking them as with a rushing wind; in arousing the careless, reclaiming the vicious, withdrawing the worldly from the pursuits of earth, and fixing their thoughts and hearts on heaven;—in all these and similar ways, the *effects* of the evangelical system are exhibited to the world. They certainly are great effects—often very astounding to those who have no sympathy with evangelical doctrines; but is there not, under God, a *sufficient cause* for them? May they not be easily and satisfactorily accounted for? They do not arise from the eloquence or the art of preachers—not at all; but in these *evangelical doctrines*, when accompanied by the influence of the Holy Spirit, there is a grandeur, an interest, a pathos, a power, which render them altogether resistless. They show the sinner what he is, and where he is, and what is before him, and what is to become of him; and he is agitated, distressed, alarmed. They show him what Heaven has felt, and done, and is doing for him; and he is overwhelmed. They set before him life and death, blessing and cursing, unending joy or unending woe, as depending on a decision to be made by himself; and with trembling haste, he presses towards the narrow gate, and flees from the wrath to come. The effects of

these heart-stirring doctrines, when accompanied by the strivings of the Holy Spirit, are precisely what we might suppose they would be. They are not disproportionate to their cause, but are its appropriate and legitimate effects.

And now, reader, are not these powerful doctrines the doctrines of the Apostles and primitive Christians? Are they not the doctrines of Paul? Did not he preach the fallen, guilty, ruined state of man? Did not he preach redemption by the blood of Christ, and sanctification by the power of the Holy Ghost? Did not he represent sinners as in a most fearful, critical situation, and urge them to flee from the wrath to come? And were not the effects of his preaching similar to those which now follow the preaching of evangelical doctrines? Felix hears him, trembles, and makes promises. Agrippa hears him, is wrought upon, and almost persuaded. Lydia's heart is opened, and she is suddenly converted. The jailer is anxious, and inquires, "What must I do to be saved"? Revivals of religion follow him wherever he goes, and the moral wilderness blooms around him. Who does not see, in the similarity of these *effects* to those of faithful evangelical preaching in our own times, that the doctrines taught must be the same? And if they are the same; then are not the doctrines of the evangelical system *the truth of God*—that truth which is to stand forever? And if these doctrines are the truth of God; then those who reject them do it at their peril.

In rejecting these doctrines, we reject the counsel of God against ourselves. We put out the only light which has ever been given us, to guide our wandering feet through this dark world to the celestial paradise. We reject the only means which heaven has ever provided, or ever will provide, for our sanctification or salvation.—But if we embrace these truths, we embrace the gospel;—with its precious promises and abounding consolations, *we embrace the gospel*. We embrace that which will be our light in darkness, our joy in sorrow, and our only support when heart and flesh shall fail. We embrace that which will be as the bread and the water of life to our hungry and thirsty souls.

## REVIEWS.

THE YOUNG CHRISTIAN: or a Familiar Illustration of the Principles of Christian Duty. By JACOB ABBOTT, Principal of the Mt. Vernon Female School, Boston. Boston: Peirce & Parker, 1832. pp. 323. 12 mo.

This work, though recently published, is already too well known to need any analysis of its contents, or any delineation of its character; but it so happily exemplifies a highly useful mode of instruction, that we take this occasion of calling the attention of our readers to the subject.

We can show by example, better than by description, what we mean by the method of instruction here recommended. It did not originate with our author; it is as old as wisdom herself; and the most perfect specimens of it are to be found in the writings of those "who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," and in the instructions of Him who taught as never man taught. It addresses the reason through the senses, the memory and the imagination. It teaches not by speculation, but by facts; not by cold and barren generalities, but by practical details, distinct, pertinent, and fitted to rouse and enchain attention; not by vague abstractions, intelligible only to deep and disciplined thinkers, but by particulars, level to the humblest minds, lying in the range of their familiar observation, and calculated to rivet conviction or impression, by leaving them to work out their own conclusion. Should we consider this mode of instruction as employing illustrations, facts, and narrations, we might find an example of each in the sacred volume.

Take an example of teaching by *illustration*. With what beauty and force does our Saviour urge the example of God's providing for the fowls of the air, and clothing the lillies of the field, to dissuade from solicitude respecting the supply of our daily wants! "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment? Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they? And why take ye thought for raiment? Consider the lillies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin;

and yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?" Matt. vi: 25—30.

What a striking picture does he give of self-deception, in the house built on the sand! "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell not; for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it." Matt. vii. 24—27.

A similar example is found in the description given of the final judgment. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left. Then shall the king say unto them on his right hand, come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me, &c. Matt. xxv: 31—46.

Our Saviour also seized on well-known *facts*, to silence the captious, and convince the prejudiced and the ignorant. Mark his defence of his own conduct on healing on the Sabbath. "Which of you shall have an ox or an ass fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the Sabbath-day?" "Doth not each one of you on the Sabbath, loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath day?" Luke xiii: 15, 16; xiv: 52.

How adroitly does he expose and rebuke the captiousness of the Pharisees and Sadduces who demanded "a sign from heaven," in proof of his having come from God to introduce the reign of the Messiah. "When it is evening, ye say, It will be fair weather; for the sky is red: and in the morning, It will

be foul weather to-day, for the sky is red and lowering. O ye hypocrites ! ye can discern the face of the sky ; but can ye not discern the signs of the times ?” Matt. xvi : 2, 3.

With what power did he apply a few facts from sacred history, to his hearers in Nazareth, who were disposed to say, “ Physician, heal thyself,” and tauntingly to inquire, after all “ the gracious words which had proceeded out of his mouth,” “ Is not this the carpenter’s son ?” “ Many widows were in Israel in the days of Elias, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when great famine was throughout all the land : but unto none of them was Elias sent, save unto Sarepta, a city of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow. And many lepers were in Israel, in the time of Eliseus the prophet ; and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian. And all they in the synagogue, when they heard these things, were filled with wrath, and rose up, and thrust him out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon their city was built, that they might cast him down headlong.” Luke iv : 25—29.

The Bible often teaches by narratives ; and whether real or imaginary, they teach the same thing with equal pertinency and force. In the description of the Pharisee and Publican, how clear the idea, how keen the reproof of self-righteousness ! “ Two men when went up into the temple to pray ; the one a Pharisee, and the other a publican. The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself ; ‘ God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess.’ And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes to heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, ‘ God, be merciful to me, a sinner.’ I tell you this man went down to his house, justified rather than the other : for every one that exalteth himself, shall be abased ; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.” Luke xviii : 10—14.

The parable of the good Samaritan compelled even the captious lawyer to acknowledge who was his neighbor ; those of the single sheep gone astray, the lost piece of money, and the penitent prodigal, must have fully answered their original design of vindicating the kind attentions of our Saviour to publicans and sinners.

We cannot help quoting from the Old Testament, the beautiful and touching parable which Nathan employed with so much success in bringing David to repentance for his aggravated guilt in the matter of Uriah. “ And the Lord sent Nathan unto David. And he came unto him, and said unto him ;

there were two men in one city ; the one rich, and the other poor. The rich man had exceeding many flocks and herds : but the poor man had nothing save one little ewe-lamb, which he had bought and nourished up ; and it grew up together with him, and with his children ; it did eat of his own meat, and drank of his own cup, and lay in his bosom, and was unto him as a daughter. And there came a traveller unto the rich man, and he spared to take of his own flock, and of his own herd, to dress for the wayfaring man that was come unto him ; but took the poor man's lamb, and dressed it for the man that was come to him. And David's anger was greatly kindled against the man ; and he said to Nathan, 'As the Lord liveth, the man that hath done this shall surely die. And he shall restore the lamb four-fold, because he did this thing, and because he had no pity.' And Nathan said to David, 'Thou art the man. And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord.' II. Sam. i : 7—13.

We have taken from the Bible examples enough to illustrate the method of instruction attempted in the work before us ; but we will extract from his own pages a few specimens of our author's style and general manner.

Take his illustration of the manner in which secret and smothered guilt operates :

"It is one of the most remarkable properties of the human mind, that a consciousness of guilt may remain a long time dormant in it,—producing no uneasiness and no suffering,—and yet, after the lapse of years it will burst forth with most terrific power, and drive the victim of it to actual despair. This has often been the case. A man who has committed sin, is like one bitten by a mad dog. The momentary pain is slight. The wound soon heals. It may keep up from time to time, a slight irritation, just enough to remind him occasionally of the occurrence ; but ordinarily it is forgotten, and he goes on with his daily amusements and pleasures, entirely unconscious of danger.

But though the wound is healed, the dreadful infection which it has admitted to his system is circulating insidiously there. The poison glides harmlessly along his veins and arteries for weeks, months, years. It does not mar his enjoyments or disturb his repose, but still the dreadful enemy, though slumbering, is there. At last, in some unexpected hour, it rises upon him in all its strength, and overwhelms and conquers him entirely. It brings agony to his body, and indescribable horror to his soul, and hurries him through the most furious paroxysms of madness and despair, to inevitable death.

And it is just so with sin. A murderer, for example, will often sleep ten, twenty, or thirty years over his crime. The knowledge of it will lie in his heart like a lurking poison, during all that time. He will recollect it without compunction, and look forward to the future without alarm. At last, however, some circumstance, often apparently trifling, will awaken him. He will begin to feel his guilt ; conscience will suddenly rise upon him like an armed man, and overwhelm him with all the horrors of remorse and despair. Perhaps if one had tried a few weeks before, to make him feel his guilt, it would have been vain, he was so utterly hardened in it ; so *dead* in trespasses and

sins. But now you will find it far more difficult to allay or to mitigate the storm, which has, perhaps, spontaneously arisen.

Every person, therefore, who commits sin, takes a viper into his bosom, a viper which may delay stinging him for many years, but *it will sting him at last*, unless it is removed. He is unaware of the misery that awaits him, but it must come, notwithstanding. This is particularly the case with sins against God; and the wonder is, that the sense of guilt will remain so entirely dormant as it often does, so that no warning, no exhortation, no remonstrance will disturb the death-like repose, and yet at last the volcano will often burst forth spontaneously, or from some apparently trifling cause, and overwhelm the sinner in suffering." pp. 167—9.

We quote his account of the way in which the Bible should be studied every day for practical purposes :

"Consider, now, another case. In an unfurnished and an almost unfurnished little room in some crowded alley of a populous city, you may see a lad who has just risen from his humble bed, and is ready to go forth to his daily duties. He is a young apprentice,—and must almost immediately go forth to kindle his morning fire, and to prepare his place of business for the labors of the day. He first, however, takes his little testament from his chest,—and breathes, while he opens it, a silent prayer, that God will fix the lesson that he is about to read, upon his conscience and his heart. "Holy Spirit!" whispers he, "let me apply the instructions of this book to myself—and let me be governed by it to-day—so that I may perform faithfully all my duties to myself, to my companions, to my master, and to Thee." He opens the book, and reads, perhaps, as follows:—"Be kindly affectioned one to another, with brotherly love, in honor preferring one another." He pauses—his faithful self-applying thoughts run through the scenes through which he is that day to pass, and he considers in what cases this verse ought to influence him. '*Be kindly affectioned!*' I must treat my brothers and sisters, and all my companions kindly to-day. I must try to save them trouble and to promote their happiness. '*In honor preferring one another.*' As he sees these words, he sighs to think how many times he has been jealous of his fellow apprentices, on account of marks of trust and favor shown them,—or envious of the somewhat superior privileges enjoyed by those older than himself,—and he prays that God will forgive him, and make him humble, and kind-hearted in future to all around him.

"*'Not slothful in business; fervent in spirit; serving the Lord,'*" He stops to think whether he is habitually industrious—improving all his time in such a manner as to be of the greatest advantage to his master;—whether he is fervent in spirit, i. e. cordially devoted to God's service, and full of benevolent desire for the happiness of all;—whether he serves the Lord in what he does, i. e. whether all his duties are discharged from motives of love to his Maker and Preserver. While he thus muses, the fire burns. He shuts his book—asks God to protect him, as he now must go out into the labors and temptations of the day. God does bless and protect him. He has read, indeed, but *two verses*;—but these verses he carries in his heart, and they serve as a memorial of kindness and love to man, and fidelity towards God, which accompanies him wherever he goes, and keeps him safe and happy. The Bible is thus a light to his feet and a lamp to his paths. Which, now of these, do you think reads the Bible aright?" pp. 210—11.

Our author deals much in "imaginary cases"; and they are generally pertinent, and sometimes extremely vivid. We cannot extract any of his stories, but will give enough of his "cases" to show his manner of using them.

“A boy knows, I will imagine, that he has an *irritable* spirit. He wishes to cure himself of it. I will suppose that he has taken the two steps I have already described, and now as the morning comes, and he is about to go forth to the exposures of the day, we may suppose him to hold the following conversation with his father or some other friend :

*Boy.* “Now I have made a great many resolutions, and I am really desirous of not becoming angry and impatient to-day. But I always do, and I am afraid I always shall.”

*Friend.* “Do you always? Do you get angry *every day*?”

*Boy.* “I do almost always. Whenever any thing happens to vex me.”

*Friend.* “What are the most common things that happen to vex you?”

“Why, I almost always get angry playing marbles. George doesn't play fair, and I get angry with him, and he gets angry with me.”

“Do you always get angry, playing marbles?”

“We do very often.”

“Then I advise you to avoid playing marbles altogether. I know you like to play, but if you find it affords too great a temptation for you to resist, you must abandon it, or you will not cure yourself of your fault. What other temptations do you have?”

“Why, I get put out with my sums at school.”

“Get put out with your sums!—What do you mean by that?”

“Why, I get impatient and vexed because I cannot do them, and then I get angry with them.”

“What, with the *sums*!”

“Yes, with the sums, and the book, and the slate, and every thing else. I know it is very foolish and wicked.”

“Well, now I advise you to take your slate and pencil to-day, and find some difficult sum, such an one as you have often been angry with, and sit down calmly to work, and see if you cannot go through it, and *fail of doing it*, and yet not feel vexed and angry. Think, before you begin, how sad it is for you to be under the control of wicked passions, and ask God to help you, and then go on, expecting to find difficulty, and endeavoring to meet it with a calm and patient spirit. If you succeed in this, you will really improve while you do it. By gaining one victory over yourself, you will make another more easy.”

“Which do you think is the greatest temptation for you, to play marbles or to do sums?”

“Why, I think playing marbles, because the boys don't play fair.”

“Well, now I wish you to practice the easiest lesson first. Conquer yourself in your arithmetical temptation first, and then perhaps you can encounter the other. And I wish you would watch yourself to-day, and observe what are the trials which are too great for you to bear, and avoid them until you have acquired more moral strength. But do not flee from any temptation which you think you can resist. By meeting and resisting it, you will advance in your course.” pp. 269—71.

The following case is designed to illustrate the influence of trial in detecting the heart:

“A Christian mother had an only child, whom she ardently loved. The mother was an influential member of the church, and was ardently interested in maintaining a high Christian character, and studying faithfully and perseveringly religious truth. She became much interested in the view which the Bible presents of the Divine Sovereignty. She used to dwell with delight upon the contemplation of God's universal power over all. She used to rejoice, as she thought, in his entire authority over her;—she took pleasure in reflecting that she was completely in his hands, soul and body, for time and for eternity, and she wondered that any person could find any source of difficulty or embarrassment in the Scripture representations on this subject.

But she did not know her heart. Her beloved child was sick—and she stood anxious and agitated over her pillow, very far from showing a cordial willingness that God should rule. She was afraid—very much afraid that her child would die. Instead of having that practical belief in the divine sovereignty, and that cordial confidence in God, which would have given her, in this trying hour, a calm and happy acquiescence in the divine will, she was restless and uneasy,—her soul had no peace morning nor night. Her daughter sunk by a progress which was slow, but irresistible, to the grave, and for weeks that mother was in utter misery, because she could not find it in her heart to submit to the divine will. She had believed in the universal power of God as a theoretical truth. She had seen its abstract beauty,—she thought she rejoiced in God's superintending power, but it was only while all went well with her. As soon as God began to exercise that power which she had so cordially acknowledged and rejoiced in, in a way which was painful to her, her heart rose against it in a moment—and would not submit. The trial brought out to her view, her true feelings in regard to the absolute and unbounded authority of God. Now there is a great deal of such acquiescence in God's dominion as this, in the world, and a great deal of it is exposed by *trial* every day." p. 253.

Our readers may be amused with our author's mode of illustrating the importance of mental culture, as distinct from knowledge acquired in the process :

"Suppose, for example, that when Robinson Crusoe on his desolate island, had first found Friday the savage, he had said to himself, as follows :

"This man looks wild and barbarous enough. He is to stay with me and help me in my various plans, but he could help me much more effectually, if he was more of an intellectual being and less of a mere animal. Now I can increase his intellectual power by culture, and I will. But what shall I teach him?"

On reflecting a little farther upon the subject, he would say to himself as follows.

"I must not always teach him things necessary for him to know in order to assist me in my work, but I must try to teach him *to think* for himself. Then he will be far more valuable as a servant, than if he has to depend upon me for every thing he does."

Accordingly some evening when the two, master and man, have finished the labors of the day, Robinson is walking upon the sandy beach with the wild savage by his side, and he concludes to give his first lesson in mathematics. He picks up a slender and pointed shell, and with it draws carefully a circle upon the sand.

"What is that?" says Friday.

"It is what we call a circle, says Robinson, "I want you now to come and stand here, and attentively consider what I am going to tell you about it."

Now Friday has, we will suppose, never given his serious attention to any thing, or rather has never made a serious mental effort upon any subject, for five minutes at a time, in his life. The simplest mathematical principle is a complete labyrinth of perplexity to him. He comes up and looks at the smooth and beautiful curve which his master has drawn in the sand with a gaze of stupid amazement.

"Now listen carefully to what I say," says Robinson, "and see if you can understand it. Do you see this little point I make in the middle of the circle?"

Friday says he does, and wonders what is to come from the magic character which he sees before him.

"This," continues Robinson, is a circle, and that point is the centre.

Now I draw lines from the centre in any direction to the outside, these lines will all be equal."

So saying he draws several lines. He sets Friday to measuring them. Friday sees that they are equal and is pleased, from two distinct causes; one, that he has successfully exercised his thinking powers, and the other, that he has learned something which he had never knew before.

I wish now that the reader would understand that Robinson does not take this course with Friday because he wishes him to understand the nature of the circle. Suppose we were to say to him, "Why did you take such a course as that with your savage? You can teach him much more useful things than the properties of the circle. What good will it do him to know how to make circles? Do you expect him to draw geometrical diagrams for you, or to calculate and project eclipses?"

"No," Robinson would reply. "I do not care about Friday's understanding the properties of the circle. But I do want him to be a *thinking being*, and if I can induce him to think half an hour steadily and carefully, it is of no consequence upon what subject his thoughts are employed. I chose the circle, because that seemed easy and distinct,—suitable for the first lesson. I do not know that he will ever have occasion for the fact that the radii of a circle, are equal, as long as he shall live,—but he will have occasion for the *power of patient attention and thought*, which he acquired while attempting to understand that subject."

This would unquestionably be sound philosophy, and a savage who should study such a lesson on the beach of his own wild island, would forever after be less of a savage than before. The effect upon his mental powers, of one single effort like that, would last, and a series of such efforts would transform him from a fierce and ungovernable but stupid animal, to a cultivated and intellectual man.

Thus it is with all education. One great object is to *increase the powers*, and this is entirely distinct from the *acquisition of knowledge*. Scholars very often ask when pursuing some difficult study: "What good will it do me to know this?" But that is not the question. They ought to ask: "What good will it do me to *learn it*? What effect upon my habits of thinking, and upon my intellectual powers will be produced by the efforts to examine and to conquer these difficulties." pp. 288—9.

Our author, in showing the kind and degree of evidence to be expected on the subjects of practical religion, adduces these familiar, but forcible examples:

A merchant receives in his counting room a newspaper, which marks the prices of some species of goods, at a foreign port, as very high. He immediately determines to purchase a quantity and to send a cargo there. But suppose, as he is making arrangements for this purpose, his clerk should say to him, "Perhaps this information may not be correct. The correspondent of the editor may have made a false statement for some fraudulent purpose, or the communication may have been forged; or some evil minded person having the article in question for sale may have contrived by stealth to alter the types, so as to cause the paper to make a false report, at least in some of the copies."

Now in such a case would the merchant be influenced in the slightest degree by such a sceptical spirit as this? Would he attempt to reply to these suppositions, and to show that the channel of communication between the distant port and his own counting room, *could not have been* broken in upon by fraud, somewhere in its course, so as to bring a false statement to him? He could not show this. His only reply must be, if he should reply at all: "The evidence of this printed sheet is not perfect demonstration, but it is just such evidence in kind and degree, as I act upon in all my business. And it is enough. Were I to pause, with the spirit of your

present objections, and refuse to act whenever such doubts as those you have presented might be entertained, I might close my business at once, and spend life in inaction. I could not, in one case in ten thousand, get the evidence which would satisfy such a spirit."

Again. You are a parent I suppose. You have a son travelling at a distance from home, and you receive some day a letter from the Post Office, in a strange hand-writing, and signed by a name you have never heard, informing you that your son has been taken sick, at one of the villages on his route, and that he is lying dangerously ill at the house of the writer, and that he has requested that his father might be informed of his condition, and urged to come and see him before he dies.

Where now is the father, who, in such a case would say, to himself, "stop this may be a deception. Some one may have forged this letter to impose upon me. Or there may be no such person. Before I take this journey, I must write to some responsible man in that village, to ascertain the facts.

No; instead of looking with suspicion upon the letter, scrutinizing it carefully to find marks of counterfeiting, he would not even read it a second time. As soon as he had caught a glimpse of its contents, he would throw it hastily aside, and urging the arrangements for his departure to the utmost, he would hasten away, saying, "Let me go, as soon as possible, to my dying son."

I will state one more case, though perhaps it is so evident upon a moment's reflection, that men do not wait for perfect certainty in the evidence upon which they act,—that I have already stated too many.

Your child is sick, and as he lies tossing in a burning fever on his bed, the physician comes in to visit him. He looks for a few minutes at the patient,—examines the symptoms,—and then hastily writes an almost illegible prescription, whose irregular and abbreviated characters are entirely unintelligible to all but professional eyes. You give this prescription to a messenger,—perhaps to some one whom you do not know,—and he carries it to the apothecary, who from the indiscriminate multitude of jars and drawers and boxes, filled with every powerful medicine and corroding acid, and deadly poison, selects a little here and a little there, with which, talking perhaps all the time to those around him, he compounds a remedy for your son. The messenger brings it to the sick chamber, and as he puts it into your hands, do you think of stopping to consider the possibility of a mistake? How easy might the physician by substituting one barbarous Latin name for another, or by making one little character too few or too many, so alter the ingredients, or the proportions of the mixture, as to convert that, which was intended to be a remedy, to an active and fatal poison. How easily might the apothecary by using the wrong weight, or mistaking one white powder for another precisely similar in appearance, or by giving your messenger the parcel intended for another customer, send you, not a remedy which would allay the fever and bring repose to the restless child,—but an irritating stimulus, which should urge on to double fury the raging of the fever, or terminate it at once by sudden death.

How possible are these, but who stops to consider them? How absurd would it be to consider them! You administer the remedy with unhesitating confidence, and in a few days the returning health of your child, shows that it is wise for you to act, even in cases of life and death, on *reasonable evidence*, without waiting for the absolute certainty of moral demonstration.

Now this is exactly the case with the subject of the Christian religion. It comes purporting to be a message from heaven, and it brings with it just such a kind of evidence, as men act upon in all their other concerns. The evidence is abundantly satisfactory; at the same time however, any one who dislikes the truths, or the requirements of this gospel, may easily, like the sceptical clerk in the case above mentioned, make objections and difficulties in abundance. A man may be an infidel if he pleases. There is no such irresistible weight of argument that the mind is absolutely forced to admit it,

as it is to believe that two and three make five. In regard to this latter such is the nature of the human mind that there is not, and there cannot be in the whole human family, an individual who can doubt. In regard to Christianity, however, as with all other truths of a moral nature which regulate the moral conduct of mankind, there is no such irresistible evidence. The light is clear, if a man *is willing to see*, but it is not so vividly intense, as to force itself through his eyelids, if he closes them upon it. Any one may walk in darkness if he will. pp. 111—114.

These extracts will suffice to exhibit the leading characteristic of the work before us, and to illustrate in part the author's mode of instruction. Our limits will not allow us to say all that has occurred to us on the utility of this method of teaching, when successfully adopted, nor all that we might say on the the necessary care and caution with which it should be adopted; but we will suggest a few hints, and we hope that the intelligent reader will give the subject a thorough and satisfactory investigation for himself.

This method of instruction, then, *is founded on the first principles and laws of mind*. Nature fitted us for particulars, not for generalities. Our senses, the inlets of all our knowledge, are conversant only with particulars. The eye cannot see an abstraction; the ear cannot hear an abstraction; the tongue cannot taste an abstraction. None of our senses can give us any idea of an abstraction. It is a creature of our own, an offspring of education, a result of mental discipline, a product of art and effort. It costs the nascent intellect years of training and toil to form one of those ethereal evanescent abstractions; and then it is kept in the mind like an exotic in a hot-house, or a bird from the tropics in a cage. Whenever we wish to form a distinct idea even of an abstract truth, we must make some particular thing represent it; and after all the purest abstractions are only particulars put for a whole class of the same sort. Who thinks of a man in general, or a creature in general, or a being in general? Not Aristotle himself. Who conceives the principle proved in the forty-seventh proposition of Euclid, without recalling the figure employed to demonstrate it? So with the most sublimated abstractions in science and philosophy. Nature clings to her own particulars, and forces the profoundest thinker to use them in representing his most comprehensive generalities.

But whatever we may think on this point, none can doubt *how the mind proceeds in acquiring its first ideas, and forming all its opinions and habits*. It begins with particulars; it uses particulars to the last; and its largest abstractions are only names put for a bundle of particulars. Look at a child. He learns to see by scrutinizing one object at a time,

and examining its parts in successive detail. So with all his other senses. How does he learn to walk? By taking steps in general? How does he acquire the wonderful art of speech? He is compelled practically to analyze sound into its simplest elements, and make one at a time, till he accustoms his organs to a correct, distinct and easy utterance of them all. He takes at first a single syllable, or articulate sound of the simplest, easiest kind, and thus proceeds till he masters all the elementary sounds in the language. In the same way every acquisition is made; and all the boasted abstractions of a Newton or a Locke, are only scientific terms used to represent the particulars they had themselves learned by a process not unlike that of the child gathering up, one by one, the elements of all its practical knowledge in physics, morals and religion.

To this course we are impelled in *teaching new truths*.—Should an astronomer discover a new planet, how would he communicate the result of his discovery? By calling it a star, a comet, or some other general name? No; he would tell us its magnitude, its motions, its distance from the sun, and all the other properties and facts requisite to distinguish it from the rest of the heavenly bodies. Should a chemist detect another gas, he would not dream of describing it merely by a name hitherto unknown in the vocabulary of his science. Should you find a new mineral or flower, how would you teach others to recognize it? By giving it a name still harder than any to be found in the semi-barbarous nomenclature of mineralogy and botany? No; you would analyze it, and describe each of its peculiar properties.

So with every thing that is to be taught. You must take it to pieces, and show the particulars of which it is composed. There is no other possible way of communicating any new truth. If you wish to teach a child what is meant by government, nation, or church, would you not be obliged to resolve each into its component parts, and show him by particulars what the term implies? Each is only a bundle of particulars, tied up by a word; and before he can understand the full and exact meaning of that word, you must untie the bundle, and let him examine its contents in detail.

Such is also *the process of discovery and invention*. It begins with particulars, and results in the detection of some new principle, or in some new application of an old one. The highest philosophy is only an induction of particulars; and the profoundest inquirer into the secrets of nature, seeks only to observe, classify and name these particulars. Every school-boy is familiar with the origin of Newton's grandest discovery. He

observed an apple falling from a tree; and from that simple fact, he went on, from one particular to another, till he grasped the all-pervading law of gravitation. He began with an apple; he ended with the universe. So with his inquiries respecting the laws and properties of light; and just so with all the discoveries and inventions that have ever been made. No truth, either in the physical or moral world, has been discovered, or applied, without a minute examination of the particulars that compose it. The principle seems to be universal; and as every learner is *discovering* truths new to himself, we ought to take a similar course in teaching him not only the elements of science, but the doctrines of the gospel, and the various lessons of virtue and piety.

For this mode of instruction, we might quote the *highest authority*. Socrates, the wisest of the ancient philosophers, employed it with signal success, against the quibbling and unprincipled sophists of his day. The Bible is a store-house of examples on this subject. We find not a few scattered through the Old Testament; and the record of our Saviour's instructions is so full of them, that he is said, by one of the Evangelists, never to have taught the people "without a parable."

Consider, then, *the pre-eminent utility* of this method. We might infer its usefulness from its actual success, and especially from the example of our Saviour; but a little reflection must show any one its peculiar adaptation to *interest, convince* and *impress*.

This method *secures attention*. It has a peculiar charm for every class of hearers. Introduce a pertinent and vivid illustration; and you will find the old and the young, the ignorant and the learned, listening to you in breathless silence. Such things interest alike the peasant and the philosopher. Every one, familiar with the life of Whitfield, knows with what success he often employed such simple and popular weapons of eloquence. When a favorite sermon of the late Carlos Wilcox was published, thousands in different parts of the country were surprised and chagrined at not finding in print, the incident which had, in the delivery, produced so deep and delightful an impression on their minds.

Instruction given in this way, is *more intelligible to all classes*. A child understands it, and is thus enabled to grasp at truths otherwise beyond his reach. Disciplined thinkers may thread the most abstruse and complicated process of reasoning; but the young and uneducated require a simpler and more direct pathway to the same result. Could such minds have been made, by the abstractions of logic, to understand

what our author teaches with so much perspicuity and force, in some of the extracts we have taken from his book? Could the importance of mental cultivation, and the nature of the evidence which is to be expected in matters of religion, have been rendered to common, or even cultivated minds, equally plain, without the example so happily employed?

This mode of instruction is also *more impressive*. We refer to the examples we have quoted, and appeal to the common sense of our readers, whether the same truths, taught in an abstract form, would have touched the soul with equal power. Would a metaphysical disquisition on the mutual relations of mankind, have awakened as much feeling as the story of the Good Samaritan? Had our Saviour justified his kind and condescending attentions to sinners by alluding in general terms to the tenderness of a father for a profligate son, returning in penitence to his arms, he would have used essentially the same argument that is made to live, and breathe, and speak in the touching parable of the Prodigal Son; but would he have drawn forth from his hearers an equal gush of emotion?

But we need not dwell on a point so universally conceded; for every one knows that a truth taught by an illustration, strikes us more forcibly, and far more deeply moves the heart, than the same truth when filtrated through the technicalities of logic. The latter is a skeleton of dry bones and shrivelled sinews; the former is the same frame-work of nature, covered with flesh, formed into beauty, and animated with life, and thought, and all the variety of human feelings.

It is obvious, then, that such instruction *will be much better remembered*. Recollection depends on the attention we give, on the distinct and vivid conceptions we form, and the impression made on our fancy and feelings; and facts and familiar illustrations have, in all these respects, a decided advantage over abstract reasoning. Relate an interesting incident; and while nine tenths of your hearers forget your whole train of reasoning, every one will remember the incident. How easily, how fondly does a child treasure up the history of Joseph, and the parables of the Prodigal Son, and the Good Samaritan! but the same lessons of truth and duty, communicated in syllogisms or in tropes, would have melted from the memory like dew before the sun, or like sand swept away by a mountain torrent. In this particular, there is no room for comparison between the two methods; and we all know that the best instructions, not remembered well and long, can never exert the permanent, all-pervading influence necessary to prepare men for heaven.

This mode of instruction is also *more likely to produce con-*

*viction.* It disarms prejudice, lulls the bad passions asleep, and takes possession of the mind before depravity has time to shut its eyes against the evidence of truth, and motives to duty. It opens every avenue to the understanding, the conscience and the heart. In this way, our Saviour silenced his wily and captious adversaries, and gained the assent of common minds to what they would have been slow in receiving through the medium of dry logic, or direct instruction. Every student of history well remembers the magic influence which the fable of Menenius Agrippa, very like one of our Saviour's parables, had on the mutinous and highly exasperated populace of Rome.

Now, does not an age of extensive and deep-rooted prejudices against "the faith once delivered to the saints," call aloud for a similar mode of instruction, to disarm these prejudices, and inculcate truth upon reluctant and embittered minds? "Technicalities will no longer do; they have lost their power, and become objects of suspicion, and watch-words of alarm. The consecrated phraseology of our fathers is covered with a cloud of prejudices that neutralize their influence; and views, once conveyed by this phraseology, must now be communicated in some other way, fitted to open the mind to a free and cordial admission of "the truth as it is in Jesus."

This kind of instruction *can be applied with far more facility and success.* It teaches duty, not by abstractions, but by living realities. We see the precept exemplified in practice; and we have only to perform the comparatively easy and delightful task of imitation. We all know how much easier it is to follow an example than to decypher and apply bare instruction. A watch-maker might tell his apprentice very minutely how to put a watch together; but would not the boy by seeing his master do the thing himself, acquire more skill in one hour, than he could have gained by the other method in a fortnight? Should a teacher write down for his pupils, a very plain rule for working a difficult sum, they might still be sorely puzzled to put it in practice; but let him work out the sum himself so slowly that all can mark every step of the process, and the dullest intellect among them will find little difficulty in applying the rule. Bating the enmity of the carnal mind against the truth itself, similar is the case in all the departments of moral instruction; and this view of the subject suggests the vast importance of adopting such methods of teaching as will most effectually prompt and enable the hearer to practice what he learns, or leave him without excuse if he neglect it.

Our limits will not let us proceed with our remarks; but we did intend to show how this mode of instruction would increase

the power of truth, by presenting it in a more interesting and less objectionable form : and how it would then tend to insure a steadier, more rapid, and more permanent growth of moral and intellectual character.

We would not urge this method alike on all ; nor will we, while we commend it in general, conceal the conviction we feel of the need of caution in adopting such a parabolic, narrative mode of instruction, especially in the pulpit. Every one has not the natural talent to do it with success, and of those who have, too many have not the necessary degree of sanctified affection, and simplicity of desire to glorify God and save souls. The preacher may easily make himself interesting by adopting it, but it is not every one, by any means, in our judgment, who can do it wisely throughout. None can do it as Christ did. Every thing was holy as he employed it ; and from relation to him, illustrations from the Bible, however familiar, never desecrate ; but not a few from common sources are liable to, except in uncommon hands.

Not that we would retract any thing we have said. We think highly of this method of instruction ; and, generally, we have long thought that preachers of the gospel spend far too little pains ON THE SCIENCE AND ART OF INSTRUCTION. Not a few seem entirely to overlook it as a distinct part of education, and exhaust nearly all their strength in collecting ideas which they know not how to bring into full and effectual contact with other minds. They are deficient, not in learning, but in the art of imparting what they know. This part of their education they have neglected. They have found time for mathematics and metaphysics, for didactic and polemic theology, for church history and ecclesiastical polity, for Greek and Hebrew, and perhaps German and Syriac, but scarcely none at all for the unwelcome labor of acquiring skill to use their acquisitions. We have often wished, that some voice of authority might speak effectually on this subject. Here is a crying delinquency. Educated men do not turn to practical account one-fourth, scarcely one-tenth part of their learning. There is a prodigious waste of talent and knowledge in the ministry ; and many a man, coming from a theological seminary, with his mind well stored with learning, is compelled to see a half-educated preacher run away with the people, and actually do far more than himself in "turning them from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God." He wonders at this, and chafes his spirit at the comparative barrenness of his own ministry ; but he ought to have reflected long before, that his knowledge must have a tongue in order to speak ; and that his

talents and learning can be useful, only so far as they are brought into favorable contact with other minds.

Our feelings plead to linger still longer on this subject ; but we must take our leave of it ; and this we do by commending the *Young Christian* to the teachers of morals and religion. We will not make ourselves responsible for every thing in the book ; but as a whole, we deem it worthy of high commendation. We might perhaps suggest some improvement for a second edition ; and the rapidity with which it is passing into circulation, increases our desire to see it as perfect as possible ; but such suggestions would be of little use to our readers, and, if desired by the author, can be better communicated to him in another way.

---

BRIEF REMARKS ON THE HISTORY, AUTHORITY AND USE OF THE SABBATH. By JOSEPH JOHN GURNEY. *From the second London edition. With Notes by M. STUART.* Flagg, Gould, and Newman ; Andover, 1833. 18mo, pp. 120.

That feeling is apt to exert a powerful influence upon perceptions and belief, and, in religion in particular, often leads men to reject or falsify the most obvious truths, and to receive as valid what is altogether destitute of foundation, is a matter of act, too notorious to be questioned. No wonder then, that, under its influence, different men should, from the very same data, draw dissimilar or even contradictory conclusions, in respect to those points in Christian ethics which are usually considered as somewhat obscure. Perhaps, however, it is not sufficiently attended to, that this very obscurity, was designed by the Holy Spirit as a delicate test, to try the integrity of the heart. No danger could in this way accrue to the genuine Christian ; as there is always a safe side in respect to those points, which he, who is full of love to God, can easily discover, and which he will surely take,—a word to him who is piously wise and zealous for the honor of his master, being sufficient. The question which has often been agitated respecting the Christian Sabbath, whether or not it be a divine institution, and as such, entitled to universal observance in the church, is of this character ; and, like other similar questions, it has been answered in different ways, according to the

dictates of feeling. The simple fact, that while man is in want of ever receiving repose for his body, and under the strongest obligations to offer God the adoration of his heart and prepare for a higher state of existence, he is, if left to himself, in constant danger of neglecting both, should of itself deeply impress him with the desirableness of having, nay, with the expectation of actually finding a specific day set apart by divine authority for these purposes. With the Christian, to a greater or less degree, it has these effects. Accordingly he finds the institution of the Sabbath by divine example, interwoven with the very history of the creation, and also various allusions to it, in the mention made of a weekly division of time, in the book of Genesis, as well as in the oldest Heathen traditions which have been preserved. He also finds it spoken of, as a well known institution, soon after the passage of the Israelites through the Red sea, and expressly enjoined for observance as such in the words, "Remember the Sabbath day," of the fourth commandment of the decalogue, which was given with such awful solemnity by God himself, from the top of Sinai, was engraven on tables of stone, and was ever spoken of, by Christ and his Apostles, as of universal obligation. Here then is enough for the Christian. With these facts before him he will hardly dispense with the keeping of the Sabbath, and in proportion to the integrity of his heart, he will doubtless receive it as a divine institution and of universal obligation. True, as a matter of fact, he finds, that under the Christian dispensation, the seventh day has been exchanged for the first; but then, the spirit of the institution requiring only a seventh portion of time, evidently permitted such a change; and besides, even though there does not appear to have been any direct command given for this change, he sees good reasons why it should have been made. The seventh day kept by the Jews was connected with various rites and ceremonies peculiar to the Mosaic dispensation, and, under the gospel, altogether useless. It was fit that they should be done away. Moreover, the seventh day was originally fixed upon by the Creator, in honor of the completion of the work of creation. Was it not as proper that the first day should afterwards be fixed upon in honor of the completion of the work of redemption? Was not this second creation, indeed, a work far more glorious, and calculated to reflect far more honor on the Creator, than the first? In addition to all this, however, the Christian feels that he is entitled to expect the blessings conferred upon man in the institution of the Sabbath, from the author of the dispensation under which he lives.

The Jew, severe and burdensome as the laws of Moses were, was blessed with this institution. One day in seven, he was called upon to bring not only his own labors, but those of his servants and even his beasts, to a close, and, while nature was recruiting, to give himself up to delightful and holy contemplations. Then, the bustling cares of life ceased, the gates of the cities were closed, and joy was in the habitation of the Hebrew,—the solemn dance, and the sacred song of praise; while children received instruction from their parents respecting the Creator, the duties of life, and the history and prospects of the church; and when the hour of holy convocation arrived, a deeply interested throng were seen winding their way towards the tabernacle or the temple,—were assembled around their prophets,—they listened to the reading and exposition of the law or the declarations of the Holy Spirit, and engaged in other acts of devotion. Blessed day! Every one feels that, to the Jew, it was truly such, and admires the kindness and benevolence of the heavenly King, to whom he acknowledged allegiance, in setting it apart and consecrating it for him. The Christian lives under a far milder dispensation than the Jew did,—a dispensation which is *characterized* by the exhibition it makes of the love and benevolence of its author. And is he not as liable to fatigue and as strongly obligated to worship God, as the Jew was, and, in these respects in as great *need* of a Sabbath? And from the dispensation under which he lives, is he not entitled to expect, at least as *much* as the Jew received from his? In short, from the principle of love which lies at the foundation of the Gospel, or, in other words, from the benevolent author of the Gospel itself, is he not entitled to expect the *institution of the Sabbath*? This is certainly the case. One day in seven is the least that he can have for recruiting the body and for divine worship. To imply the contrary is to reflect upon the character of the Redeemer.

And then, what delightful associations cluster around this day! As the Jewish Sabbath, it is the day in which the Creator rested from his labor, “the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy,” at the completion of the grand fabric of the universe. It is the day in which the worship of God commenced on earth, and Eden first became vocal with his praise. Its observance was connected with the richest promises of Jehovah and brought down innumerable streams of blessing upon the whole land of the Israelites. All the pious of the ancient church esteemed it a delight, hailing its return as the visits of the great Creator himself,—and

spent it in holy contemplations and in looking forward to a new and more glorious era in the church. As the Christian Sabbath, it is the day in which, while the earth shook and the keepers become as dead men, the angel of the Lord, with a countenance like lightning, and with raiment white as snow, descended from heaven and rolled back the stone from the door of the sepulchre; the sleeping Son of God, having completed the work of redemption, the new creation, burst asunder the bonds of death and triumphed over the grave, leading captivity captive and giving gifts unto men; and his divine radiance began to light up the darkest and most distant corners of the earth. It is the day in which he repeated his visits to his followers during his last short sojourn on earth, thus enjoining it upon them, as it were, by example, to meet for his worship on this day, and giving them reason, on such occasions in particular, always to expect his visits. It is the day in which, while the disciples were with one accord in one place, waiting to be endowed with power from on high, suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing, mighty wind, filling the whole house,—there appeared upon them cloven tongues like as of fire, sitting upon each of them, and they were filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance;—the day, in which Peter, a few hours after, preached the first Christian sermon ever preached, and three thousand were converted to the Lord; and it is the day in which the Apostles and their converts met together to engage in acts of devotion, listen to instruction, celebrate the Lord's supper, and take up contributions for the poor;—the day in which John the beloved disciple was in the spirit and received his revelation;—the day in which the primitive Christians universally met together to sing praises “to Christ as to God;” the day in which all Christians of every age have given themselves up to his worship;—and the day now consecrated throughout Christendom to the same noble employment, and in which prayers and praises ascend to heaven simultaneously from almost every part of the globe. In short, it is the birth-day of souls, the Christian's season of intimate communion with heaven, the only relict left us of the purities and joys of Paradise, and our brightest emblem of the eternal rest we hope to find with our Redeemer above, free from all the impurities and pangs of sin. Thus respecting the Sabbath, feels and reasons the man whose heart is full of love to God; and thus, to a greater or less degree, will such men, genuine Christians, continue to feel and reason about it, and the Christian's Sabbath

be observed from generation to generation, until all his days are blended in one eternal Sabbath of rest.

Not so with him whose heart is not full of ardent love to God. He is willing perhaps, to admit in general terms, the expediency of a uniformly recurring day of rest. He has no desire, however, for such a day of holiness. On the other hand, he shrinks from the idea of such a thing. His sabbath must be at his own disposal. He must have liberty to do his own pleasure in it, to walk, visit, ride, sail, or engage in any other recreation. He complains that bigots and priests have perverted the Sabbath to a day of gloom. With such feelings, he is not very likely to come to the conclusion that it is a divine institution of universal obligation. Entering upon the examination of the Bible under the influence of cold-blooded criticism, and skeleton theories, he finds it speaking quite another language. He easily imagines the declaration, that God rested the seventh day and sanctified it, to have been foisted into the text, or intended to show that the Sabbath was ultimately instituted in commemoration of an event some thousands of years after it happened. Of the various allusions to a weekly division of time, scattered through the oldest books of sacred and profane history, he makes no account. The fourth commandment had reference to the Jews only; and in short, as a matter of fact, the Jewish sabbath has been abolished and no other day has been substituted by divine appointment in its stead. This mode of reasoning seems clear and lucid; and as he has no strong attachment to the day, no fond remembrances of the manner in which it has been hallowed from age to age, no ardent longings for the courts of the Lord, no wishes for intimate communion with heaven, he embraces it, and thus cuts conscience from her moorings and leaves the Sabbath to desecration. For, need it be said, that nothing but a belief in the divine institution and universal obligations of the Sabbath will preserve it from desecration? Look at our annual fast. It is the day in which our pilgrim fathers humbled themselves before the Lord in all their afflictions, confessing their sins and imploring the divine compassion. It is intimately connected with the history of our New England churches, and has clustered around it, many a fond association. Besides, what Christian does not feel the need he has of fasting for his own sins and those of his country, at least one day in the year? It is true, however, that there is no divine command which calls upon us to keep such a fast. It is merely recommended to our attention by our chief magistrate. And how is this day treated?

Few observe it as a fast to the Lord. By many it is not heeded at all ; and by multitudes it is uniformly spent in sports and plays, hunting and fishing, and often too in the immediate vicinity of the house of God and his assembled worshippers.

Such is the manner of feeling and reasoning respecting the Christian Sabbath, which has long been cherished among the neologists and theorists in religion of Germany, and it may also be added, among the same classes of persons in England and our own country. Their views have at length become those, not only of the large mass of the unthinking irreligious, but some of those who would lay claim to a more elevated character. This is painful to the Christian, but perhaps it is as well so. He must expect to feel the poisonous influence of sin and have to struggle against its corruptions, until the millennial sun bursts upon the world, or he arrives at the blessed land where the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest. The purification of the heart and the enlightening of the mind will produce a change in this respect ; but until this is effected, is it not as well for the wicked in all their different grades, to be brought out to view, not merely by the opposition they exhibit to the plain and obvious parts of the divine law, but by the very obscurity in which the Holy Spirit has left some points in Christian ethics, as a more delicate test, to try the integrity of the heart? Should we complain, because the wicked, under the influence of their feelings, take the rank to which they properly belong? On the other hand, ought we not to feel grateful, that we can behold a mark upon their forehead, and thus warned, separate ourselves from them? I do not forget, in these remarks, that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath; nor that great charity must be exercised in this world of imperfection, toward those who honestly differ from us in opinion. And this brings me to the most painful part of my subject.

It is a matter of fact, that many who profess to be Christians, have become greatly assimilated to the world, in their manner of keeping the Sabbath. Wherever we cast our eyes, we find it strongly desecrated among them. A majority of the German church spend it in meetings of business, rides of pleasure, and in any thing in short, but private devotion. The same is too true of the English church. Among ourselves, while there are many pious who esteem the Sabbath as a day of delight, and endeavor to keep it to the Lord, there are multitudes with whom it commands no respect whatever as a divine institution. With our fathers, it was the most blessed of

days. They hailed its return with holy joy, and met it down upon their knees. The fisherman had spread out his net, the hunter returned from the chase, the husbandman brought his labor to a close. The rude voice of the teamster and the rattling of the carr had ceased. The cottage within and the village scene without, was full of peace and tranquillity. The closet, the family altar, and the house of God, bore witness to devout meditation and solemn prayer. All nature seemed pervaded with, *holiness to the Lord*. The very stranger was struck with solemnity and awe, and the scoffing sinner forced to stop in his career of sin, and turning his thoughts inward, think awhile upon eternity. It was indeed a blessed day. Even now, while recalling it to mind and endeavoring to transport myself to the past, I seem to mingle with angels and have a foretaste of the joys of Paradise. But alas! this sacred day has gone. No silent, prayer-breathing Sabbath seems to dawn upon our world. The rude voice of the teamster and the rattling of the car, disturb the devotion of the pious few, and their way to the house of God is interrupted by the party of pleasure and the driving of the furious charioteer, in which sometimes the professor of religion is known to participate.

Shall we ask for the cause of this alarming desecration of the Sabbath? The answer by implication, has already been given. The professor is a professor only by name. Or he has mingled with an unhallowed world until the delicate susceptibility of his conscience is gone, and he ceases to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Or he has accustomed himself to false modes of reasoning respecting it, until he really believes the Sabbath day was abolished by Christ and his Apostles; and hence, feels himself under no obligations to keep it holy. Luther himself, the great reformer, reasoned very loosely respecting the Sabbath; and his mode of reasoning has been followed by the pious in Germany with all its deleterious effects, down to the present day.\* England is filled with the doctrines and disciples of Paley and others like him; and America has drank largely from both these fountain heads of this error, and made great additions to the draughts of her own. What Christian can think of this state of things, without anguish of heart? It would not be so, were the church of Christ holy as she professes to be. The sweet Sabbath of our fathers would be brought back again and

\* Luther and his followers, while they hold it in some sense obligatory upon them to keep the Christian Sabbath, place it upon the same foundation as the festivals of their church in this respect.

made universal. The holy example of the righteous would produce a hallowed effect upon sinners, and bring them to *feel* like Satan, "*how awful goodness is.*" Such a change will most evidently take place, before, "From one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, all flesh come to worship before the Lord," and the world itself experiences one continued and universal Sabbath of rest. One of the first steps of this reformation is evidently, to bring Christians to feel, not merely the *expediency* of keeping the Sabbath, but the divine *obligations* they are under to keep it; to point out to them the will of God in respect to the Sabbath. To those who are free from all bias of prejudice or education, the language of the Bible will appear sufficiently plain upon the subject. Even such, however, may derive great benefit from a perusal of Wilson's Seven Sermons on the Divine Authority and Perpetual Obligation of the Lord's Day, and various treatises referred to, in the Pastoral Address prefixed to that work, while others may receive lasting benefit from it. With no work, however, that treats professedly upon the Sabbath, have we been better pleased than the one by Mr. Gurney, the title of which is placed at the head of this article, and from which several of the preceding suggestions have been chosen. The author of it, though a member of the society of Friends, has published several books on the subject of religion, particularly, "Essays on various Religious Topics," and a series of dissertations, entitled, "Biblical Notes and Dissertations, chiefly intended to confirm and illustrate the doctrine of the Deity of Christ;" the first of which was published not long since in the Biblical Repository. Of this last, a review in the London Christian Observer for November, 1831, says: "The respected author is already advantageously known to the public by his Essays; but he will now take a yet higher place. That work elevated him above the peculiarities of the religious body to which he belongs, and ranked him amongst the ablest defenders of our common Christianity and of the great truths of which that revelation consists. Our readers will have observed in that volume, the prominence given to the great articles of the Divinity of Christ, and the Atonement of his death. These articles are pursued in the present publication, which will raise the author to a yet higher rank amongst solid, able and learned Theologians." The little volume before us is exactly what we should expect from one thus accredited for his correct views and skill in Biblical criticism. It is not presented to us in the uninviting form of sermons, but in the more desirable form of brief re-

marks ; and, in the language of the American editor, has the distinguished advantage of being short, pithy, argumentative and perspicuous ; and, though interwoven with much solid learning, is for the most part intelligible to the great mass of the community. It consists of four chapters, a conclusion, and an Appendix. The first chapter treats of the Patriarchal Sabbath, the second of the Mosaic Sabbath, the third of the Jewish Sabbath, and the fourth of the Christian Sabbath. The conclusion contains some hints respecting the proper manner of keeping the Sabbath, and the Appendix a few additional and valuable notes by the American editor. A quotation or two from the conclusion will serve to show the spirit of the writer.

“ It is, indeed, a powerful argument for the divine authority of this institution, that as on one hand, a conspicuous blessing rests on the use of it, so on the other, the neglect or perversion of it, never fails to be followed by vice, misery and confusion. Ungodliness is the worst of all foes to moral virtue and civil order,—to decency, harmony and happiness of society ; and ungodliness and Sabbath-breaking act and react. The former naturally leads to the latter, and the latter confirms and aggravates the former.

Every one who is accustomed to communicate, in our jails and other such places, with the refuse of society,—with the most abandoned and profligate of men,—must be aware that Sabbath-breaking is, very commonly, a first step to every species of crime. Nor was the curse which rests on the neglect and abuse of the Sabbath, much less conspicuous, when an attempt was made to remodel the law and to alter its proportions. The sages of the French Revolution, as the reader is probably well aware, substituted one day of rest in ten, for one in seven. And what was the consequence ? So great a degree of wretchedness, that the people were driven by mere necessity, speedily to take refuge again in their ancient practice.” pp. 99—100.

We should like to enlarge our quotations from this work, but must close. Every pious heart will rejoice at its re-publication in this country, and peruse it with attention. May it be extensively circulated, and serve to remind Christians of the pledges they have taken to keep the Sabbath, or lead them to enter into such pledges. Motives of awful weight urge upon us the great question of which it treats. Our individual prosperity, the welfare of our nation, the conversion of sinners, the enlargement of the church, the regeneration of the world, all hinge upon the Sabbath’s being considered and treated as a divine institution of universal obligation.

THE  
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. VI.

JULY, 1833.

NO. 7.

---

---

COMMUNICATIONS.

---

DR. PORTER'S LETTERS ON REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

NO. VI.

*To the Committee of the Revival Association in the Theological Seminary, Andover.*

GENTLEMEN,

In examining the narratives of those glorious revivals, with which God was pleased to visit our churches, at the commencement of this century, my chief difficulty has been that of *selection*. The brevity which I at first prescribed to myself, it soon became apparent, would be inconsistent with any adequate view of the main facts and principles, which came within the range of observation. To the historical sketch of these facts and principles, which I have aimed to give with fidelity, I shall now subjoin some general remarks. In these, special regard will be had to my younger brethren in the ministry, and to the members of our beloved Seminary, who expect soon to become guides to souls. Should the opinions which I shall now express, on any doctrinal or practical points, contravene the views of others, they will, I trust, be weighed with candor; and only so far as they are found to be scriptural and reasonable, are they entitled to any regard.

*My first remark is, that Revivals of religion exhibit the sovereignty of God in its true light, as connected with the best encouragement to fidelity in Christian ministers.*

There is a kind of Antinomian Orthodoxy, which abuses the doctrine of divine sovereignty, by so representing man's dependence on it, as virtually to excuse him from all obligation to obey the Gospel. A minister, who believes that there is no independent efficacy in means to convert sinners, may gradually transmute this unquestionable truth into error; and may preach as though he believed God to be in such a sense a sovereign, that there is no connection whatever between a faithful, powerful exhibition of the truth, and the sanctification of men's hearts. Such views doubtless he may honestly cherish, from reverence to God; but they tend to paralyze his own ministrations, and to spread the slumber of death over his hearers.

There is, on the other hand, a presumptuous Orthodoxy, which virtually *denies* the sovereignty of God; and maintains that every faithful preacher will *certainly be successful* in converting his hearers. The ground really taken is, that the result depends entirely on human instrumentality, and not at all on the sovereignty of God. This tends to cherish ministerial pride and vain glory, when success is granted, and utter discouragement when it is withheld.

What then do we mean by God's being a sovereign? Not that he acts in any case without reason; but that he acts without *disclosing* the reason to us. He acts as a sovereign too, where he is at liberty as to his own *promise*, or as to the immutable *principles of rectitude*, to do the thing or not to do it. A sinner repents. God is not a sovereign in forgiving that sinner. He is bound to do it by his word. God sustains his church, so that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; but he is bound by *promise* to do this. So it is never said, "Whom he will he justifieth, and whom he will he condemneth," because the justification of a believer is a *judicial* proceeding, governed by principles entirely distinct from *sovereignty*. But effectual calling stands on the footing of strict sovereignty;—so that here, "he hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." When it is said then, that a "*faithful preacher of the truth will certainly be successful*," some explanation is needed. Is it meant that the truth by its own inherent efficacy will convert sinners? Then no interposition of divine sovereignty is required. Or has God *promised* to give his truth this converting efficacy, whenever it is faithfully preached? Still he acts, not as a sovereign, but as he has bound himself to act.

What do we mean by a *faithful* preacher? Certainly not that he is a *perfect* man, or a *perfect* pulpit orator. Not that he preaches as much truth in one sermon as Paul sometimes

did ; nor that he preaches as many thousand sermons, and with as overpowering an eloquence, as Whitefield did. But that he preaches the Gospel clearly and earnestly, though perhaps with subordinate powers of impression.

And what is meant by his being *successful*? Not that *all* his impenitent hearers will be converted under one sermon ; nor in one year ; nor in the whole course of his ministry. Let us decide *how faithful* we mean, and *how successful* ; and then say what is the ground of *certainty* that *so much* fidelity, will be attended with *so much* success. We must find this certainly either in the state of the human heart, and the nature of truth, or in the promise of God. But it is to be found in neither. All we can properly say is, that the general current of the Bible, and of divine Providence, holds out a high *probability*, that decided faithfulness in preaching the gospel, will be attended with a good measure of success. It is a probability, such as is deemed an adequate encouragement to earnest endeavors, in husbandry, in medicine, in all cases where *means* are to be employed. The faithful preacher then may labor in hope ;—nay, it is his duty to labor in high and animated hope that God will bless his efforts to the salvation of some perishing souls. Still his hope is in that sovereign mercy which has promised to render the gospel effectual to the conversion of multitudes of our lost race, but has not *promised* to convert *all his hearers*, or *any* of them. This places him between despondency and presumption ;—just the condition to call forth the powers of a Christian minister to the best advantage. If he supposed himself able to convert his hearers at any time, or at any time able to bring God under the obligation of a promise to convert them, he might sink into remissness. But while the question is, “ can these dry bones live ? ”—and the only answer is, “ O Lord God, thou knowest, ”—the faithful pastor, in his deep solicitude for dying sinners, will proclaim the warnings of the Gospel with no less earnestness, and with much more hope of success, than if his sole reliance for their salvation were on himself.

The Gospel is the power of God to salvation, just so far as he is pleased to render it so by his Spirit. To many it is “ the savor of death unto death, ” not through any fault of the preacher, but through their own stubborn depravity. The wicked man may be faithfully warned, and yet die in his iniquity ; but his blood will be upon himself, and not upon the watchman. Though Israel be not gathered ; the faithful prophet will have his reward ; every syllable of truth that he utters will glorify God as really “ in them that perish, ” as in “ them that are saved. ”

My *second* remark, which stands in close connexion with

the foregoing, is, that *the special blessing of God usually attends only that kind of preaching which exhibits in due connexion, the accountability of sinners, and their dependence on divine grace.*

This is a grand characteristic of revival preaching, that it bears down upon the conscience of the sinner, with the solemn claims of the Gospel to "work out his own salvation with fear and trembling," while it shows him, that it is "God who worketh in him to will and to do, of his good pleasure." The preaching that does neither of these, or that does one and not the other, is radically wanting in pungency and power. And this is just the defect which renders nugatory a large proportion of pulpit discourses.

You are soon to become ambassadors for Christ. Suppose you should tell sinners that they are under a law, modified and mitigated now from its original strictness, to suit their fallen condition, that the gospel regards men as *wretched* rather than as *guilty*; that it is their duty to exercise godly sorrow, not for their depravity, but for their deplorable *impotence* to do anything which God requires. You tell them to do the best they can; to wait God's time relying on his help when it is sincerely sought. You put them on a round of external duties, in each of which there is confessedly no obedience of the heart, and in respect to each of which, they may comply with your directions in every punctillio, and yet perish eternally. Now, who has authorized you to instruct dying sinners in this manner?—to represent their dependence on God, as being such, that if they do perish, the blame will be upon him, and not upon themselves? If there is no preaching in our time which avowedly takes this ground, there is too much which approaches it so far as to neutralize the force of obligation to immediate repentance, by administering a deadly quietus to conscience.

But suppose you fall into another extreme, (for there is another,) and devote one half of your time in the pulpit to prove that *sinners have power to repent.* Is it preaching the whole Gospel, to inculcate so laboriously, what Christ and the Apostles never preached, but always took for granted? Look through the sermon on the Mount, and the Pentecost sermon of Peter, and what proportion of either is occupied with this discussion? Not one word. You convince a man by conclusive argument, (what indeed he knows by his mere consciousness, without any argument,) that he is a free agent,—is he therefore a Christian? Not at all. You have not instructed him in the great truths of the Gospel; and he may believe all you have said, and perish; nay, may perish *because* he believes, contrary to your intention, that this is the whole Gospel. For though he admits fully your

main proposition, that he is a free agent, and has power to repent, his own false logic of heart, infers, that it is as *easy*, for just such a sinner as he is, to repent, as to remain impenitent; and thence again, that just such a sinner, (notwithstanding his utter aversion to holiness,) is as *likely*, of his own accord, to repent, as to remain impenitent; nay, much *more* likely, as an infinite preponderance of motives on that side, must prevail with a free, moral agent. Of course, he need not be anxious; for a work so *easy* to be accomplished at any moment, may be safely postponed for the present. This belief, therefore, is a *practical* falsehood,—because the Bible says, and experience says, that multitudes throno the *broad* way, against light, and evidence, and warnings; while *few* enter the *narrow* way and live. His belief is also a *fatal* falsehood, in its result. It leaves him to rest in impenitence because he believes but a *part* of the truth.

Now give him true instruction that he cannot misunderstand by showing him the simple distinction between *natural* and *moral* inability. Preach to him his own complete powers of moral agency, and his obligation to immediate repentance. Then show him another truth, which does not extenuate his guilt, but aggravates it to immeasurable criminality, namely, that he is opposed to God, and never will submit, unless sovereign grace shall interpose, to subdue his opposition. The man now feels himself to be in solemn circumstances. You load him down with *responsibility, guilt, danger*,—a triple weight that crushes him, and makes him cry out. Conscience shows him that his wickedness is to be charged, not upon Adam, or Satan, or God, but upon his own single self. Conscience kindles a hell in his bosom; and the Bible shows him a hell flaming beneath his feet. Preach both obligation and dependence, then, if you would transform careless sinners into anxious, trembling inquirers.

My *third* remark is, *that any system of means for the promotion of religion, which will supersede, or essentially impair, the influence of a regular, local ministry, must ultimately be deleterious to the churches.*

In the Apostolical age, it was indispensable that the few men, to whom was committed the work of evangelizing the world, should be travelling preachers. Their first object, however, was to establish local churches, with permanent pastors. On the benefits of this system, so worthy of divine wisdom, so adapted to attach the preacher's affections to his hearers, and theirs to him, and to promote a discriminating, profitable discharge of his duties, I cannot dwell. The happy results of this system have been most conspicuous in those parts of our country where re-

vivals of religion have most prevailed; and where many an anxious sinner has valued beyond all price, the privilege of opening his heart in private to a beloved pastor.

No organization, though devised by God himself, can be expected to operate in our depraved world, without some difficulties. These are so obvious, in the present case, that they need not be suggested. But that will be a day of calamity to our churches, should such a day come, when they shall be willing to exchange a *stated pastorship* for itinerant and occasional ministrations. It would sacrifice what the Head of the church has established, as the vital principle of her prosperity. It would strike away the main pillars of the edifice, that incidental props may occupy their place. Just see what would become of ministerial *responsibility*, when the same man should preach but once or a few times to a congregation. How could he know their spiritual wants, or secure their affections, or feel the full obligation of watching for their souls, when his only intercourse with them is the transient sight of their faces from the pulpit? What would become of the whole machinery of Sabbath schools, and Bible classes, and benevolent associations, which can be kept in operation only by the influence of a constant, pastoral supervision?

What would become of the pulpit? If it were practicable that itinerant ministrations should secure for it in all our towns a permanent and perpetual supply, yet the plan would transform the whole character of *public preaching*. Hearers would become fond of novelty, fastidious, and capricious in taste. Preachers would cease to be men of study; and instead of being instructive, would become diversive, and declamatory in their sermons. Of necessity, their preaching must be, not appropriate but indefinite and general.

Perhaps you may ask me, to what extent may evangelists be employed as *assistants* to stated pastors, or as *substitutes* for them? I answer;—in a large congregation, where the ordinary labors of the ministry are as great as one man can possibly sustain, a failure of his health, or a revival among his people, may render it indispensable that he should have help in his work, for weeks or months successively. Such help has often been furnished by the occasional labors of other pastors, who have had a short leave of absence from their own flocks. But perhaps the only adequate provision for such emergencies, would be, that a few men, of rare endowments for this particular service, men of God, distinguished for judgement, fervor of piety, and suavity of temper, should be held in reserve, to labor where they are most needed, as *assistants to stated pastors*.

These men of course should be ordained ministers, and hold themselves accountable to some regular ecclesiastical body.

About the close of the period which I attempted to describe in former letters, the Rev. ASAHEL NETTLETON devoted himself to the work of an evangelist. With his eminent qualifications for this work, and usefulness in it, I presume you to be already well acquainted. The fact, however, which it is especially to my present purpose to mention, and which probably many of you do not know, is, that this distinguished itinerant, found no difficulty to labor, as an *assistant* of stated pastors, without making himself their *rival*. If in any instance he could not conscientiously coincide in the views, or co-operate in the measures of a pastor, among whose charge he was invited to labor, he did not sow dissension in that church, nor seek to detach their affections from their minister; but quietly withdrew to another place. The consequence was, that the visits of this devoted servant of Christ, were always sought, and never dreaded nor regretted, by ministers or churches. But the signal success of his ministrations has called forth many others to labor in the same department, concerning some of whom, if we must admit that they have done good, we cannot but doubt whether they have not done much more harm. When invited to assist a stated pastor, or thrusting themselves forward, without invitation, they have been heady, sanguine, censorious; have aimed to subvert the influence of a Christian pastor, with the restless spirits of his own church, and perhaps in a few days have planted the seeds of mischief, that have sprung up in years of subsequent calamity. If I must say when and where a radically indiscreet man should preach the Gospel,—I would say *never, nowhere*. But if he must preach, then confine him to one spot, (where, if he kindles a blaze, it may perhaps consume his own hay, wood, and stubble,) instead of sending him to scatter fire-brands in all the churches.

As to the *substitution* of evangelists for stated pastors, I have already expressed the opinion that it is always undesirable, when it can be avoided. Candidates for the ministry are a kind of evangelists, and their services must be employed by vacant churches, in search of pastors. Churches may be so feeble too, that they must be satisfied with occasional ministrations of the word, because they cannot have stated pastors.

Perhaps you may farther inquire, how far may *occasional* or *extraordinary means of religious excitement* be relied on as a *substitute for the regular, divinely appointed means of grace?*

To this question, in its broad extent, I must answer, and every one must answer, *not at all*. For any institution, that is plainly of divine appointment, there can be no proper substitute. Any human arrangement, for example, that supersedes the Christian Sabbath, or that prevents the regular worship of local churches, or the regular influence of local ministers, on that day, is an assumption that we are wiser than God. In some of the thinly peopled districts of the south and west, where ministers are few, and pluralities are unavoidable, it may be best that several congregations should remain together, at a protracted meeting over the Sabbath. On sacramental occasions, such meetings have always been customary, among the scattered Christians of these regions. But in the compact settlements of the country, to admit any principle, which should frustrate the meeting of each congregation with its own pastor, on the Sabbath, because we presume that more sinners would be converted by bringing six of these congregations with their pastors into one great assembly, on that day, is to exalt a hypothetical theory of our own, above a settled usage of the church, founded on Apostolic authority. What if more conversions should take place on that single day?—Does this prove the measure to be wise, in the long run? Perhaps ten times as many conversions may ultimately be prevented by this same measure. It is presumption to try our *experiments* on any *rule of action which comes from God*.

But I must not be misunderstood. There are limits within which Christian discretion is at liberty to *try experiments*, as to the best means of promoting the conversion of sinners. To this head belong conferences, Bible-classes, and the whole routine of occasional exercises, which pastoral enterprise has brought into operation, in aid of revivals. And I will take this opportunity to say that *extraordinary means*, such as *protracted meetings*, may be, under the blessing of God, and the guidance of Christian wisdom, eminently proper. It were unreasonable in me to doubt this, after the blessed results of such meetings, which I have witnessed in the north and south; and the ample testimony on the same point, given by not a few of our best ministers. Nor is it difficult to see how the concentrated and prolonged attention of a large assembly, given to the truths of the Gospel, day after day,—and given without interruption from worldly cares, should be adapted to make deep impressions on the hearers. The principle involved in this case, is not a *new* one. In various forms it has been resorted to in all past revivals, though not carried to so great extent as it has been of late. Protracted meetings then, if properly conducted, have my most

cordial approbation ; and I am anxious to say this the more distinctly, to prevent misapprehension of subsequent remarks.

These meetings are certainly very liable to abuses, which it is the special province of ministers to guard against ; and concerning which all their wisdom and experience should be thrown into common stock. On some of these abuses, I shall express my views with perfect frankness, under a following head. At present let me say, that a vital principle to be remembered ; in giving the highest efficacy to these meetings, is, that they should be regarded as strictly *extraordinary* means. In different places they have been *repeated*, with various degrees of success ; and the experience of the churches will decide how often this can properly be done. Probably it has already decided that the repetition ought not to be frequent.

To return to my third remark, so discursively treated ;—let protracted meetings never supersede the stated, ordinary means of grace. Let them not disturb the customary worship of the Sabbath, nor impede the regular action of a local ministry. Let churches beware that they do not contract a false taste for preaching, from love of novelty and excitement ; and after having heard a few *extra* sermons, complain of ordinary discourses such as their own pastors can prepare, amid the pressing engagements of a revival. And let them beware, too, that their religion does not degenerate into mere alternations of zeal and apathy. Let ministers be cautious not to encourage among their people the expectation of only ephemeral revivals, to last but a few days ; and shall I add, as a suggestion specially applicable to some parts of our country, let them be cautious whom they introduce to their people, as itinerant, revival preachers,—for such strangers are not always “angels unawares.”\*

\* In illustration of the foregoing sentiments, I will take the liberty of introducing an extract from the report of the Synod of Geneva, adopted at its session, Oct. 4, 1832. This document is so full of instruction to the churches, that it deserves the solemn attention of at least every minister. After glancing over the favorable aspects of the past year, and contrasting them with the powerful and general revivals of the year before, the report proceeds thus : But, according to the facts now before us, these indications of the power and presence of God during the present year are lamentably few. In several of the Presbyteries there is not now a single revival. In some churches division exists. When religious excitements have existed during the present year, they have quickly subsided : the light was only for a moment. Having taken a step or two forth and onward last year, the churches now seem to hesitate, waver, and almost stand still. Conformity to an ungodly world prevails. The sordid strait-hearted inquiry, “Who will show us any good ?” is heard from the followers of Jesus. But the inquiry, “Men and brethren, what must we do to be saved ?” has almost ceased. A zeal, not of God’s house, but of this world, hath eaten us up.

Every Christian wishes to pause here, and ask what cause or causes have operated to produce such a depression of religion the present year, such a discouraging apathy and worldliness, such a departure of the Spirit of God.—God has not changed ; why is he not among us in power and mercy ? Sinners are yet in their sins ; why do they not come to Christ ? The Holy Ghost is still Almighty : why are they not convinced of sin, of righteousness, and of judgement ? There is nothing in the nature of a reviv-

My fourth remark is, that in revivals of religion, *great wisdom is requisite on the part of ministers and other Christians, in the treatment of those who are anxious, and those who have recently entertained hopes of their own conversion.*

The practical difficulty of this subject, and the different views which good men entertain respecting it, will render it proper for me to express my own opinions more explicitly and at length than I have already done. As preparatory to this, I shall give a few extracts from printed accounts of revivals, which occurred chiefly in 1831,—premising that these accounts purport to be written by ministers, that they relate to places in six different States, and that I avoid giving names, because some inconvenience might attend it, without any advantage.

val to prevent its continuance; why are not all our churches still rejoicing in the manifestations of God's power? There is positive wrong, positive wickedness, somewhere.

The reports of our presbyteries to-day have developed some of the causes of this state of things. Of the ministers of this synod, fifty-two only are pastors, sixty-one are stated supplies. It also appears that there is among us, a continual change of ministers, a continual settling and unsettling. These *stated* instead of *pastoral* supplies, and this change of place among the ministers of this synod, disclose to us a great evil, and great wickedness attaching to the churches, and perhaps to the ministers: these facts show us that there may be in the churches false professors, who, not doing the work of God, become disturbers of the peace; that there must be persons of unstable and uninstructed minds, having itching ears; restless spirits, loving whatever is new and peculiar, better than the truth of God which is eternally the same. These facts show that there may be ministers also too indolent, or too uneducated to furnish themselves for the pulpit beyond a sixth months' or one years' stock, who encourage this unstable fluctuating state of things. In consequence of this, the great and glorious doctrines of the Bible are not systematically and fully preached and heard. And some of our church members, especially the recent converts, being without instruction, are unsound in the faith. In some instances the additions sit like an incubus on the heart and energies of the churches. Here is one cause of the present lamentable state of things among us.

The reports of presbyteries develop another cause by exhibiting the fact, that with a few exceptions the spirit of benevolence has by no means increased in proportion to the increase of our churches. This failure of a benevolent spirit, deprives us of this divine blessing without which all is desolation. God will not water those who neglect to water others.

Another fact reported is, that religious excitements have rapidly declined as soon as special means are withdrawn, indicating that human instrumentality was made too prominent and too much trusted in, to the exclusion of the Spirit and power of God, and the simple exhibition of divine truth. God having been overlooked, has overlooked us. In the effort to bless ourselves, we have lost the blessing of heaven. Attempting in our pride and confidence to work our own deliverance, the Almighty arm has been withdrawn from us. Having lightly esteemed the influences of the Holy Ghost, we have been left without it, to go on in darkness in our own chosen way.

If we would see the Lord God walking among us again in glory and power; if we would be blessed again and refreshed, our ministers must remain in their places, and **STUDY, and STUDY, and STUDY!** They must preach systematically, and fully the whole counsel of God, and feed their people with knowledge and understanding. And the churches must be disciplined. Dead branches must be broken off. They must be satisfied to hear from the same man, the pure, plain doctrines of the Bible, if he is a man of God.—We must all use the instrumentality of God's appointment with vastly more diligence and constancy. But not trusting in these to save sinners, we must, above all, and more than all, acknowledge God, and the power of his Spirit as the only agent able to overcome the deep aversion of sinners to all good, and make them submissive to *his will*.

During a protracted meeting which is described at some length, the writer of the account says, that "two hundred *manifested hopes*." Another similar account says, "On the second day of the meeting, the *converts* and the *anxious* were called on to separate themselves from the rest of the congregation."—Another says, "Last Sabbath I attended a camp meeting at B——. The meeting was very orderly and solemn, and thirty-one *professed to indulge hope*." Another closes the account of a protracted meeting thus:—"The *number of conversions* is sixty." Respecting a similar meeting in M——, the account says: "On Saturday, an awful solemnity was on the assembly. Sabbath morning, three persons *gave themselves away to Christ, and were admitted to the church*."

"At a protracted meeting in D——, on the last day at noon, those who *hoped they had experienced a change of heart, during the meeting*, were requested to signify it, and about forty arose. Others were led to *rejoice in hope in the afternoon*." "In M——, on the last day of our protracted meeting, about fifty *professed to have passed from death to life*." In a town where no previous revival had prevailed, "A protracted meeting began on Monday. On the following Saturday, the Session *examined twenty-one*, all of whom were *next day admitted to the church*."

It is needless to multiply extracts. If you have carefully read the printed statements of revivals, for a year or two past, you must have observed that many of these statements, especially concerning protracted meetings, speak of *anxious persons*, and also of *converts*, or as they are sometimes designated, "those who *entertain hope* of their own conversion since the meeting began,"—as being called upon publicly to separate themselves from the rest of the assembly. Before I make remarks on the expediency of these measures, a few queries of a distinct character, arise respecting a protracted meeting that occurred during the past year, and the particular description of which was copied into many of our periodical papers. A mere abstract of this description is sufficient to exhibit the principal facts. "On the first day, Mr. ——, the preacher, said, at the close of his sermon,—'The Gospel offer is designed to produce an immediate decision.' Then he called upon all who were *determined now to attend to their souls' welfare*, to retire to the Lecture-room, for conversation and prayer. Near 200 went. On the second day, near 400 were in the anxious meeting. The invitation then given was,—'All who are *determined now to yield their hearts to God*, are requested to kneel down, as subjects of prayer.' About two thirds of the

assembly kneeled, and prayer was made. A similar request being made, on a subsequent day, when there were about 300 anxious, 150 kneeled, *in token of their determination, then to cast themselves on God's mercy in Christ Jesus.* On a still later day, the determination was expressed by about 200, *to become the servants of Jesus Christ.* On the last day, if I mistake not, about 400 assembled in the anxious room; the *converts* being called on to separate themselves from the *anxious*, about one third *declared themselves converts.*"

During the successive days of this meeting, a number of ministers took part in the exercises.

Now, I would be slow to condemn any work in which devoted and excellent ministers of Christ are engaged, and especially in which there is evidence that God is present, by the influences of his Spirit. Nor would I censure any measures merely because they are *new*; for this does not prove them to be *wrong*; it rather suggests a good reason why we should inquire with candor and caution as to the evidence alleged that they are *right*. Nor do I regard with the same degree of solicitude, which some good men have felt, the danger of *excitement* on these occasions. The greatest possible danger to souls, is a deadly insensibility. When the house is on fire, and the family are asleep, better that they be awakened by violence, than consumed. Better rouse them, even if it were at the expense of a momentary insanity, than let them die. Every preacher of the Gospel knows how very difficult it is to gain even the serious attention of careless men to the subject of religion. This is just the point on which occasional and special means, judiciously employed, may be advantageously brought in to the aid of ordinary means. Now and then such special exercises will help to break up the lethargy of the soul, and awaken intense interest in the concerns of religion.

Worldly men allow and demand excitement, in the orator, the poet, the statesman, the warrior; any man may be ardent on any subject but religion; while on this subject, they denounce fervor as fanaticism. But how can a subject that properly fills all heaven with emotion, be properly regarded without emotion on earth? Let excitement come, not from *appeals to the passions*, but from *clear and vivid exhibitions of divine truth*, and one most formidable obstacle to the salvation of sinners is removed.

With these remarks in view, let us come to the facts stated above. What does the Gospel require that sinners, under the excitements of an awakened conscience, shall do? That they shall repent;—not that they shall *purpose* to repent, or *prom-*

ise to repent, but—*repent*. When must they repent?—*Now*. If you turn back to the extracts last given, and examine the clauses printed in *Italic*, you will see the ground of my scruples as to some prevalent modes of preaching. “*All who are determined now to yield their hearts to God,*” &c. The preacher, on a former occasion, had spoken of the Gospel as demanding “an immediate decision.” What decision? Why, to think on religion seriously;—to “attend now to their souls’ welfare.” All this, doubtless, is well intended, but it is not the Apostolic way of pressing immediate obligation. The language is equivocal and vague on a point where the New Testament is perfectly explicit. A serious inquirer might ask,—How much does the preacher mean by my determining “to become the servant of Jesus Christ?”—determining “now to yield my heart to God?” Does he mean that by so determining, I do *now* exercise true repentance? or merely that I resolve to *become* a penitent? If the latter, I can kneel, &c., for I do thus determine. But if he had said, “*All who do at this moment exercise true repentance for sin, are requested to kneel,*” &c., I should not dare to do it, for I have not sufficient evidence that I do now exercise a penitent heart.

The practical difficulty, and it is very serious, lies here;—some men are in the habit of exhorting their hearers “to an immediate decision,”—“to make up their minds now,” &c.,—yet leave it uncertain whether they mean a decision that implies the actual present surrender of the heart to God, by repentance,—or a decision to make religion now the subject of their solemn attention, &c. But betwixt the two things there is an infinite difference. One secures the salvation of the soul; the other leaves it exposed to eternal death. Now if we preach the Gospel as the Apostles did, impenitent men cannot do what we exhort them to do, and yet perish.

But there is a greater difficulty still. “The *converts* being called on to separate themselves from the anxious, about one third *declared themselves converts.*” So in another case; “The second day of the meeting, the *converts* and the anxious were called on to separate themselves,” &c.

What I object to in these proceedings is, that sinners are encouraged to *entertain* premature hopes;—that they are encouraged to *proclaim* these hopes; and that these hopes, true or false, are *confirmed* by the influence of ministers and churches.

I. The hopes are premature. The settlement of our controversy with God, is a business of awful moment. It respects our whole past life, and our whole eternity to come. The

work may be done in a moment, and God may see it to be done effectually; but the *proof* to ourselves and to other men that it *is* done, is not the work of a moment, nor of a day. A man on Monday is a careless sinner. He listens to preaching. On Tuesday, he thinks himself converted. What is the evidence? None at all;—none, I mean, that is adequate to the momentous importance of the case. The existence of such evidence is *impossible*. No voice from heaven has announced the fact;—if it is a fact, omniscience only can know it;—for the ordinary principles of evidence cannot reach the case. There has not been *time* for this;—the *circumstances* do not allow it. The man has been under strong excitement, such excitement as I have said is properly brought to bear on the unawakened conscience. But it certainly is not safe for him to determine, under this state of mind, that he is a Christian. This requires opportunity for calm thought, reading, and examination into his own heart, and the evidences of grace. He may be truly born again, and yet be ignorant as a child respecting the proper evidences of this change.

Of course, 2. If it is premature for him, so soon to indulge a hope, it is still more so to *proclaim* it. Why should he be called upon to “declare himself a convert,” while it is *impossible* that the evidence of this can be such as ought to be satisfactory to his own mind? The measure is full of awful hazard to his soul, without any imaginable advantage. When an indiscriminate call is given to a public assembly for the “converts” of a protracted meeting to separate themselves from others, it requires but little acquaintance with revivals, and with men, to know that the confident, the ignorant, and the sanguine will be first in responding to the call; while the judicious, the modest, and the heart-broken, will stand back from so sudden and public an exhibition of themselves.

3. Another difficulty is, that these hopes, true or false, are *confirmed* by the influence of ministers and churches. I speak of that class of individuals described above, who are publicly called upon “to declare themselves *converts*.” In doing this, the understanding is, that they are regarded by the minister as converts; and thence the inference is easy and almost certain on their part, that they *are* converts. But what is the minister's proof of their being so? He may have found, amid the hurry and excitement of a protracted meeting, opportunity for momentary conversations with them; but the sum of the whole evidence is, that they have a *hope*. This ought, indeed, to imply, that there is some valid *ground* of hope, but cannot itself be that ground. Of itself, the hope is not the proper evi-

dence that they are converted, nor any *part* of that evidence.\* A man hopes that he shall be rich, or shall live to old age; is this any proof that he will be rich, or will live to old age? The foolish virgins had a hope; but they had no oil in their lamps. "Many will say Lord, Lord, open unto us," who will be shut out of heaven.

What, then, is the minister's evidence that these individuals are converted? They hope it is so; and he hopes because they do; while, in the case supposed, it is *impossible* that they or he should have such evidence as the nature of the subject demands, to authorize this hope. And yet, as if the minister could judge of hearts by intuition, without liability to mistake, or as if mistake on a subject of eternal moment must be harmless, these persons are announced as "*converts*," without the epithet "*hopeful*," or any adjunct denoting the necessity of caution in judgment. Indeed, any language implying *caution*, *danger of false hopes*, &c., is professedly, not to say contemptuously, discarded from the vocabulary of some, in these times, who glory in being called revival preachers. Perhaps they may have seen some good men who carried caution to excess, but does this justify a heedless, indiscriminating procedure in themselves? A few fanatical men in the time of Edwards, and at other periods of religious excitement, have professed to decide whether any one is a Christian, by hearing him speak a few words, or even by looking in his face. But Christian sobriety, and common sense demand *evidence* in judging of ourselves or others. If this is a needless scrupulosity, why

\* There are some striking cases in which the most substantial evidence of real conversion is given by those who have no hope in their own case. At the last interview, if I mistake not, which I was permitted to have with that eminent servant of Christ, the late Rev. Jeremiah Hallock, whose name is often repeated in the foregoing pages, he gave me the following statement.

"During a powerful revival in Hartford, I called on Rev. Dr. Nathan Strong. While he was absent for a little time after my arrival, I fell into conversation with a young lady of his family, about the state of religion among the people, and about her own feelings on the subject. Her remarks in respect to her own heart, and the way of salvation, gave me very satisfactory evidence that she had become a subject of renewing grace, though she indulged no hope respecting herself. When Dr. Strong returned from his visits, and spoke of those concerning whom he thought there was hopeful evidence of a saving change, he mentioned this young lady in his own house, as one of the number, though she saw no ground of hope in her own experience. I told him that I had conversed with her, and did not at all regret this want of self-confidence, for I had often found it to be among the best evidences of genuine conversion. A father and his son, said I, were digging a well. The son had descended into it, to prosecute the work, when the sides of the well caved in, and covered him with timbers and rubbish. The father, after a moment of agony, cried out, "My son, are you alive?—My son, are you alive?"—"No, Sir," was the answer from beneath. It was enough; it was evidence of *life* which the father desired.—Now said Mr. Hallock to me,—"*During my experience in revivals, I have often found that a man who is but recently born of the Spirit, would often say "No, Sir," should you ask him if he is converted. And yet, I may have much better evidence of his real change, than I have of another, who has an early and confident hope.*"

did the Apostles incessantly repeat their admonitions against self-deception? "Examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith."—"Prove your own selves."—"Be watchful." Why did they exhort individuals to keep up this humble, devout self-inspection through life; and exhort churches to beware of false professors, if it is sufficient evidence of a man's piety, that *he entertains a hope*? Why did Christ utter his solemn parable about the wise and the foolish builder, if there is no danger that men will build on the sand?

But on the supposition that individuals do entertain hopes, and unite with the church prematurely, in what does the danger consist? I answer, it is two-fold;—as it respects themselves, and as it respects the church.

1. As it respects themselves. It puts their eternal interests in imminent and needless jeopardy; because it surely need not be proved that a sinner, if he has a groundless hope of heaven, is in far greater danger of perishing than if he had no hope. Here I must be permitted to add more brief extracts from accounts given by ministers, as I wish it to be understood that I am not speaking at random. "A sick man was made the subject of special prayer by the people of God;—he was *convicted and converted, and shortly died.*" Christ says, "By their fruits shall ye know them;" and what were the fruits?—"converted and shortly died." Probably the man lived long enough to learn that the minister had assumed the dread responsibility of pronouncing him converted! Again. "Within a *few moments after their own conversion*, fervent cries were offered by these individuals, for their unconverted companions." Here must have been intuitive knowledge of hearts! Again. "The Lord is working gloriously here; within a little more than a week, *twenty conversions* have taken place." Again. "The two following days of the protracted meeting were distinguished by *frequent and sudden conversions.*" Language of this sort has been common, in which the number of conversions occurring within a specified number of days, before the account was written, is stated with the same confidence that we use in telling how many members there are in our own family, or how many persons of our neighborhood have died in a week.

Now, lay these facts together, and look at results. On the last day of a protracted meeting, at a call from the pulpit to that effect, ninety persons "declare themselves converts." Within a few days, perhaps the next day, they see in the newspaper the statement of their pastor, announcing them as "the converts" of that meeting. And suppose still, (as the case certain-

ly may be,) that God sees twenty or forty of the ninety to be utter aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. I ask,—and the judgment day will give the answer,—who is responsible for the consequences? These immortal souls take it for granted, perhaps, that they are Christians, and blindly cleave to this hope, in defiance of all evidence to the contrary, till their eyes are opened in eternity. The most decisive objection that I have always felt to the camp-meetings of our Methodist brethren, is the indiscriminate manner in which men and women are announced as converts, in the prayers and addresses of ministers. For all the universe, I would not be accountable for the false hopes which I fear are sometimes thus produced in a single day. And yet, from ample documents now before me, I am constrained to think that irregularities, under the name of revival measures, to some of which there is no room here to advert, have been carried to a most preposterous and presumptuous extreme, in many of our Presbyterian and Congregational churches. In too many cases, the aim has manifestly been to produce excitement; not by clear exhibitions of truth, but by rousing the passions, through continued and violent appeals, that often amount to little more than *vociferation*. The fault is not in producing emotion, for this God requires; but in presuming all high emotion to be *such* as he requires. Whereas, emotion without conviction, without light, without contrition, is not *religious* feeling, any more than is the thunder and the wind. Its action cannot be controled, nor its results foreseen,—except the certainty that it will die when the occasion is over.

The process of self-deception under these circumstances is easy. A careless sinner, ignorant of the Bible, comes under the influence of a protracted meeting. His fears and hopes are addressed by considerations appealing to his desire of happiness and dread of misery. He is told that conversion is a simple preference of God to the world, of heaven to hell; a preference as *easy* to be made by any one present, as the choice to go home when the meeting is ended. He is alarmed, distressed, melted down; his sympathies are excited by seeing others go to the seat of the anxious, and of the converts. He feels as he never felt before, and asks himself if this must not be *conversion*? This is the perilous and awful moment, when he needs a spiritual guide to say, “Take care of your soul. Bow immediately at the foot of the cross. Delay, for a moment, may be your eternal undoing. Watch and pray, and search your own heart. But be not forward to hope that you are a convert now. If you are, the work of salvation will go on in your heart, and in the fruits of holiness, will bring to yourself and others, the

comforts of a good hope in your case. If you are not a convert now, and yet entertain a hope, the probability is that you will die a self-deceiver."—So the great luminaries of past revivals have treated men in these circumstances.

But it is said, "Some pledge, given in the face of a public assembly, is necessary to bring the halting to a decision." To this point only a moment can be devoted. Meetings for the *anxious*, that appropriate instructions may be given them, are eminently proper. These, I think, should be appointed in public, and attended always by pastors, and experienced elders, without any thing of display and exhibition. But, much as I respect the judgment and motives of excellent men who think otherwise, the public designation of the anxious in an assembly, and the whole machinery of "anxious seats," as they are called, seem to me at least liable to so much abuse, as to be generally inexpedient. And as to the same procedure respecting "converts," my whole judgment and heart revolt against it.

2. To the *Church* there are serious dangers in these *premature hopes*, especially when combined with *premature profession* of religion.

This topic of itself demands a treatise, but I must confine myself to those suggestions which appear to me most practical at the present time. The prominent point for apprehension is, that the *spirituality of the church will be gradually undermined, by the admission of unconverted members.*

In the first place,—there has of late been an evident tendency in the course of revival measures, to reckon up, and to publish, as early as possible, the *number of converts*, and of *additions to the church*. Pious and zealous ministers mean by this to do honor to divine grace. But let them ask if there is no mixture of *religious ostentation*, in this "numbering of the people;" and ask also if there is no *sectarian policy*, connected with it? Sixty hopeful subjects of grace are reckoned among my people this week. If they are not admitted together into my church very soon, many of them will probably unite with the church of brother A.—and others will go to different denominations. They must be secured therefore without delay.

In the second place,—it is by no means probable that the ultimate prosperity of a church will be promoted by this hasty accession to its list of communicants. The strength of a church consists not in the *number* but in the *character* of those who belong to it. On this principle, when Gideon had mustered all his soldiers, for the war with Midian and Amalek, presuming that all would be few enough to encounter so mighty a

host, "The Lord said unto him, the people that are with thee are *too many*." Any skilful commander, if called to storm a fortification, would choose to rely on a select band of soldiers, known to possess true hearts, and tried courage, instead of ten times their number of recent and promiscuous volunteers. And why should a principle, sanctioned by experience in all ordinary concerns, be discarded in religion? Paradox as it may seem to youthful ministers, of many a church it may be said, as to all the purposes of unity, and stability, and moral strength, "*The people are TOO MANY*." For I am prepared to say now,

In the third place,—that they who rush into the church without piety, not only add nothing to its strength, but in various ways paralyse its energies, and are a dead weight on its prosperity. To its *doctrines* it is not improbable that they will be found, in one form or another, opposed. If the pastor preaches the soul-abasing truths of the Bible, with fidelity, these false professors are the men from whom he may expect an influence, secret or open, to be arrayed against him. They have never been at heart reconciled to these truths. A man who had long been a professor of religion, though not of my pastoral charge, once came to tell me his dissatisfaction with the sermon which he heard me preach on the preceding Sabbath. "So," said I, "it seems you are not pleased with the doctrine of election;"—(which was the subject of my discourse.) "No, certainly I am not." "What then did you think of my text? And what do you think of the ninth chapter of Romans, from which my text was taken?" "Indeed, Sir, to be honest, I have always thought that the Bible would have been quite as good a book without that chapter, as with it." Who can be assured that one half the members of a church may not be of this description, if they are hurried into its communion, without having been instructed in the first principles of religion, before or after their supposed conversion?

And as to the *duties* of evangelical piety, what is to be expected of such men? Strangers to the spirit of vital Godliness, will they hold up their pastor's hands? Will they actively sustain the prayer meeting and the Sabbath-school? Will they devoutly maintain family worship, and train up their households for God?

As to the *discipline* of the church, what is to be expected? The indispensable importance of this to the prosperity of religion, all experience testifies; and the intrinsic difficulties attending it, are equally apparent. But how is discipline to be maintained in a church, without a predominant spirit of piety in its members? An individual is arraigned for open, perhaps

habitual violation of the laws of Christ. He is obstinate in self-justification. Others sympathize with him and take his part; prejudices are excited; parties are formed; a struggle for influence commences; and clamor, and wrath, and all the mischiefs that result from baleful passions, blown into angry commotion, ensue. Plainly, a church cannot prosper without discipline; and discipline it cannot maintain, when one half, or one third, of its members choose to have none.

To what purpose is it then to say, "Keep the door of the church wide open, and if unworthy men enter, cast them out?" At the best, I admit the impossibility of wholly excluding such men, for with all the vigilance of the Apostles, in their day, "False brethren crept in unawares." But it is easier to *keep out* ten such men, than to *cast out* one.

And as to the *character* of the church, and its *sanctifying influence on the world*, what is to be expected from a lax system of admission to membership? How is she to be the light of the world, when the light in herself is darkness? Her unconverted members are the elements of death in her bosom, even if they maintain a blameless exterior. But generally, they will not do this. Towards many of them, ungodly opposers of experimental piety will point the finger of reproach, and say, "There are your *converts*; as worldly, as proud, as light-minded, as indifferent to religion, as other people." What is the reply? Can the church contradict what she knows to be unquestionable facts? Will it do for her to say, "These men are doubtless false professors, and the peril be on themselves;—it is no concern of the church?" It will *not do* to say this. It is a solemn concern of the church to maintain its own holy character, as a community instituted by God to train men for heaven, and not for perdition. She is pledged to do this by most sacred vows; and the world holds her to that pledge; and God holds her to it. When Achan committed his trespass, secretly, the indictment of heaven was laid in against the whole religious community to which he belonged: "ISRAEL HATH SINNED." Divine wrath rested on the church as a body, for the transgression of a single member, till he was searched out and punished. Nor is it less true now, that the tolerated sin of one member is the sin of the church.

What then, if we heedlessly admit to our fellowship, and continue in it, unconverted men, what hope can we entertain that God will bless us? If any considerable proportion of our communicants should be of this character, what is to become of our genuine revivals. Let the Spirit of God be withdrawn from us, and leave us to fanatical excitements, and human contriv-

ances to multiply nominal Christians, and then, indeed, we may have "human converts," and many accessions to the numbers of the church, but the glory of our Zion will be departed; and a few such seasons of ingathering in any church, will be sufficient to render it an utter desolation.

There are two other points which deserve more extended notice than I can give them under this head. One is the authority of *Apostolic precedent*, as alleged in favor of sudden admissions to the church. Without spending time to controvert the premises often assumed, in regard to this matter, I will barely say, that, as to any number of individuals who have recently professed religion, let me be assured on *divine authority*, (as I am, for example, respecting the Pentecost converts,) that they "believed,"—that "the *Lord* added them to the church,"—that they "continue in the Apostles' *doctrine* and *fellowship*,"—and that "they shall *be saved*;" let me have this assurance, and I can have no apprehension that any mistake has been committed. But who will undertake to give me this assurance?

The other point respects the loud note of warning to Christians of this time, from a well known apostasy, which occurred in the New England churches, during the last century. By a gradual and silent progress, the spirit of vital godliness was supplanted in many of these churches; in pulpits which had been occupied by the Mathers and Shepards of former days, laxity of doctrine was introduced, the glory of the Gospel was obscured, the real divinity of the Saviour, and the special agency of the Spirit were kept out of sight, then called in question, then denied; till at length a regular, organized apostasy from the faith of the Gospel, threw off its disguise, and boldly unfurled the standard of error. This lamentable defection among the sons of the Pilgrims, which many generations cannot remedy, did not result from accident. Whence did it come? The answer deserves to be proclaimed with trumpet-tongue:—*The Puritan churches slept, and the enemy sowed tares. Unconverted men*, in great numbers, were admitted to their fellowship, *hoping to become Christians*. If I do not mistake the signs of the times, the danger of our churches now is, that *unconverted men*, in great numbers, will be admitted to their fellowship, hoping that they *are Christians*. Should this apprehension prove well grounded, another century will disclose the calamitous results. God grant that it may prove without foundation.

It will be evident, I presume, that in the foregoing remarks, my eye has been fixed on the single danger of rash and premature admissions to the church. Justice to my own views,

however, require me to say, that there is an *opposite danger* to be guarded against, namely, too much *delay* in bringing hopeful converts to a public profession of religion. That this mistake has often been committed in our evangelical churches cannot be doubted. The consequences of this undue delay, are such as a judicious minister will most certainly perceive, at least after a few years of pastoral experience, and of careful attention to the spiritual state of individuals who need his special guidance. The most general usage of New England churches, (with many exceptions, of course, to meet peculiar cases,) I suppose has been to delay admission of candidates after hopeful conversion, from *two months* to *six*. Within the last fifteen years, probably the time has not generally exceeded from *two* to *four* months.

Did my limits allow, this would be a proper place to sketch out a plan for the systematic instruction and probation of recent converts, between the period of *hope* and *profession*; a plan by which they might be kept in a state of trial and of progress, without the liability to be carried backward in their course, by adverse circumstances. Should it please God to continue the glorious effusions of his Spirit, by which our country has been so signally favored of late years, some system of this sort will probably be deemed indispensable in our churches. At this moment, I can only recommend to your careful examination, some very lucid and judicious remarks, which you will find under the head of "*The Probationer's Class*,"—Spirit of the Pilgrims, Vol. iv. p. 656.

Affectionately yours, &c.

E. PORTER.

Walterboro', S. C., Jan. 1833.

## THE CRUCIFIXION.

### NO. III.

#### THE BLOODY SWEAT.

Before we proceed to describe the scene at Gethsemane, it may be proper to premise a few observations on the statement that Christ perspired, "as it were, great drops of blood." Clotzius supposes, that because the visit of the angel to Christ is recorded before the appearance of the bloody sweat upon him, the former event was the cause of the latter, and of course pre-

ceded it. He would therefore paraphrase Luke xxii. 43, 44, thus:—"There appeared unto Christ an angel strengthening him, and the sudden tide of joy which was raised in him by the angel, so quickened the circulation in his system, that he actually perspired blood." But although the perspiration is noticed subsequently to the angelic visit, no one can doubt that it occurred previously, and occurred on account of sorrow instead of joy. Commentators almost unanimously assign the perspiration to the time immediately after the Saviour's third prayer, and before his third walk to the disciples.

There has been much angry debate (strange, indeed, it is, that the thought of Gethsemane does not repress the least emotion of anger,) on the nature of the sweat which Luke records. The discussion seems to have resulted in the following conclusions.

First. Luke did not design to represent the perspiration as miraculous. He wished to show the extent of Christ's agony, how severe, how powerful it was, and to what consequences it led. It agitated his system so much as to make him perspire large drops. Now the perspiration could be no measure or sign of his grief, if it were not caused by it entirely. To introduce a miracle as its cause, proves the efficacy of the miracle, but hides the operation of the grief. We must therefore conclude, that Luke designed to represent the perspiration as a natural consequence of extreme mental anguish. It has been very common, however, for readers of the Bible, when perplexed with the phenomenon, to refer it to some super-human agency, and thus to annihilate its meaning, as a measure of Christ's woe.

Secondly. Blood may exude through the pores of the skin according to known physiological laws. The great question in debate is, did Christ perspire blood? And we have seen, that if such a perspiration, on natural principles, is impossible, it cannot be supposed to have occurred. It is evident that the phenomenon takes place in certain kinds of bodily disorder. Diodorus Siculus, L. xvii. p. 560, mentions a species of serpent, by whose bite is caused the most painful death, and also before death "a flow of sweat like blood." Other writers mention another serpent, called the *Hæmorrhoidis*, whose bite will cause a sweat of blood.\* Aristotle, in Chap. xix. Book 3 of his *Animal History* says,—“If the blood is too thin, and is diluted by impure ingredients, it may lose itself, and make the invalid sweat with a bloody sweat.” Actuarius, Book i. Chap. 10, re-

\* Poole's *Synopsis*, Vol. iv. pp. 1111; 1112, and Dr. Gill on the *New Testament*, Vol. i. p. 735.

lates an account of a young man, through whose skin drops of blood were perspired, in consequence of the heat of the sun and of a laborious journey. Zacutus Lusitanus, a Jewish physician of the seventeenth century, mentions "a robust, well educated man who was attacked with a fever in the blood, and was cured on the 5th, 6th, or 7th day of the fever by a sanguinary perspiration." A multitude of instances similar to these are recorded by Dr. Thomas Bartholin, a Danish physician of the seventeenth century, who occupied, with splendid success, the anatomical and mathematical professorships at Copenhagen, and published many valuable works on anatomy and medicine. In his *Hypomnemater de Cruce Christi*, pp. 184—196, he strenuously argues that bloody perspirations are common phenomena, in bodies laboring under particular diseases. Sagittarius, Wedel, Richter, and Eschenbach have collected instances of the phenomenon; Good, in his *Study of Medicine*, Schomel, in the *Dictionaire de Medicine*, (Art. *Sueur*,) and the British Encyclopedists have alluded to it as actual and frequent. It is not pretended that half of the instances on record are worthy of credit; the imaginary is intermingled with the real; still there is no more doubt among our enlightened physicians concerning the reality of diseases which cause blood to exude, than of those which cause it to inflame.

Bartholin thus explains the principle on which blood is perspired from the system. "Sometimes the pores of the body are so expanded that a liquid may rush through them as through an open gate. They are thus expanded by heat, either external or internal. The reception of inflammable spirits, and the heat of the sun or a fire are well known to open the pores. When, therefore, the veins and arteries are thin, and especially when lax at their mouths; when the blood is improperly diluted, and at the same time excited by heat, it finds easy egress." "Fernelius, a celebrated physician, records an emission of blood from the extremities of the veins when not heated. Book vi. Chap. 4." Since medical science has become more exact, physicians have ascribed this sanguinary emission to a cause like that of the hemorrhage at the lungs, stomach, nose, etc. The blood is inflamed or otherwise disordered, the capillary vessels are weakened, by an excitement of the system the blood is sent through the arteries with so great force that the capillary vessels are unable to convey it to the veins; they therefore discharge it, and then, in connection with common perspiration, it oozes through the skin.

If, then, it can be proved, that the blood and capillary vessels in the Saviour's body were diseased in the specific way

which is attended with red perspiration, no one can gainsay the opinion that such perspiration may have appeared. We cannot, however, prove that the Saviour was thus diseased. By his watchings, journeyings, fastings, and anxieties he was probably emaciated and weakened: but there is no evidence that he had any sickness other than debility, nor this in any peculiar degree. The only question, then, remaining is, would mental trouble have educed a bloody sweat from a man, debilitated, perhaps, but laboring under no particular organic disorder? It is therefore remarked,

Thirdly, there is no substantial evidence that mental emotion, though operating on an exhausted body, will ever produce the disputed perspiration. It is, indeed, not inconceivable, like an absurd proposition in logic, that the phenomenon should result from such a cause, still it *cannot be proved* that the law of the circulating system allows the result. For, by what process of induction can a thing be shown to accord with physiological principles, when the thing never occurs, in any and in all combinations of circumstances? Fact, and not fancy, must be the basis of our reasonings on this as well as every branch of physics.

I am well aware that there have been occurrences, as well authenticated as some which were noticed under the second head, which seem to prove the possibility of a sanguinary sweat resulting from mere anguish. Bartholin records an instance, originally published by “the grave and credible historian Thuanus, of the governor of a certain garrison, who, being decoyed by stratagem from the garrison and taken captive, and threatened with an ignominious death, was so affected by his misfortune, that he poured forth a bloody sweat from his whole body.” Thuanus also states, that “a young man of Florence, being, by order of Pope Sextus V. condemned to death, was so vehemently harrassed with fear while he was led along to execution, that he discharged blood instead of sweat from all parts of his system.” “A healthy and robust man at Paris, hearing that a capital sentence had been passed against him, is said by Maldonate to have been at once covered with blood oozing through the pores.”\* Considering the fact that all perspiration comes originally from the blood, and changes its color in accordance with changes in the body, being sometimes yellow, sometimes blue, and sometimes reddish; most of the physicians among the schoolmen were ready to admit that, in the words of Dr. Mead, on Galen’s authority, “the pores of the body are

\* See Dr. Gill on the New Testament, Vol. i. p. 735; also, the Essay of Bartholin, previously alluded to.

sometimes, by mental pressure, so dilated as to permit blood to come through them, and thus produce the bloody sweat."

Testimony like this must indeed force our assent, unless we can impeach the witnesses. It may be thought that, as we have already adduced some of these witnesses in proof of our second proposition, we cannot now consistently impeach them. But we must remember, that the testimony of such a man as Bartholin on such a subject as this is credible or incredible, very much according to its agreement or disagreement with the testimony of modern and more accurate physicians. His reports of blood exuding by disease are confirmed by the reports of Baconian philosophers; but when he goes farther, and tells of blood exuding *without* any disease, he goes beyond the school of more enlightened physiologists, and probably goes too far. The human system is the same now that it ever has been, and if it is not now a law, that the system shall exhibit this phenomenon through the bare influence of grief, it never was. But modern physiologists, of the most enlarged science, and critical observation, have witnessed the scenes where the mental engiæry might be expected to work with its greatest power; have seen an indefinite variety of changes wrought by it on the body; have seen them wrought in the hospital while patients were trembling under the scalpel of the anatomist, in the prison, while culprits, harrassed with remorse, were shuddering in view of anticipated execution; they have seen the body become emaciated, the eye fade, the hair change its color, the whole system break down and die solely through fear; and yet have never detected the bloody sweat. It is as well settled by experiment as any truth can be, that "in these latter days," mental excitement will not produce this disputed phenomenon. Why, then, is it, that grief will often expel the soul from the body, and yet not exudate blood? Does it require a stronger movement of feeling for the emission of a few ounces of the fluid, than for the expulsion of the soul itself?—for the opening of the capillary vessels, than for the stopping of the whole machine? If anguish is often so intense as to completely overpower the system, why does it not sometimes produce this inferior effect of deranging the venal part of the system? What better reason, than that this is not a law of the body, and, as all men have been made of the same material, that it never was a law; that the body can now, and always could, endure any amount of grief consistent with life, and yet not exude its vital fluid?

The character and circumstances of those, who stand as witnesses of blood perspiring from a sound body, require us to be

cautious in admitting their testimony. No one can read the Hypomnemata of Bartholin, without seeing that superstition was intermingled thoroughly with his learning; that he had an irrepressible desire "to prove his point," and make facts bend to it. So, with the majority of these witnesses. We know, therefore, that their will would probably bias their judgment. They were not often eye-witnesses of the events related but communicated them on trust. They give but little evidence that the subjects of the phenomenon were scientifically or closely examined, and therefore give us liberty to suspect that there may have been powerful diseases in the subjects whom they report as healthy. The greater part of them being of that class of scholastic writers, on whom, when they differ from moderns, very little dependence can be placed, and being also ignorant of Harvey's discovery that the blood circulates through the system, might easily be deceived by external appearances.\* From the circumstance that blood was seen on the skin, they might seize at the conclusion, impetuously as they were wont to do, that it oozed through the invisible pores; whereas, if they had examined carefully, they might have discovered on the skin some ruptures through which the blood had found free passage. Such facts are certainly disqualifications in the witnesses, and therefore, since the internal probability is against their enthusiastic reports, and since they publish some tales too marvellous to have even a semblance of sobriety, we cannot yield to them implicit credence. Often, indeed, they outrage all that is plausible. There is not a single writer, whose testimony in favor of a bloody sweat being educed by mental excitement is conclusive. We do not therefore say, that such an occurrence is impossible, but we do say that it cannot be proved to be possible; and as the perspiration of Christ was neither miraculous, nor the effect of a disease, we have no reason to think, on any physiological ground, that it could have been a perspiration of blood.

Fourthly. There is no evidence in the Scriptures, that Christ experienced a literal sanguinary sweat. Luke is the only writer who alludes to the sweat in Gethsemane. It was natural that he should mention it, because it was connected with his medical profession. But what does Luke say? Not that Christ sweat blood, but sweat *as it were* great drops of blood falling down to the ground. Justin Martyr, in his controversy with Trypho, omits the word *αιματος* (of blood,) and

\* Harvey published his discovery of the circulation of the blood in 1628. The majority of our witnesses wrote before that year. Bartholin, however, was born in 1616, and died in 1680.

translates the verse, "he sweat as it were great drops falling," etc. There is no authority, however, for this omission.

What, then, is the meaning of the word *ὡσεὶ* (as it were)? Chrysostom, Quenstedt, and others, say that it is here used as "a particle of confirmation and clear definition, and not of comparison," and may be translated by the word "even" or its synonyms: "He sweat even great drops." But what is the evidence that *ὡσεὶ* is thus used? The only evidence which they adduce is, that *ὡς* is used so, and corresponds with the Hebrew particle *ke*; see John i. 14; Matt. xiv. 5; Rom. ix. 32; 1 Cor. iv. 1; where the adverb expresses no comparison, but rather certainty. But, in the first place, if *ὡσεὶ* is ever used in this sense, there is no evidence that it is used so in this passage, and there must be evidence that a word *does* denote a particular thing, as well as *may* denote it, before the thing can be established. But, secondly, *ὡσεὶ* and *ὡς* are two different words, and the former is never employed in the Bible as the latter sometimes is, to express confirmation or emphasis. It is used thirty-three times in the New Testament; eighteen times to express *indefiniteness* and *bare approximation*, and may be translated by the English words, *about*, *near*, *something like*; as in Matt. xiv. 21, etc.; fourteen times to express *resemblance*, *comparison*, and may be translated by the words, "*as if*," "*like to*," "*similar*," as in Matt. ix. 36. The latter of these two meanings is the only one appropriate to Luke xxii. 44. If this verse gives any evidence that Christ sweat actual blood, Matt. ix. 36, gives evidence in the same way that men were actually sheep; Matt. xxviii. 4, that living men were actually dead; Acts ix. 18, that scales literally fell from the Apostle's eyes; and Heb. i. 12, that the firmament is literally a piece of cloth. Evidently, then, the only passage which alludes to the sweat, proves nothing in favor of a discharge of blood. It simply proves that there was a perspiration so profuse as to fall from the body as drops of blood fall from a bleeding man. Else, why was it not written, "he sweat drops of blood?"

Indeed, the passage under consideration suggests a new argument against the idea of a cuticular hemorrhage. Aristotle, Diodorus Siculus, Bartholin, and numerous physicians whom he quotes, say that blood exudes when it is "thin," "watery," "improperly diluted." The blood of Christ must, therefore, if it was perspired, have been vitiated in this way. But Luke, the most credible of all physicians who have reported this case, says that the drops were *θρόμβοι*, that is, dots; *thick*, coagulated drops of blood. This definition is given to the word *θρόμβος* by nearly all the lexicographers and commentators. Luke,

then, if he teaches that Christ perspired blood, teaches also that the consistence of it was just opposite to the consistence which is necessary for such a perspiration ; that the blood was *thicker* than ordinary, when it should have been *thinner*. Besides, the *θρόμβοι*, "grumi," "clots" of blood, would not "fall to the ground" freely, but would rather adhere to the skin.\* The supposition that Luke intended nothing but a *comparison* is the only one which removes these difficulties.

The explanation already given of Luke xxii. 44 is corroborated by the fact, that metaphors and comparisons like that found here, are now, and were anciently, very common. They are too powerful not to obtain currency. Theophylact, (Opera, Tom. i. p. 475,) commenting on the passage in question, says, "Christ sweat, and did it with so great anxiety, that, in the use of a proverb, drops of blood are said to have fallen from him. This proverb is applied to men who labor severely ; these men being said to sweat blood, just as those who weep bitterly are said to weep blood." The phrase is an expression, in Oriental style, of the profuseness of the sweat, which indicated the depth of the grief. Accordingly, Grotius, Theophylact, Euthymius, Le Clerc, Kuinzel, Rosenmüller, and the great body of exegetical commentators reject the idea of a bloody perspiration. Paulus, in his Commentary on Matthew, Mark, and Luke, Vol. iii. p. 616, says that the color of the perspiration could not be determined in the night, and therefore no one had a right to say that it was red like blood. This argument will, of course, weigh nothing with those who believe that "holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Such arguments, too, are unnecessary ; not only because there are sufficient without such, but also because we need *no* arguments, save those which are strictly *defensive*. The whole burden of proof lies with the advocates of a literal sanguinary effusion ; of us nothing more is demanded than to refute their reasonings, and to show that their opinion, as it cannot be established by evidence, cannot be safely believed. Though the opinion is advocated by such men as Poole, Gill, Pearce, Doddridge, Whitby, Clarke, and many other English Commentators, it has no superior practical influence. It must, therefore, be innocent to believe no more on this subject than evidence allows ; and be content with knowing this simple fact, that the perspiration of Christ resembled blood in some particulars, though not probably in all.

\* See Paulus on the word *θρόμβοι* in Luke xxii. 44.

## UNION OF COLONIZATIONISTS AND ABOLITIONISTS.

Every one is aware of the growing interest of the public mind in the subject of anti-slavery and colonization. The continued prosperous operations of the Colonization Society, the rise and onward progress of the anti-Slavery Society, the labors of agents, the debates held on the subject, and the speeches and arguments which are published, are proof in point.

But what is the exact state of the case between colonization and abolition or anti-slavery? Abolitionists believe or effect to believe they are opposed to each other, or at least, that colonization is not adapted to work abolition, but to rivet the fetters of the slave. Colonizationists know abolition, as of late contended for, is opposed to colonization. But are colonization and abolition opposed to each other, after all? What is the object of abolition? To do away slavery and put the colored man in possession of the blessings and privileges of honorable citizenship and Christianity. And what is the object of colonization? The same. 'But, no,' says the abolitionist, 'it precludes forever the prospect of all this, and leaves the slave in servitude.' But is he right in this? The colonizationist says, 'no,' and we think with good reason. For first, the character of the founders of the Colonization Society forbids the supposition, and secondly, the actual operation of the society proves it to have a contrary effect. The state of the case, therefore, is mistaken by the abolitionist, and the colonizationist conceives it substantially as it is. The design, the object, the aim of both is the same. Abolition is the older, but colonization is a sister of the same family, of a little different complexion perhaps, but the same in benevolence and good will to the slave, and especially to Africa,—older too after all than abolition as lately revived.

To pass, however, all comparison of the two, the decision of the case whose views are right, is not essential to the successful efforts of each in behalf of the slave. The most the difficulty can amount to, even in the mind of the abolitionist, seems to be a mistake only in judgment on the part of the colonizationist, as to the best means of accomplishing the object. But it is no strange thing in any department of labor for two separate lines of effort to conspire to the same result, and colonization and abolition, though different in some respects, are not opposed, and colonizationists and abolitionists may work together. The question between them resolves itself into a question of expediency. Both are agreed as to the rights of man. As to abolitionists, there can be no question what their views are, nor need

there be as to the views of the colonizationists; and if any abolitionists deny it, they must be considered uncandid and uncharitable, for in doing it they unavoidably reflect on the memory of the good who are dead, and assail the purity and integrity of their brethren who are alive. It is gratuitous, too, to consider the abolitionist and colonizationist as necessarily interfering with each other, or embarrassing each other's efforts. If the abolitionists will spare direct attack, it is no interference or embarrassment to the colonizationist, that he urges complete and entire emancipation as the immediate and unqualified duty of the slaveholder; and what embarrassment or interference is it to the abolitionist, that the colonizationist urges the same, as fast as, considering the circumstances of the case, the thing is practicable or capable of being accomplished. If either would not agree that the single ultimate object sought is the redemption and happiness of the slave, then they would be at issue, but as the case is, there can be no necessary clashing or variance. Both evidently are travelling the same road, and have in view each an arrival at the same end of their journey, only the one thinks his horse will bear more of the spur and that he shall get there the sooner for goading him on, while the other thinks he is advancing already, as fast as, considering the nature and strength of the animal and the length and difficulty of the way, is consistent with the the greatest speed on the whole and the earliest safe arrival.—If the abolitionist, besides advocating immediate unconditional and unqualified emancipation, would advocate the education also of the people of color, why, so much the better, for the colonizationist wants such, that is, educated blacks, to send out to Liberia.—It would seem, therefore, as though nothing but a headlong, reckless purpose to amalgamate the blacks and whites, and an affected childish pity that any of them born in this country should leave it, can be a ground of difficulty between the two; and this while a colony is springing up, as fast as possible, under the auspices of the Colonization Society, inviting a retreat for people of color, whither they may withdraw with every facility for usefulness to themselves and the world, is certainly unworthy. Union therefore between colonizationists and abolitionists, is practicable.

It is also desirable. It is true the liability of difference among good men in a good cause is common. It is a circumstance, too, which Satan is ever ready to make the most of, to his advantage and the disadvantage of the cause of truth and righteousness. We have occasion for caution, therefore, and wisdom in cases of delicacy and difficulty like the one under consideration.

There may be bad men, moreover, among both classes spoken of; slave-holders, or dealers, or men some way connected with such, who would perpetuate slavery, at least one generation more; abolitionists, too, who are impatient, rash, inflammatory, visionary and unreasonable. The slave-holding part of the country, and some of the colonizationists perhaps, are not enough impressed with the horrors of slavery, nor enough awake and determined to rid the land of the evil, and make it literally, as well as in name, a land of freedom. But the good men of both parties have the good of the slave and the speedier salvation of not only the slave but the world at heart. Now then is not union among good men desirable? It is always the devil's defeat in any cause. Union is strength, and strength among good men, is salvation to the country and the world. Union is desirable.

It is too a duty. The considerations just suggested show it, and others, proving the same, are not wanting. Contemplate the subject a moment, and mark how they rise, overwhelming in number and magnitude, in connexion with the benevolent efforts of the day and the interests of the church and the world. Africans are a part of the Gentiles, all whose fulness is to be brought in preparatory to the ingathering of the Jews and the final triumph of Christianity. They therefore are not alone concerned in what is done for them. The emancipation of them is connected with the emancipation of all nations—with their emancipation too from religious and political delusion, from ignorance, degradation, vice, immorality and debasement; it is a part of that grand achievement by which the world is to be regenerated, and in the accomplishment of which, the whole human family is to be carried forward to the acme of perfection, when the top-stone of the spiritual building shall be laid with shoutings of, GRACE, GRACE unto it. Especially is it the only hope for Africa and the slave in particular. Without colonization, Africa must remain as she is, degraded, oppressed and enslaved; with it, she may rise among the nations, and participate in the common bounty and salvation of God. Without abolition, too, the slave must remain a slave, forever denied the rights and privileges to which by nature he is as much entitled as his master. I know it is said the slave may remain in this country, although emancipated, and so we have no need of colonization; but the idea of their remaining and amalgamating with the whites, is a wild chimera, fit only for the brain of a zealot or an enthusiast of the most visionary character. And if they remain and do not amalgamate, the whites of the South must migrate to the North, and give the blacks the country;

which would be to tear the whites from their home, as much as it would be to tear the blacks from theirs, to colonize. Both colonization and abolition, therefore, are necessary, and their union a duty. Our obligations to the world and to Africa and the slaves in particular demand it.

So do the interests of the whites at the South, our brethren of this American Israel. To go on as they are going, they cannot. At every step, the prospect darkens, and the no distant result is appalling. Already do they begin to feel their insecurity and their danger. And though this were not the case; suppose them safe from insurrection and blood-shed, what is to become of the progress of the Gospel among them, and how are its principles to take effect? Known and felt they may be by some, but piety must ever weep over the not-to-be-named immoralities and abominations inseparable from slavery.

But the interests of the whites at the South are not the only interests which plead for union. A reason for it may be found in the interests of the country at large. The South and the North, the East and the West in this great Republic, are all intimately connected. The pulsations of a common life are constantly beating through them all, and the union of the states, is the happiness and glory of the country. Indeed, the dissolution of the Union would cast a gloom over the entire prospects of the whole human family, and seem to indicate that Satan was yet to reign awhile before he should be bound. Despots and tyrants would laugh in their sleeves, and cast reproach upon a country which boasted of her light and liberty and ability to govern herself, but from which had now departed her glory and her pride. And what but a direct way to mar this union and bring on a rupture between the North and the South, the East and the West, is the agitation, in a hostile manner, of the subject of slavery between abolitionists and colonizationists. The sensitiveness of the nation on great points of national interest, is well known, and need not be dwelt upon; nor need the evidence of its inflammatory tendency, as manifest from what has taken place within the last year or two, especially on the subject of the Tariff.

The artifice of Satan in tempting good men to differ, has been alluded to, and the union of abolitionists and colonizationists may be further urged on the ground of the apostolic injunction 'Resist the Devil.' It is not a slight consideration either, nor is it in a single instance only, brought to view in the Scriptures. We have the example of Christ in it for imitation. One apostle would not have us ignorant of the devices of Satan, or that he has devices, by which to ensnare us, if not wary. He commands us also not to give place to him. And another apos-

He charges us to resist him steadfast in the faith, or in adherence to right motives and right principles of conduct. We are to guard also against being led astray by the wicked, and our daily prayer should be that we may not be led into temptation, but be delivered from evil, even the evil one, or adversary.

I might urge, too, as a motive for union, the unseemliness of discord among brethren, and the folly of contending how we shall do a good thing, taking warning in this respect from Paul and Barnabas.

Wisdom also in making the most of time, strength, means, and effort, requires that we should be united. The effort of contention, whether on the part of colonizationists or abolitionists, is a misdirected, and therefore a lost effort. Wisdom requires that both direct their efforts to the single object, as early attained as possible, of putting every slave in possession of all the blessings, not only of freedom and individual relative right, but of elevation in personal character as to intelligence and moral resemblance to Jesus Christ. O how loud and imperious the call of wisdom to union!

Think, moreover, of the high and holy character of the general enterprize of benevolence in which the good of all parties in this and other countries throughout the world are engaged, and see how the consideration of this calls for union. 'I am doing a great work,' let every one say, 'I cannot come down to the arena of contention.' No; let the abolitionist press abolition, not seek to destroy the colonizationist; and the colonizationist, let him press still harder colonization, since that is what he is engaged in. Let each do his own work, as a coadjutor of the other in a common cause.

And one consideration more—a regard to personal responsibility in the case. This calls for union. The most stupid, one would think, must see that amazing results are depending here,—results in view of which, it ought to be a solemn question with every one, 'How is my influence likely to bear in the case?' The awful grandeur—political, moral, and spiritual, is overwhelming. The purity, happiness, and rising elevation—nay, the preservation and inviolability of the union of one nation, with the question of another's emancipation and exaltation, or continued bondage and degradation—the enjoyment in this life of millions born and unborn, and their eternal salvation in the life to come—these are the results depending in the case. And does it not become every one, therefore, to see not only that he be not drowsy and inactive, but that he lay out his activity and expend his energy at the right point? The thought expands to the introduction of other things beside the

the single one on which I have been remarking, but to confine attention to the subject under consideration, let the abolitionist and colonizationist, each press in his own way, but harmoniously, the GREAT PRINCIPLES OF DUTY, OF RIGHT, OF BENEVOLENCE TO MAN, OF LOVE TO GOD, OF GRATITUDE TO JESUS CHRIST.

But, perhaps it will be inquired, more particularly, what the benevolent who take different views of the subject before us, shall do in the present crisis of affairs in relation to it. I answer, first,—Govern their passions; second,—Maintain the law of love in their heart and on their tongue; and third—Do with their might what, ‘by light and love,’ they can to meliorate the condition of the species—of the African and of every other man.

And if it be said this is all general, vague, and indeterminate, and the inquiry still be put, ‘How shall a man do this?’ I answer, by speaking—by writing—by printing and distributing what is printed among all who can read. It must, of course, be the truth and be presented as such with all plainness and fidelity. But such is the way; and whatever other way there may be, as that particularly of pecuniary contributions and prayer, let it be improved.

The present crisis evidently calls for moderation, kindness, and discretion in every thing. What is called for beside what is suggested in these particulars, is what has been dwelt upon in general, namely, harmony, union, concord, with consequent energy and strength. Indeed, this one thing of union, if it be in holy love with prayer and benevolence, will do wonders, and accomplish everything; because this is what Heaven smiles on, and where he smiles, success crowns the effort. Controversy is sometimes necessary, and good comes out of it; but it is to be deprecated among friends, and where the parties are both the advocates of truth and patrons in common of the general objects of benevolence; nor is it controversy among such, but love, faith, prayer, effort and the giving of the substance yea, the giving of one’s self, that is to accomplish the object. Yes, it is love and compassion for the wretched, the love of Christ and compassion like that which he manifested—it is these that are to melt down the the world and prepare it for the impress of his holiness. ‘Behold how they love each other,’ should be the ireresistible appeal; and then another scarcely less effectual, ‘and no man said ought that he had was his own.’ Let these traits of character be acted out—let them appear throughout the nation—let there be harmony and love and benevolence after this sort; and who need care for nullification, or tariff, or abolition in opposition to colonization, things once dreaded, but now known

only as past and gone. O yes, union, this blessed union of all the good! the gates of hell even, shall never prevail against it.

It may require some apology, Mr. Editor, that I should wish to speak in your pages after this manner, and I confess I am not sure that there is any occasion. It is to be hoped, that the growing excitement on the subject of slavery may prove only as the necessary but harmless effervescence accompanying the action of affinities and repulsions in the glorious change so devoutly to be wished; but it is to be remembered also, that it may prove as the preparatory action of a galvanic battery of sufficient power in the discharge, to sever the Union and dash the hopes of the world. No exceptions, therefore, need be taken. Caution, if it do not stifle enterprize and prevent effort, will do no harm; and it was the maxim of the father of his country, 'in peace to be prepared for war.'

---

## REVIEWS.

---

*Φρόνημα τῷ Πνεύματος*, OR THE GRACE AND DUTY OF BEING SPIRITUALLY MINDED. By JOHN OWEN, D. D. *Abridged by* EBENEZER PORTER, D. D., *President of the Theological Seminary, Andover.* Boston Peirce & Parker. 1833. 12mo. pp. 211.

Every age has its own peculiar character. Take the entire lifetime of the world thus far, and no two have been alike. Call up any of the long series of past generations, and not only will their costume and behavior appear peculiar, but so will their intellectual, social and moral character. How different the simplicity of patriarchal times from the luxury and splendor of the times of Solomon. And where are the points of resemblance between the thousands who partook of the universal phrenzy of the Crusades, and those who afterwards commenced and led on the Reformation, or those who in our day have commenced and are carrying on the work of Missions and the various other modern enterprizes of benevolence.

Now whatever the age, it is important for those who live in it and would be useful, to study well its characteristics. Calvin and Luther and the other reformers were powerful men in the

age in which they lived. But were they to come forward now, just as they were when they lived and did so much, they would find themselves ill adapted to engage at once in the labors of the present age. They would quickly adjust themselves, no doubt, to whatever should invite their efforts, but they would need to become acquainted with the character of the age, before they could employ themselves to the best advantage; and the more perfectly they should become acquainted with it the more perfectly would they become adapted to be useful, and the higher usefulness would they attain.

What then are some of the characteristics of the present age? We cannot go into them at length, but they are, generally, and in a word, wakefulness and enterprize; and this is true of evil as well as of good.

We would not expose ourselves to the charge of being cynical and captious, or doubtful of the good, and disposed to augment the evil. We fully accord to what we suppose is the prevailing sentiment of the community around us, and of the world in general, that no age has ever been so buoyant in hopeful expectation. The day we believe has more than dawned—the day of redemption. The twilight is passing away. Already the summits of the distant hills are crowned with golden lustre. Vallies remain here and there where the shadows still linger, but in these, and even in the remotest glen, the darkness has disappeared or is fast retiring, and the sun is coming up rapidly to his meridian height, to shed on all at once the effulgence of his glory. Not only are the enterprizes which have been alluded to in successful progress, but so also is all that which is opposed to their complete accomplishment, in a state of decay and dissolution. Paganism is crumbling and tottering to its fall. Mohammedanism is qualmish with mortal sickness. And Infidelity and Popery, though active through restiveness, and fitfully bold and daring through conscious guilt and incipient despair alternating with lingering hope, are ghastly and pale; anticipating more and more their doom, and knowing apparently, that their time is short. The results contemplated in the moral providence of God are developing more and more, and cannot be prevented. The winter may struggle to hold dominion, and yield reluctantly to spring, but spring must come, and the summer succeed. And if in the life of man, youth and manhood and the full maturity of years, are destined in due time to succeed infancy and childhood; so in the life of the world, that maturity is coming fast to be realized. The changes which in everything and everywhere, are taking place—ominous though some of them may be in themselves considered—will no doubt

hasten it. Indeed, we fear not for changes, merely because they are changes. Improvement implies change, and unless we would be stationary and never improve where we really might, we must not be offended or alarmed at changes. What a change from the Jewish to the Christian dispensation ! yet who would not have had it take place. What a change from Popery to Protestantism ! and who would go back to the dark ages. How great, too, the more recent and more gradual change which has taken place within the last century or even half century ! and yet who would return to the state of former ages when not only science in some respects and the arts of life, but principles and modes of education, the reciprocal obligations of man to man, and all the activities of a more and more wakeful, expanded and expansive benevolence, were but imperfectly understood. It would be to turn back the sunny morning into the shadows of the night—though we had slept long enough, and would now be at our work. No ; the prospect we would hail with joy. The same God reigns, who reigned of old, and they who feared in former days, were they now alive to see what has become of the things they feared, would blush for their want of faith, and awake to new confidence and diligence in duty, leaving events with God.

Yet one thing further. With all that is so cheering and animating—and though ‘God will provide,’ it is through means that he operates, and we have need of caution. We cannot specify everything in relation to which we need it, but we need it in relation to many things, and to none more, perhaps, than to that self-confidence and self-gratulation, which from the circumstances of the age in which we live, so naturally insinuate themselves and win upon our acceptance. We speak of professors of religion, particularly, and the caution we would suggest is: “Be not high-minded, but fear.” It is lamentable for a Christian professor to be in the condition of the spouse in the song of Solomon, when she complains, ‘but mine own vineyard have I not kept,’ but it is to be feared, that not a few in this age of religious activity, have too much occasion to adopt her language in relation to personal piety and the state of their hearts towards God ; and we verily believe that here lies the principal danger in relation to all that otherwise is so fair and promising. Our dangers, like our duties, are as our circumstances and the character of the age in which we live. We need wakefulness and enterprize, and these guided by discretion and Christian wisdom, cannot be possessed in too eminent a degree ; but in order to possess the wisdom, we must “ask of God, who giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not ;” and this is necessary, not

only for the few who lead the movements, but for the many who furnish the means. Only Moses' hands need be 'stayed up,' but they must be sustained by others as well as himself,—not excepting, through their faith, the whole congregation. And if Israel failed at first to enter Canaan, as they might, through want of enterprize and confidence in God, it was yet a humble confidence and a holy enterprize that was needed; and often afterwards when they would prevail against their enemies, they were discomfited to their confusion and the exposure of their presumption. Nor need we fear, that a humble dependence on God and the cultivation of a broken and contrite spirit, will damp the ardor of religious zeal, or check the wakefulness of religious enterprize. Whatever danger of this sort there may have been in a former age, it has passed away now. Holy love is active in its nature, and now that the channels for it to flow in, are opened so broad and deep and in such numbers, too, there can be no danger of stagnation. The only danger is, that the fountain in the Christian's heart will become dried up, or degenerate into a spurious character, through lack of frequent, near, lonely communion with God and Christ. Ministers are in danger, and private Christians are in danger: while therefore the diligence and the activity cannot be too great, the aim cannot be too single to glorify God, nor the dependence for success too entire on his GRACE.

And here is just where, if Christians will read and apply the truth to their hearts, we anticipate an advantage from such works as this before us. We regret not being able to go into the subject as we could wish, but we are convinced of nothing more fully, than of the importance of a continually growing state of piety in all our churches, in order to permanent valuable Christian enterprize and action; and we venture the few suggestions here presented, not only to welcome the publication of Owen, which we think timely in this respect, but in hope also of calling out some of our correspondents or others who may have time and ability to present the subject as it should be presented, and do it justice. It is a subject which deserves a thorough discussion, and whoever will take it up as it ought to be taken up, will do a good work and promote the cause of Christ. In the mean time a revision of some of the old authors may be of service, and this of Owen is commendable and worthy. 'The Spiritual Mindedness is a book which, in this day of active exertion, is well worthy to be possessed by every Christian family, and to be repeatedly read with prayer and meditation, by every professor of religion who would have even 'a name to live.' Dr. Owen lived in an age very different from the present, and

though possibly, were he now to appear among us just as he was when alive, some of our more ordinary or less informed Christians might say a great many wakeful things to him about Missions and the distribution of the Bible, the circulation of Tracts and the Education of young men for the Christian ministry, and many other benevolent operations preparatory to the wider and more rapid spread of the gospel; yet, compared with him, how little acquainted with the heart would almost any the more advanced and experienced Christians feel, on being introduced to his society, or privileged to attend on his ministry. We speak, of course, in general terms only, and we know there are exceptions; but to so great an extent are we the creatures of circumstance; and while our circumstances are favorable to the development of all the activities of an enlarged and growing benevolence, but not so favorable to the cultivation of an acquaintance with the heart, his were more favorable to the latter, and less to the former. No doubt the good man would be much obliged to us and not a little rejoiced at all we might tell him of what God is doing in our day; but why shall not we be equally glad to hear from him respecting a devout and holy and spiritual life. He is gone it is true, and cannot be benefited by us. But may we not by him? Undoubtedly we may. Though dead, he yet speaketh; and few speak so much to the purpose respecting Christian experience and the life of piety in the soul. Baxter is not less powerful in the appeals of reason to the conscience, and the sense of obligation in man, and Bunyan is not wanting in true penitence for sin; but without the seeming legality of the one, or the real facetiousness of the other, Owen is right onward to the heart, with all seriousness and solemnity.\* No one can read him, especially in the work now under consideration, without feeling that he is holding intercourse with a master spirit in things pertaining to God and holiness, and the way of salvation by Jesus Christ.

In an age, then, when the question, 'Am I a Christian?'—though one of the most important that can be asked, and one which used in practice to be thought much of, is wont to be answered, as we fear is too often the case, in a superficial manner, how valuable such a book! And in an age when the attention is so much turned—very benevolently and very laudably to be sure—but *so much* turned towards the duty of doing for

\* Dr. Owen was the son of *Henry Owen*, fifteenth great grandson of *Lewis Owen* of *Kwyn*, near *Dollegelle*, in *North Wales*, through his grand-daughter *Susan*, who married *Humphrey Owen* of the same family in another line. He was born at *Stadham* in *Oxfordshire*, *England*, 1616, and died at *Ealing* near *London*, *August 24*, 1683. He was a non-conformist, first a *Presbyterian*, but afterwards a *congregationalist*, a distinguished scholar and a more distinguished Christian.

others, how desirable that we should read such books as this of Owen! a book which shall lead us not to overlook ourselves—lead us, indeed, to cultivate that genuine piety, without which, all these kind attentions to others will ere long fail, or spoil on our hands, like unsound goods. Not to supersede the Bible, or the judicious and well conducted paper or periodical, the perusal of such books is a means of grace, a means of grace admirably adapted, too, to the necessities of Christians of the present day; and perhaps it is one of the ends for which such good men as Owen and Baxter and Flavel and others of like character, were called to live in circumstances adapted to lead to a more intimate acquaintance with the heart, that in this respect they might bless us, who seem to be ‘all outward bound.’ Let us not defraud them then of their reward.

But it is time that we give some account of the *Spiritual Mindedness* as abridged by Dr. Porter. From some remarks in the preface, the remote occasion, it would seem, which led him to undertake it, is to be traced to his childhood, and particularly to the impressions made on his mind by the perusal of Baxter’s *Saint’s Rest*. “In the family of my father,” he remarks, “under whose Christian influence, it was the merciful allotment of Providence, that my childhood should be spent, there was a small library, consisting chiefly of religious books. Those not strictly religious, were yet of useful tendency; so that until the age of twelve years, when my academical education began, I had never seen a single *bad* book. In this little paternal library was Baxter’s *Saint’s Rest*, the reading of which, on account of its simplicity, its rhetorical vivacity, its Christian fervor and pungency, made an indelible impression on my mind.”—He goes on to remark, that the circumstance of his interest in Baxter, led him subsequently to an acquaintance with his cotemporaries, among whom was Owen. Afterwards to promote spirituality of mind as a minister and fit him the better for the discharge of the high and holy duties of the sacred office, he was led to the daily reading of a portion of some one of these authors in connexion with his closet devotions—the same which many ministers may be excited to do by his example—and hence, at length, this abridgement of Owen. The whole account is worthy of notice, too, for the hint it contains about family libraries. We do not remember the *Saint’s Rest* at so early an age, nor the *Grace and Duty* of being spiritually minded, but we do another of Owen’s treatises, the *Indwelling Sin*, and this has almost constantly been before our minds in the reading of the one before us. We wish, too, it were abridged and published anew, as this is, and we hope Dr. Porter will do

it, as he intimates he may abridge another still of Owen's treatises, the 130th Psalm. We were about to say, also, happy are those families, however retired and undistinguished, of which the children as they come forward to distinction in after life, can say they never saw a '*bad* book till they were twelve years of age.' Blest remains of our Pilgrim Fathers! May the religious purity and simplicity of their family habits long linger among their unworthy descendants.

As to the amount of abridgement the work has undergone, we should think it nearly one third; and as a specimen of the manner in which, principally, it has been made, we subjoin the following given by Dr. Porter himself, the brackets denoting the parts omitted by erasure.

"I shall first show what the spiritual mind is, [and wherein it doth consist,] and then how [it doth evidence itself, so that] we may form a right judgment whether it be in us or not.

"This is the best [and most sure] indication of the inward [frame and] state of the mind. For if it be so, [on the one side] as [un] to the carnal mind, it is so, [on the other] as [un] to the spiritual. Wherefore to be spiritually minded, is to have the course [and stream] of [those thoughts which we ordinarily retreat unto, which we approve of as suited unto] our affections [to be] about spiritual things.

"When any efficacious conviction passes on the mind, it forces [the egress of] its thoughts up[wards] towards heavenly things, [it will think much and frequently of them,] as if that were their proper motion and course; but so soon as the power of the conviction [decays or] wears off, and the mind is no more sensible of its [force and] impression, the thoughts return [again un] to their old course [and track] as the water tends downwards."

It will be seen by this about what has been done, and how without his verbiage we have all the pith and sentiment of the author, with all his discrimination, spirituality and fervor. We cannot but think the volume a valuable one for the closet.

---

THE HARBINGER OF THE MILLENNIUM: *With an Appendix.* By WILLIAM COGSWELL, *Secretary of the American Education Society.* Boston: Peirce and Parker. pp. 362.

The author of this book is favorably known to the religious public as actively engaged in the great cause of benevolent enterprise. His connexion with the Education Society for some years past has without doubt led him to the survey which he has here taken of the mighty schemes now in operation for the

conversion of the world. There is no society in existence whose plans and movements more naturally lead the mind of one connected with them, to a contemplation of the whole system of religious efforts, than the American Education Society. We cannot omit to pay a passing tribute of respect and veneration to this noble enterprize. No one has probably looked over the various means for the conversion of the world, without thinking how useless they would all be without the ministry of the Gospel. "How can they hear without a preacher?" is a question which was intended to affirm a most important truth. The Bible is dependent upon the living preacher for its efficacy as the sword of the Spirit; missionary operations depend upon heralds to publish the messages of God. Our local churches, on whose prosperity all the movements of the Church depend, must be supplied with able and faithful and efficient men. Then, the cause of Tract Distribution, of Sabbath Schools, and other religious efforts look to ministers for their support, and would be comparatively inefficient without the stated ministry of the Gospel. There seems to be a peculiar appropriateness, therefore, that such a book as the one before us, embracing notices of all the grand enterprizes of the Church, should proceed from one who holds the office of which the author is the incumbent.

This is the only work with which we are acquainted that brings together the numerous benevolent plans of the present day in one connected harmonious view. The plan of the work at its first announcement appeared to be novel, and like all happy thoughts, seemed so obvious and desirable, that we wondered it had not before occurred to some of the spiritual surveyors who are employed about the towers and bulwarks of Zion. It brings before the mind at once all which the friends of Christ are doing for the advancement of the latter day glory. In looking at the book one feels as he does after a return from "the Anniversaries," though, while like them it makes the important enterprizes revolve before the mind, it does not occasion the fatigue and uneasiness of listening, nor is it attended with the same liability of losing half the impression which is made, by crowds, and by strange, or recognized faces. It is a family portrait of Christianity, including the likenesses of twelve or fifteen sisters, beautiful as Tirzah, comely as Jerusalem. Who would ever think that any could regard them as jealous of each other, or praise one of them with feelings of deterioration or disparagement of the rest! They are as much one, as a constellation made up of many stars; and in fact they are all "Pointers" to the day star on high. One great excel-

lence in the spirit in which this book is written, is the catholic feeling which seems to fill the author's mind while contemplating the various organizations for the same great cause. It is not *his* Society, or *his* plans which it is the object of this work to exhibit, but the united though various measures in which the followers of his Lord and Master are engaged for the advancement of the kingdom of Heaven.

The title of the book is as novel as its plan. The eyes of the Church have in all ages been directed to a glorious but far distant time, when the knowledge of the Lord is to cover the earth as the waters cover the seas. What rapturous emotions did the anticipation of that day awaken in the minds of the old Prophets! How abrupt and startling, as is always the case in a highly excited state of mind, all their expressions when, as the Spirit of God lifted them up, they caught a glimpse of the Saviour and his reign! How has the theme of Millennial glory pierced the thoughts and feelings of bards in every successive age. COWPER, on whom the spirit of the latter day glory seemed to be poured, has expressed, once for all, the feelings which every Christian has in looking forward to those illustrious scenes, so that whoever begins to write upon the Millennium is here to end with

“O scenes surpassing fable, and yet true,”—

when the dwellers in the vales and on the mountain tops shall shout to each other;—each song beginning and ending with “Worthy the Lamb for he was slain for us,” till

—“Earth rolls the rapturous hosanna round.”

In order that this day may dawn upon the world, it is first necessary that the appropriate and appointed means should be used by the followers of Christ, to send the Gospel to every creature. If any one will read the book before us he will see what is to be done, and in what manner the Church is to do it. The successive arrangement in the book of the several means to be used to advance the Millennium is judicious, but were we to arrange them in the order of cause and effect we should first of all speak of the necessity of providing for a *Supply of Ministers*. As a means of this, let the most diligent and earnest attention be given to *Sabbath Schools*, that young minds may be forestalled with a holy influence before error and sin have perverted or wasted their useful energies. *Revivals of Religion* must be sought for to bring in laborers to the harvest,—especially from our literary institutions, as well as to increase the

number and the piety of members of Churches, and make them more efficient in the work of benevolence. As means of extending Revivals, we would speak of the *Promotion of TEMPERANCE*, in the largest acceptation of that term. The *Peace Society*, also, must occupy a greater share in the interest of the Churches; for the effect of war upon morals and religion is written in vivid and frightful characters in the history of New England. All nations must learn the principles of peace, or Christianity cannot spread over the earth. Then, the great work of *Foreign Missions, Distribution of the Scriptures*, and of *Tracts* must be followed up with increasing energy. As a further means of accomplishing the designs of such enterprises, Christians must unite to promote the *Observance of the Sabbath*, without which as the great mainspring of religious observances, every thing of a moral and religious nature will deteriorate and decay. In connection with the general cause of benevolence, and as a part of Christian efforts necessary to the bringing in of the latter day glory, all good men must labor for the *Reformation of Prisoners*, and especially for the *Abolition of Involuntary Servitude*. As a grand auxiliary to the spread of the Gospel, *the abundance of the seas* must be converted unto God. As a sequel for the commencement of the great day, the Church must look and labor to promote, with special interest, the *Conversion of the Jews*.

All these departments of benevolent religious enterprise, together with the kindred subjects of charitable contributions, and benevolent agencies, Mr. Cogswell has treated of in the work before us in a very fundamental, thorough, and interesting manner. The sentiments advanced in the book upon all these subjects are such as will meet the views and feelings of every real Christian, because there is nothing sectional or denominational in them. We believe that all who are engaged in the labor of doing good will love to have this work by them as the text-book of benevolent activity. There is also much valuable instruction upon religious subjects interspersed through the volume. We would refer particularly to the chapter on the *Distribution of the Scriptures*, and to the notes connected with that chapter, in which the author in a summary manner alludes to the evidence of the plenary Inspiration of the Book of God. Such remarks as are given in this connection are extremely judicious, reminding the Christian, by placing before him a view of the leading evidences, that in distributing the Scriptures, he is not following or circulating cunningly devised fables. We were also much gratified with similar remarks in connection with the *Dissertation on the Sabbath*,—a subject

which notwithstanding all that has been done and written in regard to it, lies in the minds of numerous Christians in a vague, uncertain state. To all such, the remarks upon the subject in this volume cannot fail to be profitable. For these reasons, the work is valuable as a convenient book of reference, as embracing the leading arguments and considerations which the great enterprizes of the present day proceed. The Appendix, containing historical and statistical matter, is a part of the work exhibiting great and persevering labor. We venture to say that many a tedious hour was spent in searching for some of the details in that collection; and many a future compiler will thank its author for saving him a vast amount of toil. The body of the book, as well as the Appendix, gives proof of great industry in the preservation of important facts connected with its various topics. The Author has evidently been one who in studies of this character has not labored in vain nor spent his strength for nought; for on almost every page are discovered the marks of a curious, busy and retentive mind.

The word MILLENNIUM attached to a book has been considered of late years by many as only another name for fanaticism; and its Author has been consigned to the number of visionary speculatists, and forgotten; or else remembered to grace the long enumeration of exploded theories, or to illustrate the perversion of the human faculties. That men have written upon this subject in such a manner as to expose themselves and their theme to ridicule, it is useless to deny. Sometimes the only motive in writing the book has appeared to be a love of gain. We have heard of a clergyman who many years since published a work to prove that the day of judgment and the end of the world would come in twenty years. Soon after the appearance of the book, he built a house with brick ends, which was at once considered by his people as an indication that he did not believe in his own theory, and that he had reaped the reward and gained the only object of his lucubrations. Now, this was too solemn a subject for an eccentric man to draw into contempt; and doubtless the effect of such speculations upon the minds of many already inclined to mock at religion and its ministers was, to give them occasion to fortify themselves against the truth. The seat of the scornful is crowded with "respectable" scoffers, who make the name of "the Millennium" an occasion for their thoughtless mirth. Doubtless they have long since regarded it as a sort of "Philosophers stone" in religion, because so many have made pretensions to some great discovery. The language of multitudes now is, as in the days of

Peter, "Where is the promise of his coming?" It is necessary that all who write upon "the Millennium" should bear this in mind; and we think that in this respect all which this book contains upon the subject is unexceptionable and very commendable. Without referring to the numberless theories which have been framed, or venturing one of his own, our Author lays down a proposition which every believer in revelation will approve, and which we think is all that can be said in regard to the time of the Millennium. The proposition is this: *There will be a time, in which the church of God will be in a state of far greater prosperity than it has ever yet been.* In regard to the characteristics of that time, the writer observes the "words of truth and soberness." The impression which his remarks are fitted to make on Christians is, that the Millennium is not a day of sudden brightness, with the appearance of which they have no more to do than with the breaking out of the sun after a long storm; but that it is essentially a time when the people will be all righteous; when benevolent efforts will have been made to the utmost of the ability of the church, and crowned with divine blessing; and therefore that the sooner the church begins to live and act for the Millennium, the sooner it will begin to appear. This we feel to be agreeable to the word of God; and directly opposed to the indolent and wretched spirit of many professors who, unlike the saints of old, make the divine predictions the pillows of their sloth, and every glorious promise a soporific drug. It is wonderful to observe, in reading the Old Testament, that by as much as an event was foretold with great clearness and certainty, the prayers, and intercessions with God, for its accomplishment rose to a degree of agony which could not be uttered! When Christians learn the secret of such piety, and the divine decrees are sought for in the Bible only, as the foundation and encouragement of their efforts; when they go to the word of God with full and breaking hearts, crying, "O that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion, and to see whether the promises of God warrant all their earnest desires, then," as each new prediction breaks upon their minds they will pour out their souls in prayers, and spend their strength in efforts which will be the sure presages of the Millennial years.

Suppose that to-day a voice should be heard from Heaven, saying, "The kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ." The annunciation would be to many Christians only a voice of alarm and terror. There is so little of the "latter day" spirit in their hearts and lives, that the sound would seem a precursor of some dreadful com-

motion in the earth, and perhaps would terrify them as much as the judgment trumpet. Oh what a change must take place in the church of Christ before the dawn of the Millennium! How high must be the standard of Christian character, how different a thing to pass for a Christian than at present! We learn this from an expression in one of the prophets: "Who may abide the day of his coming? and who can stand when he appeareth? for he shall be like a refiner's fire and like fullers' soap!" These words were spoken primarily in reference to the coming of the Messiah, who was to extend the application of the law of God to the thoughts and intents of the heart; but the passage waits, without doubt, for its *fulfilment* till the coming of Christ in his power and glory to set up his kingdom. Then there will be such tests of sincerity and of real attachment to his cause, that sinners in Zion will be afraid: fearfulness will surprise the hypocrite. No one will then be able to make a profession, enter the visible church, and sink into a sleep. Voices will break into his ears, "Behold the Bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him." "The master is come and calleth for thee." Every insincere professor will then be made manifest; the times will call for such ardent devotion, that no one can sustain the relation of a church member, who is not a saint, elect and precious.

It is evident, then, that before the coming of the Millennium, the standard of Christian character will be greatly raised. In order to sustain the mighty efforts which must be made for the conversion of the world, Christians must know more of the spirit of such texts as these. "The love of Christ constraineth us;" "No man liveth unto himself, and no man dieth unto himself." The miserable life which many now lead of entire devotedness to the present world will be changed for a life whose great end, in all its business, in all its cares, will be the glory of God. It is therefore in vain that any look for the appearance of the Millennium before the churches awake and put on more beautiful garments than they now wear. The disputes and divisions and jealousies which rend some of Christ's flocks must quickly cease; the indifference manifested towards the souls of men must be done away by a spirit of self-denying and disinterested labors for others, and every Christian must present his body a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God. Without this, the book which we have now considered would be merely a description of a splendid dumb show, and all the Societies here enumerated, with their mighty projects, would be only the pageantry of pride. They cannot by any means redeem a soul from death, unless accompanied by the blessing of God, and that blessing will not be

given except in answer to the prayers, and in consequence of the spiritual life of the church. The great body of Christians may contribute as much as they have already, and swell their contributions ten-fold, but unless they are themselves "*Holiness to the Lord*," it seems to us as if these offerings would be like treasures stripped from dead bodies, and that a secret pollution would go with them, preventing the blessing of that God who is a spirit. The kingdom of Christ is a spiritual kingdom; great projects, great piles of treasure are nothing to him, unless they promote in the hearts of their originators, and of those who are intended to be benefitted by them, a state of sanctification. How useless would have been the gold, the crimson, the blue, the precious decorations of the ark of the covenant, the altar, the splendid vessels, the awful scenery of the temple, without the spiritual presence of Jehovah! How useless to think of building the temple of grace without a corresponding spirituality! The sending forth of missionaries, the contribution of treasure, the raising of places of worship, the industrious dissemination of the good seed, will be useless unless Christians remember this truth: *Ye are God's husbandry. Ye are God's building.* When, therefore, we see the churches of Christendom anxious for the promotion of pure and undefiled religion within themselves, when questions of merely local or personal interests are merged in great efforts for a more spiritual life in the Christian body, when each professor feels the solemn responsibility resting upon him in particular, to be a holy, humble, zealous follower of Christ, and instead of leaving the work of his own sanctification to be done for him by his minister, or by the merely foreign or external influence upon his soul of religious assemblies; when he lives to labor, instead of laboring to live, and the spirit of the early Christians spreads through his soul and pervades the whole church, we shall see the day dawn, and the glorious things which are spoken of the city of God will begin to appear. For then the power of religion will go forth from every church upon the surrounding community, and you might as well believe that the light of the rising sun could be shut down below the horizon, as that the influence of such a body of Christians would not be felt by the world. We believe that as it is inherent in the nature of light to shine, so it is impossible but that spiritual religion should exert an immediate influence upon the characters of impenitent men. And as upon the appearance of the sun, a thousand plants and flowers, feeling the stimulating influence of its rays, open to the day, so will a surrounding community feel a pervading influence from a spiritual

church, though composed of only a few humble names. We also believe that it is the nature of divine truth whenever preached to produce an immediate effect. "Is not my word like a fire and like the hammer to break the flinty rock in pieces?" It is quick, and powerful; and whenever, if declared in a proper manner, it does not accomplish its great design, it is in consequence of adverse influences. Amongst these without doubt is the chilling influence of a dead church. A stringed instrument carried into a damp atmosphere, losing the elasticity of its strings, gives no desirable music, and a congregation of sinners addressed with ever so much skill, and power, if surrounded by a prayerless, unconcerned, and worldly minded church, will not respond to the exhortations and entreaties of the minister of God. Each professor, with only a name to live, is to the mind of the sinner, a contradiction, of all the amazing truths which are sounded from the pulpit. Hence we see the necessity of a praying church in order to a revival of religion in the congregation. For the influence of prayer is not confined to a straight line ascending and descending between earth and heaven. Prayer in the souls of Christians has a radiating power, and spreads diffusively upon other souls. Let but one man be a man of prayer, a man who walks with God, and knows the hidden life of a Christian, and you cannot be with that man without feeling his sanctifying influence. There is no element or even sublimation in chemistry whose unseen virtue goes on in its mysterious, searching and all pervading power, that is more subtile, or more immediately efficacious than the influence of spirit on spirit. But when the spirit is highly spiritualized, it has received a quick, and irrepressible tendency; and this baptism from above is as perceptible to every one as though the Holy Spirit were seen descending upon it from heaven.

This spiritual influence cannot be imparted by words merely, or by good deeds, by alms-giving, or by contributions for the heathen. Yet without it, the kingdom of Christ, which is a spiritual kingdom, will never be established in the world. We look with amazement upon those who seem to feel that the Saviour's kingdom and the Millennium are to be advanced, merely by giving, and by planning and projecting; as if the command 'Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight,' would be fulfilled by *laying out* the tracks of benevolent enterprises, and *grading* their ways. When a powerful appeal is made to an assembly upon some benevolent object, and the hearers are constrained to set apart some of their property for this object, and feel their obligations to do more than they have done in the way of such communication, we have often

wished that an appeal as powerful and lasting in its effects could be made to impress them with this thought, that *it is as much a duty which they owe to the cause of Christ, and a more effectual means of building up his kingdom, to begin thenceforth to deny ungodliness and every worldly lust, and to live holy, soberly and righteously in the world, as to give money for the spread of the gospel.* Because this truth is not felt and practised upon by Christians at large, we are called to mourn over the suspension of divine influences upon the churches. Should every church understand and feel this truth, and every member, with fasting and weeping, and turning unto the Lord, begin to live and to pray as Christians will do in the Millennium, we should not long inquire why there are no revivals of religion. There would be a revival in every soul, in the whole church, and as they lay prostrate in prayer, the minister from his watch tower would cry, Get ye up, for there is a sound of abundance of rain. We have lately tried special efforts to bring the truths of the Bible near to the hearts of men; the results were great and good, but as the consequence of such uncommon efforts, a languor pervades the churches of our land. A further trial of such measures for the present, at least would not be advisable; because a second effort, unless it goes beyond the first, is likely to do injury, and by the loss of their novelty such would likely to be the effect of a repetition of these once powerful measures. We have tried external means of a public nature; perhaps God is about to lead his children to great conquests by a more simple, private and humbling way. It may be that we are now to learn the power of holy living and of prayer; the power of spirituality, a steady, burning and shining light, sending out its rays of mercy upon the dreadful darkness. We long to see the experiment tried. We should be glad if ministers would enter into a concert of feeling upon this subject; for the sentiments which have been advanced are too obvious not to have occurred to them already, or not to have commended themselves oftentimes, to their good judgment. Many of the servants of Christ seem to be hesitating what course it is best for the churches to pursue for the promotion of religion amongst us. Is there not great need that they should labor to raise the standard of Christian character,—of a holy life? This will be done before the coming of the latter-day glory, and will be a means, as well as a presage, of its advancement.

We can easily conceive of a time near at hand when the burden of preaching and exhortation will be, that Christians should “be holy, even as” Christ is “holy;” and as of late, *immediate repentance* has been enforced upon sinners, that

immediate, thorough and persevering efforts will be urged upon every Christian to become a vessel sanctified and fit for the Master's use. We all know what the effect has been when a great truth like that of the duty of immediate repentance has possessed the minds of ministers simultaneously, and each has gathered strength from his brethren to enforce it upon his own hearers. Suppose that the conviction of greater holiness in ministers and private Christians should enter and fill the minds of a large association or conference; that by prayer and supplication they should themselves receive an unction from the Holy One, and then begin to call their church members to repentance, and prayer, to the denial of every sin, to the abandonment of every evil way, to the entire dedication of themselves, and all that they have and are to God; that they should in a more heart-searching and trying manner point out the evidences of experimental piety, undeceive or at least alarm, or else make manifest, the hypocrite, and show each professor the wickedness of an undecided and negligent spirit; and then by telling them that CHRIST IS IN THEM, except they be reprobates, and by setting before them the hope of their calling, and the exceeding honor and glory of being the sons of God, lead them on to the cultivation of a holy life, to fervent and more frequent prayer, and to earnest desires for the conversion of the world! Soon would the churches rise in their beauty and strength; the world around them would feel the enlightening and purifying influence; sinners would flock to Christ as doves to their windows; the missionary spirit, the very spirit of true Christianity, would pervade all hearts, and we should soon feel that the day of the Lord was at hand. But it is well known that concert is a great means of individual and private benefit, and the simultaneous movement of ministers and Christians towards the attainment of a greater spirituality in the churches, and for the lifting up of a higher standard of Christian character, would be a powerful means of introducing *measures* for the general promotion of religion, which, to say the least, could not be rejected because they were *new*, nor yet fail to commend themselves to those who are seeking for "*new measures.*" We cannot imagine that any real Christian, however just his disapprobation of some of the means which have been resorted to for the furtherance of religion, can object to entering his closet, bewailing his private sins, and parting with them forever, and coming forth to spend a new life of spiritual and circumspect walking with God. Are we not all as unprepared for the Millennium as we should be for the coming of the judgment! If the latter-day glory is ever to rise upon the world, must there not be a different state of

things in our churches; must it not be a more difficult thing than at present to pass for a Christian without the power of godliness in the heart; must not Christians know more of the nature and efficacy, and also of the practice of intercessory prayer? Must not the time fast come when that obstinate spirit in which some professors resist every effort of their brethren to do good shall be made to cease by the exercise, at first, of long-suffering and kind exhortation, and then, if necessary, of a prompt discipline? How much longer shall churches live with members within them who have cherished old feuds for years, and have gone to the communion with feelings in their hearts towards each other, like splinters covered with festering and "proud flesh?" How near to the Millennium shall we come while professors go about in a gossiping, tale-bearing spirit, speaking evil of one brother, and reproachfully of another, and despitefully of all? Is it a fore-token of that approaching day, that some professors are so zealous for what is right, that they cannot meet for prayer with other professors, who in their opinion are guilty of things of which they have never been convinced, and respecting which others as holy as themselves are not prepared to say that they are sinful? Is it "Millennial" to bite and devour each other?—or to be separated from offices of mutual good-will by prejudice? What mockery must splendid offerings, made by such churches, appear in the sight of heaven! The gift of the Holy Ghost cannot be purchased for the heathen with money, while Christians are driving him out of their hearts and sanctuaries! It is wrong to suffer the consciousness of evil in our own hearts, or the contemplation of it in others; to damp our zeal, or hinder our efforts, but there are times, we know, when many seem to feel as Elijah did when he threw himself down under the juniper tree, and gave up his efforts in despair, because of abounding iniquity. This is exceedingly wrong; all impatience, or hasty words, or despairing thoughts at the wickedness of the wicked, or at the manifold imperfections and sins of professors, are a violation of the spirit of Christ. Still no one can avoid the reflection, that societies, and donations, and organized efforts are useless without sanctification in the hearts of Christians. Taking even a mercenary view of the subject, we cannot see in what manner the opening fields of labor and the demands for increased supplies are to be met, without such a state of love to God and Christ, and the souls of men, as shall dispose the churches to greater sacrifices and efforts. But could this be effected while things remain as they now are, we should soon have Christianized heathen preachers and church members transported across the waters, to make us

ashamed of the superior manner in which they have learned Christ. We believe that no one will think that we are advocating the doctrines of the Perfectionists, when we say these things, or that we are recommending asceticism or a seclusive religion. But we do think that the piety of Thomas A. Kempis and of William Law needs to be added to the characters of those who seem to make religion consist merely in *the will*, and holiness and devotedness to God to be matters of religious bustle. We also think that it is too easy a thing for half instructed and half converted professors to enter the church, and too easy to remain there, when it is made manifest that they are not of God. It is also acknowledged by many that there is a common rate piety which is prevalent in the world, that satisfies multitudes who do not think that the only true evidence of grace in the heart is its increase. There is also a feeling mis-named 'love of peace,' that "covers a multitude of sins." And to sum up all in a word, is it not true that piety must exert a more visible effect, and a more entire sway over the feelings and character, before we can hope for the Millennium? When this is done, the noble array of enterprise brought forward in the book which we have considered, will be indeed the *HARBINGER* of the *MILLENNIUM*, for it will be carried forward with a spirit and energy almost adequate, as far as means are concerned, for the birth of a nation in a day!

It did not come within the purpose of the Author to enlarge upon any of these topics, any further than they are alluded to in his remarks on revivals of religion. In speaking of the book, so well calculated to direct and encourage the spirit of benevolent effort, we could not but wish that its readers would consider that the grand means of sustaining and of increasing these noble projects of benevolence, are to be found in the improvement of the private religious character of individual Christians and churches. Although there are times which are technically called Revivals, when God in an especial manner, makes truth to prevail against error in the hearts of men, and bows the proud sinner into the dust, and although these seasons are to be sought for with an importunity which knows not how to be denied, Christians should beware lest they consider the elevated feelings of such times as the only true measure and pattern of piety, and neglect the daily and uniform culture of holiness. Above all, they should remember that there are many things to be done by them as individuals and as members of the church preparatory both to Revivals and to the Millennium. The author of the book before us alludes to some of them in his answer to the question, "*When may a revival of religion be*

*expected?*" Amongst other favorable indications of a revival, he mentions the disposition in a church to maintain discipline and the order of the Gospel. This is a most important consideration, and to those who are fearful of the effect of discipline in disturbing the peace of the church, may be suggested an appropriate motto from Paul: "FIRST PURE *then* PEACEABLE." The peace of some churches is like the peace of winter, "when stones, wood, and stubble are frozen in one mass." Their union is not from their being knit together in love;—"they are in a state of congelation." The effect of discipline is to quicken the members in self-examination, and to put them on their guard lest they also be overtaken and fall. God speaks to one and another who is tampering with temptation or living in a loose manner in regard to their religious duties, opening their ears by a solemn warning in the exposure of others, and "sealing their instruction, that he may withdraw them from their purpose," and keep them from falling. It is a terrible thing to a backslider to see a fellow professor cut off from the church; "a dreadful sound is in his ears," crying, "thus will I do unto thee, O Israel." It has a good effect upon some in the church, on the principle contained in the words, "smite a scorner and the simple will beware." It is a solemn expression used by John the Baptist concerning Christ, when he says, "His fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor." This he will certainly do in the years preceding the Millennium. He will come to his churches, and purely purge away their dross, and take away their tin," and "Zion shall be redeemed with judgment, and her converts with righteousness. "He will then sit as a refiner and purifier of the sons of Levi, and thenceforth there shall in no wise enter into the gates of Zion the uncircumcised and the unclean. Hence the churches should begin to prepare themselves for the coming of Christ, lest when He cometh he find them sleeping.

Again, we are constrained to say, that without a watchful and zealous spirit in regard to the purity of the churches, their increasing efforts of a pecuniary nature will be comparatively useless. The walls of Zion, like the walls of a rising edifice, are never built with a disproportionate height in different places, presenting the uncomely appearance of a huge elevation here and there, with a frightful chasm between them. When God builds up Zion it is generally the case that the whole circumference of the walls is seen rising together; one proof of which is the fact that during the year 1831, forever to be remembered as a year of the right hand of the Most High in this country, most of the missionary stations were visited with cor-

responding mercies. Neither is religious prosperity like the tide of the sea, which when it is high upon one shore, of necessity forsakes the opposite shore. Since God has connected all parts of his church by a spirituality of sympathy, it cannot be expected that a cold and stupid condition of churches in Christian lands can have any other than a chilling influence upon the rest of the world, or that their external efforts, while they are themselves destitute of that spiritual state which is essential to the kingdom of the Redeemer, will receive the divine blessing. And unless the purity and power of the church increases in proportion to the growing demands upon her efforts, the book before us will prove to be only the "memoirs," of fallen greatness.

In regard to the subject of Benevolent Agencies, which is very properly introduced in a work of this kind, the author has stated with great clearness, the reasons why individuals should be appointed in the entire management of the great enterprizes of the day. It is plain that if left to the care of Pastors and Christians at large, the common saying will soon be fulfilled in regard to these enterprizes, that "what is every one's business, is the business of no one." Some ministers and churches have expressed great objections to the visits of agents, and have almost preferred to take the entire responsibility of the work of benevolence amongst themselves, into their own hands. This has resulted from the unsuccessful efforts of some who did not prove to be acceptable preachers, and have, in a period of special religious interest, interrupted that progress of feeling in a congregation which had been the object of a minister's long continued and anxious interest. That the introduction in a proper manner of one of the great benevolent enterprizes of the day, would endanger the existence of a revival, we cannot believe; for there are men whom we have heard preach upon the subject of Temperance, whose co-operation would be very great in a season of attention to the concerns of the soul. Other subjects, like that of the Distribution of Scriptures, and the supply of ministers, could be managed by some men, even before a congregation in a state of revival, so as to deepen their impressions. But for a man to come into a place where there is a revival, and in a cold, statistical manner, set the subject of his agency before the people as a matter of frigid calculation, it is seriously to be apprehended would do more harm than good. And even in a common state of feeling, it is in bad taste as well as tedious and almost disgusting to rehearse a set of common-place anecdotes of what "an old lady in New Hampshire said," and "a gentleman in Ohio declared to another," and "some little girls and boys in a neigh-

boring state" accomplished. We do not wonder that those who have told us of their pain, while sitting in the pulpit listening to such addresses to a congregation, who, in the previous part of the day were deeply affected by preaching, should be tempted by a sudden impulse of feeling to declare that they would thenceforth manage their benevolent enterprizes themselves. If the conductors of our societies would do that very common and easy matter, viz. *please everybody*, they must employ only the most able men for agents, men who have such versatility of talents that they can carry their sermons upon the subjects of their agencies before a congregation in which there is a revival, and so adapt them to the existing state of things, as by no means to lessen the religious interest. Powerful and solemn appeals upon religious subjects, even where no personal application is made, frequently give a new impulse to the feelings, by relieving the mind for awhile from its intense thought, without dissipating its impressions. A common opinion has been that the only qualification necessary for an agent was, to be good at begging. We demur at such a sentiment; we need the most able men, who can so interweave the great enterprizes of the day with the private and most solemn feelings of the soul, as to carry both on together. A man who is ignorant of human nature, and unskilful, may succeed, in some measure, as a private minister, but in regard to the appointment of Agents, we would say, 'Lay hands suddenly on no man.' We agree with Mr. Cogswell in what he says upon this subject, and hope that he will do all in his power to procure the appointment of the best men to any Agencies with which he may be connected. There is great sensitiveness in many minds in regard to this whole subject, and we seriously consider it as justifiable. But that there must be Agents, no one, we presume will doubt, after reading the fifteenth chapter in this book.

A few criticisms of minor importance might be made upon the work before us. Perhaps it is better to say, frankly, what they are, and then no one will magnify them in his imagination. In regard to the sentiments advanced in the book, we consider them unexceptionable.

If there is a fault in the style, we should say that it is a forced brevity of expression, which, perhaps some would call conciseness, when in fact it is apt to be the form in which prolixity chooses to appear. A constant repetition of short periods, tires the reader; but this is a beauty of style compared with the opposite extreme of long, and twisted and parenthetical sentences. The Author uses two words which are all to which we can make objection. To "*solemnize* the mind" is not an allowa-

ble expression ; to *solemnize* " has reference to a religious rite." —John is called "the Revelator." If the word could be applied with propriety, to any one, it would be to Christ rather than to the Apostle, but we should object to receiving the word, as having no rightful, legitimate existence in the language. Having used this *severity* of criticism (for which we shall make no apology) we dismiss the book ; recommending it with confidence to all our readers, and to those who wish for a convenient volume of reference in regard to the origin and statistics of benevolent societies. We wish its Author success in the noble enterprise in which he is himself engaged, prosperity of which must be regarded as one of the most prominent of the Harbingers of the Millennium.

---

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

1. *Anecdotes of Natural History with one hundred and twenty Engravings.* Boston : Lilly, Wait, Colman & Holden. 1833. pp. 320.

*Scripture Natural History, to which are added Sketches of Palestine, or the Holy Land.* By W. M. CARPENTER. *First American from the latest London Edition, with improvements, by REV. GORHAM D. ABBOTT.* Boston : Lincoln, Edmands & Co. 1833. pp. 408.

It falls not within our province to notice very particularly books of the description of the two here mentioned, but of these, one opens so pleasing an introduction to an important and interesting branch of knowledge, and the other is so intimately connected with the Bible, that we can hardly refrain from recommending them to our readers, and especially to the young.

The plan of both is substantially the same, except that the "anecdotes" are in fact *anecdotes*, while the "Scriptural Natural History," goes more into the description of things and is in illustration of the Bible. It embraces in both the history of beasts, birds, fishes, insects and plants.—The engravings are just and true to nature, so far as we have had opportunity of seeing the various creatures and things represented by them ; and no one, we think, can read either of the books, or even "look at the pictures" in them, without entertainment and instruction, and an enlarged sense of the wisdom and goodness of the Creator. Both of them afford many excellent topics of remark for the intelligent pious parent in discoursing with his children, and may be employed with profit and pleasure. The "Scripture Natural History" is of course the best, but where that cannot be afforded, the "anecdotes"

are well worthy of a place among the books of the nursery and the family. The "Scriptural Natural History" contains a severe criticism on Carpenter, though a just defence of Dr. Harris, as entitled to primary credit in this department of knowledge.

---

2. *Bible Stories for the use of Children, illustrated with Engravings.* Boston: Leonard C. Bowles. 1833. pp. 190.

Whatever is adapted to draw the attention of children and youth to the Bible, is so far worthy of patronage and support, and that there are so many books of this sort, is one of the most hopeful and cheering indications of the present age.

As to the book before us, there are some things in it which we like, and some which we dislike. It is got up in a very neat and pretty style, and will be read with interest, no doubt, by many for whom it is designed. But its *title*, we think, is unfortunate. It makes us think of "Bible News;" and both *news* and *stories* are too low and secular to be associated with the Bible. To the incidents it contains, we have no objection, nor to the engravings accompanying and illustrating them; the former being well selected, and the latter well executed. The reflections too are not bad, though they are too little discriminating to be very good. In some instances we have no complacency in them.

In the preface, the work professes to give the narratives very nearly in the language of the sacred writers, but in some cases there is a want of fidelity which ill accords with the profession. Page 142 we read as follows: "Thanks and praise be to thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast revealed these doctrines to thy honest and upright servants." The Evangelist has it: "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." We think the liberty taken with the passage unwarrantable, and calculated to mislead and pervert.

---

3. *The Active Christian, a series of Lectures* by JOHN HOWARD HINTON, A. M. *First American Edition with an Introduction* by the REV. EZRA STILES ELY, D. D. Philadelphia: French & Perkins. 1833. pp. 235.

Mr. Hinton has been some time known in this country, as the author of a popular work on Revivals; and this, we think, will introduce him still more favorably to the community. The subject of the work is one which calls for judgment and discrimination, as well as a warm and active piety, and we think the author has proved himself possessed of these qualifications in a considerable degree. He is discreet, yet warm-hearted, and onward to duty. In style and manner, he is neat and in good taste. The degree of spirituality also, which pervades the book, is very commendable. Some might suppose, from the title,—at least we did—that the *compass* of the Christian's activity contemplated, would be more extended, than, upon reading the book, it is found to be; but none, probably, will be less satisfied that it is confined to what looks towards the conversion forthwith of those immor-

diately around us. We could wish every Christian might read it, and we should not fear that by doing so, he would not be more expanded, as well as more active, in all his sympathies and efforts.—It is a good book.

---

4. *Spiritual Songs, for Social Worship, adapted to the use of Families and private circles in the seasons of Revivals, to Missionary meetings, to the Monthly concert, and to other occasions of special interest.* Words and music arranged by THOMAS HASTINGS OF UTICA, and LOWELL MASON OF BOSTON. Utica: Hastings & Tracy, & W. Williams.

We have received a copy of this work, and are happy in recommending it as worthy, so far as we can judge, of the patronage of the public. The conviction that familiar melodies are required for the purposes above mentioned has at length become so general that many religious societies have been known for a while to lay aside its ordinary psalm and hymn tunes, substituting in their place, ballads, ditties and other similar melodies, as auxiliaries to sacred praise; and to provide, in some measure, a remedy for these abuses, as well as to furnish a convenient manual for private use, appears to be the leading object of the *Spiritual Songs*.

The melodies are chantant and familiar, and several of them have been composed, it is stated, expressly for this work. We do not perceive that any of them have been injured by irrevelant associations. The words have evidently been selected with care; and in all things the compilers appear to have aimed at that species of chaste simplicity, which is so favorable to the promotion of genuine religious feelings. The work may be had of Carter & Hendee the Publishers in Boston, and of the Booksellers generally.

---

5. *Sketch of the Bible, for Children and Youth. With Notes.* By H. GRAFTON CLARK.

The design of this little work appears to be to present a very brief outline of the scripture history, with the dates of the principal events. The notes are intended to illustrate the events with which they are connected; and the whole is written in a neat and perspicuous style, adapted to the capacity and understanding of the young. We should think it well adapted to be useful among the children and others just coming to an acquaintance with the Bible at our missionary stations.

THE  
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. VI.

AUGUST, 1833.

NO. 8.

---

---

DR. PORTER'S LETTERS ON REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

NO. VII.

*To the Committee of the Revival Association in the Theological Seminary, Andover.*

GENTLEMEN,

Not having had room in my last to say all I wished by way of remark on the historical sketch of facts and principles constituting the general subject of my Letters, I now subjoin my FIFTH and *last* general remark, which is, that *Christian preachers, who wish their ministrations to be blessed of God for the promotion of revivals, ought correctly to understand and represent the subject of DIVINE INFLUENCE, in the conversion of sinners.*

This is a point concerning which God is jealous of his own prerogatives. The sanctification of the human heart, is so eminently the special work of his Spirit, that the minister who denies or but half believes the truth on this subject, or who substitutes for it some theory more flattering to human pride, is destined to labor amid spiritual barrenness. At any rate, he cannot see a genuine revival of religion, as the proper fruit of his own labors. At all periods indeed, individuals claiming to be Orthodox, have entertained views more or less erroneous as to the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration. But, for a long period, the faith of our Calvinistic churches, especially in New-England, has been as much settled on this subject, as on any other in religion; and it would be just as reasonable at this day to revive all the debates of past ages on the doctrine of *justification* or *atonement*, as on this. A spirit of bold speculation, however, has arisen in our time, and advanced theories re-

specting regeneration, the same in substance as those which have been often refuted and abandoned heretofore, but which being now advanced with the imposing air of novelty, are in my opinion dangerous to the interests of evangelical and experimental piety, just so far as they are embraced.

Do you ask me to specify what I mean? It is reasonable that you should wish this; and I will endeavor to do it with as much clearness and brevity as I am able.

One theory then to which I refer, is that which denies any *direct, divine influence* in regeneration, and ascribes the change wholly to *moral suasion*. This is an old error revived. It was familiar to my earliest theological studies; and through my whole ministry, though this sentiment has never had a single respectable advocate till lately, the reasons why I have thought it an error, and a serious one, have been the same that I shall now state.

How does God operate on minds? Whatever range we may give to our speculations, I suppose all must come to this result, that it must be done by an influence either *mediate* or *immediate*, and that no mode of influence besides these two is conceivable.

By *mediate* influence we mean that which attends the employment of second causes, operating according to the settled *laws of mind*;—as where instruction removes ignorance, argument produces conviction, and eloquence awakens emotion. There is a philosophical sense, in which the action of second causes on intelligent beings is properly ascribed to God; just as we say he *governs* the animal, vegetable, and planetary worlds by *laws appropriate to each*.

By *immediate* influence we mean that which is direct, without the intervention of second causes. Calvinistic preachers have always ascribed the renovation of a sinner in the large sense, to both these kinds of divine influence. When they speak of *conversion*, as including the Christian graces, or denoting the commencement and progress of holiness in the heart, they refer to the direct agency of the Holy Spirit, and also to the instrumentality of means. But when they speak of *regeneration*, as denoting merely the *commencement* of sanctification, and as being an instantaneous, not a progressive work, it is the *immediate* agency of God, and that only, to which they refer.

You must be well aware that there are religious teachers now, of considerable name, who boldly aver that God does not, and cannot exert any other influence on the heart of a sinner than the *mediate* kind, which consists in the power of motives. A

popular preacher has been accustomed to use language like the following ; “ In renewing men, the Spirit employs means. He does not come and take right hold of the heart, and perform an operation upon it ; but he presents motives ; he persuades by means of truth, and the heart is overcome.”—‘ To change men’s hearts, requires only the presentation of truth by the Spirit of God. His influence differs not at all from that of the preacher, except in degree.’ Doubtless you have heard the sentiment maintained in the pulpit, or seen it in theological discussions, that ‘ the Spirit of God changes the sinners heart, just as *we* change a man’s purpose in any case by *persuasion* ; and that any direct influence, distinct from *moral suasion*, would be inconsistent with the laws of moral agency.

To this theory I object in the *first place*, that it *contradicts the plain declarations of the Bible*. Not a twentieth part of the evidence on which I make this statement, can be or need be adduced here. “ Whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things that were spoken by Paul.” Ask any plain Christian to interpret this, and he will tell you here was a direct divine influence on the heart of Lydia, not only distinct from the influence of means, but expressly *preparatory* to the access of this influence. “ The king’s heart is in the hand of the Lord ; as the rivers of water he turneth it whithersoever he will.” How is this ? Suppose some one should ask, “ Does the Lord come, and *take right hold* of the king’s heart ?” Yes, doubtless, for it is “ *in his hand*.”—Let such as feel a difficulty in this language, search for an interpretation. If there is a difficulty, common sense did not create it, and need not stop to explain it. But if illustration were needed, it might be found in one simple case of fact. Nehemiah prayed, with great importunity and perseverance, that the king of Babylon’s heart might be “ turned,” to favor the re-building of Jerusalem. That heart was barricaded by policy, pride, and prejudice against the enterprize. But while no “ moral suasion” was brought to bear upon it, from argument and motives, or even from a knowledge of Nehemiah’s prayers having been offered ; it was effectually “ turned,” in answer to those prayers, by an invisible influence from heaven.

“ God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined *in our hearts*.” How did God produce light ? By the agency of Gabriel, or the instrumentality of other second causes ? No, but by the immediate energy of his own word, “ Let there be light.” So in regeneration, he *shines in* our hearts ; ‘ Let there be love to God.’ Call this moral suasion, and what becomes of Paul’s analogy, in which consists the whole

significance of his language? Was light *persuaded* into existence, at the beginning? Paul preached to the Corinthian converts, but the light that shined *in their hearts*, was an immediate influence of the Holy Spirit.

“Holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” How was Isaiah *moved* in uttering predictions of the Messiah? Certainly by a direct influence of the Holy Ghost, not by moral suasion. True the kind of influence in this case was very different from that employed in regeneration; but it shows that *immediate* access to a human mind, is not impossible to Him who made it, nor inconsistent with the laws of moral agency. Again,

“Work out your salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh *in you*, to will and to do, of his good pleasure.” How does God work *in men's hearts*, to produce holy volition and action? The theory says, by *motives*;—“just as one man's mind is influenced, in any case, by the *persuasion* of another.” But unperverted Christian experience says, ‘An immediate, divine influence is super-added to the motives of the Gospel.’

I object to the theory of moral suasion, in the *second place*, because it subverts the scriptural doctrine of *depravity*. The question is, have the light and motives of the Gospel, when exhibited to the sinner, the same power to change his *heart*, that argument has to influence his *judgment* in common cases? Suppose you state to him the common argument to prove the existence of God. He is an intelligent man; he sees the force of that argument fully; his understanding is convinced. But suppose you proceed, and set before this same man, with equal clearness, the *moral character* of God; do you, by the same process, bring him to *love* it? If so his opposition to God before, was not to his *true* character; it was founded in *mistake*. All he needed was intellectual light to correct his false views of God, and then he was pre-disposed to love him; for opposition to every false character of God, denotes a right, and not a criminal state of heart.

Now this is not such a sinner as the Bible anywhere describes. Paul speaks of men who were opposed to God, not merely by intellectual mistake, but “their *understanding* was darkened, *because of the blindness of their heart*.” The Jews rejected the Messiah, not because the means of moral suasion were wanting, but in using these means, “the *veil* was on their *hearts*.” And Christ speaks of them, not as pre-disposed to *love* the *true* character of God, if they had only been instructed so as to *see* it; “Ye *have* both *seen* and *hated* both me and

my Father." The doctrine of Christ, as to the guilt of men, is, that they *have light* enough, but *love darkness*. The theory of moral suasion is, that they have no love of darkness, but such as light and motives will remove.

I object, in the *third place*, to this theory, because it subverts the Scriptural doctrine of *special grace*.

"In regeneration," it has been said, "the sinners heart is changed by the influence of truth and motives, presented by God;—just as one man's mind is changed in any case, by the *persuasion* of another." How does the orator persuade his hearers? By appeals to their understanding, conscience, passions, interest, &c.; that is by addressing principles that are *in* the men already,—principles that are in *all* men. He operates on their minds by an *objective* influence; by the presentation of *external* motives, adapted to sway their purpose. This is all he *can* do. But is this all that *God* can do? He addresses men by the solemn motives of the Gospel, through preaching, and other modes of presenting external means of persuasion. But is this all that he can do? Certainly not; for besides the presentation of motives through the instrumentality of second causes, he can exert an *immediate* influence on minds, such as no man has the power of exerting on another man; and this is the influence which he does exert in regeneration. To deny this is to deny *special grace*. For if regeneration is produced by an influence the same as that employed by one man on the mind of another, in common *persuasion*, certainly it is not in any sense a *supernatural* work. It takes place according to the laws of nature, in the ordinary course of cause and effect.

Why then is one sinner in an assembly regenerated, rather than others, who possess the same powers and principles of moral agency as he? An event occurs in this case, for which, according to the theory in question, there is *no reason*. A hundred men, of essentially the same intelligence and moral character, listen to the same sermon. God addresses them all by the voice of the preacher; but only one of the hundred is savingly renewed, and he by just the same influence, which is applied to all the rest without effect! On the theory of *special grace*, a good reason, (namely the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit,) is to be assigned for this difference of result; but on the theory of moral suasion it is absolutely without any reason.

The Scriptural representations of Christians as "begotten through the Gospel," and "born again by the word of God," are in no measure inconsistent with the doctrine of immediate, divine influence on the heart. God wrought *miracles* "by the

rod of Moses," and "by the hand of Paul;" but the instrumentality employed, surely did not supersede his own supernatural agency.

But it has been said, "The power of God which creates and governs matter, is a very different thing from that which is applied to minds. One is physical, the other can operate only through moral suasion." It is very true, that the laws of matter are different from those of mind; but it does not follow that the power of God by which different effects are produced, must be of different kinds, according to the nature of those effects. "Are we to conceive that the power proper to create inanimate matter could never create a thinking mind!—that angels and the souls of men were persuaded into being, by arguments and motives; and that the material world was forced out of nothing, by the power of attraction!"\*

Great perplexity has arisen in recent discussions as to divine influence, from a very indefinite use of the term *physical*; and from the assumption that a direct agency of God upon the heart in regeneration, must be a *physical* operation. The power of one *man* to influence the mind of another man, is solely of the *mediate* kind, through motives. But it is neither becoming nor logical to infer, as some have done, that the power of *God* is restricted in the same manner. His access to the heart may be *immediate*, and in regeneration must be so. The change in this case is *moral*; it is wrought in a *moral* agent: the effects produced are *moral* effects. But the power producing the change, or the work itself, is not *moral*,—it is not *physical*, but *supernatural*.

I know that there are good and respectable men, who have adopted the theory of moral suasion, and still do not mean to deny special grace. This latter doctrine they find sanctioned by the whole current of the Bible and of Christian experience. Hence they attempt to make out a complex theory; and seem to maintain that besides the moral power of motives, (such as the orator brings to bear on his hearers,) there is super-added, in the regeneration of a sinner, a divine influence on his heart, which still is not a *direct* influence. What is it then? Not a *mediate* influence, through the power of truth and motives. Not an *immediate* influence on the heart. What *is* this influence? Not a few, I apprehend, who have begun to slide downward from the faith of our Calvinistic churches, but who have been accustomed to use the current language of Orthodoxy, as to divine influence, and verily suppose that they mean what this language imports;—if they would look carefully at the

ground on which they stand, must be convinced that their favorite theory of moral suasion, and the doctrine of *special supernatural* influence in regeneration, *cannot both be true*. I have spoken thus freely, because I regard all speculations, which tend to exalt human instrumentality, and diminish a humble reliance on God, as fundamentally erroneous, and fatal to the spirit of genuine revivals.

Another topic, which I would class under the general head of incorrect views concerning divine influence, is the theory which amounts to *regeneration by self-love*.

Paul says "the carnal mind is enmity against God." He did not mean against an imaginary and false character of God, such as *ought* to be hated; but against his *true* character. How is this enmity to be removed? Paul says, by such a change in the "carnal mind," that it shall love holiness, and become "reconciled to God," as he is; in other words, by bringing *up* the human heart to the standard of the Bible. Another mode of removing this enmity, is, to bring *down* the character of God by such a modification of his attributes, that the "enmity" of the carnal mind towards it shall cease, without any radical change (in this mind); that is, with no change but such as will spontaneously occur in the sinner, from a change in his views as to the relations and feelings of God, towards *himself*. It was by appealing to the principle of self-love, and a correspondent modification of the gospel, that the Romish Missionaries in Eastern Asia, seemed likely to convert the whole heathen world. But after a fair experiment, it turned out that the converts were no better men than before; because "it was one thing to Christianize heathen, and quite another thing to humanize and heathenize Christianity."

Paley resolved virtue into,—*"doing good to mankind in obedience to the will of God, for the sake of everlasting happiness."* Belingbroke, and the school of infidels to which he belonged, maintained that the "chief principle of action in every man *must* be regard to his own interest." The same sentiment has been, at different periods, maintained by theologians, professedly of the Arminian, as well as of the Antinomian school. But it has been a subject of no small surprise to many, that the following statement should be made by a professed Calvinist, at this day;—"This self-love or desire of happiness, is the primary cause or reason of all acts of preference or choice, which fix supremely on any object." Again, "the being constituted with a capacity for happiness desires to be happy; and knowing that he is capable of deriving happiness from different objects, considers, from which the greatest happiness may be derived, and

as in this respect he judges, or estimates their relative value, so he chooses, or prefers the one or the other, as his chief good." Again, the feelings of the sinner under the influence of self-love, are represented during a process adapted to excite intense interest, till at last,—“he is *willing* to fix, and does in fact fix the eye of contemplation upon the object of holy affection, and does, with such glimpses of its glories as he may obtain, feel their attractions, and summon his heart to that love of God his Saviour, which is the only condition of his mercy.”

This language certainly is not so precise as one could wish ; but it seems unavoidable to understand it as meaning ; ‘That regard to his *own happiness* is the primary and proper spring of action, in every man ; that his moral character is determined solely by the object of his choice, or his estimate of his own interest, as correct or incorrect ; that if he chooses the world, as his chief good, from self-love, he is an unholy man ; but if he chooses God, from self-love, he is a regenerate man.’ And by that voluntary act in which he *first* prefers God to the world, from regard to his own interest, he *becomes* regenerate.

Now I have always supposed that where a man chooses one thing for the *sake of another*, as when he “eats or drinks for the glory of God,” the latter is the *chief*, and the other a *subordinate* object of regard. In some cases the subordinate is not chosen at all for its own sake, as where a bitter drug or the amputation of a limb, is chosen to save life. At the most, therefore, if he who loves God, does so with an ultimate regard to his own happiness ; and if he “who chooses the happiness of others, does so for the happiness he expects in seeing others happy,” (as the above mentioned writer believes ; ) he makes God and his neighbor the *secondary*, and himself the *primary* and *chief* object of his regard.

What then is the *standard* of duty ? We have been accustomed to answer, *the divine law*. What does this require ? “Thou shalt love,” (not THYSELF, but) “the LORD THY GOD,—with all thy heart.” Say that I exercise love to God, not because he requires it, not because he deserves it, but from the same motive as that with which I have loved wealth or worldly honor, namely, a desire of my own happiness, will God allow it, will common sense allow it to be a fulfilment of this great command ? Plainly, this would be to fix my *supreme* love not on God but on myself.

But is it the *object*, or is it the *motive* of a voluntary affection, that determines its character ? Its *motive* certainly. This is coincident with its *supreme object*, but not with its *subordinate*. I might choose to be burnt at the stake ; but who could

say whether this subordinate choice is holy or sinful, without knowing the ulterior *motive*;—whether it is to get honor to myself, or to do honor to Christ? So if I choose God, the state of my heart is determined by the governing *motive*; is it because I love his holy character? Then my choice is holy. Is it because he can make *me* happy? The ultimate regard of my heart, (my *motive*) is not to God but myself.

But is it wrong for me to regard my own interest? No,—I am commanded to do it, by Him who made me the special guardian of my own life and happiness; and required of me duties to my own soul, and my immediate connexions, which no one else can perform. But my self-love must be regulated by a proper regard to God, and the interests of the universe; and of course must not be the “primary cause” of my moral preferences; it must not exalt myself above the creation around me, and the Creator too.

Any man *may* use language so as not to express his own meaning. But deliberately to admit that self-love must be the primary ground of moral affection, is to supersede all intelligent discussion, about *regeneration*, or any of the kindred doctrines of grace. This one principle sweeps the whole away. There remains no radical distinction of character between the saint and the sinner. The most depraved individual on earth, or even among apostate spirits, doubtless is the centre of his own affections. And though he may have perverted views of what *is* his real interest, he means notwithstanding to act, and does act from a “primary” regard to himself. And if this is the highest principle of action to a holy being, then an angel and a devil stand on the same ground, as to moral character;—(in other words,) there is no distinction between holiness or sin.

Besides, this theory would split the moral system into as many jarring parts, with as many centres of “primary” affection as it contains individuals. It would set every moral agent at variance with every other moral agent, and with God himself. Whereas, the simple precept, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart,”—sets up another standard in every bosom. It establishes a common centre of moral affection to the universe of moral agents; and binds the hearts of all to each other, and to the throne of Jehovah.

I intended to analyse the “self-love theory,” in its *practical* bearings on revivals, and its tendency to subvert all correct views as to special divine influence. I intended to show how easy it is for a man, who has been thoroughly alarmed with fears of hell, to become persuaded that God is his friend, and will make him happy; and thus to feel that he loves God, when

no spiritual change whatever has taken place in his heart. I intended to show how easy it is for such a man to mistake his "love of happiness," and his choice of heaven for conversion, while he has no "love of holiness." But I must forbear to extend these remarks.

You will perceive, gentlemen, that in giving you my thoughts on so many points of prominent importance, in this day of revivals, I have been drawn into a train of observations, which could not well be restricted to narrow limits. Still there is one more head of remark, under which I will call your attention, to a few things in our *theological* and *pulpit phraseology*, which I fear tend to *obscure*, if not to *subvert the scriptural doctrine of special divine influence*.

Probably there is some significance in the fact, that many preachers of the younger class, often mention in their sermons *repentance, conversion, &c.*, while they rarely if ever use the word *regeneration*. They consider these words, however, as synonymous, though the authority of biblical and of theological usage decide otherwise. It is agreed on all hands, that the sinner is under immediate obligation to love God and repent; and that the only obstacle to his doing this, is his supreme love of sin. Now when this obstacle is removed, and the love of God begins in his heart, by *what agency* does it *begin*? Is it his own agency or that of God, in which the change *originates*? The Bible ascribes it to God, and the change it calls *regeneration*; distinguishing by this term that beginning of holy affection in the heart by divine influence, from the contrivance and developement of holy affection, under the same influence, which it calls *conversion, sanctification, &c.* Hence we say, as the Bible does, concerning a man, who repented;—but the Bible never teaches us to say, and we never presume to say, "*he regenerated himself.*" The words are no more exactly synonymous in Christian experience, than in technical theology. To illustrate my meaning by an analogy which is certainly imperfect,—(as analogies must be on this subject,) in the call "Lazarus come forth,"—the voice, the re-animating influence was of God;—the rising, and coming forth, was the act of Lazarus. Substantially the same difference exists between regeneration and repentance. Regeneration, the work of God on the heart, is done, but *once*; repentance is needed *daily*. God's breathing into Adam the breath of life, so that he became a living soul, was done but *once*; Adam's breathing and living was a continuous exercise of his vital functions. Man is *created but once, born but once*, but lives and walks daily. The

Christian is "created anew," and "born again" but once, but repents every day of his life.

The practical bearing of these remarks is this; some preachers speak of the sinner's "conversion," "making himself a new heart" &c. (for *regeneration*, as I said, is a term they avoid) by a formal act of his own will, *resolving* to do it. Accordingly conversion is put on a footing with any common transaction in which a man changes his mind. And the representations of a change of heart, as being a great, and serious, and difficult thing, are treated with an air of flippant severity, sometimes approaching to profaneness. But this loose, indefinite mode of describing conversion, be the preacher's motive ever so good, is certainly liable to great and dangerous misapprehension? *Regeneration*, in its grave and scriptural import, may be synonymous with conversion, but not with conversion as thus described. It is holiness and heaven begun in the soul by the Spirit of God. No *regenerate* man will be lost. But a man may be *converted* from Mahometanism to Christianity, and be lost. He may be converted from Unitarianism to Calvinism, and be lost;—converted from levity to thoughtfulness, and from thoughtfulness to deep anxiety,—and yet be lost. Nay, he may be converted from perfect indifference, or violent opposition to the Gospel, into a joyful believer that he is an heir of salvation, and yet be lost.

Now when I hear a sinner told from the pulpit, that "conversion is a mere volition,—a mere making up of his mind to embrace religion;—that the change of his heart is wholly an affair of his own will" &c. I am not sure that the sentiment *intended* to be taught is wrong; but I am quite sure that the practical *tendency* of such language is to mis-lead this sinner as to his dependence on the Holy Spirit, and to cherish in him a presumptuous reliance on himself. Especially is it so, when, to give prominence to his own voluntary agency in his conversion, the change of heart is represented as a thing perfectly easy to himself, but entirely beyond the reach of omnipotence, except as effected by the spontaneous movement of his own will; God being unable to control his moral exercises, consistently with his freedom as a moral agent. Edwards, speaking of views similar to these, says, "Thus our own holiness is from ourselves, as its determining cause, and its original and highest source.—Man is not dependent on God, but God is rather dependent on man in this affair; for he only operates consequentially in acts, in which he depends on what he sees we determine and do first.—What can more effectually encourage the sinner in present delays and neglects, and embolden him to go on in sin, in a pre-

sumption of having his own salvation at all times at his command."

When it is said, "It is as *easy* for a sinner to repent, as to remain impenitent," the meaning may be right, but the language is not proper for the pulpit. There is no difficulty for a man to choose that to which his whole heart is inclined; but is it as *easy* for him, to *counteract* all the moral habits, affections and inclinations of his heart, as to *comply* with these? The doctrine of free-agency is to be maintained by appeals to consciousness, experience, and common sense;—not to absurdity. Gabriel is a free-agent; but who would think it proper to illustrate his free agency, by affirming that, "it is as *easy* for him to blaspheme God, as to praise him?"

As to the expression which represents conversion as consisting in "the sinner's *making up his mind* to serve God;"—though the preacher's meaning may be correct, (as it certainly may be);—the effect is that of a colloquial caricature of a sacred, scriptural truth. I mean that such is the effect, when this and other forms of expression are so employed, as virtually to leave out of view the Holy Spirit, and reduce the sinner's moral renovation to the familiar level of an ordinary transaction. During those revivals which I have described in the foregoing pages, a certain minister, in a sermon on the *new-birth*, summed up his statement of the doctrine thus; "All I know concerning regeneration is, for one to draw up *strong resolutions* to keep the commandments of God." This man was an avowed disbeliever in special, divine influence. At that day no one anticipated, that in thirty years, substantially the same language would be employed by "revival preachers," to describe a change of heart.

The ample scope given to my remarks, in the foregoing letters, has arisen from a deep conviction that the *doctrines of grace*, embraced by our Pilgrim fathers, and regarded as fundamental, in the churches which they established, must owe their preservation and perpetuity amongst us, in no small degree, to the influence of Christian ministers. Just so far as these doctrines are modified, from a love of philosophical theories, or from conformity to a vitiated taste, the sanctifying influences of the spirit will forsake our churches, and our ministrations will cease to be the power of God unto salvation to perishing souls. All who wish to see an uncorrupted Christianity handed down to coming generations, should guard against open attacks on its vital truths, and against equivocal forms of expression by which the simplicity and power of these truths may be obscured, and gradually subverted.

I must however add one caution in closing these Letters. While it has been my object to call your attention to several things which I think doubtful, and to others which I think decidedly wrong, in modes of preaching and conducting revivals;—I would by all means advise you to avoid that hesitating and paralyzing apprehension, which leads a minister to be so much afraid of *being wrong*, as to *do nothing*. Under God, the ministers of the nineteenth century have a mighty work to accomplish. Our own vast country is to be brought under the influence of the Gospel. The wide world is to be evangelized. The day of slumber is past. The sacramental host of God's elect are marshalled in arms, and wait for ministers to lead them on to victory. Gird on your armor then, soldiers of the cross! The Captain of salvation heads the van, having on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS! He has gone forth in the triumphs of his grace, conquering and to conquer. Stubborn hearts, in numbers unexampled, bow before the all subduing influences of his Spirit. From the east and west, from the north and south, glad voices are heard to mingle in songs of salvation. "Awake O Zion, put on thy strength!"—"Arise, shine, for thy light is come; and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee!" The great battle of God Almighty will succeed these wonderful effusions of his Spirit. Wo to those inhabitants of the earth, who shall withstand all the overtures of the Redeemer's mercy, and be found at last, among the incorrigible despisers of his grace!—whom the Lord will destroy with the breath of his mouth and the brightness of his coming!

Affectionately, yours &c.

E. PORTER.

Walterboro, S. C. Jan. 1833.

---

*From Committee of Hampden Association to Rev. LEONARD WOODS, D. D., Chairman of Committee of Pastoral Association.*

DEAR BROTHER,

The questions which the Committee of the Pastoral Association submit for our consideration, we will endeavor to answer, in accordance with the resolution of that body. The subject to which they refer, we consider of vital importance to the pros-

perity, union, purity and glory of the churches; and that it ought to be examined thoroughly, in the light of Scripture and experience. And we hope that the result of the proposed examination of it will be, a more Scriptural and zealous use of the means of promoting God's work, and a more decided resistance of all measures, which serve only to awaken passion, and substitute excitement for vital godliness.

We will premise, in the the first place, that we fully believe in the necessity of divine influence to convert sinners,—to turn them from sin to holiness;—that men are so entirely sold under sin, that they will never repent and embrace the Gospel, if the Holy Spirit be withholden, if they be not “born of the Spirit,”—that regeneration is, in such a sense, the work of the Holy Spirit, that He must have all the glory of it. At the same time, we believe, that there is no such suspension of human liberty and action, that man, at any moment, ceases to be accountable. It is effected by the special operation of God upon free moral agents, in such a manner as that they are not conscious of its destroying, impairing, or suspending their agency. We see not why He, who made man free, cannot control his powers, and turn his will and affections from sin to holiness consistently with his freedom. “You, hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins.” We fully believe, too, in the free agency of men; that they have the power of choosing and refusing, in view of motives; and yet, that they will invariably choose the evil and refuse the good, unless they are drawn by the Father, or enabled by his special influence to come to Christ. We preach, therefore, the necessity of divine influence, the dependance of the sinner and his obligations to submit immediately to God. In our views on these points, we are very harmonious. We rejoice in them ourselves, and feel that they afford a solid ground of hope for success in our labors.

With grateful praise to our glorious Lord, we are permitted to say, that we have not labored in vain, nor spent our strength for nought and in vain. Our churches have been increasing in numbers, and we believe, too, in vital godliness. Within twenty years, our congregations have been visited with repeated effusions of the Holy Spirit, in a greater or less degree. Some of them, with no less than from three to eight seasons of special refreshing from the presence of the Lord. The year 1831 was particularly distinguished by revivals, within our bounds. Eleven of our societies enjoyed the presence, and experienced the triumphs of the Divine Spirit, in the conviction and hopeful conversion of sinners. We know of no period, when the work of God was revived in so many of our congregations, at the same

time, though it had been before more powerful and lasting in some of them.

As to the characteristics of these revivals, there have been some things common to them all, and some which have been peculiar. We believe, that every genuine revival is the work of God. The Gospel is preached with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. The word of God arrests the attention of sinners; and their minds and the minds of Christians begin to contemplate the subject of salvation, with self-application, and with an interest, in some measure, proportionate to its infinite importance. As it is "that one and the self same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will, which worketh," through the same means, in all; the essential characteristics of every genuine revival will be much the same.

The first tokens of anything special, of what we would term the movings of the Spirit upon the minds of the congregation, have usually appeared in an increased solemnity, and a more marked attention to the word; in more numerous assemblies on the Sabbath, and at occasional meetings in the week;—in a more general waking up among Christians to the duty of prayer, and in greater humility, penitence and fervency in their supplications. These tokens have sometimes passed off, and the hope of a revival has been blasted. But when they have continued, the anxious inquiry has soon been heard from one and another, 'what shall we do to be saved.' In some cases this inquiry has spread rapidly, and there has suddenly been a rushing of the people to the assemblies for religious worship and instruction, in others, the inquiry has extended itself more gradually. But in proportion as this anxious feeling prevails, we have found that worldly and sinful amusements are abandoned, and mere temporal concerns regarded as of minor importance. We have seen the whole congregation brought to a stand, and the minds of all turned, apparently, to contemplate, with deep solicitude, eternal scenes. In those days, the word of God was precious, and the heart and conscience felt its authority. The same means, the same truths, the same sermon which had made no impression, now alarmed the sinner and subdued him to the obedience of faith. Religious meetings, at these times, were distinguished by a death-like stillness, by earnest, anxious attention, and sometimes by weeping and the sigh of distress. The inconvenience of a crowded throng, many of whom could not sit, occasioned no uneasiness throughout a long service.

Every one seemed absorbed, as if alone, in the great subject of personal salvation. Rarely have we noticed any bodily agitations, any out-cries, any resort to self-righteous, fauatical do-

ings and feelings to obtain relief and comfort. In some instances, individuals have, under a lively sense of their danger, been deprived of strength, and manifested much agony of feeling. These and similar peculiarities, have always taken place, under the alarms and fears awakened by a deep conviction of exposedness to divine wrath; and they have, uniformly, appeared among those, who had been the most thoughtless, ignorant and inattentive on the subject of religion,—whose conscience had been in so deep a sleep, under the power of sin, that they were insensible of their accountability to God. These things we have considered as adventitious, or such as may come and go, and the subjects of them remain “in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity.”

Some of the revivals, which we have been permitted to witness among our people, have been attended with considerable animal excitement; and others, with little apparently of this, even in the same place and under the same general directions. A great degree of this, we have regarded as unfavorable, and by a calm and plain exhibition of truth we have endeavored to turn it to good account. The effects of sympathy, too, we have witnessed, when a whole community have been awakened to eternal concerns. This is a principle which should not be overlooked, but properly directed. Its influence may be the harbinger of serious alarm and conviction of sin, or it may not. We have seen persons much affected, who could give no other reason for their being so, except that others were anxious about their salvation. We have seen the awakened sinner, when hearing others tell how they found peace, work up his feelings to what he deemed a corresponding state, and then, under the idea that he had attained to a place of safety, rejoicing in hope. We have felt it to be very important, to guard against the delusions of this principle. By mistaking the excitements and imaginings of this, for conviction and submission to Christ, we believe that many have been deluded and perished. Not a few, who were alarmed and appeared to be anxious for a time, and then expressed much joy, in the persuasion that they had experienced a change of heart, we have seen, with grief, return to their former state, like the dog to his vomit. They were wrought upon by sympathy and imagined that they had those feelings and views, which others expressed as essential to this great change.

The subjects of these revivals, who have given us substantial evidence of their conversion to God, were thoroughly convinced that they were lost, undone, condemned sinners, before they submitted to Christ. They struggled, a longer or a shorter time

in the vain attempt to recommend themselves unto God. The lesson of immediate, unconditional submission, they found it difficult to understand and practice. Salvation by grace alone, was to them a mystery, until experience taught them the emptiness of every other source of help, and that unless God had mercy on them they must perish. When they cast themselves in all their pollution and guilt, upon the atonement and grace of Christ, feeling that their condemnation was just, and ceasing to look for deliverance to any other quarter, they have found peace. Now, their hearts were drawn out in praise to God and benevolence to men. They experienced great delight in spiritual exercises,—in contemplating the character and government of God, and the grace and command of Christ, and felt, that his “yoke was easy and his burden light.” At the same time, they manifested much solicitude, lest they should be deceived, lest they should rest on false evidence and embrace a false hope. They were, generally, very slow to cherish the hope, that they were actually born of God. But they were, uniformly, so deeply convinced of their entire depravity, that they ascribed the change to the sovereign grace and power of God. The language of the apostle was the language of their experience: “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saveth us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.”

One characteristic of the revival in 1831, was its comparative shortness. Some of the revivals, with which portions of this heritage of God had, previously, been blessed, continued from one year to another, but this was like a short passing shower. The reason of this may be, so far as human agency is concerned, either the unusual degree of animal feeling which was awakened, or an undue dependence on the extraordinary means which were employed. Many, however, have been added to the church as the fruit of this work of grace. The churches have been strengthened as to numbers, and we hope in piety and good works; but whether they have been strengthened, as to union and subordination to the order of Christ, remains to be seen. Time and trial must prove how much fruit has been gathered to eternal life.

But one characteristic of most of the revivals that have blessed our churches, we would more particularly notice. It is said by the prophet that “when the Lord shall build up Zion he will appear in his glory.” This has been exemplified. Our eyes and our hearts unite in the testimony. That He was present, working according to his pleasure, we felt there was no doubt. We thought of Elijah, when, under a sense of the di-

vine presence in the still small voice, he hid his face in his mantle, and of Isaiah, when he saw the glory of God. All animal excitement was allayed; all passionate emotions subdued. God was there. The sinner trembled; fearfulness surprised the hypocrite. The wicked were convinced, and felt themselves justly condemned, and cast themselves upon the divine mercy. We seemed, in the midst of our labors, but to "stand still and see the salvation of God." In one instance, where there was much unhallowed feeling and division in a church, the Spirit came down, in the midst of it, and wrought for his name's sake. The sovereignty and riches of divine grace were most illustriously displayed. The truth, that God is the author of genuine revivals, we have been taught in our own experience. The scene, where he works and converts many, is as different as light and darkness from those excitements, awakened by human instrumentality operating, only, on the sympathies and passions of our animal nature.

Constituted as men are, and prone as they are to self-righteous efforts, to do and live, there will be, in all times of special attention to religion, more or less mere animal excitement, and exertions to recommend themselves unto God. These things are not to be *violently* resisted, but removed by presenting and urging those truths which belong to the work of the Spirit, in convincing of sin and turning the heart to Christ. So far as our experience has testified, a revival often takes its visible character from its beginnings, and from those whose influence gains the ascendancy. If it commence among the more ignorant class, among those to whom the subject of religion is new, there is usually more excitement at first; and if those who direct are full of strong feeling, with little experience and knowledge, the same thing is manifest among others.

Experience has taught us to rejoice with trembling, when a revival commences; and to fear lest souls shall perish through false hopes. On this point, we have learnt to be exceedingly solicitous. In answer, not a few, have shown us, that those who are awakened and convinced of sin may lose their impressions and become more hardened; and those who, in their own estimation and that of others, are converted to God, may return to their former state of feeling and practice. Many have come up to the help of the Lord, with much zeal, in times of great religious excitement, who have gone back when the fervors of the occasion are passed, to cast suspicion upon the work of God and to resist the truth by their errors and ungodly influence, under the name of Christian. The fruits of revivals are not to be determined by those who are active in them only during their pro-

gress, who stay not to witness their results; nor by those who do not mingle in them, and yet undertake to teach and decide on every thing pertaining to them. Of these classes there are some, at the present day, who would direct the public mind on this momentous subject, whose views would be corrected, by engaging in the labors of revivals and watching their results, as stated pastors are obliged to do. There is much more zeal, anxiety, joy and hope expressed, often, at such times, than there is of holy fruit, brought forth with patience by the good and honest heart, in the final result. The fruits of righteousness have fallen short of our anticipations, even when we counted on many as subjects of renewing grace; yet a great number, have been added to the churches of such, we have good reason to believe, as shall be saved. We have had opportunity to witness their Christian character, and to see the power of godliness sustaining them in times of temptation, and in the hour of death. We have, in many instances, been much comforted and encouraged, in beholding the religion, embraced in a revival, shining more and more in obedience and devotedness to God, and filling the closing scene with holy joy and heavenly peace. While the progress of the work has, in some cases, awakened much visible opposition, and drawn out the enemy from his concealment, in others, its power has so turned the current of public opinion, that the enmity of the heart to God has been vented only in private, and expressed by individuals whose consciences were disturbed by serious reflection. But, generally, the effect of revivals has been very happy upon society. Often has it softened asperities and healed old difficulties which existed among individuals. It has driven out of practice sinful and vain amusements, which served to kill time and destroy souls, such as balls, assemblies for drinking and gambling and so forth. Often has it put a new moral aspect upon the whole community. Instead of idling away the Sabbath and neglecting the institutions of God, the inhabitants have become a church-going people, who listen to the word, enter the Sabbath School, favor benevolent objects, and contribute to promote the cause of Christ.

In most cases, perhaps in all, the holy fruit has been sufficient to prove, that the revivals which have blessed us, were the work of God, though often marred, and, it may be, shortened by the infirmities, pride and self-sufficiency of men. We have no doubt that the Spirit, sometimes, departs and the Lord frowns, because men, in their pride, bring unhallowed fire to the altar, or stretch out their hand to help in an unauthorized manner, forgetful of their dependence, and of God's jealousy for the hon-

or of his own name and grace. But when we have seen many in these times of merciful visitation, become new creatures, almost in mental capacity, and wholly so in a moral and spiritual sense, we have understood, more perfectly, the declarations of the divine word, that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and to depart from evil is understanding."

We are fully convinced, that nothing is wanting but genuine revivals, to spread the triumphs of the cross and bring the whole world to the obedience of faith. The frequency of their occurrence under the preaching of the word, we hail as a harbinger of the glorious days. But we feel that there is great danger of their being corrupted, by the wisdom of the world, and of being turned to scenes of display for human pride and self-righteousness.

With respect to the means, by which the work of God has been promoted among us, they are such as have been commonly employed by the Orthodox churches and ministers in New England,—such as we believe the word of God sanctions. And we can testify, that they have been mighty through God. Nothing very remarkable has, in this respect, distinguished the beginnings of these seasons of divine mercy. The plain and continued exhibition of divine truth on the holy Sabbath has been the means, effectual perhaps above all others, of inciting Christians to duty and alarming the consciences of sinners. And we have noticed impressions made in this way, gradually deepening, until Christians have come out to do something for Christ, and sinners have begun to inquire what they must do to be saved. Prayer-meetings, one or more in a week, to seek for the Spirit have frequently been the harbinger of the coming time of refreshing. Sometimes the improving of a funeral occasion, or some alarming event in Providence by urging the great subject of salvation, has roused the careless and led the Christian to self-examination and more earnest prayer. The awakening or hopeful conversion of persons, who were in some respects conspicuous, has sometimes been the means of bringing many to consideration.

In these times of refreshing, we have regarded the Sabbath as a day of peculiar interest, which we have endeavored to improve in three public services, with a prayer-meeting, in some instances, in the morning and at noon. One stated lecture in the week has been common, and, sometimes, three or four in different parts of the congregation, if it were large. In addition to these, it has been usual to have one or two meetings for prayer, and for exhortation by the pastor and by the leading officers of the church. Visiting from house to house, as time could be

found, has been observed. When some were discovered to be under serious impressions, a meeting particularly for this class has been usually held every week, in which the instruction was adapted by the pastor to their case. Private praying-circles of believing females by themselves, and of brethren by themselves, have been blessed. Church conferences and seasons for prayer with fasting have been attended, in some instances, with great interest. With the pastor and leading members of the church, as laborers, we have seen the work of God go forward with power in the use of these means, without any help from abroad, and hundreds brought hopefully to embrace Christ for righteousness and life. The multiplicity of public religious meetings in times of revival, is not without its dangers. Secret prayer, reading the Bible and self-examination, so important to the inquiring and to others, are in danger of being neglected. Besides, some will begin to depend on meetings and to make a righteousness of them. Others will judge of their state, according as they enjoy themselves at meetings, or not. Others again will become unstable and restless, or greatly excited, and seem to think that religion consists much in all this, and in some public exhibition of themselves in prayer and exhortation.

In the revivals of 1831, we combined these means, as many did and are now doing, in Protracted meetings. One or more of these was held in most of our churches during the season. In almost every instance, there was some special attention existing, or some indications of a revival, previous to the holding of the meeting. These meetings were continued from three to five days. Every day there were two public services, and one or more in the evening. The intervals were spent in prayer both social and private. At the close of the whole process, those who were inquiring and desired to be addressed and prayed with, were requested, either to remain after the congregation had dispersed, or to go to another place assigned for the purpose. We believe the Spirit of God attended these meetings in a greater or less degree. But the result, in most cases, did not equal the expectations of some. That they were instrumental of much good, in quickening Christians and awakening sinners, we have no doubt.

We have stated, in general, the means by which the revivals which have blessed us, have been promoted; and now we will answer the other part of your third inquiry, viz. What are the doctrines and mode of preaching? The doctrines which we hold, as the doctrines of the Gospel, are those which are commonly termed Orthodox; the doctrines of the reformation, as expressed in general, in the shorter catechism;—the same

which our Puritan fathers held, as explained and held by Edwards, Bellamy, Dwight and others;—the doctrines of grace, which bring salvation to men, “according to the eternal purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.” These we endeavor to preach according to their order and relative importance; and in such a manner as to make them bear upon the hearts and consciences of men. We have not been in the habit of discussing them in a metaphysical way, or exhibiting them in connexion with what is termed, the philosophy of religion; but have labored to present them as the revelation of God, and to urge them upon the conscience by his authority. In the same practical manner, in which the spirit has recorded them, we have endeavored to bring them out in their length and breadth. In times of revival we have perhaps dwelt more on the doctrine of depravity, showing the state, character and destiny of sinners in the light of God’s law;—on the necessity of special divine influence to renew the heart, on the distinguishing grace of God in the bestowment of this influence, on the claims of God upon men and their obligations to submit, on the atonement of Christ and the riches of his grace. We have endeavored to show men that God *must have mercy* on them, or they will certainly perish;—to persuade them immediately to repent and comply with the offer of salvation through Jesus Christ. We have pressed these things upon them by every argument drawn from their accountability, from the commands and sanctions both of the law and gospel of God, and from a regard to the judgement of the great day. To address sinners and treat them as free moral agents, has ever been our practice; and we have labored earnestly to press their obligations to an immediate compliance with the terms of salvation. This we have supposed to be perfectly consistent with their entire dependence on divine mercy. We have taught them that the only reason why they did not choose religion was, that they loved darkness rather than light;—that the guilt and the blame of the refusal, and of their alienation of heart from God, were entirely their own;—that their love of sin, opposing will and wicked heart formed no excuse;—that this was their condemnation, “Light had come into the world, and they loved darkness rather than light;—that they hated the light and would not come to the light, lest their deeds should be re-proved.” We have proclaimed these things, “in season and out of season,” in written sermons and extemporaneous discourses, and in private conversation. But while we have endeavored to preach the Gospel and have been permitted to see sinners, under its joyful sound, turning to God, we have noth-

ing whereof to glory. "The excellency of the power is of God and not of us." We have much reason for humiliation when we remember our deficiency in wisdom and knowledge, and in the manner of preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ.

Your fourth inquiry respecting "the estimate we have formed of the utility of Protracted meetings, and our opinion of the manner in which they should be conducted in order to be most conducive to the interest of the church," we could answer with more decision and satisfaction if we had more experience on the subject. By having Protracted meetings in our own congregations, we have manifested our approbation of them. And this approbation we do not wish to withhold, conducted as they have been within our personal knowledge. But still, we feel a backwardness in resorting to them as a means, powerful above all others, in promoting the work of God. There are some reasons in favor of them, which, in theory, seem to have much weight. The principal one is, that they present and keep before the mind the great subject of salvation, and press it, as the great concern, with constant appeals to the heart and conscience. And as the truth is the grand instrument by which the Spirit works to convert men, this mode of presenting it must be very powerful in its effects.

But it is quite doubtful in our minds, whether experience will confirm this reason, and show that these meetings are, in any respect, to be set above those means which have been commonly used among us. We have seen greater results from the continued use of these, than from any Protracted meeting within our bounds. The truth is, that the word, when brought before the mind and kept there after the manner of these meetings, may produce much excitement, may awaken strong feeling, but unless the Spirit give it efficacy no saving effects will follow. There are some evils and dangers attending them, which are not so directly incident to the ordinary means of promoting God's work. Constituted as men are, much excitement of animal feeling cannot well be avoided. To produce this is, indeed, their natural tendency. In prospect of a meeting of this kind, much expectation is awakened, and great dependence is placed upon it. It is confidently assumed, that now the work of God will surely triumph. A state of feeling is produced which is rather fitted for disappointment and despondency, than for a scene of protracted displays of divine mercy in the conversion of sinners. Amidst the preparations and the doings, and the bustle of the occasion, the natural tendency of the whole is, to draw off the minds of Christians from that simple and humble reliance on God for help, and that penitent and

believing looking to him, in despair of effectual aid from any other source, which are necessary in order to obtain the divine blessing. We think this must be evident from the nature of the case, and from the selfish nature of men.—They tend, also, to make Christians and others discontented with the usual, or ordinary means of grace,—to produce an excessive love of excitement, and to desire such seasons merely for the pleasure which they afford. Sinners, too, will cherish the idea that they may rest at ease, that they cannot get religion until a Protracted meeting comes. Churches will demand their frequent repetition, their periodical seasons of excitement and effort, and of apathy and inaction. That affectionate confidence in their pastors, which is necessary to their usefulness, will be dissipated, while they are away from their own flocks much of the time, laboring in Protracted meetings. These and similar evils, it seems to us, will attend the general prevalence of this system of means.

Considering the natural proneness of the human heart to superstition,—to depend on religious forms, and plans of its own devising,—to be pleased with things new, attractive and exciting, and to rest in them as a substitute for humble piety and a patient continuance in well doing, we feel opposed to much parade, and the sound of a trumpet before us, in the use of the means of reviving God's work. We look for more saving fruit, from the effect of those silent and humble labors of faithfulness, which do not put on the appearance of ostentation, nor cry "lo! here, or lo there;" but which urge the truth upon men, uniformly, in public and in private, and with the powerful sanction of that Christian temper and example which are peculiar to the true children of God. We do feel that great display in men and measures, in this matter, is not among the most encouraging signs of the times. It is our decided opinion that Protracted meetings should not become common, by being too often repeated. They may be useful to wake up a stupid community, and occasionally employed to give a spring to the thoughts and affections of Christians; but they are too sacred, or too exciting to come every few months. But experience must yet decide upon their utility in New England, above those means which have been in use. We express our opinion from what we have witnessed, not confidently, but in the way of caution.

The manner of conducting these meetings, which has been described, we approve. The ministers who officiate in them should come from the immediate vicinity, without preferring one above another, if they be strictly evangelical. We think the effect upon the churches and upon the ministry will be bad, if

none are employed except those of celebrated name from a distance, or if these are principally depended on. Let the whole be managed in the most simple and unostentatious manner. The church, where a meeting is about to be held, should be prepared by humiliation and penitence before God, and by proper instruction as to their entire dependence on his grace, and as to the uselessness of the means, about to be employed, without the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. The preaching on the occasion should be of that character which aims to bring up Christians to the duty of holy living, and "to convince sinners of sin, of righteousness, and of judgement," to exalt the Saviour, and persuade men to come to him for life. Attempts merely to excite the passions or to make up feeling;—measures calculated to lead alarmed and ignorant men to mistake the true nature of conversion to God, and to rest on their own self-confident purposes, urged as a condition of relief from their fears, should be studiously avoided. To promise them salvation, if they will come out from the assembly and show themselves on the Lord's side, and to pronounce them converted to their face, when their alarm subsides, and some different modification of feeling takes place, ought to be reprobated as a direct way to destroy souls rather than to save them. If Protracted meetings are used, the same caution should be observed, in guarding against self-deception, against all measures which lead to this, and which will give birth to false hopes, false confidence and vain glory, as has been observed by those who have labored in revivals with much success in past times. The preaching, therefore, should be discriminating; the deceiver should be weighed, his false refuges exposed, and the danger of delusion plainly urged. Under the influence of excited religious feeling, we are in danger of judging hastily that anxious sinners are converted, when there is some change in their state, which affords them joy; or through delicacy, or want of discernment and knowledge of the truth and of the depths of Satan, we may encourage those to hope, or embrace them as Christians, who ought to be rebuked, and told that they are yet in their sins. Protracted meetings might be more useful to the churches, if they were always improved as seasons of laying the axe at the root of the tree, and of hewing down every one which did not produce good fruit. It is important that there should be a thorough investigation of the Christian character, as the word of God presents it, and a clear and distinct exhibition of the marks of grace, together with all those delusive imitations of them by which many are beguiled and ruined. Such a heart searching operation should every Protracted meeting be. Let ministers and Christians bring every

one to the test of the divine word, and require distinct exhibitions of the fruit of the Spirit ; and then the church would rise in glory and in strength, and not be weakened by the accession of those who are unstable as water, who are carried about by every wind of doctrine, whose fruit is dead, and whose private life and conversation are a libel on true godliness.

In answer to your fifth inquiry we remark, that we have reason to believe, there 'are some doctrines and some irregularities in practice, against which it is important to guard the churches at the present day.' Under the cover of changing the phraseology or terms used in Theology, and of explaining some important truths, more intelligibly, we fear that positive error is making its way into the church. To unsettle the common mode of thinking on the grand truths of Orthodoxy, and the common language of thought, has ever been the first step in the downward road to heresy. We look, therefore, at an effort like this, with alarm. To unsettle the language of the Orthodox churches, by which they express their faith, and which they understand, is to unsettle the truth which they profess to believe. And we actually find that there is a wide difference in fact, if we can understand terms, between the statements and explanations which some make of the doctrines of native depravity, of regeneration, of divine agency, &c. and those which have been received and understood by the churches of the Orthodox. We cannot but think, after looking at these statements, that their tendency is to undermine the faith, as it was once delivered to the saints. We give full credit to the motives of those who have ventured upon this innovation ; and we believe, they sincerely think, that it removes difficulties. But, although it changes the place of these difficulties, which are objected to by the unhumiliated, we cannot see that it removes them at all. It is a vain thing to attempt to bring the Gospel down to the reason and apprehension of depraved man, and clear it of all objection on his part. We cannot but think, that the tendency of this new exposition of the doctrines, is downward to Arminianism, and that the controversy on this subject, is the same precisely, with that by which the church has been agitated in past ages. There is nothing new in fact, in this "new divinity," as it is termed. Overthrow Pelagianism, root and branch, and you overthrow this new theory. It has been manifest, that its young disciples do not walk merely in the steps of their masters ; but they go beyond, and urge human ability in the matter of salvation, to the exclusion of any divine efficiency, beyond what is exerted in sustaining the powers and preserving the existence of men. In their endeavors to make men feel their responsi-

bility, they set aside special divine influence in regeneration. In urging the free agency of men, which we all fully believe, they seem to make them independent agents; and to show that their depravity is of such a nature, that divine influence is not absolutely essential to turn them to God.—But our limits will not suffer us to dwell on this subject. We fear that the directions given to sinners, and the measures adopted to promote religion, growing out of these peculiar views, are dangerous to the souls of men. Are sinners in no danger of a false hope, when they are told while trembling with fears of wrath, that nothing more is necessary to their conversion than a change of purpose, a change of such a nature, as they often have occasion to make in their daily business;—when they are told to make themselves a new heart and convert themselves, while their dependence on divine influence is kept out of view, and they are not instructed, that God must give them a new heart, and form a right spirit within them? These two things must come together and be exhibited together, in their true light, else we shall have the omnipotence of the human will on the one side, or the equally destructive error of fatality, on the other.

From the views to which we have referred, have no doubt arisen those peculiar measures which have been devised to awaken the feelings, and bring sinners to form the purpose to serve God. The design is good, but the result is often deceptive. To set about getting up a revival, mechanically, as we set about accomplishing any worldly project, in which the hearts of all who shall be concerned are interested, is to be expected of those who believe, that the whole work belongs to man, and that the result is the mere fruit of his efforts. That they should resort in pursuit of their object to various measures of human device, and often to unwarrantable means of excitement, is not to be wondered at. When any system of religious belief leads to such results, it is to be suspected that it is not of God. Against such departures, from the Orthodox views and practice which have been received as resting upon the oracles of God, we feel that there is occasion to warn the churches.—It may be owing to the insidious influence of those sentiments which draw away the heart from a full and practical belief in the necessity of divine influence to turn men to God and preserve the Christian, that many churches so recently refreshed and enlarged, have relapsed into a state of spiritual indifference. No doubt they need to be, and perhaps are about to be, taught anew, that God is the author of every genuine revival; that he is jealous for the honor of his name, and will be acknowledged, and adored and sought unto, as the efficient agent in the conversion of men.

Your last inquiry, viz. "What in your view ought ministers and Christians to do, in order to secure the continuance and increase of the special operations of the Holy Spirit, and to render the influence of the Gospel general and permanent,"—we regard as of the highest importance; and yet unless we extend this communication to an undue length, we must answer it in a very general manner.

Ministers and Christians must humble themselves before God and submit to the teachings of his word, and let alone all matters of doubtful disputation which gender strife. More deeply must they feel their dependence on God, and seek the blessing of the Spirit more earnestly.

Ministers must, first and above all, strive to partake in larger measure, of the spirit of Christ. They must possess the same uncompromising regard to the glory of God, the same constraining and disinterested benevolence towards the souls of men, the same fixed and decided purpose of heart in the labors of the Gospel, the same meekness, forbearance and patience, which distinguished our divine Lord in his ministry on earth. They must draw the instruction which they give to the people, more directly from the fountain of truth. The word of God, "this broad land of wealth unknown; where hidden glory lies," must occupy more of their time and attention, until they become familiar with it in all its length and breadth; and, with greater simplicity, must they depend on Christ for wisdom, and look for his spirit to guide them into all truth. We fear that the Bible, as a practical, experimental Book of God, by which actions and feelings must be tried, is neglected, at least in some measure, and its authority, in all matters of faith and holy living not sufficiently felt by those who minister at the altar. The power of *Gospel* piety and example will give an efficacy to their public preaching which few can perseveringly resist. And in contending for the faith, they must rest, with less confidence, on human reason and wisdom, and depend more entirely on 'the sword of the Spirit,' and use it more skilfully. They must preach not themselves, their own speculations and theories, but Christ Jesus, the Lord; and do this patiently and faithfully, in season and out of season. They must exhibit the doctrines of the Gospel, in the plain practical way in which they lie in the Scriptures, and urge them upon their hearers whether they will hear or forbear, depending on God for success, and not upon plans and schemes of their own devising. Then will the word be mighty through God.

Shades of difference in sentiment, which do not affect the vitals of the Gospel, must not interrupt harmony. That they

be united, too, in the manner of using the means of promoting God's work, is highly important. They must watch with solicitude the movements of the enemy, and guard with vigilance the avenues to the sacred desk. "Lay hands suddenly on no man," is an apostolic injunction. They should be thoroughly satisfied, that those who ask for authority to preach, are qualified according to the requisitions of God's word, that *they have vital piety*, that they love the truth and the work, and are Orthodox in doctrine, and in their views of Christian character. Ministers must exercise the authority vested in them by Christ, without fear or favor, but in a spirit of meekness and love. They must see that the discipline of Christ's house is strictly maintained; and in this they should endeavor to strengthen each other's hands. Observing these things and laboring, in concert, with a zeal according to knowledge, they will not spend their strength for nought and in vain. The Gospel will be preached with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. Christ will own and bless his own institution.

Christians must hold up the hands of their ministers by their prayers, and their influence, by esteeming them highly in love for their work's sake, and by strictly regarding the order in all things, which Christ has established in his church. They must be ready for every good work, and cleave to the truth, and not be unstable and wavering. Cheerfully should they engage in every benevolent plan to promote the cause of Christ, and "show out of a good conversation their works with meekness of wisdom." They must sedulously watch against the seductions of error, and not be led away by new and strange notions. They must not be assuming but humble, not teachers or preachers but learners, not directors but helpers, not heads but members of the body of Christ, not "hearers only but doers of the word."—They must study the Bible more, and especially be more earnest and persevering in the duty of prayer for the Holy Spirit to guide them into all truth, and to revive his work. They must not be periodical Christians, but uniform, consistent, active, growing Christians.

The churches should regard themselves as members of the same family, and as having but one interest. There should be among them a family order, a family union, a family likeness. They must not be divided, but endeavor to concentrate their influence and labors, in promoting the cause of holiness and the salvation of souls, within their own connexion and abroad.

Let every one stand at his post, and quit himself as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. Let all deeply feel that it is not by

might nor by power but by the Spirit of the Lord, that religion must be revived.

Finally, "the Lord God is a sun and shield." He is our light and our defence. He must appear for us, and work for his own name's sake, or we are wasted and ruined by the arts of the enemy, and the pride and self-confidence of the professed defenders of his truth. "O Lord revive thy work. In the midst of the years make known, and in wrath remember mercy."

#### QUALIFICATIONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

In this age of the world, and to those whom we write, it would be unnecessary for us to say, that we consider piety as indispensable for a minister of the Gospel, and we add, without hesitation, that piety alone is far from qualifying any man for this exalted station. It is a remark of one of the greatest men of Europe, that, "after all, *it is education that makes men.*" There is a certain expansion of mind, which is essential to a vigorous and successful effort; while each important department of life, requires additional attainments peculiar to itself. No acquaintance with one, will necessarily qualify us for the duties of another. A talent or taste for mechanism, may secure excellence and eminence in the mechanic arts, yet the fullest skill and experience in one branch, do not secure experience and perfection in others. This is equally true in the learned professions. Some general knowledge is required for success in either, and yet for eminence and extensive usefulness in either, there is required laborious study and extensive acquisitions in those departments of knowledge, which are specially connected with the profession in view. The Jurist may be profoundly learned in the principles and practices of law, and yet remain entirely ignorant of every other science. The most exalted Statesman, may succeed but poorly in the chair of the university, or the labors of the country school-master: so the man of giant mind, and such in resources of literature and science, who enchains thousands by his eloquence in the senate-chamber, may fall far below the humble missionary of the cross, when placed in the sanctuary of God.

Taste, study and practice are universally required for success and permanent influence in almost every department of life. We are apprehensive that in the minds of many, an exception

may be made to this, in relation to the Christian ministry. Ignorance and superstition have wrought in the minds of some men, a strange perversion here. Ignorance of the subject, has shut out of view the broad field of ministerial labor; and vague impressions and superstitious regard for what is falsely called the "teachings of the Spirit," have denied the necessity of all qualification for the ministry, but a heart honestly and piously devoted to the good of souls. Some will read of the teachings of the Spirit, and that the Bible is so plain the way-faring man shall not err therein, and hence trusting to unpromised aid, start in that exalted profession, which made the learned Apostle cry, 'who is sufficient for these things?'

The profession of the ministry stands by itself, and like other learned professions, requires laborious study in its own peculiar department. The question, what constitutes preparedness for this profession, is one of high importance.

In a late article on this subject, the opinion of President Edwards was given, and that also of the various religious denominations of our country, as sustained by public sentiment. If this opinion was to be regarded, it would be easy to settle the question at once. But to arrive at a more satisfactory result, we should consider the station which the Christian minister is to hold and the duties which are to devolve upon him, as a teacher of the word of God, the sacred and sublime principles of natural and revealed religion, to rational and immortal beings: He is to try the spirits, to prove all things, and hold fast that which is good: to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." From the works of creation and providence, as well as from the word of God, he is to establish and enforce the existence and character of Jehovah; to unfold the principles of a moral government, and also to lead his people over the whole ground of redemption by Jesus Christ. To do this, with the hope of success, he must possess more expansion of mind and richer resources of knowledge, than what most men enjoy. The manners and customs of mankind in ancient days; the progress of truth, and the history of the church, must be understood; and tracing prophecy to its accomplishment, he is to anticipate events from the providences and predictions of God. It is almost unnecessary to add in this place, that he should be acquainted with the languages in which the Scriptures were originally written. These Scriptures he is to teach to others, in an age too, when they are interpreted in a thousand ways, and by multitudes wrested to the destruction of souls. To discharge the earliest duties of his office, he is to understand and explain the Scriptures philologically, and from them draw out a system of

doctrines and precepts for the faith and obedience of men. This is to be done with strict reference to the symmetry of the truth and the analogy of the faith of the Gospel, and then this system is to be presented to the ever-changing intellectual and moral character of his people. As he is to explain the word of God, he must, to some extent, understand the principles of interpretation, and these cannot be understood and safely applied without mental discipline and study. To interpret the Scriptures says Keil, 'a man must first of all acquire some historic knowledge of the author of each book; of the state of things existing when it was written; of the body and collection of the New Testament books; of the particular history of its ancient versions, editions and parts in which it was written and other things of this nature. To this must be added a knowledge of the principles of criticism in respect to the text of the New Testament. He must understand the language in which the books were written, and possess a knowledge of the things respecting which they treat; such as geography, chronology, civil and political history, manners and customs, the sentiments of the Jews in regard to religion at the time the books were written; the precepts of the Christian religion; the doctrines of heretical sects;' to which he adds, 'a knowledge of grammar, rhetoric and philosophy.' And we would remark, that to meet the beautiful and forcible illustrations of the Bible, he should above all other men, be richly read in the various branches of general science, and of ancient and modern literature.

As the minister is to write and exhort, to reason and persuade, he surely should be acquainted with the science of logic, of rhetoric and of intellectual philosophy. Many men fail in the powers of persuasion, because they have not sufficiently instructed the minds of their hearers; and errors in religion, which have been most destructive to the purity and peace of the church, have arisen from false principles, in intellectual philosophy.

As the minister is to write and speak for the public and popular ear, to instruct and elevate the ignorant, as well as to interest and benefit the educated and refined, we insist on the importance of scrupulously regarding the rules of good taste. Who that has read, has not assented to the remarks of Foster on this subject? And when the Spirit of God makes illiterate fishermen speak and write agreeable to the finest rules of correct and delicate taste, it surely becomes the preacher of the Gospel in this enlightened age, to stand aloof from that vulgarity which is without benefit, either to the learned or the ignorant, and alike offensive to both. The uneducated are not flattered

by such a compliment, and the more intelligent will not long endure it. Paul before the Cæsars, would gladly seize the purity and sublimity of the Roman dialect, and not scorn the illustrations of her poesy; while to the humble Hebrew he would adorn and enforce the language of Israel.

Are the above qualifications too high for one, who rises before his fellow men, to instruct them in the principles of that religion which God has been developing for near six thousand years, and by which they are to regulate their lives and build their hopes for eternity?

The question may arise, is it necessary in order to secure an education for the ministry, that so many years should be spent at the academy, college and seminary? We would ask, can the requisite qualifications be secured in any other way? If so; it is well.—But will it be done? Scott and Fuller might do it, but will our young men at the present day do it? We believe that few if any will be found to gather in a more private path what may now be easily secured at our public institutions: indeed, that important branch of knowledge, which is secured by mingling with men, and constantly coming in contact with minds of equal and superior character, and above all that which arises from the concentrated resources of numbers associated in the same pursuits, is of necessity lost, as well as the fruits of laborious industry acquired by able men long set apart for the express purpose of instruction. As a general remark, we may say, the requisite qualifications for a minister of the Gospel at the present day, can hardly be obtained without a public education in our colleges and theological institutions. Advantages which were enjoyed in former years in a more private course of study, have, to a great extent, flowed into these public institutions, and an amount of knowledge may here be gained, which cannot be secured under any private instructor or at any *one* institution.

The question naturally arises, does the present state of the church and of the world demand such an education in the Christian ministry? It is our firm conviction that it was never more imperiously demanded than it is now.

THE AGE IN WHICH WE LIVE REQUIRES AN INTELLIGENT AND A THOROUGHLY EDUCATED MINISTRY. The period of "passive obedience and divine right" in the church, has passed away. Men do not and cannot now resign the keeping of their minds and consciences to the hands of others. The world has at length become convinced that each one is to think and act and answer to God for himself; and men will not passively submit to the professed instructions of those

who are inadequate to comprehend the subjects which they investigate. No man will entrust an important cause and the disposal of his estate to the hands of him who is not acquainted with the principles of common and of statute law ; nor will any sensible man commit the keeping of his life and health to the care of a half educated physician. By common consent, a thorough, systematic education is demanded in each of these departments, and no one can calculate on success and usefulness in either, without a regular education. Hence we have our schools of law and medicine, and the men who come from them, come prepared to sustain and elevate the public intellect, as well as to secure respectability and usefulness in their respective spheres of labor. If public sentiment demands thorough education in these professions, much more does it in the Christian ministry. This holds a higher and a holier character, and is instituted expressly to teach mankind the all important principles of intellectual and moral science.

*The present state of the world demands a permanent ministry.* We are aware that this is a sentiment contrary to the opinions and practices of many at the present day. But we think, that we more and more clearly perceive the necessity of settled and permanent principles of action, and, especially, a demand for a more settled and permanent character of religious sentiments and measures ; to secure which, nothing is more important than a permanently established ministry. The present is an active, enterprizing, restiff, changing and in some respects an intelligent age of the world, and HE who is to stand forth most prominent of all, to secure confidence and respect, should be far before others especially in that department, to which he has devoted his life. There is so much written and read at the present day, on religious and theological subjects, that an uneducated minister will find many in almost every congregation who are more intelligent than himself, on the very subjects which he attempts to teach, and we are assured that such will not long rest satisfied with his ministrations. Such a minister cannot calculate on a permanent settlement in any part of our land. The intelligent cannot and ought not to sustain his ministry, and the unenlightened part of the community have too much pride to do it.

*We live in an age of active and untiring opposition to the religion of the Gospel.* Unprincipled men are watching the defects of the clergy, and are assailing them, for the purpose of weakening the public confidence in the religion of Christ, and of destroying the faith for which the ministry is to contend. The press is crowded with infidel productions, while many a

pulpit is pouring forth the most destructive heresy. Many of the opposers of religion are intelligent men, who wield the weapons of infidelity with uncommon skill: heresy is springing up in new and ever-changing forms, presented in the most imposing attitude, fortified by the show of extensive research, and recommended by the charms of literature and the powers of eloquence. Many are striving to convince the people, that evangelical religion is opposed to correct philosophy, and that increased knowledge will dishonor its absurdity, and additional refinement be offended with its spirit. Hence more than ordinary talent and learning are required to meet and correct these mistakes, and to turn the weapons of infidelity to its own destruction. Truth often suffers in the hands of the unskilful, while intelligently directed, it is sure to prevail.

*The age in which we live, is also, an age of speculation.* Long established principles are yielding to new theories of thought and feeling, and sometimes it would seem, that the whole system of moral action must be changed. It is emphatically an age of experiment. Even good men are often disposed to dwell on the philosophy of religion, rather than enforce the pure principles of piety. And no men are so liable to be captivated and bewildered by the crude speculations of religious philosophy, as those who are but partially educated. There is an appearance of learning and research about it, which they imagine will conceal their real defect of education, and which will be received by the mass of people, as the substantial elements of truth and righteousness: And from want of mental acumen and intellectual discipline, they are unable to foresee objections and to apprehend difficulties: Every thing appears to them perfectly plain and consistent: where many a profound scholar has found his way dark and difficult, they seem to walk with unclouded vision; and the result is, they arrogate to themselves the powers of the most giant minds, capable of divesting the most intricate subjects of every difficulty, when years have failed to give satisfaction and success to the labors of the most intelligent and learned. No men are so arrogant and fearless, so unwilling to walk in beaten paths, so reckless of consequences; and yet no men are so liable to be deceived and ruined. At such a time as this, every minister should be settled and grounded in the faith of the Gospel, and be able to distinguish between the philosophy of religion and religion itself; and also be prepared to bring before his people, in the most plain and affecting light the *results* of his own investigation, rather than dwell in scholastic terms upon the philosophical proofs by which he obtained them.

*The present is an age of enterprise* ; when plans for extensive usefulness are to be formed and carried into almost immediate execution : And these plans are deeply to affect the future generations of men ; to become a blessing or a curse, long after their projectors are dead. That intelligence and foresight which are gained only by mental discipline, acquaintance with history, and a correct judgement as to the probable result of moral causes, are now most imperiously demanded.

*The present age demands the whole time and the most untiring energies of the ministry.* After the ministry is once entered, few opportunities are afforded to increase scientific and literary attainments, and in fact, theological knowledge in most cases, must be improved, rather by reflection upon what has already been obtained, than by continued and extensive reading and investigating the labors of other men.

*This is also an age in which the moral and intellectual character of our country may be said to be forming.* This is emphatically true of that portion of our people, who are soon to hold the balance of power, and decide the destinies of this mighty nation. Those institutions are yet to be planted in the West, by which the intellectual and moral character of the people are to be formed. If that wide field, now sustaining in its ample bosom four millions of souls, be left without those institutions, upon which intelligence and sound morality depend, fearful indeed will be the result, when in the maturity of strength and the multitude of their population, its inhabitants shall rise and say to the whole land, who shall be our rulers and what shall be our laws. And who that has had any knowledge of the past, does not know that Ministers of the Gospel, have had the chief labor and responsibility in creating and sustaining our literary and religious institutions, and hence acting with prodigious power on our political character ? Our sympathies are justly excited for the West ; our kindred and friends are there. We would extend across the mountains the right-hand of fellowship, and pay them that tribute which is justly due to their enterprize and toils. There we should send our ablest and best men. It requires, comparatively, but little talent, education and experience, to sustain literary and religious institutions in our older settlements ; but to harmonize, arrange and compact the elements of society in our new settlements, brought together from every part of the world, with every variety of feeling, shade of sentiment and aspect of character, requires consummate skill, and no ordinary share of public confidence. We must not forget that in our new settlements, are found men of the first enterprize, talent and experience ;

many of whom have gone from us, because they were most enterprising and active, if not most intelligent. It is a mistaken idea, that ministers of partial education will answer the demands of new settlements. To form the character of society there, we must send intelligent, educated men, and where we can, men of some experience. The rapid march of mind must be rightly directed, and that immense moral power secured on the side of truth and virtue, or all is lost.

*There is also a growing disposition in the present age, to undervalue and depreciate the Christian Ministry.* Every judicious measure should be adopted to check the growth of this spirit; but how shall it be done? We cannot compel men to respect the ministry. We have not the aids of ignorance and superstition; nor is there any thing in the circumstance of office to sustain them. They can gain respect only by showing that their influence is powerful, and at the same time salutary. They must hold dominion over the empire of mind, not by depressing the public intellect, but by elevating it, and leading the way to higher and nobler attainments in mental and moral science. Let the world see and know that the principles inculcated by the ministry are the results of sound philosophy, of thorough, systematic investigation; that they cannot be overthrown;—so convincing, that they cannot be refuted; so firm, that they cannot be shaken, and so clear that they cannot be obscured. Here is the right dominion over mind; and it is a necessary, unavoidable and an acceptable dominion; not a slavish acquiescence in what it cannot understand. This is the dominion, which every intelligent and good man should strive to obtain; and most of all, the man, who, to the ordinary attainments of human life, adds the knowledge which is borrowed from the inspiration of God. The church has nothing grand or imposing in her march when conducted by unskilful leaders. They retard the progress of Zion, disgrace themselves—and cause both “priest and people,” to sink in the estimation of the world. There was a time when the clergy of New England were loved, not feared as dangerous men; when their attainments were respected; their councils sought and confided in; when they threw around the intellectual, civil and religious interests of this endeared land a lofty and unbroken bulwark of defence. And with all she has lost from the degeneracy and heresy of many of her clergy, she stands pre-eminent now, and she stands so, because to a great extent, she still values and demands, and loves and respects an intelligent ministry. The Dissenting clergy of England have long stood low in the estimation of the people generally. While legal disabilities have contributed to their

depression, want of education has done a thousand times more. Talent and education will rise under all the discouragements of civil injunctions, while the strongest arm of legal immunities and the widest extent of governmental patronage cannot elevate and sustain that ministry, whose moral and intellectual superiority are wanting. And what has moral and intellectual superiority occasionally done for the clergy of England and Scotland ! We need only mention the names of Hall, Fuller, James, Foster and Chalmers—stars, that have gone up so beautiful and brilliant in the firmament of mind, to encourage, to cheer and to elevate. Let such men be multiplied in Europe and America as they should be, and as they might be, and soon there could not be found an infidel on either continent, who would dare oppose the truth they preach, while the clamorous ignorance of foolish men would be put to silence. Then, and not till then, will the Christian Ministry stand where God designed it should, as the sacramental hosts, as burning and shining lights to guide an erring world back to righteousness and peace.

E.

---

 REVIEWS.
 

---

RESEARCHES OF THE REV. E. SMITH AND REV. H. G. O. DWIGHT, IN ARMENIA: *including a journey through Asia Minor, and into Georgia and Persia ; with a visit to the Nestorian and Chaldean Christians of Oormiah and Salmas.* BY ELI SMITH, *Missionary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.* 2 Vols. 12mo. Boston : Crocker and Brewster. New York : Jonathan Leavitt. 1833.

We owe an apology to our readers for taking no earlier notice of these interesting volumes. It is a circumstance highly honorable to the American Board of Missions, and to our country, that they are able to engage in their service so many men who are competent and disposed to avail themselves of their favorable opportunities for adding to the stock of public information. No small share of the knowledge we now possess of the East has been derived from the communications of the Missionaries. How long is it, since anything calculated to excite our ordinary sympathies, was known respecting the people of Egypt, of Pal-

estine and Syria, and indeed the whole coast of the Levant? That such countries existed, we were aware, and we may have been tolerably familiar with their geographical relations, but as to any living interest in the character and condition of their inhabitants, we felt as little of it, as we now do in the people of Tartary or Thibet, or of any other country with which we are as imperfectly acquainted. But the East, at present, is a quarter of the world with which the religious public at least feel a sort of intimacy. Greece, and a considerable portion of Asia Minor, including the region about Constantinople, the whole of Palestine, Syria, and Egypt, as far up as Thebes, have been laid open by our Missionaries; and their permanent residence in several of the most interesting spots in those countries, their daily intercourse with the people, the facilities they have enjoyed for that minute observation without which an accurate knowledge of the manners and condition of a community cannot be obtained, and more than all, the *nature* of their intercourse so well adapted to draw out the prevailing notions and prejudices of every class on a subject which lies perhaps nearer the foundation of all national peculiarities of character than any other, have contributed to throw more light upon the actual condition of that part of the world, than had been communicated by all preceding travellers.

The expedition of Messrs. Smith and Dwight was designed to complete the body of valuable knowledge which had thus been acquired. Among the great number of important facts brought to light by the researches of Missionaries in Western Asia, not the least interesting were those which relate to the present condition of the *Oriental churches*. The information obtained respecting several of these churches, particularly such as are situated in the countries already mentioned, was as full and minute as could be desired. There were others, however, more remote in their situation, but not less important in their bearings upon the prospects of Christianity in the East, respecting which no more was known than could be learned from the scattered members of their communions, who occasionally came under the notice and observation of the missionaries. These were the Armenians, Georgians, Nestorians and Chaldeans, whose principal seats, to the East and South East of the Black Sea, are in countries lying quite out of the common range of commercial intercourse, and hitherto but imperfectly explored by any traveller. Of these sects the Armenians were the best known. Dispersed by their peculiar spirit of commercial enterprize through almost every part of the Turkish empire, and possessing churches in many of the principal cities, they came early in

contact with the missionaries, and the more the people became in this way known, the stronger grew the desire to ascertain their condition as it is in Armenia itself. The Georgians, Nestorians and Chaldeans, although of less account in respect to numbers and influence, yet residing in nearly the same region of country, might all be easily embraced in a single tour of observation, and thus four of the most eastern churches, situated in the heart of Asia, might be introduced at once to the familiar knowledge, and so to the sympathies of their brethren in the Western world.

We think there can be but one opinion respecting the manner in which this important object has now been accomplished : and every one must admit that the Prudential Committee of the American Board have been as happy in the choice of their agents, as they were wise in the conception of their plan. The enterprize was an arduous one—and required persons of peculiar qualifications to engage in it. In the first place, it required no common share of physical resolution and intrepidity, to undertake a journey which must inevitably be attended with so many inconveniencies and perils. A country but imperfectly known, occupied in some of those parts which it would be necessary to traverse by rude and predatory hordes, destitute of roads, of inns, and of almost every other accommodation necessary to the comfort and even safety of travellers, presented but a forbidding prospect ; and we scarcely wonder at the strong presentiment, which, Mr. Smith informs us, was felt at the commencement of the enterprize, both by himself and his companion, that they should never survive to re-visit their friends. A competent knowledge of some one or more of the languages generally understood and spoken in the countries to be visited, was another qualification, for which it is evident that the best interpreter would have been but a sorry substitute. It was also necessary that the travellers, whoever they might be, should possess some knowledge of men and things, especially as they exist in the Oriental world, so as not to be imposed upon by the disposition so strong in every country, and no where, perhaps, more so than in the East, to tax the credulity of strangers. In addition to this, they must be men of address—and possessed of such a tact in discerning character as would enable them always to choose at a glance the best possible way of conducting their inquiries. They should be men of enlarged views, free from narrow prejudices, capable of looking beyond mere forms, and of appreciating the true spirit of a people and of their institutions. If to these qualities we add a good share of prudence

and enlightened Christian zeal, we finish our own picture of an accomplished missionary pioneer.

Judging simply from the work before us, we should think that all the above qualifications were united in a remarkable degree, in the persons actually employed by the Board. The journey was not without its adventures and hair-breadth escapes; but these were nothing compared with the inconveniences and exposures to which the travellers were constantly subjected. In the simple, unaffected narrative, however, there is no parade of their personal sufferings. We only gather that these must have been oftentimes very great. Yet wherever we find them, whether lying under the wheels of their waggon, racked with fever, on the deserted plains of Gánjeh, or struggling alone through the snow-storm over the bleak mountains of the Kürds, it is with a stout heart, sustained by an unwavering trust in Providence, and conviction of the worth of their object. The ability and faithfulness with which this object was accomplished are evinced by the vast amount of information respecting the countries traversed, the manners of the people, the state of their intellectual and moral culture, and especially of their religion, which these "Researches" embody. We venture to say that there are few modern books of travels of the same size, which contain so much valuable matter, tending to illustrate the character and spirit of the people described, and calculated at the same time to interest readers of almost every class. The travellers seem to have let no opportunity escape them of drawing from the very best sources of information, a thing which required, in some instances, no small degree of perseverance and address: and the scrupulous accuracy with which every important fact is stated, together with the authority for it, invites the confidence of every discerning reader. In fact the whole narrative breathes an air of simplicity and truth. The delicate task of commenting upon the religious customs and character of a whole Christian people is performed with a becoming modesty and independence. For the most part, the facts are stated, and the reader left to draw his own conclusions. But whenever the writer chooses to report his own impressions, it is done in a manner equally creditable to his judgment and to his heart. These volumes contain no over-charging of colors merely for the sake of producing an effect: and although all descriptions of foreign countries must necessarily be of a *subjective* character, and tinged more or less with the peculiarities of the traveller through whose mind they come to us, yet we must say, that the work before us is as free from that necessary defect as anything of the kind we ever read.

We may here remark that whatever merit is attached to the execution and form of the work, as it appears before the public, belongs to Mr. Smith; who availed himself, however, of the separate journal kept by Mr. Dwight, so that we have embodied together the results of the observations made by both of those gentlemen, independently of each other. The manner in which this is done, is worthy of all praise. There is one particular in which we think Mr. Smith is peculiarly happy, and that is, in the arrangement of his matter. The results of his observations on the several subjects of inquiry, which, if they had been all brought together under so many distinct heads, might have proved rather dry and tedious in the reading, are so interspersed with the personal narrative, that the attention of the reader seldom flags, and few we believe, would take up the work, and be willing to relinquish it, until they arrived at the end.

In proceeding to give some account of the contents of these volumes, we shall confine ourselves chiefly to the thread of the narrative.

Messrs. Smith and Dwight met at Malta in February 1830, and pursuant to their instructions, brought by the latter gentleman from America, proceeded in the following month to Smyrna, and thence by land to Constantinople. Whilst here, they took an early opportunity to call upon the Armenian patriarch, by whom they were received with much apparent cordiality. The patriarch of this See, although not superior in ecclesiastical dignity to the other bishops, is, it seems, in one sense, the most important officer in the Armenian church; being the only recognized medium of communication between that church and the Turkish government. Hence his authority extends, in a certain sense, over all the Armenians in Turkey. Having received from this important personage all the information which could be obtained in repeated visits, and, with the assistance of several intelligent friends, definitely fixed upon their route, to the farthest point which they reached, on the morning of the 21st of May the travellers were ready to leave the Turkish capital for Armenia. According to their instructions they were to embark here in some vessel for Trebizond. But fortunately the prevailing winds rendered this plan impracticable. Thus they were obliged to go by land; and to this circumstance we owe the exhilarating account of their journey through Asia Minor. The Turkish mode of travelling post is somewhat different from our own, and we therefore introduce the following description of it by Mr. Smith.

"We now travel tartar in fine style, and I must invite you to look at us, as we move over these naked plains. Two horses, the first led by a *sürjij* upon a separate animal, and the second tied by his halter to the tail of his companion, carry our baggage. Our tarter, with a *kalpak* (cap) of black lambskin upon his head some twelve or fifteen inches in length, looking much like a stove-pipe with a yellow cushion stuffed into its upper extremity, and a heavy *kumchy* in his hand to give force to his frequent exclamation of *haideh*, rides by their side. We, metamorphosed into Turks, with unshaven lip and turbaned head, bring up the rear. Every stage, often thirty miles or more, is travelled without allowing our horses a drop of water, and our gait is frequently a rapid gallop; in enduring which, the loaded animals especially exhibit a strength and hardiness that quite astonish us. Besides the smart of the tartar's lash, the weight of their load, and the swiftness of their gait, they are subject to many cruel accidents. A false step in such rapid travelling often causes one to stumble, and the other, tied as he is to him, is most ungently and unceremoniously arrested; or if the ground is hilly, one sometimes rolls down a declivity, and drags his companion reluctantly after him. Their motion is so great, that, snugly as our baggage is packed, not a stage is passed without its turning more than once, so as to bring the girt, sustaining the whole weight of the load, suddenly across the poor animals' back, often already completely excoriated by the chafing of the saddle. Such accidents being frequently the fault of the *sürjij*, are apt to bring him into a quarrel with the tartar, in which we have more than once seen the *yataghan*, instead of the *kumchy*, applied to his back."

In this way our travellers scoured over the plains, frequently at the rate of 60 miles a day, without any considerable halt except at night, until in just 10 days from Constantinople they arrived at Tokát. The sensations produced by such rapid and continued riding on horseback is thus naturally described.

"The last two or three hours of our stage seemed of interminable length, for drowsiness came upon me like an armed man, and resistance was in vain. My utmost efforts could but just open my senses sufficiently to external objects to give my dreams a new starting point, before away they would fly in spite of me with all the velocity of their nature. If a nod, that disturbed my balance, again arrested them, it was but to allow them to start afresh from some new goal as speedily as before. Thus the velocity of dreams was mistaken in my imagination for our actual gait, and we seemed to have travelled hours, when we had really advanced but a few rods."

Tokát will always be remembered by the friends of missions as the place where the excellent Martyn found his early grave. It is described by Mr. Smith as a beautiful city, surrounded with extensive and luxuriant gardens, and containing, in connexion with its vicinity, not far from 24,000 Armenians. The last circumstance, if no other, would be sufficient, we should suppose, to indicate it as the most eligible spot for a missionary station among the Armenians in that part of Asia Minor. The climate, however, should certainly be taken into consideration.

After spending a few days at Tokát the travellers proceeded on their journey at the same rapid rate. The season was "leafy June," as we suppose it must be in that part of the world as well as in this. In some places they found the fruit-trees

now in blossom. The country was a continual succession of mountains and vallies, and the inhabitants with their picturesque costume contributed to diversify and enliven the scene. Thus it continued to Sheriván, from which place there is a direct post-road of but two stages to Trebizond; but our travellers were persuaded to give up their contemplated excursion to this city, which they did with the less reluctance as they were anxious to reach Erzroom before it should be left by the Russians. Here they began to see some of the effects of the Russian invasion, for the post-establishment had been completely broken up, and it was not without difficulty they succeeded in procuring horses to convey them on their journey. The last of these, which they could obtain, failed while they were still four hours from the end of the stage. It was near night, and the rain poured down in torrents. A peasant, whom they providentially met, directed them to the nearest village, consisting of a few Turkish houses. The one in which our two travellers lodged on this occasion, is given as a fair sample of the under-ground houses so common throughout Armenia.

“It was formed by digging into the side of a hill so as completely to bury in it three of the walls, and leave only enough of the fourth exposed in front to admit of a door-way. Upon the terrace was thrown a mound of dirt that restored the hill almost to its original shape, and gave a front view resembling the burrow of some animal. Its walls were of rough round-stones; its terrace was of unhewn branches of trees, blackened by being intentionally burnt to preserve them, or incidentally smoked by the daily fire; and its floor was the naked ground. It consisted of but one room, eighteen or twenty feet square, around which were scattered a variety of kitchen and dairy furniture. By the side of a post was a cheese pressing between two stones. A bag of yoghoort was suspended from a straggling stick that contributed to form the terrace. In another part hung a cylindrical churn some six feet long. In the centre a hole in the ground did, when heated, the service of an oven. In a corner stood two calves.”

From this place they were obliged to prosecute their journey to Erzroom in ox-carts.

Ezroom is situated in the middle of a vast plain not far from the sources of the Euphrates. It is considered as the capital of the Armenian possessions in Turkey. When visited by Messrs. Smith and Dwight, the place was in the utmost confusion, having just been deserted by nearly all its Arminian population, amounting to about 19,000 souls, who had been induced to abandon their homes by the persuasion of the Russians, or their dread of the Turks. The Russian general advised our missionaries to go too, assuring them that it would be unsafe for any European to remain in the city after the departure of his troops. But the missionaries chose to follow their own judgement, and did not leave until four days after the Russians

were gone. Yet so far were they from experiencing any incivility from the Turks, that they were treated with rather unusual attention. Perhaps they owed their good fortune in part to their knowledge of medicine—which was the means of introducing them to some respectable Turkish families. It was with difficulty, however, that any of the Turks could be made to understand from what part of the world they were come, as not a soul in Erzroom had ever heard of such a country as America.—We find here the same complaints of the inhospitable climate of Erzroom as have been repeated ever since the days of Alexander Scoerus. Mr. Smith ascribes it to the elevated situation of the place, which we were surprised to learn is estimated at 7,000 feet above the level of the sea. This would account for it in part, but there may be something also in the conjecture of Tournefort who was here too in the middle of June, and supposes the extreme cold which one night froze the water in which he kept his plants to the thickness of two lines, to be owing to the mineral salts with which the soil is every where deeply impregnated.

The departure of the Armenians, hastened that of our travellers, and nine days after their arrival at Erzroom we find them on the way to Kars. The road was filled for a great part of the distance with Armenian emigrants, whose general appearance was that of extreme poverty and wretchedness.

“ They were clothed in rags. Their furniture consisted of a few dirty mattresses, cushions, coverlets and rugs, a cradle, a churn, a pail or wooden bottle, a few copper pans and kettles, and in some cases a small chest. A few cattle and sheep accompanied them. Mothers with infant children generally found a place in an empty cart. But in some cases, they were mounted upon a horse, a mule, or an ass, with the heads of their little ones projecting from baskets or bags upon either side of the animal; in others the tender charge was fastened alone upon the baggage in a cart, or upon the back of a beast; and not unfrequently the mother walked with it slung in a pouch upon her back. Most of the rest, men, women and children, were on foot, though the mire in some parts of the plain was deep. All had the same hardy, sunburnt and coarse complexion. In none, not even in the females, all of whom, except the marriageable and newly married girls, were unveiled, did we discover that fair and interesting countenance which distinguishes their countrymen in Smyrna and Constantinople. They were equally inferior, too, in form, being lower in stature, and of a broader and coarser frame. Nearly all bore marks of a desponding spirit. What had brought upon them this extreme of penury? Their country is hardly inferior to any in the world for the cultivation of grain, and the raising of herds and flocks; and their sobriety and orderly conduct is acknowledged by all. It can be nothing else than the blighting influence of Mohammedan oppression, that has caused them thus to wither away.”

Kars, the last considerable town in Turkey, was now also in the hands of the Russians. Messrs. Smith and Dwight tarried here a few days, and were then expedited on their journey

by the politeness of the Russian commandant. Thus they entered the territories of the Czar and proceeded on their way till they were arrested by a sanitary cordon, in a valley so beautiful, that they could hardly regret the necessity of being detained in it to perform their 15 days of quarantine. Here they found themselves in the midst of a large Russian army. The commanding officer, to whom they brought a letter from Pankraticff at Kars shewed them many kind attentions and gave them the most eligible lodgings in the camp.

But we must hasten on with our travellers to Tiflis the capital of Georgia. The following lively description of this city under its present Russian masters, almost transports one into the midst of it.

“Tiflis has the appearance of an excessively busy and populous place. Its streets present not only a crowded, but, unlike many oriental cities, a lively scene. Every person seems hurried by business. Nor is the variety of costumes, respecting different nations and tongues, many of which are curious and strange, the least noticeable feature of the scene. The Russian soldier stands sentry at the corners of the streets, in a coarse great-coat concealing the want of a better uniform and even of decent clothing. The Russian subaltern jostles carelessly along in a little cloth cap, narrow-skirted coat and tight pantaloons, with epaulettes dangling in front of naturally round shoulders. In perfect contrast to him stands the stately Turk, if not in person, yet represented by some emigrant Armenian, with turbaned head and bagging shalwar. The Georgian priest appears, cane in hand, with a green gown, long hair and broad brimmed hat; while black flowing robes, and a cylindrical lambskin cap, mark his clerical brother of the Armenian church. The dark Lesgy, with the two-edged *kama* (short sword,) the most deadly of all instruments of death, dangling at his side, seems prowling for his victim as an avenger of blood. The city-bred Armenian merchant waits upon his customers, snugly dressed in an embroidered frock-coat, gay calico frock, red silk shirt, and ample green trowsers also of silk. The tall lank Georgian peasant, with an upright conical sheepskin cap, and scantily clothed, looks as independent in his *yapanjy* (cloak of felt,) as Diogenes in his tub. His old oppressor, the Persian, is known by more flowing robes, smoothly combed beard and nicely dinted cap. In the midst of his swine appears the half-clad Mingrelian, with a bonnet like a tortoise shell tied loosely upon his head. And in a drove of spirited horses, is a hardy mountaineer, whose round cap with a shaggy flounce of sheepskin dangling over his eyes, and the breast of his coat wrought into a cartridge box, show him to be a Circassian.”

Our author gives no very favorable account of the influence which the present military government of Georgia has had upon the intelligence and morals of the people. There was no general provision for the education of the young. In Tiflis a school had existed for some time, for Georgians and Russians consisting of about 200 scholars, a small number compared with the population. The whole native population of Armenians, Georgians, and Moslems, is computed at 30,000 souls, of whom the Armenians constitute about one half. The system of education among the latter, under the direction of arch-bishop

Nérses, had promised to be very extensive and efficient, but since the removal of that enlightened and patriotic Armenian by the Russians, things were fast returning to their old state. The splendid structure which he had erected chiefly from his own resources was going to decay, and the establishment dwindling from a gymnasium of the first class to a common school. Not far from Tiflis lies one of the German colonies, to which the attention of the missionaries was directed in their instructions. They visited it on the first Sabbath after their arrival.

“ It consists of two rows of neatly white-washed houses of one story, at moderate distances from each other, along a broad and straight street; and contains not far from 200 inhabitants, who have the regular instructions of a minister of the gospel. We had already become acquainted with pastor Saltet, and found him an intelligent and extremely devout man. We felt at our first interview, that he was ripe for heaven, but knew not that he would so soon be there. Within a month, he was brought by the cholera, in less than twenty-four hours, from perfect health to the grave. He was the general spiritual inspector of all the colonies, and informed us that some at least of his charge were excellent Christians. As we entered his church, the worshippers were dropping in one by one, and quietly taking their seats; while the devotion in their countenances showed that they felt the solemnity of the duties in which they were about to engage, and the books in their hands testified that they had been instructed to understand, as well as to perform them. The prayers of the pastor seemed to breathe the united and heartfelt devotion of all; his sermon was a direct, affectionate, and earnest address to every hearer; and the singing, which affected me more than all, was in good German taste, simple, solemn and touching. I shall not attempt to describe the feelings awakened by this scene, refreshing as an oasis in a boundless desert, though, in spite of me at the time, they expressed themselves in tears.”

The history of these colonists which Mr. Smith afterwards gives at length, is one of the most interesting parts of his work.

On the road between Tiflis and Shoosha, to which they were hastening, as a retreat from the hot season, both the missionaries together with their Armenian attendant were attacked with fever. The air was filled with pestilential vapor, for the cholera, of which, however, they had as yet heard nothing, was then passing and sweeping everything before it through the isthmus between the Caspian and Black seas. After much exposure and fatigue, from which they did not soon recover, they at last reached their place of destination, on the top of a lofty mountain, and here in the family of the German missionaries experienced that kindness and hospitality which strangers in sickness and at a distance from their native home best know how to appreciate.

It was not until the first of November, when the cholera had begun to cease from its ravages in the neighborhood, and the health of Mr. Smith was in some good degree restored, that our travellers thought it safe to resume their journey. Their

ultimate point being Tebriz in Persia, instead of taking the common route, they chose a less frequented one which leads over the mountains of Kara-bagh to Nêkhchevân. They had two reasons for pursuing this course. It was the route to Ecmiâdzin which it was their design to visit on their way; and it would afford them an opportunity of "seeing the Armenians in a more primitive and simple state than they are perhaps elsewhere to be found."

The account of the ancient convent of Datev, whose hospitality the missionaries engaged for the night, does not give us a very exalted idea either of the intelligence or the piety of its inmates, and we imagine that the companion of the Apostle Thaddeus, who is held to have been its founder, would now be not a little ashamed of his successors. In the Kakhia of the neighboring village, however, at whose house they were detained by a violent storm, they found a more interesting character.

"Seated in the family circle with our host, his wife and children, and a few neighbors, around the tandoor, we passed an interesting evening. He was the son of one of the priests of the village, was a sober-minded thinking man, and possessed much more information than one would expect to find in such a place. His own inclination gave the conversation a serious turn, and to prove or illustrate the various topics discussed, he brought forth and frequently referred to the *family Bible*; a treasure which we found in no other instance in Armenia, and even here perhaps an unwillingness to think that it does not exist, rather than the real circumstances of the case, induce me to use the name. It was a quarto printed at Moscow and given by the missionaries at Shoosha to the father of our host; and though in the ancient dialect, we found him able to understand it, and somewhat acquainted with its contents. His seriousness made him a promising subject for missionary instruction; and that his candor was encouraging, may be shown by the effect which only one passage of Scripture had upon his mind. Having learned from Antonio that bishops in our country are married, he appealed to us with the greatest astonishment, for the reason of so uncanonical a practice. We simply referred him to 1 Tim. 3: 2. After examining it attentively, his astonishment was completely reversed, and he asked us with quite as great anxiety, why the Armenian church had forbidden the custom. We replied, that in the face of such plain passages of Scripture we could not be responsible for its decisions, and he must ask his own bishops the reason of them."

The author's description of the mistress of this family may serve as a specimen of the Armenian women in this district.

"Our host's wife, like most of the women in the mountains of Kara-bagh, was unveiled. But her chin, in the usual style, was swaddled in an enormous muffler reaching to her nose, and a white cloth passing over from her forehead flowed down upon her shoulders behind. She spoke not a loud word from the time we entered the house. If occasion required her to address a person too distant for a very low whisper to be heard, her little daughter stood by her side, and listening to her whispers, expressed her wishes aloud. Such is the etiquette of female modesty in the presence of strangers, not only here, but extensively among the Armenians. It applies, however, only to the younger women; as we had to-day abundant evidence. For some old ladies of the neighborhood, who happened to call, were not prevented by it, nor by the still greater obstacle of their mufflers, from almost stunning us with their chatter."

Soon after leaving the mountainous district of Karabagh they entered the city of Nakhcheván which, as, claiming the honor of being the oldest one in the world, deserves a passing notice. Its houses are built of mud baked in the sun, and having no windows opening to the street, present a peculiarly dreary appearance. The city, however, is surrounded with luxuriant gardens, and "the grapes, especially, are almost unequalled in excellence, and seem to deserve the honor of growing on the spot where "Noah began to be a husbandman and planted a vineyard." "On the road from this place to Eriván, the travellers obtained their first and best view of mount Ararat, which like other insulated mountains, was found to vary its appearance considerably when seen from different points of view.

"At Eriván it presents two peaks, one much lower than the other, and appears to be connected with a range of mountains extending toward the northwest, which, though really elevated, are in comparison so low, as only to give distinctness to the impression of its lonely majesty. From Nakhcheván, not far from a hundred miles distant, and also from our present point of observation, it appears like an immense isolated cone of extreme regularity, rising out of the low valley of the Aras; and the absence of all intervening objects to show its distance or its size, leaves the spectator at liberty to indulge the most sublime conceptions his imagination may form of its vastness. At all seasons of the year, it is covered far below its summit with snow and ice, which occasionally form avalanches, that are precipitated down its sides with the sound of an earthquake, and, with the steepness of its declivities, have allowed none of the posterity of Noah to ascend it. It was now white to its very base with the same hoary covering; and in gazing upon it, we gave ourselves up to the impression that on its top were once congregated the only inhabitants of the earth, and that, while travelling in the valley beneath, we were paying a visit to the second cradle of the human race."

A few miles from Eriván is Echmiádzin, the ecclesiastical capital of the Armenians. Here the missionaries seem to have been received at first rather coolly, although they brought letters to the Catholicos and his secretary from the most respectable quarters. As they were afterwards treated, however, with great civility, perhaps the first apparent slight was owing, in part, to the hurry and bustle occasioned by the reception of other more illustrious visitors who arrived at the same time with our missionaries, as well as by the preparations for the approaching festival. Mr. Smith thus describes the St. Peter's of Armenia, where he was present at the celebration of a pompous mass.

"The church itself added to the imposing ceremony, by its venerable structure. The main body of it, substantially built of hewn stone in the form of a cross, is surmounted by a dome in the best style of the cylindro-conical order already described. Its belfry, an antique tower terminated in several pyramidal turrets and loaded with bells, rests upon massive square columns, which form the porch to the main entrance at the western extremity. Within, four enormous pillars descending from the circumference of the dome, uphold it with all the lofty vaults which support the roof. Portraits of saints, and sketches of scripture and legendary events, cover its walls, and by their grotesque de-

sign and clumsy execution, contribute to deepen the impression of the monkish scene. One venerable father stands forth in perfect nudity, except that a monstrous beard, extending to the ground, performs one of the most necessary uses of dress. Numerous silver lamps and a few glass chandeliers suspended from above, were on this occasion all lighted. More than half of the floor from the altar to the porch is enclosed by a railing for the special use of the clerical attendants, and was covered with carpets, some of which surpassed description in elegance and richness. The principal altar occupies a high elevation in a lofty alcove, or sanctuary, at the eastern extremity, and groaned under massive gold crosses, silver candlesticks, and many other not less costly ornaments. Two sanctuaries of smaller dimensions are furnished with altars on either side of it, and one of them served this morning for a sacristy. In the middle of each of the side walls, too, is another sanctuary, or chapel, and still another small one occupies an isolated position in the middle of the floor, directly under the centre of the dome. The latter was surrounded by curtains of gold cloth of different patterns, and far surpassed every other part, in the exquisite finish and superlative richness of its furniture and ornaments. It is probably built upon the stone, respecting which Chardin reports a tradition of the Armenians, that it covers the hole where Christ, when he appeared to Loosavorich, thrust down to hell the evil spirits which formerly dwelt in the idol temples of Armenia. In a word, the display of wealth this morning, in candlesticks, crosses, curtains, carpets and dresses, seemed to me not surpassed even by that which is made at the celebration of high mass in the church of St John at Malta."

After this description of the principal church of the Armenians, we may next introduce that of their ecclesiastical head, whom, it seems, the missionaries had but one opportunity of seeing, and then only on a public occasion.

"On leaving the room of the bishop, mentioned at the close of my last letter, we found the monks, in their gayest clerical robes, paraded in double file along the pavement, which leads to the church door from the entry to the apartments of the Catholicos. It appeared, on inquiry, that to-morrow was to be the twentieth anniversary festival of his inauguration, and that they were now about to conduct him in pomp to evening prayers, as the commencement of the ceremonies of the occasion. He soon came forward tottering with the decrepitude of age, and, leaning upon the arms of attendants, was led through their ranks. A gold cross only upon his cowl, and a staff, his badge of office, in his hand, distinguished him from rest. Two attendants held a broad canopy of crimson over his head, and two or three deacons, going backward before him, perfumed him continually with incense. It was the pope of Armenia in festal show."

The peculiar office of the Catholicos is to ordain bishops, and to consecrate the *meiron*. The *meiron* is a sort of holy oil, to which the Armenians attach a superstitious value, and its indispensable importance on various occasions of ecclesiastical ceremony, renders it a source of considerable income, both to the treasury of Echmiádzin, and to the agents who are employed in distributing it about. The power of the Catholicos in appointing bishops is confined at present to Armenia proper; and since he has become a subject of the Russian government, his relations with the Armenians of Turkey are less close than they ever were before. Mr. Smith is of the opinion that an entire dissolution of them would leave the Armenians of Turkey more open to the operations of missionaries.

After several very interesting interviews with the vartabèds, and the secretary of the Catholicos, in which they strove to make amends for their former coldness by the frankness and cordiality of their behavior, our travellers took their leave of Echmiádzin and proceeded on their journey to Tebriz. Before they could reach the latter place, Mr. Smith was attacked by a violent disease, and in this condition was obliged to pass two days on the ground in a miserable stable, where the offensive smell and constant noise would have been intolerable, even to a well man. A messenger was immediately despatched by his companion, Mr. Dwight, to Tebriz, and by the prompt attention of Dr. McNeill, the physician, and first assistant of the English embassy at that court, who lost no time in repairing to the spot in person, the sufferer was safely removed to the Persian capital of Prince Abbas, where he found comfortable and well furnished apartments ready for his reception. Here, in the midst of friends, to whose hospitality and kindness there were no bounds, he soon recovered sufficiently to resume his duties.

The number of Arminians in Tebriz is at present extremely small; great numbers of them having emigrated since the late war from the Persian into the Russian territories. Those who remain are under the protection of an English governor. Their moral character is proverbially bad, but they are comparatively free from the prejudices of their sect, against missionary labors, and a school might be established among them without difficulty. It was here Messrs. Smith and Dwight had the opportunity of attending the only Armenian sermon which they heard during the whole of their journey. The preacher was a bishop, distinguished among his brethren for his peculiar gifts.

“ In the absence of a pulpit, a chair was placed for him in front of the altar, and a rich carpet spread before it. Chairs were also offered to us, but we declined them, and took our seat among the audience on the floor. His subject was the proper observance of the fasts; and his thoughts were probably unpremeditated, and of little value. But his manner was striking. He commenced sitting, and that seemed the posture he chose to maintain, but the animation of delivery frequently called him upon his feet, and urged him forward to the edge of his carpet with a fine effect. No tone marked his enunciation, nor any stiffness his gestures. It was nature that spoke and acted; and nature indeed in too undisguised a form except for these regions. Violent actions; varied, often high keyed and passionate tones; and significant contortions of the countenance, expressed his sentiments more clearly than the words he uttered, and would have astounded a more polite audience, as the ravings of madness. But here, where every man is accustomed from infancy to be kicked and flogged into his duty, all was in place, and was needed. He took occasion in his remarks to reprove the boys who had sported with the bonfire yesterday, by accusing them of bringing upon their church the ridicule of the foreigners who were present; and, as if unable otherwise to express his feelings, he actually spat at them in contempt. All his violence of action, however, failed of fixing the attention of his audience. The women were repeatedly engaged in loud talk; once, conversation seem-

ed to be general throughout the house ; and the boys, stationed near the altar for the purpose of aiding in the performance of prayers, manifested such a constant disposition to play, that he was once constrained to order them in a rage, to be silenced by flogging."

While at Tebriz, the missionaries made many inquiries respecting the Nestorian and Chaldean Christians of Kúrdistán. Finding it to be impracticable from the lateness of the season, and the unsettled state of the country to return (as it was suggested in their instructions that they might find it expedient to do) by the way of Mesopotamia and Syria, and thus to visit those sects upon the southern side of the Kúrdish mountains, they turned their attention to those Nestorians and Chaldeans who, they were informed by the English at Tebriz, inhabited in considerable numbers the western borders of the lake of Oormiah.

They left Tebriz on the 4th of March, to make the circuit of this lake, having first provided themselves with a *rákam*, a passport from the Persian Government, and with several recommendatory letters from English officers to the chiefs and khans at the places which they intended to visit. On the 9th they arrived at the first Chaldean village, Khósrova. This is the residence of the bishop of all the Chaldeans on the northern side of the Kúrdish mountains. As they rode up to his house, they were met and welcomed by "an old man with a long Kúrdish cap, green turban, and ragged sheep-skin pelisse. It was Mar Yohanna, the bishop." They found these Christians to be nothing more nor less than Papal Syrians. Both the bishop and his confidential priest had been educated at Rome, and were still connected with that See.

The most interesting part of this excursion was the visit to the Nestorians in the province of Oormiah. Their frank and open character, the simplicity of their service, the extreme liberality which they profess towards other sects, the freedom with which they communicated information, and the eagerness with which they received it, all made a strong impression upon our missionaries. They are, however, extremely ignorant, and the church services which are in the Syriac language are not comprehended by the common people. None of the Nestorian females are taught letters. This neglect of education according to the account of one of their bishops, is involuntary. "You," said he, "can attend to such things, but we, both men and women, are obliged to labor with all our might to get money for the moslems. Even if a boy sits down to read, a moslem comes up before he is aware, and with a blow upon his neck, says, 'Give us money.'"

Different from the Chaldeans, the Nestorians in celebrating the eucharist, all partake of both the elements, though they firmly believe in the real presence. They also admit all known Christian sects, who will come, to their communion, and in return "the Nestorians have full liberty to go to the communion of any other denomination."

Mr. Smith concludes his account of this very interesting people with the following remarks on the expediency of establishing a mission in this part of Persia.

"We have little to say, in addition to the account already given of the Persian *moslems*, to enable you to judge what would be the prospects of a mission established specially for them. Such a mission we are not prepared decidedly to recommend; though our persuasion is strong, that a missionary, while directing his attention expressly and primarily to the Christian population, would find many occasions and means of doing good to the followers of Mohammed also, as a secondary branch of labor.—The *Armenian* population is so small and dispersed that any considerable number could with difficulty be reached; not to mention another certainly important consideration—their extreme degradation. In hesitating to recommend these two classes of people as promising objects of missionary labor in Persia, we are of course to be understood as declining to propose the city of Tebriz for a missionary station.—But to the *Nestorians* of Oormiah we would specially direct your attention. That Abbas Mirza would, without doubt, patronize missionary efforts for their improvement, and in fact for the improvement of all his Christian subjects, we received the unanimous testimony of all the members of the English embassy. Equally decided assurance was given us that missionary families in Oormiah, would be secure from any oppression; for besides being favorably regarded by the prince, the ambassador also would protect them. Among others who accorded with these sentiments, were two gentlemen, who had resided some time in that province; and one of them added that the climate is very fine.

"That religious instruction is needed by the Nestorians, this and the preceding letter will have sufficiently convinced you. How it would be received by them experiment alone can fully determine. We cannot but refer you, however, to their extreme liberality toward other sects, their ideas of open communion, and their entire rejection of auricular confession, (that efficient police system of the other old churches,) as considerations which have produced in our minds a firm conviction, that a mission to the Nestorians would meet with far fewer obstacles, than among any other of the old churches. The week that we passed among them was among the most intensely interesting of our lives. For myself I felt a stronger desire to settle among them at once as a missionary, than among any people I have ever seen.

The missionaries returned to Tebriz on the 23d of March, and on the 9th of the following month set their faces towards home. As far as Khoy they retraced their former steps in the journey from Echmiádzin. Thence they proceeded in a north-westerly direction through the pastoral country of the Kürds, and crossed the Turkish frontier into the province of Bayezeed. The only important adventure they met with was in crossing the mountain which separates the last named province from the pashalik of Erzroom. Here they encountered a terrible storm, their baggage horses fell, and occasioned

them great delay as well as vexation, finally they were abandoned by their tartar, and left without a guide to find their own way as they best could. We give the rest of the story in Mr. Smith's own words.

"We had not yet reached the highest part of the mountain; the road we were unacquainted with, and it was beginning to be hidden by the newly fallen snow; the wind had acquired almost the violence of a hurricane, and drove the damp snow and sleet against us with such impetuosity as thoroughly to drench our clothes; their weight, as our jaded horses obliged us to walk almost every step, impeded our progress; and all our remaining strength was repeatedly called for to re-load the bags, which were repeatedly thrown off in our struggles to master the snow-drifts. As this accident happened once in an exposed situation, a dense dark cloud enveloped us, and a blast so piercing accompanied it that it seemed to penetrate to the heart. An indescribable sensation of horror came over me, and my companion was completely bewildered.

"The clouds at length broke away for a moment, as we reached a lofty summit, and showed us that we were at the top. Far down an unbroken and steep descent appeared the dark sides of naked hills, stripped of their wintry covering by a southern exposure to the rays of the sun. We dragged our horses, with all the speed that our strength and weight could give us, to the bottom; and then stumbling as we could, over snow-drifts and through mud, were at last cheered by a view of human habitations. Just then a single horseman, sent (whether by the old Kùrd or by our tarter at this late hour, we never learned,) to bring up our party, met us. No remonstrances, however, would induce him to go on to the succor of those we had left behind, and he returned with us. The village we had found was inhabited by Kùrds and called Dâhar: we entered it at sunset, having spent thirteen hours in riding six."

On the 23d they arrived at Erzroom, which, after their leaving Persia, seemed less uninviting than at their former visit. At Trebizond they embarked in an Austrian vessel for Constantinople, and on the 2d of July arrived safely at Malta, after an absence of fifteen months and a half.

"The Lord had delivered us," says Mr. Smith in recording this event, "from all our fears. The forebodings of misgiving nature or of wavering faith had not been realized. In the midst of pestilence, among barbarous people, and in inhospitable countries, the 'angel of the Lord had encamped around about us for our deliverance,' and we were brought back again in peace. Our friends had been equally protected, and now affectionately welcomed us again to their bosom. Letters awaited us from America, also, and cheered us with the most gratifying intelligence of what God was doing for our kindred and the churches of our land. And in the fulness of our hearts, we blessed the Lord, who had 'redeemed our life from destruction, and crowned us with loving-kindness and tender mercies.'"

The "Researches" are very appropriately introduced by "an historical sketch of Armenia," which appears to have been carefully compiled from the best sources of information. We conclude by expressing it as our confident opinion that this work will increase the general reputation of our missionaries, already so high, as men of enterprize and intelligence, as well as of piety, and will be considered as a valuable addition to the literature of our country.

MISCELLANEOUS.

---

IS SIN THE NECESSARY MEANS OF THE GREATEST GOOD?

MR. EDITOR,

My attention has been called, at this time, to the question above stated, by a paragraph which lately appeared in the *New York Evangelist*. Speaking of the Doctrinal Tract Society at Boston, a correspondent of the *Evangelist* says,

“I hope the society will do good; and I have no doubt it will, except so far as it adopts and acts on the principle that *sin is the necessary means of the greatest good*, and is therefore, in every instance, of its commission, better than holiness in its place. I say except, because I do not believe that it is better to *break* God's laws than it is to *keep* them. I think God knows what is best for himself and his kingdom than any man does. And when he, therefore, requires me to obey him on pain of death eternal, I think it is best to do it, and if God or His government is injured by it, to leave Him to look after the injury. I believe God understands his own interests and the interests of his kingdom too well to require me, on pain of eternal death, to do what will injure them. I am decidedly of the opinion that it is the safest and best on all accounts to *mind God*, let the consequences be what they may.”

I, Sir, am a member of the Doctrinal Tract Society, and have been so from its commencement. I know the principles on which it was instituted, and am well acquainted with most of its members; and I hesitate not to say that the insinuations contained in the foregoing paragraph are unfounded and injurious. If the writer knew no better than to pen such a paragraph, he is inexcusable for his ignorance. If he knew better, he is inexcusable for a worse reason.

The phrase, ‘Sin is the necessary means of the greatest good,’ was first coined and put off upon the Orthodox, I believe, by Dr. Taylor of New Haven. It was adopted—but with such explanations as went to nullify it—by some of those who replied to him. I say, *with such explanations as went to nullify it*; so that I think I may safely affirm, that there is not a member of the Doctrinal Tract Society, and probably not an Orthodox person in the United States, who holds (using the words in their proper sense) that “sin in the necessary means of the greatest good.” Certainly, there is not one who holds this, as the phrase is understood by the writer in the *Evangelist*.

We do believe that the system which God is pursuing, and will certainly accomplish, is (notwithstanding the sin involved in it) *the best conceivable system*. We think it dishonorable to God to represent him as having done the best that he could, and as being sorry that he could do no better. We believe that the plan which he has adopted, and is carrying into effect, embraces the highest amount of good which he can conceive or desire,

so that his whole mind is filled and satisfied with it, and rests in it with entire complacency. We hope none of our brethren entertain a different opinion, in regard to this important subject. But is this holding that "sin is the necessary means of the greatest good?" Nothing like it. What is "a necessary means?" Something more than a mere *sine qua non*;—it is that which has a necessary *tendency* to bring about a particular end. A *means* always implies an *end*; and must have some *tendency* to promote its end. But has sin any necessary, inherent *tendency* to bring about the greatest good? Nobody believes it. So far from this the plan of God, involving the greatest good requires that sin should be *over-ruled and counteracted in all its tendencies*.

Our Saviour once said, that he "came not to send peace on earth, but a sword. For I am come," says he, "to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law." Matt. x. 34. Suppose now it should be said, that Christ represented his religion as a *necessary means* of exciting wars among nations, and promoting broils and divisions in families. Would this be a fair interpretation of the Saviour's words? And yet it would be quite as fair, as to represent those who hold that God will *over-rule* the existence of sin for the greatest good, as believing that sin is "the *necessary means* of the greatest good." It is one thing for God to *cause* the wrath of man to praise him; and quite another, for the wrath and wickedness of man to have a necessary *tendency*, as means to an end, to promote his praise. It is one thing to suppose that God will *cause* sin, in opposition to all its tendencies and in spite of them all, to contribute to the greatest good; and quite another, to suppose it a "*necessary means* of the greatest good." The former of these suppositions, the great body of the Orthodox throughout the world adopt. The latter, in its proper signification, I presume no one adopts. And I hope the writer in the Evangelist, before he touches the subject again, will take pains to inform himself respecting it: and also that he will pay some attention to the ninth commandment.

P.

---

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

1. LECTURES, on the *Literary History of the Bible*; by REV. JOEL HAWES; on the *Principle of Association, as giving dignity to the Christian Character*; by REV. T. H. GALLAUDET; and on the *Temporal Benefits of the Sabbath*; by REV. HORACE HOOKER. *Originally delivered before the Goodrich Association.* Hartford: Cooke & Co. 1833. pp. 111.

We have read each of these Lectures with more than ordinary interest,

and can cheerfully recommend them to our readers as well worthy a perusal. It does not always take three men to make a book, especially in these book-making days, but when each of them might make a good one by himself, and two of them have done it, once and again, we may expect the better book, as the result of their joint labors.

These Lectures, however, have no relation to each other, except that they are bound together in the same volume. The subject of each is common and familiar, unless perhaps there is a slight air of novelty in the respective titles of the first and second. In the treatment of their subjects, the authors have all been happy; and many things are better said by them, than they have been wont to be said, by every one and on every occasion.

The most striking parts of Dr. Hawes' lecture are his quotations from Grimke, and his remarks on the friendliness of the Bible to civil liberty, on its power to awaken and cultivate the intellect, on its adaptedness to the wants and necessities of man, on its power of subduing all things to itself, and on the prospect and probability of its final universal reign. What he says on the history and literature of the Bible, though learned and adapted to be useful by enlightening the common reader, is well known and familiar to most persons acquainted with Biblical studies. But on the topics above mentioned, his thoughts, if not altogether new, are yet so fresh in form and manner, and so earnest in application, that they must, we think, necessarily lead to an enlarged estimation of the value of the Bible, and to a quickened sense of obligation, on the part of all its friends, to spread it abroad as fast as possible, till all of every land are supplied with the inestimable treasure. The lecture is a valuable one, and contains as succinct and lucid a view of the copious subject of which it treats, as could well be given.

In the lecture of Mr. Gallaudet, the author states the law of association both as to thought (which is all perhaps that is more commonly observed) and as to feeling, which, however, is no less important. He then goes on to point out some of the circumstances which go to modify this law; such as the progress of time, repetition, the perception of sensible objects, and the interest we feel in the objects associated, at the time when they are thus connected in the mind. In all this, though the general subject is trite, what is said, is said strikingly, often with much taste and beauty, as well as strength and force, in a way, too, not unfrequently, to make many common things appear in a new light.

The general result to which he comes in this part of his lecture he sums up thus:

“It seems, then, to be an important truth, that so far as we aim to have our happiness, in this world, derived from other sources than those of mere animal enjoyment, we are dependent, for a great amount of it, on our associations of thought and feeling; that these associations, generally, take place in accordance with the prevailing desires and purposes of the soul, and of course, derive their character from the objects of pursuit, and of hope, to which these purposes and desires are directed. If these objects are worthy of the affections of a virtuous and elevated mind, such will be the character of the associations of that mind, and such the kind of happiness which it enjoys.

“ But if these objects of pursuit, and of hope, are low, degrading, vicious, the mind that directs its desires and purposes towards them, must of necessity have similar associations of thought and feeling, and enjoyments, if, indeed, they can be called by that name, of the most base and unworthy kind.

“ It follows, also, from what has been said, that those objects of time and sense with which we are daily conversant; those occupations in which we are engaged; those duties which we are called upon to perform; those innocent pleasures in which we are permitted to indulge; those sufferings, difficulties, and trials, which we have to endure, become to us sources of happiness, on the one hand, or of wretchedness upon the other, not so much from the immediate and direct effects which they produce upon us, as from the associations of thought and feeling with which they are connected. So far, then, as we aspire to enjoyments, not of an animal, but of an intellectual and moral kind, we have it in our power, (by the control that our desires and purposes have over our associations of thought and feeling,) to shed the freshness and brightness of some kind of mental imagery, (as our peculiar taste may be,) upon all the objects and pursuits which interest us, and to see reflected from all that is around us, as in the mirror of Nature itself, the splendid illusions of a poetical fancy, or the fairer and prophetic visions of heaven-born Hope.”

In the remaining part of the lecture, his object is, to exemplify the truths contained in this result, in relation to Christian character, or to use his own language, ‘ in relation to that kind and degree of happiness, and to that elevation and dignity of character, which the objects of the Christian’s faith and hope, have a direct and natural tendency to produce in him, in strict accordance with the known laws of the human mind, and more especially with this law of association.’

He then proceeds to speak of the body as a medium of pain or pleasure also of the contemplations of the works of nature, and finally of the occupations, duties, pleasures, sufferings, difficulties and trials of life.

Whether it is because we apprehend him less perfectly in his exemplifications than in the statement of his principles, or because we have a fondness for principle rather than illustration, we cannot say, (though we think it is not want of understanding our author,) but for some reason we have not been so much interested in the latter part of the lecture as we were in the first part of it. However, the whole is full of elevated and pure thought, expressed in the author’s usual happy style; and a perusal of the lecture can hardly fail to awaken greater watchfulness over the operations of a principle, which, though lamentably overlooked, affects materially our happiness and our usefulness. We wish he had illustrated the subject in relation to the duty of parents and others in the education of the young, and the formation in them of intellectual and moral character; a subject which we have thought much of, and which, we doubt not, Mr. Gallaudet would do ample justice to, if he should engage in it.

But of the three lectures, we have been most interested, in the last, by Mr. Hooker. He is less known as an author (except as editor of the *Conn. Observer*) than either of the other gentlemen: but this lecture we think will give him a favorable introduction to the community, and lead the intelligent and reflecting who are favorable to good order and the welfare of society, to wish him to come forward more at length, and on such other topics, besides the subject of this lecture, as he may feel interested to take up.

It does not belong to us to give him a subject; and yet his happy and suc-

cessful treatment of the temporal benefits of the Sabbath, has suggested, as we have read, a subject which we will venture to suggest, as one to the discussion of which we should think Mr. Hooker particularly well adapted. George Combe has written an instructive and useful book on the constitution of man in relation to external things; and what we have thought of for Mr. H., is, the constitution of man in relation to *internal* things: or, the adaptedness of the Law and the Gospel of God to the physical, intellectual and moral necessities of man. The subject may have been touched upon slightly in one or two of its bearings by Erskine, but otherwise we do not recollect at present of anything on any part of it, answering to what we conceive of as here suggested. We wish, therefore, Mr. Hooker would take it up, and we doubt not if he will, and will give us such a philosophico-religious discussion of the whole subject, as he has of that part of it contained in this lecture, that he will bring home to a large class of thinking men, an evidence of the truth, reality and infinite desirableness of true religion, which they have not been accustomed to feel, and which has never perhaps been fully presented for consideration. In relation further to the lecture, after glancing at the simplicity and benevolence of the Sabbath as a proof of its divine origin, apart from revelation, the proof from which is also briefly noticed, Mr. Hooker proceeds with his main subject, the temporal benefits of the Sabbath, considering them as either *Physical*, *Intellectual*, or *Civil*. These topics he illustrates at length, showing that the Sabbath is just such an institution as meets the necessities of man in relation to each of these particulars. He is neat and classical, as well just and forcible, and we do not remember one among all the authors who have given us treatises or discourses on the general subject of the Sabbath, who has presented it in the view which Mr. H. takes of it, with more weight of seriousness, or force of conviction, than he does in this lecture. We do not know how it may strike other minds, but the thought has several times occurred in reading it, that it would make, with some little alteration perhaps, a good tract for distribution; especially among magistrates and legislators. And if the members of our national government and of our respective state governments, could have a copy of it put into their hands, with a polite and respectful request that they would consider it, might we not hope that something would yet be done, to save so sacred an institution from utter desecration, and even to bring back its primitive blessedness and glory?

We know nothing in particular of the Goodrich Association, whose meetings, it seems, occasioned the delivery of these lectures; but we are glad to see men of eminence, turning the incidents of life into occasions of usefulness; and we hope their example may be followed, more and more, till the *utile* shall come to be all in all, in every department of business and of relaxation.

---

2. WAR UNREASONABLE AND UNSCRIPTURAL. *An Address before the Hartford [Conn.] County Peace Society.* By CYRUS YALE, *Pastor of the First Church in New Hartford.* Published by the Society, Hartford, Printed by Philemon Canfield. 1833.

We have been gratified with the apparent increase of interest in the cause

of peace in the country at large the year past, and particularly so with the worthy example of Connecticut. No state, we suspect, as such, has of late experienced so great an influx of pacific influences, and none, so far as we are informed, has been more disposed to pour them forth and shed them abroad, as is happily manifest in the publication of Newspaper articles in favor of peace, which we have noticed occasionally, and particularly of this address by Mr. Yale. We hope too she may be encouraged to go on, and we shall not be sorry to see her take the lead, if others are remiss, in awakening the public mind effectually on the whole subject of Peace and War, so that it shall no more slumber over it, till the olive branch of peace shall be welcomed universally, and the nations shall learn war no more.

In relation to Mr. Yale's address, it is of a close, sententious, pithy character, and may be considered as a fair specimen of the better sort of addresses, delivered on similar occasions. The general subject is well announced in the title, '*War unreasonablc and unscriptural*;' and the discussion exhibits a combined view of reason and scripture, showing the evil of war as unnatural, wasteful, foolish and inhuman; not required by God, but forbidden; at variance with the Gospel, unfavorable to the conversion of sinners, opposed to the progress of Christianity and greatly ruinous to souls. The thoughts suggested on all these topics are pertinent and forcible, and on some overwhelming. We wish every statesman, and indeed every man, woman and child would read it. —We were particularly pleased with the proposition, that, should occasion offer, the *United States* should take 'the first national stand in favor of universal and permanent peace.' Angels would look on it as a glorious attitude.

As a specimen of the address, we quote the closing paragraph.

"I seem to see this favored nation—already first in political and civil liberty; first in general intelligence; first in religious privileges; first in the temperance movement;—I seem to see her improve her rare advantages, and take the first firm stand in favor of peace. She rises, slow and fearless, in the sublime of pacific principle, lays off her armor to the last article, and reaches forth her affectionate hand to all the world. O how do the stars on her flag brighten into so many suns! and how lovely is the Dove in its centre, in place of the less comely Eagle! England sees the example of her daughter, and hastens to exchange her Lion for the Lamb. Soon, all nations exchange their war-like emblems for those of peaceful cast—for the *white banner of the Prince of Peace*. And now, the last sound of war has died on the ear; and a grand procession of the nations, unarmed, friendly happy, with appropriate insignia, celebrates the universal, bloodless revolution; the world's great Jubilee; passing under triumphal arches, lofty, and broad, and beautiful as the bow in the heavens after a long, dreary storm. O come, some master-spirit—some Wilberforce, some Clarkson:—COME THOU GREAT PRINCE OF PEACE, COME QUICKLY, AND MAKE THE VISION REAL."

ERRATA. In our last number, p. 394, third line from the bottom, for 'dots,' read clots; p. 395, fifth line from the top, for 'θδδμβοι,' read θρδμβοι; also, the same in the reference at the bottom of the same page.

THE  
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. VI.

SEPTEMBER, 1833.

NO. 9.

---

---

THE CRUCIFIXION.

NO. IV.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Immediately before the agonies in Getsemane, Christ and his disciples partook of the Paschal Feast. It was on Thursday evening. The first three ceremonies of the sacred supper had been finished, and the closing ceremony, the distribution of the bread and wine, was now to come. Here was a fit opportunity for the Master of the feast to display his aptness to teach. While he had been eating the memorial of his nation's deliverance from bondage, his soul had been revolving on the still greater deliverance of the world from sin. The Passover was designed to typify the spiritual fact as well as the temporal, but the disciples recognized only the temporal. Why shall they not now be taught that by the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, eternal justice would pass over without punishing the sins of the church? It was fit that, as the Phoenix from its ashes, a new and enduring rite should spring from this, which "was ready to die?"

When the disciples are expecting, their Master to distribute, as usual, the bread, he takes it and sets it apart from its common to a peculiar and sacred use. The Talmudists have preserved the form of thanksgiving prescribed for this fourth ceremony; "Blessed be thou, O Lord, our God, the king of the world, who hast produced this food from the earth." Having thus given thanks, he distributed the bread, and made the address which is recorded in the xiv. chapter of John; and then, having in a similar manner given thanks for the wine, he dis-

tributed the liquid emblem, and made the address which is recorded in the xv. and xvi. chapters.\*

We do not suppose that all the words which Christ spake during this interesting sacrament are preserved to us. We have, including Paul's and John's, five different accounts of them, and each narrator mentions some words which the rest omit. The historical notice of this rite suggests some facts which it may be well to consider.

First. The rite was designed to be perpetuated as a Christian sacrament. "This do in remembrance of me," was addressed not only to those who had believed in him already, but also to every one who hereafter "shall believe on him through their word." "For," saith the Apostle, "as often as ye eat this bread and drink his cup, ye do show the Lord's death until he come" to the final judgment at the end of the world. 1 Cor. xi. 26.

The Paulicians and many of the Socinians have denied the perpetuity of this rite; † and Barclay in his *Apology*, (pp. 467—470) contends that it can no more be proved to be a standing ordinance, than the ceremony which is enjoined in John xiii. 14 of washing each other's feet. But the two ceremonies are not parallel. For, first, the washing of the disciples feet was on the face of it a representation of a moral duty, and the direction, "ye ought to wash one another's feet," is at first glance viewed as a command to perform the duty which is imaged out. On the other hand we intuitively see, that the *supper* is prominent, not as an illustration of our duty, so much as a memorial of an event; and by the injunction "do this in remembrance," our minds are at once fixed upon an external rite "showing the Lord's death," and not upon a naked feeling, figuratively denoted by the rite. Secondly, the ceremony of washing the feet was founded on customs peculiar to the Orientals‡ and necessary for them, and highly agreeable to their tastes; whereas such customs are not adopted among us, are not needed, would be very inconvenient, and indeed disgusting. This is a reason for discontinuing the ceremony. As the supper, however, violates none of our customs, and shocks none of our tastes, there is not the same reason for limiting its observance. Thirdly, the washing of the feet has never been generally observed by the

\* That the remarks recorded in John xiv., xv. and xvi. are to be thus divided is probable, or to speak more guardedly, is plausible from their internal character. Newcome and other Harmonists thus divide them.

† Within a few months an attempt has been made to discontinue this rite in one of the oldest Unitarian churches in Boston. And why not? What does the ordinance signify to the disbeliever in an atonement?

‡ See Jahn's *Archæology*, § 123 and § 149.

church ; the eating of the bread has always been. Indeed the Apostles under inspiration both practised it, and enjoined it on all. See Acts ii. 42, 46. xx. 7. 1 Cor. xi. 17—34. 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. Fourthly, there is not so much propriety in observing a ceremony like that of the ablution, as in observing a memorial of the atoning sacrifice. This sacrifice was the great pole-star of the Mosaic economy. It was celebrated by numerous rites in anticipation. Surely then does it not deserve to be now celebrated “in remembrance?” Is the atonement less valuable since it was made than before? Does it now breathe life and strength into the whole system of truth, and shall it not be preserved fresh in our memories, as it was once preserved fresh in the hopes of the church?

Secondly. Our Saviour and the disciples reclined, as usual, at the table, while they ate the Paschal lamb ; and yet the original command which had never been revoked, was, “*thus shall ye eat it, with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand, and ye shall eat it in haste ;*” See Exodus xii. 11. This command was given to the Jews when departing on a journey ; it respected a mere mode or form ; it required them to feast in the standing posture. When the condition of the Jews *changed*, then they changed the mode but retained the substance of the rite ; and by Christ’s sanction of the change we are taught that a mere mode is unimportant, that it may be varied according to our varying circumstances, and that so long as its substance and significancy are preserved, an accommodation of it to our customs is no essential departure from its original design. Our mode of celebrating the Eucharist has been changed from the Primitive with perfect propriety. Circumstances do not allow us to celebrate it as the Apostles did in a large upper room ; to lie down, with our feet bare, at a common table ; to eat unleavened bread, and drink the fruit of vines which grow in our own gardens. The mode in which Christ partook of the sacrament is *certain* ; yet by his deviation from the original mode of keeping the Passover, he has permitted us to deviate from the original mode of the sacrament. How much greater reason then we have for deviating from the ancient mode of baptism ; for it is not *certain* that Christ had a uniform mode, and if it were so, we who eat leavened bread at the supper, might, on the same principle, consult our convenience at baptism.

Thirdly. The disciples did not fully understand the meaning of the Eucharist when they first celebrated it. They could not give up their long cherished hopes of the temporal kingdom, nor understand the meaning of Christ’s going away.

Soon after the breaking of the bread, Jesus dropped this remark in his address; "whither I go ye know and the way ye know." But, said Thomas, quickly interrupting him, "Lord, we know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way." Jesus saith, "I am the way." So after the cup he observed, "a little while, and ye shall not see me, and again a little while, and ye shall see me." "What does this mean," whispered the disciples, "*a little while*?" we cannot tell what the "little while" means. One would think, that they might have learned from his conversation more than they appear to have done, yet we can easily see how they must have been bewildered and alarmed at the unusual words, "this is my body,"—"this is my blood." If we attentively examine the sixth chapter of John we shall find it easy to admit, that the remarkable expressions concerning the "bread of life," probably had reference to the bread of communion, which had before never been hinted at. But how strange do these expressions sound to men who had no idea of a future atonement or Eucharist. "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread he shall live forever, and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." "This is a *hard* saying," murmured the disciples, "who can hear it?"

The fact that the sacramental rite was not at first understood, teaches us some very important truths. We are apt to wonder at the sins of the disciples, and to think that if we had been in their stead we should neither have denied nor forsaken the Saviour. But they were altogether more ignorant of divine truth than we; almost wholly ignorant of the great, the principle doctrine; of course, they were less firmly shielded than we against temptation. The youngest child who is admitted to the sacramental board, is sometimes a profounder scholar in the fundamental doctrine of Christianity than Peter was, when he was first admitted. If, then, so much is given to us, how much must be required? And yet do not we forsake him whom we know to be a Redeemer?

Again, we learn from the inability of the disciples to see the meaning of the Lord's Supper, what was his favorite mode of teaching. He was wont to utter expressions which he knew that his hearers could not understand, and to let the mysterious sentiments work in their minds, perplex, confuse them, and thus prepare them for a sudden and joyful illumination when he should send the Comforter. The Comforter was to "bring all things to their remembrance," and when, he had done it, they would carry back their new knowledge to their former difficul-

ties, and would find it a solvent for all; untying their knots, straightening their crooked things, and clearing away their mists. It must have been inexpressibly delightful to have the scales all at once fall from their eyes, and new beauties burst on their vision from the old landscapes over which they had before gazed intently and longingly. The words of Christ had fallen like seeds upon the earth, they had lain hidden under the soil, "that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die;" on a sudden at the descent of the Comforter, the seeds spring up, and the fields are covered with plants which bring forth their fruit in its season. The same divine mode of instruction is pursued with us. Many doctrines, many events are now inexplicable. We hear God's voice in the mysteries of religion, in the afflictions of life;—and we are confounded. But we are profited by the very unintelligibility of the voice. We are shown our ignorance, and are humbled, and are inspired with curiosity to *learn*, and when we shall have learned the meaning of things not yet understood, we shall rejoice the more at the new drape-ry of light which is flung over all the obscurities of this vale of darkness. It will be as if a new sun were called up to shine upon those sides of objects which had always been shaded. Oh who can tell the ravishing happiness of that hour, when every thing strange on earth, and every thing sad, shall be so fully explained as to call forth new praise for things which had long been known, and talked of, and wondered at.

Fourthly. The first Eucharist was designed to be one of joy, but it was one of sorrow. Feasting, is indicative of gladness, and so peculiarly delightful was it to the Jews, that the words "joy" and "feast" were synonymous. See Matt. xxv. 21, 23. The Heathens often celebrated religious festivals with great hilarity, and it was from the general character of feasts as mirthsome scenes, that the Corinthian Christians were led to revel at the Eucharist as they had previously done at other entertainments. It was fit to use a symbol of joy in memory of the means of our salvation. But how *could* the disciples rejoice? Instead of being flattered by a splendid supper at a palace, with prospect of a long triumphal reign over the nations, they are baffled in their hopes by the frugal repast, and by the appalling words of the living man, "this is my blood," "drink ye of it." They did not see that the supper was triumphal; that the sad memorial of a broken body were the trophies of just such a victory as Christ delighted to win; the only kind of victory congenial with his compassionate spirit, a victory gained over wickedness by the slaughter of himself. The celebration of this spiritual triumph, was one of mild and majestic pleasure to

Christ ; but the disciples looking only at the emblems of death, could not share in the pleasure designed for them. As *they* perverted the ordinance, so do many modern Christians. The curse denounced against the licentious communicants of Corinth, thus many now apply to themselves, and fear that they shall irretrievably drink damnation unless they are conscious of drinking in all respects worthily, and thus they envelope the feast in the blackness of terror. They live so negligently, and so often cherish habits of obvious wickedness, that the sacrament is only the means of arousing their consciences to remorse ; and when they partake of it, instead of feeling love and the gratitude of forgiven suppliants, they are disturbed with fear, haunted by the old sins which they have been cherishing for months, distracted by a tumultuous conflict between their moral sense and their evil passions ; *that* being too much enlightened to remain asleep now ; *these* too long strengthened by indulgence to be now put down. The communion season is no time for this distressing conflict. It supposes that the conflict has been previously ended, and that the soul is prepared for at least "*one hour*" of peace. It is no time for any save *pleasant* as well as holy emotion. Penitence indeed is admitted into this hour, but penitence is not pain. There is penitence in heaven. It is a favorite feeling of the thankful heart. The stricken child loves to feel and express it. It mingles sweetly with love and faith and hope, and softens the joy of the true communicant, and makes him hail the feast-day with eager anticipation. "Howbeit this kind cometh not forth but by prayer and fasting." We must labor to feel habitually humble, if we wish to keep the feast as an antepast of the bliss of heaven.

Fifthly. Neither Judas nor Christ partook of the sacramental emblems. That Judas did not partake of them can, perhaps, never be determined with certainty ; it may, however, be pronounced probable. Commentators are divided on the question ; Henry, Whitby and others, supposing that he did partake of the emblems, Doddridge, Newcome, Tholuck and others, that he did not. On the one hand, Matthew and Mark seem to describe the exposure of Judas' sin, as previous to the sacrament, and John says, that Judas left the feast room *immediately* after the exposure, so that he could not have been a partaker of the symbols. See Matt. xxvi. 21—25. Mark xiv. 18—21. John xiii. 30. On the other hand, Luke xxii. 21. seems to designate the traitor as at the table during and after the ordinance. There is no need of thinking, however, that Luke intended to preserve a correct chronological order in his descrip-

tion of the feast, and to teach that Judas was not exposed until the feast was ended. The historical fact recorded in chap. xxii. 21—23. after being compared with the whole course of events, may be assigned to that part of the course which consistency requires. Is it not probable then, that Matthew and Mark, though they did not intend uniformly to observe the order of time, have yet observed it in this instance, and are correct in assigning the farewell of Judas to the period preceding the ordinance? Does not the consistency of the whole narration seem to require this arrangement? The Eucharist taking the place of the closing ceremony of the Paschal supper, the remarks recorded in the xiv, xv, and xvi of John, occupying all the remainder of the feast hours, is it not an unnecessary and unpleasant interruption of this, probably the actual train of occurrences, for one of the communicants to secede in a rage? Besides, is it not a relief to think that the son of perdition never drank of the blood shed for the remission of sins; the blood appropriated to the pardoned alone? And especially that he never drank it from the hands of Him who “knew what was in man,” and who in the very hour of the sacrament averred that Judas’ sin never should be remitted? Is it not hard to see the propriety of giving to a known and declared reprobate the bread, whereof if a man have a right to eat, “he shall live forever,” and giving it at the *first* sacrament, which was to be the model of all others? As the Saviour did not even wash the feet of Judas without qualifying the meaning of the act in its application to the “unclean one,” (see John xiii. 10.) is it probable that he would have offered him the significant bread without also showing that, in *his* case the bread did not retain its accustomed significance? And as no such exception was made, is it not a sign that the exceptionable man was not present? Rather than adopt the idea, so unnecessary and strange, that a man who was both known and published to be one of the basest of reprobates, should be honored with the symbols of pardon within three hours from his commission of an unpardonable crime, we choose to think that Christ was anxious to rid himself before the communion of this polluted companion; and that with this design he said to him, “what thou doest do quickly, as soon as possible be gone, and let us who are faithful enjoy the seal of our fidelity.” This is a very plausible conjecture of Tholuck. The fact is, no hypocrite has a right to that seal; let every false professor remember it, and let every open sinner in the church know, that if Jesus were sitting at the table with him, the stern command would be reiterated; “Woe unto thee, thou son of per-

dition ; go quickly from us, do what thou meanest to do, and leave us to ourselves. Good were it for thee hadst thou never been born !”

Notwithstanding, however, that the evidence preponderates in favor of the absence of Judas from the sacrament, it is not impossible, that being a professor and not having yet forfeited his character by open crimes, he was treated as a professor, and the responsibility of touching the emblems was thrown upon himself. “Christ,” says John, “knew from the beginning who should betray him ;” and yet he retained the hypocrite not only as a member, but as the treasurer of the band. He might have intended to teach this rule of ecclesiastical discipline, that whatever a church may suspect, or even know against a member, they should not exclude him from fellowship until they can *prove* him, by his visible sins, to be a hypocrite. By his external fruits must the standing of a professor be determined ; and when these are not decidedly unchristian, he must be treated according to his own pretences, and not according to the private opinions of the brethren. It would cause so much confusion to erect our surmises about inward character, into a standard for retaining or excommunicating members of the church, that Christ in our own days suffers “many to eat and drink in his presence,” to whom he will profess, “I never knew you, depart from me.” There was in Christ’s mind a certainty that Judas was intending the speedy commission of an open sin ; yet this intention might not have been regarded as evidence tangible enough to justify the apostolical church in excommunicating the traitor, and therefore it is not demonstrable but that he is now suffering for unworthy communion of the blood which he betrayed.

It has been supposed by some, that Christ partook of the sacramental emblems. Chrysostom in his 72nd Homily on Matthew, uses the bold expression, “Our Lord himself drank even his own blood.” Not one of the Evangelists, however, gives the least authority for such a remark. They represent him as saying, “this is my body broken for you,” “my blood shed for you,” “for the remission of sins ;” “Eat *ye*, drink *ye*, all of you.” It was not for himself then that the mysterious man gave up his body, but for *us* ; and for this reason ; *he* had no sins to be remitted, *we* have. By offering the emblems to others, and significantly abstaining from them himself, he meant to teach that he was holy, harmless, undefiled ; that unlike him all other men needed forgiveness ; that he “came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance ;” that before men venture to touch the sacrificed flesh, they must feel that they are sick

and urgently require a physician. The supper then was not designed for any at either extreme of character; for any who have been totally destitute of piety, or totally destitute of sin. It was designed for *penitent transgressors*. If any man has never cried for mercy, he eats condemnation when he eats the supper. If any man has never sinned, or if he denies his actual sinfulness, he mocks God in eating. It is absurd for a man who is sinless, or who esteems himself so, to join the church of a Redeemer. Such a man can feel no personal interest in any thing like *grace*, and no trust in a Messiah who saves only the lost. Christ would himself have partaken of the Eucharist if he had intended it for any who had no guilt to bewail. See here then, the doctrine of depravity is at the foundation of the doctrines of grace; and if you tear away the foundation because uncomely, the beautiful and costly temple which is reared on it, is thrown down. The more you contend for the native purity of man, so much the more do you tarnish the lustre of the cross; and the higher your opinion of your own heart, so much the lower your estimate of the atonement. Take care, therefore, thou Pharisee, that thou say nothing for Christ, with whom thou hast nothing to do; and above all that thou hope for nothing through Christ, who has nothing to do for such an one as thou in thine own esteem. "Whosoever thou art" that boastest of thine own merits, thou and the man who betrayed innocent blood, must stand or fall by your own characters, and for both of you there is no remission. This is a thought for every communicant.

Sixthly. The Lord's Supper, for the comprehensiveness and simplicity of its instruction, is the most admirable rite ever instituted on earth.

It is admirable for its comprehensiveness. We have already rehearsed some facts which are taught by it. In addition to them, it proves the truth of Christianity. As it never could have been so early and generally practised, unless the death which it denotes had occurred, it is a standing monument of that great fact. It not only stands as a proof of our common faith, but also as a pledge of our common friendship. It is a feast,—the emblem of friendship. In many of the oriental nations the simple act of feasting together was regarded as an earnest of indissoluble union, and the guests, even if they had partaken of nothing more than bread and salt and a beverage, considered that they had become inalienable friends. Nay, "if a man received another, even a robber, into his house, and ate with him even a crust of bread, he was bound to treat him as a friend, to defend him at the hazard of his own life, unless he was willing to meet with the scorn and

contempt of all his countrymen.\* The same friendship is contracted and sealed at the sacramental supper. It is represented by the uniting of the brethren in one room, at one table, in the same act of prayer to one Lord, of eating from one loaf, and drinking from one cup. It seems as if communicants must be one, when they use this symbol of the need and the supply which all have alike, and when they see that their feast is not only a bond of brotherhood on earth, but a type of a glorious feast at which they shall all unite in their Father's house. Never does a communicant drink at the feast without *pledging* himself anew to befriend and love the brethren.

At the same time that this comprehensive rite represents and promotes brotherly kindness, it also represents the connexion between the pious, their interest in the same Saviour, their destination toward the same heavenly feast; and it becomes a bond of brotherhood to which all the members of Christ's family are intimately and forever united. Whether the remarkable expressions in the sixth of John were uttered in reference to this sacrament is disputed. If they were, how pertinent and forcible. "I am the bread of life. Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drunk indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead; he that eateth of this bread shall live forever." These expressions at the time of their utterance were unintelligible to the disciples. Still they may have been uttered in view of the intended sacrament, so that their meaning, after having perplexed the inquisitive intellect, would be unfolded by events. Indeed the disciples did not understand the significancy of the Eucharist itself when first originated. "This is my body" was a dark saying. Christ loved to teach in such a way that the mind, after having revolved in vain on what he said, should be enlightened suddenly after his resurrection. So to us many things are now inexplicable. Still the great scheme of our salvation, promotes the humility and faith and kindness which that scheme requires.

The body and the blood are vividly depicted before our eyes; can we then shut out the instruction, that an immense price was paid for our redemption. We see the body broken piece

\* See Jahn's *Archæology*, § 143; also Knapp's *Theology*, Vol. 2, p. 548.

by piece, the blood poured forth ; can we then fail to see what manner of love Christ felt when he despised the shame and pain of crucifixion ? Can we help seeing the cost of sin ? Can we keep ourselves from the dust at the foot of the cross when we hear the words, “ broken for you,”—“ shed for you,”—“ remission ?” Can we help feeling that our friend died for us, while we were his enemies, and *because* we were enemies ? and does not this truth reflect back new brightness upon his shining grace, and move us instinctively to cry, “ the chiefest among ten thousand,” “ altogether lovely ?” Can we avoid seeing the justice of Jehovah, which did not spare the head of his only begotten son ? Can we avoid seeing the hatefulness of all opposition to a character which blends with such rainbow sweetness the most attractive excellencies ? Indeed there is not a doctrine of the Gospel, which this rite does not place before our eyes ; for it reaches to us the atonement which is the key of the whole scheme. Nor is there a fibre of the pious heart which it does not touch ; for the “ bread is the staff” of spiritual life, the “ wine maketh glad” and “ refresheth” the fainting grace. No wonder that Christ, in view of his favorite ordinance, burst out in his bold and pithy remark ; “ Except ye eat the flesh of the son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you ; whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life ; he dwelleth in me and I in him ; My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed ; as the living father hath sent me, and I live by the father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me ; this is that bread which came down from heaven ; not as your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead ; he that eateth of this bread shall live forever.” No wonder that the Apostles loved the rite so ardently ; that the early Christians administered it every day, and several times in the day. No wonder that it has always been dear to the church, and been denominated, for distinction’s sake, *the* sacrament.

Admirable as the ordinance is for its comprehensiveness, it is equally so for its simplicity. No complexness of parts, no tedious routine of observances ; the simple act of eating and drinking a little aliment is expressive of all the richness and sweetness of the divine economy. The sight, the touch, and the taste are employed for a few minutes in perfect stillness, and the magnificent rite is closed. Contrast this with the cumbersome institution of the Passover, the multiplied and confusing steps in all the Jewish rites, the parade of Catholic and Heathen mummeries. What devotee of a false religion is so practised in its complicated formulary, as to remember half of it ; but what observer of the sacramental ordinance can forget

the least part of it? It is *touching* by its simplicity. It exerts thereby a permanent influence. Wherever we move, we can carry in our memories the symbols which show forth the Lord's death; at every temptation to sin, can hold up distinctly the broken bread and the cup of symbolical blood; and, by the instantaneous view which we obtain of the Gospel scheme, we may be instantaneously humbled when proud, and lifted up when bowed down. Is there not displayed a noticeable wisdom in thus contriving the simplest means for the accomplishment of the most magnificent ends? Is it not wisdom to effect such great results in the kingdom of nature from so simple a law as gravitation? Must we not admire the same compass of plan by which the whole system of religious truth in all its glory, is made to revolve around our hearts? And yet the means of thus illuminating the moral world were communicated by their great Author, not in an hour of dignified leisure and outward ease, but in the midst of the most exciting and harrowing scenes. Within four hours he was to be apprehended by the Jewish authorities; within twenty, was to be taken down from the tree a corpse. The traitor was now absent on the nefarious business, the Priests were agitated with hopes and fears, his own disciples were overwhelmed with conflicting passions, and very soon were disgracefully to abandon him. In all this whirl of outward excitement he remained calm and unruffled, he held up the fainting hearts of the eleven, looked forward through the long succession of ages, and then spoke with the intention of being heard by the remotest posterity. Many good men would have been too severely agitated to have pursued a consistent train of thought, still more of remark. We all have felt how difficult it is to converse on any absorbing affliction, even when viewed remotely from ourselves. But he with a composed look at the mystical emblems, pronounced them to be his own flesh and blood, and with majestic calmness ordered them to be used by future generations. Was not this the wisdom and the strength and the authority of a superior being? Was it not the language of a *peculiar* being? Let him who denies the vicarious nature of Christ's death account for the fact, that a man, who before another sunset was to be hung as a malefactor, should coolly and deliberately command his despised friends not to *conceal*, but to *celebrate* his punishment; a capital punishment, approved by the ecclesiastical power, inflicted by the civil; to celebrate it, not by rearing a monument or parading in a procession, but by drinking his blood? Who ever heard of such a thing? What can be the meaning of it?

## MINISTERIAL QUALIFICATIONS.

There are many things, peculiar to the age in which we live, demanding an intelligent Christian ministry; some of which we have already considered. It has been said with truth, that the present is an age of *Revivals of Religion*. Not that past ages have been denied these precious seasons of divine grace; but, that the present stands peculiar, as to the extent and power of these blessed and glorious seasons.

It cannot be denied, that the present prosperity and future welfare of our churches, depends in a great measure on the views, the character and the conduct of the ministers who are placed over the churches, at such a time as this. The moral and Christian character of multitudes is now to be formed; the most yielding materials are now thrown into the hands of religious teachers. The mind is open to instruction, the heart susceptible to the slightest impression. Every experienced minister will say, that if he ever needs superior wisdom, sound discretion, extensive acquaintance with revealed truth, and a thorough insight into the windings of the human heart, it is during the season of religious revivals.

As we trace the history of piety and of benevolent effort, we find the character both of experimental and practical religion, determined, almost exclusively, by the character of the Gospel ministry, under whose labors have been enjoyed extensive revivals of religion. We are among those who revere the name of Whitefield; and would bless God for the labors of love which he expended in our country, and for the bright examples, which many of his worthy coadjutors have left us. And yet we cannot doubt, but there were serious defects in the system of measures which was adopted in their day, and which in more unskilful hands led to most deplorable results,—some of which results were, disagreement among ministers; new and irregular proceedings; wild and extravagant measures, in some cases, gross enthusiasm and indelicacy, and what was most permanent and pernicious of all, a disregard of correct evangelical sentiment, so that lax theology and the grossest errors, at length widely prevailed. The intellectual energies, the prayers and pious labors of many of the brightest ornaments of the ministry, were unable to check the strong tide of degeneracy. That thorough, systematic education in the ministry, by preserving unity of sentiment and harmony of views

as to measures in promoting piety, would have guarded in a great measure against these evils, we have not a doubt. The extensive revivals of religion at the commencement of the present century, whose history has been so minutely drawn, by one who was permitted to witness their progress, and from this day to review their results, were attended by no such unhappy fruits. The ministry in connexion with whose labors these revivals were enjoyed, were united in sentiment and harmonious in action, and they were among the most thoroughly educated and intelligent men who have adorned the American church. A sound, rational, consistent piety resulted, and that system of vigorous, benevolent action was commenced, which is now fast filling the world with the knowledge of Jesus Christ. And nothing but the vast power of doing good or evil, which revivals of religion place in human hands, will enable us to defeat those high designs of Christian charity and zeal, which mark our age illustrious in the "History of Redemption." It remains for the future historian of the church to record the results on practical piety, of the recent and continued revivals of religion in our land. From the rapid springing up of diversity of sentiment, and want of harmony as to measures best adapted to promote religion, we are not without our fears; while the intelligence of the great body of the clergy, and the settled principles of experimental and practical piety, fortify our hopes that all will be well, and the day of glory be soon ushered upon the world; the diversity of sentiment and clashing of feeling, operating like the concussions of electric clouds, to purify and brighten its meridian splendor.

During the season of religious revival, there is danger of substituting mere *feeling*, for *correct principle*; zeal without knowledge, for correct sentiment; of inventing measures to advance the work, which are not only unnecessary, but unscriptural and injurious to its prosperity. As there is now uncommon activity and vigor of Christian effort, there is danger of forgetting our entire dependance on the special and sovereign agency of the Holy Ghost, and of giving a prominence and power to human instrumentality, which is peculiarly dangerous to souls and dishonorable to God. At this time the errors of Arminianism are most easily and successfully propagated. To these errors all men are more or less exposed. There is a strong tendency in human nature towards them; a peculiar fondness in our unsanctified affections for the aid which they promise, and the false security they impart. It requires no common share of moral and mental qualifications, to secure those who are anxious on the subject of religion, from reliance

on some false foundation. The danger in question stands not alone. The opposite extreme is perhaps, to many, equally alluring and fatal; which is, to deny the necessity of human agency and of personal effort in the work of salvation. Hence it becomes the minister of the Gospel wisely to distinguish and guard against the errors of Arminianism on the one hand, and Antinomianism on the other. To do this successfully, he must have a mind well furnished with correct principles of intellectual philosophy, and be well grounded in the faith of the Gospel; and more than this, he must understand and preserve the symmetry of the Gospel system. As an example and illustration of what I mean, and which will at the same time show the reality of the danger in question, I would refer to the three grand divisions of the clergy, during the "great revival of religion in New England." In the first division, were Edwards, Bellamy, and many other distinguished men, who like them, were rich in theological learning, and with all their hearts devoted to the work. They preached the doctrines of the Bible, clearly and systematically; and no men, perhaps, ever more successfully secured the pre-eminent advantages of the essential union of divine sovereignty and free agency in the formation of moral and religious character. In the second division, were the Antinomians and the Arminians, both of which opposed the revival. Though they did not harmonize in their religious sentiments, yet the extremes of their errors met, as to practical influence. While our evangelical churches rose from the first, or were strengthened by their labors, the various heresies of the present day had their origin in, or were handed down by, the second. In addition to these, there was, says an able writer, "a *third class*," "who rushed into the revival, as the horse rusheth into the battle, confident, zealous and reckless." "Instead of trying the spirits, whether they were of God, they believed every spirit. Every thing which was found to attract attention and affect the minds of men, they regarded as good. Their object was to excite all the feeling possible. This led to the love of every thing which could produce excitement, and a determination to have it: and this led to a preference of such *measures* and of such *preachers* as were found to produce excitement the most immediate and most violent;" and it is added, "*these are the spiritual fathers of our moral deserts.*" Edwards, Bellamy, and others of the class, to which they belonged, were distinguished for their literary and theological attainments. The second were somewhat elevated by fashionable literature, but extremely deficient in metaphysical science and correct theological learning; and the

third class, was crowded by those, who were generally without the ordinary attainments, which the public sentiment, even of that period, demanded for the Christian ministry. Their range was almost every where, their influence great and extensive; their errors of sentiment, and the extravagance of their measures, were permanent and destructive, furnishing ample occasion for the caviling and complaint of the sceptic, as well as for the grief of the pious. Hence we have Edwards "on the Revival," and on the "Religious Affections," both demanded by the circumstances of the age in which he lived, and two of the most splendid productions of intellectual and moral strength and acumen, and the richest legacies to the church, that any of her ministers have left. A volume, instead of a single paragraph, might be written on this subject, and before leaving it we cannot avoid suggesting the fact, that uneducated ministers, most often advance the opinion, that the *doctrines* of the Gospel are not to be preached, during revivals of religion, while such as more fully understand these doctrines and the nature of the human mind, find this the very time to preach them, and the grand security of substantial and Scriptural hope to the trembling sinner.

If the churches are not well instructed in the doctrines of the Gospel and wisely directed, as to the course of Christian duty, this age of religious revivals, will be followed by a cold and cheerless formality, and a lamentable dearth of the resources of Christian effort.

From the imperfection of our nature, it is not surprising, that errors should arise during revivals of religion. Much is yet to be learned respecting the best method of promoting them; yet there are general principles respecting them, which are well established, and which cannot be changed, without destroying the work of grace or impairing its character. Whatever is new and untried, which is in accordance with these general principles, may be introduced with probable safety; but whatever is in opposition to these principles, can never be admitted with safety or with divine approbation. These principles should be well understood and studied, that they may be safely and correctly applied at a time of such vast solemnity as the season of a revival of religion.

It is infinitely desirable, that the age of religious revivals should be perpetuated, until the predicted day of the Redeemer's glory shall come: and there is no room for doubt, that, as *truth* is the grand instrument by which the Holy Spirit carries forward revivals of religion, very much depends upon the manner in which the Gospel is preached. It is a question of

serious inquiry, whether the peculiar success which attended the preaching of the Apostles was not owing to the manner in which they presented divine truth. In this age of superior light, and with the same inspired truth to preach, our success is comparatively small. The Apostles were men taught, *for at least three years*, by Christ himself, and afterwards were under the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit; and no doubt they preached the truth, more agreeable to the divine will, than is the preaching of the present day. They understood the doctrines of the Gospel and rightly divided to every man a portion in due season.

To secure the richest benefit from revivals of religion, there is required no ordinary degree of intellectual discernment and facility in adapting the peculiar truths of the Gospel, to the condition of the people, both to the public assembly and to the constantly changing state of individual feeling. If the doctrines of the Gospel are correctly understood and properly presented, this is the most favorable time to give an experimental knowledge of their truth and efficacy, as well as to secure their permanent, practical benefits. The hopeful subjects of religious revivals, who are instructed to compare their own experience with the doctrines of the Gospel, and to discover the influence of particular truths upon their minds, are seldom found unstable in religious sentiment, nor easily led astray by erroneous opinions. I need not add, that almost every thing here, depends upon the preacher, in properly arranging and presenting the truth, so that the peculiar state of the mind may be met by truth corresponding to its immediate necessity. What would have been the result, if the uneducated clergy in the days of Edwards and Bellamy, had been thoroughly trained in the theological schools of those men? And what was the actual result of the lamentable want among them, of those correct and systematic views of truth, which Edwards and Bellamy embraced and preached? If the first had been the case, we see not why revivals of religion might not have been continued with purity and power in unbroken succession to the present time, and we now far advanced in the day of the millennium. Let the revivals of the present age be produced by the truth correctly understood and properly presented, and the noon-tide glory of that promised day will soon arrive.

It is found in the history of Providence, that the severest judgments have followed the richest seasons of divine refreshing. The Babylonish captivity succeeded the revivals in the days of Hezekiah and Josiah, and "the pouring out of the Spirit in the days of the Apostles, was the precursor of the long

desolation of Judea." A protracted period of darkness and stupidity followed the revivals in the days of Edwards and of Whitefield. We would by no means attribute this succession of divine judgments, in all cases, or even generally, to the improper method of conducting the revivals; for there is no doubt, and perhaps independent of this, to be recognized in the economy of God's government, a most important principle in relation to this subject; which is, to visit his enemies with judgment when he remembers his friends in mercy; or we might say, that from the contrariety of moral character in man, that course of Providence which is most favorable to the pious, is most fatal to the enemies of righteousness: As saith the Lord, by his prophet, "the day of vengeance is in mine heart, and the year of my redeemed is come." "Angels restrain the winds, till the elect are gathered in, and thus nations become fitted for judgment by the Gospel being faithfully preached, those who receive it being gathered into the ark of mercy, and those who reject it being ripe for immediate judgment." How far human weakness, error and indiscretion may contribute to this result, it becomes every minister well to consider—that God acts in sovereignty, irrespective of all such weaknesses, errors and indiscretions, we have no authority to conclude.

We have before alluded to the fact, that there were general principles respecting the promotion of revivals of religion, which were well understood and established: and it is one of these principles, that men are to be converted through the truth and by the power of God: that truth is the instrument by which revivals of religion are to be promoted, as it is brought to bear upon the minds and consciences of men. In relation to the point now before us, vast injury is done in revivals of religion by uneducated and inexperienced men. Our argument is this. Truth is the *instrument*; the human mind and the affections, in their diversified and ever changing character, are the *subjects* upon which this truth is to be made to operate; God in his gracious sovereignty is to render it efficacious, while man in his freedom is to feel his obligation to yield his cheerful obedience. Here we may ask, How is it possible for an uneducated man, so to understand this truth, the sublime system of moral science, revealed to us in the Bible, and so to discover and unravel the secrets of the human heart, as to bring this truth to bear upon it, so that it may secure the end which God designed? We are not to presume that divine sovereignty will interpose and prevent or correct the evils which human ignorance and error may create. It seems preposterous to say that piety is all that is here demanded. We might as well say, that

piety is all that is required to navigate the sea, survey the heavens, measure the mountains and preside in the chair of mental and moral philosophy. The only difference which we can discover, is, that piety in one case, is absolutely essential, and in the other not so; yet in neither is piety sufficient to safe and successful effort.

---

THE MODE OF GOD'S GOVERNMENT OVER THE MORAL  
WORLD.

By the REV. ENOCH POND, Bangor, Maine.\*

The Scriptures uniformly ascribe to God the government of the *moral world*. They represent the hearts, the free exercises and actions of men as under the control of God, not less than the mighty movements of nature. God is said in the Scriptures to 'harden the hearts' of men, to 'fashion their hearts,' and to 'turn their hearts.' The host of the king of Assyria is as much in the hand of the Lord, as the axe is in the hand of the hewer, the saw in the hand of him that shaketh it, or as the rod and the staff are in the hands of those that lift them up. Is. x. 15. The house of Israel is in the hand of the Lord, as clay is in the potters' hand.' Jer. xviii. 6. 'The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord, as the rivers of water; he turneth it whithersoever he will.' Prov. xxi. 1.

Indeed, unless we suppose the government of God to extend to the moral world, he can hardly be said to have a government; since, in this case, he cannot accomplish his purposes, or fulfil his predictions, or answer the prayers of his people, but is liable to be continually thwarted and defeated by the capricious and independent agency of his creatures. It is a settled point, therefore, and with Calvinists (so far as I know) an undisputed point, that God governs the moral world. He directs and controls, according to his pleasure, the free exercises and actions of moral beings.

But *how does he do this?* In what manner is his government over the hearts of men sustained and administered?—

\* We depart in this instance from our common practice as to giving the names of contributors, by the request of Professor Pond, which we presume he wishes in consideration of the character of his communication.

It hardly need be said that this is done in a manner entirely conformable to their natures, and consistent with their accountability. The human constitution is the work of God. He formed the minds of men, made them what they are, and in governing them, we may be sure that he does no violence to the work of his own hands. The king of Assyria was not the less free, or the less responsible, because he was in the hands and under the control of the Almighty. And the same may be said of every other intelligent created being.

It may be presumed that God governs the moral world, like the natural, according to established laws. The laws of *nature*, as they are called, have in many instances been discovered; and perhaps it will be found that the laws of moral agency, or the established modes of Divine influence over the hearts of men, are equally discoverable.

It may be laid down as a universal law, that *every moral exercise or action must have a motive.\** Every exercise of love or hatred, choice or refusal, necessarily implies an *object* on which it terminates. Every moral accountable action implies some *reason* or *end* in view of which it is performed. To love when nothing is loved, or choose when nothing is chosen, or to act rationally without reason or end, or (which is the same) without a motive, is an absurdity.

And not only is it true, that every act of the will must have a motive, it may also be said, with President Edwards, that "*the will is always as the strongest motive.†*" By the strongest motive, I do not mean that which is *intrinsically* strongest, or which ought to have the greatest weight, but that which at the time *appears* the strongest, or strikes the mind with the greatest force. To say that the will is always determined by that motive which is intrinsically strongest, would be the same as to say that men always act right. But to say that it is determined by that motive which at the time *appears* the strongest, or which strikes the mind with the greatest force, is only to say, that men always act as it seems to them most agreeable; or in other words, that they do as they please. And is it not self-evident, that free, responsible agents do act in this way? "There is scarcely a plainer and more universal dictate of the sense and experience of mankind, than that, when men act voluntarily, and do what they please, then they do what *suits them best*, or what is *most agreea-*

\* I use the word motive here in the *objective* sense, to signify something without the will, and by means of which this faculty is excited to action.

† Works, Vol. v. p. 17

ble to them. To say, that they do what they please, or what pleases them, but yet do not do what is most agreeable to them, is the same thing as to say, that they do what they please, but do not act their pleasure; and that is to say, that they do what they please, and yet do not do what they please.”\*

If motives always accompany action, and are in any sense the exciting causes of it, then it is plain that men always yield to those motives which, at the time, appear the strongest. To suppose the contrary, would be to suppose a less excitement to be more powerful than a greater; or a weaker cause to prevail over one of superior strength.

The proposition before us is also confirmed by every man's *experience*. We are all conscious of being influenced by motives; and that the degree of influence is in proportion to the strength of motives. A certain amount of motives will lead us to *think* of a proposed measure, or course of action; additional motives will lead us to think of it seriously; and a still further increase of motives may lead us to adopt it. We are often in situations where the motives before us are so nearly equal, that we hesitate and are in suspense what course to pursue. And we all know, how a very slight inducement, coming up on one side or the other at such times, will be sufficient to turn the scale. And what is the inference to be drawn from such facts? That we are mere machines, turned about mechanically by weights and balances? Not at all; but that we are rational creatures, who are influenced by reasons or motives; and that we are proportionally more influenced by those motives which seem to us strong and forcible, than by those which strike us with less power.

That the will is always as the strongest motive, and that mankind universally are convinced of this, is evident from the manner in which they attempt to influence and direct the actions one of another. This is done invariably by the presentation of motives; and their hope of success (other things being equal) is always in proportion to the strength of motives which they are able to exhibit. Thus a parent, wishing to direct the actions of a reluctant child into a particular channel, sets before it the *reasonableness* of the thing proposed. If this is not sufficient, he shows the child how much is to be *gained* by acquiescence. If the child still refuses, the parent appeals to his sense of *obligation*, and urges this as a motive to obedience. And if nothing else will prevail, he threatens to inflict deserved punishment. In this instance, we see the

parent proceeding in a regular course, adding motive to motive, till at length the will of the child is gained. And the parent need be no philosopher, in order to understand and accomplish this, and to do it effectually. The most unlettered man knows how to exert an influence, in directing the actions of his fellow creatures. Common sense and observation teach him to exhibit motives; and if he would increase his influence over those whom he addresses, he must increase the power of motives.

The whole system of rewards and punishments, both in human governments and in the Divine, is proof of the truth now under consideration. On any other principle, why does a rich reward, and a severe punishment, have greater influence than those of a trifling nature? Why does the magistrate offer a reward of thousands, rather than of tens, for the apprehension of the murderer? And why is murder punishable with death, rather than with bonds? Why does the Supreme Being hold forth eternal life to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, honor and immortality; while he declares that the wages of sin is eternal death? Is it not manifest from the whole system of rewards and punishments, not only that the actions of men are directed by motives, but that it is the stronger motive which is expected to prevail?

It is on the same principle, that men acquire a knowledge of human nature, and derive benefit from experience in observing the actions of their fellow beings. The man of experience and judgment finds no difficulty, ordinarily, in predicting how individuals, in particular circumstances, will act, especially if he is acquainted with those individuals, and knows their characters. "The farmer presumes, with as great certainty, that the best grain at the lowest price, other things being equal, will meet with the most purchasers, as that the sun will shine to fertilize his fields, or that the best season will produce the richest crop." And he reckons upon the labor of individuals in his service, especially if he has tried them and knows their characters, with as much confidence as he does on the utensils they employ in the execution of his work. Still, such individuals act freely and voluntarily, in yielding to the influence of motives, and fulfilling the expectations of the employer.

We always expect our fellow men to act from the stronger motive; and when we see any appearing to act in a different way, we conclude, either that they have motives of which we are ignorant, or that they are insane, and of course not responsible. So the Egyptians, in all probability, judged of Moses, when he chose to suffer affliction with the people of God, rather

than enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season. So the Jewish rulers judged of Paul, when he left their company, and joined the followers of the crucified Nazarine. And so the world judge of the most disinterested and engaged Christians now. They know not how to appreciate the real motives of such Christians ; and they sometimes think them literally deranged, acting either from no motive, or from the weaker in opposition to the stronger ; and sometimes that they have motives which are not avowed, such as worldly ambition, or a desire of applause.

On the whole, I think it perfectly plain, and worthy to be reckoned among the laws of our moral nature, that *every act must have a motive ; and that the will is always determined by those motives which at the time appear the strongest, or which strike the mind with the greatest force.\**

But if this is true, then a way is opened in which God may and does control the actions of his creatures, in perfect consistency with their freedom and accountableness. He does it by the presentation of motives, and by rendering the motives presented sufficiently strong and efficacious to overcome those of an opposite tendency. And it must have occurred to every attentive reader of the Scriptures, that this is the manner in which God is there represented as controlling the actions of men. When he wishes to direct their actions into a particular channel, or to accomplish an important end by their means, we uniformly find him bringing appropriate motives to bear upon them, and in this way leading and governing their wills. For instance ; in bringing the children of Israel into Egypt, to be preserved there through a season of famine, the co-operation of numerous free agents was concerned ; and this co-operation was secured, at every step, through the influence of motives. Jacob had motives for sending Joseph to visit his brethren ; and Joseph had motives for going ; and his brethren had motives for selling him to the Ishmaelites ; and the Ishmaelites had motives for purchasing him, and taking him into Egypt ; and his father

\* To this it may be objected, that we are all conscious of having *power* to yield to the weaker motive, in preference to the stronger. And I reply, without doubt we have *natural power*, or the *necessary faculties*, to yield to the weaker motive. But do we ever exert such a power ? And if any who hold the theory should attempt to put it to the test of experiment, would not the supposed value of the experiment itself constitute a motive stronger than any on the other side ?

It may be further objected, that to sinners under conviction the motives for embracing religion often appear much stronger than those against it, while yet their hearts remain unchanged. But is it even so ? Sinners under conviction desire to be happy, and they feel strongly induced to seek religion as a means of happiness ; but do they seek or desire it for its own sake ? They have motives enough to *take* religion (if they could get it) as the sick man does his medicine ; but do they desire to *embrace* it, as a thing good in itself, and to be loved on its own account ?

and brethren, a few years after, had motives enough to induce them to follow him. So when the children of Israel were to be released from servitude and brought out of Egypt, their oppressors were visited with a succession of judgments, till they were induced by motives to let Israel go. When Saul was to be anointed king over Israel, events were so ordered as to furnish motives to bring him into the presence of Samuel. And when David was to be advanced to the kingdom in place of Saul, he was led along through all his previous trials by an invisible hand, but always under the influence of motives. It was appointed of God that the child Jesus should go down into Egypt; and motives were furnished to induce his reputed father to carry him there. It was also appointed that he should be brought up at Nazareth; and when his parents came out of Egypt, they were induced by motives to turn aside to that city, instead of going to their former residence.

In all these and innumerable other instances of the like kind, we see how God governs the world by motives. When he has an end to accomplish through the instrumentality of creatures, he always exhibits sufficient motives, and by means of these directs their actions. Indeed, the actions of rational beings cannot be directed or performed, independently of motives. As I have said already, there cannot be a choice, without a thing chosen; or an accountable action, without some reason or end for which the action is performed. But the *thing chosen*—the *reason or end* of the action, is the motive. There must be motives, therefore, to accountable action. In this way, we influence the actions one of another; and God directs and controls the free actions of his creatures, and turns their hearts "whithersoever he will," by the same means.

That motives constitute the *exciting causes*, the *instrumentality*, by which the moral world is governed, is too plain to be denied. But an important question here arises, *Are the hearts of men governed by motives exclusively? Has God no direct agency or influence in the matter?*

In reply to these questions it should be observed, that God governs the moral world, as well as the natural, *by his own power*. This proposition, however, needs to be explained.

By some, the doctrine of Divine efficiency, so called, is understood to imply, that God creates every volition of every creature, whether holy or sinful, by a *particular act* of his omnipotence; or, in other words, that there is an individual act of God reaching and producing every individual act of every created being throughout the universe.

To those who regard the subject in this light I would say,

that I believe the hearts of men to be *as much* in the hands of God, as any other part of his creation,—and no more. I love to see and acknowledge God in everything;—in the falling drops, the springing grass, the waving trees, the rolling ocean, and in all the changes which take place around us. What are commonly called the laws of nature are but established modes of divine operation; so that in all the phenomena of the natural world, from the greatest to the least, we witness a continual exertion of the power of God. And now I would ask, are we to suppose that there is a particular act of God preceding and causing every individual change which takes place in nature? Cannot a drop of rain form in the atmosphere, and fall to the earth, without a number of specific Divine acts to form it, and to bring it down? Cannot a leaf quiver in the breeze, without a corresponding number of Divine acts to move it? Cannot an insect spread his wing, or a mote fly in the air, or a wave roll upon the deep, without a particular act of God preceding and causing these several changes? Must we suppose there are innumerable Divine acts, put forth at the same time, preceding and causing all the countless, innumerable changes which are continually taking place in the universe of nature? I believe no philosopher has ever accounted for the changes in the natural world in this way. Nor is it possible they should be thus accounted for; since a great proportion of them are so minute as to be to all appearance progressive;—such as the growth and decay of animals and vegetables, and the formation and dissolution of many solid substances.

We consider the changes in nature as the work of God, because they are the result of *an omnipotent energy*, continually and steadily exerted—exerted, under the direction of infinite wisdom and goodness, and ordinarily according to established laws. And why may we not account for God's government of the *moral* world in the same way? The instruments by which he controls the actions of creatures, we have seen, are motives; but there needs something not residing in motives to make them effectual. And why not suppose that the same Divine energy, which controls all nature according to fixed laws, controls also the moral world, according to the law of motives? *Why not suppose an energy continually going forth from God through the moral world, not only to sustain the faculties of creatures, but to connect motive with action, according to the laws of mind, and according to the purpose of the Supreme Disposer?*

Will it be said, on the one hand, that an efficiency such as

this is not enough to answer all the purposes of Divine sovereignty? But why not enough? It exalts God high above the moral world, as he is above the natural, and represents both as alike subject to his control. It represents him as 'doing his pleasure in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth,' and as literally 'working all things after the council of his own will.'

Will it be said, on the other hand, that the efficiency here supposed is inconsistent with the freedom and accountableness of creatures? But how inconsistent? It interferes not with the regular influence of motives, but sustains this influence. It interferes not with the laws of mind, but sustains and gives effect to these laws. From the energy or efficiency of which I have spoken, creatures feel no more restraint, than they do from the upholding hand of God. Indeed this energy, so far from impairing freedom and accountableness, is believed to be indispensable to the continuance of accountable action. Were it withdrawn, we should not be in a situation to act, more than if God should withdraw his sustaining power.

If evidence be demanded of *the reality* of the energy here supposed, I adduce the fact that we are creatures, dependent creatures, all whose springs are in God, and who live and *move*, and have their being in him. Such creatures cannot have an independent efficiency within themselves. They are not capable of it, and they do not need it.

I adduce also the consideration, that the moral world needs to be as entirely under the control of God, as the natural. It certainly needs controlling as much, and, without doubt, vastly greater consequences depend on its being controlled wisely and efficiently. Why then shall we regard the natural world as placed completely in the hands of God, and the moral world as left to the independent action and direction of creatures?—I see no necessity, on the one hand, of placing the wills of creatures any more under the control of God than the rest of his works, by making every volition the product of a distinct creating act; and I see no necessity, on the other, of placing them less under the control of God than the rest of his works, by giving to creatures an independent efficiency in originating their own volitions. God should rather be considered as reigning over the world, of matter and mind alike,—not indeed in the same manner, but with *equal certainty and efficiency*—and as fulfilling his purposes in both, by the energies of his power.

I cannot but think, too, that the view here given is more in accordance with the representations of Scripture, than that

which limits God's control over mind to the mere presentation of motives. In the Scriptures, God's control over the hearts of men is set forth as frequently, and with as little qualification, as his government over the world of nature. If he 'covereth the heaven with clouds, and prepareth rain for the earth, and maketh grass to grow upon the mountains, and giveth to the beast his food;' he is said with equal explicitness to fashion, to turn, to melt, to break, to incline, and to harden the hearts of men. It is needless to quote passages, as they will instantly be recollected by every attentive reader of the Bible. That theory, then, must be most in accordance with the Bible, which represents the worlds of matter and of mind as alike in the hands and under the control of God, and which represents him as directing the actions of creatures, not less than the changes of nature, by his own power.

In addition to that constantly supplied energy by which God sustains and carries on his government over creatures, there is needed, in one event of life, a *special* exertion of Divine power. I refer to the change in regeneration. I need not enlarge here in describing the nature of this change. Suffice it to say, that it is an instantaneous change in the internal exercises or affections from sin to holiness. It is a change in which the subject is voluntary; and it is so deep and radical, that, when regenerated, he may properly be denominated 'a new creature.' Old things have passed away with him, and all things have 'become new.'—This change is represented in the Scriptures as the result, not of God's ordinary operation on the heart, but of a *special, extraordinary* influence. It is spoken of as an extraordinary display of Divine power. It is 'the exceeding greatness of God's power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power which he wrought in Christ Jesus, when he raised him from the dead.' Eph. i. 19.

It is of great importance that this special work of God should be distinguished from that common energy by which his government over the moral world is sustained. This distinction has been virtually confounded, not only by Liberalists, who deny the necessity of regeneration, but by some very good men, who seem to have verged to the other extreme. If we suppose that every moral exercise, sinful and holy, is the product of a distinct creative act, and that there is no other way in which God's ordinary government over the hearts of creatures can be maintained, we obviously leave no room for an extraordinary exertion of Divine power in regeneration. If the ordinary assistance of God accomplishes every thing, there is nothing for special grace to do. Accordingly, those who adopt

these views relative to the ordinary assistance of God, do not admit that there is any *special power* exerted in regeneration. The power is the same which produces the last sinful exercise, as that which produces the first holy one; and is exerted in the same way; and there is nothing special in the latter case except the effect.—But the Scriptures, I am persuaded, give a different view of the subject. When we pray for the outpouring of the Divine Spirit, we mean something more than the ordinary assistance of God; and when the Spirit is said to be poured out, for the conversion of sinners and the upbuilding of the church, something more than ordinary assistance is intended. The work of God in regeneration is uniformly represented in Scripture as a *special work*—something above and beyond all common efficiency—and as a manifestation of extraordinary power.

There are various particulars in regard to which the ordinary and extraordinary work of God on the hearts of men may be distinguished. The former of these works is not appropriated, in Scripture, to the third person in the Trinity. It is not spoken of, like the latter, as the peculiar work of the Holy Spirit. Neither has the former any tendency, like the latter, to turn back the perverted current of the affections, and produce a change from sin to holiness.

It may also be observed, that *the ground of the necessity* for these two Divine operations is entirely different. The necessity for that ordinary influence by which the government of God over the hearts of men is sustained, lies in the fact that they are *creatures*. It is needed as much in heaven as upon earth; and would be as much needed on earth as it now is, were all its inhabitants perfectly holy.—But the necessity for that special, extraordinary influence, by which the soul is renewed, lies in the fact that we are *sinners*. We are perverse and obstinate transgressors, and need to have the stubbornness of our hearts subdued by special power. If we were not sinners, we could not be regenerated; and should not need that extraordinary influence by which regeneration is accomplished. If we were not fallen, guilty creatures, who must be born again in order to be saved, the exigency would not exist, to meet which the *special* operations of the Holy Spirit are bestowed.

Another mark of distinction between common and special influences is, that in dispensing the former, God acts as a *moral Governour*; but in dispensing the latter, as a *Sovereign*. That common energy, by which his government over the hearts of creatures is sustained, he never withholds from any rational being. He bestows it by an established law, and he might as well be expected to subvert the law of gravitation, or any other of

the laws of nature, as this. But the special operations of his Holy Spirit—which are rendered needful by the voluntary and inexcusable wickedness of men, and the object which is to overcome this wickedness—he gives or withholds, as seemeth good in his sight. He is under no obligations, in point of justice, to bestow these influences upon any one. He might withhold them universally, and leave all his sinful creatures to perish unreclaimed, and his throne would be guiltless. Wherever they are bestowed, they are bestowed in mere mercy; and he has mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he leaves to his own chosen way.

It is on the ground of the distinction here made between common and special influences that we learn in what sense God may be said to *leave* any sinner. He never leaves his sinful creatures as to that *common* energy by which his government over them is sustained; for so left, they would not be moral beings. They would not be in a situation to sin or repent, more than if God were to withdraw his supporting hand. But they are left as to *special* influences and restraints. In righteous judgement, God withholds from them that special grace, without which it is certain they will persist, in face of all their obligations, in the road to death. In this sense, he ‘*gave up* some of his ancient people to their own heart’s lusts;’ Ps. 81. 12, and ‘*suffered* the Gentile nations to walk in their own way.’ Acts 14. 16.

It is sometimes asked, in these days, whether sinners have not power to repent and do their duty *without God*, or *without Divine assistance*. The distinction between common and special influences may serve to throw light on this inquiry. If by Divine assistance be meant that *common* assistance of God, by which his government over the moral world is sustained, it is obvious that without this, sinners have *no power* to repent and do their duty; because without it, they would have no power to act any way, and would not be moral agents. But if by Divine assistance be meant that *special* Divine influence by which the hearts of sinners are renewed, then the proper answer to the question will depend on the meaning attached to the word power. Sinners have no *moral* power, no *disposition* to repent, without *special* Divine assistance, although they may be said to have *natural* power.—On the whole, the phraseology under consideration is so liable to be misunderstood—to be received in a sense which is not true, which contradicts the Scriptures, and is opposed to the experience and the prayers of Christians, that it ought not to be used but with great caution, and with all needful explanation.

If any ask, what we are to understand by *special*, in distinction from *common* influences, and what they do for those on whom they are effectually exerted; I answer, they do all that is necessary to be done, in order to their awakening, conviction, and conversion. They enlighten and impress the sinner, not by revealing new truths, but by opening his eyes to see, and his heart to feel, the weight and importance of truths already revealed. They not only present motives before the mind, but prepare the mind to be influenced by motives, so that the truth of God may become effectual.

I cannot doubt that the special influences of the Spirit are *direct* and *immediate* in their operation upon the mind. Indeed, I think this is true of common Divine influences; and much more of those which are special and extraordinary, and by which the deep currents of the soul are changed.

The supposition that the work of the Spirit in regeneration is *direct* upon the mind accords best with the representations of Scripture, and with facts. Renewed souls are spoken of in the Scriptures as *God's workmanship*, *God's building*. They have been *new created* in Christ Jesus. And the power by which they have been new created is said to have *wrought effectually in them*. In the account which inspiration has given us of the conversion of Lydia, it is said that 'the Lord *opened her heart*, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul.' Acts 16. 14. The Lord, it appears, first opened her heart—her mind was wrought upon by an immediate Divine influence—and then her attention was easily caught, and the preaching of Paul was soon effectual.

And the evidence from *facts* is equally decisive as that from Scripture. Here is a person who has gone to the same meeting, and heard the same truths from the same preacher hundreds of times; and in every instance without any good effect. The most weighty considerations are urged upon him, but he continues indifferent and insensible. At length, however, his heart is touched, and the truth comes armed with unwonted power. It arrests attention, excites feeling, leads on to a new train of thoughts and exercises, and speedily becomes the power of God unto salvation. But why this sudden and surprising change? The truth dispensed is the same. It is no more or less important than it was years ago. The preacher, too, is the same; and outward circumstances are all the same. Must we not necessarily conclude in a case like this (and such cases are of frequent occurrence\*) that there has been *a secret*

\* "I have heard men of respectability assert," says Dr. Baxter of Virginia, "that their manifestations of Gospel truth were so clear, as to require some caution when

*invisible influence on the mind of the individual?* His heart has been opened, like that of Lydia, that he may attend to Divine instruction. By a direct influence on his mind, he is prepared to hear and feel, and soon becomes willing in the day of God's power.

It should be remarked, however, that in all this process there has been no miracle performed—nothing contrary to the nature and laws of mind, or to the free unembarrassed use of its powers. Instead of embarrassment, indeed, the powers at such times are usually exercised with unwonted energy and freedom. Instead of compulsion or restraint, the subject of renewing grace is, if possible, more free than ever. The mind is awake; the thoughts flow easily and rapidly; the sensibilities are alive to feel; and when the stubborn will bows, it bows as freely as before it resisted.

If it be inquired farther, *how* this great change has been effected by an immediate operation of the Holy Spirit, while yet the mind retains its freedom; I freely answer that I cannot tell. The *facts* in the case are sufficiently plain, and these are all with which we are particularly concerned. The *manner* is beyond the limits of human research; and the language of Scripture respecting it, is rather calculated to repress curiosity, than to afford information. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

It may be observed, in conclusion, that the work of sanctification in the heart of the believer is obviously the result of a *special* Divine operation.—The Christian, in this world, is sanctified but in part, and is beset by a thousand influences adverse to his spiritual progress and interests. He needs, therefore, *special* aid. The exigency, which existed before conversion in a great measure continues, and to meet it, *special* grace is still needed and is bestowed.

Christians often pray that they might not be deserted of God, and that he would not take his Holy Spirit from them. The meaning of such prayer is, not that God would not withhold that universal energy by which his government over the moral world is sustained, but that he would not remove *special* influences and restraints. These the Christian is deeply sensible

they began to speak, lest they should use language which might induce their hearers to suppose that they had seen those things with bodily eyes; but at the same time, they had seen no image, or sensible representation, nor indeed any thing besides *the old truths contained in the Bible.*" Letter to Dr. Alexander on the Revivals in Kentucky in 1802. See N. York Miss. Mag. Vol. iii. pp. 86—92.

that he needs. Without them, he knows that he shall fall and perish forever. He prays, therefore, with the Psalmist, 'Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thine Holy Spirit from me. Put not thy servant away in anger; leave me not, neither forsake me, O God of my salvation.'

---

## REVIEWS.

---

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY. *By the* REV. CHARLES BRIDGES, B. A. *Vicar of Old Newton, Suffolk, and Author of Exposition of Psalm cxix.* 2 Vols. 12mo. New York: Jonathan Leavitt. 1833. Boston: Crocker and Brewster.

The book at the head of this article, embraces topics of vital interest to the church and world. It is chiefly occupied, as its title imports, in considering the causes of ministerial inefficiency, and in suggesting remedies, and pressing incitements to duty. The author, who is a clergyman of the established church in England, manifestly entertains high views of the duties and responsibilities of those who watch for souls. He writes with ability and with a spirit deeply serious and thoroughly evangelical—as one, who is himself strongly impressed with the magnitude and awfulness of the sacred charge. He is evidently a man of unaffected diffidence and modesty; hence his frequent quotations from nearly all writers of eminence, who have discussed kindred topics, that in this way he might reinforce his own views and opinions with the grave authority of the mighty dead.

Well written treatises of this kind are ever to be hailed with approbation. There is constant need of them. And they cannot be attentively read without essential benefit. Borne down with the depressive action of a burdensome and monotonous round of duties, cut off frequently for a length of time from the stirring intercourse of their brethren, ministers are in danger of falling into a desponding, inefficient state of mind. Their duties appear hard, perhaps impracticable. Many are either neglected entirely or heavily performed. In such seasons, yea, in *all* seasons of slumbering, disheartened unfaithfulness,

these printed monitors are opportune and useful. They rouse up the dormant elements and capabilities of usefulness. They fasten the conviction, like a spur upon the conscience, "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel." Who, for instance, that is not dead in sin, can stand unmoved before the awakening expostulations of "the Reformed Pastor?"

Whilst we can cheerfully recommend this work as one adapted to be useful, we would record the desire and the request, that some of our own ministers, who have had experience and who wield a strong pen, would favor the public with a treatise on ministerial responsibility and duty. There are those who can make a better book on this momentous subject than any we have imported, or shall import—at least, a book better adapted to do good in this country.—Circumstances here are peculiar, and they should be consulted in a work to be circulated amongst our own pastors and candidates. There is manifestly too much done in reprinting foreign books, and not enough in making books on the ground; or rather, though foreign books of certain kinds may well be reprinted, and enough are made at home of certain kinds; yet, of such as meet our peculiar and experienced wants, we want more made here. We depend too much on foreign talent and industry, as though there were no heads and hearts, on this side of the waters, competent to the responsible business of writing books. We would make the remark with some qualification, and yet there is truth enough in it to justify us in making it.

Our author treats of the following general topics. 1. General views of the Christian ministry. 2. General causes of the want of success in the Christian ministry. 3. Causes of ministerial inefficiency connected with our personal character. 4. The public work of the Christian ministry. 5. The pastoral work of the Christian ministry.

In the treatment of these several points, if any thing is wanting, it is more of the close, home-work of Baxter. He gives admirable instruction, but he does not apply and press it with sufficient directness and power; he lets us off too easily, without making us feel with adequate depth and strength of conviction, that these duties *must not* be neglected,—*must* be performed.

We shall not attempt to follow our author in the details of his work, but make a few free remarks upon the same general subject. Severe inquisition should be instituted to search out and expose the causes, so widely at work, which detract from the efficacy of those labors, which are appointed for the saving of the immortal soul.

The writer of these pages does not expect to suggest any thing especially new, or startling to his brethren; he claims only the humble intention of stirring up their pure minds by way of remembrance.

In regard to the causes of ministerial inefficiency, there is little need of ignorance or mistake. The more active of them are prominent and obvious. They are chiefly defects in personal character. And the main thing is, *deficiency in piety*—a want of warm, devoted love to God and the souls of men.

Having said this, we are sensible that we have made a very trite remark. But shall it on this account cease to be made? Is it *felt*? Want of piety—of active, constraining godliness in ministers, is the main operative reason that no more sinners are born into the kingdom of Christ. Is the truth *felt* at the core of the heart? It ought to be so felt, and this great cause or occasion of men's perdition forever removed.

It is not said, that ministers cannot preach without piety. They may even preach well; on many subjects they may deliver and press truth with an affecting solemnity and earnestness, whilst destitute of all deep and saving experience of the truth in their own souls. Probably all do not realize how far a person of respectable talents and vigorous imagination may go in proclaiming the doctrines of the Gospel, and even in describing the peculiarities of Christian experience, when he himself remains under the dominion of an unbroken depravity. We fully accede to the sentiments of a distinguished writer, that "it is possible for one to declare, with ability and effect, the Gospel to others, and yet himself be a castaway—to unravel the whole of that spiritual mechanism by which a sinner is transformed into a saint, while he does not exemplify that mechanism upon his own person—to explain, what must be done, and what must be undergone, in the process of becoming one of the children of the kingdom, while he himself remains one of the children of this world." It is, furthermore, admitted, that a minister may, to some extent, be successful without personal religion. If he utters the messages of truth with plainness and solemnity, and discharges the other various duties of his office with tolerable external fidelity, God may, and in many instances, will add his blessing; and the minister may become instrumental in effectually pointing others to that Saviour of whose love he is ignorant, and to that heaven from which he is in the way of being finally excluded.

But whilst it is conceded, that ministers may sometimes preach well and even successfully, without personal religion, or with only a small measure of it, still it is true, and the

truth must ever be urged, that *piety*—ardent love to God and the souls of men, is the first and indispensable qualification in a minister, the main cause of all his power and usefulness. It may be safely affirmed, that where there is eminent and active piety there will be, ordinarily, if not invariably, efficiency and success. Whereas if there be an utter want of piety, success will necessarily be limited and casual. We do not undertake to say, that the reason why ministers accomplish no more, is, that they are destitute of personal religion. Such a statement would be grossly uncharitable, and we trust, wholly untrue. We choose rather to repeat what we have already said, that the grand reason of ministerial inefficiency is found in the sadly depressed standard of religious character, which attains amongst those who publish the Gospel. There is a deficiency in the minister's piety. The sure consequence is, a deficiency in the manner, spirit, and thoroughness of performing incumbent duty. Ministers of this stamp do not intensely love the souls of those around them. Of course, they do not labor and toil, and spend themselves for their salvation. They even sleep at their posts when all the energies of their being ought to be roused and nerved, and solely directed to the momentous business of their calling. They are dead in devotion, sluggish in duty, and inhumanly indifferent, amid all the startling solemnities of truth and eternity. The result is, as might be expected; those for whom Christ died, go on, *by* them and *over* them, to perdition. If any are saved, it seems to be by a surprizing interposition of God's inscrutable sovereignty. Thus, want of success follows directly from want of *piety*. First, coldness at heart; hence, neglect of duty; hence, the everlasting death of the soul.

On the other hand, from ardent devotedness to God, follows, with equal conclusiveness, the probability, if not the absolute certainty, of glorious success. First, deep-seated, energetic godliness; hence, fervor in prayer, promptness in duty;—and hence, the Spirit's presence, and the sinner's conversion to God. This is not mere declamation. It is the conclusion of universal experience. On every side, we see the fact, conspicuous as noon day, that a low state of pious feeling in the ministry is associated with the tardy and doubtful edification of believers and the sadly unfrequent conversion of the ungodly. Equally decisive is the voice of facts, when we fix our attention upon ministers of eminent godliness and fidelity. Can a single instance be found of a servant of Christ, ardently pious, unceasingly devoted, who has been doomed to the anguish of protracted ill success? Was it Edwards? Was it Brainard? Was it Pay-

son? These men lived almost in a perpetual revival, because they lived near to God, under the very droppings of heaven. As it was with them, so it will be with all those, who in spirit and practice are like them. God will bless such ministers every where. This is matter of promise; it is as certain as truth itself.

How vastly increased then would be the power of the ministry, if all who serve at the altar would come up to this standard and this spirit. To what a high and venerated dignity it would be raised, and what a rebuking energy would go forth from it upon a wicked and an adulterous generation. A new and brighter glory would gather around Zion; triumphs of salvation would attend her progress. She would immediately arise and shine; her light would come, her walls be raised, her courts be crowded with thronging multitudes of converts, shouting in loud accents the praises of her King.

*Deficiencies in intellectual character and habits*, may be adduced as another radical cause of ministerial inefficiency. There are frequent instances of an inadequate mental training for the work. Sufficient time is not taken to lay a deep, broad, solid foundation. With many, there is an impatience on this subject, which, though it springs from commendable motives, is unfavorable to thorough preparatory discipline. They look abroad and behold darkness and irreligion prevailing, and souls pressing in unnumbered millions down to ruin; and they long forthwith to be in the field, to warn and save some of them. Whilst we approve of the benevolence and zeal, we are compelled to say that as a general thing the haste is decidedly injudicious. It is admitted that there are exceptions. Cases will occur in which a protracted process of study would not be advisable. Men of certain habits and character may be extensively useful in the ministry whose original preparation is very defective. Examples illustrative of this remark are found in such men as Andrew Fuller of England, and Jeremiah Hallock of our own country. It is a pernicious rule that would deprive the church of services of so valuable and efficient a character. Whilst we plead for a thorough professional education, we say nothing to the disparagement of worthies of this class; we yield them double honor. Nor do we exalt mere learning above piety. We place piety first; it is indispensable, it is the foundation. Having done this, we must earnestly insist, as a general thing, upon a regular, patient course of professional study. The young man who takes this course, will ordinarily accomplish more good in his whole term of labor, though it be considerably shortened, than he can rationally

expect to accomplish, by hurrying and compressing his preparation, and rushing confidently into the field, with crude notions, and unfurnished, uncultivated powers. The wisest and most experienced amongst us give a harmonious and decided opinion on this subject, and all observation confirms it.

There is another thing which deserves to be mentioned. Some who take time enough and pursue a regular course of study, injure their subsequent usefulness by *not being sufficiently professional in their studies*. They are not chiefly occupied with those great departments of knowledge which relate immediately to their work. Some enter the Theological Seminary with very strong literary tastes and propensities. They indulge them. They lay aside works of exegesis and theology, and give their paramount attention to the pursuits of general literature. Sacred science comes in incidentally. They imbibe only, what may conveniently fall in their way in the prescribed routine of lectures and discussions. Of course, they go out into the world very imperfectly qualified for the arduous and responsible duties of the ministry. They may have a popular talent—be able to write with ease and elegance. But they cannot endure: they are deficient in the requisite resources. They create expectations which they fail to fulfil. If a young man wishes to make a solid, efficient, growing minister, let him lay the foundation in the Theological Seminary, by a diligent and devoted attention to the prescribed course of studies. If he does not, we can assure him he will bitterly regret it, when he is called to sustain the difficult, responsible, and ever recurring duties of a settled pastor.

A cause of ministerial inefficiency may be found not only in deficient preparation but also in *subsequent professional indolence*. Ministers do not universally continue through life to be students as they ought. There are those who seem to practice as though they supposed their studies, and the *necessity* of study were finally ended, the moment they leave the Theological Seminary—that all necessary accumulations of knowledge have been made, and henceforward they have nothing to do, but diffuse their moral and intellectual treasures. Though it can hardly be conceived as possible, that an idea so highly preposterous, should obtain possession of a *cultivated mind*; yet too often is it manifestly there and ruinously at work. At any rate the *fact* is conspicuous, that not a few of Christ's ministers are intellectually lazy. They do not bend their mental energies to hard investigation and noble exertion. They spend comparatively little time in their libraries, or what is better, in

the solitude of deep and strenuous thought. The consequence is, the mind is stationary. It even grows dull and rusty. These men preach no better at forty than at thirty, no better at fifty than at forty. Indeed some might be found, whose earliest performances were decidedly the best; and were we called upon to select from their stock of manuscripts a discourse on which to rest their posthumous reputation, we should be likely to take one written at the farthest remove from the time they were buried. It is shameful, it is wicked, to let the immortal mind which is set apart to impress and mould for an endless destiny other immortal minds, thus to dwindle and run to waste. This mental indolence is surely a prominent and notorious evil in the ministry; it is an evil which must be corrected, before this divine institution shall accomplish any thing like its designed and practicable amount of success.

The usefulness of some ministers undoubtedly suffers from the *mode in which they conduct their studies*. They are deeply solicitous to furnish, discipline and strengthen their minds; and they spend much time in efforts to attain this important object. But they fail to a considerable extent from not selecting the right material, the proper nourishment. Perhaps, a course of light desultory reading is pursued, such as reviews, biographies, and the still more ephemeral productions of the day. These are good in their place; but their place is a retired and subordinate one. It will require effort and self-denial even, to turn away from them to higher and harder application. They come often, fresh and new. They contain something that never was printed before, many interesting facts and thrilling appeals. It costs but little mental labor to read them. Thus constituted and coming, they are tempters to allure and steal away precious time. They *do* steal away time. He is a favored man who has a large number and variety of newspapers, periodicals, &c. coming into his house weekly, whose heart is not afflicted with the bitter recollection of hours, perhaps days unprofitably spent over them. Still ministers must have them; they are good—they are even indispensable. But they must not be abused, nor suffered to injure those who read them. Properly used, they will prove a most valuable incitement and benefit. But if indolently pored over, during hours and days which ought to be consecrated to study, they will dissipate and enfeeble, instead of discipline, store and strengthen the mind. If we fail to raise in the present generation such divines as have gone before us, probably one reason will be, the present overflowing abundance of light milky reading.

There is another kind of busy indolence, to which ministers

and especially students in theology, are exposed, and which detracts from mental power and injures usefulness. We allude to *the practice*, to which there is a temptation in every extensive library, of *looking over a great many books—of glancing from one thing, and from one author, to another, as a mere matter of dreamy curiosity.* The mind, unless forced and chained to the point of labor to which we wish to keep it, will, from its natural reluctance to fixed effort, fly off upon these idle excursions: That detriment is incurred by every indulgence of this kind, there can be no doubt. This soft, luxurious rambling has a direct tendency to unsettle the mind, render it uncontrolable, and in this way effectually to undo the work of a stern and sober discipline. Cecil in his *Remains* gives us his experience on this point, and it is well worthy of attention. “Every book really worth a minister’s studying, he ought, if possible, to have in his own library. I have used large libraries, but I soon left them. Time was frittered away: my mind was unconcentrated. Besides, the habit which it begets of turning over a multitude of books is a pernicious habit. And the usual contents of such libraries are injurious to a spiritual man, whose office it is to transact with men’s minds. They have a dry, cold, deadening effect. It may suit dead men to walk among the dead; but send not a living man to be chilled among the ruins of Tadmor in the Wilderness.” There is frequently an injudicious haste—a desire to pass over a great field of learning. Particularly is this an evil in Theological Seminaries. Students generally meddle with too much. They take in hand too many authors—get a glimpse of a great deal of knowledge, but fasten and rivet inalienably upon the mind comparatively but little. The remedy of this evil is very simple, easily pointed out, and perfectly practicable. Let a few *standard works* in the several branches be selected, and thoroughly studied, mastered and digested, and the benefit will be incalculable. A minister need not have a great library. A small number of works which have been put together by the strong, deep and sound thinkers of different ages, will be enough, if he uses them aright, to make him a workman, that need not be ashamed. No matter if the number be *quite small.* Intimate and prolonged communion with some one great master spirit, will do more to exalt and ennoble the mind, than a careless, hurried attention to ever so great a multitude of the common stamp. When ministers will do this, and push aside the ephemerical things which with a bright exterior are continually courting their attention, and come to the patient, determined, thorough study of solid standard works, there will be seen at once a

marked increase of intellectual strength, and evidences of an augmented moral efficiency which will bring glory to God, and by his grace, souls to heaven.

Ministers find out very soon after they enter the field that what they want is principles—the first great principles of moral and theological science. Unless they have these well-defined and maturely settled in the mind, they never can know with any confidence, where they are going. If they *do* have them, though they may be deficient in some of the details of their profession, they will be enabled to proceed with safety and success, even through scenes of darkness and difficulty. They will have an intelligent confidence that they are in a correct course. These principles, carefully and firmly fixed, will be like posts on each side of their path, which will intercept all attempts to wander. And how are these principles acquired? We answer, by a thorough and reflective study of standard works. Such, for example, as Butler's Analogy—books like this are the true material, that will put the mind on a deep and sure foundation, and raise it up a strong and massive structure.

In alluding to the causes of ministerial inefficiency, it will be expected that we say something of the prevailing style of preaching. We feel that this is a difficult point. Whilst there is much to commend in the mode and spirit of pulpit efforts in this country, there is much undoubtedly which needs correction. This is easily said, and often said. But to point out the errors and deficiencies of this most important part of clerical duty, so that they may be seen and corrected, is quite another affair. Yet there is great room for improvement, and improvement must, in some way, be effected, ere this prominent instrument of human reformation arrives at its full and destined measure of power. All those ministers, who have warmly at heart the salvation of souls, undoubtedly feel at times intensely and with agony on this point. Before entering upon the work, many are apt to think, that they shall be able to make men hear and receive the truth of God; but how soon comes bitter disappointment. The Gospel is preached; the terrors of the Lord, the love of Jesus, doctrines and motives, adapted to move and melt the heart, eloquently and forcibly uttered, but the apathy of death, the insensibility of the grave, reigns under the whole momentous disclosure. And why is it so? Is it enough to say—may ministers say it and feel satisfied with their performances—that none but a Divine power can affect the heart; and of course the whole reason of this indifference and stupidity, lies in the fact, that God has not been pleased to grant the Holy Spirit? This will never do. Much of the failure is undoubt-

edly to be attributed to the preacher's own manner and spirit. And where is the prominent, *specific* fault? Some tell us that written sermons do a considerable part of the mischief; they are cold, dry and formal. True they are so, sometimes, but they need not be so. There may be life, power, simplicity, in short, every quality of a subduing eloquence thrown into a written, as well as into an extemporaneous performance. These elements of power *are found* in sermons carefully prepared in the solitude and amid the prayers and communings of the closet. Baxter preached written sermons which were followed with the most glorious results. He says, "It is a regard to the work and good of hearers that makes ministers use notes. I use notes as much as any man when I take pains, and as little as any man when I am lazy, or busy, or have not time to prepare." It never has been the case, nor is it now, that the whole evil consisted in written sermons. Ministers may preach efficiently with them, and without them. And if they would attain to the highest point of efficiency as preachers, they should accustom themselves to both methods.

Ministers are apt to be wanting in simplicity; not alone simplicity in language, but in order, illustration, and general style of exhibiting truth. They take for granted that more is known and understood, than is actually the case. The consequence is, that many in the congregation, and those most urgently needing instruction, derive but little benefit from the Sabbath performance. They cannot follow the preacher. He is in a region above them. They may wonder at his learning and eloquence, but their own hearts are not affected, because their minds are not enlightened. Ministers, undoubtedly, think too much of their cultivated hearers, when preparing for the pulpit. Pride is concerned. They want to come up to *their* standard; secure *their* approbation, because reputation is depending very much upon what *they* may think and say. Such a course is wrong, and it will be hard to answer for it at the judgement-seat of Him who humbled himself to the form and condition of a servant that he might aid, instruct and redeem the most ignorant and *vile*. To the poor the Gospel must be preached, ere its trophies will be signally multiplied, and its power witnessed in its sublimest measure and extent. Ministers must be willing, if need be, to make themselves of no reputation, to condescend to the capacity of the most illiterate, and pour the light of truth into the narrowest and darkest minds, if they would be extensively useful, and guide multitudes to the kingdom. "Not many mighty, not many noble are called."

Much preaching is lost for not being sufficiently discrimina-  
tive and applicatory. Good instruction is given; doctrines are  
demonstrated; but they are not brought in pungent contact  
with the individual heart and conscience. No voice says, 'Thou  
art the man.' Sinners will not apply truth, they will resist it.  
*Ministers* must apply it and not spare. They must deal out  
blow after blow till the subject is felt. It should always be  
made known very plainly, that what is said, belongs not to beings  
in the distance, but to beings on the spot.

"The preacher who aims at doing good," says Robert Hall,  
"will endeavor above all things to insulate his hearers, to place  
each one of them apart, and render it impossible for him to es-  
cape by losing himself in the crowd. At the day of judge-  
ment, the attention excited by the surrounding scene, the  
strange aspect of nature, the dissolution of the elements, and  
the last trump—will have no other effect, than to cause the re-  
flections of the sinner to return with a more overwhelming tide  
on his own character, his sentence, his unchanging destiny;  
and, amid the innumerable millions which surround him, he  
will "mourn apart." It is thus the Christian minister should  
endeavor to prepare the tribunal of conscience, and turn the  
eyes of every one of his hearers upon himself."

One of the most difficult parts of the preacher's work is,  
rightly to divide the Word of truth, to present the Gospel in its  
just and beautiful proportions. Preachers are apt to have their  
peculiar points, their favorite topics, which they make very prom-  
inent. They can speak, perhaps, more easily upon them, or  
they are more congenial with their constitutional temperament,  
or, they can manage them with more skill and impressiveness,  
or they attach an undue importance to them as the means of  
awakening and conversion. One will dwell upon the Sovereignty  
of God—his character and purposes as a moral Governor.  
Another is too exclusive upon topics which relate immediately to  
the sufferings and death of Christ, as though the only way to  
preach the cross, were by direct allusion. Another holds up,  
with too constant and stern severity, the "terrors of the Lord."  
Where either of these courses is pursued there can be expected  
but little saving impression. Mere mercy will be trampled up-  
on; mere denunciation will throw the unbelieving heart into  
an attitude of sullen, desperate resistance. But both together,  
properly intermingled and tempered, are adapted to produce  
fear and relenting. The sinner should be made to see contin-  
ually that infinite love is solicitous and laboring for his rescue,  
and, at the same glance, let him see stern and vigilant justice  
ready to inflict merited retribution, if that pleading love is treat-

ed with cold and scornful neglect. The minister should ever utter the woes of his message with the tenderest spirit of kindness, if he would make any real and useful impression upon the heart of the sinner. An aged man recently told the writer that when he was young, and under the most agonizing convictions, a hard, unfeeling exhibition of the doctrine of future punishment—of the intensity and circumstances of the sinner's misery, annihilated instantaneously every trace and emotion of religious anxiety from his mind.

“Every part of the duty of the minister of religion is more easy than to maintain, in vigor and purity, the Spirit he needs as the reprover of sin and the guardian of virtue. It is easy to teach the articles of belief, and easy to illustrate the branches of Christian ethics; it is easy to proclaim the Divine mercy; but to speak efficaciously of the holiness and justice of Almighty God, and of its future consequences:—to speak in modesty, tenderness and power of the approaching doom of the impenitent, is altogether another matter; and one that must be left to those whose spirits have had communion with the dread Majesty on high.” The preacher in this part of his duty needs, and must have, strong faith and *love*. For, says the writer just quoted, “As often as we set foot upon the region which sin has replenished with terrors, we have need of all the strength we can derive from the very firmest convictions. Fatal to his influences as reprover of sin, must be a lurking scepticism in the breast of the public teacher. No care will avail to conceal the inward misgiving of the mind: the tongue of the speaker will flatter; and the reserve—the indecision,—the vagueness of his manner; or still more, his artificial vehemence will betray the secret of his doubts; and the infection of these doubts will pass into the heart of the hearer, and will serve to harden each transgressor in his impenitence.”

Strong, undoubting faith in the verities he announces, will operate propitiously in another respect on the preacher's efforts. It will help cause him to preach with the expectation that the truth will make a productive impression. The fear, the conviction, that nothing will be accomplished, is enough to ensure ill success. And how common is this conviction. How often does the minister in his despondency, almost feel as he enters the pulpit, and in his heart say,—“for the most part this is a mere form, a vain and useless service. Sinners come Sabbath after Sabbath, listen respectfully, and go away again just as they came. It will be so to-day.—My appeal will reach no heart—urge no soul to the Saviour.” If the minister *feels* so, it will *be* so. If he rises to deliver his message with this faint-heartedness, it will do no good. But whence

comes this soul-sinking expectation of laboring in vain? It springs from a wrong state of the heart—from want of a living, indestructible faith in the greatness and importance of the Gospel. If there were this strong conviction in the minister's heart, he would feel very differently when on the point of addressing his people. He would say, "I have a most weighty message to deliver. It is true as the oath of God—important as the destinies of eternity. It must be heard—it must, it will be felt. God will bestow his spirit. He will honor his own word. It will not return void. Some soul will be everlastingly benefited." Such a conviction is not enthusiastic; it is sober, rational faith in the promise and power of God. Let the minister have this conviction; write with it, pray with it, preach with it, believing that good may be done—and *good will be done*. And how can this effective conviction, this living faith be produced? The grand method is prayer: intense prolonged communion with the great Jehovah. This places a minister on an eminence of light, clothes him with an energy, and imbues him with an unction, which together will render him widely instrumental in recovering souls from the dominion of sin and death. As matter of fact those who have been peculiarly successful in the work of the ministry, have been pre-eminently men of prayer. They studied on their knees. Their best thoughts came, their most productive sermons were conceived and sketched, in their devotions. They preached environed with the light of truth and heaven, and they preached with strength, significancy, and to the purpose. Those who would follow them in the same bright career of usefulness, and rise to a like elevation and splendor in the heavenly firmament, must follow them also in their course of deep humiliation, and intense, emphatic prayer. Days and nights should be passed in the unutterable heavings and outpourings of irrepressible desire. Then the heart will be full of faith and love. The lips will deal out truth with the demonstration of the Spirit, and with a power from above which no perverseness nor obduracy, will be able to resist.

Pastoral visitation also, has an intimate relation to the results of the pulpit. A neglect, or imperfect attention to this department of duty always operates very unpropitiously upon the labors of the Sabbath. Ministers, who do not converse with the members of their congregation in private, cannot know their peculiar condition and wants; of course, they know not how to meet definitely their spiritual necessities. Their preaching cannot be distinctively appropriate, giving to each one his portion in season. Even if it were, it will not accomplish as

much good, as it would have done, if the preacher had mingled more with his people and sought their salvation in the retired and personal interview. They have not that belief in his sincerity, and anxious, benevolent regard for their spiritual welfare, which is invariably produced by faithful and judicious pastoral intercourse, and which, when produced, throws wide open the hearer's heart to the convicting admission of truth. Of the minister, who does not his duty in private, from house to house, the people will be apt to say, "true, he preaches well, and very solemnly; but it appears to us, that if he *really believed* what he delivers, he would say more to us about these things when he meets us during the week. Yea, he would search us out, and with tears warn us of our danger, and beseech us to become reconciled to God." Thus the direct influence of a neglect of pastoral instruction and learning is to make the people feel, that the minister does not care much for them. And consequently, they will not care much for him; affection cools, confidence is lost. Those, that repair to the sanctuary will not hear with interest and profit. Many will grow remiss in their attendance, and at length cease altogether. Experience shows, that there is no more effectual way to scatter and annihilate a congregation, than that of a prevailing neglect of pastoral visitation. Who then can compute the wide destruction of souls from unfaithfulness in this fundamental particular.

But the whole evil of the neglect does not consist in a diminished attendance upon the house of God, or in the diminished efficacy of the preacher's public efforts. It is a forfeiture of the minister's very best opportunity for fixing conviction in the mind, and for arousing and arresting the soul to its eternal concerns. In the personal interview, the sinner cannot escape, as he does in the crowd. He must be sensible, that *he* is meant—that he is in peril—that religion is an important and imperative reality, which if neglected here, there comes an eternity of woe. The sinner is very apt to *think* of what is faithfully said to him in private. A single sentence, pointedly and appropriately uttered, has been known to adhere in the transgressor's conscience like a barbed arrow, inflicting a restless agony, until application was made to the great Physician.

But this duty is often a trial. It is unpleasant to break in upon the conscience, and disturb the cherished securities of the soul, in the friendly personal intercourse, and perhaps awaken wrath and incur reproach. And how many shrink back through fear and false delicacy, and suffer the careless sinner to go on unwarned, till he sinks and is seen no more? And where will the blood of souls so perishing be found?

This whole subject is, one which demands the most serious and scrutinizing attention of all ministers of the Gospel. What can be devised to augment the efficiency of the consecrated profession? What can be done, more mightily, more successfully, by those set to watch for souls, to arrest the wide and fearful rush of men to the gates of eternal death? It is a fruitful theme, and one of agonizing interest; but we must dismiss it, and commend it to the regard of others. It is worthy of an angel's pen.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

---

### EXPOSITION.

Rev. iii. 14.—“THE BEGINNING OF THE CREATION OF GOD.”

It is well known, that Unitarians alledge this phrase as decisive testimony, that *Christ is the first created being*.

But what right have they to *quote the passage at all?* Do they believe in the *Divine authority* of the Apocalypse? Do they not call it “a disputed book?” Is it *ingenuous* to catch up a sentence, from a “disputed book” because it looks a little favorable to their opinions? Let the candid judge.

I have not said these things, however, as intending to imply, that the Revelation of John is spurious. Far from it. The Divine authority of this book *was never disputed before the third century*.\* All the early writers acknowledge it; as Papias, Justin Martyr, Melito, Irenæus, Theophilus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian. This last one says (A. D. 200) “Though Marcion† rejected the Revelation; yet *the whole series of Bishops from the beginning*, stand up for John as the author.” “Etsi apocalypsin ejus Marcion respuit; ordo tamen Episcoporum ad originem recensens, in Joannem stabit auctorem.”

Besides, Origen classed the Revelation with the *universally received books*.

Nor do the enemies of this book dare to deny, *that it was received as genuine in the earliest times*.

The *earliest opposers* of its divine authority did not *even at-*

\* Vid. Storr and Flatt, Bib. Theol.

† A schismatic, who discarded at pleasure any part of the Scriptures that opposed his opinions.

tempt to bring *historical arguments* against it. Dionysius,\* one of the first, said; "It cannot be called a *Revelation*; for it is in the highest degree obscure and unintelligible. *Its obscurity*, then, was the first ground of its condemnation. And Epiphanius ascribes the doubts of his contemporaries, *not to ancient historical accounts*; but to *their embarrassment when they attempted its explanation!*

Perceiving that there is full reason to receive the Apocalypse, as of Divine authority, I proceed to consider the expression, which stands at the head of these remarks.

And, in the first place, it is *not very probable* that John intends to represent Christ as *the first created being*; because it renders him *so inconsistent with himself*, and contradictory to the other Scriptures. In chap. i. 5, and 6, he speaks of Christ as *an object of worship*, and as worthy to receive "*glory and dominion forever and ever.*" Could he have done so, if he had thought him merely the first created being? Chap. i. 17, he has represented Christ as the "First and the Last;" yet John well knew, that these are the epithets, by which *Jehovah* has declared *that he will forever be known*; and that *he will not give his glory to another*. He never could therefore have given these epithets to Christ, if he had considered him *a created being*.

Nor would John have given Christ the appellation "The living one" (ὁ ζῶν) "who was dead," and "*who lives forever*," "having the keys of hell and of death," if he had considered him *created and limited*. (Vid. Chap. i. 18.) In the same book he gives the most *unequivocal* testimony to the Omniscience of Christ; Chap. ii. 23. "And all the churches shall know that I am he who searcheth the reins and hearts." Observe, that this passage *does not merely say*, that *Christ searches the reins and the hearts*. But there is something exclusive in it; as though *none but he* does it; "I am *He*,—*that one* who searcheth."—Could John have ascribed this to Christ, if he had considered him a created being?

But further, John has used many expressions in reference to Christ, which pre-suppose the possession of Divine attributes. Chap. ii. 16. "*I will fight against thee, with the sword of my mouth.*" Chap. ii. 10. "*I will give thee a crown of life.*" Chap. ii. 13. "*Antipas my faithful Martyr.*" Chap. ii. 17. "*I will give to eat of the hidden manna.*" Chap. ii. 5. "*I will remove thy candlestick out of his place.*" Chap. ii. 21. "*I gave her space to repent.*" Chap. iii. 5. "*I will not blot out his name out of the book of life.*" Chap. iii. 10. "*I will keep thee from the hour of temptation.*" Chap. iii. 7. "He that openeth and (ὀψδεῖς) *no one* shutteth; and shutteth and (ὀψδεῖς) *no one* openeth." Chap. iii. 18. "*I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, &c.*" Chap. iii. 16. "*I will spew thee out of*

\* About the middle of the third century.

my mouth." Chap. iii. 19. "As many as I love I rebuke." Would it not be impiety in a *created* being, however exalted, to use such language?

Still further, if John had meant to teach, that Christ was *the first created being* he would have been inconsistent with a multitude of *his own declarations in his gospel and epistles*. In these he has declared that "The word was God;" that "he made *all things*;" that "without him was *not anything made*;" that "in him was (ζωή) LIFE; that he was *that* (ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος) ETERNAL LIFE *which was with the Father*;" that "He and the Father are ONE."

Moreover, there is something, in this verse, which is under consideration, inconsistent with the idea of a *created being*. "These things saith *The Amen*." What can be the meaning of this? This term is derived from the Hebrew word (אמן vid. verb in niphal) which signifies "to be firm," "to be true," "to be sure," "to be worthy and exalted." *The Amen*, by way of emphasis, therefore means; "the firm one," "the true one," "the sure one," "the worthy and exalted one." And *who can this be*?

Besides, there is something else remarkable in this verse. "*The faithful and true witness*." Were not *prophets and apostles faithful*? Were they not *true witnesses* in things pertaining to God? But Christ is called emphatically "*The faithful and true witness*." Would it not be remarkable for a *created being* to adopt such phraseology? But,

*In the second place*, since we have found what John *did not mean* to teach, unless he was very inconsistent, let us endeavor to determine *what he did mean to teach*.

I expect to make it appear that the following is the sense of the passage: "Thus saith the Amen; the faithful and true witness; *the Head (or Ruler) of God's creation*." The Greek is ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ. To the word (ἀρχή) let us attend.

I. We will look at the use of this word in the New Testament writers. It very frequently means *the beginning*, as John i. 1. Matt. xxiv. 8. Mark x. 6. and other places, too numerous to be cited.

But *this is not its only meaning*. It is very frequently put for "*Dominion*," "*Principality*," "*Power*," "*Rule*," "*Authority*," "*Government*." And the verb (ἀρχω,) derived immediately from it signifies, "to command," "to rule," "to obtain the principality," "to wield the magistracy."

We will now look at some of the examples in which ἀρχή is put for "*Dominion*," "*power*," "*authority*," &c.

Luke xx. 20. "That so they might deliver him to the (τῆ ἀρχῆ) *power and authority* of the governor."

Rom. viii. 38. "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor (ἀρχαὶ) *principalities*," &c.

1 Cor. xv. 24. "When he (Christ) shall have put down all (*ἀρχήν*) *rule, authority and power.*"

Eph. i. 20, 21. "And set him (Christ) at his own right hand, &c. far above all (*ἀρχῆς*) *principality and power, and might, and dominion.*"

Eph. iii. 9, 10. "God created all things by Jesus Christ, to the intent the manifold wisdom of God might be made known by means of the church, unto the (*ταῖς ἀρχαῖς*) *principalities and powers in the heavenly places.*"

Ephes. vi. 12. "We wrestle, &c. ; but against (*τὰς ἀρχάς*) *principalities, against the rulers of the darkness of this world.*"

Coloss. i. 16. "By him were all things created, &c.—whether they be thrones, or dominions, or (*ἀρχαί*) *principalities or powers.*"

Coloss. ii. 10. "And ye are complete in him, (Christ) who is the Head of all (*ἀρχῆς*) *principality and power.*"

Coloss. ii. 15. "Having spoiled (*τὰς ἀρχάς*) *principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly.*"

Titus iii. 1. "Put them in mind to be subject to (*ἀρχαῖς*) *principalities and powers—to obey magistrates.*"

2. Now let us look at the *Septuagint translation of the Old Testament* ; the only book extant, in the same dialect in which the Apostles wrote.

Isaiah ix. 6. "Unto us a Child is born ; unto us a Son is given ; and the (*ἀρχή*) *government shall be upon his shoulder.*"

Jer. xxxiv. 1. "The kingdom of Babylon,—and all the kingdoms of his (*ἀρχῆς*) *dominion.*"

Dan. vi. 26. "I make a decree that in every (*ἀρχῆ*) *dominion of my kingdom,*" &c.

Dan. vii. 14. "And there was given him (*ἡ ἀρχή*) *dominion and glory, and a kingdom,*" &c.

Dan. vii. 27. "And all (*αἱ ἀρχαί*) *dominions shall serve him.*"

Micah iv. 8. "Unto thee shall it come, even the first (*ἡ ἀρχή*) *dominion—the kingdom shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem.*"

Other examples might be adduced were it necessary.

3. But, I observe, further, that this use of the word (*ἀρχή*) is very common among *pure Greek writers*. "To receive the *principality*, (*δευδεξῆσθαι τὴν ἀρχήν*) and to receive the *government*, (*δευδεξῆσθαι τὴν βασιλείαν*) are frequently used as synonymous. Vid. Diod. Sic. I. c. 59. p. 69. c. 63. p. 72. c. 64. p. 73. Wess. Ed.)

Now, if all these examples will not justify us in rendering the text, "The *Head* (or *Ruler*) of God's creation," it will be difficult to establish any doctrine by recurrence to *Greek usage*.

4. Besides, this rendering agrees with the things which *John afterward ascribed to Christ, in this very book.*

Chap. iii. 21. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in MY THRONE," &c.

Chap. v. 12. "WORTHY is the Lamb, that was slain, to receive power and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing."

Chap. vii. 17. "The Lamb who is in the MIDST OF THE THRONE."

Chap. xvii. 14. "The Lamb shall overcome them, for *He is* (Κέστος κυβλων και βασιλευς βασιλεων) King of kings and Lord of lords."

Chap. xix. 13—16. "He, whose name is called (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ) the Word of God, and whom the armies in heaven followed; is afterward called *King of kings and Lord of lords.*"

Chap. xxii. 3. "The throne of God and the Lamb, shall be in it; and his servants shall serve him." Here God and the Lamb are represented as holding the same throne, and his, refers equally to the Father and the Son.

Chap. xxii. 12, 13. "Behold I come quickly. And my reward is with me, to give to every man as his work shall be. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the First and the Last."

Every humble disciple, therefore, instead of accounting Jesus a created being, may say, "In the Lord, have I righteousness and strength." "My Saviour is "THE ROOT AND THE OFFSPRING of David;" "THE HEAD of all principality and power;" THE "PRINCE of the kings of the earth;" "HEAD over all things to the Church;" and nothing can wrest me out of his hands! "Even so, come, LORD JESUS!"

---

#### RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE.

Toleration, like many other virtues is much talked about, and little practised; and perhaps least practiced, by those whose professions are the loudest. It is no uncommon thing at the present day to hear a man rail against railing. In communicating a few ideas upon the subject of intolerance, I will endeavor to avoid an intolerant spirit, though I may not succeed better than some of my neighbors have done.

1. The religious community is divided into various denominations, all assuming the name of Christians, and professing conscientious zeal for the promotion of their Christian views. Now it often happens that husband and wife are divided in religious sentiments. They cannot conscientiously worship together. So far as religious freedom is concerned, it is no matter which is right or which is wrong. If the wife be not permitted to worship God as her conscience demands, her liberty of conscience is destroyed. She is persecuted. It is intolerance, and that [the most inexcusable and oppressive. What is meant by religious liberty; mere-

ly that *men* may worship God as their consciences dictate, and that women have no right of conscience? It is a Mohammedan doctrine that women have no souls, and from the habits of some husbands, it might be inferred that it is a Christian doctrine also. It is to be feared, that in the free and professedly tolerant state of Massachusetts, the cry of religious oppression has ascended from many a persecuted wife to the ear of God. If a man compel his wife to attend a form of worship in which she cannot unite; or if he attempt to harrass and obstruct her in that form of worship which she deems proper, he is exercising an intolerance as relentless, as that which erected the Spanish Inquisition, and kindled the fires of Smithfield. Could we read the domestic history of religion, for the last twenty years, in this state, it is to be feared that there would be developments, which would show that the persecuting spirit of Papacy is not dead. There is many a lady in our state, now groaning under religious bondage. She has no recognized religious rights. She is the bond-slave of her husband and is compelled in servile subjection to follow him to the temple *he* frequents, be it ever so obnoxious to her own conscience, and repugnant to her own feelings. Can that mind be liberalized by learning; can that heart be subdued by piety, which under all the light of the present day, can perpetrate such outrages against the religious liberty of a fellow immortal? Here is the genuine spirit of religious intolerance, in its most hateful and oppressive form. The man who will not tolerate religious liberty in his family, wants but the power to crush the spirit of free enquiry in the state. He who will make the companion of his life the miserable victim of religious persecution, would surely feel less reluctance, to wield this oppressive power over the consciences of others. *Toleration, like charity, should begin at home.* He who is the tyrant of his family, would be a tyrant in the senate chamber, or on the throne. We may talk loudly of free enquiry, and religious liberty; and flatter ourselves that our own minds have burst the shackles of superstition, but the proof lies in the *action*, not in the *profession*. Hume, who certainly was a shrewd observer of human nature, remarks that those sects who boast the most of toleration, generally have the least of it. And any man who denies his wife that religious liberty he would himself enjoy, is as un-Christian in his conduct, as he is illiberal, ungentlemanly and brutal.

2. There is such a thing as parental intolerance. He who will persecute his wife will persecute his child. The relation between parent and child is such, that it is the parent's duty for many years, to ensure the strict obedience of the child. He is to instruct his child in religion, and is to *enforce*, if necessary, his attendance upon all those means of instruction, which the parent thinks proper. The manners and the morals of the child are committed to the parent's care, until the child shall be capable of judging for itself. But when that child shall have attained such a degree of

maturity, as to be capable of forming a correct judgment;—when that child adopts its religious belief, sensible of its accountability to God, then further restraint is persecution. It is precisely the same spirit which led to the “act of uniformity” and the “test act,” and all the outrages of the “court of High commission.” Is it not possible that in the enlightened state of Massachusetts, some parents may be found, who are doing violence to their children’s consciences—who are depriving them of their religious freedom? Here is opportunity for the exercise of intolerance, which the laws of the state cannot reach. Each family is in itself an independant empire, of which, the Father is the law-giver and the monarch. He has power to oppress his wife. He has power to oppress his children. And the arm of the state cannot be thrust in. And the cry of oppression may not come out. The tear may flow in secret, and the prayer be unheard but by God. Yes! in the elegant parlors of the opulent of our own land, there may be the unhappy victims of an intolerance, as relentless in its spirit, as that which forces a shriek of agony from the sufferer in the dungeons of Goa. That father deserves not the name of a man, who will tyrannize over the free spirit of his child. He can lay no claim to be the friend of civil or religious liberty, who is the spiritual tyrant of his family—who resolves that his mind and his religion shall be the mind and the religion of one and all—who sits at his own fire-side in the Papal chair, and there rules with the intolerant spirit of the court of Rome. He who truly loves religious liberty, will love to feel that his family is free, and he never will thunder parental anathemas against the son or the daughter, who exercises this inalienable right of every immortal being.

3. The history of intolerance conclusively shows us, that no religious sect, can be safely trusted with exclusive power. And here there is occasion for the guardians of our civil and religious liberties, to keep ever a wakeful and a vigilant eye. If our officers of state; if our law-givers and judges, are selected from any one denomination, then is that denomination elevated to state partiality, and the bribe of civil office, is held out as the lure to conversion. To make any party of religionists the subjects of state favoritism, is intolerance to all the rest. Suppose an opposing denomination wishes to have a society incorporated, or to obtain a charter for a Theological or Literary Institution, its right may be denied, and its petition thrown back with scorn. The government degenerates into a sectarian cabal. And suppose the denomination, which has thus grasped the power of the state, should wish to pervert the literary institution of the state, into the nursery of its own sentiments—Nay, more!—suppose it should have the hardihood to contemplate uniting a theological school of its own, with this Institution of the state, and thus to take the money of the people to educate sectarian preachers of its own faith, who is then to resist this high handed religious usurpation?

Let the offices of government be placed in the hands of *any one religious denomination*, and this may be done, and before the people dream of their danger all the power of the state be arrayed in support of an established religion. It would be possible for such a state of things to become so confirmed, that the judges of our courts should unblushingly become religious partizans, furiously declaiming in popular assemblies, and enlisting their passions and their prejudices, in subjects which are daily coming before them for sober judgment, and which deeply affect the property and the happiness of their fellow citizens. Other churches may thus be deprived of their rights; other Christians be thus the subjects of persecution, and the sceptre of intolerance be swayed over the whole length and breadth of the land. There is no religious denomination which can be exclusively trusted with the civil power. The friends of civil and religious liberty will do well to look more earnestly at this. Usurpation is generally gradual and silent and secret in its advances. The balance of power should with care be preserved. Then will all classes be protected, and all interests receive proportionate attention.

The true spirit of toleration appears to me to be this: In all our intercourse with our fellow men, we must remember that they have rights of conscience as well as ourselves, and those rights must ever be respected. Let us not, however, deceive ourselves by thinking that indifference is *liberality* or *candor*; on the contrary it is *guilt* and *shame*. Toleration does not demand of you the belief that all the errorists with which the earth is filled, are right. It commands you to treat them with kindness, and not deprive them of their just dues. If you have not confidence in your own professed opinions, it is hypocrisy. If you believe that certain feelings and actions are essential to prepare men to meet God in judgment, it is a crime of the deepest dye, not to make vigorous exertions to warn men of their danger, and to induce them thus to think and act. Untiring efforts and ceaseless prayers should be given for the redemption of man's immortal spirit. But this should be done in that spirit of humility and meekness and benevolence, which our blessed Saviour both taught and exemplified.

A

---

REMARKS ON THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE FRIENDS AND ENEMIES OF COLONIZATION.

It not unfrequently happens, in those controversies which unfortunately often divide even good and wise men into opposite and angry parties, that in the zeal of each to convince or confound the other, the great principles which lie at the bottom of the whole question in dispute, are utterly lost sight of. This is a fact, which,

it would seem, must have been observed by every one, who has candidly reflected on the controversy between Colonizationists and anti-Colonizationists—if we must use these formidable words—a controversy that has now become so rife and keen in almost every part of New England. Much is said on both sides, indeed, about justice and common sense, actual principles and inalienable rights; and much, no doubt, that is really worthy of attention; but we must be allowed to say, that to us the views generally presented of this whole subject, appear both superficial and confused. There has been a mingling together of questions, and a misapplication of principles acknowledged by all, to be just and important, by which the disputants have too frequently darkened counsel with words—we will not say—without knowledge; but, at least, without a definite apprehension of the main points in the controversy.

It is admitted on all sides, that Slavery is a deplorable evil, and that it is immeasurably important the evil should be removed as speedily as possible. Now the great question which swallows up all others connected with the subject, is, How shall this be effected? And in what manner is this question met by the enemies of Colonization? All men, they affirm, are by nature equally free and independent; and hence no man has a right to hold his fellow in bondage; consequently, the slave-holder is guilty of violating the principles of natural justice; and, therefore, the readiest, and indeed the only way of bringing him to his senses, and to wash his hands of the guilt, is to denounce him as a felon, and cry out against the schemes of the Colonization Society. The consistency of the several members of this logical *catena*, will undoubtedly, be as apparent to our readers as ourselves. In these propositions, however, with the exception of the last—for we choose to call them propositions, rather than *terms* of a proposition—few even of the warmest friends of Colonization would find much to which they would very strenuously object. That all men are by nature equally entitled to freedom, and that no man can justly usurp authority over another, so as to deprive him of his freedom, excepting extraordinary cases, we take to be unquestionable truths. And these are the principles which are claimed as lying at the foundation of the entire fabric of self-styled anti-Slavery. Very good principles, it is true, in the abstract. But what is their application? Do they prove that the evil of slavery can be removed by no other means than denunciation and abuse? To this question they have no relevancy whatever. All they demonstrate is, the guilt of the slave-holder.

But let us look, for a few moments, at this last point, the guilt of the slave-holder. Possibly we may discover some principles universally acknowledged and acted on, which, when set off against those on which that guilt is predicated, may serve, in some degree, to limit their application, and to place the slave-holder in a some-

what less unfavorable light. We grant that everyman is, by birth, entitled to freedom; that he has a natural and inalienable right to govern himself, to regulate his own affairs, and to enjoy the rewards of his own industry. But we know, that up to a certain age, every person is subject to the authority and control of the parent, as absolutely as the slave to that of the master. His education, his whole course, and all the circumstances of his life, are directed by the parent's will; and all the avails of his industry go to the parent's advantage. Up to that period, the child, civilly considered, has no will and no existence of his own;—in other words, he has none of that self-control, and none of those civil rights, which belong to every free citizen. Now, we ask, is this right? Unquestionably it is; because the good of the child, and the welfare of the community require it.

But who shall determine precisely when the point shall be fixed, at which the child becomes the man,—master of himself and a citizen of the state? One is as capable of self-government at twenty years of age, as another at twenty-five; and is it not unjust to keep him in bondage? Is it said, we have a Divine command on this subject,—“Children, obey your parents?” So we have the Divine command,—“Servants, be obedient to your masters.” But, who shall decide how long a person shall be considered as a child? The point of transition is differently fixed in different countries; and the Bible leaves the matter altogether undetermined. It must evidently be left for decision to common sense, either of individual parents, or as embodied in the laws of the country.

Here then we have an instance, to which nobody objects, of the limitation of the principle of universal freedom, according to the dictates of common sense. Now let us suppose there is a legal provision for extraordinary cases, by virtue of which the parent, on account of the incompetency of his son to manage his own concerns, may continue to hold and treat him as a minor, after he has passed the ordinary period of minority. If the evidence of the son's incompetency is clearly made out, is there any injustice in his being still held and treated as a minor? Is there not the same reason for it, as for his being so held and treated before he arrived at the age of manhood? Analogous cases are by no means of rare occurrence. A man is addicted to intemperance. He becomes morose and cruel, abuses his wife and children, threatens to burn his dwelling, and reduces his family to a state of starvation. A guardian is appointed; and the right of entire self-control, and of managing his property, is taken away. Is there any injustice here? Again;—a man discovers symptoms of insanity, of such a nature that his friends no longer feel safe in his presence. Perhaps he has not, hitherto, committed any offensive act; he has injured no man's person, he has destroyed no man's property. But he shows a strong disposition to injure himself and his neigh-

bors; and that disposition is every day increasing. Now, must they wait till he plunges a knife into their bosoms, or burns down their houses over their heads? Or may they on such grounds, take him into custody, in anticipation of the evil? Unquestionably they may take him into custody. Nor would the case be essentially different, if the insanity were not of the head, but of the heart. Whatever the law might pronounce on this point, common sense and common justice would sanction and require the same treatment.

Hence it is evident, that the right of self-control or of liberty, with which every man is vested by nature, has its limitations that are to be determined by common sense alone. Cases do actually and almost daily occur, in which the public good and the good of the individual himself, require that he should be divested of that natural right, either partially or altogether. And the grand principle involved here is, that an abstract individual right, can never be allowed to contravene the rights of the community.

For the same reason, every citizen of the state is obliged to yield up to the state a portion of his freedom, for the common good. It may be said that he does it voluntarily, and that he receives an equivalent—the protection of the laws. The former, however, is more than questionable in many cases which frequently arise; and as for the latter, many an individual regards the equivalent he receives as about as fair, as the corn-meal and bacon of the slave, in exchange for his liberty. These considerations will suffice to convince us, it is believed, of the truth of one or the other of two things,—either, that there is something radically wrong in almost the whole operation of the machinery of civil society; or, that very great caution is to be used in the application of abstract principles, taken singly and alone, as if they were strictly absolute and universal.

We are now prepared to attend to the question—To what extent is the slave-holder to be regarded as guilty of violating the principles of justice and humanity, in retaining in bondage a number of his fellow creatures, whom necessity, perhaps, and not his own choice, has thrown upon his hands? He regards them, and the laws of his state regard them, and a majority of his countrymen regard them, as a species of minors, incapacitated by all their feelings and habits, to govern themselves and regulate their affairs in a manner consistent either with their own good or the good of the community. Are we told that they are not considered as minors, but as property? Where, in principle, is the difference? A parent may *bind out* his child, and a guardian may *bind out* his ward, in consideration of an equivalent,—and how, in the abstract, does this differ from *selling*?—during the whole period of their minority. Now, if the slave is practically incapable of properly governing himself, if he is not in a condition to be safely entrusted with his freedom, and especially if the civil

law and public sentiment declare this to be the fact,—does it not, to say the least, *palliate* the master's offence in holding him in servitude? Let us not be understood to justify slavery, least of all, the practice of buying and selling slaves. We do not mean even to vouch for the correctness of the prevalent opinion, that slaves are almost universally incapable of properly and safely regulating their own affairs as freemen. It may be wrong. But, allowing it to be so, is not an opinion so general entitled to some consideration; and is the slave-holder to be denounced as a tyrant and a felon for adopting it as true, and following the course which he, at all events, believes that it sanctions? We believe the slave-holder to be pursuing an unjust and criminal course—not so much in refusing, under present circumstances, to emancipate his slaves, since he sincerely deems himself bound to retain them in servitude, not by considerations of personal interest alone; but for the same reasons and in the same manner as a father or a guardian is bound to retain in his hands the natural rights of the minor;—we regard, as the main ground of his guilt, his refusal to prepare them, by proper instructions, to receive into possession the precious boon of liberty, and then to place them where they can enjoy it. This is the object at which every slave-holder in the country ought, even on his own principles, most sedulously to aim; and this is the only point to which the philanthropists of the country can reasonably hope to bring him. So much for the guilt of the slave-holder.

Let us now go back and resume the main question where we left it. Let us grant, for argument sake, that the master is totally unjustifiable in retaining possession of the slave a single hour; and that he is, consequently, bound by every principle of justice, to send him out free forthwith and unconditionally. What follows? Is it any thing to the purpose, that scores of philanthropists traverse those portions of the country where not a slave exists, and continually pour forth against the slave-holder the language of violent denunciation? Suppose that, in a hundred families in the city of New Orleans, the crime of infanticide were practised. What would be the advantage of weekly proclamations, in New York, Boston, Baltimore and Philadelphia, of the enormity of the crime? If these noisy declaimers would go, in the soberness of reason and the zeal of a good cause, to those families themselves, and there labor, at the very root of the evil to effect its extirpation, they would deserve the thanks of the community, and might more reasonably hope for success?

But what is the object to be accomplished? The universal emancipation of the slaves. This is desired by all, perhaps with equal ardor. And what has the guilt of the slave-holder to do with *our* duty, in relation to it? That is *his* concern; *ours* is, to find and follow the most effectual way of removing the evil. If we have any thing to do with his guilt, it is, that we go and urge

on him repentance and reformation. But it must be our first care, to restore the injured slave to the enjoyment of freedom. And the question is—How can this be done? Let it be admitted that his right to liberty is paramount and unconditional. Still, how can that right be effectually secured to him? This is the inquiry which *we* are to make; here is the point at which *we* are to aim. The master says, “I will not and cannot emancipate my slaves, unless they are transported; my hands are bound, if not by considerations of common safety, at least by the laws of the state.” We see the truth of the assertion. We know that he will not do it, and that he has no civil power to do it. The door of immediate and unconditional emancipation is closed and barred by the hand of law. What shall we, philanthropists, do? Run from Dan to Beersheba, and rail against the slave-holder, taking care, however, to keep clear of *his* territories? Shall we not rather apply ourselves to the task of emancipating our enslaved countrymen, in a way which the laws and the safety of the country leave open, and which, in fact, will be most productive of good to themselves?

Just at this point the Colonization Society comes in, and proposes a plan which precisely meets the difficulty. It unties, in a manner, the hands of the master, and furnishes him the means of liberating his slaves without violating the law or endangering the public safety; and it points both the liberated slave and the free black to a place of refuge from the tyranny of prejudice, un-Christian perhaps, but irremediable. Then, to the land of their fathers, it offers to transport them, and to guarantee to them the rights of freemen—and the means of an honorable, an affluent, and a happy independence. Such, at all events, are the views and expectations of the friends of the Colonization Society.

They believe, moreover, that the course pursued by them, exactly coincides with the spirit and precepts of Christianity, in relation to slavery. They read the New Testament and find frequent allusions to slavery; but no where on its pages do they find, in reference to it, the language of denunciation and harsh rebuke. And why? Why does not Paul denounce it, and labor for its immediate extirpation? Why does he not pursue the same course in reference to this, that he does in reference to fornication, covetousness, and many other vices? Not, certainly, because it was less a moral evil then, than it is now;—but because, unquestionably, he deemed it expedient to leave this, as he did many other things, to be brought about by the progressive influence of the religion he inculcated. That is, he deemed it expedient to resort, not to violent measures, but to measures whose operation, though slow, would nevertheless, be safe and sure. The former, he knew, could have no other than a mischievous effect, under the existing state of society; but the latter would infallibly lead, at length, to the desired result. We leave our readers to make the application for themselves.

To the Editor of the Spirit of the Pilgrims.

SIR,—The following is a copy of a letter in the hand-writing of President Edwards on the subject of *Lay-preaching*. The publication of it will be gratifying to many. The letter is in possession of one of the descendants of the excellent author. L. W.

Andover, July, 1833.

Northampton, May 18, 1742.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

I am fully satisfied by the account your Father has given me, that you have lately gone out of the way of your duty, and done that which did not belong to you, *in exhorting a public congregation*. I know you to be a person of good judgement and discretion, and therefore can with the greater confidence put it to you to consider with yourself, what you can reasonably judge would be the consequence, if I and all other ministers should approve, and publicly justify, such things, as Laymen's taking it upon them to exhort *after this manner*? If one may, why may not another? and if there be no certain limits or bounds, but every one that pleases, may have liberty, alas! what should we soon come to? If God had not seen it necessary that such things should have certain limits and bounds, he never would have appointed a certain particular order of men to that work and office, to be set apart to it, in so solemn a manner, in the name of God: the Head of the church is wiser than we, and knew how to regulate things in his church.

'Tis no argument that such things are right, that they do a great deal of good for the present, and within a narrow sphere; when at the same time, if we look on them in the utmost extent of their consequences, and on the long run of events, they do ten times as much hurt as good. Appearing events are not our rule, but the law and the testimony. We ought to be vigilant and circumspect, and look on every side, and as far as we can, to the further end of things. God may if he pleases, in his sovereign Providence, turn that which is most wrong to do a great deal of good for the present; for he does what he pleases. I hope you will consider the matter, and for the future avoid doing thus. You ought to do what good you can, by private, brotherly, humble admonitions and counsels; but 'tis too much for you to *exhort public congregations*, or solemnly to set yourself, by a set speech, to counsel a room full of people, unless it be children, or those that are much your inferiors, or to speak to any in an authoritative way. Such things have done a vast deal of mischief in the country, and have hindred the work of God exceedingly. Mr. Tennent has lately wrote a letter to one of the ministers of New-England, earnestly to dissuade from such things. Your temptations are exceeding great: you had need to have the prudence and humility of ten men. If you are kept humble and prudent, you may be a great blessing in this part of the land, otherwise you may do as much hurt in a few weeks as you can do good in four years. You

might be under great advantage by your prudence to prevent those irregularities and disorders in your parts, that prevail and greatly hinder the work of God in other parts of the country: but by such things as these you will weaken your own hands, and fill the country with nothing but vain and fruitless and pernicious disputes. Persons when very full of a great sense of things, are greatly exposed; for then they long to do some thing; and to do something extraordinary, and then is the devil's time to keep them upon their heads, if they be not uncommonly circumspect and self-diffident.

I hope these lines will be taken in good part, from your assured  
Friend, JONATHAN EDWARDS.

---

THE DOCTRINE OF MERIT.

The doctrine of merit is the bane of true Christianity, and of real vital religion. It is the nauseous scum arising from the ebullition of pride, in the corrupt hearts of fallen creatures. To suppose a creature, even of the highest order capable of meriting anything at the hands of his Creator is an affront to common sense. But, to imagine a sinner—a transgressor of the law of the Most High, to perform works meritorious in his sight, is an absurdity that wants a name; and can be nothing less than the spawn of hell, and the smoke of the bottomless pit, which stupifies and blinds the souls of men to their own destruction and perdition.

I am persuaded the idea of merit, never entered the minds of those pure spirits that worship before the throne; and it is that which can never enter the realms of bliss. No, the language there is, “not unto us! not unto us! but unto thy name be all the glory.” And the saints at the judgement day, astonished at the condescension of their adorable judge, will, with holy wonder, ask, “When saw we thee hungry, or thirsty,” &c. spurning the idea of merit from them with the greatest abhorrence. I verily believe there is nothing in the whole empire of God that he more hates, than that pride which influences a sinful worm to imagine he can merit anything at his hands. “Can a man be profitable unto God, as a man that is wise may be profitable to himself? Is it any pleasure to the Almighty that thou art righteous? or is it any gain to him that thou makest thy way perfect?” Man's goodness extendeth not unto him; for when we have done all, we are unprofitable servants, and have done no more than we ought to have done.

*Tucker on Predestination.*

THE  
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. VI.

OCTOBER, 1833.

NO. 10.

---

---

THE CRUCIFIXION.

NO. V.

SCENE AT GETHSEMANE.

After all the fatigues of the disciples in preparing for their last Passover, and all their disquietudes in partaking of it, they needed sleep. When therefore Jesus led them from the hall of their feast, they supposed that he was leading them to the suburbs of Jerusalem for sleep. It was late at night when they left the hall, John 13 : 30. " 'Twas on that dark and doleful night," Watts says, hymn 1, book 3 ; but as Thursday was the thirteenth after the new moon of Nisan, the moon was nearly at its full, and therefore the evening of Christ's agony was one of those brilliant glorious evenings which the moonlight of Palestine distinguishes above all others. About 1052 years before this time, David, in his flight from Absalom, passed over the brook Kidron with his sorrowing friends, and ascended the Mount of Olives, "and wept as he went up, and had his head covered, and he went barefoot, and all the people that was with him covered every man his head, and they went up weeping as they went up."\* Ahithophel had gone over to Absalom the persecuting usurper. The king sung in reference to this apostacy, "it was not an enemy that reproached me ; then would I have borne it, &c. &c." The 42nd, 43rd, 55th, and 143rd Psalms will let us into the sorrows which he felt when he crossed the Kidron. And now his descendant is crossing it, perhaps at the same place, and with eleven similar attendants ; the Ahithophel of Jesus is on Mount Zion with the priests, as the Ahithophel of David was there with Absalom ; he is concerting mischief against the son of the king, as his renegade pro-

\* 2 Sam. Chap. 15.

totype devised it there against the king himself. Jesus however, did not, as David, go up the Mount of Olives ; he stopt at the foot of it, near the house of one who was his friend, and desirous of concealing him from his enemies. For several preceding nights he had lodged in the same garden, Luke 21 : 37. John 18 : 1, 2 ; and because it was his resort for sleep, there being no evidence for a common assertion that it was his resort for prayer, the traitor knew where to find him on this, the night preceding the crucifixion. According to Maundrell, the modern garden is 57 square yards in extent, retired, and secure, well adapted to purposes of rest and devotion. It is thus described by Rev. Jonas King, who visited it, in connexion with Rev. Pliny Fisk, ten years ago last April. As our Saviour's walk to Gethsemane, in the spring of 33, was strikingly similar to that of David ; so it was somewhat similar to that of our missionary, in the spring of 1823. "Having waited a little time," says Mr. King, "for two men to accompany me, I went out of the city, passed over the brook Kedron, and entered the garden of sorrow. It lies within a stone's cast of the brook Kedron. In it are eight large olive trees, whose trunks shew that they are very ancient. They stand at a little distance from each other, and their verdant branches offered a refreshing shade. The land on which they stand, and around them is sandy and stony, and it appears like a forsaken place. Around it is the appearance of a little wall, composed of small stones and broken down. On entering this garden, I requested the two men with me to sit down under one of the olives, which they did ; and I went a little distance from them to another olive, and read the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, and also in the four Gospels the scenes of that sorrowful night when the Son of man was betrayed into the hands of sinners. During this, some dark, fierce looking Bedouins, armed with long spears and swords, advanced on horse-back, and I was not without some fear that they would think me alone and attack me. After looking at me very attentively, and at the two men under the olives at a little distance from me, they passed by. The momentary fear which this excited brought to my mind, more impressively, the scene when Jesus was betrayed, and taken by a multitude who "came out against him with swords and with staves."\*

It was in Gethsemane, that the sufferings which distinctively made up the atonement began. "Jesus commenced his passion," says Quenstedt, "in a garden, and in a garden he ended it ; for in the place where he was crucified there was a garden,

\* See *Missionary Herald*, Vol. 20. pp. 65, 66.

in which was a new sepulchre." "There was a peculiar propriety," says Augustine (Sermon 71,) "that the blood of the physician should be poured out, where the disease of the sick-man was contracted." Eden, and Gethsemane, and the burial garden at Calvary are the three scenes, where entered, and was attacked, and defeated the arch enemy of God and man.

There are some views of the scene at Gethsemane more impressive than the crucifixion itself. At the foot of Olivet, there was none of the noise and bustle of Calvary; there was none of the coarseness and roughness of driving the nail, and thrusting the spear, and drawing the blood. All was spiritual, refined agony. It was the agony of a soul, working with immense power, at dead of night, in entire solitude, on events which were yet to come. Let it be remembered on reading of this mental anguish, that it arose before a blow was struck by the executioner; and that thousands of martyrs, even while enduring the cross which Christ was anticipating, were free from the least resemblance of such anguish. Let it be remembered, that thousands even of the more delicate sex, that multitudes of children of both sexes, have suffered tortures externally more excruciating than the Saviour's, and have felt none of his dejection. While bound to the rack and the wheel, while tied to the stake, and consumed by slow fires, while lingering whole days on the cross, they have *triumphed*; triumphed in the very man who was so severely depressed in view of his sufferings; triumphed in the very depression of that man; and, while their own feelings at death were so different from his, have venerated him as their *model* in all things; and yet have triumphed in the difference between his death and theirs. "How can these things be?" Let them be remembered.

Every reader of the Evangelists must have noticed the distinctions which Christ, during his ministry, had been accustomed to confer on Peter, James and John. There was an uncommon forwardness in these disciples, as is seen in Matt. 20: 22, 26, 33, 35; and perhaps on this account they were deemed most promising candidates for usefulness. John too was peculiarly amiable in his disposition. We perceive in Mark 3: 16, 17, 18, 19, that Christ distinguished these three from the remaining nine, by new and honorable names; in Luke 22: 8, and similar passages, that he was in the habit of committing to them the transaction of important business; in Mark 5: 37, and Matt. 17: 1, that he had permitted them alone to witness one of his most illustrious miracles, and even his transfiguration on Tabor. "It was fit," says Quenstedt, "as he had exhibited to these disciples a specimen of his celestial joys, when his

face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light, that he should now exhibit to the same a specimen of his infirmity and bitter distress." He therefore, bidding the eight to remain behind, takes with him his three intimates to a more secluded part of the garden. Now his agony came on. "My soul," he says, "is exceeding sorrowful; it seems as if I should die under my trouble." Matthew asserts with emphasis that he now began to be sad, and full of anguish (*λυπεῖσθαι και ἀδημονεῖν*.) Mark, that he was "struck with fear and wonder," (*ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι*,) as well as with anguish. He was agitated with dread and anxiety.

He had, ere this evening, meditated on his crucifixion. "I have a baptism to be baptized with," he had said (Luke 12: 50,) "and how am I perplexed, hampered, straightened, (*συνέχομαι*,) till it be accomplished." But he had never, probably, meditated upon it as he did now. He had attended principally to the good which would ensue from it, rather than the misery it would cost him. He had indeed a few minutes before, been consoling his disciples with a description of its glorious results. But now, all on a sudden, he turns his eye from the bright to the dark side of the picture. He confines his view to the multitude of woes which throng around him. His own bodily pains, the unpardonable treason of Judas, the lie and the profanity of Peter, the dispersion of the eleven, the sins of his murderers, the fearful consequences of his death on the beloved people; things like these rushing all at once into his mind distressed him. He cannot but be grieved at the foresight, that such multitudes in all future ages, and in all lands, would shut their eyes against his clear light, and sink deeper in despair, than if he had not died for them. But there is another grief more poignant than all. There is a mysterious, awful "*cup*," the very thought of which filled him with shuddering. We shall see at the close of our essay what this cup was. So intensely was Jesus afraid of it, that he sought now, notwithstanding his fatigue to relieve his fears in prayer.\* He chose however, as is common with sufferers, to pray alone. He withdrew to a solitary spot about eighty yards from the three intimates. He fell first upon his knees, afterwards prostrate on his face. No finite mind can conceive the poignancy of his distress during this prostration. It exceeded, probably, all his corporeal distress on the cross. He continued in prayer a whole hour. We do not know all his

\* It must be borne in mind, that though Christ was God, he chose to take no advantage from his Divinity during his sufferings; but to pass through all in his simple human nature; to endure the same fears, and long for the same helps, and adopt the same means of preservation, as ordinary men.

expostulations during this hour. It were interesting to be informed of them, but only the substance of them was allowed to be written. "Abba, Father! all things are possible with thee. Let me be delivered from the cup which threatens me. But if, on the whole, it be thy will that I drink it, then I prefer to drink it, to its dregs. I yield my will to thine."

The writer of the 45th Psalm, in addressing the Saviour, exclaimed, "Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty, with thy glory and thy majesty." Alas, this mighty conqueror was lying down without even a bed of straw, was trembling, faint, praying in anguish. "And in thy majesty ride prosperously;" "thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things; thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the king's enemies;" but the arrow of his enemies was now thirsting for his own blood; and of all postures possible, he had taken the one most appropriate to a subdued, lowly spirit. The Jewish attitude in prayer was, ordinarily, standing; frequently, kneeling. Solomon kneeled in the temple, and raised both his hands. Stephen also kneeled, when he breathed out his dying request. Elijah, during a particular prayer, sat, with his head bent down to his knees. Christ in his prayer after the sacrament, stood erect, and "lifted up his eyes," but when, scarcely two hours from that time, the terrors of the garden had seized him, he was not content, not able indeed, either to stand or to kneel, and there was no lifting up of the eyes. Having thrown himself at full length upon the ground, as David did while fearing one of his severest cups of affliction, he lay a personification of unconsolated distress.\*

At length he rises, and returns to the three disciples. He well knew that it was a critical hour for them. They were soon to lose their only hope, and to behold the imagined conqueror of the Romans taken prisoner, even by the subalterns of the Sanhedrim. Was there not reason to fear that the unexpected imprisonment would so shock the blinded disciples as to result in their apostacy; and in apostacy at the conspicuous moment, when fidelity was most loudly demanded? With the view of fortifying them against impending calamities, Christ expressly enjoined, when he left them an hour ago, "tarry here and watch; you have great need of watching, and praying, and thus preparing your minds for coming trouble. Unless you do prepare, you will be tempted soon to give up your confidence in me." Who now would conjecture that this injunction, after all that had been said and seen, could have been disobeyed by such a man as "that disciple whom Jesus loved." And yet,

\* See instances of such prostration in Num. 16: 22. 2 Chron. 20: 18. Neh. 3: 6.

when Christ returns to the three, he finds them all asleep? "Peter," he says, choosing to address the one who had made the boldest professions, "*Peter* are *you* asleep? Could you not watch with me a single hour? Unless you watch and pray, you will be in danger of falling by temptation. I believe, however, that you are willing in heart, but your bodily weariness has overcome your will."

Most men, when under excitement, are prone to reprove harshly, and to excuse themselves for wounding the sensibilities of the reprovèd, by the plea, that they were too much excited to consider what they said. But in Christ's most agonizing excitement he made all due apology for the foibles of his friends; and, lest he should injure the feelings of the sensitive John, veiled the rebuke to the three, under an address to that one of them who was most able to bear its brunt. Why did he not say, John are you awake? Because the younger disciple would have been overwhelmed, if Christ had not broken the force of the reproof by striking it first upon the elder, sterner, rock-like disciple. When Job was in his affliction, his three friends "sat down with him upon the ground, seven days and seven nights, and none spake a word unto him for they saw that his grief was very great;" Job ii. 13. But it was not so with the three friends of him who was more patient than "perfect" Job; and we have so much the more exalted esteem of his tenderness in reprovèd, when we consider that he, when in trouble, needed as well as other men the sympathy of friends, and yet was left the only one awake, in the moment of his keenest distress, in the hour of his greatest danger; was left by the three whom he had selected from his chosen, and in defiance of his express, solemn command.\*

The agony of Christ being too great to be endured, he goes quickly back to the spot for prayer. He prays again, that the mysterious *cup* may not be applied to his mouth, yet he finds no relief. He gets up again, and returns to see whether the disciples have minded his warning to watch and pray. Again he finds them asleep. He awakes them, and looks at them. They look at him, but are too much ashamed and out of coun-

\* The disciples were indeed criminal in their disobedience to their master, yet their very lethargy was an evidence of their deep interest in him. Luke, who was a physician, and on that account most apt to notice corporeal phenomena, says, that they were "sleeping for sorrow;" and other medical men have described sleepiness as a symptom of grief, particularly in a state of animal exhaustion like that of the disciples. "I have often witnessed profound sleep," says Dr. Rush, "even in mothers immediately after the death of a child. Criminals, we are told by Akerman, the keeper of Newgate in London, often sleep soundly the night before their execution. The son of Gen. Custine slept nine hours the night before he was led to the guillotine in Paris." *Diseases of the mind*, Page 319.

tenance to say a word. Christ therefore says nothing, but lets his eye speak out his disappointment and grief. His sorrowful and desponding eye speaks enough. It wilts them down. He goes back the third time for prayer. Instead of finding relief from his tremblings, he was now more burdened than before. His God did not listen to his request, and his dearest friends would not keep awake. The city near him is still. All the inhabitants, save the watchmen on the towers, and the knot of conspirators against his life, are locked in sleep, and he, with the world against him, finds the very stillness of his solitude an enhancement of his grief. He is hunted as a "partridge on the mountains." He weeps. We can hear him in the silent moonlight, weeping aloud. It is "strong crying and tears."\* It is impossible to restrain his feelings, which were wont to gush out with the simplicity of innocence. It is now the highest pitch of his excitement. Oh the cup, the cup! All the terrors of the world of darkness, and all the pains of this, are clustered around him, by one desperate effort of the tempter. His mind affects his body. His frame is inwardly and thoroughly shaken. A profuse perspiration starts from him. Though a chill-dew was falling, and the night was cold enough for men to need a fire, who were sheltered within palace walls, and had just been exercising, John 18: 18; though Christ had been standing *without* exercise and in the open air, and though he felt the cold far more intensely than we feel it, because his system like that of other Orientals was peculiarly sensitive and tender, yet the pores of his skin were so freely open, that large drops of perspiration oozed out, from his forehead and all parts of his body. The falling of the drops to the ground could probably be heard, just as you may hear the drops of blood which fall from a wounded man's bleeding arm when it is stretched out. "Oh! my Father, Abba Father, he cries, if it be not merely convenient, not merely easy, but if it be in any way *possible*, let the cup pass from me. Nevertheless if I must drink it, then I will."

Who, is so insensible to the distresses of the Saviour, as not to see that he was, at this critical hour, enduring a hidden, stifled agony, immensely deeper than a mere man ever endured or fathomed? How his whole appearance and every motion indicates his perplexity. He was so inwardly agitated, that he could not stand still. Though he was exhausted as well as

\* Heb. 5: 7. This passage indicates, that the Saviour wept in the garden, though the Evangelists do not notice the fact; and also that his voice was affected by his weeping, and sounded like that of any man who earnestly begs for help while he is convulsed in tears.

the disciples, yet he left the eight to sleep, and went forward himself with the beloved three to pray. But he finds that he cannot pray even with the select friends, and he leaves them also that he may pray alone. While the three are struggling without success against stupor, he is all wakefulness and life, and emotion. In his perplexity he throws himself down, with his face grazing on the earth. He gets up, and moves with hurried step and care-worn face to the sleepers; reproves them, but stays with them scarcely a moment; hies back to the spot for prayer; back again to his friends; then with renewed grief to beg the third time for ease; and soon returns to the place which he had started from, and revisited so often. His moving to and fro, now walking, now standing still, now lying down, not once trying to rest, sometimes pouring out the most earnest prayer, sometimes sobbing aloud, while the tears silently rolled down his face, at last his sending out, by mere force of feeling, a cold full sweat; all this vicissitude of hurried movement and plaintive cries is an exact picture of a man penetrated to his inmost soul with ineffable fears.

But what reason had Christ to shudder at death? Whose gold or silver had he coveted? Whom had he reviled? What one sin had he ever committed? If any one was beloved of God, was not the only begotten Son? why then should he distrust? If any one could be cheered by heavenly antepasts, could not he who merited and indeed was expecting a richer reward than all others, even than angels? Fix your eye, reader, on the self-styled "chief of sinners." Hear his courageous tones when he speaks of dying. "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course; I have kept the faith. 'To live is Christ' to me, 'and to die is gain. I have a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better. O death, where is thy sting! O grave, where is thy victory?" Listen to the words of a sinner in modern days, the lamented Payson, as he lay on the verge of the grave. "I have done nothing myself. I have not fought, but Christ has fought for me; I have not run, but Christ has carried me; I have not worked, but Christ has wrought in me." Since my sickness commenced, "I have suffered twenty times—yes, to speak within bounds, twenty times as much as I could in being burnt at the stake, while my joy in God has so abounded as to render my sufferings not only tolerable but welcome." "Death comes every night and stands by my bedside in the form of terrible convulsions, every one of which threatens to separate the soul from the body. Yet while my body is thus tortured, the soul is per-

fectly happy. I seem to swim in a flood of glory.\* Said an imperfect martyr, "I glory in these flames; I am enwreathed with a crown of fire." Said another, "I make my stake my throne. This burning is all I wish for on earth." Turn now your eye from these men, and gaze at Christ, stretched out on the damp ground, and there weeping and sweating, even before any corporeal pains have seized him. Tell me, you who think that Christ died the death of a mere man; tell me, why it was, that the man, better than all others, should be overborne by his inward thoughts, more than others by their thoughts and pangs? Why this shuddering and shrinking back in the only one who could justly claim salvation? "The sting of death is sin;" oh why then was the death of one "who knew no sin" so full of stings. Had not God promised, "if thou wilt prepare thine heart and stretch out thine hands toward me, then shalt thou lift up thy face with joy;" "when thou art in tribulation, if thou be obedient unto the voice of the Lord, he will not forsake thee;" "he is the strength of his people in *times of trouble*?" Will not Christ confide in promises like these? Can he not believe as much as a transgressor, who said, "when my father and my mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up?" What! shall a slothful servant rejoice in God, and a faithful son be left to wailing? Is this the reward of faithfulness? For this end had the man of sorrows encountered all the perils and hardships of his pilgrimage? Hundreds of dying penitents in our own day, hundreds who were to be saved "scarcely," "so as by fire," have feared less, recoiled less than Jesus. If his death had no meaning distinct from theirs, why was it so inferior to theirs in the expression of noble feeling? You say, that he was a mere man; but no, on your principles he was less than a man. You say that he died as a common martyr; but not so, on your principles he was a weak, timorous, irresolute martyr; trembling lest an evil come upon him, though he deserved no evil; fearing that God would forsake him, though God had promised a thousand times, to ten thousand sinners, that he would never forsake. Truly the idea, that Christ died an ordinary death, robs his character, not only of its divine glories, but even human virtues; denies his divinity, and impeaches his humanity; impugns his courage, insults his fortitude, and well nigh annihilates his faith.

Biographers, aware of the honor conferred on the character by courage in the midst of perils, have been careful to blazon abroad the bold expressions of their heroes, and to conceal such as indicated fear. But the Evangelists shew no such concern.

\* See Memoirs of Dr. Payson, pp. 361, 365, 367. Fifth Edition.

Instead of straining to make Christ appear brave in his afflictions, or on the other hand of blushing at some apparent pusillanimity, they let us freely into a full view of his faintness and sorrow. This fact has bewildered a host of critics, who "are wise above what is written." The agonizing sweat, the necessity of receiving comfort from an angel, have staggered them. Some have been so afraid of the bearing of these two occurrences upon the character of Christ, that they have expunged Luke 22: 43, 44, from the record.\* Others have endeavored to fritter away the true sense of the verses; one supposing that the disciples, their own eyes being yet scarcely opened from sleep, mistook a shadow, or Christ himself, for an angel; a second supposing that they derived their belief in the angel's visit from a misunderstanding of an expression of Jesus; a third, that the account of the angel is a mere fable, conformed to the Jewish mode of explaining unusual events. Of this last opinion, is Gabler; and, so long as he overlooks the peculiar meaning of the Redeemer's agony, he reasons well. "Christ," he says, "as through his whole life, so also in the last act of his life, displayed the greatest wisdom, constancy, greatness of mind. Although therefore, being truly a man, he might be affected according to the manner of men, and might tremble under his impending grievous woes; yet the anxiety of mind by which he was oppressed could not be lasting; and as he was eminently conspicuous for wisdom and magnanimity, he must have repressed all his disquietude by his own strength, and have solaced himself in the recollection of his Father's love, in the thought of his own office, and the advantages redounding to the world from his death. Therefore, the appearance of an angel by which his mind might be strengthened, was evidently superfluous."† Such testimony is valuable. It shews, that just in proportion as we exalt our estimate of Christ's human virtues, we must attribute his peculiar melancholy in the garden to a peculiar cause. In a person of ordinary weaknesses, this agitation or manner would be far less noticeable than in one so distinguished for a clear and solid mind, an equable temperament, considerateness, patience, and fortitude. In him, as a common man, it is foreign from all that we should have expected, from all that had been witnessed before: it is a mystery.

The frankness of the Evangelists in relating his sorrow

\* Several Greek and Latin manuscripts, of very early date, omitted these two verses according to Epiphanius, Hilary, and Jerome.

† See Kuinoel on the *Evang.* vol. 2. pp. 133, 9.

without the least attempt to apologize, shows that they regarded it as the price of our pardon ; that they saw the necessity of his being pained and afflicted. All the sins of all generations of men were heaped together upon his head : how could he then be cheerful ? His Father was expressing to him the unmingled displeasure of a God toward wrong : how could he then be glad ? He chose to be almost overwhelmed with anguish, or he would have failed to prove how much God hated sin. He chose to let men see, that his baptism was a baptism of blood. For the world he would not have it thought, that he was insensible to his pangs and woes. As much as he valued his Father's justice, he was intent on showing, that the "stripes with which we are healed" were heart-felt, and the price for our ransom was an immense agony in his own spirit. No other man ever endured so violent temptation as he, so strong trials of fortitude and fidelity. Who but he ever carried the sorrows of his ancestry and successors ? Who but he ever bore a world's salvation ? His fortitude amid all his wailings was unparalleled ; his love for enemies greater than all our love for friends. Here then is the reason, why the Apostles gloried in publishing his tremblings ; it was the only way to make known his magnanimity ; his matchless compassion ; his love, that would resist a world's hatred and the malignity of hell. Here is the reason why saints, instead of dying like their model, have died triumphing in his groans and tears ; it was that he groaned as the Redeemer, and wept to wash out the sins of all. Else is their "glorying void ;" nay it is cruel ; for why shall we clap our hands at sight of the cross ? Else is the boasting of the Apostles, else is the whole New Testament a riddle which man cannot expound ; for who ever heard of such zeal to paint the distresses of a champion ; such confidence in the overwhelming agonies of a king and a conqueror ?

But the question is yet to be answered, what was the cup, from which Christ begged to be released ? Can it be, that he shrank from making an atonement ? More than all things else, he desired to make it. His whole soul was bound up in the thought of dying. As he spake in the temple no longer ago than the preceding Monday, he exclaimed, "now is my soul troubled ; and shall I say, Father save me from this hour of suffering ? No, no. For this very hour came I into the world." I was born that I may suffer. I have set my heart upon saving the race. "Father glorify thy name." Besides, Christ knew his Father's will that he should be crucified, and for the world he would not pray against that will. Still more, his prayer was answered ; "he was heard in respect to that he

feared;" God commissioned an angel to relieve him, and so the cup passed away without his drinking it. But did he not die? Did he not atone for sin? Then atoning death was not the "cup."

It was deliverance from the cup of *frailty*, rather than of suffering that he begged; from being left, as in his human nature he might be left, to sink under the load of his troubles, and thus lose his ability to redeem. He had heretofore received peculiar aid from God, John 3: 34; but that aid, when most needed, was to be withdrawn. In his capacity as a man, he was inferior both to the good and evil angels; yet now in this simple capacity, he was to be exposed to the whole army of fallen spirits. As the time of his death was to be the most important time that the world ever saw, the fallen spirits would occupy this time with more artful stratagems and bolder attacks, than were ever attempted before. Luke says, (4: 13,) that after the struggle in the wilderness, Satan had departed from Christ for a season; John implies, (14: 30,) that the cunning deceiver having collected his strength, and finding the man again in a solitude, came back to him with fresh virulence. It was an alarming question to the victim of these attacks, can a man, deserted by his Father and encompassed with foes, who by nature are stronger than he, who are aware that now is their time, and who put forth unprecedented power because their time is short; can a man, all alone, sustain their incessant and violent assaults? No wonder that this danger almost overpowers him. Oh, should he sink under the withdrawal of God's face, should the temptations which had been resisted in the wilderness now prevail, the long wished atonement could not be made. If, in the extremity of all his sufferings bodily and mental, the great adversary should raise in him one thought of impatience, or entice him into a solitary wish that God would change his decree, then would the sacrifice be incomplete. The lamb must be without blemish, or its death without avail. Or if, remaining incorrupt, he should give way to sorrow, and die before he was delivered to the cross, then too the predicted scheme of salvation would fail. What a harrowing thought was this to the soul of Jesus! He recoiled from the thought of sinning. He could not bear to think of going to his father's house, until he could say, "the work which thou gavest me to do," "it is finished." He prayed, and prayed, and prayed, that he might not yield as a captive to his wonderful temptations, nor sink into premature death under his wonderful burdens. Instead then of praying, that he might not die as an atoning sacrifice, he prayed that he might die so; and the cup, from which he

would fain be delivered, was just the opposite of that which selfish men have imagined.\*

And now, as to the record of an angel's appearance to Jesus, did any one, unsophisticated, ever question its literal truth? Why should it be questioned? Does the reception of angelic aid derogate from the divine honor of Christ? Why need we forget, that Christ was a man, as really as we; that God answered his prayers as he answered ours, by employing the instrumentality of second causes; and that angels, being superior to Christ's human nature, might as well be employed to assist it when in need, as to assist Paul and Silas when in prison. He needed the consoling offices of a bright spirit from heaven, as much as he ever needed food or sleep, and it was no more derogatory to be cheered by an intelligence above him, than to be carried, as he was on the Monday previous, by an animal below him; see Matt. 21: 1—11.

It was during Christ's third prayer, that he became more fervent, more importunate than ever. His earnestness rose with his distress, and at the height of his distress the supplicated aid was given. A friend, hale and vigorous from God's circle, strengthened him to sustain the ponderous load without sinking. Never, therefore, can we find a better example of both the duty and the influence of prayer. Christ prayed perseveringly;—while the answer was long deferred. It is the characteristic of true perseverance, to importune through the longest delay in the darkest night, without a gleam of evidence that the answer is coming. He prayed submissively; while the answer was most intensely longed after. So strong was the Saviour's will, that once, twice, yea thrice he withdrew in solitude; for a whole hour lay on the cold earth in high excitement; praying perseveringly that he might not sink under his load; yet he was willing to give up this strong desire for the *mere pleasure* of his Sovereign. Sometimes we submit, because we say, "it is just, we deserve the evil we suffer;" Christ submitted not to evil which he had deserved, but to the simple will of another. It is the characteristic of submission to surrender our highest good to the will of him who "giveth no

\* It is unbecoming in us to pronounce *confidently*, on the causes of Christ's suffering in the garden, or the meaning of his prayer. The Scriptures being so silent on the subject, we must be content with probability, and may well suppose that the full cause of the agony cannot be ascertained on earth. Read on the subject, Doddridge's Family Expositor, page 317, Note h.; also Stuart's Com. on the Hebrews, Excursus 11; also Hess. Geschichte der drey letzten Lebens—jahre Jesu, B. 10. C. 1. For illustrations of the word "cup," as used in the prayer, see Ps. 11: 7; 75: 7, 8; Is. 51: 17; Jer. 25: 15; 49: 12; 51: 7; Rev. 14: 10. Christ had previously alluded to it; see Matt. 20: 22; Mark 10: 38; John 18: 11.

account to his servants." Christ prayed affectionately, while drinking the bitterness of his Father's chastisement. How difficult we find it to love God when we are in acute pain! How much more difficult would it be, if that pain were not deserved? But Christ, while "wounded and bruised" by Jehovah "for *our* transgressions," not his own, was so far from murmuring, that he looked up with a child's love, and could not leave off the endearing appellation, "Father," but must say "Abba," even when the Father's face was clouded with a frown. His prayer availed much at least; the fervent prayer of the righteous man always will avail much. At the very time when most needed did the answer come; the time of his greatest distress; in the very way which was most honorable to him, because a spiritual way; most interesting to us, because so instructive. It instructs us in the humanity of Jesus, he was strengthened by one stronger than he; in God's mode of instrumental government, "who maketh his angels spirits, his ministers a flame of fire." The curiosity of man would fain search out, what was the angel's name, to what order did he belong, did he ever appear on earth before or since? Was it Gabriel, or Michael, or he who came down to Christ in the wilderness, or he who brought "good tidings" to the shepherds of Bethlehem? But this curiosity must wait, to be satisfied when we arrive at the angel's home. Suffice it to say, this same angel is now worshipping the Being, whose human nature he once strengthened; see Rev 5: 8—14.

---

#### MINISTERIAL QUALIFICATIONS.

From want of education and experience in ministers, it results that the purity of revivals of religion, is often injured and their duration suspended, by a defective method of presenting the truth; by not understanding and enforcing it as a system; by not being able to see the consistency of its parts, as well as the grand and powerful influence of its entire revelation, when brought to bear on the minds and consciences of men. In no way is the symmetry of the Gospel so much endangered and the force of truth so much weakened, as by men, in revivals of religion, who are not able to see the consistency of its parts and to secure its influence as a perfect system.—And hence it is, we find the class of preachers alluded to, in danger of selecting a few truths of the Gospel, and such as are

best calculated to produce the most immediate and strong excitement, and urging them from day to day, with honest and most devoted vehemence : and they are still more in danger of mistaking the excitement thus produced, for the enkindlings of the Holy Spirit and the sure indications of deep and genuine conviction. And when this high state of feeling is not at once secured by the reiteration of some favorite and startling truths of revelation, there is often a hazardous resort to new and questionable expedients, to reach and fill the soul with those lively emotions, which shall resemble, at least, the strivings of the Holy Ghost ; and then there is the delusion to which such preachers are always exposed, which is, to presume the measures of their adoption to be sanctioned by the consequences which succeed, taken for granted as the genuine fruits of the truth and the Spirit of God. Just as though it was settled, that if there is excitement produced, it must be of course, genuine religious awakening. And if God sees fit to overrule these expedients for good, or in defiance of them, to save souls in immediate connexion with them, they are adopted as sanctioned by infinite wisdom and saving grace, and are at once enrolled among the discoveries of the age, to promote the cause of Jesus Christ ; than which, nothing can be more presumptuous and fatal.

We do not say, that in such cases there is no genuine religious excitement, but where there is, an intelligent apprehension of truth would render the conviction vastly more hopeful and safe, and the subject of it, if converted, far more stable and useful. Nothing is more common, than for the class of preachers in question, to declaim against severe study, and denounce labored sermons and doctrinal preaching during revivals of religion. Unable to frame the one, or to understand and properly arrange the other, they have little acquaintance with the efficacy of either, and hence, honestly, we doubt not, decry both. The result of the labors of these men may be, as is often seen, a powerful excitement, celebrated by the apparent feebleness of instrumentality, numerous reputed conversions, sudden suspension of feeling, speedy difficulties and dismissal of the stated minister ; and from want of being well grounded in the faith of the gospel, and thoroughly indoctrinated during the season of "religious experience," if not in many cases from actual and fatal deception, there is often a sickly and deformed growth of Christian character, great looseness in religious sentiment, alarming indifference as to religious practice, and generally a protracted reign of spiritual coldness and sterility succeeds.

Here we confidently believe is found one of the greatest evils of an uneducated ministry. And we appeal to the most natural and obvious tendency of such preaching, as that to which we have alluded, and we appeal to facts, abundant in the history of the church and of revivals of religion, to sustain the declaration, that the looseness of Arminian sentiments and the grossest Antinomian practices, have resulted and do continue to result from such defective administration of the truth, and especially from such defective administration of truth with the admixture of unauthorized human invention, during the season of religious revivals. It is now the time, when Satan seizes on the defects of preachers and sows his tares amidst the wheat, and loudly boasts of reaping richest harvests from the sunshine and showers of divine grace. Thus are many of our revivals of religion, scandalized before the enemies of righteousness, and regarded with distrust and caution by many of the sincere friends of God. Many souls are deceived as to the hopes on which they rest for eternity, and judicious measures are deferred or discontinued, from the abuse which they receive from the unskilful and inexperienced.

Lest our remarks should be associated with some whose labors have been signally blessed, we would add, that such have learned from experience, from intercourse with intelligent men and from books, to some extent at least, that knowledge which is essential to safe and successful ministrations. They may indeed surpass many men who are regularly educated, in plain, systematic, and argumentative sermons: we have known such, and have listened with respect and profit to the embodied resources of their powerful minds; and in this plain, systematic, argumentative preaching, is found the main source of their success. Their appeals to feeling are sustained by the enlightening influence of well arranged thought, forced as by demonstration on the mind; and hence, however highly raised, the danger of deception is avoided and a guard is placed to melancholy and ruinous reaction.

But the evil to be avoided remains yet to be considered. Others, without the intellect, without the experience and without the discretion if not the piety of such men, will vainly attempt to tread in their steps:—fixing their eye on the high feeling produced and the rapturous results that succeed, they first and vigorously aim to produce the same excitement, their hearts no doubt set upon securing the same happy results. We must fear, we must believe, that there is in most cases an entire failure, though we have often witnessed the most strong and elevated state of feeling. The salutary, gracious conse-

quences are not secured—or if hopefully and nominally secured, they are, after all, of a very doubtful character—and if not doubtful, as before stated, they are of a most defective character, and so defective that the question becomes serious whether the church can bear the expense at which all the good arising has been secured. The reason of this defect or deception is obvious. This state of feeling was not raised, as in the first case, by the plain and pungent preaching of the truth, logically arranged and forcibly illustrated. The mind, the understanding and the conscience were not secured. The way was not in this scriptural manner, prepared; but the first immediate and vigorous effort was to produce feeling.—Disregarding its character, all happy and saving results must be hazarded if not lost. If the same logical and scriptural process is attempted, the failure is still greater, for an unsuccessful attempt here, is certain death to that feeling, which might otherwise be produced, and every attempt will be unsuccessful, where a well furnished and disciplined mind is not found engaged in the effort.

Hence we find uneducated men, generally, foregoing, or failing in the attempt, to furnish the mind with instruction, preparatory to arousing the feelings of the heart, and generally directing their efforts to produce immediate excitement, which unguided and uncontrolled by intelligent apprehension of truth, becomes subject to all the danger to which we have alluded. How does this affect the character of revivals of religion and the prosperity of the church? It endangers the purity and continuance of the one and correct sentiment in the other. Revivals of religion will be pure and protracted in proportion as the doctrines and precepts of the gospel are better understood and more correctly preached. Our firmest hope, that these seasons will yet become pure as the Pentecost of the Apostles and protracted as the Millennium, rests on increased attention to education in the gospel ministry, attended with correct principles in developing the doctrines of inspired truth, and *deep piety of heart*.

As another argument in favor of an Educated Ministry, we would mention the importance of securing *continued and increasing interest, untiring activity and permanence of settlement* in the ministry.

That man, whose resources are limited, and whose attention is confined to a few of the more obvious, however important truths of the gospel, and who does not see their connexion with the remaining truths of the Bible and the practical bearing of all united, will always be in danger of losing his interest in the very truths on which he dwells; and they will soon become so

familiar, both to himself and to his hearers, that their value and influence will become entirely suspended; and the only resort of such a minister, to secure a return of interest to himself in the great subjects of his profession, will be, to change the people of his charge. But let him become well acquainted with doctrinal and practical theology; with that system of truth, every part of which is so important, and the whole, in its natural arrangement so beautiful, and in its legitimate influence so powerful; and the more he contemplates it, the more he studies it, the more he prays over it and preaches it, the more will he be astonished at its genuine philosophy, enraptured by its unparalleled sublimity and enchained by its power; and from its ever new discoveries, its endlessly diversified relations, he will appear before his people, from week to week, with the charms of novelty in his preaching, with ever growing ability to interest, to instruct and to impress. To such a man, a thousand lives would be inadequate to comprehend the wisdom, and to exhaust the power of the doctrines of the cross. Look at the ever increasing interest of Paul, of Luther, of Knox, of Edwards, in the gospel of Christ, as the divinely given system of sacred truth, and we are at no loss to understand the spring of their *untiring activity*. From these exhaustless stores of heavenly science, they imbibed and strengthened the principles of holy living: observing the necessary and immutable relation of doctrines with duties, the more they learned, the more they loved and labored; and from the broad range of their intelligence and influence here, we cannot but contemplate with astonishment, the stand their unfettered minds must have taken, when heaven broke upon their view. Interest in the truth and engagedness in its precepts, both here and hereafter, must depend in no small degree, on the extent of our acquaintance with the revealed doctrines of Jesus Christ. Hence we find from Paul to the present day, that educated ministers are most interested and active in defending and disseminating the truth; in starting and in carrying forward the great enterprises of Christian charity.

The *permanency* of the ministry equally demands education. We will not here discuss the question, whether the ministry should be permanent or itinerant. With those who advocate its itinerancy, any arguments on the main question would doubtless be lost. We take for granted that the question as to a permanent ministry is settled. How shall its permanence be most effectually secured? We reply, by thorough education. Let the minister be able to take the lead of intellect, hold influence over the mind, and with common prudence

and *piety*, he makes himself essential, not only to the spiritual good, but to the best worldly interest and reputation of his people. He gains their confidence and secures respect for his sentiments, and thus prepares the way to their hearts; and while they may repel the truth he presses on the soul, they are compelled to respect his intelligence and allow the consistency between his sentiments and his labors—and the most inveterate opposers will hear, from such a man, what they would not endure from one, whose education and resources were inferior to their own. But this is not the only cause of his permanence. An educated man is capable of continually instructing and of continually interesting his hearers: they feel that they are benefitted by an attendance on his ministry. They see in their growing intelligence a reflection of his wisdom and cannot but appreciate the value of such a man. But how is it, with those who are uneducated? They are generally far from securing permanence. To meet the inadequacy of their professional furniture, in many cases, the whole system of their ministry, is a system of itinerancy; and for the same reason, we find many who are uneducated, where this system is not generally introduced, pleading for its partial adoption at least. They no doubt feel its necessity and not capable of estimating the value of a permanent ministry, are honestly in favor of its being made itinerant. They would have it appear, that revivals of religion, would spread over the country, if the established clergy would break loose from their people, and, going from congregation to congregation, pour out their souls in plainness and fervor, preaching as though they were preaching for the first and last time to immortal souls, and exhausting all their power in the production of so great a good. In theory this may be imposing to a certain class of minds, but when reduced to practice, the purity, the stability and promptitude of action for which our church has long been distinguished, would be endangered, if not wholly destroyed.

The numerous subjects of our religious revivals should be trained in gospel sentiments, Christian enterprise and laborious action, and no other man can so successfully accomplish it, as he, under whose ministry they have been converted, and to whom their hearts are attached by that kind and prayerful interest which watched and guided their footsteps in the perilous moments of their deep and doubtful struggles. But education in a minister and permanency of location is essential to all this, and without it no man can train the youthful subjects of grace, to meet the demands of the present age.

It was a remark of Whitefield, that *he* could not sustain him-

self in any one congregation for the space of a single year. Whitefield had discernment to mark the extent of his resources.

Permanent settlement in the ministry is endangered, not only by a loss of interest which is thus experienced, and by loss of respect and confidence on the part of the people, where the ministrations of the uneducated are long continued; "but if such a minister attempts to continue and as is often the case, attempts to retrieve the past deficiencies of his education, by great and special effort in his preparations to preach, while at the same time he sustains the great, various and arduous duties of his office, *he is a dead man!* he will sink in hopeless infirmity or a premature grave." Or if, in the language of the experienced and intelligent writer first quoted, "he attempts to bring up all his arrears by incessant study, while he saves his life by neglect of pastoral duties, though he should become a tolerable preacher, he is a *dead man* in another respect, there will be a sad failure in the amount of his usefulness."

We have but one more general argument to advance at this time in favor of a thoroughly educated ministry, and to this we have before briefly alluded. *It is the great and growing demand for ministerial labor.* In the Congregational and Presbyterian churches alone, there are now more than fifteen hundred vacant congregations, and half as many more might be at once formed within our country, if ministers could be found to go forth and organize them. In proportion to the intelligence and pious efficiency of the ministry, will be the demand for its labors; that is, the ministry will be valued and sought for, in proportion to its intelligence and piety, and its number will increase as this demand becomes more and more pressing. Not only so, but the number of ministers will be greatly increased or diminished by the *spirit* of ministers. As they become active, prominent, influential men; men sought for and valued by the community (and we need not say that uneducated men, will not as a general thing find this the case in respect to them) young men will be easily induced to turn their attention to the ministry—they will regard the profession, not only as respectable but useful, securing a wide range of influence, which rightly directed is usefulness itself. Let the spirit of the ministry be what it ought to be, and that spirit will increase the number of ministers beyond any other human power whatever. Nor are unholy feelings appealed to, in this case. To illustrate, what is here intended: The men who have been sent abroad as missionaries to foreign lands, have been well educated men—men of enlarged and mature minds—and what

has been the result? They have carried influence with them. To the once despised cause of the missionary, they have given a dignity and a charm too: they have opened the way for more extended enterprize and exertion. Their success has rendered foreign and heathen lands, fields of promise as to influence and usefulness. Young men now feel, that they are not lost to the church and the world, by engaging in missionary labors; and multitudes stand ready to enter with all their hearts on this life of foreign exertion. What would have been the result, if these pioneers in the missionary cause, had been half educated and ordinary men? They had secured, comparatively a small amount of influence—the formidable difficulties of foreign languages, had not so easily yielded before them—they could not, so, like the apostles, have accommodated themselves to the manners and customs of Pagan nations:—the Bible had not so soon and so extensively been translated into new and different dialects; and of course the grand amount of usefulness had been vastly curtailed:—the churches at home had been discouraged and relaxed exertion:—the missionaries abroad had been disheartened and returned with reports like the men of Israel sent to spy out the land of promise;—Satan had triumphed over their defeat, and few, if any, had arisen to fill their places, vacated by death and desertion. But now, there is no want of men for missionaries: or, rather, though more are wanted, many are found ready to become such. No difficulties of distance, nor deadly climates can intimidate and keep back the sons of the church. Here is opened a field of glorious warfare,—consecrated by the piety, honored by the intelligence and enriched by the success of those endeared men, who first explored it. Young men stand ready, qualified, and anxious to go, waiting for the church to send them. So, let any department of ministerial labor be shown to be respectable, influential and *useful*, and as long as there is piety in the church, her sons will be pressing into it, in constantly increased numbers. But, let there be an inactive, uneducated, ordinary ministry, whom the people do not demand and will not employ, and the impression is at once given, that the profession is crowded and few will look forward with confidence of employment and success if they enter it. One unsuccessful minister will keep back ten who might have been burning and shining lights in the church; while *one*, elevated and successful champion of the cross will lead the way for a hundred more, anxious to secure his influence and to press upon his footsteps. Let us place the ministry, where God, both in his ancient and new economy hath placed it, preminent, in intel-

ligence, *influence*, dignity and *piety*, and a few years would consecrate a *tithe* of all our young men, if the world demanded it, to the service of Christ in the gospel ministry.

We have but one additional suggestion, which is the infinite importance of sustaining and elevating the CHARACTER of the ministry. As says a judicious writer—"it is not mere addition to our numbers, a large list of ministers of any sort, that we need, but more ministers of the *right stamp*; men fitted by the union of holy zeal, sound wisdom and solid knowledge, to enlighten, council, guide and bless the church; and if they be essentially wanting in the qualifications necessary for this purpose, they had better be in any other profession, than that of the ministry. The truth is, if we had but half our present number of ministers, yet if that half, were all men of primitive apostolic spirit, our beloved church and country, would be far more richly blessed than they are at this hour." He that gives *one* minister to the church, well qualified, will on the whole, give a greater amount of ministerial influence, than he who gives *ten* of an ordinary character, and to say nothing as to the positive injury such men may do to the cause they labor to advance, no doubt the amount of positive good of one well qualified man, will more than equal all that their combined agency will secure. Paul carried his influence as wide and reaped a measure of success, as great perhaps, as all the apostles beside; and who will say that his learning was not a powerful aid in his labors? It is ministerial influence that is wanted, and that influence is by no means increased necessarily, as the number of ministers is augmented—the very contrary may be the case, and will be the case, if the increase is not of the right character. Burden the church with a multitude of unqualified, inefficient, unsuccessful ministers, and the very incubus of death is on her bosom.

Let it be the prayer and effort of the church, that we may have men like Paul, Luther, Knox, Edwards, Martyn, and Gordon Hall; and the ranks of her ministry would soon be full. The sweet, clear sound of the gospel trumpet, would speedily be heard on all the hills and through all the valleys of our fallen world, and the jubilee of its emancipation would be sung in more than prophetic raptures.

E.

[The following note seems to imply the presumption of our probable unwillingness to do what it requests. It indicates, withal, a little disposition to carry things by the force of a name. With perfect respect, however, we can assure Mr. Tappan and the William Penn too who comes thus endorsed, that there is no occasion. We are not constrained, but cheerfully comply with the request of the note: nay, we are glad if the article we published in our July No. has had the effect to call forth so definite and distinct an expression of the views of Abolitionists, as is contained in the communication following. We are of no party, *as such*, and where there is any thing to discuss, we would by all means have it discussed. The truth is great and will prevail, sweep where it may. Only be candid, keep cool and preserve discretion, and there is no danger. The article will of course speak for itself.]

*To the Editor of the Spirit of the Pilgrims.*

The enclosed communication I trust will find an early place in your columns. Justice to those denominated Abolitionists entitles them to be heard, and that the reasons why they cannot unite with Colonizationists should be stated through the medium of your very respectable publication, as the inquiry has there been made.

Respectfully yours,

ARTHUR TAPPAN.

*N. York, Sept. 9, 1833.*

"UNION OF COLONIZATIONISTS AND ABOLITIONISTS."

Mr. Editor,—In the July number of your valuable periodical, I notice an article designed to show the utility, the practicability, and the duty of union between the Colonizationists and Abolitionists. I cordially approve and would heartily maintain a part of the sentiments contained in the article.—I believe that we should, at all times, "maintain the law of love in the heart and on the tongue;" and also that "the present crisis calls evidently for moderation, discretion, and kindness in every thing." It is likewise undeniable that there are wise and good men, in the ranks of both the parties; and equally so that their union "as coadjutors in a common cause"—the emancipation of the enslaved, and the elevation of the degraded, is an important and practicable duty.—It is also true, as the writer assumes, at the outset, that in order to effect so desirable a union, it is necessary to institute a critical inquiry into "the exact state of the case between colonization and abolition or anti-slavery," as they exist in the minds and operations of their adherents in this country; or as they may be conceived to exist.

With the hope of throwing some light on the object of this inquiry, the following remarks are submitted.—Being, myself, one of that class of your readers who are called Abolitionists and, believing that many of my brethren who hold the same views, agree with me and with you in desiring such an union, and in seeking the diffusion of light as the means of cementing it;

will, with your leave, proceed to specify some of the obstacles which I suppose Abolitionists find, or think they find, in the way of a co-operation between themselves and the Colonizationists. And I do it in the full assurance that if these obstacles can be removed, surmounted, or shown to exist only in imagination or misapprehension, there will be no reluctance on the part of Abolitionists in general to co-operate with Colonizationists; at least so far as to "press abolition, and not seek to destroy the Colonizationist," that is—on condition of a reciprocity of pacification, an item which it is to be presumed, the writer in your July number, did not intentionally omit to recommend.\*

1. In the first place, then, I suppose Abolitionists have found a difficulty in forming anti-slavery societies, and in "pressing abolition," from the fact that good men, almost every where have been led to suppose that the Colonization Society is sufficient, of itself, to effect emancipation as speedily as it is safe and practicable to do it. This has been abundantly taught by the agents and publications of the society. And just so far as it is believed, just so far that belief stands an insuperable barrier to the formation of an anti-slavery society. or any anti-slavery effort, distinct from colonization. Now *every* abolitionist (if the term is to be used *at all*, in distinction from colonizationist) believes, *of course*, that the Colonization Society is *not* sufficient for this end; otherwise he would be simply a Colonizationist, and not an Abolitionist, in any distinctive sense of that term.—Unless he relinquishes his belief that emancipation may be safely and speedily effected, without the slow process of Colonization, (which he believes to be far distant, not to say absolutely hopeless, in its efficacy,) he *must* give his reasons for this opinion, *before* he can possibly produce a single direct effort for *present* emancipation. From the very nature of the case, therefore, Abolitionists are obliged to teach and maintain that Colonization is not a sufficient remedy for slavery: just as the advocates of total abstinence are obliged to maintain and teach that all other remedies for intemperance are insufficient. But to maintain and teach this, is generally considered and treated as opposing the Colonization Society.—Perhaps it is so.—But the question now is, how can it be avoided by Abolitionists, without their ceasing to "press abolition?"

2. The advocates of a direct and present abolition are not only obliged to encounter the impression that Colonization is

\* "Let the Abolitionist press abolition, and not seek to destroy the Colonizationist; and the Colonizationist, let him press still harder, Colonization, since that is what he is engaged in." p. 400.

an adequate and sufficient remedy for slavery, but that it is the *only* safe and prudent remedy.—This sentiment has also been inculcated by the Society and its friends, from the beginning. Gen. Harper of Maryland, in his Letter published in the first annual report of the Society says: "This great end," [i. e. ultimate emancipation] "is to be attained *in no other way* than by a plan of universal colonization."—And within a few months past, this very sentence has been quoted by Mr. Gurley in his correspondence with sundry citizens of New York, as expressive of his own views and those of the "leading friends of the Society."—But in direct opposition to this sentiment, every Abolitionist holds that emancipation may be effected more safely and speedily, on the plan of immediate emancipation. In what manner, therefore, shall he "press abolition," in a community where this sentiment has taken deep root, without endeavoring to show its fallacy? But to do this, is to oppose the claim of the Colonization Society, which has been pressed for seventeen years.—The simple inquiry here is, how shall this collision be avoided? Must the Abolitionist give up his distinctive sentiments, and become a Colonizationist, in order to effect a union *between* Colonizationists and Abolitionists? If not, *how* is he to "press abolition?" What arguments may he use, and in what manner shall he proceed?

3. The great extent of this difficulty remains yet to be stated.—Not only is the Colonization Society claimed to be an adequate, and the *only* practicable remedy for slavery; but the advocates of direct and immediate abolition have thus far "pressed," its claims under the pressure of direct and explicit censure.—In his speech before the 11th Annual meeting of the American Colonization Society, Mr. Harrison of Virginia said that the Society "having declared that it is in no wise allied to any Abolition Society in America or elsewhere, is ready, whenever there is need, *to pass a censure on such societies in America.*"—This speech was officially published in the 11th Report of the Society, without the least disclaimer, and at a time when no opposition to the Colonization Society on the part of Abolition Societies, could have provoked the censure.—It is needless to add that similar censures have been frequently and strongly expressed in the resolutions of Auxiliary Societies, at various places and periods, up to the present time.

As a further illustration of the continued fulfilment, on the part of the friends of Colonization, of the promised censure, (when needed,) of Abolition Societies, I might notice the very singular, not to say unprecedented, frightful, and defamatory epithets so perseveringly bestowed on all, of every temperament

and character, who attempt to advocate a direct and present emancipation; a course of opposition, by means of which a panic, a contempt, and an abhorrence are engendered, which to a great extent, exclude them from the pulpit and the press, and which deny them a patient and candid hearing. I name not things like these for the sake of palliation or excuse, still less as a warrant for that propensity to render railing for railing, which may, at times, have been excited among us.—But still I find some difficulty in conceiving how Abolitionists can re-assert and vindicate their claims to sanity, patriotism, benevolence and common sense, without at all impeaching the justice, and wisdom of the award by which these qualities have been so constantly denied them. How shall we, or how can we hope to move against the *influence pledged to crush us with its censures*, without the least degree of resistance against that influence? Must we not breast the stream, unless we would be borne away by it?—Besides,

4. Every Abolitionist, to be consistent with his creed, must "press abolition" as a present and practicable duty. How can he do this, without pressing *against* the doctrine that would *defer* it, till a *future* period? How can he preach "Repent *to-day*," without saying defer it *not* until "a more convenient season?" It has been often stated by advocates of Colonization, that its operations could not touch the question of emancipation within a century to come. The Abolitionists "press abolition" on the *present* generation. Their time, is God's time, "*now*"—"to-day." They address the oppressors *now* on the earth—not their *posterity*. The oppressor, like every other sinner, pleads delay. The indulgence offered him by Colonizationists is all he asks. He says in his heart, let there be emancipation a century hence, if it needs must be so. But "let there be peace and quietness in my day." Let *me* not be disturbed, while *I* live. Shall the Abolitionist leave him in undisturbed possession of his plea, and of his sin? Or *must he strip him of his plea?* To do the latter is to strip the Colonizationist of all *his* pleas, and claims, and plans. Must the Abolitionist "spare direct attack" on the very obstacle that stands in his way, and thus *cease* to "press abolition" for the sake of an union with Colonizationists?

5. "What is the object of abolition? To do away slavery, and put the colored man in possession of the blessings and privileges of honorable citizenship and Christianity." So says the writer in the Spirit of the Pilgrims, and he says truly. *What* slavery, and *what* colored man does the writer speak of? *American* slavery, and the *American* colored man, assuredly.

None other do the Colonization or Anti-slavery societies of America intermeddle with, or mention. The object of the Abolitionist then is, to put the American slave and the American colored man in possession of the blessings and privileges of honorable *American* citizenship, and the blessings and privileges of Christianity enjoyed in *America*. It is to *this* citizenship, and to *these* blessings, *if to any*, that the slave, the colored man has just claims. To no citizenship or privileges in any *other* country than that of his birth, has he any rightful claims—to none *other* is his oppressor, or is any one, bound to restore him. To deny the obligation of restoring him *these*, is to deny the obligation of restoring him *any*. Of *none other* has he been *deprived*: none *other* would be to him an *equivalent*. On *this* point, the colored man has a right to speak for himself, and he has spoken, in terms not to be misunderstood.

Is it then, true that the Colonizationist and the Abolitionist, are "*both agreed as to the rights of man?*" What says the Colonization Society, and its leading friends, on this point? The sentence already quoted from Gen. Harper's letter, published by the Society at its first commencement, and recently approved by its present Secretary, is sufficiently explicit. "*In no other way,*" can emancipation be attained, "*than by a plan of universal Colonization.*" In other words "*the colored man*" must *either* be held "*a slave,*" or *banished from* the enjoyment of his unalienable birthright, "*the possession of the blessings and privileges of honorable*" American "*citizenship and Christianity*" in his native land. With Abolitionists it certainly is not "*affected,*" if it be a "*childish pity,*" that makes them feel such "*tender mercies*" to be "*cruelty.*" *They* have not thus learned "*the rights of man,*" nor can they comprehend why a banishment *from* the enjoyment of his rights of "*citizenship*" should be offered to the American "*colored man,*" under the imposing name of a *restoration* of them. They see no need either of their amalgamation with the whites, nor of the white man's emigration to give them room. The presence of the colored *slave* has never scared the white man from his home. Nor need we fear that the colored *free* man would be either more dangerous or more polluting. Such, at least, are the principles held by *Abolitionists*. If Colonizationists deem them "*wild chimeras, fit only for the brain of a zealot, or an enthusiast of the most visionary character,*" and turn with horror from the sober facts of history and geography, teaching that such things are, and have been; the fact but adds fresh emphasis to the enquiry—"How can Abolitionists

'press abolition,' according to *their* views of its essence and of "the rights of man," without "opposing the Colonizationist?"

6. How can the Abolitionist "press abolition" without opposing the absurd and unrighteous modern prejudice against color, known only in North America, which practically denies that God has made of one blood all the nations of the earth? On what but this sinful and infidel prejudice, is the whole system of American slavery founded? Nothing. Who believes that the slaves could be held in bondage a fortnight, should their features and complexions become the same as our own?—or should that prejudice become as unknown and inoperative here, as it is in Europe? No one. What else but the same prejudice, withholds from the colored man, for an hour, "the blessings and privileges of honorable" American "citizenship and Christianity?" Nothing. What but the *removal* of that prejudice can restore him to those blessings and privileges? Nothing. What can the Abolitionist effect, until he has removed that prejudice? Nothing. *What else, has he to effect?* NOTHING. How is he to remove that prejudice, but by opposing it! Will change of place—will "citizenship" in Liberia remove it? It will not. It *does* not. Liberian Sheriffs and Lieut. Governors, travelling among us, cannot ride in our northern mail stages, on account of this prejudice. *Is it then, invincible to the force of Christian truth?* No. Truth, and truth alone *can* triumph over error. Holy love can displace contempt, hatred and sin. Every Abolitionist *believes* this. And he "presses abolition" by teaching and proving it. He can "press abolition" in no other way. In no other way have they ever, either in England or America attempted it.

But what is the Abolitionist, *of necessity, doing*, when he opposes this unholy prejudice? Does he not, of necessity, oppose whatever *sustains* it? Do not his labors unavoidably tend to *undermine* whatever is *founded* upon it?

But what is the Colonization Society *doing*? and on what is it founded? Does it not say repeatedly and repeatedly—I need not quote its voluminous documents—does it not, and do not its friends, at every turn, and with every breath, assure us that this prejudice is insurmountable? Does not the writer in the Spirit of the Pilgrims assume this when he rejects, as "visionary" the idea of the whites remaining with the blacks at the South (i. e. after they shall become *free*—I know not whether he thinks freedom will increase the prejudice) and supposes that the whites must remove to the north? And what can *sustain* the prejudice in question, so effectually as such grave assurances of its invincibility?

Nay, more. On what is the American Colonization Society founded? On what can it rest, for a single hour, but on this same prejudice? What, but this prejudice induces the desire to send *the mass* of the colored people out of the country? It is useless to speak here, of the utility of a colony, and of the good of Africa. Neither the welfare of the colony nor of Africa can require, *or admit*, the removal of even the annual increase of our colored population. The Liberian officers have attested this, and we all know it to be true. The *only* solid ground for the removal of *the mass* of our colored population must be the existing prejudice against color. And this is the plea actually made, when we are told that they cannot rise, in this country. And if this prejudice should instantly disappear, or the whole colored population become white, who then would plead for "the plan of *universal* colonization?" No one.

The Abolitionist, therefore, whenever he "presses abolition"—in other words whenever he presses *against* this prejudice—the *sole* cause that upholds slavery, and the removal of which alone can remove it, *cannot avoid* "pressing," or seeming to press against the Society that sustains it, and is founded on it. If the Abolitionist succeeds in overcoming this prejudice, there remains no foundation for the Colonization Society, on its present plan. It ceases to exist, of course. On the other hand, if the plea of the Colonizationist respecting the invincibility of this prejudice, proves to be correct, then the Abolitionist fails, of course, in *his* efforts, and can never succeed in putting "the colored man in possession of the blessings and privileges of honorable" American "citizenship and Christianity;" this being the only country in which he is entitled to them, or, indeed, in which, it is expected by any one, that *the mass* of the race now in this country and their posterity, will ever exist. [I assume, in this last assertion, the very remarkable fact, that notwithstanding all that has been said of Colonization, as "the only hope" of the colored man, no individual has ever yet been found by the writer, who, after sitting down, for fifteen minutes, to an arithmetical computation, has not frankly owned the prospective removal of the entire mass to Africa, an incredible and improbable consummation.]

How then stands "the exact state of the case, between Colonization and Abolition, or Anti-slavery," under the item we are now considering. Why, in one word, simply thus. If the prejudice against color *be perpetuated*, the Colonization Society continues its operations, but not otherwise. If that prejudice *gives way*, the Abolitionist succeeds in his efforts, but not otherwise. At least, such is the apparent state of the case. Is

it not really so? If not, how can it be otherwise? *How* can the scheme of "universal Colonization" succeed *without* the continuance of that prejudice? *How* can Abolition succeed, *with* it? And *how* can the Abolitionist "press abolition" without pressing against the fundamental principle of Colonization?

7. I will mention but one more obstacle in the way of a co-operation between Abolitionists and Colonizationists. That obstacle is found in the position now assumed by the American Colonization Society and the free people of color. Until recently, it has been supposed that the Society and its friends would frown indignantly on any attempt to remove the free people of color, without their consent. Assurances understood to amount to this, have been repeatedly made, and are even still continued. But with what color of consistency, the following facts may show. The Legislature of Virginia has made an appropriation to the funds of the Society, for the purpose of assisting in the removal of the free people of color, in that State. It is carefully provided that these funds shall not be applied to the removal of slaves hereafter set free. It was admitted by the advocates of that law, that its object was the removal, *at all events*, of the free people of color. Some of them went so far as to propose a clause in the same act, providing for their forcible ejection: and the only reason why it did not pass was because it was suggested that the means *heretofore* used, that of whipping, mobbing, &c. could be made to answer all the purposes of a legal enactment, *for the present*: but if necessary, the legal provision, it was said, could be added afterwards. Such was the enactment appropriating funds for the American Colonization Society, and in direct allusions to its "liberal" provisions, the Secretary of the Society has lately published an advertisement, inviting emigrants from Virginia. This may be called "removing the free people of color with their own consent." But, with their *present* views of the "rights of man," Abolitionists cannot but consider it a high-handed and aggravated persecution, and they cannot conscientiously "co-operate" with a society that "co-operates with Virginia in an act so unjust and disgraceful.

Such, I conceive, are the principal obstacles existing in the minds of Abolitionists in general, which prevent a "co-operation between themselves and Colonizationists." If these obstacles can be removed, or shown to be ideal and imaginary, I have no doubt that a "co-operation" between them, will immediately take place.

And, not to be wanting, on our part, I will now specify, in a condensed form, the course I suppose to be necessary in order to produce the desired "co-operation."

Hitherto, I have spoken of Colonization, as I supposed it to exist in the views and plans of its leading friends, including the present Secretary of the Colonization Society. [I have made no mention of the views and plans of those members of the Society, whether a majority or otherwise, who are dissatisfied with the views I have described, and displeased with the members who advocate them; on the ground that they are too favorable to emancipation. That the Society *has such* members, who really seek to render it subservient to the continuance of slavery, is a fact which no intelligent man will deny; but I wished to put the most *favorable* construction on the Society, and have only exhibited what I understand to be the views of the *emancipation party*—so called—among the members of the American Colonization Society.]—But in distinction from all this, I will now speak of *Colonization*, as it *might* perhaps, be *conceived* to exist, and as it may *hereafter* exist; nor can I be certain that the picture I shall now exhibit, may not meet the views of very many who now support the *present* American Colonization Society.

Suppose a Colonization Society to exist, which is not proposed as a remedy, either wholly, or in part, for slavery; suppose it never to have passed or threatened any censures against Abolition Societies, or their supporters; suppose the influence of its leading friends and publications to be in no way hostile to the principles and plans of immediate emancipation; suppose the objects of the two societies in no degree to clash with each other, so that the success of the one to involve the defeat of the other; suppose the Colonization Society to make no appeals founded on the prejudice of color, or on the supposed impossibility of raising the colored people to the "possession of the blessings and privileges of honorable" American "citizenship and Christianity." Suppose it to hold no communion, and exert no "co-operation" with expatriating Legislatures and other persecutors of the free colored man;—suppose, in a word, that it assumed, toward the colored people, no bearing different from that which would characterize a benevolent association for assisting such white citizens as, without direct or indirect persecution, should desire to establish a colony at Oregon, or elsewhere;—suppose it to be a Society for planting a colony in Africa or elsewhere, on Christian principles, for the civilization of Africa, by appropriate moral influences without the aid of the sword, and unaccompanied with strong drink;—suppose *such* a Colonization Society, I say, and I have no doubt of an immediate and hearty "co-operation" between *such* Colonizationists and the friends of immediate emancipation.

And it gives me pleasure to add, that since I commenced writing this article, I have heard it rumored that a distinguished

gentleman of your "city of the pilgrims" heretofore a friend and patron of the *American Colonization Society* has conceived the plan of a *new colony*, on principles similar, if not identical with those I have just delineated. I hope he will soon publish the details of his plan, and that they may be such as Abolitionists and Colonizationists can unite in adopting.

WILLIAM PENN.

---

DUTIES OF PRIVATE CHRISTIANS.

THE Church of Christ may be likened to an army under the guidance of an invincible leader, pressing on to sure and universal conquest. The kingdoms of the world are to become the kingdom of the Lord. Idolatry and every heathen superstition are to be driven from the earth, and the empire of holiness is to be every where established. To such a glorious triumph of the Gospel every intelligent Christian looks forward with joyful hope and confident expectation. The eye of faith fastens on those bright millennial scenes which stand forth in bold delineation on the pages of inspired prophecy, and which animated Apostles and Martyrs amid the revilings of an ungodly world and the devouring flames of persecution.—Were not the promises of God explicit that his glory will one day fill the earth, the humble believer might despond and give over all exertion to extend the blessings of his religion beyond the present bounds of Christendom. From the slow and frequently interrupted progress of Christianity since the first announcement of its glad tidings to shepherds on the hills of Palestine, he might be led to conclude that it was a religion destined, not for the whole, but for a part only, of mankind, and that his efforts should be directed to the increase of piety in Christian communities, rather than to the propagation of Christianity among heathen and Mohanmedan nations. But as it is, there is no room for doubt or scepticism, as to the final prevalence and subduing power of the Gospel, to one who receives the Bible as the word of God. Nor can any thing but wilful blindness fail to perceive that within the last half century, the light of Divine truth has made great and prosperous advances. Amid some of the darkest portions of heathenism, there are radiant spots whose brightness is beginning to be diffused, and will soon spread itself over every adjacent region. Both in the providence of God and in the movements of the

Church, there are evident indications that the latter-day glory is drawing nigh.

It is right and reasonable that Christians should frequently contemplate the coming strength and glory of the church, and the actual fulfilment of all the divine promises respecting the final triumphs of pure and undefiled religion. For their encouragement, as well as for the exercise of faith, were these promises given. But it must not be lost sight of, that this sublime result is to be achieved through the instrumentality of God's people. The work of evangelizing the world, is the work of Christians—God has made it thus, and to them as dependent on him, he looks for its complete and speedy accomplishment.

In order to the increase and spread of religion, Christians must exemplify its excellence in a blameless life, and its power in their zeal and efforts for its progress. All who hope they have been the subjects of spiritual regeneration, should feel that they were separated from the world expressly for the honor and service of the Redeemer. It was not merely for their sake or that they might escape perdition; but also that Christ might be glorified, that they were called. At the moment they renounced their allegiance to Satan and chose Immanuel for their king, they were expected to gird on the panoply of the Gospel, and resolutely prepare themselves for action. They were supposed to have counted the cost, and to have entered upon the Christian warfare with a valiant and devoted spirit. The rewards they hope to obtain are promised only to the faithful and persevering. Desertion is certain death, and habitual indolence or fainting by the way, is little short of it. Every individual follower of Christ, whether young or old, rich or poor, weak or strong, is exhorted and commanded to exert all the powers of his being in the cause of his divine Master. None is allowed to bury a single talent in the earth, or neglect any practicable means of increasing his power of usefulness. It has been unalterably decreed, that none whose delight is ease and slothfulness, shall participate in the blessedness of heaven. The Lord Jesus has no mansions in his Father's house, no royal seats, no starry crowns of glory, for such as cannot endure his service on earth.

Hardly any remark is more common than that all classes of Christians may be expected, at the present day, to expend freely their *united* and *diversified* efforts in the cause of Christ; and surely no truth can be more undeniable. A professor of religion in any circumstances, unless actually incapacitated by Providence, who should openly plead exemption from the ac-

tive duties of Christianity, would be justly deemed the victim of self-delusion or a hypocrite. That charity must be blind, which does not see in the case of such a one, the most fearful indications of coming perdition. Tried by the infallible rule, "He that loveth me will keep my words," he is found a stranger to the love of Christ.

The simple admission in general terms, of the truth, that no Christian has any further evidence of his good estate than he finds in himself a willingness and desire to do his utmost for the promotion and diffusion of evangelical religion, is of little practical efficacy. Experience proves it to be so. It too seldom prompts to those specific acts and that specific course of conduct, which the acknowledged obligation requires. The great body of professing Christians accomplish but little, compared with what they might accomplish, in their appropriate spheres of influence and exertion. Much of their work is left undone, for the neglect of which they can offer no excuse. Opportunities for doing good pass away in rapid succession; but the report they bear to heaven is full of condemnation, and will stand recorded against them, till the day of the Lord Jesus.

Why is it, we would ask, that while Christians are thus professedly agreed, as to the extent and imperiousness of their duty to use all possible effort in carrying forward the cause of Christ, so little, so very little comparatively, is done? Is it because their inward convictions do not correspond with their professions? Have they one purpose in their hearts, and the profession of another on their tongues? We would not, we cannot believe it. We rather give them full credit for sincerity when they pray that they may be faithful *in all the work which God has given them to do*. We know that true and sincere Christians may be greatly deficient in duty. They may even mourn over their short-comings, and still do little by way of amendment. They may desire and design to accomplish many a good work, which, though practicable, they utterly fail of doing. Now why is it so? It is because they do not examine the subject of duty *in detail*. Their views of it are too general and vague. They fix upon no specific plan of religious effort. They study not *when, where and how* each particular duty should be performed. They make little direct preparation for usefulness. Feeling their insufficiency, they leave for others much of the work which Providence has most evidently allotted to them. Like the young man who sighs for riches, but neglects to prepare himself for business and actually to engage in it; the Christian who longs to be rich in good

works, but omits preparation and does not attend to the particular duties appropriate to present time and circumstances, will surely and utterly fail of his object. While he may think he is sincerely seeking the advancement of religion and thus securing the rewards of the faithful, he is wasting his energies and his probation in fruitless and deceptive resolutions. Every one who would answer the requisitions of the Gospel, must determine what is *present* duty; and this duty, be it what it may, he must immediately and resolutely perform. Not a day or an hour passes, without an appropriate opportunity for Christian exertion in one way or another. Time is precious and every moment should witness, on our part, some acceptable service to God.

We would now invite the attention of our readers to some of the duties of private Christians, such, we mean, as are more intimately connected with the further spread of religion and a more elevated standard of piety. We shall not attempt to prove that every Christian must be an *active* and *laborious servant* of the Lord Jesus. The example of the Master speaks more than language can express, in regard to the duties of the disciple, and he who can disregard what the Bible has said on this point, is, it would seem, at present beyond the reach of conviction. Our remarks are intended for those who acknowledge and in some measure, feel, that, as they are not their own, they are bound to exert all their powers for the glory of God in the salvation of men. The time has been when pious laymen appeared to think they had little to do for the souls of the impenitent around them. The whole business of instructing, exhorting, and warning sinners, was left to the regular ministers of the word. But in this respect, there has already been a great and happy change. Private Christians have begun to come up to the help of the Lord and of his ministers. The condition of society has also become so changed, that a variety and aggregate of religious effort, which fifty years ago, could hardly have found an outlet in appropriate and useful action, are now absolutely demanded, to meet the wants of the age. A thousand new channels of influence have been opened; and if they are not kept full of the healthful waters of religion, they will be filled and poisoned by the dark and deadly waters of infidelity. Ministers can do but little comparatively towards satisfying the wants of those who are perishing for Christian instruction and counsel. The church, the whole church, with all her diversity of talent and qualification, must engage directly in the work of saving men. Were private Christians faithfully to perform all the duties which the commands of

Christ, in connexion with the circumstances of the age, require of them, the moral power of the church might defy all the assaults, artifices and resistance of her enemies. The walls of Zion would be strong—the valor and skill of her defenders would put all the forces of Satan to flight. Heaven-born peace would again return to the earth, and the name and praise of God would everywhere be one. We shall now enumerate some of the duties of private Christians, which we deem peculiarly important at the present day.

1. The first duty of the private Christian, which we shall mention, is, *that he make himself well acquainted with all the important doctrines of the Gospel.* He should be thoroughly settled and grounded in his religious belief. The compendium of his religious views, or, if the term be not offensive, his creed, should be made up by an attentive study of the word of God. As a being responsible for the proper use of his understanding and judgment, he has no right to receive any system of faith from his fellow men, simply upon trust. He is bound to search the scriptures for himself. In this way only can be obtained clear and permanent convictions of religious truth. Doubts will always be intruding themselves into his mind, in regard to those parts of his system, which he has not derived from the infallible word of inspiration. Duty and usefulness require, not only that he be satisfied for himself as to the truths he professes to believe, but that he be able to give to others a reason for his profession. He should be able to meet the caviller with plain, scriptural argument, and to direct the anxious sinner in the way of salvation. We do not mean that every layman should be skilled in technical theology, or enter minutely into biblical criticism. Perhaps it is not even desirable that the great mass of professing Christians should be acquainted with the less important topics of religious controversy, which engross so much of the attention of ministers and teachers. Their zeal and energy should be directed to more practical purposes. But every professing Christian should have clear and well defined views of all those truths, upon a cordial reception of which, the eternal well-being of the soul depends. No one is at liberty to remain in doubt upon subjects so momentous. What can the Christian who is ignorant of the doctrines of the Bible, do for the advancement of religion? What can he say to vindicate, recommend, or enforce divine truth, if he has never settled in his own mind what is divine truth, and what is not. What would be said of the well-informed active Christian who should voluntarily neglect all the duties which his religious knowledge enables him to perform, or

which flow from his mental qualifications to promote the cause of truth? Would he not forfeit, in the eyes of all, his claims to Christian character? But is he less guilty, who voluntarily remains destitute of religious knowledge, and by consequence does little or nothing for the promotion of religion? His, will be the final condemnation of the slothful servant—his talent will be taken from him, and he will be doomed to have his part with hypocrites and unbelievers.

2. *Every pious layman should qualify himself to take a part in social religious meetings.* He should be willing and prepared to pray and exhort whenever and wherever circumstances may require it. Nor should he think a preparation for this work a hard, unwelcome task. It should be his delight to cultivate his talent for speaking, and to employ his tongue, "the glory of his frame," in showing forth the praises of God, and in persuading men to repent.—To those who know the condition of many of our churches, this suggestion cannot appear unimportant. There are many churches in our own favored New England,—and we believe they are vines divinely planted,—that have no pastors to preach to them the word of life, or lead in their public devotions. They seldom have the privilege of greeting a regular minister of Christ. Providence has left them to depend almost entirely on themselves, so far as human agency is concerned, for the nurturing and maturing of their own piety, and for the diffusion of religion among the impenitent around them. They frequently, and, we believe, generally, find it difficult to keep up the number of religious meetings requisite for their spiritual prosperity and improvement. Or, if they come together as often as is expedient, their meetings are wanting in interest. Frequently there is no one present who seems to have anything to say,—one waits for another,—the moments, not deigning to delay, run on—a prayer perhaps is offered, and all return home; many sorrowing that the time was so nearly lost, from the backwardness or silence of those who might have rendered it a precious and interesting season. Now what we say is, let every lay professor prepare himself for emergencies of this nature:—he may meet them when he little expects them. Thus he may do great good, when it otherwise would not be done. His efforts to benefit others will have a tendency to warm his own heart. He may be the means, not only of quickening his fellow Christians, but also of awakening and converting sinners. Every male member of every church in our country, should take this subject into serious consideration. It will be found to be much more intimately connected with the life

and prosperity of religion; than the majority of professors are aware.

3. *Professors of religion should be well acquainted with the benevolent operations of the day.* They should *discern the signs of the times.* If there is one thing calculated to arouse and interest the feelings of the Christian, it is the benevolent and religious efforts of the age. Every pious heart shares in the spirit of that love which, in a degree hitherto unknown, is now seeking the temporal and eternal good of all mankind. He, who remains ignorant of the cheering indications of Providence—of the rapid march of truth—and of the vast amount and harmonious operation of the moral machinery which the church is employing, and by which she confidently hopes to bring all nations under the sway of Immanuel, is blind to his own best interests and deaf to the call of an imperious duty. He lives in the midst of light, but sees none of the beauties of creation—the healthful and exciting breeze plays around him, but he feels it not. The stir of Christian enterprise encompasses him, but he catches none of its spirit. Unhappy, as well as useless, he may well be supposed to be.

4. *Professors of religion should understand the nature, form, and object of church-government, in the denomination of Christians to which they themselves belong.* This is a duty they owe to the church whose rules and discipline they have pledged themselves to observe and support, so far as is consistent with the spirit of the Gospel. They owe it also to the Great Head of the Church, who requires order, harmony, and efficiency in this sacred and responsible association of his followers. In churches based on Congregational principles, according to which the duty and power of discipline is left, not to a few, but to the whole body, it is especially important that every member should be well acquainted with this department of Christian duty. He shares in the responsibility of rightly administering the various functions of church-government. He may unexpectedly be called to act in a case of doubt and difficulty, in which an ignorance of the nature, mode, and end of discipline, may lead to a violation of covenant obligation, and do immense harm to the interests of religion.

We think there is a laxness at the present day, among many of our churches, in the enforcement of necessary and salutary discipline. They exercise too little of the vigilance and decision, which characterized the churches of primitive times. Many a professor whose conduct we believe the Apostles would have pronounced disorderly, is suffered to go on unadmonished, and in full fellowship with Christians, till he brings disgrace

upon religion and wounds the feelings of the Saviour. When such an individual has at length outraged all propriety, and something *must* be done, the majority of the church are often at a loss to know what they shall do. Having never attended to this part of their duty, they are entirely unprepared for action. Without any fixed principles or rules to guide them, they will be likely to be divided among themselves, as to the course they shall adopt. They will do nothing promptly and efficiently. For the sake of peace, they may be disposed after all, perhaps, to drop the matter without calling the offender to account. In such cases not a little trouble to themselves and no small detriment to religion might have been prevented, by a timely and proper attention to the duty here considered.

5. *Private Christians should qualify themselves to visit, FOR RELIGIOUS PURPOSES, the sick and the dying.* The chamber of disease is oftentimes a place peculiarly favorable for the exertion of religious influence. When the strength of the strong is taken away, and the tide of worldliness checked by a sense of human frailty, or by the fear of death, a word of warning or exhortation may reach a heart that has long been proof against conviction. The solemnity of the place, the object of the visitor, and the fearful uncertainty of life, combine to arrest the attention of the thoughtless sinner, and thus to render efficacious the power of divine truth. The agitated soul that has never before trembled in view of coming wrath, may now desire to hear the prayers of the Christian, and to learn the way of life. The denunciations and invitations of the Gospel, which he has long disregarded and treated as mere fictions, may now appear to him in their true light, as momentous, soul-stirring realities. The disciple of Christ also, on whom disease has laid its hand, desires frequent interviews with his fellow Christians. He loves to speak and to hear concerning the realities of the heavenly world. While his earthly tabernacle lies prostrate in weakness, his spirit mounts the upper skies, and holds communion with spirits of the just made perfect. The conversation of God's people not only sustains him, but gives intensity to his aspirations after holiness and a perfect conformity to his Saviour. It adds wings to his faith, which at happy intervals bear him away to regions of bliss where he tastes of the fulness of immortal joy. The Christian, who, when brought down to a bed of sickness, finds his mind full of darkness, and doubts, needs sympathy and encouragement from his brethren. United to him in a most solemn and responsible connexion, they should kindly and readily minister to his spiritual wants. They should faithfully examine his case, and if warranted,

pour into his perturbed spirit the full consolations of that hope which the word of God authorizes him to cherish. It is impossible that a minister should pay all that attention to the sick, which they expect, and have a right to expect, from Christians. He is often sent for to pray and converse with an impenitent sinner who appears to be dropping into the grave, when a previous engagement of some indispensable duty may prevent him. He longs to make an effort to save the soul of a dying fellow being by administering to him the truths of the Gospel, but his most ardent and benevolent wishes are in vain. He cannot go. If, in such a case, he can direct the messenger to some member of his church, who is both qualified and willing to undertake so trying but interesting a duty, how is his swelling, anxious heart relieved. A soul too might be saved by the timely instrumentality of a faithful child of God. Were private Christians to qualify themselves, and faithfully engage in this important duty, how many stars might they add to the crown of their Redeemer. Though the hope which rests upon death-bed repentance wants the brightness and assurance of one whose genuineness has been tested by a pious life, we yet believe that many a sinner, like the thief on the cross, has found mercy and acceptance in the last hour.

6. *It is an important and unquestionable duty of laymen to establish themselves in business in places where they may do most for the cause of religion.* They should ascertain where their religious efforts are most needed and would most be felt. Every follower of Christ must enter his vineyard with a disposition and zeal to labor for him. No calling or profession in life can exempt a Christian from the obligation to live for Christ. The merchant, the mechanic, and the husbandman, are as much bound to consecrate their talents and influence to the cause of truth and holiness; as the regular minister of the Gospel. They will as assuredly be called to give an account of their stewardship. If, through inattention to the extent of their religious obligations, when selecting a place of residence and business, they seek their own and not the things that are Christ's; if, when forming their plans of life, they have no special regard to the claims which God and their fellow men have on them, they incur the guilt of wilful, actual transgression. They violate the whole of that law which requires them to love God with all their heart, and their neighbor as themselves. They appropriate to their own selfish purposes the talents that were given them for the service of their Redeemer.

It is too generally taken for granted that ministers alone are to have respect to their *usefulness*, in *choosing a place of*

labor. Christians in the other walks of life acknowledge their obligation to be actively devoted to the cause of religion; but *where*, in what part of the country or the world, they can do most good, they seldom inquire. They do not even cast their eyes over the broad extent of the field before them. They are satisfied with performing the duties appertaining to the place and occupation, which worldly interest may have led them to fix upon; and do not regard the high and imperious duty of choosing a vantage ground of religious effort, from which they might exert a more commanding influence. But what would these same Christians say of a band of soldiers, that, when the enemy was thick around them, and their country needed all their strength and valor, should deem it enough merely to fight bravely, without any regard to their position. The skill and patriotism of a general may be as correctly inferred, from the point he selects for action, as from his adroitness and intrepidity in the heat of the conflict.

In whatever point of view we contemplate the character of our Pilgrim fathers, we behold in it much to respect and admire. Their native energy, their fortitude, their contempt of the world, and their confidence in God, fill us with wonder and veneration. But nothing gives to their name so great a sanctity, in the estimation of the devoted Christian, as the fact, that they were actuated in no small degree, by religious motives and a missionary spirit in coming to this country. They came, not as exiles only from Europe, but as heralds of salvation to America. The ignorance and savage condition of the multitudes that were then spread over this wide and wilderness continent, touched their religious sensibilities and moved them to cross the Atlantic, *for the sake of doing good*. In their own language, they had "an inward zeal and great hope of propagating the religion of Jesus to the remote ends of the world." They considered themselves as ambassadors of Christ to the poor Indians. They come in obedience to the divine command, "go teach all nations."

While multitudes of benevolent and devoted laymen have contributed freely of their worldly substance to foreign and domestic missionary societies, and have long and fervently prayed, that the Lord would send forth more laborers into his harvest, there have been comparatively few among them, who have felt it to be a personal duty to become missionaries themselves. The *work* of evangelizing the heathen, has been regarded as belonging exclusively to ministers of the Gospel. They have been considered, not only as the principal, but almost the only persons, whom duty calls to leave home for the service of Christ.

But it is evident from the nature of the case, and experience has demonstrated it, that the influence and labors of pious laymen cannot be dispensed with. The missionary needs their presence and co-operation on the spot. There is a part of the work, which they alone can perform. The preacher may teach the principles of religion and enforce its duties, both in public and in private; he may lay down rules by which all men should be governed in their dealings and intercourse with each other; he may explain the principles upon which trade should be conducted, and inculcate the duty of ever doing to others as we would have others, in like circumstances, do to us; but he cannot exemplify, in his own conduct, the practical influence of Christianity upon the social condition and business transactions of life;—at least, not to any considerable extent. The nature of his profession prevents it. He must give himself to his ministry. He has little opportunity of carrying out his religion, in all the complicated concerns of life, because his duties confine him, for the most part, to one particular mode of action. In this respect therefore, the layman has an advantage which he ought to improve.

The power of example is great every where; but nowhere greater than among an unlettered heathen people. In proportion as they are destitute of fixed principles of action, and uninstructed in the science of morals, their feelings and conduct will be controlled by the conduct of others. They cannot be made to understand the nature and importance of true religion, any farther than they witness its power over the actions and outward conduct of men. It is from the *effect*, that they must be taught the existence and nature of the cause.

From what has been said, we may see the importance of lay influence at and around missionary stations in foreign lands. It is absolutely essential to the practical exhibition of the power of religion. It is this alone, that can fully show to the heathen the excellence of Christianity above Paganism. This will throw the strong light of the Gospel upon the ghastly features of Idolatry, and exhibit in startling contrast the lovely fruits of true religion on the one hand, and the revolting abominations of heathenism on the other. CHRISTIAN EXAMPLE is an instrument by which nations the most fierce and intractable, may be moulded into the image of gentleness and docility. It is the lever by which mountains of prejudice may be removed, that now so greatly impede the progress of divine truth among the nations to which missionaries have been sent.

Now is it not plainly the duty of pious laymen to have a strict reference to their *usefulness as Christians*, in all their

plans and purposes for settlement and business in life? Ought they not to be willing to go to whatever part of their country or the world may open to them in their appropriate department of religious action, the widest and most promising field of Christian exertion? Ought they to shrink from the hardships and self-denials incident to a residence in heathen lands, when they may there become co-workers with the regular missionaries of Christ, in supplanting the standard of Idolatry, and erecting the standard of the cross? We hope the time will soon come, when every pious, enterprizing young man, who shall be seeking a place in which to commence business for himself, will make it a question of conscience and of duty, *whither he shall go*. It is not right, it is not Christian, to regard it merely as a question of self-interest.

We cannot doubt that there are hundreds of places in the vicinity of missionary stations, which would afford great facilities for lucrative business, as well as for the exertion of religious influence. Men of the world, who hate religion, tear themselves away from friends and country, and take up their abode among savages. For filthy lucre's sake, they subject themselves to toils, perils, privations, and sufferings, and not unfrequently, by diligence and perseverance, acquire a fortune, with which they return in joy to their native land. Why should the Christian be less resolute and enterprizing in business, than the man of the world? He need not expect greater hardships, or be less confident of success. The one is impelled by narrow and selfish motives—the other should go forth for benevolent and pious ends. The one has no assurance that God will bless him—the other knows that his heavenly Father will watch over all his interests. The one leaves all his friends behind—the other will be constantly attended and supported by a friend that sticketh closer than a brother.

We cannot contemplate the subject of Christian missions, either as it regards foreign lands, or the newly settled portions of the United States, without a firm conviction that a greater number of private Christians, and particularly of business men, ought to give themselves personally and directly to the missionary service. Their example in the multifarious concerns of active life, is the most perfect medium through which the excellence of religion may be seen, and its power felt. Their influence, like the air we breathe, readily diffuses itself through the corruptest masses of savage society, and thus prepares the way for the direct and effectual application of Gospel truth to the hearts and consciences of the vilest idolaters.

Besides, one great obstacle to the progress of the Gospel in

the islands of the Pacific and other heathen lands, has been the dishonesty and vicious character of *fortune-seekers*, who have hitherto monopolized the trade of many tribes to which missionaries have been sent. These agents have always been found hot and fierce enemies to the Gospel. They dread its light. They know that the diffusion of its holy principles, will bring their craft to nought. They therefore oppose every effort of the missionary. They calumniate his character, misrepresent his motives, fill the minds of the natives with the bitterest prejudices, excite their fears and suspicions, and rally all the superstition and hellish malignity, with which the Prince of darkness can inspire an idolatrous people, in order to prevent the ignorant from being enlightened, and the wicked from being reclaimed. In many cases, they have had the fiend-like satisfaction of seeing the chariot of the Lord delayed by their exertions. They have gloried in their own strength, and exulted at the tears and heart-achings of the faithful servant of Christ, until God has either put them out of the way, or rendered their efforts powerless.

If these enemies of all good could be forestalled or supplanted by devoted Christians of business talents and habits, a powerful hindrance to the spread of the Gospel would be removed, and a great advantage gained to the cause of Christ. The way of truth would be cleared of one important obstacle. Missionaries, on their arrival at their fields of labor, would then find Christian love and kindness, where they now meet nothing but hatred and ferocity. They might obtain friendly counsel and assistance, where now they must guard against malignant device and open opposition.

Among the Indian tribes of our own country, the progress of Christianity has been greatly impeded by the efforts of ungodly white men. Many who have styled themselves "traders," have lived by defrauding and plundering the ignorant and unsuspecting red-man. They have uniformly opposed every benevolent exertion which the Christian or philanthropist has made in his behalf. They have occupied posts which honest and religious men ought to have possessed, and enjoyed facilities for business, from which an enterprising and pious layman might have acquired a large estate.

In conclusion, we would suggest for the consideration of our readers, whether the times and present condition of the world do not demand, that pious laymen should survey the world, with a view to ascertaining *where* they can do most for Christ. Their talents, habits, and circumstances should be taken into account; but with a due regard to these, ought they

not to seek the *widest, most effectual, and most appropriate* field of usefulness, whether it lie near home and friends, or in the uttermost parts of the earth? Might not little colonies of Christians, taking each a minister with them, go forth and found religious communities in places from which their influence, like circling waves from an agitated centre in a peaceful lake, would spread on every side, until it should be felt by thousands and perhaps millions of their generation? The plan is feasible—it has been tried and found a successful means of enlarging the borders of Zion. If we mistake not, it will in time, be carried into extensive operation, and be regarded as an indispensable and most important expedient in subduing the powers of darkness, and establishing the empire of holiness throughout the wide domains of heathenism and irreligion.

M.

---

## REVIEWS.

THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF MISS SUSANNA ANTHONY, *consisting chiefly in Extracts from her writings, with some brief Observations on them.* By SAMUEL HOPKINS, D. D. Second Edition. Portland. 1810.

More than twenty years ago, "the Life and Character of Miss Susanna Anthony," compiled by the late Dr. Hopkins of Newport, was put into our hands, and perused with much satisfaction. Within the last few months, we have taken up the book again, and the reading of it has so revived all our former feelings of interest, that we have resolved to give some account of it to our readers.

Perhaps no private devotional writings have been more highly esteemed by American Christians, than those of President Edwards and David Brainerd. Those in the work before us are of the same general character—based on the same great principles, and expressing the same feelings and views; and we hazard the assertion, though we know it is saying a great deal, that in many parts they are not at all inferior. Indeed, for richness and propriety of thought; for loftiness of conception; for depth and tenderness of feeling; for earnestness of aspiration; and for simplicity and manifest sincerity of lan-

guage, we know of nothing which surpasses some passages in the writings of Susanna Anthony. And yet it ought to be remembered that these are the writings of an uneducated female, penned in seasons of deep retirement, and laid up for her own perusal and benefit, without the thought or intention that they should ever meet the eye of any other human being.

Miss Anthony wrote her own spiritual history during the first seventeen years of her life. Her motive in this was to promote her own good ;—to excite, as she expresses it, “the warmest sentiments of gratitude, love, and wonder, whenever I review these records of the unmerited displays of Divine grace to my soul.”—She was born at Newport, R. I., Oct. 25, 1726. Her parents were connected with the Society of Friends, in which she received her early education. She was the subject of religious impressions from her childhood, and was hopefully converted when about eight years of age. She joined the first Congregational church in Newport, the day before she was sixteen years old, of which church she continued a member till her death.

Miss Anthony was of a delicate and sickly constitution, and was brought, in repeated instances, apparently near to the grave. She was never married, but resided with her parents as long as they lived. They seem to have been in easy circumstances during her childhood and youth, but were afterwards reduced to comparative indigence. She was able, however, to support herself by her needle, and by occasionally teaching a small school. Her health in the latter part of her life, perhaps owing to the necessity of more vigorous exercise, was much better than when in youth.

Not long after Miss Anthony became a member of the church of Christ, her feelings prompted her to make the inquiry, so natural to every devoted Christian, ‘Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?’ She felt deeply concerned for the advancement of Christ’s kingdom, and the salvation of souls, and wished to know what an obscure young female in her situation *could do*, to promote objects which lay so near her heart. There were no Sabbath Schools, in which she could enlist as a teacher. There were no Missions from this country in which she could engage ; and no Missionary Societies, of which she had any knowledge, to which she could attach herself. After much deliberation, she concluded that she could do more for the cause of God and truth by continued and earnest *prayer*, than in any other way. Accordingly, she often set apart whole days, when circumstances would permit, and spent them in secret fasting and prayer. She endeavored to spend the last

afternoon and evening of every week, and the morning of every Sabbath, in the same way. Of a female praying circle, which was formed in Newport, she was a member and an ornament for about fifty years. When it devolved on her to lead in the exercises of this most interesting association, she expressed herself with a holy freedom and familiarity, as one who knew the way to a throne of grace, and had been often there.

“At particular times, says Dr. Hopkins, “she had such enlargement and access to the throne of grace, that she would pray an hour and a half, or more, with such engagedness and fervency, without any repetition, with a flow of words expressing the most pertinent and affecting ideas, and with such a natural connexion and progression from one thing to another, that none who joined with her would appear tired, but all were pleased, affected, and edified; and they felt a consciousness that none could have an adequate idea what passed at such times who were not present, as a full description of the holy fervor, the clear view of invisible things, and that nearness to God which she discovered, while she poured out her heart before him, cannot be made by any narration of them.”

Speaking of Miss Anthony, on another occasion, Dr. Hopkins says,

“She was, in my judgment, one of the most eminent female Christians with whom I have had any acquaintance. The public, and even Christians who never were acquainted with her, will not, by reading what is published, have a full and adequate idea of her excellent character. I think it a great happiness to have been intimately acquainted with her for near thirty years, and to have enjoyed her friendship and her prayers.”

Miss Anthony was seized with a violent inflammation of the lungs, in the summer of the year 1791, and after a week's sickness died in the 65th year of her age. During the progress of her disease, she had none of those conflicts which she had sometimes feared, but with a sweet and calm confidence rested her soul on Christ, and died without a doubt as to her union with him, and her happiness in his kingdom forever. She cheerfully laid down what she used to call her clog of flesh, and soared to meet that Saviour for whose presence she had so long and so fervently aspired—to “sing among the birds of paradise, the heirs of glory.”

We shall not detain our readers with long extracts from the volume before us,—hoping that some of our enterprising booksellers may be induced to republish it;—or (what we should prefer) that some one would prepare a new arrangement and abridgement of the writings of Miss Anthony, and give them to the public in a form to be more generally useful.—We shall conclude our remarks on these Memoirs with a few reflections;—such as have occurred to us, and we think would occur to any evangelical Christian, in perusing them. And,

1. We learn the *value and excellency* of the religion of the Gospel. In the pages before us, we see how much this religion *can do* for the temporal, spiritual, and eternal good of those who embrace it and live under its influence;—how much it can contribute to the excellence of their characters, and open for them new sources of consolation;—how much it can promote their glory and joy, in this world and forever. It is interesting to trace the progress of Miss Anthony's mind, under the influence of religion, from small beginnings—from the darkness and feebleness of spiritual infancy, till she came to glow almost with the ardor of a seraph.—After she became interested in religion, and indulged a hope in Christ, still we find her, in knowledge and grace, a child. Her mind is enveloped in much darkness and ignorance, and she is subject to numerous temptations and distresses, which more enlarged views of things would have enabled her better to understand, and more effectually to overcome. We next see her struggling with prejudices of education, and emerging into light and freedom in regard to the ordinances and institutions of the Gospel. Still, she is relying evidently too much upon her feelings, and is subject, in consequence, to sudden and painful fluctuations and depressions. But her spiritual course is steadily onward, and she soon attains to a settled hope in Christ,—so much so, that for years, she seems scarcely to have entertained a doubt as to her acceptance with God. Meanwhile, this hope was producing its legitimate effect upon her heart, redeeming it from the power of sin, and purifying it even as Christ is pure. Her soul was transforming into the image of her Saviour, and becoming adorned with all the graces and virtues of the Gospel. Such love of God, and longing after his spiritual presence; such an affectionate reliance upon Christ, as the only resting place for her feet and refuge for her soul; such delight in duty, especially in the secret duties of religion; such childlike submission under trials and injuries; such concern for the salvation of others; such carefulness; such fear; such vehement desire; such assurance of God's love, and peace of conscience, and joy in the Holy Ghost; such frequent longing for death, and panting after immortality;—we scarcely know what to add to such a character, to make it more thoroughly and desirably Christian. And yet Miss Anthony was not more remarkable for any thing, than for a deep sense of personal deficiencies, unworthiness, and sinfulness. She had set her standard of Christian attainment high, and felt that she was far—very far from reaching it. She forgot the things which were behind, and to which she had already attained, and press-

ed onward to "the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

But as much as the religion of the Gospel did for Miss Anthony, so much will it do for any one, who embraces and adorns it in the manner she did. What it made her, it is capable of making every person, who takes it to his bosom, and suffers it to rule in his heart. And could this religion pervade the globe, and reign in the heart of every individual, what more would be necessary to convert earth into a paradise, and fill it with the peace of heaven.—How excellent then, is the religion of the Gospel! How poor, and powerless, and worthless are all human theories and speculations, when compared with this!

2. We see the benefit of deep and thorough *convictions of sin*, in their influence upon religious character. Miss Anthony was distinguished, both before her conversion and afterwards, for such convictions. Indeed, her language on this subject may be thought by some to be extravagant; importing, perhaps, even more than she felt,—more, certainly, than could be true. But those who have looked deepest into their own hearts, and have compared themselves most faithfully with the character and law of God, will not think her language extravagant. They will know how to sympathize with her in her sense of unworthiness, and in her deep and painful convictions of sin; for they have felt the same.—It is obvious that these convictions, in the case of Miss Anthony, had a powerful and salutary influence on the character; and so they have in every other case. They teach and impress the great evil of sin, and excite to persevering struggles against it. They break down and subdue pride, and induce that godly sorrow which worketh repentance unto life. They show persons their perishing need of Christ, and lead them to cling to him, as all their salvation, and all their desire. And when they indulge a hope in Christ, their love, their gratitude, their zeal in duty, and engagedness for the salvation of others, will be in proportion, ordinarily, to their sense of the guilt and condemnation from which, by divine grace, they have been delivered.

From the days of David and of Paul to the present time, distinguished piety, in this world, has always been associated with deep convictions of sin; and obviously it always must be. The two things are naturally and necessarily connected.

3. From the example before us, we learn the importance of *early piety*. Miss Anthony considered it her honor and privilege that she was early converted;—that she was led, in the morning of life, to submit to Christ, and devote herself to his service and kingdom.

“I count it an honor,” says she, “to be a disciple; but peculiarly so, to be a young disciple. I think myself happy that I am a member of the church; but peculiarly so, that I was admitted the youngest member belonging to the communion, the youngest member of our female society; as likewise the youngest of all my Christian friends. And though some may despise my youth, yet, since I know the grace of God has appeared more glorious by it, I will rejoice in it, if thereby the power of God may be the more manifested, and he ordain praise out of the mouth of a babe and suckling.”

Miss Anthony was not more than eight years old, when she entered the school of Christ, and began to sit, as a learner, at his feet. And to this circumstance is to be attributed, undoubtedly, much of her future eminence in knowledge and grace. Her heart was now susceptible, and her mind docile. She had no strong prejudices to obstruct the truth, nor confirmed habits of sin to be resisted and overcome. Like every young Christian, she had special promises for her encouragement;—and besides, she had almost her whole life before her, in which to advance in holiness, and be useful to others. And all these advantages are equally within the reach of every other young person, who is willing to commit his soul to Christ, and become a disciple of the Saviour. How important that such persons be sensible of their advantages, and be persuaded diligently to improve them! Every day they neglect religion is so much loss to them—a loss which they can never repair. Every day spent in sin is making the work of repentance more difficult, and increasing the fearful hazard that all their days may be spent in the same miserable manner.—Do any of our young readers revere the exalted character of Miss Anthony? Do they desire to be what she was on earth, and to dwell forever with her in heaven? Then let them, like her, in early life, renounce the deceitful pleasures of sin, and become the disciples of the Saviour.

4. The spirit of Christianity is a *Missionary* spirit. No sooner had Miss Anthony been delivered from her besetting temptations, and been brought into the clear light of the Gospel, than she began to be concerned for Jews and heathens; and because she knew no other way in which to benefit them, she spent no small part of her life in prayer for their conversion and salvation. Could she have lived in our times, she would have been foremost among her benevolent sisters in efforts to send the Gospel to the destitute; and would not have hesitated to devote her life, and to wear it out, in so good a cause.

The spirit of the Gospel, wherever it has existed in high degrees, has always proved itself a missionary spirit. So it was pre-eminently among the primitive Christians. So it was through all that gloomy period which has been appropriately

called the dark ages. In order to discover any traces of piety during this period, Mr. Milner found himself obliged, as he tells us, "to travel with faithful Missionaries in regions of heathenism, and describe the propagation of the Gospel in scenes altogether new."\* And we know how the Christian spirit has developed itself in modern times. Look at the Reformers. Look at the early settlers of New England. Look at Whitefield, and Edwards, and Brainerd, and at a great multitude of the most devoted Christians, who have lived since their days, and are living now. It is just as natural for the engaged Christian to be a Missionary, at least in spirit, as it is for him to breathe. When Andrew had found Christ, he went and told his brother Simon. When Philip was called into the service of his Lord, he persuaded Nathanael to engage in the same service. John i. 40—50. The spirit of the Gospel is everywhere a spirit of benevolence. It prompts those who possess it to feel for others; and earnestly desire their conversion and salvation. And such desires are not circumscribed by the limits of kindred or country, but spread themselves abroad through the earth. They aim to bring all men to the knowledge of the truth, and to fill the world with the glory of the Saviour.

5. It has often occurred to us, in reading the writings of Miss Anthony, that though the spirit of religion is always the same, the ways in which this spirit manifests itself at different periods, is somewhat different.—That the spirit of true religion is at all periods the same, is witnessed in the experience of the people of God from the beginning of the world to the present time. Those who, in reading the Psalms of David, or the Epistles of Paul, or the devotional writings of Edwards, Brainerd, Mrs. Graham, or Miss Anthony, do not find a chord of sympathy—a unity and correspondence of feeling, in their own breasts, may be sure that they do not possess the spirit of religion.—Still, this spirit manifested itself in a very different manner in the days of David, from what it did in the days of Paul; and in a somewhat different manner in the days of Miss Anthony, from what it does now. Fifty years ago, the piety of the age was rather contemplative, than active. It prompted its possessor to seek retirement, and to commune much with his own heart, or with a select number of Christian friends. Religious books were then comparatively few, and these few were thoroughly read. Christians pondered much upon the doctrines of religion, and aimed at precision and correctness in

their doctrinal views. They kept days of secret fasting and prayer; searched deeply and accurately into their own hearts; and kept regular and continuous journals of their exercises and feelings.—I hardly need say, that what may be called the fashion of the religious world, or the manner in which the spirit of religion now commonly shows itself, is different. Every thing now is in rapid motion; many are running to and fro; Christians are active, rather than studious and contemplative; divine instruction is dealt out in small portions, in newspapers, tracts, &c., which are flying in every direction; a thousand benevolent enterprizes, unknown to our fathers, are in successful operation; and the way is evidently preparing for great and important changes to take place in the world.

The times in which we live are certainly full of interest; but it deserves consideration whether they are not also full of danger. If there was a tendency formerly to a sort of contemplative indolence, or morbid melancholy, is not the tendency equally strong and dangerous now to spiritual dissipation? If Christians were too much occupied, in some former years, with theological speculations, are they not in danger now of satisfying themselves with only general and superficial views of truth? If Christians at present, by their activity, may be more generally useful to their fellow men; is there not danger that, in their zeal for others, their own vineyard may be neglected, and they fall far behind their brethren of a less favored age in attainments in holiness.—I know of no way in which these dangers may be more effectually counteracted, than by recurring often to the example of holy men and women who have lived before us, and holding them up for inspection and imitation, that a portion of their spirit may possess our hearts, and the peculiarities of their age be mingled, in some measure, with those of our own.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## EXPOSITION.—NO. 1.

For the Spirit of the Pilgrims.

## JOHN xvii. 3.—“TO KNOW THEE, THE ONLY TRUE GOD.”

Self styled “liberal christians” have attempted to make much of this passage, as an argument to show, that “the Father only is the true God.” Considerable warmth of feeling has been expressed, in view of the *obtuseness* of those intellects, which have not perceived the irresistible force of their arguments, and the *obstinacy* of those, who still maintain, that “Jesus Christ is the true God and eternal Life.” With how much candour and critical acumen their discussions have been made, let us now attempt to discover.

The words, ἀληθινὸς θεός, “the true God,” were specially designed to distinguish Jehovah from “*fictitious Gods*,” as can be made fully apparent. The usage of scriptural writers with respect to ἀληθινός requires us to understand it as opposed to that which is *vain, emblematical, feigned and fictitious*. It is employed twenty seven times in the New Testament, and thirty in the LXX. And an instance of any other use, than that above given, cannot be found in the scriptures. A few specimens may here be given; John iv. 23, οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ, *unfeigned worshippers*; Heb. viii. 2. σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, the true tabernacle, and not one *emblematical*; Heb. x. 22. μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας, with a true heart and not with *hypocritical worship*.

And when ἀληθινός is applied to God, both in the LXX, and in the New Testament, it *always* is done, to contrast him with those that are no gods, ii. Chron. xv. 3. “Now for a long time Israel had been without the (θεὸς ἀληθινός) true God.” They had worshipped *fictitious gods* under every green tree, and on every high hill, Is. 65, 16. “He, who blesseth himself in the earth, shall bless himself in (τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἀληθινόν) the true God. And he, that sweareth in the earth, shall swear by (τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἀληθινόν) the true God.” They shall not look to *fictitious gods,—to idols*, for blessings; nor invoke *false gods*; but they shall acknowledge Jehovah in all things 1. Thess. i. 9. “And how ye turned to God from idols, to serve (θεὸς ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ) the living and true God.” 1. John, v. 19, 20. “We are of God; but the whole world lieth in wickedness”—*are idolaters*. And we know that the son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know

him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. *ὁυτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινός θεός*, This is *the true God* and eternal life."

Now if all the passages, where *ἀληθινός θεός* occur together, in the scriptures, (except this in John xvii. 3,) contrast the *true God* with *idols*, is there not strong probability that it is used for this purpose in John xvii. 3? Especially, as Schleusner ranks it with 1. Thess. i. 9, (where *ἀληθινός θεός* evidently distinguishes God from idols); and says "*Diis fictitiis opponitur.*"

But, should it be said, that "the manner of address here excludes *all but the Father*; and that he only, (to the excepting of the Son and Spirit) is put in opposition to false gods"? It is the kind of argument in which Unitarians delight "the *petitio principii*"—*the assumption* of the very thing that *they ought to prove*. Though the passage does exclude *all but Jehovah* from being the *ἀληθινός θεός*; yet it does by no means exclude *him* who is elsewhere called *ἀληθινός θεός*, (1. John v. 20, before quoted) even *Jesus Christ, the Son of God*, "*the true God and eternal life.*"

I am aware of the attempts, which have been made to show, that *ἀληθινός θεός* in 1. John v. 20, is applied to the *Father*, and not to *Jesus Christ*. But, legitimate principles of exegesis require us to apply it to Christ. Says Professor Stuart, "there are two reasons here, why *ὁ ἀληθινός θεός*, *the true God* may be referred to Christ. 1. The grammatical construction favours it. Christ is the immediate antecedent. I grant that pronouns sometimes relate to a more remote antecedent; but cases of this nature stand on the ground of necessity, not of common grammatical usage. What doubt can there be, that John could without scruple call the Logos the true God, *ὁ ἀληθινός θεός*, whom he had before asserted to be *God*, and to have created all things?"

But 2dly. My principal reason for referring *the true God* *ὁ ἀληθινός θεός*, to Christ is, the other adjunct which stands with it; "*This is the true God—and the ETERNAL LIFE.*" How familiar is this language with John, as applied to Christ!—"Now as I cannot find any instance in John's writings, in which the appellation of LIFE and *eternal LIFE* is bestowed upon the Father, to designate him as the author of spiritual and eternal life; and as this occurs so frequently in John's writings as applied to Christ; the laws of exegesis compel me here—to construe both *ὁ ἀληθινός θεός*, and *ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος* both of Christ." (Letters to Channing.

It is surely a begging of the question, then, to say "*The Father only* is put in opposition to false gods." If Unitarians can prove, that He, who has all the *names* and *attributes* of Jehovah ascribed to him—He, whom inspired men worshipped—He, who made and upholds the universe, *is not the true God*; then may they argue, that he is excluded in John xvii. 3, from participating with the *ἀληθινός θεός* who is contrasted with false gods. And, if they can prove, that "the God, that made the heavens," "hath

given his glory unto another"; and that "he, who hath seen Christ, hath *not* seen the Father"; then will the controversy be ended, for all will be obliged to admit, in that case, that "the Father only is the true God." But, until that be done, the humble disciple may safely unite with Thomas, and cry to the Saviour, "ὁ κτίσις μου, καὶ ὁ θεός μου!"

B.

## EXPOSITION.—NO. II.

For the Spirit of the Pilgrims.

Matt. i. 18.—"NOW THE BIRTH OF JESUS CHRIST WAS ON THIS WISE."

It is hardly necessary to remark, that many Unitarians have denied the *miraculous conception* of our Saviour; and that they have pronounced it "the fable of some one who wished to exalt the founder of Christianity."

How far such a notion may be received by Unitarians in this country, at the present time, the writer will not attempt to say. But he does know, that *some of them start objections* against the divine authority of the text, from the end of the genealogy, to the baptism of Christ; even if they do not deny the miraculous conception altogether. They likewise do the same, with respect to Luke's account of the same subject. And these objections are unhiuging the minds of some, who are led to believe, that there is want of evidence for the *divine inspiration* of these portions of the Gospel history.

But, what is the ground of the objections in question? Is there any striking *discrepancy of manuscripts here*? Is there any *ancient version* which shows that they were not considered authentic? Or has any Biblical critic of eminence been able to prove that they belong not to the true Gospel? Nothing of all this can be alledged.

But, is there *no semblance* of authority for rejecting these passages? The writer of the notes, in the "Improved Version," quotes Epiphanius and Jerome, as affirming; "that these passages were wanting in the Gospel of the Nazarenes and Ebionites." And the impression is left upon many minds, that Epiphanius and Jerome accounted the Gospel of these heretics as *the original text*. But what must be thought of the *honesty*, to say nothing of the critical skill of a man, that could leave such an impression on those who should read the "Improved Version?" Must he not have *known* what Epiphanius and Jerome did testify concerning the corrupted text of the Ebionites and Nazarenes? Did he not read, that "Evangelium illud *corruptum* esse;" and "Multa addimenta assuta sunt?"\*

\* Vid. Epiph. Hær. 29. And Jerome in loco, as given by Poole.

Besides, is it not known, that "the Ebionites *blotted out* the whole that followed the genealogy even to the baptism of Christ;" and that "they did it, because they wished it to be believed that Jesus was born *ex concubitu Josephi*, and for his exalted virtue obtained the unction of the spirit?"\*

Surely, if Unitarians will consent to take such a course, in their attempts at destroying the influence of the Gospel history, it is time that their dishonesty should be exhibited in the light of day!

But what is the argument for rejecting the introduction of Luke's Gospel, excepting the four first verses? Is there any ground for accounting it *a fable*? Are these passages wanting in any of the ancient manuscripts, or versions? No. Has any one proved, that the scriptures used by the Christian fathers did not contain them? No. "But, these two chapters were wanting in the copies used by Marcion!"

What of that? Who does not know that "Marcion rejected all the evangelical histories excepting Luke's;" and that "he suppressed passages in that, to suit his own system."† Any one, that could quote Marcion's authority, for rejecting the sacred text, must have had a high sense of the value of the scriptures!

I will only add the nervous remarks of Dr. Lawrence in the closing part of a Dissertation on these passages; "Upon the whole, then, taking a retrospective view of what has been advanced on both topics, will Unitarian candor act unworthy of itself, if, instead of rejecting any part of St. Matthew's Gospel upon the credit of the Ebionites—or any part of St. Luke's Gospel upon the credit of the Marcionites—it be disposed to give a due weight to that text, the authority of which no Biblical critic of eminence has ever yet attempted to shake;—if it put the concurrent testimony of antiquity, supported by the accurate collation of Manuscripts, Fathers, and Versions into one scale; and throwing the spurious Gospel of Ebion, and the more spurious Gospel of Marcion into the other, **BEHOLD THEM IGNOMINIOUSLY KICK THE BEAM!**

B.

---

 AUGUSTINE.

Augustine was born at Fagasta a city of Numidia, in the year 351. His father who was a burgess of that city, conceiving a high opinion of his son's talents, set his heart upon his literary advancement, and gave him all the advantages, which his small

\* Vid. Orig. Praef. in Suc; Euseb. Epiph. &c., as given in Poole.

† Vid. Epiph. Haer. 42. and Iren. Lib. 1. C. 23, &c.

fortune would admit. And his mother, a woman of memorable piety, early and so faithfully instructed him in the principles of the Christian religion, that at a time of extreme illness, while yet young, he desired to be baptised, but on account of his speedy recovery it was omitted. At first he was strongly averse to mental exertion, but on reading Cicero's Hortensius, he imbibed an ardent thirst for literary fame, and devoted himself to the study of eloquence. Not finding, however, in the works of Greek and Roman authors, the pure precepts of him whose name, falling from the lips of his pious mother, had indelibly impressed his mind, he turned his attention to the sacred scriptures. But here again, failing to discern those flowers of rhetoric, which were, by his profession, the grand objects of pursuit, he suffered himself to be seduced by the Manichees, who were then becoming numerous in Africa. Lax in principle and debauched in morals, he was left at the age of nineteen, by the death of his father, to the care of his anxious mother. And notwithstanding her prayers and tears and entreaties, he continued an avowed Manichee until the age of twenty-eight, when he stole from her presence, repaired to Rome, and soon after through the influence of some of his friends, was appointed professor of rhetoric, at Milan. Previously, however, to his learning Carthage his faith had been somewhat shaken by frequently comparing the absurd fables of the Manichees with the philosophy of Greece and Rome, and by the utter failure of Faustus, an eloquent man and leader of the sect, to support his positions, by sound argument. Augustine had now become an inquirer after truth, and his situation at Milan proved to be peculiarly favourable to its apprehension. The powerful preaching of Ambrose, then bishop of that city, the study of Paul's epistles, attended by the influence of Divine Grace in answer to the prayers of his absent mother, wrought in his mind a true conversion to the Christian faith. He therefore relinquished his profession, received baptism, returned to his native land, and associating with eleven others, as austere as himself, became with them distinguished by wearing the leathern girdle, having all things in common and paying exclusive devotion to fasting and prayer and the study of the word of God. About three years after Valerius, then bishop of Hippo, charmed with the talents and piety of Augustine, drew him from his retirement, ordained him priest over his own church, and contrary to the usual practice, permitted him to preach in his presence. The fame of Augustine, however, as a preacher, a counsellor and a Christian soon became so great and extensive, that Valerius, now far advanced in life, fearing that he would be called to some other portion of the Christian church, prevailed upon the ecclesiastical authorities to appoint him colleague bishop with himself.

We now arrive at that period of his life in which it is interesting to contemplate his character. We behold him labouring in

the strength of the Lord and in the power of his might, wielding the weapons of Christian warfare, and contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. His arduous labors, more delightful to his active and benevolent mind than any other employment, daily increased upon him. For such was the fame of his piety, hospitality and benevolence, that his habitation was a place of constant resort. Here the afflicted found council, the stranger a home, and the indigent relief. As a companion he was kind, affectionate and instructive,—as a Christian strict even to severity—as a preacher, distinguished rather for the soundness of his doctrine and the strength and vividness of his expression than for the chasteness of his oratory on the logical preciseness of his argumentation. He chose rather to instruct the understanding and improve the heart, than to charm the ear or please the fancy—always adapting his language to the capacity of his hearers. Though apparently enthusiastic in every thing in which he engaged, yet it is pleasing to find that as a polemic he was candid, forbearing and affectionate, ever desiring, not so much of vanquishing his antagonist, as of convincing him of his error, and of reclaiming him to the bosom of the church.

Such a man was eminently qualified to stand forth the champion of truth, in a day when various heretics were spreading devastation and death over the fairest portions of the Christian world. Their desolating march was arrested by the powerful arm of Augustine, and though they divided their bands against him, he put them all to flight with the sword of the Spirit. The Manichees, the Donatists, the Arians, the Pelagians and the Pagans, with other smaller tribes of errorists, were each in turn obliged to acknowledge the zeal of his piety, and the force of his arguments, and to retire, in shame and defeat, from the field of contest.

The chief points of Christian doctrine which he had occasion severally to defend against the tenets of these various sects, were the same that were long after embraced by the Reformers of the sixteenth century, and maintained at the hazard of their lives. Tranquility was restored to the African church by the persevering efforts of the bishop of Hippo, and the work of salvation eminently prospered under his indefatigable ministrations. But notwithstanding all his faithfulness, and all his success, he was not permitted to leave his church in peace at his final departure. He lived to see his country invaded and plundered by the Vandals, a barbarous tribe from the north, and even his own beloved city besieged by the hostile foe, for seven long months. It was in the midst of these scenes of desolation, spreading far and wide over the land, that, worn out with labour, and grieved with the fearful prospects of the churches which had been gathered and nurtured by his care, he closed his eyes on earthly things. Thus lived and thus died the famous Augustine.

He lived at an important era in the Christian world. The church

had now passed through ten successive persecutions, and had gained at length the affections of the world, and been received to her embrace. Kings did her homage, and princes stood up for her support. But the vine which God had planted and caused to shoot out its branches beyond the river, withered at their touch, and refused to be nurtured by their care. The Spirit was withdrawing and darkness visible was settling in upon the temples of Christianity.

Now then it was that the appearance of Augustine was as the breaking out of a western sun from behind the portentous cloud to pour a flood of cheering and reviving effulgence upon the garden of God.—*Sad* was the hour in which he died; for then again the day went down, and the mantle of night spread over the world; except that such proved to be the influence of his writings in after ages that, his death was rather as the sitting of a polar sun, which, while it floated below the horizon afforded a twilight sufficient to guide many a Christian pilgrim to the cross of Calvary and to Zion above. That he had faults, we cannot deny; that these faults had a deleterious influence on the church in succeeding generations, we as readily admit. But his faults were the faults of the age in which he lived, and it becomes us to exhibit the same candor towards him, that may be necessary for ourselves.

G.

---

INTRODUCTION OF MORAL EVIL.

1. It is in the highest degree, probable, that Satan, the chief of the fallen myriads, was advanced nearest to the godhead of all the sons of glory. And this appears, because, had it been otherwise, it is not likely he could have drawn such a multitude to participate his guilt; for the higher his exaltation, the greater his influence on those around. Nor is it probable, that such a number, could have united as one in that grand rebellion, without some head, whom they highly esteemed: whose word was their law, and whose influence was equal to the black and awful event. Yea, it seems certain that he was so advanced, from that dominion, which he now holds, over the unhappy partakers of his fall. Scripture represents him, as having such dominion; he is called a king, the angel of the bottomless pit; and the prince of the power of the air. All which carry evidence of his rule and dominion now: and prove it more than probable, that he was advanced to peculiar dignity before the fall.

2. His intellectual powers were strongest, and shone with unrivalled splendor: This I think, appears from his refined subtlety, by which he drew aside unknown numbers, of the once happy tenants of glory, by which he still keeps them under his dominion; and by which he rules in the hearts of the children of disobe-

ence. It also appeared in the method he took to deceive Eve; which discovered peculiar penetration, foresight and sagacity; for nothing could be more fitly calculated to attain his diabolical end. It also appeared, in his daring attempt on the Lord of life and glory: by which, he thought at one stroke to conquer heaven and earth; and destroy both. It appears farther manifest, in the variety of his temptations, by which he lieth in wait to deceive, not only sinners, but saints: none of whom are wholly free from his fiery darts, and cunning devices; and over whom he would gain his infernal aims, did not God in infinite wisdom, love and grace, circumvent his malicious designs. All which, demonstrate his intellectual powers, (though now debased to diabolical purposes,) to be of the superior degree. Consequently,

3. He was honored as such by those around him. This it seems natural to suppose; and there is no doubt, but he was esteemed and exalted by them in proportion to his high state, and intellectual accomplishments, and which gradually arose to a kind of a devotion and to a degree of honor and worship, incompatible with his state as a creature. Thus, perhaps, they became tempters to each other.

4. He could not be insensible of his exalted and superior abilities. The higher his dignity, and the more capacious his powers, the more clearly he could discern the difference between himself and those beneath. This consciousness of superiority, and the respect paid him, by the surrounding intelligences, generating high thoughts of his own worth, self-love, and self-complacency, and, in the end, self-admiration took place; all which engendered pride: pride darkened his mind, both to the past and the future; he forgot the rock that begat him, and that now upheld him and all his power became absorbed in self. Pride thus generated, became exceedingly prolific, and the now fallen spirit, conveyed the dreadful bane through ten thousand minds.

This is as probable an account of the introduction of sin, as perhaps can be supposed. In which it appears that the immediate cause, or occasion of sin, was Satan's exaltation, superior intellectual powers, and the consequent esteem and honor paid by those around him. In all which, where can the fault or blame be fixed, but on the guilty subject? This cause, instead of extenuating his guilt, aggravates it to the highest degree: for the more elevated his station, the greater his obligation to his sovereign; the more capacious his powers, the more able was he to glorify his Creator; and the more exalted his obedience and worship ought to have been; therefore his rebellion sunk him into proportionable guilt, and rendered his base revolt absolutely inexcusable.

WILLIAM TUCKER.

THE  
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. VI.

NOVEMBER, 1833.

NO. 11.

---

---

COMMUNICATIONS.

---

REMARKS INTRODUCTORY TO THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

That period in the history of the Jewish nation which passed under the Judges is replete with interest and instruction. In many respects it is obscure, and requires more than ordinary attention to understand it. For this, two special reasons may be assigned. First, it is difficult for us, at this distance of time and in widely different circumstances to enter into the peculiar situation of that people during the period to which this book relates. And secondly, the account is exceedingly compressed. The Book itself is but a few fragments, the whole of which is shorter than a single message of the President of the United States usually is. Suppose our Republic should continue 300 years from the declaration of Independence, and then that its whole history should be comprised in twenty or twenty-one short chapters; then suppose that 3000 or 4000 years hence, a people on another continent, speaking a language bearing no resemblance to ours, with manners, customs and habits as different from ours, as the manhood of the world is different from its infancy, and it is easy to see that they could not understand such a brief history of our nation, civil and religious, without care and study. Let any one sit down, and as he reads over the book of Judges, carefully note only such parts as are obscure, and he will at once feel that if he can answer many questions which arise, there are more which he cannot answer.

The period embraced in the book of Judges, dating from the settlement of Canaan at the death of Joshua is 300 years. The whole period during which the nation was under this form of

government, from Joshua to Saul was 450 years. As this is the history of men in entirely new circumstances, it probably throws stronger light upon the human character, than the same number of pages either in sacred or profane history.

1. The first question naturally arising is, who wrote the Book of Judges?

A few words of explanation seem necessary before coming to the answer. There seems ever to have been in the Jewish nation, an officer of a peculiar character. We have no word which exactly expresses the nature of the office. Perhaps *Genealogist* will come the nearest to it of any single word. In our translation of the Bible it is usually if not always translated by the general term *officer*. While the Hebrews were in bondage in Egypt, these genealogists, or as the original word is, *Shoterim*, kept an account of the families; and under the task-masters, saw that the proper quantity of brick was made and delivered. The Septuagint calls them scribes, *γραμματεως*. Vide Gen. 5; 14, 15. Under Joshua these Shoterim or registers delivered the orders of the General to the army, and kept an accurate account of all the families, and of their ability to furnish soldiers. Vide Josh. 1: 10, 11. After the settlement of the land these Shoterim were placed in all the principal cities. In keeping these rolls of families, they sometimes inserted short and curious memoranda, and notices of remarkable incidents. See a remarkable example of this in 1 Chron. 4: 10, 21, 22, 23. Similar memoranda occur as they give the list of families who were reared in Egypt. They were undoubtedly inserted by these Shoterim.

These Shoterim seem always to have been peculiarly active whenever an enrolment for war took place. They were elected from the first citizens, and were men of sound integrity. Now it is highly probable that the Shoterim wrote the history, each of his own times, or of the particular war in which he was engaged. Thus the Book of Judges, which was most evidently composed by more than one pen, was probably the composition of several of these Shoterim, each writing the history of his own times during the 300 years.

But the book seems not to have been collected, or put together as a whole, till the days of Saul, the first king. In several places the compiler throws in the remark, "in those days there was no king in Israel," plainly implying that there *was* a king then; i. e. after the crowning of Saul. The compiler also says that the Jebusites held Jerusalem at that time, (ch 1: 21) but we know that David expelled the Jebusites, and ever after held the city: consequently the book must have been written

or compiled somewhere between the crowning of Saul and the reign of David. And we next infer that as SAMUEL lived just at that time and held the pen of a ready writer and was clothed with the spirit of prophecy, he was the compiler of the book. What greatly strengthens this supposition is, that several parts of the book were composed long before Saul. We know that the song of Deborah was, as it was committed to memory by the army of Barak ; so undoubtedly were other parts, especially the dialogues which are minutely related, and which must have been spoken at least 250 years before Samuel. This supposition does not in the least affect the proof of the inspiration of the book. It may be just as really and as fully inspired as if every word had been suggested to the compiler at the time of writing it. The several little histories were probably before him, and the Holy Spirit directed him to write such a book, what things to insert and what to leave out.

2. What was the real situation of the Israelites during the reign of the Judges.

A question much easier to ask than to answer. I must be allowed here just to glance back and look at the causes which would naturally tend to form their national character. The generation who, led by the angel of the covenant, came out of Egypt, were, as a whole, exceedingly unpromising. They had been bound and broken in slavery ;—so completely, that more than once they would have exchanged all their prospects of freedom, for the bondage of Egypt, if they might again have their leeks and onions. Add to this, they were educated in Egypt, the very hot-bed of idolatry, from which, seed spread over almost the whole of the world. As to *soldiership*, they were about as unpromising as the slaves of the West Indies would now be, and not much better prepared for the pure worship of God than the most degraded idolaters would be. Thus when led through the Red Sea, and on the borders of the promised land, they were commanded to go up and conquer and possess it. Their army at that time was at least 600,000 fighting men, and their whole population nearly 3,000,000. They sent twelve of their most respectable and courageous men to spy out the land ; but these, partaking of the spirit of their generation, spread dismay through the whole camp ; and although God was visibly with them, and although they had a number and a strength nearly or quite as great as that of this country when we threw off the yoke of Great Britain, yet their heart sunk at the very idea of fighting. Such was their cowardice that they not only openly talked of rebelling, but of stoning their leaders, till God interfered and punished them.

That generation was then sentenced to die in the wilderness, and the land to remain unconquered and unpossessed, till a more warlike generation could be raised up. This sentence equally dissatisfied them, and they then felt eager to fight, and actually made the attempt to go out and conquer. It was the faint-hearted attack of cowardice. They were smitten and obliged to return, and gladly acquiesced in the sentence. This repulse seemed to convince them, that whatever else they might have, they had but very few of the fighting qualities. They had rather wander and die in the wilderness than to fight.

But God had another object in thus leading them so long a journey over the deserts of Arabia. He designed to organize a church, and to have one spot on earth not polluted by idolatry. No nation then existed not sunk in the most debasing idolatry.

And here is the place to remark that idolatry is the prevailing desire of man. It matters not how enlightened and refined a people may be,—how much learning and skill they may have, if the direct revelation of heaven and the ordinances of God are wanting, they rush into all the abominations of idolatry. And why? Surely there must be some resistless cause for such a propensity. And a little reflection will show us there is such a cause—a cause as universal as the depraved desires of man. No system of idolatry could be maintained, if it consisted in nothing more than merely paying homage to a block, a stone, or an image of silver or gold. Idolatry meets the unholy desires of man in a different way. It is always attended by impure rights, by lascivious songs, and by practices still more impure and abominable. The very vices of man, which need all the laws of God and of man to restrain them, are thus consecrated by the worship of idols. They are made a part of worship. The fact that at Corinth, just at the time when the Gospel was introduced into that city, there were one thousand abandoned females consecrated to one temple, and the fact, that in the days of the Judges, the whole tribe of Benjamin were so madly bent on protecting the city of Gibeah in their awful treatment of the wife of the travelling Levite—so madly indeed that they would fight the other eleven tribes, and nearly lose their own existence, shows how and why idolatry makes and retains its votaries. Even while Sinai was shaking at the presence of God, the people had their calf of gold; and what is still more astonishing, during all that long march in the wilderness, with the cloud and the pillar of fire and the miracles before them, they were not cured. Idolatry broke out once in a manner so dreadful, that it cost the lives of 24,000 to check it; and never did

the ark of the covenant remove, but it was followed by the portable tabernacles of Satan. Vide Amos 5: 25, 26; and Acts 7: 42, 43. The fact is well known, that there is not a temple of idolatry on earth, but it is the high-way of debauchery; nor an idolater, but he expects to have all his depraved appetites gratified, and his vices sanctioned by his religion. Is it any wonder, then, that Satan should be successful, when he appeals to the most unholy and depraved appetites of man, and sanctions them by songs and rites and worship? To be sure he has forms, rites, and solemn worship, but these are necessary in order to lull the conscience. Matthew Henry somewhere says, perhaps with more point than reverence, *the devil is God's ape!* Vide Buchanan's Res., and Miss. Journals passim.

This universal cause of idolatry will account for the continued propensity of the Israelites to fall into it. The surrounding nations were full of it. They had their gods and goddesses, rites and ceremonies, and practices which may not be named, mostly performed under the cover of night. To these the Israelite was invited. The temptation was so agreeable that he fell, and his conscience was hardened by the fall. Moses and Joshua well understood the strength of this propensity, and took every possible precaution to keep the nation from idolatry. The food, the dress, the habits, every thing of the Hebrew was designed to prevent his mingling with idolaters. Just before his death, Moses called the nation around him and delivered his farewell address, which is contained in the book of Deuteronomy. In this address he recounts what God had done for them, and why he had done it, and again and again do they swear allegiance to the God of heaven. This solemn act was repeated by Joshua just before his death; and as a general fact, it is undoubtedly true, that all who were upon the stage of life with Joshua, kept clear of idolatry. The book of Judges, then commences with the next generation after Joshua.

The great principle or law which lay at the foundation of their existence as a nation and a church, was, that Jehovah should be their God, and at the same time their temporal king. This Theocratical form of government was not forced upon them, for they voluntarily elected God to be their king, and several times, the whole nation, including the women and children, swore their allegiance to him as their king. Consequently temporal rewards were promised and conferred, if they were faithful to their temporal king, and judgements denounced and executed, when unfaithful. Hence every species of idolatry was high treason against their king. So of every inducement to idolatry. This brings me to say a word in regard to the

expulsion of the Canaanites, which has too often been said to have been the result of cruelty. It is obvious to remark that the country belonged to God, who had a perfect right to give it to whomsoever he would. Add to this, he expressly says he suffered them to be driven out for their abominable idolatries. It was a just judgement upon them. There were three courses before the Canaanites, either of which they were at liberty to take.

(1.) They might have renounced their idolatry and acknowledged Jehovah as their God. In that case they would have been spared. Indeed some of them did so, and were promoted by David. No one will say that they had not abundant proof of the divinity of the God of the Hebrews, and that they ought to have renounced their idolatry, incest, and human sacrifices and acknowledged the God of heaven. If they chose to die rather than forsake sin, it was not unjust in God to give them their choice, or expel them.

(2.) They might have left the country, which they undoubtedly knew belonged to the descendents of Jacob: and if they had taken their property and departed peaceably, they would have been spared. Many of them, as we have reason to believe, *did* thus leave their country and plant colonies in Africa. Two marble pillars in Numidia contain the following inscription in the Phenician characters; *ἡμεῖς ἐξμεν οὐ φυγόντες ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λησιτοῦ, υἱοῦ Ναυῆ*. Undoubtedly the greater part of these nations might have saved themselves in the same way.

(3.) They might try the contest with the sword and in open day, fight against the God of heaven. This was the course which most of the tribes chose to pursue, and being thus found in arms, in defence of all the abominations of idolatry, they were exterminated. God has an unquestioned right to remove the wicked in any way he pleases. Analogous to this were the dealings of God towards the aboriginal inhabitants of this country. Just before our fathers came to plant a church of Christ here, God had removed a great part of the Indians, by a plague more awful than the sword of war. They too, had filled up their cup of iniquity, and were far gone in pollution. And they too, by the mysterious providence of God were doomed to extermination, and the probability seems to be, that with their own ferocious wars, and the oppressions of the white man, they will one day be gone. The Canaanites were never exterminated to an extent any thing like what has come upon the tribes who once occupied these hills and these vallies. Vide

Trumbull's Hist. Con. Vol. I. Jefferson's Notes on Virginia, and Mather's Magnalia.

Let us now look at the Hebrews having passed the great desert and settled in the promised land, with their government in full operation, the Tabernacle pitched at Shiloh, the ark of the covenant completed, the Levites, a learned class placed in the cities of each tribe, the Canaanites driven out or subdued so that each tribe can occupy its allotted place. God is their king and defender, and they are in the fair way to become the happiest, holiest, and mightiest nation ever known. What was the government of this singular people? At the death of Joshua, there was no king or supreme magistrate but God himself. He was the king—the Tabernacle was his palace—the chief priest was his prime minister, and the Levites were his officers and agents. Each tribe was, in many respects, an independent republic; and the resemblance to the relations which the several states of our Union bear to each other, is surprising. Each tribe having its own officers and rulers, and acting independently, sometimes acted right, sometimes otherwise. Thus the tribe of Benjamin undertook to protect the inhabitants of Gibeah against all the other tribes. The tribe of Judah elected David to be their king, and he reigned over them seven years before the other tribes fell in. Hence too, each tribe had its own enemies, to drive out after they had entered possessions. Sometimes two or three tribes united as they did under Gideon and Jephtha. But though each tribe seemed to act as sovereign, yet they had some common bonds. They spake one language,—often needed each other's aid,—had one king and God—one set of Priests—one Tabernacle—one oracle called the Urim and Thummim, and one common law of church and state. Mutual jealousies, would, of course, spring up under such a government, just as in our own country. The two powerful tribes of Judah and Joseph were always jealous. Judah, because their ancestor was the first-born, and from them the Saviour was to come. Joseph, because this tribe was divided into two, Ephraim and Manasseh, and had a double portion, to fill the place of Levi, elected to the priest-hood. Thus they continued to struggle for the preponderance till at the death of Solomon, they succeeded in rending the kingdom, and the tribe of Joseph carried away all but Judah and Benjamin. Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth!

Idolatry crept into the nation by the next generation after Joshua in two ways. First, the several tribes after entering upon their possessions, neglected to drive out the Canaanites, though expressly commanded to do it. They were content

simply to make them tributary. The next step was to form alliances with them by marriage, and in a short time they could not expel the Canaanites without fighting their own children and relatives. It was then easy to join in all their idolatry. The second way was by making images, probably of the ark and sacred things, and then worshipping them. Thus the first introduction of idolatry in Israel when openly practised, was by the images which Micah set up in his own house. These were carried up to Dan, or Laish, the northern part of the nation, and, as the place was distant from Shiloh, they found it easier, and more agreeable to pride, to worship there, than to go to Shiloh. Thus the fashion of having domestic gods was introduced, and soon spread through the land. Each tribe would naturally wish to have the rights of religion within its own bounds. The Ephod which Gideon made, and which might have been made merely as a monument of his victory, was, after his death; made an object of worship and became a snare to Israel. Vide Jahn's Hist. Heb. Com.

I am now better prepared to answer the question started some time since: viz. What was the state of Israel during the time of the Judges? I reply,

1. In general, it was a time of peace and prosperity.

This assertion may excite surprise, but it will be but momentary. The period of the Judges was 450 years. By the largest possible calculation, the people were oppressed only 111 years of this time. And it should be distinctly remembered that when they were oppressed, it was only one or two tribes at a time. The Philistines sometimes harassed one or two tribes on the south, and the Midianites as many more on the north, or at the centre; but even in these sorest times, the great body of the nation was unmolested. Had they not been weakened by mutual jealousies and idolatry, there never was a time when the united strength of all the tribes might not have cleared the land of all their enemies, and that too, without supernatural aid. The Book of Judges has very aptly been called a register of diseases—from which it would be improper to infer there were no well-men in the nation, because some were sick. Idolatry seemed to spread like an epidemic, and then judgements would fall upon that particular part of the land, till it was removed; but there were long and healthy periods even then, when no part of the nation felt the disease. So short a history must be, of course, only an outline of this long period, and it embraces only the darker shades. After David, the Rulers were from the tribe of Judah; but during the Judges, they were raised up from the tribes most oppressed; and hence

they were from eight different tribes. The general prosperity of the nation may be inferred from the facts, that during all these years the Tabernacle of God was at Shiloh, and his altars constantly revered. The first High Priest of whom we read, is Phinehas, who held his office under Joshua, and it was probably his summons, as the prime minister of the king, (God,) that assembled the nation to see what should be done in the case of the city Gibeah. Regular courts of Justice were, for the most of the time in full operation. The events related in the Book of Ruth took place during the days of the Judges; and there we find regular courts of Judicature held at the gates of the cities, to one of which Boaz appeals when he proposes to marry the widow of an Israelite. The very histories of these deliverances, show these seasons of oppressions to have been exceptions to the general state of things. The wandering hordes who came in upon them like waves of fire, driving off their cattle and devouring their harvests, were large bodies of robbers or freebooters, who might have been easily repelled, had there been union in Israel.

2. During this period there was very great anarchy in some parts of the kingdom.

It may seem almost needless to remark here, that the last five chapters in the Book of Judges, are not in the regular order of time. The events took place soon after the death of Joshua, for we find Phinehas High Priest at the time of their occurrence. They were probably put at the close of the Book, in order not to break the history. They may be called an appendix, and might as well have been put at the beginning as at the close.

The story of the treatment of the wife or concubine of the Levite at the city of Gibeah, shows the almost entire want of civilization, to say nothing of refinement. "And when he was come into his house, he took a knife and laid hold on his concubine and divided her together with her bones, into twelve pieces, and sent her into all the coasts of Israel." This was a summons to the whole nation, and the call probably, went in the name of Phinehas; but what people but those of a barbarous age, would send pieces of a corpse to call them together! Something like this takes place among any barbarous people, and among none but barbarous. The Indian warrior of our country, when he would call his warriors to battle, sends a stick to each, having as many notches scored in it, as there are days before the war commences. "When I send out one arrow," said the half-civilized, talented Saladin, in the time of the Crusaders, "when I send out one arrow, a thousand horsemen

leap into the saddle ; if I send two, five thousand ; if I send my bow, ten thousand lances glisten in the sun." Among the partially civilized clans of Scotland, when a chieftain would gather his clan on a sudden emergency, he slew a goat, made a cross of light wood, seared its ends in fire, and quenched them in the blood of the goat. This was called the fiery cross. It was delivered to a swift runner who ran from hamlet to hamlet, stopping only long enough to name the place of rendezvous. He who received the cross sent it forward with the same speed to the next village, and thus with incredible speed it passed over the hills and vallies of the Highlands. At the sight of the cross every male over sixteen, hastened to the place of rendezvous armed, and he who failed, suffered death by fire and sword, as by the emblem of the cross. So late as 1745-6, the Fiery Cross often made its circuits, and upon one emergency went over the whole district of Breadalbane, a tract of 32 miles in three hours. It was usually prepared with the most awful curses on the head of him who refused to obey it. [See a curious account of this cross in Scott's *Lady of the Lake*, Canto III. xi. and Note I.] Suppose when the pieces of this corpse were sent through Israel, the threatening was, "God do so to him who comes not up to the gathering of Israel," and we can see how it was that the nation almost to a man, rose up at the summons. At the same time it shows the want of an organized mode of conveying intelligence, and an awful savageness in those times when "there was no king in Israel."

The same inference also, is drawn from the beautiful song of Deborah. "In the days of Shamgar the son of Anath ;— in the days of Jael, the highways were unoccupied, and travellers walked through bye-ways ;" that is, the land was so destitute of government, and so full of robbery, that the highways could not be travelled, and men must creep about in bye-paths. "The inhabitants of the villages ceased, they ceased in Israel, until that I Deborah arose, that I arose a mother in Israel ;" that is, the state of the country was such, that the villagers could not till their land, and were obliged to flee into fenced or walled cities. "Then was war in the gates ;" that is, the courts of Justice which were held at the gates of the cities were broken up, and there was no redress or peace. "They that are delivered from the noise of archers in the places of drawing water, there shall they rehearse the righteous acts of the Lord ;" that is, their wells and cisterns were beset with robbers who were archers—that is, horsemen, ready to drive off the cattle as they came for drink. How long such a state of things continued, or how widely these evils were spread, cannot be known ; but

strip the account of its poetic costume, and it shows, that the land was full of violence and robbery; industry was at an end, because protection was. The punishment which Gideon inflicted upon the rulers of Succoth, is also an evidence of the savageness of those times. "And he took the Elders of the city and thorns of the wilderness and briers, and with them he taught the men of Succoth." Severe teaching, truly; but milder than the lesson which poor Warsaw has recently been taught.

3. The Hebrews after entering the land of Canaan, were peculiarly exposed to the oppression of surrounding nations.

(1.) Surrounding nations viewed them as intruders. A people strong enough to break away from slavery in Egypt, and to be victorious in their marches and wars, would be looked upon with peculiar jealousy, and great dread.

(2.) Surrounding nations would delight to make war upon them for the sake of plunder. They brought much silver and gold out of Egypt. We are told they borrowed so as to spoil the Egyptians. It must require an immense sum of jewelry to call for, or even allow, of such language. Whenever gold was required to build the tabernacle, or for any other purpose, they had it in abundance. Besides, they had an abundance of cattle which would attract the cupidity of surrounding nations. But the skill of the Hebrews in the arts, peculiarly drew the Barbarians upon them for plunder. "Moreover thou shalt make ten curtains of fine-twined linen, of blue, and purple, and scarlet, with cherubims of cunning work;" that is, they were of beautiful colors and embroidery, with angels woven upon them. Thus the mother of Sisera looked out of the window expecting her son to return from the conquest of the Jews, with a prey of divers colors, a prey of divers colors of needle-work,—of divers colors of needle-work on both sides. Just call to mind how the barbarians poured down from the north, and like a cloud of pitch once overflowed Europe, and overturned the finest buildings and pillars which the art of man ever reared, for the sake of their ornaments, and you will not be surprised to see the eagerness with which their neighbors made war upon Israel for plunder. Thus the Midianites and children of the East came in swarms, and "encamped against them, and destroyed the increase of the earth till thou come unto Gaza, and left no sustenance for Israel." Thus the angel found Gideon threshing in a hidden place, lest he should be plundered.

(3.) The surrounding nations hated the religion of the Hebrews. They felt at once that such a religion held up be-

fore them must be a constant reproof. It was pouring in light upon their dark and abominable practices. The same feeling which has always been exercised towards true religion. Thus the Hebrews were hated in exact proportion to the purity of their religious state. Never did religion prosper among them as during some parts of the reign of David, and never was the opposition of surrounding nations so virulent. The same spirit precisely brought persecutions upon the Apostles. Even after all the glory of the Hebrews, their splendid kings, and their glorious history, their religion was hated still. Even the refined and liberal Cicero calls it *barbara superstitio*, and adds with all the feelings of a Roman, *stantibus Hierosolymis, pacatisque Judæis, tamen istorum religio sacrorum a splendore hujus imperii, gravitate nominis, nostri, majorum institutis, abhorrebat*. No doubt but this feeling added not a little to the fierceness of some of the wars upon the Jews, or, as they are emphatically called in the Bible, "the wars of God;" that is, such as were undertaken in order to destroy the religion of God.

(4.) The surrounding nations hated the Hebrews on account of their form of government.

The history of other nations is the history of their kings. Thus we read of Cyrus, Nebuchadnezzar, Darius, &c.; but of the Jews, the children of Israel did so and so. Their government was fully republican. There were judges over tens; these were elected. There were heads of families; that is, every fifty-nine families elected one magistrate, and these magistrates elected their princes or heads of thousands. Each tribe had its own representatives. These met in council, with their prince, and, like our Congress, made war or peace. Sometimes all the males in the nation assembled to transact business. Vide 19th and 24th chap. Ex.; Josh. 9th. So Samuel addressed the whole nation when they came and clamored for a king. All the people were with Samuel at Gilgal, when their first king was elected. The daughters of Zelophehad came to the whole congregation, and demanded possessions among their brethren, and the whole nation acted on the request. Vide also Judges 20th chap. Theirs was a government as much above that of any surrounding nation, as ours is superior to that of any in the darkest period of the dark ages. Liberty was hated then just as it now is. What are the crowned heads of Europe doing at this very time! They would rather have half of their crown-jewels drop out, than to have poor Greece free. They dare not have a republic near them; and they give an inch on the ground of despotism only as they

are compelled. But there was no such compulsion among the kings and nations around Canaan, and therefore were they eager to put out the light of an example so dangerous. This was undoubtedly, one great cause of the hatred of other nations. Their government, as well as religion, was a model for the world. So we find all were ready to ruin the Hebrews the moment God took off his restraining hand; and nothing but this hand prevented their being swallowed up before.

These remarks are deemed sufficient to show the correctness of a previous proposition: viz. that the surrounding nations were peculiarly desirous of exterminating the Hebrews. For among them, all enjoyed the same liberty. There were no empty titles among them—no insignia of false glory:—little of rank, except what arose from virtue, dignity of age, or services rendered their country. Their lands were parcelled out to the families, and could not be so alienated that a part of the nation should be poor, and a part rich, a part noblemen and a part vassals. Men were called from the plough, as Shamgar,—from threshing, as Gideon, from the sheep-fold, as David, to the highest posts of honor. Heroes, kings, and prophets, came from any and all ranks of life.

A word on the beauty of the composition of the Book of Judges, which, as before remarked, is probably from several different pens. Who would expect to find in a work containing scraps of the history of troubles and war, some of the most beautiful writing that ever excited the admiration of man! These beautiful places are like the suns and rainbows which dance upon the tail of the hoarse peacock, and which are more beautiful for being seen in glimpses: or, as Spencer expresses it, like gold which is more beautiful for being partly covered with the loom in weaving:—

“ —Round about the walls they clothed were  
With goodly arras of great majesty:  
Woven with gold and silk so close and near,  
That the rich metal lurked privily,  
As faining to be hid from curious eye;  
Yet here and there, and everywhere unawares,  
It showed itself, and shone unwillingly;  
Like a discolored snake, whose hidden snares,  
Thro' the green grass his long bright burnisht back declares.”

What description of the pénitence of a backsliding nation could be more beautiful than this? “And it came to pass when the angel of the Lord spake these words unto all the children of Israel, *that the people lifted up their voice and wept!*” We frequently read as follows: “and the earth had

rest four-score years ;” as if the very earth was troubled to its heart by the afflictions of the people of God, the hills and valleys bowing under the oppression, till God raised up a deliverer, and then the earth could rest ! But the most remarkable spot is the song of Deborah, whose design is, to celebrate the deliverance of Israel by the mercy of God. Some parts of the poem are obscure ; but the parts which we do understand are inimitable. I pass by the bold opening which astonishes and awes the reader at the very threshold. At the close of the song are the master-strokes. You see the mother of Sisera, driven here and there by alternate hope and fear, looking out of the window with all the solicitude of a mother. Her son has led his army down to fight Israel, and it is time for the battle to be over, and for her son to return a conqueror.

“ Thro’ the window she looked and cried out—  
The mother of Sisera thro’ the lattice ;  
Wherefore is his chariot so long in coming—  
Wherefore linger the wheels of his chariot ?”

Anticipating the consolations of her friends, she talks on, giddy between hope and fear, though she tries to conceal her fears.

“ Her wise ladies answer her :—  
Yea, she returns answer to herself—  
Have they not found ? Have they not divided the spoil ?”

“ How well adapted,” says Lowth, “ every sentence, every word is, to the character of the speaker. She takes no account of the slaughter of the enemy, of the valor and conduct of the conqueror, of the multitudes of the captives, but burns with a female thirst of prey and spoils. Nothing is omitted which is calculated to attract and engage the passions of a vain and trifling woman ;—slaves, gold, and rich apparel. Nor is she satisfied with the bare enumeration of them : she repeats, she amplifies, she heightens every circumstance : she seems to have the very plunder in her immediate possession : she pauses and contemplates every particular !”

“ Have they not found ?—Have they not divided the spoil ?—  
To every man a damsel, yea, a damsel or two !—  
To Sisera a spoil of divers colors !—  
A spoil of needle-work of divers colors,  
A spoil for the rich of divers colors of needle-work on either side !”

Such the dreams of the fond and sanguine mother ! See how the fatal disappointment is more than insinuated by the sudden, unexpected, awful catastrophe !—“ So let all thine enemies perish, O Lord !” How eloquent is the very silence of

this doting mother—much more forcible than any description, however accurately painted! [Vide a beautiful version and critique upon this song by Prof. Robinson, in the *Biblical Repository*.] Let it be remembered too, that this beautiful song was committed to memory by the great army of Barak, and it will be seen that ten thousand men could not learn such a song and carry it home, without influencing the whole nation. It has been said by one, that if he might make the ballads of a nation, he could mould and govern that nation. No wonder then, that the Holy Ghost should dictate songs, and that Prophets should teach by poetry and song. Poetry and songs are easily committed to memory, and long retained; hence we see the wisdom of God in giving so great a part of the Bible in poetry, for a people who had no such art as printing.

I shall trust myself to give but one more example of what is beautiful in this book. It is Gideon's answer, chap. 8, when the tribe of Ephraim complained, that they were not called at first, though they went out and aided in completing his victory. He might have blamed them for waiting to be called, since they might have gone first as well as he; but he turns away wrath by a soft answer. It will be remembered, that Abiezer was the region of country which followed Gideon to battle. "And they did chide with him sharply. And he said unto them, what have I done now in comparison with you? Is not the gleaning of the grapes of Ephraim, better than the vintage of Abiezer? God hath delivered into your hands the princes of Midian, Oreb and Zeeb: and what was I able to do in comparison with you? Then their anger was abated towards him when he said that." Here is a simple narrative. No notes of admiration at the meekness of Gideon, or at the effects of a soft answer in turning away wrath. Let this be compared with a truly beautiful passage from an uninspired pen, Henry Martyn. "Putting my gun into the boat, I walked into the village where the boat stopped for the night, and found the worshippers of Cali by the sound of their drums and cymbals. I did not think of speaking to them on account of their being Bengalees. But being invited to walk in by the Brahmins, I walked within the railing, and asked a few questions about the idol. The Brahmin, who spoke bad Hindostanee, disputed with great heat, and his tongue run faster than I could follow, and the people, who were about one hundred, shouted applause. But I continued to ask my questions without making any remarks upon the answers. I asked, among other things, whether what I had heard of Vishnu and Brahma were true, which he confessed. I forebore to press him with the conse-

quences, which he seemed to feel, and so I told him what was my belief. The man grew quite mild, and said it was *chula bat*, (good words) and asked me seriously at last, what I thought—was idol-worship true or false? I felt it a matter of thankfulness, that I could make known the truth of God, though but a stammerer, and that I had declared it in the presence of a devil. And this I also learned, that the power of gentleness is irresistible. I was never more astonished than at the change of deportment in the hot-headed Brahmin!" This is beautiful; and was doubtless, penned by Martyn, as he says, to shew that "the power of gentleness is irresistible." The account of Gideon was penned for the same purpose. But how differently is the story told. The whole account of the controversy between a successful and powerful general and the tribe of Ephraim, is despatched in two or three verses. The pronoun *I* and *my*, is used only twice. But in Martyn's account you have *I* and *my*, just twenty times! Thus the most beautiful of human composition is tame in comparison with that of the Bible. See too the difference as to particulars. In the account of Gideon, you have just enough to show you the conclusion. In Martyn you have item after item till they become painful: you see him putting his gun into the boat, walking to the village, finding the temple by the noise of music, and what music it was, then that they could not speak Hindoostanee, but spake Bengalee—that he was invited in, and went in, asked questions, the priest angry, talked fast, Martyn kept cool, continued to ask questions, &c. embracing a multitude of particulars which in the Bible are omitted, when the Holy Spirit would teach us that the power of gentleness is irresistible.

Thus, though I fear I have been tedious, I have only cleared away the rubbish preparatory to entering this very ancient Temple. Were there time and space, the following questions merit a careful and full answer.

1. What was the office of the Judges?
2. What the individual character of each, as men, and as good and useful men, particularly Jephtha and Sampson?
3. What instruction peculiarly profitable can the world now derive from this book?
4. Is there any thing in it which throws light upon the character of God as Immanuel?
5. Is there any thing in the accounts in this book degrading to religion or to the character of God?

May some abler pen answer these questions.

## SELFISHNESS AND DEPRAVITY.

By Professor Pond.

In discussing the subject under consideration, it is proposed,  
First, to describe selfishness.

Secondly, to show that unrenewed men are universally selfish. And

Thirdly, to inquire into the bearing of this truth upon the natural character of mankind.

By selfishness I mean something more than that *instinctive desire of happiness and aversion to misery*, which is a part of our constitution—which we possess in common with all sentient beings—which is not a matter of choice, and of course is not of a moral nature.—I mean, too, something very different from that *due or proportionate* regard to self, to our own concerns, our interest and happiness, which is required of us in the Scriptures, and which our circumstances render needful. We are required to love our neighbor *as ourselves*,—which implies that we are to love ourselves as our neighbor. We are to love both ourselves and our neighbor, not separately and supremely, but as parts of the great whole, and in proportion to perceived worthiness of affection. In addition to this, we are entrusted with our own proper concerns, in a sense that we are not entrusted with those of our neighbor, and it is no more than right that the trust should be executed. It is right that we should provide for our own personal necessities, and for the wants of our families; and that we should leave our neighbor to a certain extent, to make the same provision for himself and his. An apostle directs, that Christians “learn first to show piety *at home* ;” and he declares, that “if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.” 1 Tim. v. 4, 8.

Selfishness is a *disproportionate and supreme love of self*. It is a reigning desire of personal emolument and gratification. It is a setting of self above every thing, and a pursuing of one's private, separate interest as the chief good. With the selfish man, the great question in regard to measures is, How will they affect *me*? How will they bear upon *my* reputation, *my* interest, *my* family, *my* prospects and happiness? With such an one, self is the central point, and objects are chosen or refused, loved or hated, just according as they bear upon this.

The affections of *the disinterested* travel abroad throughout the universe. They fix supremely upon God, because

he is supremely, infinitely worthy. And they fix upon other objects, and upon self among the rest, in proportion to perceived worthiness. But the affections of the selfish man are all drawn around a single point, and that point is self. Over this he broods; upon this he dotes; and the degree of affection which is expended upon other objects depends entirely upon the relation which they sustain to this.

I am to show, in the second place, that mankind, in a state of nature, are universally selfish.

The truth of this proposition, I might almost say, is almost universally admitted. It is admitted, not only by evangelical Christians, but by the generality of mere worldly men. Such men tell us, that other considerations may influence people occasionally, but self-interest always; that when you have learned what a man judges to be for his interest, you may safely calculate how he will act. I have conversed with numerous individuals in regard to this matter, and of individuals of almost every character, from the most virtuous to the most unprincipled; and though widely differing on other subjects, I have found them wonderfully accordant in this, that *mankind are selfish*.

Indeed, this is a point on which every one's *experience* adds its testimony. We all know, if we have been accustomed to examine our hearts at all, that so far back as we can recollect, we have been (for the most part, if not entirely) under the dominion of selfishness;—that, in respect to *temporal* things, our chief inquiry has been, what *we* should eat, and what *we* should drink, and wherewithal we and ours should be provided for; and if our hearts have been exercised on the subject of religion, that a principal source of anxiety has been, our own *personal salvation*. But although the universal selfishness of men is so generally admitted, and is a truth to which every man's experience responds, still, it may be necessary to establish it by unquestionable proof;—by an appeal to *observation* and *facts*.

How early and clearly do we discover selfishness in *children*? Little children are incapable of much disguise. They commonly speak and act out their real feelings. And how obviously do they exhibit feelings of selfishness? For what do they cry, but that self may be gratified? And for what are they pleased, but that self *is* gratified? And for what do they contend one with another, but to get or to keep some good to themselves? And for what are they angry and revengeful, but to resent some injury supposed to be inflicted on the same darling object?

And those feelings of selfishness which children manifest

without disguise, men labor to disguise in vain. Men commonly are ashamed of them, and endeavor to conceal them; but the effort is entirely unsuccessful.

The selfishness of the world is manifest in most of those *maxims* which pass current in society, and which, with not a few, have more authority than the precepts of the Bible. The spirit of these maxims, in numerous instances, is just about this, 'Take care of yourself;' 'Look well to your own interest;' 'Keep what you have got, and get what you can;'—all going, not only to justify, but to inculcate, downright selfishness.

The selfishness of the world is manifest in that *suspicion* and *distrust* with which we early come to regard our fellow beings. If men loved one another as themselves, there would be no room for suspicion or distrust. The most perfect confidence would be restored, and would be universal. It is because we are satisfied that those around us are selfish, and will injure us if they can, that we distrust them; and for the same reason, they distrust us.

If mankind are not selfish, what mean the locks on our doors, with which to exclude the midnight intruder? And what mean the *notes*, and *bonds*, and *deeds*, with which we endeavor to compel those with whom we have intercourse to be true and faithful to their engagements? These things would not be needed, and would be unknown, in a world where each loved his neighbor as himself. It is selfishness which has created the necessity for them, and which has led to their invention and their existence. It is selfishness which disposes one man to invade the rights of another; and it is because of the abounding selfishness of the world, that we all find it necessary to be furnished with the means of repelling such invasion.

The selfishness of men is clearly manifest in their *bargains*. Why, it may be asked, do the buyer and seller so often disagree respecting the value of whatever is in question between them? And why do they always disagree in a particular way—the seller estimating it more highly than the buyer? To be sure, if they were disinterested, they might not always agree in judgment; but in this case, they would be as likely to disagree one way as the other. The seller would be as likely to say to the buyer, 'You offer me too much,' as 'You offer me too little;' and the buyer would be as likely to say to the seller, 'The thing is worth more than you ask,' as to say, 'It is worth less.' I hardly need remark, how very different from this the mutual intercourse of mankind always has been, and still is, in this selfish world. Bargains often are little better than mere trials of skill, in the pitiable arts of over-reaching and deceiving. The

buyer saith, "It is naught, It is naught; but when he is gone his way, then he boasteth." And the seller is as selfish and as fraudulent as he.

The *institutions* of men all assume the dominion of selfishness, and are based upon it, as a first principle. What, for instance, are the *laws* of civil society, but so many attempts to restrain and control selfishness? The prohibitions in our statute books are in effect this, 'You shall not act out your selfish feelings, in this way, that, and the other, to the injury of your neighbor.'

How manifestly, and how properly too, do our *courts* all proceed upon the principle, that mankind are selfish? Why may not a man be judge or witness in his own cause, but that he is presumed to be selfish? And why may not the wife, whose interests are identified with those of her husband, be a witness in his favor, but that she, too, is presumed to be selfish?—I do not complain of these regulations. They are what they should be, and must be, in this selfish world. But then how clearly do they show—for this is the point—that the world is selfish.

The *quarrels* among men invariably originate in selfishness; and by one side, or the other, or both, are continued in the same spirit. Men never quarrel to promote the good of each other, but always with a view to advance or defend their own private interests. This man, in his zeal for self, encroaches on the rights of that; and that, with an equally selfish zeal, retaliates, and revenges the wrong. A furious quarrel is now begun, to be carried on with mutual bitterness and fraud, and to be terminated, probably, in the grave.

The instances of *falsehood*, with which this world is so deeply disgraced, are all so many proofs of selfishness. Men do not utter falsehoods for the good of their neighbors, but commonly with a view to injure some of them, and to promote their own private interests.

The *profligacy*, *sensuality*, and *intemperance* of men are but so many exhibitions of selfishness; since these vices are invariably pursued with a real though mistaken endeavor after personal enjoyment.

And what is the multiform *avarice* of the world, but a selfish desire to retain and increase wealth? And what is the *ambition* of the world, but a selfish desire to advance in honor and in power? And what is the revenge so commonly indulged, but a selfish determination to injure others, because they are supposed to have injured us? Indeed, all those numerous and nameless vices, with which this world has been

filled, and under the weight of which it has groaned, are but so many instances and exhibitions of selfishness.

The selfishness which is so manifest in the actions of individuals, is equally conspicuous in the movements of *public bodies*, and of *nations*.—What scenes of selfishness, for example, are most of our public *elections*? The claims of rival candidates are pushed, with a great show of patriotism, and with a zeal and interest which could hardly be exceeded, if the existence of the nation were at stake;—and all for what? To gratify, in the first place, the ambition of the individuals promoted; and then to gratify the numberless dependents, who are receiving bribes, or expecting offices at their hands.

The *wars* of nations, like the quarrels of individuals, always originate in selfishness. “From whence,” asks an Apostle, “come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts? Ye lust and have not; ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain.” To gratify the lust of power or of gain, one nation encroaches on the rights of another. Reparation is, of course, demanded, and revenge is taken. Open war is now proclaimed, the sword is drawn, and battle-fields are strewn with slain and drenched in blood.

Indeed, the whole intercourse of nations, one with another, proceeds avowedly on the principle of selfishness. It has been openly contended by writers on national law, that however benevolent individuals may be, nations must take care of themselves. National policy may and must be selfish.

Men betray a *consciousness* of universal selfishness, in the readiness with which they impute selfish motives, one to another, in actions which are seemingly and professedly benevolent. Such actions are always suspected by men of the world, and the motives of those who perform them are impeached. And when actions are sometimes witnessed, which do not admit of being resolved into selfishness, these are regarded by such men as perfectly mysterious and unaccountable. It was, no doubt, very mysterious to the court of Pharaoh, that Moses should prefer affliction with the people of God, to all the honors and pleasures of a palace. It was mysterious to the chief priests and Pharisees, that Paul should attach himself to the despised Nazarines, in contempt of the high worldly advantages which they held out to him. And it is equally mysterious to men of the world now, that young persons of education and promise should be willing to leave their friends and homes, and go to the destitute of our land, or to the distant heathen, with no better prospect than that of wearing out life, and encountering hardship, suffering, and death, for the advancement of Christ's

kingdom and the salvation of souls.—The occasion of all this mystery is, that men are naturally selfish, and they believe all around them to be selfish. They have no notion or conception, from their own experience, of any higher principle of action than selfishness. Of course, when they witness actions, for which no selfish motives can be assigned, they are puzzled with them, and know not how to account for them.

It would be superfluous to adduce farther proof of that which is so obvious as scarcely to need proof;—of that which most men are willing to admit, and which the experience of all men declares to be true. Selfishness may well be regarded as the mainspring of human conduct. Whether in childhood or manhood, whether among the savage or the civilized portions of mankind, selfishness, in the present condition of the world, is the grand moving principle of the human race. Men plan and execute, they bustle and labor for *themselves*. For this, the student studies, and the husbandman tills the earth, and the mechanic visits his shop, and the merchant his warehouse, and the seaman traverses the deep, and all the powers of nature are pressed into the service of man. Self is the rallying point with each individual. Self is the ruling motive with all, —unless it be with a very few; and these are looked upon by the mass of men as anomalies and mystics, for whose actions it is impossible to give any rational account. It is thought the strangest thing on earth, that a person should be willing to labor, as Paul did, and as the Saviour did, without a supreme and governing regard to his own private interest.

Having described selfishness, and shown that mankind, while unrenewed, are universally selfish, I proceed, thirdly, to inquire into the bearing of this truth upon the natural character of our race.

And obviously it must have a very important bearing, according to the views which are entertained of selfishness. If selfishness is right, as some pretend, then this is a very *holy* world—as holy as Paradise—as holy as heaven. But if selfishness is in its nature wrong, then this is a very *sinful* world. It will depend on the views to be taken of selfishness, not only whether men are entirely depraved, but whether they are depraved at all. That they are naturally and universally selfish, there can be no doubt; and now if selfishness is a virtue, it is idle to talk about the depravity of men. If selfishness is a virtue, not the angels in heaven are more uniformly virtuous, than we are in this lower world. But if selfishness is sinful, it is not enough to say that we are partially depraved, we are entirely so. If selfishness is sinful, then the strong representa-

tions of Scripture respecting the sinfulness of unsanctified men are fully justified. Their hearts are *full* of evil, and *fully set* in them to do evil. Every imagination and thought of their selfish hearts are *only evil*, and *that continually*.

In order to determine, then, the bearing of the great fact which has been established—the universal selfishness of men—upon the question of their native character, it is indispensable that a previous question be settled. *Is selfishness right, or wrong? Is it holy, or is it sinful?*

In answer to these inquiries, I think it may be clearly shown, that selfishness, in its very nature—in all its forms and degrees—is sinful.

1. Selfishness is sinful, in the first place, because it is *unreasonable*. What is there in this little *self*, to entitle it to supreme regard? Am *I* more worthy of love than God, and than all other beings, that I should love myself more than all? Is my little private interest of more consequence than the interests of Christ's kingdom, and of the universe, that I should pursue it as an ultimate good?—Every selfish affection is obviously *unreasonable*; and of course sinful. It is loving a very little object more than one of infinite magnitude. It is esteeming, valuing a mere trifle, beyond the interests of the universe.

2. Selfishness is sinful, because it is uniformly condemned by the *enlightened conscience*. Though an affection which every person naturally cherishes, it is one (when called by the right name, and seen in its true colors) which no person in conscience can approve. It is one of which every man is ashamed, and which his feelings prompt him to conceal.—How do we regard manifest selfishness in our neighbors, and in those with whom we have intercourse? Do we think of them the better for it, or the worse? Do we approve and esteem them the more, or the less? But as much as we despise selfishness in our neighbors, so much do they despise it in us; and so much should we despise and condemn it in ourselves, were it not for the influence of this very selfishness, in searing our consciences and hardening our hearts.

3. Selfishness is sinful, because it is condemned in *the Scriptures*. “We that are strong,” says the Apostle, “ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and *not to please ourselves*,” in other words, we ought not to be selfish. “Christ died for all, that they which live should live no longer *unto themselves*,” or which is the same, that they should be no longer selfish. The oft repeated command to *deny ourselves*, is an express prohibition of selfishness. It is noticed by Paul

as among the deplorable characteristics of the last days, that men shall be "lovers of their own selves."

4. Selfishness is sinful, because it is directly opposed to the *example of Christ*. Was Christ selfish? Some, indeed, have said that he was; and in proof of it have quoted the representation of the Apostle, that it was for *the joy that was set before him*, that he endured the cross. But what was this joy that was set before Christ? Was it a selfish, or a benevolent joy? Was it the joy of seeing his own private interest promoted? Or the joy of seeing his Father glorified, and the happiness of the universe increased, and myriads of lost souls redeemed from death, in consequence of his sufferings? Let any one contemplate the example of Christ, from the moment when he engaged in the work of our redemption to his final ascension into heaven;—see him who was rich, for our sakes becoming poor, that we through his poverty might be rich;—see him who was in the form of God, and thought it no robbery to be equal with God, voluntarily taking upon himself the form of a servant, and humbling himself and becoming obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;—and say, if his whole example is not one continued and most illustrious exhibition of disinterested love—a continued reproof and condemnation of every form and degree of selfishness.

5. Selfishness is sinful, because it is directly opposed to the *law of God*. This law requires, that we love God with all the heart; but the selfish person loves himself with all the heart. This law also requires, that we love our neighbor as ourselves; but the selfish person loves himself more than his neighbor, and more than all other beings. The Divine law requires, that whether we eat, or drink, or whatever we do, all should be done to the glory of God; but whatever the selfish person does is done with a supreme regard to his own private interest and happiness. The contrariety of selfishness to the law of God, is direct and palpable. It cannot but be perceived by all who have any conception of what the Divine law requires. But is not an affection, which is directly contrary to the law of God, sinful? What is sin, but a transgression of the Divine law?

6. Selfishness is sinful, because its tendency, when unrestrained, is to spread disorder, confusion, and misery, throughout the universe.—Holy love,—which fixes supremely on God, and impartially on the creatures of God, in proportion to their worthiness, serves to unite, as with a golden chain and in a most blessed union, all intelligent beings. It binds them together in one harmonious and happy commu-

nity, each sympathizing with every other, and loving all around him as himself.—But selfishness is directly the opposite of this holy love. It is a principle of disunion, disorganization, and confusion. It separates every one from his fellow, and influences each to set up for himself, in opposition to all the rest. It creates as many centres of attraction, as many separate interests, as there are individuals under its control; and prompts each to take care of himself, whatever may become of those around him. Now it is easy to see that a principle such as this tends necessarily to division, confusion, and misery. It leads to wars and fightings among nations; and to the indulgence of every vice, and to the perpetration of all manner of crimes, among individuals. It is ambition; it is avarice; it is envy, malice, and revenge. Indeed, there is no sin or vice which does not originate in selfishness, and which does not partake of the nature of this base affection. Surely, then, the *least* that can be said of selfishness is, that it is *always sinful*. In every instance—in all its forms and degrees—it is sinful and abominable in the sight of a holy God.

But I have before shown, (what is generally admitted) that men are naturally and universally selfish. How then is the conclusion to be resisted, that they are *naturally and universally sinful*.

This, I well know, is a disputed proposition. It presents, also, a humbling and melancholy view of the human character. But it is no more melancholy than true. That we are all naturally selfish beings, no one can deny. And certainly we are as sinful as we are selfish; for all selfishness is sin. Who then can deny that mankind, in a state of nature, are "*dead in trespasses and sins?*" Who can be ignorant or insensible of this humbling fact, in relation to his own character?

The best and only way to convince persons of their great sinfulness, is to explain the subject, and *show them what sin is*. We may silence them from the Bible; that is, if they will receive the Bible in its plain and obvious import. But we wish to do something more than silence them. We wish to convince them; to satisfy them; and to leave an impression of their sinfulness on their hearts. And in order to this, we must *tell them what sin is*, and make it so plain that they cannot mistake it. And this is what I have endeavored, in the previous pages, to do. My readers all know that they are naturally selfish beings. When you look back upon the past current of your affections, you see how they have been perpetually flowing in the channel of selfishness. But every selfish

affection that you have ever indulged is wholly sinful. Every such affection is a transgression of God's law, and renders you odious and guilty in his sight. How then can you suffer yourselves to dream of the native innocence and purity of your characters? How can any one say, with the Jews of old, "*I have not sinned* ; and therefore his anger shall turn away from me."

The doctrine of the entire natural depravity of the human heart is one requiring to be much insisted on, and to be firmly established. It is *fundamental*, among the doctrines of grace ; and yet it is so contrary to the common apprehensions of thoughtless, careless sinners, and so revolting to their pride, that they will disbelieve and reject it as long as possible.

The views which persons entertain respecting their natural character and state, will have a controlling influence upon their *faith*, and upon all their religious course and prospects. Let a person adopt the conclusion, and become settled in it, that he is naturally good—as good almost as he wishes to be ; and he feels in no need of a Divine Saviour, and will not long believe that such a Saviour is provided. He feels in no need of an atonement, and will be easily led to deny that an atonement has been made. He feels in no need of a change of heart, and doubts whether such a change is ever experienced. He feels in no need of the sanctifying operations of the Holy Ghost, and does not know that there is any Holy Ghost. He feels in no danger of eternal punishment, and cannot believe that the wicked will be punished, as the Bible represents. He begins with doubting his own depravity, and ends in becoming a thorough going liberalist and sceptic.

The truth is—and I hope it may be impressed on every reader—*we are naturally and entirely depraved beings*. So God assures us in his word ; and the same fact stares upon us, whenever we look out into the world around us, or look inward upon our own hearts. Selfishness stands written in capitals every where ; and all selfishness is sin. And it is important that men *believe* this truth ; and not only so, but that they *feel* it. They must feel that they are sick, before they will apply to the Physician for help. They must feel that they are sinful, self-ruined creatures, before they will go to the Son of God that they may be saved.

---

## THE UNJUST STEWARD.

Luke xvi. 1—8.

The object of our Lord in this parable seems to be principally to inculcate a right use of riches. The parable contains, however, many important suggestions respecting life and duty generally. And the use to be made of it in these remarks, relates wholly to our spiritual condition and the duty which, situated as we are, devolves upon us in relation to our salvation.

The steward is to be regarded as personating man generally. By his lord, may be understood, God our Maker, who is Lord of all. The circumstances of our situation are such as will be named, and the duty devolving on us is such as must unavoidably arise out of the circumstances. The children of this world are all those who are impenitent, particularly the worldly. While by the children of light may be understood all those who are penitent and converted. The steward is called unjust, because, whether we regard the waste he suffered in his master's goods, or the fraud he practised with his lord's creditors, he was evidently in both respects unjust.

The topics which present themselves for particular consideration are,—the similarity between the worldly circumstances of the steward and our spiritual circumstances—the commendation passed on him in view of the course he took when he found himself straitened and in difficulty—and the course we must take to have commendation passed on us, and be received to everlasting habitations.

1. The similarity between the worldly circumstances of the steward and our spiritual circumstances.

(1.) The first point of parallelism between us and the steward is, that as he was a steward, so *we are stewards*.

What is a steward? He is one who manages another's business and is responsible accordingly. Ministers of the Gospel are "stewards of the mysteries of God," because they are "ambassadors for Christ," act under his authority, and conduct the affairs of his church.

Ministers of state are stewards. They are entrusted with the business of government, and have important concerns to transact in which they and others have a deep interest.

In like manner, in the parable of the nobleman who went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, all men are

represented as stewards. "He called his ten servants and delivered unto them ten pounds, and said unto them, 'Occupy till I come.'" In this parable, the nobleman represents our Lord, and the servants his disciples. The commitment of the ten talents to them signifies our being entrusted with our various powers, faculties, blessings and privileges. The whole teaches our obligations, the certainty of our being called to account, and the impartiality, strictness and equity with which we shall be treated.

We therefore are stewards. We are entrusted with various gifts which we hold in trust for our Master's use. We are ourselves these gifts. We are at once the occupiers, and the gifts to be occupied. We have, as we say, immortal minds. That is, we are those minds ourselves. Now, they are the gift of God. He has a perfect right to them. We are his property and not our own. We are instruments—living, animated instruments. Endowed with the power of self-motion, and capable of working ourselves, we are the instruments of his glory.

First, therefore, our *existence*—our simple being, is a trustment which makes us stewards. These faculties and powers by which we are constituted what we are, and which are the gift of God, we are to employ for him. We hold them in trust for God. Our intellects and hearts, our understanding, will and affections are entrusted to us to be exercised for God, and consecrated to his service. Every exercise of every power is pledged beforehand to God, from the fact that he gave that power and requires such an exercise of it as shall be for his glory.

Next, besides our existence—our simple being, the *means and opportunity of cultivating ourselves in the service of God*, are a trustment which makes us stewards. We are active beings in our very nature. Indeed, to act, belongs to us as a necessary attribute of our existence. Activity is, as an essential property of mind, as extension or solidity is of matter. We must think and have our feelings of preference and dislike. To have it otherwise with us would be for us to cease to be what we are—moral agents.—Now in this state God gives us means and opportunities of thinking and feeling, and consequently, of acting as we ought; and this constitutes us stewards in relation to the manner in which we act. As with our faculties so with our means and opportunities of cultivating them, whether they be greater or smaller, we are stewards according to the extent and variety of what is afforded and given us to possess. The whole possession of his bounty, be it more or less, we are to occupy as his stewards; and for every oppor-

tunity of employing it to his honor we are accountable to him, the rightful Proprietor and Lord of all. The unjust steward was bound to a faithful occupancy for his lord, of all committed to his care, and so it is with us—only we have the bountiful and only Lord God for our Lord, while his lord was a man like himself. But he was a steward, and we also are stewards.

(2.) The second point of similarity between us and the steward is, that as he wasted his master's goods, so *we have wasted* our Master's goods. It is to be supposed the steward was competent to his business. The master expected no more than might have been rendered. At least, his interest would have disinclined him to commit more to his steward than he thought might be faithfully superintended and improved. Waste therefore, must have come from neglect or misuse; from want of care and attention. It implies unfaithfulness and criminal disregard to duty.

In this respect the similarity holds between us and the steward. We stand accused with the charge of having wasted our Master's goods. And, whether we regard the employment of our powers and faculties in his service, or that of the bounty he has given us, and the improvement of opportunities afforded us of glorifying his name, we are guilty. Instead of serving God in every exercise as we ought, we have in every exercise come short of his glory and our duty. We have never loved him in a single exercise with "all our heart and mind, and soul and strength, and our neighbor as ourselves." Nor have we employed the means and opportunities of cultivation, whether of ourselves or others, as we ought. We are therefore guilty. Nay, we are not guilty of mere defect and negligence, of carelessness and inattention. These, in relation to God, considering who he is and what he has done for us, would be sufficient. But we have done more. We have not merely neglected to improve as we should what God has given—we have not merely withheld affection and service such as we ought to exercise and render: but we have perverted what he has given, and we have come out in rebellion against him. Every sin is rebellion, and we are sinners. Sin has been justly defined to "be any want of conformity unto, or transgression of, the law of God;" and we we have not only never conformed to it, but constantly transgressed it, notwithstanding the benevolent tendency of obedience, and the high and holy authority with which the law is established. We are guilty, "we are verily guilty."

(3.) A third point of parallelism consists in this, that *we are now no longer considered faithful and trust-worthy, but disloyal and faithless*. Such was evidently the case with the unjust

steward. However honest and worthy of confidence his lord may have regarded him once, he now regards him so no longer. He has detected his unfaithfulness, and found him disappointing his confidence ; till now, at length, he has confidence in him no longer, but regards him as altogether treacherous and deceitful. So it is with us in relation to God. He created man upright, after his own image. He looked upon his work with pleasure, and pronounced it very good. But he does so now no longer. Since the fall, all have strayed, and God treats us now as treacherous and deceitful. He curses the man who trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm. The solemn declaration of his word is, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." He adds also the appealing interrogatory, "Who can know it?" He regards us as having proved ourselves to be destitute of right affection toward him. We have disloyally withheld our service and perversely misapplied his bounty. There is therefore, a parallelism between us and the unjust steward in this respect.

(4.) There remains also a fourth point of parallelism in this, that as the steward was called to an account for his unfaithfulness and perversion, *we also shall be called to an account* in like manner. The master of the steward had probably, detected his dishonesty now of a long time. He had been observing, how his interests were served, whether the steward did his duty or neglected it ; and he had discovered his unfaithfulness.

In like manner, while God looks down to see if there are any that seek after him, he beholds all gone astray, so that in the language of the psalmist "there is none that doeth good, no not one." A report went up to the master of the steward impeaching his character and conduct ; upon which the master said, "How is it that I hear this of thee ? give an account of thy stewardship, for thou mayest be no longer steward." And a report impeaching us has gone up to the throne of the great God our Saviour. He delays casting us out of our stewardship for the present ; but we stand accused before him by his holy word. He waits our repentance and better conduct, that, if recovered and proved faithful, he may, advance us by and by to a station nearer to himself ; but sooner or later, if we do not repent and believe in Christ, the summons will come, "Give an account of thy stewardship, for thou mayest be no longer steward." It is appointed unto all men once to die, but after death the judgement. For we shall all stand before the judgement-seat of Christ, that every one may receive according to the deeds done in the body, whether they be good or whether they be evil.

(5.) There is one point more, fifthly, to be considered, which is, that, *being called to give an account of ourselves we must unavoidably find ourselves straitened and in difficulty.* We need but a slight acquaintance with ourselves to know that we are chargeable with guilt in the sight of God. We may turn away our eye from it—in the thoughtlessness and vanity of sin, we may flatter ourselves with our own deceivings till our iniquity be found hateful, but we can never look candidly and impartially at the truth respecting us, and not discover that we are undone. As often as, and, whenever we are brought upon the subject of our account as stewards of the gifts and bounties of God, we find ourselves straitened. We may be brought to this moreover in various ways and at any time. There is no certain tranquility for the sinner a single day. As in the changing weather of the season, a storm may be near at hand, while he thinks himself most secure. The sea now calm may soon be thrown into billows mountain high, and this is an image which God employs to represent the wicked. “The wicked are like the troubled sea which cannot rest whose waters cast up mire and dirt.” From the very nature of our situation and circumstances we are exposed to apprehension and disquietude every moment of our lives, till we believe in Christ. We have a power of mind which looks behind, around and before us; and we stand guilty at the bar of God in the light of our own consciousness. Through consciousness and memory we are personally the same. We have continued conscious existence. We recall the past, and, though it be what we cannot but disapprove and condemn, we cannot but recognize it as our own. *We* are the persons who have done it. Nor can we, when we look around and reflect on what we are, throw off, as though it were not our own, that mass of evil which attaches to us. When we look up to God and forward to the judgement, it is impossible, if we are candid and impartial, not to carry along with us a consciousness of being lost and ruined by sin. Like the steward we are conscious of what we have done. We know we have sinned. We are aware it must come to light; and the consequences, if not prevented by faith and repentance, we know must be fatal. Like the steward therefore we are in trouble. Something must be done, and the more we look at our case the more we see it is critical and dangerous.

2. But this brings us to the course adopted by the steward, and to the second general particular proposed,—the commendation passed on him in view of the course he took.

The steward doubtless knew long before others what he had done. He was conscious of every step he had taken and how

long he had been preparing for the opening result. He anticipated the disclosure of his unfaithfulness and foresaw the effect of it on his credit, character and happiness. He felt the approach of an urgent crisis in his circumstances ; nor did he, till he thought of the expedient he adopted, know what to do. In this state he reflected on his condition, till at last in desperation, he meditates further dishonesty and resolves what to do.

The expedient adopted by the steward was to draw in his lord's debtors as accomplices in fraud ; and so, at his lord's expense, confer an obligation on them to favor him. In this way he would have them in his power, and in case of their refusal to assist him he could inform against them to the ruin of their estates and their reputation ; while he himself, as one in desperate circumstances, would have nothing to lose. This was the expedient for the adoption of which he received the commendation mentioned in the text.

In view of this statement of the course pursued by the steward we come now to consider the commendation passed upon him. And the lord commended the unjust steward.

I may be mistaken, but in the reading of this passage, and more especially in the use of it as commonly quoted in religious conversation, I believe it is understood by many to be the language of Christ. But it deserves here to be distinctly stated, that this is not the language of Christ. It is Christ who is relating the parable to his disciples, and this is what he says not of himself but of the lord of the steward of whom he was speaking. This circumstance alone, to a person who reads the passage with the least attention to this particular, is enough to show that this commendation is the commendation not of Christ but of the temporal lord of the steward. It was he who commended him in his fraud and not the Saviour.

Besides, it is not necessary at all to suppose that even this temporal lord of the steward approved his fraudulent proceedings. He could not have approved of them ; for as a man who loved and favored his own interest as all men always do, he must have felt the loss thus fraudulently occasioned him. The commendation therefore is not to be understood to go in any form or degree towards an approval of the conduct of the steward in relation to his duty. It was on the other hand the height of dishonesty and wickedness in him to do as he did.

But the course he took was calculated to secure a provision for himself, and this is the light in which we are to regard his master as commending him. It was for his policy and prudence in relation to temporal support, and not for his discharge of duty in the thing, that his lord commended him for what

he had done. The testimony is, because he had done *wisely*, (*φρονιμως*) not *justly*, (*δικαιως*.) The serpent has wisdom, but we are not recommended to serpents as patterns of goodness. No more is the conduct of this steward set forth for our imitation, except as it embraced a plan, which, without regard to right or wrong any way, was well calculated to secure a desirable object, namely, his support—and surely for this it was a most admirable plan, deserving commendation. The case implies forethought and calculation. The man may have been thought weak and foolish,—and in relation to his duty and the favor of God, which he ought to have prized above all price, he was foolish in doing as he did. It may have been mere indiscretion which first embarrassed him, and even now had he thrown himself with all frankness upon the generosity of his lord, all would have pitied him as unfortunate, though such was not his course. But the course he took, though dark in guilt, is yet no proof of inability or weakness. Keeping simply the end in view it was a course fraught with wisdom. As I said, it implies forethought and calculation. There was a knowledge of what would soon take place and an admission of the truth respecting his circumstances. There was a deep conviction that something must be done and done immediately—without delay. No time must be lost. Write ‘quickly’ said he to the creditors. He feared he might be removed before he should accomplish his design. There was a clear inspection of things, and a careful examination of what was wanting to secure his object. In all these respects therefore the conduct of the unjust steward is worthy of commendation and imitation; for these things in the case are what is consistent with duty in a case where all is honest and the highest interests are at stake, even the salvation of the soul.

3. I come now then to the third general particular, the course we must take to have commendation passed on us and be received to everlasting habitations.

The steward meant, as has been suggested, to lay his lord’s creditors under obligation, that, when dismissed from the stewardship, he might find an asylum in their families, and live at their table; and from this Christ inculcates the duty of using liberally what we have, in ways of benevolence and gratuity, that in the changing scenes of life, should we ever come to want, as all are liable to, we might find friends to help us whom we had helped before. This moreover is an important item of instruction on the ground even of common expediency, not to speak of it as a religious duty. The Lord loveth a cheerful giver. “He that giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord.” And

we are exhorted to give with the assurance that it shall be returned unto us, good measure, pressed down and running over.

We know, however, heaven is not to be bought by any sacrifices we may make, since entrance there has been opened only through the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without spot.

It is therefore, in a higher and more spiritual sense that I would speak of the course we must take in order to have commendation passed on us, and be received into everlasting habitations.

Let it be presupposed that we have a knowledge of Christ within our reach, and what has been mentioned as implied in the case of the steward, points out our course almost to perfection. As has appeared, there was a clear inspection of things, and a careful examination of what was wanting in the case. This therefore is one thing, and the first thing in our course. We are to examine what our state is, and get a clear view of the truth of God respecting us. We must examine impartially and thoroughly. If the steward had flattered himself all the time that he had property enough yet; or, had he disbelieved the hour of trial and distress would come, he never would have taken any steps for his security: and it was the consequence, apparently, of a thorough examination of his case that he was led to the expedient he adopted. So with us, unless we carefully examine and ascertain what we need, we never shall go the way we ought to go. We must be brought to a solemn stand, and to a careful inspection of our state.

Next, we must admit the truth, though it cut us to the heart. It was humiliating to the steward to learn his needy state, and so it will be to us to learn how needy and perishing we are; but we must submit, notwithstanding. Though it cut off all our hopes and lay us low in the dust, close down by the borders of despair, just on the brink of the pit, we must admit the truth. Then we shall chance to be moved. When we come to see our bankruptcy and ruin, then, by the blessing of the Holy Spirit, we shall feel.

But we must farther become convinced of what is so soon to take place, and how if we repent not, we shall be left houseless and friendless, when turned out of our stewardship. O, that hour when it shall be said, "give an account of thy stewardship, for thou mayest be no longer steward." When we shall be called to give account of the manner in which we have occupied as stewards—when our unfaithfulness shall be exposed beyond our power to conceal it—when the anxieties and fears and apprehensions of trial shall come upon us: Then, O

then, who will not wish to have made some provision for the extremities of his situation.

But, consider here, you cannot take the course of fraudulency with God. "Be not deceived. God is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." If you would take the course to secure commendation and be received into everlasting habitations, the case of the steward will be of no use in this view of your situation. You have the omniscient God to deal with, and none can deceive him. If you would take the course, therefore, which secures his approbation, you must take the way of the Lord, cast up for the righteous, on which "the ransomed of the Lord return with singing and everlasting joy, and gladness on their heads;" the way appointed by his own infinite wisdom and goodness. You must come out in the open acknowledgment of your guilt, and the renunciation of all your abominations. There must be no reservation, and no reluctance. The sentiment of your heart must be, "To God belongeth righteousness; but to us confusion of face."

And one thing more which the case of the steward inculcates. There must be an experience of this sentiment, "The time is short." You must feel the pressure of a great crisis in your moral state; you may have been sensible a long time that you are sinners before God; but you must come to feel that you are in complete bankruptcy, owing ten thousand talents, and having nothing to pay. And whereas you may have thought to avoid the distress of your situation, in one way and another not appointed of God, you must feel that now all your refuges of lies are swept away, and you left at last to the simple way of God's appointment through Jesus Christ. In this view, with the Lord Jesus Christ full before you, lifted up like the serpent in the wilderness, as an object of faith for your dying soul; you must come, under the urgency of the case, to feel, like the steward, that something must be done, and done immediately. In this way close with the Redeemer, as the Saviour of the lost, and you shall do more wisely than the steward, receive an unqualified commendation, and be admitted into everlasting habitations, even the mansions prepared before the foundation of the world.

## REVIEWS.

MEMOIRS OF AMERICAN MISSIONARIES, *formerly connected with the Society of Inquiry respecting Missions, in the Andover Theological Seminary: embracing a History of the Society, &c.,—with an Introductory Essay, by LEONARD WOODS, D. D. Published under the Direction of the Society.*—Boston: Published by Peirce & Parker, No. 9, Cornhill. 1833. pp. 367.

Perhaps we owe an apology to our readers for our delay in noticing this interesting little volume. At its first appearance we gave it a hearty welcome, and we take this opportunity to express our thanks to the Society under whose direction it was published, for so valuable a contribution to the missionary literature of our country. We had long felt that something was needed to make our churches better acquainted with the character and labors of our missionaries, and the publication of this volume affords the means at least of the better acquaintance desired. Several of these devoted servants of Christ have already entered into rest. The majority of them however, are still bearing the burden and heat of the day. And though the former have passed beyond the influence of praise or blame, or even the prayers of Christians, the latter have an undeniable claim to their tenderest sympathies and most fervent supplications in their behalf.

It is a well known fact in human nature, that in order to feel a deep interest in any enterprize, we must be acquainted with at least its most distinguished actors and with many particulars of its history. Oftentimes from a personal knowledge of an individual who is reported in the public papers as having taken part in the proceedings of some political and religious assembly in a distant part of the land, we are induced to go through all the detail of the account given of the meeting; thus becoming absorbed in a subject to which we should otherwise have been entirely indifferent. Who does not feel a deeper interest in the Slavery Question, from his knowledge of the character and exertions of men like Clarkson and Wilberforce? Who that is acquainted with individual missionaries, now toiling in the wilds of Asia, does not feel a peculiar solicitude for the success of Asiatic missions?

It has not yet been found an easy matter in modern times

to secure sufficient attention on the part of Christians, to the subject of missions. In this respect the churches of our own day differ widely from those planted by the apostles and their immediate successors. In the primitive ages of Christianity, the spirit of missions was deemed one of the same with the spirit of the Gospel. To forget the heathen was to forfeit all just pretensions to a personal interest in the great salvation. This apostolic touchstone of Christian zeal was at length lost—the spirit of missions departed. While it lay buried in the dark rubbish of the Middle Ages, Christianity not only gave over farther conquests, but retired from many a field she had won, and almost from the earth. The tests and badges of genuine piety become as numerous and whimsical as the errant fancies of bewildered mind could make them; and when the dawn of the Reformation began to rise, slowly did the Church return to any thing like the apostolic mode of thinking and judging in regard to the nature and extent of Christian duty. The simple-hearted, praying Moravian at last caught a portion of the primeval missionary spirit. He loved it—cherished it, and obeyed its benevolent dictates. His humble example was the breath of new life to the Church. From that time to the present, the claims of missions have been taking stronger hold upon the conscience and benevolence of Christians. Missionary intelligence has begun to be scattered as on the wings of the wind, and the heart of the Christian community to beat high at the prospect of speedily evangelizing the world. Still there is a lamentable degree of ignorance and criminal apathy on this subject, in many of the American churches. There are churches in New England, that while they observe the Monthly Concert in imitation of their better informed neighbors, are as ignorant of the number, stations, and labors of our foreign missionaries, as of the number, posts and trials of the individual tithing-men in Ireland. Painful facts on this subject have recently come to our knowledge, which we would fain disbelieve, but cannot, though we forbear being more particular.

Much has been said of the Moral Dignity of the missionary enterprize. And surely no work ever undertaken by men can in this respect challenge so high honor to itself. It is grand beyond conception. The conquests of Alexander, the extension of Roman dominion through the world, and the all grasping plans and fearful achievements of Europe's late tormentor, dwindle into insignificance, when compared with the sublime purpose and approaching result of missionary movements. The object of this enterprize is the moral and intellectual reno-

vation of the whole pagan world, and the ennobling subjugation of every tribe and family of man, to the righteous dominion of the Saviour. It aims not simply at improvement, but at the highest practicable perfection in the condition of all mankind. It is hard, however, to bring the popular mind to any thing like a tolerable examination of this great scheme of pious benevolence. Vast multitudes of professing Christians feel as little concern for the heathen as for the inhabitants of a distant planet. They think less of the temporal degradation and hastening perdition of six hundred millions of beings, endued with like faculties and susceptibilities as themselves, than of some trifling matter of personal or national interest. In time of war, every individual is eager for all existing intelligence respecting the condition and success of his country's forces and the probable issue of the contest. He watches every movement and stratagem of the enemy. His eyes and ears are to catch every particle of flying information. The nation knows the names and stations of all the principal officers and the comparative importance of the several military posts. The discharge of a gun on the frontiers, is echoed by a thousand continuous voices, to the remotest parts of the land; and the capture or loss of a fort is matter of national gratulation or regret.

Now we wish the entire Christian community in every Christian land, but particularly in our own, to feel a like pervading interest in the missionary enterprize. We wish them to possess an equal amount of correct, definite information, on a like number of particulars respecting it. They owe it to themselves and to the world to be familiarly acquainted with its past history, present attitude, and future prospects. Without such knowledge, they will never act the part which duty imperiously requires. They can neither labor nor pray effectually for the success of an undertaking of which they know little or nothing. In order to act, they must feel,—in order to feel, they must know.

How then shall the Church be brought to a better acquaintance with the whole subject of Christian missions, and as a consequence, to more correct views and a deeper sense of her duty to the heathen world? By what means shall the requisite light be thrown upon the mind, and the proper amount and intensity of emotion be excited in the hearts, of those to whom the missionary enterprize must look for support? We answer, by the conjoined instrumentality of the living ministry and the press. Ministers must give the subject of missions a prominent place in their regular public exercises. They must labor

to press to the centre of every Christian's conscience, the pungent, agitating conviction, that the heathen are now perishing for want of the Gospel. They must enforce the indispensable duty of every follower of the Saviour to come up to the help of the Lord against the might of pagan superstition. The question of personal duty and the obligation of individual churches to marshal themselves for instant attack upon the powers of darkness in foreign lands, should be frequently and pointedly discussed. The practicability of subverting the giant fabrics of idolatry or converting them into temples of the living God, should be demonstrated from the unexampled success of missions and the sure promises of Jehovah. The miserly Christian, if indeed there can be such a Christian, must be made to feel that his hoarded gold and silver will one day eat his flesh, as it were fire. Nor should the preacher think he has done enough when he has merely made his people sensible of their obligation to contribute of their property to the support of missions. He must strive to excite in them a spirit of prayer for the success of the means employed for the speedy renovation of the world. When Christians love to wrestle at the throne of grace for the conversion of the pagan nations, then their benefactions will be greatest and most acceptable, and their efforts most direct and effectual. The cause of religion at home will also derive unwonted vigor from this fervent zeal for the universal spread of the Gospel. When the fountains of Christian benevolence in the heart are once opened, they send forth perennial streams in every direction. So long as the early Christian Church was intent on making inroads into the empire of heathen darkness, her own domestic altars glowed with a living flame of pure devotion. An ardent love for the souls of distant millions is like the sun at the meridian, which, while it sheds a benign influence over all the earth, pours its rays with burning intensity upon the objects more immediately within its power.

We repeat then, that it lies principally with ministers to awaken and keep alive a missionary spirit in our churches. The trumpet is in their hands,—they must give the sound. They are placed upon a watch-tower from which they are expected to survey the desolations of the earth and give the people warning, when and how they shall aid in turning these desolations into the garden of the Lord. It is the voice of the living preacher, that must summon the host of God's elect to this glorious war of extermination against all superstition and idolatry.

But while the pulpit is to arouse Christians to a sense of their duty and responsibility in respect to missions, the press

is to furnish them with the more extended necessary information respecting the stations and the missionaries demanding their prayers and their support.

A true knowledge of the real nature and results of missionary operations, has hitherto been communicated principally through the biographies of devoted servants of Christ, who have been called at different times from their labors among the heathen to the rewards of a better world. The lives of Swartz and Martyn, of Brainerd and Elliot, of Mills and Fisk, and a few others, have done more for the vindication of the missionary enterprize in the eyes of worldly men, and the diffusion of correct intelligence concerning it among Christians, than perhaps all other means together. But the voice of these men was not heard through their memoirs till having closed their mortal career, they had ceased to need the prayers and co-operation of their fellow Christians. Though dead, they indeed call loudly on all believers to labor for the advancement of the work for which they thought it their privilege to live, and in which they died; but their exhortations are less arousing than though they came directly from living laborers soliciting for themselves and their immediate co-workers, the prayers, sympathies, and pecuniary assistance of those who love the Saviour. When a missionary is removed from the scene of his earthly labors, many among the friends of missions, are disposed to feel a kind of discouragement and dejection very unfavorable to prompt and determined effort. They seem to take it for granted that the good cause which has been advancing so steadily must for awhile be measurably retarded. A little less immediate exertion, they therefore suppose is required of them. When the time shall come for a new effort they will not be backward. Now these contributors to the support of missions, ought to know that when a missionary dies, or a missionary printing house is burned, or any other disaster befalls a mission, their assistance is more especially needed. The work must never stop nor be retarded, but be urged on.—The biography of a living missionary, or an appeal from him comes in many respects under more advantageous circumstances and with greater power, than that of a deceased laborer. The reader feels that the subject of the memoir or author of the appeal, is still flesh and blood and entitled to the strongest affection of Christian fellowship. He may be personally in need of aid—his mission may want to extend the sphere of its operations, for which additional resources are necessary; the claim cannot be resisted or set aside; it presses for help without delay, and assistance can hardly be withheld. Is this servant of our common Lord, thus

toiling and suffering for his Master's honor, and shall I not pray for him and lend him all the aid in my power? is an inquiry that will often thrust itself into the reader's mind and arouse all the pious energies of his soul. It will kindle into a glow of religious fervor that can hardly expend itself in vain. It will transport him to scenes of action where the self-denying missionary with whose station and wishes he has thus been made acquainted, is laboring, and open his eyes to the most eligible means of helping him forward in his work.

From the foregoing considerations and several others which we cannot here present, we regard the appearance of the volume placed at the head of this article as highly favorable to the cause of foreign missions among us. It is to every reader a letter of introduction to all the living missionaries whose memoirs it contains. It brings him as it were to a personal acquaintance with one and another, of whom, before, he has hardly heard, but whose hands as a disciple of the same Lord, he is bound to uphold by prayer and appropriate effort. It gives him in a condensed form a variety of just such information as is adapted to awaken and increase an interest in the great and advancing enterprise of converting the world.

The history of the Society to which the public are indebted for this volume, is full of interest. It discloses some interesting facts connected with the incipient stages of several great schemes of benevolence which have spread themselves over the land and changed the aspect of society. It shows the point in the religious thermometer at which the zeal of the Christian community stood a little more than twenty years ago. To one who has not himself been borne along and changed with the times, the change which has taken place in our churches during this period, must appear great and encouraging.

The Society of Inquiry was formed in Jan. 1811. It owed its origin to the promptings of religious benevolence in the hearts of some young men then students of Theology in the Theological Seminary at Andover. The motives which led to its formation, are briefly stated in the preamble of the Constitution, which is as follows: "Feeling the importance of a more extensive acquaintance with the subject of Missions to enable us to ascertain our duty, and prepare us to promote the glory of our Redeemer and the eternal happiness of our fellow men; we, the undersigned, looking to our Heavenly Father for direction, do form ourselves into a Society, and adopt the following Constitution." The spirit and tenor of the Constitution may be easily inferred from this preamble. Samuel Nott and Samuel J. Mills were the first who signed the Constitution.

As early as June, 1810, several members of the Seminary had come to the determination of spending their lives in heathen lands. There was, however, no missionary society in this country, to which they could look for direction and support. In this exigency they applied to their fathers in the church for advice. At a meeting of the General Association of Massachusetts, held at Bradford, June 10, 1810, the following paper written by Mr. Judson, was presented.

“ ‘ The undersigned, members of the Divinity College, respectfully request the attention of their reverend fathers, convened in the General Association at Bradford, to the following statement and inquiries :

“ ‘ They beg leave to state, that their minds have been long impressed with the duty and importance of personally attempting a mission to the heathen ; that the impressions on their minds have induced a serious, and they trust a prayerful consideration of the subject in its various attitudes, particularly in relation to the probable success, and the difficulties attending such an attempt ; and that after examining all the information which they can obtain, they consider themselves as devoted to this work for life, whenever God in his providence, shall open the way.

“ ‘ They now offer the following inquiries, on which they solicit the opinion and advice of this Association. Whether, with their present views and feelings, they ought to renounce the object of Missions as visionary or impracticable ; if not, whether they ought to direct their attention to the eastern or the western world ; whether they may expect patronage and support from a Missionary Society in this country, or must commit themselves to the direction of a European Society ; and what preparatory measures they ought to take previous to actual engagement ?

“ ‘ The undersigned, feeling their youth and inexperience, look up to their fathers in the church, and respectfully solicit their advice, direction, and prayers.

ADONIRAM JUDSON,  
SAMUEL NOTT,  
SAMUEL J. MILLS,  
SAMUEL NEWELL.’

“ This document occasioned the appointment of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.”

The formation of a general Bible Society for the United States, was the subject of a discussion before the Society, in Nov. 1813 ; and a dissertation on the same subject was read about the same time. This was about two and a half years before the American Bible Society was formed. At a meeting in March, 1814, a Committee was appointed “ to lay before the Professors of the Seminary information relative to the formation of a Bible Society for the United States, and request them to write to gentlemen in the middle states on the subject.”

The Society of Inquiry has from the beginning taken a lively interest in the condition of the colored population in our country. In 1816, previously to the formation of the American Colonization Society, one of its members read a dissertation on the subject. In 1817, Mr. Mills who was then at Washington exerting all his influence and rendering his unremitting services in favor of the American Colonization Society, recommended

the formation of a Colonization Society in the Andover Seminary. For a number of years a Committee on Colonization has been one of the four standing committees of the Society of Inquiry.

We would remark in passing, that the assertion which has of late been vociferated through New England, that the American Colonization Society was originated by slaveholders and enemies to the freedom of the blacks, is without any foundation in fact. No man was more active in the conception of the plan and the formation of that society, than Samuel J. Mills. If he was a friend to slavery in any of its forms, bodily or intellectual, we have yet to learn the fact. He beheld in the efforts then made for colonizing free people of color, to use his own words, "*a mighty movement of Divine Providence.*" His benevolent heart exulted in view of the great and good work which he believed the Colonization Society destined to accomplish. He prayed for its success—he was confident that Heaven would smile on the plan. How different the views and feelings of this foreseeing Christian philanthropist, from those of such men as tell us the scheme of colonization was conceived in the bottomless pit. If infatuation were not so fashionable in our day, we should be constrained to question the motives of those who give the credit of so much true wisdom and real benevolence to his Infernal Majesty. Believing fully, however, in the doctrine of human infirmity as well as peccability, we will be as charitable as we can. The heads of good men may be turned, and their sincerity only attest their infatuation.

We wish the object, principles, and tendency of the Colonization system to be well understood. We would have the whole subject canvassed with the most searching scrutiny and strictest impartiality. In the present state of the world, it rightly comes in for no small share of the discussion and investigation of a society like that for Inquiry respecting Missions, whose ultimate object is nothing less than the universal emancipation of every human sufferer from every species of degradation, moral, intellectual, and physical, voluntary, or involuntary. Africa, has high and imperative claims on the friends of missions, and too seldom as yet has the eye of Christian benevolence been turned upon her dark moral wastes. While the trumpet of the Gospel is beginning, though faintly, to be heard along the coasts and interior of Asia, this wide extended and ill-fated country with scarcely an exception has never heard a whisper of the way of salvation by the cross of Christ. Her mountains have never echoed to the sounds of prayer and praise; her sky has never been pierced by the acclamations of

Christian triumph; spiritual or intellectual light, she has none;—her land is a land of darkness, her region the shadow of death.

We are strong in the conviction that the light of Christianity must be diffused over Africa by means of colonies. The colony at Liberia is now the radiating point of moral influence to all the adjacent country. A number of such settlements along the coast, might be easily made to serve the double office of radiators and reflectors, by which the light of true religion might be thrown far into the darkness of the interior. We subjoin a paragraph from a Report on Colonization, contained in our volume.

“Hitherto the extension of civilization, and, since Christianity was established in the Roman Empire, the extension of Christianity, has been almost exclusively by colonies. Whence came the civilization of Greece? It was brought by colonies from Egypt. How was Italy civilized? By colonies from Greece. How was Europe civilized? By the Roman military colonies. Whence came the civilization of America? And is not that universal spirit of improvement which is springing up in Hindoostan occasioned, more or less directly, by the British conquests there, which have poured in thousands of Englishmen, who are in effect colonizing India? Two centuries hence, the little band who are now cultivating their fields and building their houses at Montserado, and spreading over the wilderness around them a strange aspect of life and beauty, may be remembered by the thousands of their descendants, with the same emotions with which the little band who landed at Plymouth two centuries ago, are now remembered by the thousands of New England. We do not fear to say, that to the friends of missions, the Colonization Society presents a loud and imperative claim. The advantage of the Moravian missions and of the modern missionary establishments in savage countries, is, that they are in substance, little colonies. If you could carry from this country to the Sandwich Islands a thousand civilized and educated natives, would you not think you had done much for Hawaii? This is what can be done, and must be done, for Africa.”

We hope at some time not far distant, to know the view which the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions take of this subject. No other body of men in our country can so well judge of the nature and extent of the connexion, if there be one, between the cause of African Colonization and African missions. Should they see fit to favor the public with an avowal or their convictions on this point, accompanied by the reasons that have led to them, it would, we believe, do much towards settling the question which is already agitating and distracting some of our churches, Whether the American Colonization Society is to be regarded as the friend and coadjutor of Christian Missions in Africa? For ourselves we are willing to submit the decision of such a question to such men. Their information on kindred topics, their sound judgement, their habits of investigation, and their disinterestedness would constrain us to submit to their arbitration. We would not, however, have them say a word on the subject to hazard their

being thought partizans in favor of Colonization on the one hand, or immediate unlimited emancipation on the other.

In bringing this article to a close, we subjoin a brief analysis of the work under review. After the introductory essay, it is divided into four parts,—the first containing an historical sketch of the Society and its several committees; the second, brief notices of those members of the Society, who have gone as missionaries to foreign lands or to the American Indians; the third, the correspondence of the Society with the Rev. Dr. Burder, of England, and the most distinguished foreign missionaries who have been connected with it; and the fourth, dissertations on various important subjects, read before the Society. The Appendix gives an account of the Constitution and By-laws of the Society, a Catalogue of its members, a notice of its Library and books published, and a description of its Museum. Parts III and IV, contain a variety of interesting and useful matter. The subjects of the correspondence and dissertations are practical and important. They are also ably treated.

We will only add that we wish for this volume a rapid and general circulation through our country. It is an appropriate manual for the parlor of every Christian family. Its influence in quickening a spirit of Missions, will, we doubt not, be considerable.

---

UNITARIAN TRACT, No. 18. ‘*The evidence necessary to establish the doctrine of the Trinity.*’

This Pamphlet is from the pen of the late Rev. Samuel Cooper Thatcher of Boston, and has been twice published, previous to its appearance as a Tract.\* The argument of the writer may be stated in few words. “There is,” says he, “*a priori*, a strong presumption against any proposition which apparently interferes with the doctrine of the unity of God.” “The doctrine of the Trinity is *apparently* inconsistent with the unity of God.” Hence “there is a very high probability, a strong previous presumption,” that the doctrine of the Trinity “will not be found” in the Scriptures. “A student of the Bible is bound to take it for granted that it is not there, till it is proved that it undoubtedly is; he must conclude it to be false,

\* In the Appendix to the American Edition of Yates’ Reply to Wardlaw; and at the end of the volume of Mr. Thatcher’s Sermons, printed after his death.

till it is fully and clearly demonstrated to be true. Every thing must be presumed against its evidence, and nothing in its favor. It will prove nothing for such a doctrine, that passages can be produced, which may possibly mean something like it, unless it can be unequivocally shown, that *they cannot possibly mean any thing else.*"

This reasoning, it will be seen, has no connexion with the Scriptures, except as it is intended to prepare the mind for the study of them. And the amount of it is, that we must come to the Bible with "a strong presumption" that the doctrine of the Trinity is not there. We must come to the Bible under the impression, that this doctrine contradicts some of the plainest principles of the religion of nature—that it is incredible and absurd—and that nothing but a frequency and force of Scripture declaration which "cannot possibly mean any thing else," shall ever induce us to embrace it.

This, then, we are authorized to say, is the manner in which Unitarians read and study the Bible,—and in which they recommend the study of it to others. Instead of going to the sacred word without bias, without prejudice, and for the simple childlike purpose of learning and receiving whatever the Lord our God shall say; it is here gravely inculcated, that we should go to the Scriptures with a fixed prejudice against certain doctrines—with "a strong presumption" that they are not true, and of course not revealed—and with a determination not to discover or embrace them, if we can possibly avoid it. No passages shall convince us of the truth of these doctrines, "unless it can be unequivocally shown, that *they cannot possibly mean any thing else.*"

But coming to the Bible with these "strong presumptions" and inveterate partialities, is it strange that Unitarians do not perceive in it the peculiar doctrines of the Gospel? Is it strange that they can torture it to speak a language conformable to their own prejudices and wishes? Plain language presents no obstacle in the way of such interpreters. Studying the Bible in this way, they may be Unitarians or Universalists, or any thing else, just as their prepossessions lead.

But to return to the argument of the Tract: This argument assumes, in the first place, that the unity of God is *so palpably, undeniably evident from nature*, that "there is a strong presumption against any proposition" which so much as *appears* to interfere with it. But is this true? Is it confirmed by observation and facts? The fact is, that nearly all those, in past and present times, who have been left to the mere light of nature, have been the worshippers of many gods. And it is also

a fact, that not a few under the Gospel have doubted whether the unity of God can be so much as proved from the light of nature. 'The *a priori* argument,' say they, 'has puzzled more than ever it convinced; and the argument *a posteriori* proves little more than unity of *design*, without determining whether this is the design of an individual Being, or of several united and perfectly harmonious Beings ?

We believe most assuredly in the unity of God; but we embrace this doctrine, not so much on the ground of evidence derived from nature, as on the firmer ground of revelation. God has told us, in his word, that he is *one*—a declaration which perfectly harmonizes with the voice of nature, though nature alone might never have proclaimed it in a way to remove the doubts and the scruples of men. God has told us that he is *one*; and it is chiefly on the ground of this repeated and unequivocal declaration, that we embrace, with full assurance, the important doctrine of *the Divine unity*.

But if the Christian embraces the unity of God on the authority rather of revelation, than of reason and nature, then how can reason authorize such strong controlling presumptions in favor of this doctrine, as are supposed in the argument before us;—presumptions which are to go with us to the word of God, and prejudice our minds in judging of its contents? How can mere reason authorize us to suspect and call in question every doctrine of the Bible which so much as *appears* to contradict the Divine unity, and to explain away, if possible, every passage, which seems at all to interfere with this doctrine?

But it is important to inquire, in the second place, whether the doctrine of the Trinity is *apparently inconsistent* with the unity of God. The affirmative of this inquiry is assumed in the Tract before us; but certainly it should not have been. It is a point which requires, and before being admitted must receive, substantial proof.—Of course, the doctrine of the Trinity can be *so exhibited* (and so it commonly is by Unitarians) as to appear inconsistent with the unity of God. But thus set forth, it is not the real doctrine of the Trinity, as taught in the Bible, and as received by Evangelical Christians, but quite another thing—a mere figment of Unitarian prejudice and fancy. If the doctrine of the Trinity is not *really* inconsistent with the unity of God (and the author of the Tract does not affirm that it is) then, if properly stated and explained, it cannot *appear* to be inconsistent with it,—unless it appear different from the reality. And to suppose it to appear different from the reality, is to suppose it to lack a proper statement and explanation.

But we go further than this, and say, that the doctrine of the Trinity, instead of being inconsistent, really or apparently, with the Divine unity, *necessarily includes it*. It is as much a part of the doctrine of the Trinity, that God is in some sense *one*, as that he is in some other sense *three*. He exists in a threefold distinction of persons, but is *one God*. No person ever believed in the doctrine of the Trinity, who did not believe in the Divine unity; and from the nature of the case, none ever can. Persons may be Tritheists or Polytheists, if they will; but Trinitarians they cannot be, without believing in the *essential unity* of the Supreme Being.

What then becomes of the argument in the Tract before us? The premises obviously are gone; and the conclusion must go with them. Nature, we have seen, is not so full and unequivocal in teaching the unity of God, as to stamp with absurdity every proposition which may *appear* to interfere with this doctrine; and neither does the doctrine of the Trinity, properly explained, *appear* to interfere with it at all. So far from this, the doctrine of the Trinity necessarily includes that of the Divine unity. The former doctrine cannot be held or retained, if the latter is discarded.

What then becomes of the "strong presumption" against the doctrine of the Trinity, with which, it is pretended, every person ought to study the Scriptures, on account of its apparent interference with the unity of God? It vanishes at once. There is no imaginable ground for it, and it disappears.

We have remarked already on the influence of such a presumption or prejudice, as is gravely inculcated in this Tract, on the study of the sacred Scriptures. It will lead the student rather to attempt to guide the Bible, than to suffer the Bible to guide him. It will lead him to decide rather what the Bible ought to say, than what it does say. It will lead him to prove or disprove almost any thing from the Bible, as his heart or his fancy may suggest.

In regard to the subject of the Trinity, we have seen that there is no ground for indulging a controlling prejudice one way or the other; but persons should go to the Scriptures for instruction with perfectly unbiassed minds. They should go with a childlike readiness to hear and receive whatever the Lord has been pleased to reveal. They should go with the honest purpose of ascertaining the plain meaning of the inspired word, and of embracing it, when discovered, with the whole heart.

Let any intelligent inquirer go to the Bible with this feeling, and in this manner, and we have no fear as to the result of his investigations. It is these "strong presumptions" against the

Trinity—which bias the understanding, and warp the judgment, and unfit it to appreciate the force of evidence—which make men Unitarians, and which keep them so. And it is, doubtless, because these presumptions against the Trinity are felt to be necessary, that they are so earnestly recommended. If this doctrine has no appearance of support from the Bible, as its opposers sometimes insist; then why not allow people to study the Bible without bias or prejudice, one way or the other? Why direct them to commence their investigations under the impression that the doctrine “is false”—that “every thing is to be presumed against it”—and that no passages must be allowed to stand in its favor, “unless it can be unequivocally shown that *they cannot possibly mean any thing else?*” Is there not betrayed here a consciousness, that the Bible, fairly interpreted, is in favor of the Trinity; and that great care must be taken to fortify the minds of people against the doctrine, before they go to the Bible, or they will be likely to come out Trinitarians?

So clear, to our own mind, is the testimony of Scripture in support of the Trinity, that we could almost be willing to rest the whole argument on the erroneous principle laid down in the Tract, that *the passages to be adduced in favor of the doctrine must be such as “cannot possibly mean any thing else.”* We suppose that all who admit the proper Divinity of Christ will also admit the doctrine of the Trinity; and really there are many passages which go to prove the Divinity of Christ, which, as it seems to us, “cannot mean any thing else.” It is not our intention to quote proof texts, but we shall appeal to an authority, which is of great weight with Unitarians on some subjects, and from which they ought not lightly to dissent; we mean that of J. J. Griesbach. “There are,” says he, “so many arguments for the true Deity of Christ, that I see not how it CAN BE called in question,—the Divine authority of the Scriptures being granted, and just rules of interpretation acknowledged. Particularly, the exordium of John’s Gospel is so perspicuous, and above all exception, that IT NEVER CAN BE OVERTURNED *by the daring attacks of critics and interpreters.*”\*

The writer of this Tract affirms, that the doctrine of the Trinity, “if proved at all, must be proved from the New Testament alone;” the Old Testament does not teach it; and “at the time of the introduction of the Gospel, it was wholly unknown to any human being.” But on this principle, how are we to account for much that we find written in the Old Testa-

\* See Preface to Vol. ii. of Griesbach’s New Testament.

ment? If David knew of only one person in one God, what ideas could he have had of that Messiah respecting whom he was inspired to write, "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre." "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way when his wrath is kindled but a little. *Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.*"\* And what were the views of Isaiah respecting the Personage of whom he was speaking, when he said, "Unto us a Child is born; unto us a Son is given; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, *the Mighty God*, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of peace." "Prepare ye the way of *Jehovah*; make straight in the desert a highway for *our God*."† And how must Jeremiah have viewed the subject, while uttering predictions like the following, "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment in the earth. In his days, Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is the name whereby he shall be called, **Jehovah our Righteousness.**"‡ And what could Zechariah think of the sentiment he was uttering, while representing the great Jehovah as saying, "They weighed for *my* price thirty pieces of silver; a goodly price that I was prized at of them." "They shall look upon *me* whom they have pierced."§

And if the pious in Israel had no thought of more than one person in the Godhead, what idea could they form of that mysterious One, so often introduced in their sacred books under the appellation of *the Angel of Jehovah*? After an extended and thorough investigation, Dr. J. P. Smith sums up the account given of this Angel in the Old Testament, in the following words: "He claims an uncontrolled sovereignty over the affairs of men. He has the attributes of Omniscience and Omnipresence. He useth the awful formula by which the Deity, on various occasions, condescended to confirm the faith of those to whom the primitive revelations were given; he *swareth by himself*. He is the gracious Protector and Saviour; the Redeemer from evil; the Intercessor; and the Author of the most desirable blessings. His favor is to be sought with the deepest solicitude, as that which is of the highest importance to the interests of men. He is the object of religious invocation. He

\* Ps. cx. 1. xlv. 6. ii. 12.

† Is. ix. 6. xl. 3.

‡ Jer. xxiii. 5, 6. xxxiii. 15, 16.

§ Zech xi 13, xii. 10.

is in the most express manner, and repeatedly, declared to be *Jehovah, God, the ineffable I am*. Yet this mysterious person is represented as *distinct* from God, and acting (as the term *angel* imports) under a Divine mission.\*

It may be important to consider, for a moment, the opinion of those Jews who were cotemporary with Christ, relative to their expected Messiah. And it is evident, in the first place, that they expected the Messiah to be the Son of God. Indeed, the words, *Son of God*, and *Messiah* or *Christ*, seem to have been regarded by them as of the same import, "The high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be *the Christ, the Son of God*." "We believe and are sure that thou art *the Christ, the Son of the living God*." Martha said unto him, "I believe that thou art *the Christ, the Son of God*." "These things are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is *the Christ, the Son of God*."† It is manifest from these passages, that the words *Christ* and *Son of God* were regarded by the cotemporaries of our Lord, both enemies and friends, as of the same general import. They were regarded as synonymous expressions. The Jews expected that the Messiah promised to their fathers, whenever he should appear in the world, would be the Son of God.

But we are sure, in the second place, that the Jews, in the days of the Saviour, regarded the phrase, *Son of God*, as importing *Divinity*. "The Jews therefore sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that *God was his Father*," (and, of course, that he was *God's Son*,) "making himself *equal with God*." On another occasion, when Jesus had spoken of himself as the Son of God, the Jews took up stones to stone him, saying, "For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy, because that thou, being a man, *makest thyself God*."‡—It is thus evident that the Jews, in the time of Christ, expected their Messiah to be the Son of God; and that they understood the phrase, *Son of God*, as importing *Divinity*—as importing, in some sense, *equality with God*.

But we have other means of knowing the opinion of the Jews, near the time of the Saviour, relative to the important subject before us.

Philo was a learned Jew of Alexandria, of a sacerdotal family, who was born a little before Christ, and who lived several

\* Smith's Scripture Testimony, Vol. i. p. 490.

† Mat. xxvi. 63. John vi. 69, xi. 27, and xx. 31.

‡ John v. 18. x. 33.

years after his death. In all his references to the expected Messiah, he applies to him the appellation of *Logos* or *Word*; and although his conceptions are confused and sometimes contradictory, yet he manifestly speaks of this mysterious Personage as partaking of *Divinity*. "According to him," says Professor Norton in his late work against the Trinity, "the Logos, considered as a person, *is a god*." p. 235. Dr. Smith thus concludes his full and very satisfactory examination of Philo: "To this object," (the *Logos*) "he gives the epithets of the Son of God; the first begotten Son; the eldest Son; the Divine Word; the eternal Word; the Offspring of God, as a stream from a fountain; the Beginning; the Shadow of God; the Image of God; the eternal Image; the Inspector of Israel; the Interpreter of God; a second God, &c. This Word is described as presiding over all things; superior to the whole universe; the eldest of all objects that the mind can perceive; next to the Self-Existent. To this Word are ascribed intelligence, design, and active powers; and he is declared to have been the Instrument of the Deity in the creation, disposition and government of the universe."\* Such were the conceptions of a learned Alexandrian Jew, a cotemporary of Christ, in regard to the Messiah promised in the Old Testament.

The Book Zohar is attributed to Rabbi Simeon, the son of Jochai, who lived before the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. That distinguished scholar Schættgenius devoted much time to the study of this book, and has made important use of it, for illustrating the New Testament, in his *Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ*. The following is part of the summary drawn up by this learned author: "With respect to the names of the Messiah, he is expressly called in the Book Zohar by the incommunicable name Jehovah; the Angel of God; the Shekinah, or Divine Glory; the Mediator; Michael the Archangel; the Angel of the Covenant; the Word of the Lord; God, the holy and blessed; the Image of God; the Brightness of his Glory; the Lord of hosts; the Son of God; the faithful Shepherd; the Lord of the ministering Angels; the Angel Redeemer," &c.†

Justin Martyr, speaking of the Jews in his time, a few years after the death of the Apostles, says, "They profess to expect that the Messiah is yet to come, and that he will possess a kingdom, and that he will be GOD, THE OBJECT OF WORSHIP."‡

\* Scripture Testimony, vol. i. p. 594.

† Horæ Heb. Talmud. Tom. ii. pp. 911—913.

‡ Dial. cum Tryph. p. 209.

Celsus, the first and ablest literary opponent of the Christian religion, flourished within seventy or eighty years of the Apostles. He writes as a Jew, and "reproaches the Christians with absurdity and folly, for imagining that such a mean and contemned person as Jesus could be the PURE and HOLY WORD, THE SON OF GOD. He declares the belief of the Jews that the *Word* was *the Son of God*, though they reject the claims of Jesus to that honor."\*

Even Gesenius, in his Commentary on Isaiah, admits that the Jews, near the time of Christ, were expecting their Messiah to be the "*incarnate Jehovah*." "This splendid conception," he thinks, "had its origin near the time of Jesus Christ, after the hope of a Messiah had been so long the object of tantalizing disappointment, but yet was raised continually higher and higher."

We have dwelt the longer on this point, because it is often said, as in the Tract before us, that the Jews were always Unitarians; and that "at the time of the introduction of the gospel," the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Divinity of Christ "were wholly unknown to any human being." Consequently it is insisted, that these doctrines, if revealed at all in the New Testament, should be revealed most explicitly and abundantly, and that the revelation of them might be expected to strike the minds of Jews with great astonishment. 'What astonishment,' it is said, 'must the disciples have felt, when it was first announced to them that their Master was a Divine person!'

But all such declamation is the result of ignorance as to the real opinions of the ancient Jews, or of something worse. We have seen that the Messiah promised in the Old Testament was to be a Divine person; and that Philo, and the ancient Rabbins, and the Jews at the time of Christ, regarded their expected Messiah in this light. He would be the Son of God, and of course must be, in some sense "equal with God." John v. 18. It was on this account, undoubtedly, that our Saviour, in the earlier part of his ministry, avoided making a frequent and open declaration of his Messiahship. He knew that such a declaration would expose him to the charge of blasphemy, and that the Jews would think themselves under obligations to stone him.

That the modern Jews, like the Mahometans, are Unitarians, we do not deny; but that the Jews in the time of Christ, and before, were Unitarians—that they were ignorant of the

\* See Smith's Scripture Testimony, Vol. iii. p. 564.

Divinity of their expected Messiah, we shall by no means admit. The Old Testament is as full of the Divinity of Christ almost as the New, and both unite in beaming forth the light of this glorious doctrine upon the world.\*

There is another point incidentally touched in this Tract, as it frequently is in the writings of Unitarians, on which we feel bound to offer a few remarks. "The doctrine of *immortal life*," like that of the Trinity, "is not expressly taught in the Old Testament." The pious under the former dispensation, it seems, had no revelation on this subject. They had no knowledge of a future and immortal life, except the little they were able to glean from the glimmerings of nature, or from their heathen neighbors.†

Now to us it seems scarcely possible that any should read the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and maintain an opinion such as this. What did the Israelites of old think became of Enoch, when he was translated; and of Elijah, when he was taken up in a chariot of fire, if there was no future and immortal life? And what did the Psalmist mean, when he said, "Thou wilt show me the path of *life*; *in thy presence is fulness of joy, and at thy right hand are pleasures forever more.*" "As for me, I shall behold thy face in righteousness; *I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness.*" "Thou wilt guide me with thy counsel, and *afterwards receive me to glory.* Whom have I *in heaven* but thee? And there is none upon earth that I desire besides thee. My flesh and my heart faileth; but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion *forever.*"‡ And how are we to understand Solomon, when he says, "Then shall the dust return to the earth, as it was; *and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.*" "The righteous *hath hope* in his death."§ Hope of what, if he has no knowledge of a future life? God says by Daniel, "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth *shall awake*, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt;" and by Hosea, "*I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death. O death, I will be thy plague! O grave, I will be thy destruction!*"|| Our Saviour directs the Jews to "search the Scriptures," (meaning the Old Testament) "for in them

\* Even the Editor of the Christian Examiner affirms, that the doctrine of the Trinity may be "traced to ages long before the Christian era." Vol. iii. p. 2.

† "The Hebrew faith never taught the immortality of the soul." Chris. Exam. Vol. ix. p. 68.

‡ Ps. xvi. 11; xvii. 15; lxxiii. 24.

§ Ecc. xii. 7. Prov. xiv. 32.

|| Dan. xii. 2. Hos. xi. 10.

ye think ye have *eternal life*." He also proves to the Sadducees the doctrine of a future life, from the writings of Moses.\* We are told, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that Abraham "*looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God*;" and that Moses "*had respect unto the recompense of reward*;" and that the patriarchs whom he led towards Canaan, "*desired a better country, even an heavenly*;" and that the ancient martyrs "*were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection*."† And yet it is said by professed Christian teachers, that "*the Hebrew faith never taught the immortality of the soul*;" and consequently, that God's ancient people had no means of knowing, from any revelation which he had given them, whether there was a future state of rewards and punishments—a world of spirits, a judgement-seat, a heaven, or a hell!

The Tract here examined is more argumentative than almost any in the series with which it is connected; but we are sorry to be obliged to say, that the argument throughout is based upon mistaken principles, and consequently leads to wrong results. "A strong presumption" against the doctrine of the Trinity is inculcated as a matter of duty, and as indispensably necessary in order to a proper consideration of the testimony of Scripture in relation to the subject. We know of no other subject, in regard to which prejudice has been inculcated, as necessary, in the search after truth—as calculated to aid the inquiries of the student, and render them successful!!

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### EXPOSITION.—NO. 1.

For the Spirit of the Pilgrims.

Matt. iii. 11.—"HE SHALL BAPTIZE YOU WITH THE HOLY GHOST AND WITH FIRE."

Most of our excellent commentators endeavor to explain this passage, by referring to the wonderful effusion of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. They imagine that the marvellous appearance of cloven tongues *like as of fire*, which rested upon

\* John v. 39. Luke xx. 37.

† Heb. xi, 10, 16, 26, 35.

the disciples, was a fulfilment of the promise ; “ He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and *with fire.*”

The same notion prevails extensively among Christians in common life, and in those that minister at the altar. Who has not heard from the pulpit, and from the conference room, the following prayer : “ Baptize thy people with the Holy Ghost and with fire.”

But it seems to the writer that there is a very great mistake in that exegesis which authorizes the use of this text for such purposes. Neither the scope of Matthew in the connexion of the passage, nor the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers, will justify such principles of interpretation.

The word “ fire,” in its *figurative* application by the inspired writers, generally, (if not always) denotes something *severe, fearful and calamitous*. Thus Christ says, Luke 12. 49. “ *Ἦνθ ἡλ-θὼν βάλειν εἰς τὴν γῆν;*” “ I have come to send fire on the earth.” As if he had said, “ My doctrines will give rise to most *fearful dissensions*—so that parents will deliver up their children to death, and children their parents ; and a *calamitous state of society* will result from my coming.” Vid. Luke 12. 51—53. Where a lively description is given of the effect produced by the peaceful words of the Saviour.

Look next at Isaiah 47. 14, in the LXX, *ἐπι πυρὶ κατακαυθη-σονται*—“ They shall be burned in the fire.” The meaning is, as will be seen by the connexion, “ They shall experience *overwhelming calamities* from which they cannot escape.”

So also God’s judgments upon Nineveh (Nahum 1 : 5, 6.) are compared to a *volcanic eruption*, when his *fury is poured out like fire*. The like signification is given to fire, in its figurative use, in various passages in both testaments. Probably I might safely say, that *it always denotes severity*.

But, further, the scope of the context forces us to believe, that the speaker was setting forth a *fearful separation* which was about to be made among the Jews ; when the pious were to be blessed, and the contemners of religion to be grievously punished. In the 7th verse, &c. he alludes to “ *the coming wrath,*” and exhorts his hearers to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance ;—not to presume upon safety, because of their connexion with Abraham, because that “ the axe was already laid at the root of the tree.” This is the same as saying ; “ Divine judgments are already impending ;” as all may know, by attending to the *proverbial use* of this phraseology among the Jews. “ And every tree, that bringeth not forth good fruit, is cut down *and cast into the fire,*” that is, “ Every despiser of piety will be *grievously punished.*” “ I indeed baptize you with *water unto repentance* ; but he, whose way I am come to prepare, will show himself *more mighty* than I ; for he will baptize you with the Holy Ghost, *and with fire* ;”—he will give efficacy to his doctrines in them that be-

lieve; and he will *punish with severity* the despisers of his religion! "For his fan is in his hand, and he will make a *thorough separation* between the wheat and the chaff; gathering the wheat into his store-house, and *burning up the chaff with unquenchable fire.*"

And here the whole scope and design of the argument is fully seen. It comes out with a force not to be resisted, that it is his object to show that a *fearful separation* is to be made between the sincere worshippers of God, and *the impious contemners of his authority.*

But should any imagine that there is no propriety in giving such a meaning to *βαπτίζω*, in its metaphorical use, they may consult Matt. 20 : 22, 23 ; Mark 10 : 38, 39 ; Luke 12 : 50 ; and various other places. None need question it, that the Saviour was expecting to be *overwhelmed with calamities* when he should be baptized with that baptism which awaited him.

Besides Schleusner (in *βαπτισει υμας εν πυρι*) says; "graviter puniet vos contemptores religionis suae;" he will grievously punish you, the despisers of his religion.

And let such, as would see an awful fulfilment of this *baptizing with fire*, read the account of Josephus of those calamities which came upon his nation, when Titus Vespasian took their citadel, and when distress came upon them, "such as was not since men were upon the earth."

---

EXPOSITION.—NO. II.

For the Spirit of the Pilgrims.

Heb. 1 : 8. "THY THRONE, O GOD, IS FOREVER AND EVER."

This is the language of God the Father to the Son. And it would be strange if it did not convey an unpleasant sound to the ears of Unitarians. Hence, as might be expected, they have tried their Biblical skill, to give it a different translation.

With a great parade of learning, and many quotations from the classics, they have endeavored to show, that *ὁ θεός* is in the *nominative*, instead of the *vocative*; and that the true rendering is the following; "God is thy throne forever and ever."

But what is the idea conveyed by this phraseology? Which is the greater, the *throne* or *the one that sits upon it*? The language really conveys no definite sentiment. And in order to make it mean anything, they are obliged to substitute something else, as "God is the *supporter* of Christ's throne." And after all that Unitarian criticism can do for it, the passage gives no definite idea.

But supposing that this objection were out of the way; and that the passage means "God is the supporter of all Christ's au-

thority, and the author of all his instructions ;” how does this agree with the scope of Paul’s argument ? It has evidently no connexion with it. None can read the context, without perceiving that the writer was showing *the pre-eminence of Christ above angels !* And what has this to do with the idea, that “God is the supporter of Christ’s throne ?” Any other sentiment would have been as consentaneous and appropriate.

Besides, Unitarians themselves, much as they have tried to fix this gloss upon the text, have been obliged to admit, that there is no expression in the Bible that is analogous to this. Still they have persisted in maintaining their exegesis, in the face of all argument to the contrary.

But why are all the ancient versions to be rejected ? Why are orthodox critics all wrong upon this passage ? None can rationally deny that *ὁ θεός* is used in the vocative. Did not the Saviour, upon the cross, cry *ὁ θεός μου, ὁ θεός μου*, (Mark 15: 34) ? Did not Thomas cry, *ὁ θεός μου* ? It is indeed the more common form of address to God in the new Testament, and in the Greek of the LXX. The passages are abundant, as any one may see, who will consult his concordance.

Besides, the very passage in question was taken verbatim from the LXX. (Vid. Ps. 45 : 6.) “*ὁ θεός σου, ὁ θεός, εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος.*” And it will not be denied, that it was the address of the Psalmist to the Most High God, as it stood in the Old Testament. For a single instance cannot be found, in which an *individual specified* is called by the name *Elohim*, (the word for which *ὁ θεός* is substituted in the LXX,) in any other than the *proper sense* of the word,—the eternal Jehovah. (Vid. Storr and Flatt.)

How is it possible, then, to avoid the conclusion, that Heb. 1 : 8. is applied to Christ, calling him God in the proper sense of that term ? And why should Professor Stuart give up, in his excellent work on this Epistle, the argument, which he so ably defended in his Letters to Dr. Channing ? I see no necessity nor propriety in doing it.

Besides, the exegesis which admits that Christ is here called God in the *proper sense* is best conformed to the scope of the apostle, who represents Christ as the “Creator of the worlds” and “the supporter of (*τα πάντα*) the Universe.”

In spite of Unitarian criticisms, and the incautious admissions of the orthodox, will not the humble disciple of Jesus maintain, that his Saviour is addressed *as God in the proper sense*, in the words, “Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever.”

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *A Manual for Young Church-members.* By LEONARD BACON, *Pastor of the First Church in New Haven.* New Haven: Stephen Cooke. 1833. 12mo. pp. 218.

This and several other works sent us by their authors or publishers, we should have noticed earlier, but for the pressure of responsible duties which have left us only scraps of time in which to read and examine them.

In calling the attention of our readers to it now, we recommend the Manual to their perusal, and deliberate consideration, as a book well adapted to be useful, not only to young church-members, for whom it was more particularly designed, but for not a few who are older and have been many years in the school of Christ. The subjects on which it treats are important, and the discussion of them is such as can hardly fail to enlighten and instruct.

It is perhaps called for more in Connecticut than in any other of the New England States, still, not only in Connecticut but in the other New England States, and more especially in the Middle, Southern, and Western sections of our country, such a book, if read, cannot fail to be extensively useful.

James' Church Members' Guide, is an excellent book and of a higher character in some respects than the Manual of Mr. Bacon; but in relation to several important points, the Manual is no less deserving attention, and especially the attention of *Congregational* Christians. Many of this class, though well informed in general, and perhaps highly intelligent in most things pertaining to doctrine and sentiment in religion, are lamentably ignorant as to form and order, and the difference between Congregationalism and other modes of religious organization. In this Manual they may find instruction respecting these things. We do not say that they might not find it elsewhere, and the Tribute of Dr. Hawes as well as other works of older and later date, ought not to be forgotten, but we have seen nothing, which for Congregational Christians especially, we, on the whole, think better adapted to be useful than this little book of Mr. Bacon's. We hope it may have a general circulation.

The subjects discussed are entitled, 'Constitution and rights of the Apostolic Churches—The Officers of a church—Ordinances and Ceremonies—Duties of Church Members—Discipline in a church—Responsibilities of Church Members as professors of Religion—Relation of Churches to each other, and Responsibility of the New England Churches.' An appendix is added containing some notes referred to in the different chapters.

2. *The Glory of the Age, or the Spirit of Missions.* By JOHN FOSTER. Boston: James Loring. 1833. 12mo. pp. 191.

In one respect we have been wholly disappointed in reading this book; nor are we, as we suspect, though we know not how the case may be with

others, alone in our disappointment. The title of the work though striking, is certainly adapted to mislead. General principles are more or less implied, but the chief expenditure of the Essay is on India and the Baptist mission there. But this, though worthy—for we certainly would not detract from the magnitude or nobleness of the enterprise so far achieved—who would pronounce the glory of the age? That it is one item of that glory we cheerfully admit, but that glory as a whole is altogether, too widely diffused and shared in, to be spoken of with propriety as denominationally or topically appropriated. The author certainly had a right, if he chose, to limit himself to the particular view he has taken; nor would we be offended at his exclusiveness in this respect; only, when from the title of the work we had anticipated the pleasure of sitting down to the perusal of the thoughts of one of the most gifted sanctified minds of the present age, and had thought we should have our own minds expanded and fired with new zeal in relation to the entire enterprise of the whole evangelical Christian world; we could not but feel disappointed in being confined to India.

But the mention of even this slight exception to the work, or rather, to its title, and of our own disappointment at its limitation and exclusiveness, might almost have been spared; so rich is it in thought, and so forcible, and often beautiful in expression. Its intrinsic excellence stamps it with great value, and is in some respects, nearly incomparable. The Essay is founded, like that on Popular Ignorance, on a passage of Scripture, and like that too, was originally presented in the form of a popular discourse. Among the topics discussed, we were most interested in that styled by the author "Religious Fatalism," in which he shows the inconsistency and want of benevolence there is in indifference and negligence in reference to missions.

To the Essay is added a few pages, first published in another form, and entitled, "God Invisible." It contains some striking thoughts, but is in no respect very remarkable.

---

3. *Essays in a series of Letters on the following subjects: On a man's writing memoirs of himself; on decision of character, on the application of the epithet romantic, on some of the causes by which evangelical religion has been rendered less acceptable to persons of cultivated taste.* By JOHN FOSTER. Fifth American from the Eighth London Edition. Boston: James Loring. 1833. 12mo. pp. 311.

This, so far as we are informed was Mr. Foster's first work; at least, it was, we believe, the first published in this country; and though whatever has come from his pen has been uncommonly deserving, nothing of his that we have seen, has rivalled, or indeed equalled these Essays. We are glad to see them in so convenient a form. What the additions and improvements are, we have not had opportunity to examine, except that we observe that each letter has a summary view of the contents of the same, which we regard as an improvement. The book is worthy almost beyond all praise, as every man of reading very well knows.

THE  
SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. VI.

DECEMBER, 1833.

NO. 12.

---

---

COMMUNICATIONS.

---

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

We have long been of the opinion that the doctrine of the Trinity, considered simply as a *revealed fact*, admits of as clear and indubitable proof from Scripture, as any doctrine whatever, which rests solely on divine revelation. In the following article, we shall aim to present this proof in a concise form, both to confirm the faith of the Churches, who already admit the doctrine in their creed, and to convince, if possible, those who reject it, while they profess to receive the Scriptures as the infallible standard of truth.

STATEMENT OF THE DOCTRINE.

Our argument will be based on the two following passages of Scripture: Isa. 42: 8. I AM THE LORD; THAT IS MY NAME, AND MY GLORY WILL I NOT GIVE TO ANOTHER. Matt. 28: 19. TEACH ALL NATIONS, BAPTIZING THEM IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER, AND OF THE SON, AND OF THE HOLY GHOST. The first passage, teaches the oneness or unity of God. His name alone is Jehovah; and his glory, —i. e. the peculiar attributes or perfections by which he is known, he will not give, impart to, or share with, another. The second passage, expresses, in our view, a Trinity, or three-fold distinction in the nature of that one Supreme Being, Jehovah, whose glory cannot be given to another. In other words, we believe, on the authority of these and other passages of Scripture.—1. That there is in the universe one, and but one Supreme Being, or Divine Nature; 2. That in this Divine Nature, there is a real three-fold distinction, which is designated

by the personal names Father, Son and Holy Ghost ; 3. And that these three have equally, and in common with one another, the perfections of Supreme Divinity, and are the one God revealed to us in the Bible.\*

PROOF.

In support of this belief, we rest our argument on the Bible alone, as the inspired and infallible standard of truth. Thence we shall briefly show—1. What are the marks or characteristics, which, by common consent, belong to the one God. 2. That these marks belong equally, and are common to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost ; and 3. Hence the conclusion must follow that these constitute the one God of the Bible.

I. First, then, what are the marks or characteristics of Supreme Divinity, as made known in the Scriptures? To which we answer,

1. Certain *names* with qualifying or descriptive adjuncts. As “the Almighty God,” Gen. 17 : 1. Ex. 6 : 3. “The true God.” “The living God and an everlasting King.” “The living God and, steadfast forever.”—“Which made heaven, the earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein.” Ps. 115 : 5. Jer. 10 : 10. Dan. 6 : 26. Acts 14 : 15. John 17 : 3. 1 Thes. 1 : 9. Heb. 9 : 14 and 10 : 31. These adjuncts distinguish the Supreme Being from all the deities and idols of the heathen—who are sometimes called God or gods simply—as are also in a few cases, rulers and princes. Ps. 82 : 6. Ex. 7 : 1. Besides these, are the incommunicable names. “I am that I am.” Ex. 3 : 14. “Jehovah—that is my name,”—a name which means the same as “I am that I am,” or “he is as he shall be,” self-existent, eternal, unchangeable. Ex. 6 : 3. Isa. 42 : 8, etc.

2. Certain *attributes and works*, are marks of Supreme Divinity—such are the following: “He is the King eternal, immortal.”—“From everlasting to everlasting, thou art God.”—“The “First and the Last ; the Alpha and Omega.” 1 Tim. 1 : 17. Deut. 33 : 27. Ps. 90 : 2. Isa. 44 : 6. Rev. 1 : 8. “With God all things are possible.” “The Lord God omnipotent reigneth.” “Thou hast laid the foundations of the earth—and the heavens are the work of thy hands.” See Ps. 102 : 25. Jer. 10 : 12. Ps. 33 : 9. Eph. 1 : 11, etc. “The Lord is perfect in knowledge—his understanding is infinite—he searcheth the hearts and trieth the reins of the children of men, to give every one according to his ways.” “Behold the

\* See Knapp's Theol. Vol. I. Art. 4, § 33, 2.

heaven of heavens cannot contain thee." Ps. 139 : 1—4 ; 147 : 5. Job 37 : 16. Acts 15 : 18. Jer. 32 : 19. 1 Kings 8 : 27, etc.

3. Being possessed of these attributes, eternal existence, omnipotent creative power, infinite knowledge and omnipresence—exclusive worship is claimed by him and for him.—“Thou shalt have no other gods before me.” “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve.” “If thou do at all forsake the Lord thy God and walk after other gods and serve them and worship them—ye shall surely perish.” Ex. 20 : 3. Deut. 8 : 19 ; 4 : 15. Matt. 4 : 10, etc.

Here observe that the several marks of Supreme Divinity which have been mentioned, are admitted by all who believe in one God, to belong appropriately to him. No other marks stronger than these, either revealed or unrevealed, make him known. What can possibly be more definite. The true, living, Almighty God—who made all things—Jehovah, eternal, all powerful, creating and upholding all things—every where present, infinite in knowledge, and the only proper object of religious worship.

II. Let us then, proceed to the second step in our argument—viz. that these marks of true Divinity belong equally and in common to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost.

1. It is universally conceded, by those who admit and those who deny the doctrine of the Trinity, that the marks of Divinity which have been named, do belong to God—the Father. The Supreme Being is often called Father, on account of his being the Creator and Preserver of all things. Isa. 63 : 16 ; 64 : 8. Rom. 9 : 25. Eph. 4 : 6. Also the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, because Christ, as Mediator, was delegated and sent into the world to accomplish our redemption. Rom. 1 : 3, 4 ; 8 : 32. 2 Cor. 11 : 31, etc. The title of Father likewise denotes, as we believe, a peculiar, divine union and distinction in the Godhead—“The Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost.” John 5 : 18 ; 10 : 36 ; 19 : 7. Matt. 28 : 19. Since, therefore, it is conceded by all without debate, that true Divinity belongs to God, the Father, the main point to be established is, that the same marks belong also equally and in common to the Son and to the Holy Ghost. To this point, then, we would direct your undivided attention a few moments.

2. Do these marks of Divinity belong to Christ—or to him who is called Son ? Do these titles of Supreme Divinity—the true, great, mighty God, who made all things, belong to him ? Hear the Scripture answer. “In the beginning was the Word, the Logos—and the Logos was God—all things were made by

Him—the world was made by Him.” “Christ, who is over all, God blessed forever.” “Looking for that blessed hope, the appearing of the great God and, or *even* our Saviour Jesus Christ.” “His Son Jesus Christ—this is the true God and the Eternal Life.” The apostle Thomas convinced of the resurrection of Christ, and probably calling to mind what Christ had before said, addressed him reverently, and in faith—“My Lord and my God!” John 1 : 1—3. Rom. 9 : 5. Titus 2 : 13. Heb. 1 : 8. 1 John 5 : 20. John 20 : 28.

But further. The very passages in the Old Testament, in which that peculiar, incommunicable name, Jehovah, is used, are applied in the New Testament to Christ.

Isaiah had a vision of Jehovah, God of Hosts, and heard his voice—saying, “Go tell this people,” &c., 6 : 5—10. But St. John informs us—“these things said Isaiah when he saw his [Christ’s] glory and spake of him.” John 12 : 37—41. By the prophet Malachi, Jehovah speaks—“Behold I will send my messenger and he shall prepare *my* way before *me*.” But in Mark, this very text is applied to Christ—before whom John Baptist was sent to prepare *his* way. The Psalmist, addressing Jehovah, 68 : 18 says, “Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive ; thou hast received gifts for men :” but turn to Eph. 4 : 7, 8, and you find that this very passage belongs to Christ, who ascended up on high and received gifts for men. And the apostle Paul, in Heb. 1 : 10, as if to place the Divinity of the Son beyond all doubt, at least so far as could be done by the use of any name, applies the strong passage in Ps. 102 : 25 to him, “And thou, LORD, Jehovah, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth.”

Again. Do those attributes and works which we found to be marks of true Divinity, belong to Christ? Listen to the Scripture testimony. As to his eternity—it is declared in the same language in which that of Jehovah is expressed. “I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.” Rev. 22 : 13. Isa. 44 : 6. When Christ said “before Abraham was *I am*,” the Jews understood him to assert for himself a divine attribute—inasmuch as that word *I am* describes the unchangeableness of the Divine nature ; and hence they accused him of blasphemy, and took up stones to cast at him. “Glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was,” i. e. before time, or eternally. “He is before all things”—“the same yesterday, to day and forever.” John 8 : 58 ; 17 : 5. Coll. 1 : 17. Heb. 13 : 8.

As to his creative, omnipotent power—“By him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are on earth, visible

and invisible—whether they be thrones or dominions, or principalities or powers—all things were created by him and for him—by him all things consist.” “He shall change our vile body according to the working of his mighty power, whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.” Phil. 3 : 21. Heb. 1 : 3. Coll. 1 : 16, 17.

In respect of his unlimited knowledge and universal presence, what testimony can be plainer or stronger than this? “He knew all men and needed not, that any should testify of man, for he knew what was in man.” “All the Churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts; and I will give unto every one of you according to your works.” “Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.” “I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” John 2 : 24, 25. Rev. 2 : 23. Matt. 18 : 20 ; 28 : 20, etc.

But, once more, does that other mark and evidence of true Divinity, viz. religious worship, belong to Christ? In answer to which, we briefly refer you to five sources of testimony. 1. To Christ himself. “That all men should honor the Son even as they honor the Father.” John 5 : 22. 2. To the apostles assembled to choose a successor to Judas, “Thou, Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of the twain thou hast chosen.” Acts 1 : 24. 3. To all the primitive disciples who were distinguished as those “that call on the name of Jesus Christ our Lord.” 1 Cor. 1 : 2. 4. To the dying martyr, Stephen,—of blessed memory—who, with his expiring breath, prayed, “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.” Acts 7 : 59. 5. And, last of all, to the saints and angels that surround the throne in heaven. “I beheld, and lo! a great multitude which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God, which sitteth on the throne and unto the Lamb.” “And I heard the voice of many angels about the throne and, the four (living creatures) and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice—Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing.” Rev. 7 : 9—12.

Here let us pause a moment, and recur to the text, “I am the Lord, that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another.” How is it possible to reconcile this unqualified declaration with the fact, that all the peculiar, descriptive titles of

Supreme Divinity—all the attributes and works by which he is known, and even the very same kind of worship which he claims as his exclusive right, should be given to Christ? If Christ is a dependent, created being himself—has not the name and the glory of Jehovah been given to another? And is it indeed credible, that he who alone is Jehovah, would, contrary to his word, give up to, or divide with, a creature, all the ensigns of supremacy? Would he challenge his right to Divine titles, and then give them away? Would he reveal himself as the Creator of the universe, and then ascribe the work and honor of it to another? With reverence and humility we demand, could he *create* a being and make him *eternal*? or could he impart infinite power to a being dependent? or unlimited knowledge to one whose existence is limited? and would he allow that created and dependent being, to claim worship and be worshipped by saints below and saints above, in the same pure and lofty strains that he himself is worshipped? His own solemn asseveration is—never, never! “My glory will I not give to another.” You will observe that the passages which we above cited, as belonging to Christ, are distinct from, and independent of, another class of passages, which belong to him in his assumed, mediatorial character and office—in which authority, power, dominion, knowledge, and judgement, are said to be committed and given to him by the Father. The argument above presented, is not touched by this latter class of texts—these prove what we fully believe, that Christ, in his office as mediator, is inferior to the Father; the other, that in his inherent qualities and original character, “he is one with the Father.” John 14 : 28 ; 10 : 29—33.

3. On this part of our argument it only remains to be proved, that the marks of supreme Divinity which we have named, do also belong to the HOLY SPIRIT. The first inquiry on this point which presents itself, is—What is meant by the term Holy Spirit? Does it mean simply God himself, an attribute of God, a divine influence, mode of operation, extraordinary gifts, miraculous powers? or does it mean a real agent, distinct from God the Father, and possessed of attributes of true Divinity? To which we reply; the term has evidently various meanings attached to it in Scripture. Sometimes it may be synonymous with the term God. At other times it may mean, divine influence, miraculous gifts, right affections or dispositions of heart, &c. But after admitting this, it is equally evident too, that the term Holy Spirit means a person or agent distinct from the Father and the Son. How plain and unequivocal are the following passages: said Christ, “When the Comforter is come, whom I

will send unto you from the *Father*, even the *Spirit* of truth which proceedeth from the Father, *he* shall testify of *me*. When he is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he will show you things to come." John 14:26; 16:13. "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same *Spirit*: differences of administrations, but the same *Lord*: and diversities of operations but the same *God* which worketh all in all."—Then enumerating the gifts of wisdom, knowledge, faith, prophecy, miracles, &c., the apostle says, "all these are the work of that one and the self same SPIRIT, dividing to every man severally as HE will." Mark this passage. The Spirit is first distinguished from the gifts which he imparts; next from the Lord, Christ, next from God, the Father, and finally those works are ascribed to him which imply unlimited knowledge, power and sovereignty: "dividing to every man severally as he will." "The Spirit searcheth all things; yea, the deep things of God." "As the apostles ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them." See 1 Cor. 12:4, 6, 11. 2 Cor. 2:11. Acts 13:2; 20:28. As these passages distinguish the Holy Spirit from both the Father and the Son, and ascribe to him personal acts; so those which follow clearly declare his Divine nature.

In Acts 5:3, Ananias and Sapphira are said "to lie to the Holy Ghost;" then, v. 4, Peter says, "Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God:" clearly to be understood that the Holy Spirit, to whom they lied, is God. So at one time Christians are said to be the "temple of the Holy Ghost," at another time the "temple of God." 1 Cor. 3:16. Gal. 6:16. Paul made solemn oath, which was an act of religious worship: "I lie not, my conscience bearing me witness in—or rather by the Holy Ghost." And to speak against the Holy Ghost, is blasphemy which can never be forgiven. Rom. 9:1. Matt. 12:31.

Turn now to those passages in which, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are named together, as objects of worship. Matt. 28:19. "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." To baptize in, or into, the name of any one, is to impose the obligation, to honor, obey, follow him. And, as being the initiatory rite of our religion, it is solemnly to dedicate one to the service of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. But who, with all reverence we ask, are they? what do their names mean, who are thus united as the equal object of our religious homage? The idea that the term Son means only a dependent

created being—and the Holy Spirit, a divine influence or miraculous power, and are united with God, the Father of all—is repugnant to the essential rights of Him who has said “My glory will I not give to another.” Besides, if Holy Spirit means divine influence or gifts—then what can it mean to baptize into the name of this influence or gifts—especially after being already baptized into the name of the Father, from whom the influence or gift proceeds?

Hear also the prayer, offered by the Apostle for spiritual blessings upon his brethren at Corinth. “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.” 2 Cor. 13:14. Is this a prayer addressed to the Father and to two of his creatures—or as some would say to one of his creatures, viz.—Christ, and to an attribute or influence? Is it then right and scriptural thus to pray? Remember it is written, ‘I am Jehovah—that is my name—my glory will I not give to another.’ The apostle Jude also directs, vs. 20, 21, “praying in the Holy Ghost, keep yourselves in the love of God; looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life.” But why connect these three in this solemn devotional manner, unless they are equally and in common the object of religious worship?

Suspending now our argument, let us review the proof which we have thus far adduced. We have said that the Scriptures reveal one, and but one, Supreme Being;—that the marks or characteristics by which he is known are certain names, attributes, works, and the exclusive right of worship;—all admit that these marks belong to Him who is called God, the Father; they also belong as we have shown, equally to the Son. For example, is the true Divinity known by the names, the true, great, mighty God, and Jehovah?—These very names are repeatedly and in the strongest manner given to Christ! Is the true Divinity eternal, omniscient, all powerful, the Creator of all things, and every where present? So is Christ. Does the true God claim divine worship, as his right, and forbid it to all others? Christ was worshipped in the highest sense by apostles and primitive disciples, by all the angels, and is now by all the hosts of heaven; and he enjoined it also as a duty “that all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father.”

In regard to the Holy Spirit, we have found, from the Scriptures, that he possesses the qualities and attributes of a real agent or person distinct from the Father and the Son; that to him is ascribed omniscience and the disposal of all things; that he is called God, and the same works ascribed to him, in one place, as are ascribed to the Father in another; and finally, that he is an

object of religious worship, both alone and in conjunction with the Father and the Son.

III. We are then prepared for the third step or conclusion of our argument—viz: that the one God, whose name alone is Jehovah, and whose glory he will not give to, or share with, another, is, as to his mode of existence, revealed to us as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This conclusion seems to us direct and irresistible. The Scriptures declare that there is but one true God, and describe him by certain marks or characteristics. But the same Scriptures teach that the same marks or characteristics belong equally to three persons or subjects, viz. The Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost: therefore, these are the one God. This conclusion we must admit, or else confess that the Bible is replete with dark sayings, which ill accord with its claim to be a revelation and which it seems utterly impossible to reconcile: holding that the Bible is true and infallible, we take our stand upon it. We receive the doctrine of one God in Trinity as a revealed fact, just as we do any other fact of revelation; and place it above all valid objection. We know it is common for writers and preachers, in their discussion of this sublime doctrine, to spend much time in answering objections which are urged against it from reason or philosophy: but we confess we have no objections to answer. We are no apologists for the great and incomprehensible Being, whom we are taught to love, reverence, and obey. Rather, we are thankful that he has revealed himself to us in his word, in such a manner as fills us with awe of his majesty and adoration, of his ineffable perfections!

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.

In conclusion, we ask your attention to a few additional remarks, that may both strengthen your confidence in our Scriptural argument, and illustrate the great practical importance of the doctrine.

1. This doctrine has been the unvarying Orthodox belief, from the time of the apostles till now; and every departure from it has been marked and condemned as heresy.

In the first century, and during the life time of the apostles, a sect arose called *Ebeonites*, who taught that Christ was a mere man. About the same time also, the sect called *Gnostics*, who maintained that Christ was an *aëon*, or emanation from God, inferior to the Father, and when on earth was only a man in appearance, not in reality. To these sects, Paul, Peter and John are supposed to refer, when they speak of “de-

nying Christ," "denying the Lord that bought them," "of Antichrist," and "denying the Father and the Son."

In the second and third centuries, when the common doctrine of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost was taught in the Church generally, Praxeas and Sabellius wrote against it, on the ground, as they alleged, that it destroyed the divine unity. They maintained the sole supremacy of the Father, and that the terms Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were only modes or forms of the manifestation of God to his creatures. Against this sentiment were arrayed all the distinguished fathers of the Church, Justin the Martyr, Theophilus of Antioch, Athenagoras, Ireneus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Cyprian and Novitian. Though these fathers differed somewhat in their philosophical speculations, and improperly attempted to define the distinctions in the divine nature, yet they all agreed in rejecting the errors of Praxeas and Sabellius. Their errors were also publicly condemned in a council, held at Antioch, about the year A. D. 264.

Next, in the fourth century, arose the celebrated Arius, who taught that the Son was totally and essentially distinct from the Father; the first and noblest of all those beings whom the Father had created out of nothing, and the instrument by whom the world was made: that the Holy Spirit was of a different nature from the Father and the Son, and created by the Son. This doctrine gained many adherents, and produced great excitement, as being a departure from the faith. In the year A. D. 325, Constantine, Emperor of Rome, called a council, consisting of 380 bishops, or presbyters, to discuss and settle the disputed doctrine. They met at Nice, and the doctrine of Arius was condemned as heresy, and he himself was condemned and banished as an heretic. Athanasius, the leading opponent of Arius, drew up a creed of the Catholic or Orthodox faith, in which he says, "The Catholic faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, is all one; the glory equal—the majesty co-eternal."

From the fourth to the sixteenth century,\* but few writers or bishops dissented from the Athanasian or Nicene creed: but when the Reformation was in full progress, Faustus Socinus of Poland, advanced the doctrine that Christ was a mere man,

\* The semi-Arians held that the Son was of *like* substance with the Father, and begotten, not created.

endowed with extraordinary gifts, and constituted the Governor of the world; and that the Holy Ghost was a mere attribute or operation of God. The followers of Socinus were known by the name of Socinians, or more generally Unitarians, because they held to the divine Unity in opposition to Trinity. But this doctrine was rejected, both by Protestants and Catholics. Not long after, Servetus revived the old doctrine of Sabellius, that there are no distinctions in the divine nature, but that the terms, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are modes or forms in which God manifests himself: he was condemned by the magistrates of Geneva, and executed on the charge of heresy, and violating the peace of the state. Since then, others in England, Germany, and the United States, have advanced theories differing from the ancient faith; but it is a pleasing fact, that at this time, the doctrine of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—is the prevailing doctrine of the Christian world—the faith of every Christian denomination that has *any written and established creed!* The very faith drawn from the living pages of inspiration, in which holy men have lived, and martyrs died in triumph—the faith that wrought so mightily in such men as Edwards, Doddridge, Baxter, Luther, Augustine, Chrysostom, Tertullian, Iræneus, and the venerable Polycarp. If we are mistaken in our belief, we have at least the consolation of knowing, that it is a common error of the Church on earth, and that in which those best entitled to the name of saints, have believed and died, during eighteen centuries!

2. Another consideration that may strengthen your confidence in this doctrine is—that while the belief of it as a revealed fact makes the Bible appear plain and consistent with itself, every departure from it involves us in doubt, and sets the mind afloat on the ocean of conjecture. We know it has been common to represent the doctrine of the Trinity, as very mysterious, wonderful, incomprehensible; and, on the other hand, that of one God the Father only, as simple and clearly understood. But to us, on supposition that the Bible is our standard, directly the contrary is true. We admit, that closing the Bible, and looking solely at the works of creation, the idea of a Supreme Being, without the distinctions of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is simple. But you are not a deist. You do not take your religion from nature, but from the Scriptures. Open then that volume. You read, “I am the Lord, that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another.”—But a little farther on, you read, “Christ, who is over all, God blessed forever”—Creator, Upholder of all things, to be worshipped

by all on earth and all in heaven :—a little farther you read of the Holy Ghost—the Spirit of truth searching all things—dividing as a sovereign his gifts—united with the Father and the Son as an object of worship, into whose name we must be baptized, and from whom we invoke and receive spiritual blessings. Now, which is the more plain and easy to be understood—to say that the one Jehovah is revealed as to his mode of existence, as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; or to deny it, and then define what the Son and Holy Ghost means ? Is it easier and plainer to deny ? Come, then, tell us what you mean by Christ and the Holy Spirit. Do you hold with the Ebeonites, that Christ was a mere man, just like one of us ? or with the Gnostics, that he was a divine emanation, a ray from the Father ? or with the Arians, that he was the first of all creatures, and then made the Creator of the world ? or with Sabellius, that he was a mode of God's operation, an energy put forth in this particular form ? or do you hold with the semi-Arians, that he was of like substance with the Father, begotten, not created ? or with Socinus, as man, and nothing more in nature, but deified—that is, made a God, like a heathen hero, and appointed to rule and judge the world ? We ask, What do you believe ? Can you defend what you believe ? Are you willing to say what you believe ? What, we would ask, do you call the Holy Spirit ? an energy, an attribute, an emanation, a miraculous power, or what ? If any of these, is it a proper subject to be baptized into—to be united with the great Father of all in prayer—to be distinguished over and over again from that God, of whom he is an attribute, influence, or power ?

Here, then, we have on the page of history, the glaring fact, that all who have departed from what we call the simple doctrine of one God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, have ever and always been at variance in their belief—while all who hold the doctrine of the Trinity, have uniformly agreed or differed only in philo-sophical explanations of it. This fact we throw into the scale against the thousand objections about mystery in the Trinity. We say, admitting the Bible to be the standard, the mystery all lies on the other side. It is a mystery that the Bible reads so, that almost all the Christian world, through eighteen hundred years, should believe the doctrine, if it is not true. It is a mystery, that the very design for which the Bible was given, viz. to promote the worship of the only true God, should, if this doctrine is not true, lead to almost universal idolatry. It is a mystery, that if this doctrine is not true, no man can tell what is—for from the Ebeonites to Faustus So-

cinus, and ever since, there has been no agreement among those who have denied it.

If any of you falter in this doctrine; if you are tempted to deny it and embrace some other, let us request you first to decide, what you will believe, and why you will believe it. You will find a scale of faith respecting Jesus Christ, extending from earth to high heaven. At the bottom of the scale you will find him marked as a mere man, like one of us, liable to err and to sin; and at the top, you will find him marked next in rank to the great Supreme, though created and dependent. Determine where you will place him; and, after having placed him there, then take the Scriptures, and read every passage relating to him; and we predict that, before you shall have read your New Testament half through, you will sincerely doubt whether you have placed your Lord on the right spot. As to the Holy Spirit, make out, if you can, what you are to believe, before you renounce his distinct personality and true divinity. We pray you take not a leap in the dark!

Do you ask, how it comes to pass that so many are in difficulty on this doctrine, if it is indeed plain? We will tell you. It is because, they undertake to know and explain what God has not revealed. He has revealed the fact that divine attributes, works and worship belong to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—and this as a fact, is as plain and easy to be understood, as that God made the world. Not content with this, you ask *how* the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are united, so as to constitute the one Jehovah? what is the exact distinction between them? This the Bible does not say one word about. Yet you allow your mind to work itself into difficulty on the subject, and your difficulties are the necessary result—the punishment of your presumption. Suppose you were to try to explain *how* God is self-existent and eternal—*how* he created the world out of nothing—or *how* your soul and body are united? You would find quite as many difficulties on either of these points, as you ever did on the subject of the Trinity.

3. A third consideration which should endear the doctrine to you, is its important connexions and practical influence. It gives us some knowledge of the Supreme Being, which we could never have learnt from the light of nature. Suppose a new system of worlds were laid open to your view, in which the Deity should make a more full and sublime manifestation of himself, than he has done in the world which we inhabit? Would you shut your eyes and refuse to learn more? Rather would you not thankfully receive and treasure up the additional knowledge, and derive from it a new impulse to obedience, and

a fresh influx of joy? In the Scriptures, God has laid open a new system. He has displayed himself in a more ample and glorious manner than in the works of creation. Respecting the mode of his existence, "all nature is mute." It says nothing for or against a Trinity in the Godhead. It tells us He is, but not in what manner. "From one end of the earth to the other, through all the starry heavens, there is silence." Nor is it probable that one ray of light would ever have been reflected on this subject from all the works of creation, in their grand revolutions, to the end of time. But the Bible has disclosed a new fact respecting God. It tells us that in the one Jehovah, whom we adore, is a threefold distinction; that he exists as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Shall we refuse to receive this addition to our knowledge, because we saw it not written on the open volume of the sky? In the revered names of Reason and Religion, we demand, why is it that the discoveries made to us by revelation, are not welcomed with the same gratitude, and proclaimed with the same enthusiasm as are the discoveries made by the natural world? In the revealed doctrine of a Trinity in the Godhead—there is indeed a "sublime peculiarity." But, "by virtue of it, in the person of the Father is reflected the glory of the Son and the Spirit; in the person of the Son, that of the Father and Spirit; and in the person of the Spirit, that of the Father and Son; and thus the radiance is reflected and re-reflected, gathering lustre at every reflection, until the High and Holy One, who inhabiteth eternity, shines forth in all his works and all his dominions in glory transcendent and divine."

Again—this doctrine is interwoven with all the peculiar doctrines of the Christian system; so that the rejection of it is naturally, we may say, inevitably, followed by the denial of all the rest. For instance, the doctrine of atonement for sin, by the sacrifice which Jesus Christ offered, once for all. Deny the proper divinity of Jesus Christ, and you destroy the efficacy of his atonement. You disrobe him of all the qualities essential to such a work. You reduce the atonement for sin, which the Scriptures ascribe to him, to nothing but an example of suffering virtue, or a worthy instance of martyrdom. It is not possible in the nature of things, unless he was more than a created dependent being, for him to make satisfaction for our sins, any more than Paul, or Stephen, or Peter could. Deny his divinity, and who is your Saviour? A dependent creature, to whom you can assign no definite rank in the universe! Oh, how can you commit to such an one that precious soul, and enter eternity! Do you say, God is my Saviour—but out of

Christ, he is a consuming fire? There is no other-name given under heaven among men whereby we must be saved—but the name of Jesus Christ!

Farther, the doctrine of regeneration and sanctification by the Holy Spirit, is plainly taught in the Scriptures. By his efficacy the plan of redemption is carried forward, and a multitude, which no man can number, fitted for the society and employments of heaven. But, deny the doctrine of the Trinity, and there is no Holy Spirit to which you can attach any definite meaning. Who then will convince of sin? Who regenerate the heart? Who give consolation to the trembling sinner, or to the dispirited believer? Who fit the soul for heaven?

But we must conclude. Only let us say, brethren, you have reason to love this doctrine and to hold it fast. It is that into which you have been baptized. And if there are any inhabitants from our world now in heaven, we cannot but believe that they are adoring, with ineffable joy, the one Jehovah, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. In your devotions, let this truth exert its full practical influence. When you meditate upon the one God, or pray to him, you will have in view that one Being, who possesses all the attributes of Divinity. When you think of Christ separately, degrade him not to the rank of a dependent creature, but remember, that in him, "God was manifest in the flesh;" and that "he is able to save to the uttermost," only because in his original character he is the "Mighty God." When about to bid farewell to these earthly scenes,—when friends near and dear are taking the final adieu, and you feel the want of support,—think of him who has said, "My grace is sufficient for thee." In your dying agonies, do as the martyr Stephen—"Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." And when, brethren, your hearts despond on account of sins within, or trials without, remember the Holy Spirit is the comforter and sanctifier. When you look abroad upon the world, and see wickedness abounding—when you are ready to be disheartened in your efforts to do good,—think it is the Spirit's work to convince of sin and renovate the heart; and engage in the use of all proper means for your own salvation, and for the conversion of the world, in humble dependence on his efficacious influence. And may "the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen."

## PRAYER OF FAITH.

I have read many treatises upon the prayer of faith, and they have been very commonly unsatisfactory to my own religious feelings. That prayer is to be explained to be nothing more than a mode of producing a certain influence on my own mind; a preparatory process to the right use of blessings; or, to be a mere act of homage to superiority, or, a means of obtaining some indefinite good, because God had constituted a connection between asking and receiving, my own conscience, in the closet, cannot admit. That prayer involves these, I never doubted; but that these exhausted the idea of prayer, I never heartily believed. The last thought, viz. that God has constituted a connexion between asking and receiving, has been much insisted upon, but it always appeared to me to be a very cold enunciation of a part of the truth. And when it has been urged as the constraining and powerful motive to prayer, it has seemed as though the preacher was building a splendid ice palace for my soul to dwell in. I always shrink away from its frosty severity.

Nor have I, on the other hand, been able to reconcile my feelings and experience with the thoughts advanced by the opposite class of writers and preachers on this subject. They demand, that I should believe the divine promise to be so clear, so full, and so adopted to the distinctive peculiarities of my own mind, in distinction from other minds, that whatsoever I believe, with a sufficient certainty of conviction, would be granted.—That the promise of God was pledged to my faith. The two parties I have supposed were at the opposite poles of the same idea, and I have fancied the truth was to be found at the *punctum indifferens*, the centre point between the two. In looking at the subject, for my own spiritual benefit, I have found satisfaction in contemplating two points. They may be said to involve each other, with some truth; but they are distinct in themselves, though the thoughts issuing therefrom soon form a junction, and coalesce most delightfully.

The one point is the idea of prayer as supplication, *supplicatio, supplico, sub and plico*. The attitude of soul and spirit is not that of demand, as conscious, of power and of right, and therefore of unquestioning certainty; but of asking, entreating, earnestly beseeching. Now the idea of supplication forestalls that of demand as a matter of right, or of absolute certainty. The soul supplicates. Think of it, in the hour of the most fervent petition ever honored by a human heart in its closet.

How it pours forth its deep feelings, its strong and anxious desires. What earnestness of humility, so to speak, has taken possession of it. It ought not to be satisfied, and it cannot be until it obtains what it seeks. Therefore it lies at the fountain of blessing, resolved not to depart, until its cup runneth over with the possession, or the foretaste of mercies. Through the whole of this intense feeling there is still found predominant the spirit of *grace and supplication*. If I obtain, the soul cries, O *it will be grace, grace*; favor to the unworthy, to the guilty; and because it is all *grace therefore*, I beg and beseech, even to loud agony.

The second point I look at is the Being of whom we supplicate. In most discussions on this subject God is regarded as a Being of power, as a sovereign dispensing favors as he may choose. And as he has constituted a connection between asking and receiving, so we may hope for a favorable answer to our requests, with that strength of confidence, which we have in the certainty of the connexion between asking and receiving. I wish prayer to be supported in the soul by a richer and more sustaining element than such a meagre conception;—a conception, as it is usually exhibited, little else than *power forming connexions*. One thinks of power as an engine, perchance of steam, and of connexion, as a chain of iron attached to it. Such an anatomy vanishes in one's closet, or rather becomes so clothed, that you can scarcely recognize it.

The second point I look at, as I said, is the Being, whom we supplicate. And in him I find not power or sovereignty alone, but wisdom and goodness and love and mercy as shades and lights and proportions, which make the impressions upon my spirit. And what is the impression, which is made? Why, all that wisdom and love and mercy wishes to be given, will be given, and all that they would withhold, it would be satanical for me to desire, and dreadful for God to bestow. By being regenerate, and thus a "partaker of the divine nature," it is supposed that my prayer is the offspring of this nature—an instructive call of the spirit of the parent in the child for more of the spirit of the parent, either in itself, or in others. And because my mind is weak and limited, I may not accurately judge of the law, which bounds love; of the sin and guilt that might result, if this or that should take place; and if it could be supposed that I saw the effect of the gift I sought, the very spirit that prompted the regard might cry out, "That be far from thee, O Lord; shall not the judge of all the earth do right?" Let us then suppose that prayer is not a form of words, a collection of sounds, but the utterance of the "divine nature"

within us, in reference to our peculiar circumstances; and then ask, Will it plead with confidence? It would deny itself if it did not!! Itself is of God; and is the bosom of everlasting love shut against its own compassions? Does God deny his own Spirit? Never; and when I thus think, I rest in confidence, that prayer will be heard. God must be different from what he is, before my confidence can be shaken. Doubts, fears, difficulties, or dangers, so long as my mind rests in this covert, cannot move me. I think of Gideon, and Baruch, and Sampson: I think of David, and Daniel, and John, and Paul; and I feel girt about by the same strength, and standing on the same foundation—the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob. The utterance of such prayer would be the prayer of faith; the prayer, that was founded, built up, and uttered in faith. And what would be granted to it?—All that *it*, viz. the regenerate, germentant principle of faith desired; and that is all that any holy soul can desire, unless having baptized its wishing-cap of sense and sin by the name of faith and holiness, it call *that* the prayer of faith.

But I seem to hear some one say, Will my friend, for whom I pray, be converted? I wish to have the prayer of faith in relation to him. Can I have it? Such an inquirer wishes for a certainty of conviction, that the friend will be converted, that he may feel more at rest, and that his progress may be more earnest from the prospect of a speedy answer. Now the very putting of such a question involves a spiritual absurdity; a contradiction in one's Christian experience. The inquirer wishes for the prayer of faith in relation to a particular object, but is not willing to have his confidence grounded where all faith must be grounded, viz. in the character of God;—not in God's power merely, not in his naked sovereignty, but in the spiritual, holy excellence of God. He is not willing to trust *that*, and be at rest; but demands that his own sight shall be gratified in the conversion of his friend; and if not converted, he cries out, "I have no faith." Now, this is demanding to walk by sight, and, were it possible, would destroy faith itself. It would make our confidence strong in our own faith, and not in God, or in the promise of God; as the mere utterance of authority, and not confidence in the promise, as the word of wisdom, truth, and love, as it is, and as it was intended we should receive it. Any faith in God, that is not founded in wisdom, truth and love, is no faith in God;—it may be faith in the figment of the imagination. And all genuine faith must, in every act of anticipated fulfilment, be subject to the

condition, the variations, changes, &c., that pertain to wisdom and love, as they go forth to accomplish their purposes.

In this world of sense and sin, there is always the temptation to confirm *our wishes*, under the name of faith, by outward effects; to reduce them to the certainty of a *visible* accomplishment. Increasing faith has, however, less anxiety about these material, visible changes; and delights more in the free, liberal, angelic confidence, which is found in studying the character, and in reposing upon the arm of Him, who is from everlasting to everlasting, and who, as to the ends and purposes of wisdom, and truth, and goodness, is without variableness or shadow of turning. Our minds, occupied with the cares of this world, do not love to rest on the ever-growing, and ever-expanding manifestation of God in all his word, and in all his works; our hearts do not return as to their rest, to the substantial, but spiritual attributes of his character. We do not look at the promise, as a rent in the veil of flesh, through which we may behold the holy character of the promises, and dwell upon the cloudless beauty of the spiritual world that is thus open to our view. We ask for something more visible, more tangible. "Our soul loatheth this light food." "O, for the *flesh-pots* of Egypt!" the *gout* of something addressed to our senses. And this, in despite of that awful declaration, "To be carnally (sensually) minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace." The life of faith, is the life which God demands; and the life of faith will be more or less filled with the prayer of faith; but it is not a life bounded by something standing out to the senses, as completed and perfected in this world. If it was, it would cease to be a life of faith. Nor is the prayer of faith bounded by the accomplishment of particular individual requests; nor does the soul in its exercise dwell with self-appropriating minuteness and spirituality upon its own wishes. No, it rather seeks to hide itself in the fulness there is in God to bestow; the love there is in God to lead him to bestow; the wisdom there is in God to guide him in the bestowment; and the unchangeable truth there is in God, that he will not fail to bestow all that wisdom and love and truth can desire.

J. M.

## REVIEWS.

A STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR NOT BELIEVING THE DOCTRINES OF TRINITARIANS, *Concerning the Nature of God, and the Person of Christ.* By ANDREWS NORTON. 1833. pp. 331.

After an attentive perusal of this volume, we lay it down with mingled emotions, such as we find it difficult to analyze, and still more difficult to express. There is a feeling of satisfaction in seeing a man frank and open in his declarations, although these may involve great inconsistencies and pernicious errors. There is a feeling of satisfaction, too, whether right or wrong, in the verification of one's own predictions—in witnessing results which have been long foreseen, and often foretold—even when these results are in themselves of a nature to be deeply regretted. There is a satisfaction also in the belief, which has been growing upon us for a considerable time, and which the volume before us tends to confirm, that that current of fashionable irreligion which, under imposing names and appearances, once threatened to sweep away all our landmarks, and involve our churches in a common ruin, has in a great measure spent its force, ceased to be formidable, and is now running its last dregs; and that its promoters (or some of them) have come at length to a point, where it may be hoped their follies “will correct them, and their backslidings reprove them.”

On the other hand, it is exceedingly painful, to see a man of education and talents—of a refined and cultivated mind, who has long been pursuing studies connected with the Bible, and has been a professed teacher of it, taking ground, not merely against the doctrines of religion, but against the integrity of the sacred word,—denying its inspiration, and rejecting large portions of it at pleasure. It is painful to see a person, who for years occupied a station of great responsibility in an Institution consecrated “to Christ and his church,” from whom many who are now settled as ministers received their instructions in the Bible, and whose decisions are still regarded by them as next to oracular,—pretending to be more wise than the inspired Apostles, talking about their mistakes and errors, and endeavoring to assign reasons why they were not more fully instructed by their great Master. It is painful to see one, who is bound with others to the judgement, and is exercising a mighty influence

over some of them, denying that there will be any general Judgement, and sweeping away all those foundations, on which alone *sinner*s can hope to stand there with acceptance.

The volume before us commences with a Preface of more than thirty pages, in which Mr. Norton apologizes for writing again on such a subject as the Trinity; sets forth the reasons which induced him to write; affirms his *sincerity* in what he has written—a virtue which he deems very rare among theologians (referring, we suppose, to those with whom he has been chiefly conversant;) and throws out some hints as to the manner in which he thinks improvements in theology are in future to be promoted. “Religion must be taken out of the hands of *divines*, such as the generality of divines have been, and its exposition and defence must become the study of *philosophers*.”

One of the most obvious *moral* qualities displayed in this Preface, as indeed in the volume generally, is intolerable arrogance and pride. The author settles questions at once, and with an air of authority, about which a greater share of modesty, if not of learning, would have led him to hesitate; and he looks down often upon the cherished sentiments and pursuits of others with contempt. It would really seem, at times, that Mr. Norton regarded himself as a being of some higher order—elevated far above the ordinary inhabitants of this mundane sphere—and that it was a mortifying condescension for him to come down, and shed upon their darkness a portion of his superior light. It is not strange that a man, who seems to imagine that nearly all the learning and intelligence of the world are embodied in himself and a few of his Antitrinitarian friends, should speak of the Trinity as an “obsolete” relic of a former age—as exploded and abandoned, like “the supremacy of the pope and the divine right of kings,” by “the generality of those, who, on every subject but theology, are the guides of public opinion.” It is strange, however, that after vaunting himself in this manner, our author should make the following statement on his very next page:

“The treatises of European nations still begin with a solemn appeal to the “Most Holy Trinity”; the doctrine is still the professed faith of every established church, and, as far as I know, of every sect which makes a creed its bond of communion: and if any one should recur to books, he would find it presented as an all-important distinction of Christianity by far the larger portion of Divines. It is, in consequence, viewed by most men, more or less distinctly, as a part of Christianity.”

How the doctrine of the Trinity can be “viewed by *most men* as a part of Christianity,” and still be so universally rejected, that to attempt a refutation of it “may seem to imply a *theologian’s* ignorance of the opinions of the world”—(our

theological readers will mark in what estimation they are held-- is not obvious, certainly, to common minds. It must be remembered, however, that there is no reasoning from men of ordinary light to minds as perspicacious as that of Mr. Norton. What seems absurd and contradictory to others, may be all plain to him. We should think it superfluous to write a book in refutation of a doctrine which no person believed; but Mr. N. has written more than one book, to refute and subvert the doctrine of the Trinity—a doctrine which he gravely assures us it is impossible, from the nature of the human mind, should be believed”!!

The chief reason, as set forth in the Preface and in other parts of the volume, which moved Mr. Norton to stoop so low as to take up his pen again in opposition to the Trinity—a doctrine, by the way which he thinks no man ever believed, or ever can—was, that he ‘might by any means save some’ from the yawning gulf of infidelity. Men, it seems, are in danger of rejecting Christianity for the Trinity’s sake; and, consequently, the Trinity must be given up, that Christianity may by this means be spared.

But if Unitarianism is such a potent preservative against Infidelity, how shall it be accounted for, that so many professed Unitarians have, at different times, become acknowledged Infidels? This was the case with Thomas Chubb. He commenced his career, as an author, by writing against the Trinity; and finished it by discarding revealed religion.

“A number of celebrated writers,” says Lord Shaftesbury, “have made open profession of Deism; and *most of the Socinians have at length joined them.*”\*

Mr. Belsham, speaking of his Students at Hackney, says, “The studious and virtuous part of our family *have very generally given up Christianity.* This is an evil to which no remedy can be applied.” Speaking also of his hearers at Hackney, Mr. Belsham says, “Some are offended,” and “what is worse, some are disturbed in their habits of thinking, and either talk inconsistently, or *become unbelievers.* And these are not the youngest of my hearers.”† It will not be pretended, that the hearers and students of Mr. Belsham were driven off from Christianity, by his insisting too strenuously on the doctrine of the Trinity.

Mr. Belsham calls the German Neologists, “dishonest Infidels;” and, in this judgement, Mr. Norton appears to coincide.

\* See Voltaire’s General History, Nugent’s Translation, Vol. iv. pp. 243, 244.

† Williams’s Memoir of Belsham, pp. 462, 495.

But if Unitarianism is a sure preservative against Infidelity, how came these Neologists to incur such a reproach? Surely they have not been disturbed of late, by any lingering prepossessions in favor of the Trinity.

On supposition that Unitarianism is so powerful an antagonist to Infidelity, we should like to know, farther, why there has been, and is now, so much *sympathy* and *cordiality* between the abettors of the two systems,—Infidels, on the one hand, have represented Unitarians “as a sect of philosophers, who do not choose openly to avow pure Deism, and reject—formally, every kind of revelation,—but who are continually doing, with respect to the Old and New Testament, what Epicurus did with respect to the gods—*admitting them verbally, but destroying them really;*”\* while Unitarians, on the other hand, are insisting, that Infidels may be truly pious and excellent men, and worthy to be received into the Societies of Christians. Mr. Norton has said, “that Lord Herbert was not inferior, in Christian charity, to Calvin, or in truth and honesty, to Beza, or *in piety and holiness to either.*”† Dr. Channing “does not condemn the unbeliever, unless he bear witness against himself by an *immoral and irreligious life.*” He even thinks, “that to reject Christianity, under some of its corruptions, is rather a *virtue* than a crime.”‡ Some of the English Unitarians are insisting, at this time, on the propriety of receiving Infidels into their Societies, and charging with illiberality, all who oppose the measure.§ The efforts of such men as Belsham and Norton, for the conversion of Infidels, resemble those of some of the Catholic emissaries, for the conversion of the heathen. “These sorts,” says an old writer, “will turn themselves into several forms; with the heathen, a heathenist; with the atheists, an atheist; with the Jews, a Jew; and with the reformers, a reformade; purposely to know their intentions, their minds, their hearts, and thereby bring them, at last, to be like the fool, that said in his heart, *There is no God.*” If Christian ministers are willing to turn Infidels, no doubt their infidel brethren will be willing to receive them, and will not suffer a mere question of names to be any bar in the way of union. They will be willing to bear our name, if we will consent to embrace their doctrine. They will be willing to harmonize on the basis of a Christianity, which rejects the inspiration of the Bible, and so much of its contents as may be thought reasonable and convenient.

\* French Encyclopedia, Art. Unitarians.

† Discourses, pp. 9, 12.

‡ Repository, Vol. i. p. 7.

§ See Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. i. p. 615.

The professed purpose of the work before us, is, "to give a view of the doctrine of Trinitarians, respecting the nature of God and the person of Christ; to state the reasons for not believing those doctrines; and to show in what manner, the passages of Scripture urged in their support, ought to be regarded."

In describing the doctrines of Trinitarians, Mr. Norton divides them into five classes—which he afterwards reduces to two;—those who profess to believe an intrinsic *absurdity*, and those who hold to *three Gods*. The ground, and the whole ground, for undertaking to divide Trinitarians into different classes, has been furnished by the unwarrantable attempts of Trinitarians to *explain* what they profess to regard as mysterious and inexplicable. The Christian fathers of the second and third centuries attempted, by the help of the Platonic philosophy, to explain the doctrine of the Trinity; but in so doing, they, in some instances, corrupted it. They dropped expressions, occasionally, which are inconsistent with the true doctrine of the Trinity, with the language of the Bible, and with their own language in other places. Later writers have attempted, at different times and in various ways, to explain the doctrine of the Trinity;—but with no better success. And this is what might have been anticipated. Do not all Trinitarians profess to regard certain points connected with this doctrine, as mysterious and inexplicable? Why, then, endeavor to explain them? Why not take the facts relating to the doctrine, as God has stated them in the Bible, and leave minuter explanations, to be attempted, if at all, when we shall be favored with superior light?

"But it is absurd," we are told, "to profess to believe what we do not understand, and cannot explain. How can a person believe that, of which he has, confessedly, no understanding?"

In reply to this, it only need be said, that what we profess to believe in regard to the Trinity, we profess also to understand; and respecting that of which we have no understanding, and can give no explanation, we entertain no belief, one way or the other. We believe that the Divine Being is, in some sense, one, and, in some *other* sense, three. We believe this, as a revealed fact; and as such, we understand it. But in what sense he is three, and in what other sense one, or *how* the three personalities are united, so as to constitute but one Divine Being, we profess neither to understand nor believe. We believe the *facts* in regard to the Trinity, as God has revealed them in the Scriptures; and these facts we can state, in a way to be understood by ourselves and others; but we know nothing of the *manner* in which these facts consist, and in respect to this, we,

of course, believe nothing. In the same way, our faith is exercised and limited in regard to many other subjects besides the Trinity. We understand that soul and body are united in the human person, and this, we believe; but *how* they are united, we do not understand, and neither do we believe. We understand the fact, that heat and moisture promote the growth of vegetables, and this we believe; but as to the process or manner in which vegetables grow, under the influence of heat and moisture, we neither understand nor believe any thing.

In regard to the charge of tritheism, we have nothing to say,—except that we are as clear from it as Mr. Norton himself. And as to the charge of contradiction and absurdity, it is only by a *false* statement of the doctrine in question, that our author has given to it the air of plausibility. If Trinitarians believed the Divine Being to be one and three in *the same sense*; or that the word God, when applied to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit *collectively*, imports the same as when applied to either *one* of these Divine persons, (and Mr. Norton assumes that such is their belief\*) then, indeed, they might be charged with contradiction and absurdity. But, with one voice, Trinitarians disclaim such a belief. They believe, as before stated, that the Divine Being is in some sense one, and in some *other* sense three; and in this proposition there is no contradiction. None can be discovered in it, or by any possibility be fastened upon it. For the same reason that Trinitarians cannot explain the *different senses* in which God may be said to be one and three, it is impossible for Anti-trinitarians to prove that he cannot, in *different senses*, be one and three. The subject, in this view of it, is above the comprehension of either party. It is beyond their reach. And it becomes us to rest satisfied with what God has revealed, without pretending to understand or explain, to believe or deny, what he has been pleased to reserve among the secret things which belong only to himself.

We design not to go into a prolonged examination of Mr. Norton's interpretations, for the very good reason that, according to his principles, it is impossible to prove or disprove any thing by the Bible. He does not consider the Scriptures as the word of God, or admit them to be a safe and infallible directory in the things of religion. The Apostles, he thinks, were often mistaken, not merely in their private opinions, but in their published writings—those which are contained between the covers of our Bibles. And really, when a man avows opinions such as these in relation to the Bible, we think it idle to

\* See p. 44.

go into a discussion with him respecting the meaning of particular passages. For when the meaning of a passage is ascertained and settled to his satisfaction, still it is of no authority with him. It must be proved further, that the sacred writer was not mistaken. We must bring him to the bar of our reason and judgment, and decide as to his competency and credibility;—and this is what no Christian can ever consent to do.

It may be expected, however, that we shall give our readers some account of the manner in which Mr. Norton disposes of the passages commonly relied on to prove the Trinity, and the other connected doctrines.

He has frequent recourse to the old sophism, that because the Scriptures represent Christ as in some sense distinct from God, and inferior to him, therefore he is not a divine person. “The Logos was *with* God, which, if the Logos be a person, necessarily implies that he is a different person from God. Whoever is *with* any being must be diverse from that being with whom he is.” “Read over the history in the Evangelists, and ask yourselves if you are not reading the history of a man.” pp. 238, 32. We should like to know how long Mr. Norton thinks it will take to convince and silence Trinitarians by argumentation such as this? Do not they hold, as strenuously as himself, that Christ was, in some sense, distinct from God and inferior to him? Is not this view of the case as essential to their doctrine, as it is to his? Nor is there the least inconsistency (that he can show, or any one else) in supposing that Christ is, in some sense, inferior to God, and distinct from him, and in some *other* sense, equal to God, and one with him.

Mr. Norton does not pretend, in many instances, to be at all confident as to what the proof texts of Trinitarians do mean, but he affirms repeatedly, and with the greatest confidence, that they do not and cannot teach the Trinity. Having first proved, as he thinks, that the doctrine of the Trinity is absurd, he lays it down, as a fundamental principle, that the Scriptures, or at least that portion of them (whatever it may be) which he regards as of Divine authority, cannot teach that doctrine. Whatever else they may teach, and whether we can be satisfied or not as to what they do teach, we may be sure that the Trinity is not there. “If Christ and his Apostles communicated a revelation from God, these doctrines” (the Trinity and Divinity of Christ) “*could make no part of it; for a revelation from God cannot teach absurdities.*” “*It is a thing impossible, and not to be imagined.*” pp. 22, 119. In view of principles such as these, our Trinitarian friends will be at no loss to conjecture what kind of treatment their proof texts have

received from the hands of Mr. Norton. He admits that particular passages seem to teach the doctrine of the Trinity; the "words will bear a Trinitarian sense;" but then this cannot be the sense; for the doctrine of the Trinity is absurd, and nothing which God has revealed can teach an absurdity. Instead of going to the Bible without bias or prejudice, to determine what its meaning is, Mr. Norton establishes, *a priori*, what it does not mean; and then sets himself to make the best of the language which his learning and ingenuity can devise. Some passages he rejects, without hesitation, as not belonging to the sacred text. Others have been interpolated and corrupted. Not a few have been very improperly translated. A great number of passages, referring to various important subjects, are represented as figurative. The word Logos is used figuratively to represent "the attributes of God." The Holy Spirit is a figurative expression, setting forth the same idea. The passages commonly relied on to prove the doctrines of atonement and regeneration are all figurative. "Christ speaks of the ministry of angels figuratively, to denote some manifestation of the power of God." The resurrection of the dead is figurative. And the coming of Christ to judgment "is a scenical representation" teaching us "that our happiness or misery is to be determined by ourselves."

Where no expedient will answer the purpose better, the Apostles are declared to have been ignorant and mistaken. John was an "unskilful writer," who "adopted a popular error of his countrymen respecting the existence and power of a being, the supposed author of evil." He "preserved *essentially* the *thoughts* uttered by his Master," but "conformed *the language* more or less to his own modes of expression;" so that we cannot confide implicitly in John as a reporter either of the thoughts or the words of the Saviour. "Supposing that Thomas *had* believed and assented that his Master was God himself;" "there would be little reason for relying upon his opinion, as infallible."

Mr. Norton, when it suits his convenience, can become a strenuous asserter of the doctrine of God's eternal purposes, or decrees.

"Facts connected with the introduction of Christianity were spoken of by Christ and his Apostles,—according to the verbal meaning of their language,—as having taken place before the world was; the purpose being to express in the most forcible manner, that their existence was to be referred immediately to God, and had from eternity been predetermined by him. What they meant to represent God as having foreordained, they described as actually existing."

The object of this is to establish a principle on which to explain away the pre-existence of Christ—a doctrine which Mr. Norton utterly rejects, affirming that our Saviour had no existence previous to his appearing on earth. He pre-existed only in the purpose of God. In other words, it was fixed, in the eternal purpose of God, that at the appointed time Jesus should be born, and should accomplish his ministry in the world. And with due deference we would inquire, whether it was not fixed, in the eternal purpose of God, when every human being should be born; and whether, on this ground, Samuel or David might not have said of themselves, with equal propriety as the Lord Jesus Christ, that they “came forth from God,” “came down from heaven,” existed “before Abraham,” and possessed “a glory with the Father before the world was.”

Mr. Norton affirms that “there is nothing in the nature of prayer which renders it improper to be addressed to a being inferior to God.” Accordingly he admits that Stephen prayed to Christ in his last moments; and that Paul prayed to Christ that the thorn in his flesh might be removed. p. 160. And yet, with marvellous consistency, he affirms “that the first Christians did not offer prayers to Christ,” and that such prayer is forbidden to us.\*

But we cannot dwell on Mr. Norton’s interpretations; and for the reason above assigned, this is wholly unnecessary. Persons must admit the Divine authority of the Bible, and the whole Bible, before they can expect Christians to enter into any discussion with them as to the meaning of particular expressions of the sacred writings. From what has been said, however, our readers will have no difficulty in forming a judgment as to the character and tendency of Mr. Norton’s exegetical labors. They are all aimed, not to exalt the Scriptures, but to sink them; not so much to show what they do mean, as what they do not mean; not to open them, and bring forth heavenly riches from the fulness of their treasures, but to explain them away. Figure is added to figure, and every artifice seems to have been resorted to, which ingenuity could invent, to root out certain hated doctrines from the Bible, and bring it down, almost or altogether, to the standard of the religion of nature.

\* To show that Christians are forbidden to pray to Christ, Mr. Norton refers to John xvi. 23, “In that day, ye shall ask me nothing; verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.” But our learned author ought to have known that there are two Greek words here rendered *ask*; the first of which ( $\epsilon\rho\omega\tau\alpha\omega$ ) properly means to *ask questions*, and the latter ( $\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon\omega$ ) to *ask for a favor*. Accordingly, Campbell renders the verse thus, “In that day, ye shall *put no questions to me*; verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall *ask the Father*,” &c.

Accordingly, the creed of Unitarians, as set forth by Mr. Norton, is one to which most of the old English Deists would have subscribed, without the least hesitation, and without abating one iota of their Deism.

“Christianity, we believe, has taught men to know God, and has revealed him as the Father of his creatures. It has made known his infinite perfections, his providence, and his moral government. It has directed us to look up to Him as the Being, on whom we and all things are entirely dependent, and to look up to Him with perfect confidence and love.”

And does not the religion of nature teach the existence and perfections of God, the dependence of creatures upon him, and their obligations to love him?

“It (Christianity) has made known to us that we are to live forever; it has brought life and immortality to light. Man was a creature of this earth, and it has raised him to a far nobler rank, and taught him to regard himself as an immortal being, the child of God. It calls the sinner to reformation and hope. It affords to virtue the highest possible sanctions. It gives to sorrow its best, and often its only consolation.”

And does not the religion of nature teach the immortality of the soul—less authoritatively, indeed, than revelation, but yet satisfactorily? And does not this furnish motives in favor of reformation, and reasons for submission and acquiescence under sufferings?

“It (Christianity) presents us, in the life of our great Master, with an example of that moral perfection which is to be the constant object of our exertions.”

Infidels generally have professed to believe that there was such a person as Jesus of Nazareth, and to approve of his example. This did Morgan, and Chubb, and Bolingbroke, and Rousseau.

“It (Christianity) has established the truths which it teaches, upon evidence the most satisfactory. It is a most glorious display of the benevolence of the Deity, and of his care for the beings of this earth. It has lifted the veil which separated God from his creatures, and this life from eternity.”

And according to the view here given of Christianity, the religion of nature establishes much the same truths, and is scarcely an inferior display of the benevolence of the Deity.

So much for the “wondrous things” which Unitarians profess to discover in the word of God. No wonder they discredit the assertion, that “the angels desire to look” into such things as these.\* Perhaps they think, also, that these things looked larger than the reality to the Apostle Paul, on account of his seeing them through a mist, when he spake of them as

\* Angels, it will be recollected, are mere *figurative* existences.

“the great mystery of godliness,” and exclaimed in view of them, “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!”

Having favored the world with the above epitome of Unitarian belief, Mr. Norton adds,—

“This religion of joy and consolation will, it is contended, lose its value, unless it announce to us, that we are created under the wrath of God; that it is impossible for us to will, unless our moral natures be created anew; and that this is a favor denied to far the greater part of men, who are required to perform what he has made it morally impossible they should perform, with the most unrelenting rigor, and under penalty of the most terrible and everlasting torments.”

We should like to inquire of Mr. Norton, whether he ever saw or heard an individual “contending” for doctrines such as these;—whether he supposes there is an Orthodox minister in New England who would contend for them;—and whether, as he assures us, he actually wrote this miserable caricature of the religious sentiments of his neighbors, “as it were on the tombstones of these who were most dear to him.” and “with feelings of the character, purposes, and duties of life, which his own death-bed will not strengthen.” One might think it enough for him to write books to refute the Trinity—a doctrine which he affirms no man ever did or can believe—without undertaking to refute other doctrines which none perhaps in the world, certainly none in this vicinity, do believe.

We have intimated already, that Mr. Norton is not satisfied to receive all our sacred books as of canonical authority. It may be gratifying to our readers to know what portion of them is rejected.

In the first place, the Epistle to the Hebrews is rejected, as not being the production of Paul, and consequently as not “a canonical book, in whatever sense that word may be used.”\* Christians have long loved and studied the Epistle to the Hebrews, and regarded it as a precious portion of the word of God. But it seems they have been mistaken. They have been imposed upon. The Epistle to the Hebrews, it is at length discovered, is no part of the Bible, and ought never to have been included in the sacred volume.

The second Epistle of Peter is also rejected, as not being the production of the Apostle whose name it bears. But if this Epistle was not written by Peter, it certainly was written by a gross deceiver, a wilful falsifier. For the writer declares himself to be “Simon Peter, a servant and an Apostle of Jesus

\* See *Christian Examiner*, vol. vi. p. 343.

Christ;" and speaks of having been personally with Christ in the mount of transfiguration, "when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory. This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," chap. i. 17. There is no alternative, therefore, but either to regard this Epistle as the production of Peter, or to reject it, not merely as uncanonical, but as the production of a vile deceiver.

Our author furthermore discards the Apocalypse, as not being the work of the Apostle John. He speaks of "the imperfections of its language," and "regards it as the production of some early Jewish Christian whose imagination was highly excited by the expected coming of Christ."—If those who "take away" *ought* from this mysterious and awful book, shall have "their part taken away out of the book of life, and out of the holy city;" then what must be the portion of him who does not hesitate to reject it *all*—putting it on a level with the Visions of Hermas, or the dreams of John Bunyan!

Our readers will perceive, from what is here said, that the work of expurgating the Bible has been commenced, in sober earnest, at the fountain head of Unitarian influence. How much further it is to proceed, time only can disclose. We think it of little importance, however, so far as the authority of Scripture is concerned, how far it does proceed. There is manifestly no great difference, in the mind of Mr. Norton, between books canonical and uncanonical; since in the canonical books, those written by the Apostles and Evangelists, there are frequent mistakes and errors, and these books have need to be corrected, in many things, by the superior light of Unitarian Expositors.

The object of Mr. Norton's Appendix is to expose some of the mistakes of the Apostles, and to assign reasons why they were not more fully instructed by their great Master. The first he mentions is the belief, which he supposes they all entertained, that Christ would shortly appear to judgment. "They all appear to have expected his personal and visible return to earth, as an event not distant, and to have believed that he would come to execute judgment, to reward his faithful followers, to punish the disobedient, and to destroy his foes." p. 310.

In regard to this subject, we would remark, in the first place, that if the Apostles were mistaken respecting the coming of Christ, and have recorded their mistakes in the Bible, then the Spirit was not given them, agreeably to promise, to "guide them into *all truth*" (John xvi. 13;) and the words which they spake were not, as the Apostle Paul avers, the teachings of the Holy Ghost, 1 Cor. ii. 13. If they were mistaken in this matter, and have recorded their mistake in the Bible; then who can

tell how many other mistakes are recorded in the Bible? And if this blessed book must be subjected to our revision and correction; then what is to be the ultimate standard,—our reason, or the word of God?

But we observe, in the second place, there is no evidence that the Apostles expected a speedy return of their Master to judge the world. Indeed, there is satisfactory evidence to the contrary. To be sure, they used expressions, which imported that Christ was to come quickly, that the day of the Lord was at hand, &c., much as ministers do at the present day; but it is evident that they used this language in a comparative sense, believing that “one day is with the Lord as a thousand years,” and that all time is as nothing compared with eternity. The Apostle Paul seems to have written his second Epistle to the Thessalonians, for the express purpose of instructing his Christian brethren there, in regard to this important subject. “We beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, *that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition. Remember ye not that when I was yet with you, I told you these things,*” chap. ii. 1—5. We know not how any person can read this whole passage, and maintain, as Mr. Norton does, that Paul lived in expectation of the near approach of that day, which he here expressly refers to as *not at hand*—as to be preceded by great changes in the church and world—as appointed to be ushered in at some distant but unknown period.

But Mr. Norton does not believe that Christ will ever come to judgement, or that he gave any intimations of such an event. “He did not predict his visible return to earth to be the Judge of men. There is nothing in his words which requires or justifies such an interpretation of them.” p. 328. We shall not trifle with the understandings of our readers, by referring to passages in which Christ *did* predict his return to judgment. If Mr. Norton cannot find such passages, there are thousands of children in our Sabbath Schools who can. If our Lord is never to come in the clouds of heaven to judge the world, and if he never intended to come in this way; it is not enough to say that he forbore to correct the errors of his disciples in regard to this matter;—*he directly led them into error.* He used language which he must have known would excite expecta-

tions, which, on this supposition, he never intended should be realized.

Another of the alleged mistakes of the Apostles is thus introduced by Mr. Norton :

“The Jews had adopted what is called the allegorical mode of interpreting their sacred books ; and had found many supposed predictions and types of their expected Messiah in factitious senses which they ascribed to particular passages. This mode of interpretation was adopted by some of the Apostles. We find examples of it as used by them in the Gospels of both Matthew and John, and in the Acts of the Apostles. One is surprised, perhaps, that this mistake was not corrected by Christ. Nothing may seem more simple, than that he should have indicated, that this whole system of interpretation, and this method of proof, so far as the supposed prophecies were applied to himself, were erroneous.”

Mr. Norton does not inform us whether he regards any of the predictions of the Old Testament as referring to Christ ; or if so, what these predictions are.\* Indeed, it is manifestly impossible, on his principles, for any person now to lay his hand on a particular passage in the writings of the prophets, and say, *This refers to Christ* ; for if the inspired Apostles and Evangelists were in ignorance on the subject, and fell into frequent mistakes, who, at this distant day, can pretend to be better informed ?

When the risen Saviour walked with the two disciples to Emmaus, and saw their despondency, and heard their complaints, he said, “O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that *the prophets have spoken* ! Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory ? And beginning at Moses, and all the prophets, *he expounded unto them, in all the Scriptures, the things concerning himself.*” Shortly after this, standing in the midst of his disciples, he said, “These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in *the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures, and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day.*” Luke xxiv. 25—46. Our Lord here informed the disciples, in person, concerning the Scriptures which related to himself ; and opened their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures. But it seems, after all, that they did not understand them ; and the knowledge which they acquired they soon lost. For Mr. Norton will have it, that they adopted the fanciful interpretations of

\* Respecting the celebrated passage in Is. ix. 6, “Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given,” &c. Mr. N. says, “There is no evidence that it relates to Christ.”

the Jews, and fell into frequent and great mistakes in regard to this important subject.

On a certain occasion our Lord directed the Jews (and may be understood as directing us) to "search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and *they are they which testify of me.*" "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for *he wrote of me.*" John v. 39, 46. Our Lord here expressly speaks of the Scriptures of the Old Testament as bearing testimony to himself. But to what part of these Scriptures does he refer? What passages did he wish those whom he addressed to consult? The Jews, according to Mr. Norton, did not know; and the disciples, with all their advantages, did not know; and how shall we know? How shall any person, not excepting our learned author himself, acquire, at the present day, this important knowledge?

Still another mistake of the inspired Apostles is introduced in the following manner:

"In the time of Christ, and for a long period before, the doctrine of demoniacal possession prevailed among the Jews, and many diseases were ascribed to this cause. Our Saviour never taught that this was a false doctrine. He occasionally used language conformed to the conceptions of those who believed it to be true. Why was he silent on this subject? Why did he leave some, if not all his Apostles, in error concerning it, as appears from the common belief being expressed in the first three Gospels, though not in that of St. John?"

If the doctrine of evil spirits is an error, it surely is not enough to say of Christ that he *left* his disciples in the belief of it. He directly led them into this belief. Or, if they entertained it previous to their acquaintance with him, his teachings all went to confirm them in it. He taught the existence and agency of fallen spirits as fully and plainly as he ever taught any thing. He taught it before the multitude. He taught it to his disciples in private. The doctrine is so interwoven with the instructions, the history, and sufferings of our blessed Lord, that it can never be rooted out.

If the doctrine of evil spirits is an error, there is just as much evidence that Christ was in the error, as that his disciples were; —or if he was not, he continually countenanced and taught what he knew to be untrue. It is impossible to clear the character of the Saviour, and exhibit him as a competent and faithful teacher, on the theory adopted by Mr. Norton, and by Unitarians generally. Accordingly, not a few leading Unitarians have expressed doubts as to the entire perfection of our Lord's character. One charges him with "*inconsistency,*" an account of his exclamation on the cross, "My, God, my God,

why hast thou forsaken me?"\* And another represents it as the belief of all Unitarians, that "Jesus of Nazareth was a man, constituted in all respects like other men, subject to the same infirmities, the *same ignorance, prejudices and frailties*;" and that when "*he*, or his apostles, delivered opinions upon subjects unconnected with the object of their mission, such opinions, and their reasonings upon them, are to be received with the same attention and *caution*, with those of other persons, in similar circumstances, of similar education, and with similar habits of thinking."†

But we cannot distress our readers or ourselves, by pursuing this subject any further. As to our Lord's character, the Scriptures have expressly decided: "*He did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.*" And as to the Apostles, it is enough for us to know, that they had the promise of the Spirit to "guide them into *all truth*"—to "teach them *all things*, and bring *all things to their remembrance*," whatsoever their Divine Master had said unto them; and they uniformly insisted that this promise to them had been fulfilled. "I certify you," says Paul, "that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man; for *I neither received it of men, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ.*" Gal. i. 11, 12. "Which things we speak, *not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.*" 1 Cor. ii. 13. "The things that I write unto you are the *commandments of the Lord.*" 1 Cor. xiv. 37. Such were the promises made to the Apostles, and such the claims which they put forth. And now for a man, calling himself a Christian, and professing extraordinary zeal for the purity of the Christian faith, to be talking about *mistakes* in the writings of these inspired Apostles—to pretend to know more than they—to arraign them at the bar of his unaided reason—and to sit in judgement on what he is pleased to call their errors;—we hardly know in what terms to speak of such irreverence and inconsistency. On this ground, what standard of doctrine, of truth, of Christianity is there left to us? We know not when to believe the Apostles, and when not; and as we have no account of the sayings and doings of Christ, but from their testimony, we are altogether in doubt, and have nothing on which with confidence to rely, respecting the history of his life and death. We are afloat together on an ocean of uncertainty, knowing neither the course we are steering, nor the shore we

\* Monthly Repository, Aug. 1819. p. 475.

† Belsham's Calm Inquiry, pp. 447, 451.

are approaching—having nothing to guide us, and no prospect of ever arriving at the haven of peace.

It is an honor to the doctrine of the Trinity, that its opposers cannot destroy it out of the Bible, without destroying the Bible with it. Repeated experiments have proved that both must stand or fall together. Persons may indeed speculate in opposition to the Trinity, and think to explain away one passage after another, and call themselves Unitarians, and yet cling to the Bible ; but let them grapple with the subject as Mr. Norton has done, and carry the war into the heart of the Book of God, and carry out principles with unflinching pertinacity, whatever inspired Apostles may say to the contrary,—and they will find, ere they are aware perhaps, that they have little Bible left. And what they have is rendered comparatively worthless, its standard authority being gone, and nothing remaining to certify or sanction it, but the concurring judgment of men.

We love the doctrine of the Trinity. We feel that we *need* just such a doctrine, and need each of the Divine personages which it brings into view. We need our heavenly Father, to watch over us and provide for us, on whose protection to rely, and in whose favor to trust. We need our Divine Redeemer,—his teaching, his example, his merits, his blood and his prevalent intercession at the right hand of the Majesty on High. We need the Holy Spirit, to be our Sanctifier and Comforter, to subdue our sins, and prepare us for heaven. We feel that we cannot part with either of these persons in the holy Trinity, and we rejoice that we may not part with them ;—that the evidence of their existence is so full and complete, that while the Bible remains to us, it can never be destroyed.

And that the Bible, and the *whole* Bible, will remain, to cheer and bless the world with its light and influence, we cannot doubt. It has sustained, without injury, many a rude assault ; and it is able, if called to it, to sustain many more. Infidels, the open and the disguised, may oppose it in their hearts, and soil it with their hands—may reject it in the gross, or attempt to tear it piecemeal ; but they cannot detract from its integrity or its glory. Its influence at this moment is rapidly and widely extending ; it is being translated into all languages, and is travelling into every land ; and its enemies may as well think to tear the sun from its centre, or pluck down the stars, as to put out the light of heavenly truth, beaming from the pure pages of THE WORD OF GOD.

LETTER TO THE CONDUCTORS OF THE CHRISTIAN  
EXAMINER.

GENTLEMEN,

I rejoice at the opportunity, which your article on my "Viti-perations" affords me, to call your own attention, and that of the public, to a connected view of the injuries you have committed against the cause and kingdom of Jesus Christ. Probably you are not yourselves aware, to what an extent you have proceeded, nor what is the precise nature of the impression left upon the mind of a believer, by the consecutive review of your own course and system. It is one of your characteristics that you advance at random, without seeming to know what yourselves are aiming at, other than a complete emancipation from the system of religion preached by the Apostles. Nor do we need more powerful proof of the destructive tendency of your system, than is to be found in the pages of your own periodical, and in the writings of Dr. Channing. I may, however, have occasion to refer to other authors.

Let us now, together, take a calm, plain, and solemn survey of your course. And I entreat you not to do me the injustice to set down the severity with which I may have occasion to speak, to the score of bitterness or angry feeling. I know the wickedness of such a temper; equally liable to it with yourselves, I earnestly desire to avoid it, and pray to be preserved from it. Yet it may be very far from duty, in such a case as this, to avoid severity; and when we have looked at your system, in some of its developments, I do believe our readers will acknowledge, that were I otherwise than severe, I should be otherwise than just. Nor is severity inconsistent with meekness.

Such an injurious device of the great adversary of souls, to accomplish his object, as is found in your system, ought, indeed, whenever it is contemplated, to excite feelings, both of pity and of indignation, in every pious heart. It is a system, which sets aside a Saviour, and boldly proclaims, that the religion hitherto revealed, is only an imperfect form of Christianity, suited to the circumstances of an unenlightened age, and requiring constant improvements to be adapted to the growing perfectibility of man's character. It is a system, which seeks to allure men away from the clear, definite light, and truth, and obligations of revelation, and leave them wandering amidst the uncertainties of the religion of nature. It is a system, as shifting as the sands, having no stability, no permanent creed, no grounds of certainty, nothing fixed but a mortal aversion to the evangelical scheme. It is a system, from beginning to end, designed, such as Hall said the infidels, whom he found rejoicing at the progress of Unitarianism, undoubtedly considered it, "as a natural opening, through which men may es-

cape from the restraints of revealed religion;" designed, while preserving something of the form of godliness, to abolish its power, and destroy its regenerating spirituality. It is a system, which aims at removing the distinction between the converted and the unconverted, and would break down all the barriers, by which the institutions and ordinances of our Lord are now kept from being profaned by those, who "have not the Spirit of God." It is a system, in which sin is made but a very little evil, and the question, whether it will be punished at all in the eternal world, one of extreme doubt. It is a system, indeed, in which doubt and darkness are thrown over every subject involving the eternal destiny of man, and therefore over the whole Bible.

We do not deny that there are varying shades in your unbelief, from the highest and most serious sentimentality, down to absolute infidelity and deism. We only know the unequalled deceitfulness of your system. Whenever you fear an exposure, or some of your number have been betrayed into too open an exhibition of the features of infidelity, it is easy for you to retreat behind orthodox Scripture phrases, and put on an evangelical garb. If it were possible, you would be glad to rest undisturbed in the assertion that you receive the Gospel, while every particular portion of it, in succession, you reject. You would be believers in general, unbelievers in particular. You would be glad if you might never hear a definite doctrine of the Gospel named. But the common reason of all mankind declares that there *are* definite doctrines, and you are compelled to meet them, and to cope with them at every step. Though in fact rejecting them, and wishing you could be fairly and completely rid of them, so that they might no more be thrown in your way, (for indeed they are perplexing to you) you will therefore conceal your repugnancy, and sometimes, instead of openly denouncing them, you will artfully state what you call *your views of them*. In regard to the doctrines of Atonement and Regeneration, for instance, while in reality you leave your adherents as far as ever from the conviction of their necessity and experience of their power, you contrive to insinuate, that you do not wholly reject these grand tenets of the Bible, and to provide ground on which you may, with some shade of plausibility, accuse us of misrepresentation, when we declare that Unitarianism does, in fact, reject them utterly and contemptuously. That it does, we prove to you from your own authors; and it is all in vain for you to attempt, by one or two bare affirmations of belief, to resist the tide of proof that sets against you in the whole tenor of Unitarian Sermons and Periodicals, and in the declarations, almost without number, uttered when not particularly on your guard. Your distinct and deliberate denial of the distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel, many times and in many ways repeated, we assert, and with perfect justice, is, in fact, infidelity, and nothing else. Nor can it be denied, that whatever important principles

there are in God's word, over and above those of natural religion, you do either completely reject, or render, by your sophistical explanations, entirely inefficacious. Your whole system is a mere republication of natural religion, with just one article added, the divine mission of Jesus.

Now it seems so absurd to pretend, that in the Bible, a book said to be "*the power of God unto salvation*," the only truth we can discover, over and above natural religion, or dare put in definite language to insist upon, as an article of belief, is that Jesus Christ was divinely commissioned, that the very statement of the proposition renders a serious refutation of it unnecessary. That this is the only definite point of belief, which can properly be required, for an admission of Christian character, and the only definite article, by which the kingdom of Satan is to be overthrown, and God's rebellious subjects brought back to their allegiance, demands a credulity, that, though we have the humblest and deepest veneration for the true and glorious mysteries of Godliness, we are not prepared to exercise. Before we proceed any further, let me call your attention earnestly to some considerations on this point. I do assert, and you cannot deny it, that the power of the Bible lies in certain definite, essential doctrines; that these doctrines can be ascertained; that they are of vital importance; that without the belief of them, the soul cannot be saved; that they are intimately connected with each other; that the rejection of any one of them, is dangerous, involving the rejection of them all; and that, in order to salvation, they must not only be believed, but that the full, unhesitating reception of them *all*, is essential to a happy, harmonious, useful, and self-denying Christian character; essential to the growth and development of any of the true Christian graces. Let us attend to some of these points.

The power of the Bible lies in certain definite, essential doctrines. That the Bible is a powerful book, none will deny; and its power must inhere in something definite; it could have no power were this not the case, for, every thing indefinite is powerless; the power of the Bible inheres, therefore, in the important, definite truths, which the Bible contains, and is great in proportion to the definiteness and energy with which these truths are presented.

These doctrines are of vital importance. If the Bible be a powerful book, the power of God unto salvation, then, the definite truths which the Bible exhibits, and in which its power consists, are essentially important,—cannot be given up, without, in effect, giving up the Bible. These truths, as in every case where a book is powerful, are great, outstanding, definite principles. The power of the Bible does not consist in a multitude and succession of little truths, unimportant in themselves, and important only in their accumulation. No book ever had power in this manner. Neither Butler's Analogy, nor Burke's Reflections, nor Edwards on

the Will, nor the Pilgrim's Progress, are powerful in this way, but in the development and pursuit of great and powerful principles. And so it is with the Bible, only in an infinitely higher degree. Its power lies in a few grand and comprehensive doctrines, embracing in themselves the great principles of God's government. Consequently, and undeniably, these doctrines are of vital importance.

Again. These doctrines can be precisely ascertained. Here is a great point. There are those who pretend to be full of charity for errorists, because, forsooth, according to their ideas, it is so difficult to discover what is truth. Now the Bible certainly teaches something—something definite. It is one of the greatest absurdities ever uttered, to suppose a revelation given from God to man, and for man's own benefit, and yet to pretend that we cannot discover definitely what it does teach. If the Bible be not the most absurd book in the world, we certainly can discover what truths it contains. If the Bible be a book of power, we certainly can discover definitely in what its power lies. It is want of common sense to suppose otherwise. Who ever heard of a book of any kind, that possessed power over the mind, which was destitute of known truths powerfully presented? Who ever heard of a book, powerful in its influence, and yet it could not be ascertained precisely what truths it contained? Among the instances referred to above, take Butler's Analogy, a powerful book, and you can at once analyze the elements of its power; you know they consist in certain definite propositions, clearly ascertained, plainly exhibited, powerfully reasoned on. That work would have no power, if men could not tell precisely what it means, what truths it contains. Take Burke's Reflections on the French Revolution. Would that book have had any power, if it had been so contrived, that men could not discover the meaning of its author—or so, that every ten men who read it might gather from it a different and opposite meaning? Take Doddridge's Rise and Progress. Would that book have any power over the soul, if it had no definite, clear, energetic truths in it? Would it have power, if it were so constructed, that Mahommedan, Pagan, and Christian, all might study it, and arrive at opposite conclusions, or remain in equal doubt as to the nature of its contents? Or Baxter's Saint's Rest: would that book have any power, if it had no clear, definite, vividly presented truths; no truths that you could definitely and precisely ascertain? Would it have power, if every ten of the millions that have read it might justly learn in it, opposite and contradictory truths? The thing is a great absurdity.

And yet there are men, who pretend that the Bible, the most powerful book in the world, is a book of such uncertainty, that it is actual bigotry to say that you have discovered the exact truths it contains. Yes! They will actually call men intolerant bigots, who affirm that they know that the Bible contains such and such

definite truths or doctrines, which are binding on all men to believe. The Bible certainly contains some truths; and those who read the Bible, must believe those truths, or they do not believe the Bible; and if they do not discover those truths, (which never can happen, without voluntary blindness,) then the Bible to them has no power; for its power lies in the truths that it contains. If you blot out those truths, you blot out the glory of the Bible; and if you will not behold those truths, then you exclude yourself voluntarily from their regenerating influence; and if you take them away, then there is no Bible left. The Deity of Christ; the atonement by his sufferings and death; the entire depravity of all mankind; regeneration by the power of the Holy Ghost; a future state of endless retribution in happiness to the penitent, misery to the impenitent;—these are truths so definite, so glorious, so important, that if you take them away, you take away the soul of the Bible; you leave it no longer the word of God, quick and powerful; it will shed neither glory nor power on the heart that will not behold and love these doctrines. You might as well expect the milky way in the heavens to shed its brightness, when you have swept from the sky those beautiful clusters of stars, whose united light irradiates a path across the firmament.

I said—"if they do not discover those truths." But they *do* discover them. They cannot read the Bible without discovering them, any more than one could read aloud the pages of a book without pronouncing its words; any more than one could travel through a magnificent city and not behold its streets and palaces; any more than one could look at the rainbow without seeing its colors, or at the sun without beholding its light.

Again. These doctrines are of such importance, that without their acceptance and belief the soul cannot possibly be saved. It is only by the power of the Holy Ghost, in the instrumentality of these doctrines, set home upon the heart and conscience, that the soul is converted to God. He therefore who disbelieves these doctrines, renders it certain that he never has experienced their influence, and makes it impossible, so long as his rejection of them continues, that he ever should experience it. The deliberate rejection of the doctrine of Regeneration is incompatible with the supposition that the man who does deliberately reject it can have experienced its power. It is impossible that any one who feels this holy change within him, and loves his Saviour for it, should deny that it is true. A blind man restored to sight might as soon doubt whether there be any such thing as human vision. Moreover, such is the character of this change, that, in the nature of things, he who rejects and denies it, *cannot*, as long as the denial continues, experience its power. So, likewise, the rejection of the doctrine of human depravity shows the man who rejects it unacquainted with the state of his own heart, unconvicted of guilt, unconscious of his lost condition, and proves that he has never resorted for healing

mercy to the great Physician of the soul. And not only so, but while he rejects this doctrine, he never will resort to him. The rejection of future endless punishment shows a heart insensible to the nature of sin and the holiness of God, and opposed to his character and government as revealed in the Scriptures. Nor will any one, who disbelieves in the wrath to come, ever be seen fleeing from that wrath. Likewise, also, the rejection of the Atonement proves the individual equally insensible to his guilt and danger, and opposed to God's plan, and throws him beyond the pale of all those influences, by which, in the preaching of Jesus Christ and him crucified, God seeks to bring men to repentance.

Thus, the whole Bible is a touchstone of the heart, and each doctrine, as it is presented, proves, in the manner of its reception, the state of the affections towards God. It is "*a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.*" Without the love of the truth none can be saved. It is the preaching of these doctrines only that ever has moved, or ever can move the soul back to its God. No man was ever converted without the reception of them, or ever can be. It is impossible in the nature of things. For, they grow out of the essential attributes and perfections of God, in connexion with the actual ruined condition of man. Consequently, no creature can be converted without the belief of God's truth, any more than he can be converted without the love of God. He who does not believe these doctrines does not believe God; and he who does not believe God, does not, and, while unbelieving, cannot, love God. These doctrines, being the inevitable result of God's essential perfections, no man can reject them, and turn from them with aversion, without demonstrating that his own heart is at enmity against God.

And these doctrines are intimately connected with each other, being each an essential part of one grand scheme. The Divinity of Christ is the ground of his Atonement, and this again is inseparably connected with the depravity of man, the necessity of regeneration, and the endless punishment of the wicked. To be consistent, he who denies one, must deny all. The rejection of the truth of man's entire depravity is accompanied and followed by the rejection of the Atonement and **R**egeneration, as needless, and eternal punishment as unjust. The same inevitable consequence to the other doctrines follows from the rejection of eternal punishment. The whole scheme of salvation is a burlesque, if there be not an Eternal Hell, to which mankind are, without exception, exposed. So it is, if mankind do not need to be regenerated in order to be fitted for heaven. It is therefore not to be wondered at, that those who reject depravity and an eternal future retribution, should also reject the Atonement and the truth that all must be born again. Nor is it any marvel that the Atonement is a doctrine disliked by unbelievers, since it exhibits *all* the truths of the Gospel in the most powerful manner.

It is very manifest, as a consequence of their intimate connexion, that the rejection of any one of these truths is unspeakably dangerous, involving, in fact, the rejection of them all. The Bible, in the truths it contains, is the remedy provided by a God of mercy for the miseries of a ruined world. Nor can one of these truths be rejected, without infinite danger to the soul. If a medicine be important, then the ingredients of which it is composed are so; and if one of those ingredients be taken away, or neutralized, it alters the whole medicine, and renders it no longer adapted to the purposes for which it was prepared. This is the case, in the most striking manner, with the truths of which the Gospel is composed. Take away one of them, and you have, in fact, taken away the sword of the Spirit. Take away the Atonement, and all the other truths remaining would have no power over the heart or conscience. Take away Regeneration, and the Atonement, with all the other truths, would be ineffectual. Take away the belief of depravity, and your means of convincing the sinner of his guilt and ruin are gone, and the whole Gospel is lifeless. Take away the truth of eternal punishment, and you have nothing left to convince the sinner of danger; no reason, indeed, why any such thing as salvation is necessary. Take away the deity of Jesus, and you take the Atonement, and the whole scheme of salvation, along with it. Dr. Priestley was consistent when he said that "Christ being only a man, his death could not in any proper sense atone for the sins of other men." And the same is true, whatever hypothesis you assume, below the uncreated and eternal Divinity of the Saviour.

All these doctrines in succession you do deliberately reject. In your *Examiner* for May, 1830, you declare explicitly as follows: "The Liberal and Unitarian system—is very serious in rejecting these irrational doctrines, which have so long been popular, and have so long assumed to themselves the titles of peculiar, essential, orthodox, and evangelical. We take *our Heaven-inspired reason, the gift and light of the Lord*, and holding it up before the record of his word, we behold *no such doctrines there, as those which have been called evangelical*. We therefore renounce them as *not Christian, as not rational, as not beneficial*." This is plain; you leave no room for mistake; and your rejection of each particular doctrine of the Gospel in succession corresponds to this your general denial of them all.

Your system, we repeat it, sets aside a Saviour. On your theory, Jesus Christ was no more the Saviour of mankind than Paul was. With a dreadful consistency, one of its adherents asks, "Why do we, Unitarians, not believing in the common notion concerning it, call Jesus Christ our *Saviour*? Our *teacher*, divinely inspired, he certainly was; but DOES NOT SAVIOUR IMPLY SOMETHING MORE? And is not our using the term as we do, implying an acquiescence IN THE ABOMINABLE DOCTRINE OF A

SACRIFICE FOR OUR SINS?"\* *This is truly and fearfully consistent.* And why, we may ask, do you not magnify Paul and celebrate his death? Was he not a man sent from God? Was he not divinely commissioned to teach the way of eternal life? Was he not a man of unequalled benevolence? Was not his life a record of sufferings for the good of his fellow-beings? Did he not die for his fellow-beings, a martyr to the truth and the cause of God? You pretend, sometimes, (and it is an affectation that inspires disgust) to speak of Jesus as "*that great and wonderful being;*"—on your theory, what one element of greatness do you find in him, entitling him to your adoring gratitude, which you cannot find in the chief of his apostles? If your pretended love to Christ for the excellence of his character be so "*heart-breaking;*" why, indeed, do not your hearts again break with their excess of gratitude and love at the exhibition of unwearyed benevolence in the character of Paul? And with your theory, we solemnly ask, what could you do in the eternal world, with the song of Moses and the Lamb? None will ever sing it there, unless, with hearts renewed by the Holy Spirit, they first learn it here. But suppose, for a moment, that in all your denial of the Atonement, you were there. In the very ascriptions of praise to Him "*that hath redeemed us to God BY HIS BLOOD,*" you would have to turn aside to the horror-stricken angels—and, for fear they should imagine you have embraced the truth contained in those expressions, interpose your cautious, chilling explanations, "*that is, by Christianity,*" or, "*by his doctrines and example!!*"

It cannot be gainsayed, that your system is not a whit better than the merest republication of natural religion. The articles of the Christianity of the New Testament, you discard. Rejecting the Atonement, and the endless punishment of the wicked, and the entire depravity of man, you cannot hold to Regeneration. You hold to improvement of character; but this is all, and may take place, on your theory, without the influences of the Divine Spirit, without a conviction of depravity, without an atoning Saviour. When you pretend to preach repentance, it is not regeneration by the Holy Ghost, but inferior and worthless, and, as the pretended adequate ground of acceptance with God, positive perdition to the soul. "Repentance and a good life," said Dr. Priestley, † "are, OF THEMSELVES, sufficient to recommend us to the divine favor." The tone of all your writers is the same; and this one sentiment, if it be not relinquished, and its place supplied by a heart-felt trust in Jesus Christ and his merits, as the ONLY ground of hope, excludes the sinner from heaven. And your preaching of the duty of love to God, being on an entirely different ground from that of the Bible, is equally injurious with your repentance. They are both "*other foundation than that is laid.*" The whole case

\* Monthly Repository, March, 1833, p. 182.

† History of the Corruption of Christianity, Vol. 1. p. 155.

is like that of Judaism since Christianity. The Jews preach the love of God, and *they* hold to what you, in *effect*, reject, the inspiration of the Old Testament. Both you and they err fatally, in supposing, that though Christ has died, you can still continue to approach God, with or without a Mediator, just as it may please you, and without any application to "*the blood of Jesus Christ his Son, which cleanseth from all sin.*" Without this, all that is good in your system, all remnants even of natural religion, all regard to God, all external morality, are worthless, not being the morality of the Gospel. The best of it is set aside, and resolved into the manifest work of other principles than the influence of the Holy Spirit, by the fact that you reject those terms of approach to the mercy seat, which God has declared to you, are his chosen and only plan, and choose to come in your own way, and on your own terms. This is not the work of the Holy Spirit. His work is, first to convince of sin, then to lead to the blood of a Saviour, and thus to bring the sinner back from his enmity to a reconciliation with God in Christ. You choose to rely on your repentance and the mercy of God, with the declaration, that you cannot believe that in order to your pardon, it was necessary that Christ should die; or that "*thus it behoved Christ to suffer.*"

Now this very declaration puts you and your repentance out of the pale of God's mercy. This is sad and solemn truth. Natural religion might have taught you the duty of repentance and love to God, and if you had nothing but natural religion, and acted *completely* up to its dictates that is, if you never; in any respect, transgressed the law of God, so far as it was made known to you, (which is what no man that ever lived, or will live, can say of himself) it might have been well; but your natural religion is not the Christianity of the Gospel. If, under the light of the Gospel, the perishing sinner trusts in it, then it can result only in his condemnation. *You cannot* be saved on the terms on which you think Socrates *may* be saved. Now that Christ has died, if you persist in your natural religion, it is fraught with ruin to the soul, and becomes melancholy proof that the heart is alienated from God. You set aside the death of Christ, and trust in your own system; and however good you may be in other respects, this, of itself, shows that you are among the number of the unregenerate. Perhaps some will answer, that if none but your regenerated ones enter heaven, they themselves expect to be shut out; but they do not believe in conversion, and are very sure, that if a man lives up to the light he has, and does as he would wish to be done by, God will never condemn him, because he could not believe in certain fanatical tenets. Such is the heedless, irreligious sentiment, which your system is too apt to inculcate, and with which, it is to be feared, multitudes are blindly rushing, in the rejection of a Saviour, into the presence of a holy God.

We acknowledge that your system does not always appear as mere natural religion; though when you attempt to put it in the

form of a creed, you yourselves find (as in the recent work of Prof. Norton) that its result is in fact nothing more. Yet you sometimes give it a far more evangelical appearance.

There is perhaps no heresy that ever afflicted the church of Christ, that can so readily adopt the garments and semblance of an angel of light. It may come as winning as the breath of May, and beautiful as a Claude Lorraine landscape. It may put on the appearance of a belief in the Atonement, while it denies the whole doctrine, and preaches peace to the sinner in such a way that he would never be sent, convicted or wretched under a sense of his guilt, to apply to the soul's only Physician. When, for instance, a Unitarian minister visits a sick patient, he may perhaps speak in the most winning, tender terms of Jesus Christ, and of coming to God by him, together with soothing expressions of the blessedness of trusting in him; and yet he may leave the soul of the sick man quieted and happy, without any sense of guilt, or any of the faith of the Gospel in a crucified Redeemer. And when the minister has departed, and you ask what he said to the sick, the answer perhaps will be—Oh if you could only have heard him! You don't know how *beautifully* he talked! We *do* know how near a man may come to the true Gospel ground in this thing, and yet keep himself and his hearers ignorant of their own guilt, and ignorant of Christ, as an atoning Saviour for the guilty, perishing, broken-hearted sinner.

The truth is, without an acknowledgment of utter depravity, there cannot be a true belief in the Atonement. Unless you make the sinner feel his guilt and acknowledge it, you will never induce him to fly to Christ for refuge, though you may easily quiet his fears, by speaking of a Saviour's readiness to pardon. In a sick chamber, much of the routine of Gospel language may be used, while yet, if you have left the soul untroubled with a sense of sin, if you have planted no arrow of conviction in the conscience, if your business has been to soothe the heart, instead of probing its moral depravity, you may have presented Jesus Christ and talked *beautifully*,—but you have lulled the dying unconverted being before you, to the apathy of spiritual death. There is a way of presenting, under pretence of the Atonement, error which is ruinous to the soul. Lead your patient to hope that God is too merciful to punish sin; exhibit only his tenderness; or suggest the thought that the Atonement is such, that none ever will be lost; and you have, in all probability, with all your beautiful conversation, ensured the being before you an impenitent death, and a lost eternity. It is one reason why a sick chamber or a death-bed is so miserable a place and season for conversion, that in a time when, of all others, plainness and pungency to the conscience is most urgently demanded, it is most fatally neglected. Tenderness and delicacy are deemed appropriate, instead of the language of warning and conviction; and the conscience, that might otherwise have been roused, is most likely to be stupified, or deluded with a false hope.

The voice of a genuine Unitarian is peace, peace, when there is no peace.

These remarks are peculiarly applicable in regard to the indignation you profess to feel, at having Mr. Ware's book on the formation of Christian character specified as a volume of unequalled deceitfulness. It is easy in such a volume to throw around the system which denies the Atonement a sentimental resemblance to the system which receives it. And if it be easy, even with the evangelical system, to be an almost Christian, Oh how much easier with that system of liberal deceit, which never reveals the depravity of the heart, nor shows to the impenitent soul the wrath of God abiding on it, nor the extent and spirituality of God's holy law, nor the dreadful nature of sin, nor the necessity of application to the blood of Christ, nor the doctrine of regeneration; and yet adds to the kindest form of the religion of nature a coloring of sanctity imitative of all these truths! A better contrivance there could scarcely be, for the formation of an almost Christian, than the system of Unitarianism as developed in the artful volume of Mr. Ware. It will make a serious, amiable, correct character: perhaps it may induce to the maintenance of the habit of secret prayer; though this is doubtful: but alas! what multitudes it may delude into the belief that these things are religion. Now a book which goes so far as this does, and yet does not reveal the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world, is of incalculable injury. It is in the form of an angel of light. Any thing spoken against it indicates to its admirers, in the mind of the speaker, an astonishing intensity of prejudice and bigotry. And the reason is, they are not acquainted with the nature of salvation by the cross, and forgiveness through the blood of Christ, and do not acknowledge the entire depravity of the heart. It is with the greatest justice that we condemn this book, not for what it is, but for what it is not: say rather, for what it is, in being what it is not; for in this case, the absence of what we require is positive destruction. Where Christ, and him crucified, are not, there, unsubdued depravity and certain ruin are.

It requires all the power of the Atonement, even now, to bring the sinner to repentance. It is a work for Almighty grace alone, even with such an instrument as the mighty and humbling doctrine of the cross. And can it be expected that such a book as this of Mr. Ware's will be efficacious to this great end? Even Baxter's Call, and Doddridge's Rise and Progress, with all their presentations of a Saviour, and all their clear, plain, pungent exhibitions of divine truth, are resisted by the power of depravity in multitudes; and, compared with the number of the impenitent, only here and there a few are brought back to God by the instrumentality of those books. What then must be the weakness, the utter inefficiency, or rather the positive injurious efficacy, of a book lifeless in doctrine, soothing in precept, and destitute of Christ, as

an atoning Saviour? It will conduct a serious Unitarian to complete satisfaction with himself and his system, and this is as destructive a result as could well be arrived at; for without the instrumentality of higher and more pungent truth than is to be found in its pages, we believe its readers will be lulled to their ruin.

We deeply and sadly feel that you are making the commandment of God of none effect by your traditions, in setting up a standard of external amiableness and morality, in place of the Christian graces that are the only morality which the Bible recognizes, and that never spring but from the cordial reception, in the soul, of the *doctrines* which the Bible announces. Pagans are sometimes good external moralists; nor is mere moral living or preaching either the life or the preaching of the Gospel. If Christ and him crucified be left out of view, with the connected truths, then it is no better than heathenism. Plato would have preached as well; Seneca delivered sermons about as good; and as to the result in eternity, you yourselves declare it would be unjust to shut out men like Socrates, and your *virtuous* DEIST Herbert, from heaven. Your system tends to produce a frigid set of moralists, that have in fact the Paganism of the heathen Philosophers, without their intellectual power.

The best sermons in the world, without the savor of the Gospel doctrines, are utterly inert as to the feelings, and tame even to the intellect. It is wonderful to see how the moment Christ crucified is rejected, that moment the production becomes intellectually as superficial and lifeless, as it is powerless over the heart. In fact, mere moral preaching accomplishes nothing, even in the article of morality. It does not even reform people externally. On this point we have a most striking testimony, from a great and powerful preacher, who has tried both systems, but found, that with all the power and pathos of his genius, struggling, for the first twelve years of his ministry, against the innate poverty and feebleness of the system that leaves out of view the distinguishing doctrines of Christianity, that system still remained without any reforming influence whatever over the moral habits of his parishioners. This was Dr. Chalmers. "And it was not," he adds, "till I got impressed by the utter alienation of the heart from God; it was not till reconciliation to him became the distinct and prominent object of my ministerial exertions; it was not till I took the scriptural way of laying the method of reconciliation before them; it was not till the free offer of forgiveness through the blood of Christ was urged upon their acceptance, and the Holy Ghost, given through the channel of Christ's Mediatorship to all who ask him, was set before them as the unceasing object of their dependence and prayers; it was not, in one word, till the contemplations of my people were turned to those great and essential elements in the business of a soul providing for its interest with God, and the concerns of its eternity, that I ever heard of *any of those subordinate reformations*, which, aforesaid, I made the earnest and zealous, but

I am afraid at the same time the ultimate object of my earlier ministrations."

A republication of natural religion, amidst the light and power of Christianity, cannot but be a vapid, inefficient scheme. Intellectually as well as morally it must be superficial and powerless, and must lead to superficiality in every thing over which religion exerts any influence.

Hence it is, that all your lucubrations on spiritual subjects are so insipid and lifeless. In attempting to speculate upon them, you fall inevitably, both in feeling and language, beneath that sense of their dignity, which prevails even in the common consciousness of men. As you deny the master truths and principles, both in morals and religion, the superficial tendency of your views is a charge that cannot be evaded. Were they universally prevalent, we are persuaded they would soon conduct us to complete darkness and uncertainty in respect to the simplest principles of the moral being. You cannot put your pen to paper on any of the grand realities of eternity, but the paralyzing curse of your system is on it, and it wearies the mind with its tameness, almost as much as it pains the heart with its spirit of unbelief. Hence it is too, that you spend so much of your time on subjects connected with the mere externals of Christianity, or subjects that, since the light of revelation shines to us, we deem it superfluous to examine. The whole range of your conceptions on spiritual truth is degraded and indefinite. Your definitions of Christianity and the applauses you bestow upon it, your definitions of a Christian, your descriptions of human nature, your definitions of the object of preaching, your explanations of self-denial, your descriptions of the nature of self-love, your ideas of the love of God, your thoughts about "the *gifted mind* of our Lord and Saviour," and your recommendations of his character, are more than insipid to every being whose heart and intellect have been accustomed to the distinctness and simplicity of the gospel of Christ.

Knowing your system as we do, your eulogiums on Christianity, and your recommendations of the institutions of God, are any thing but pleasing to us. We do not think they need the seal of your approbation. Our feelings of grief are mingled with a sense of the ludicrous, to observe the tone, in which you will sometimes speak of your obligations to a Saviour, and your love to him. You insist upon it that you do think you are under great obligations to him. And when you have fallen into what some of your party might perhaps deem an extravagant expression, you declare that you should not be ashamed of your feelings even if people esteemed you enthusiasts. Noble resolution! Heroic firmness! The spectacle is very curious to behold a sect that seems to look upon the commonest spiritualities of the Bible as if they were new and strange discoveries, and seems scarcely to know whether they shall take the bold step of speaking very highly of them or not. You

seem afraid to decide resolutely in regard to their merits; and when you have used a decided expression of approbation, one would think from your manner you really esteemed it a great reach of moral courage, an uncommon and most fearless stand for you to take. We have been amused to see the earnestness with which, after repeating some things that the evangelical believer in Christianity regards as principles so acknowledged that it is almost superfluous to dwell upon them, you "say and insist that it is desirable to believe these things," and you go on to say that it is desirable, "because, *if truths*, they are most glorious truths."! And then you put the supposition that infidelity were true and Christianity not true, and you think it would really be quite a sad change!

You must not charge us with improper plainness of speech, while we tell you that your modes of reasoning and habits of expression in regard to religious truth are such as we should think the infidel himself would sneer at. You appear in the attitude of blushing, hesitating apologists for the things of Christianity, as if you were half-ashamed to be caught believing them yourselves, and half afraid to recommend even your own unsatisfying belief to others. You "beg not to be misunderstood," you entreat pardon for your boldness, but really you hope, you conceive, you cannot but think these things are true; you would not for the world say anything irrational or enthusiastic, but still you do "say and insist that it is desirable to believe." Not that you would "measure any man's virtue by his creed," or charge him with guilt because he does *not* believe; that be for from you; you would not be so rash and uncharitable for the world; you beg we will not on any account entertain for a moment a thought so dishonorable to your generous feelings. No! "Professed unbelievers in the Scriptures have often possessed great amiableness, and a very high degree of social worth." You would not "measure a man's virtue by his creed." You "can conceive of a man's being a sincere and honest unbeliever." You "can conceive of his entertaining such false views of Christianity as to be induced to reject it." You "can conceive of many influences at work upon his mind, to expose him to this result." You would not presume to say that unbelief has always arisen solely from a bad mind. You only say that sin is "peculiarly favorable to it." And on the whole, you do think "that the good states and tendencies of the mind are much more likely to lead to belief in the great fundamental truths of our religion, than to disbelief." Begging pardon, therefore, for your boldness, you do humbly think the infidel ought to take these things into serious consideration. Not that you would strongly reprobate "the unbelief of calm, reasonable, thoughtful, feeling human nature." But you do think—you must be permitted to say and insist—a man ought not to be a sceptic without the proper qualifications. "The ordinary spirit that has prevailed in the school of unbelief," you say, "we are perfectly certain has amounted to a total disqualification." "*The qualities of a rational doubter are*

no ordinary qualities." "Let no man think himself qualified to disbelieve or doubt, without a fervent and affectionate piety, without much reflection and sober thinking, and especially without understanding that nature in himself, on whose fate he is deciding."!! And at the close of this singular exhibition of your feelings in regard to belief and unbelief (we refer our readers to the January number of the Examiner for 1830) you have a paragraph which reminds us with great power of what Robert Hall has said of the unexampled deference, which Unitarianism displays to human authority. The amount of it is this: the greatest and wisest men have lived and died in the Christian faith, and "they must be no common men who are entitled to deny a faith thus sanctioned." A wise man may honestly be an unbeliever, but an ignorant man has no right to doubt. Such are the speculations by which you pretend to recommend religion to infidels, and your own system as the sure remedy for infidelity. It is sure. It destroys the patient along with the disease.

It is part of the essential, inherent tameness of your system, that on all the grand truths and principles of Christianity, and in the presence of them all, you appear abashed and embarrassed. The mighty principles of revelation, which you deny, are

——— truths that wake,  
To perish never,

and that grasp the guilty conscience with a power that will by no means suffer it to rest unbelieving and easy in their presence. Deep in the soul of man they find answering to them,

High instincts, before which mortal nature  
Does tremble like a guilty thing surprised!

It is no wonder then, that you shun the presence of those awful truths, and remain without the precincts of the Temple where they are enshrined. You cannot enter it and live. Contented with professing to admire its proportions, and to be glad, on the whole, that the building was erected, you abide in the chosen freedom of the external cloudy day of your own, cold, unworshipping, unsanctified, pretended Reason. The light within is too excessive in its brightness and holiness. That Divine atoning High Priest, that Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world, himself the Priest, the Sacrifice, and the Lord of the whole Temple, in whom only we can love its inward spiritual mysteries, and sanctities, and realities, or be prepared for their participation, or feel at home in their presence, you darkly reject; and choose to employ yourselves as the mere external hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Christianity you profess on the whole to admire. And as such,—as hewers and drawers, we acknowledge that even the adherents of your system have performed some useful labors, while destitute themselves of that experimental, spiritual knowledge, which none ever possess, but those who are born of the Spirit. These external labors are the only ones connected with religion, in which, consistently with the nature of your system, you can possibly engage.

Apparently you pride yourselves much on your having in some measure occupied this province. You seem to think, if a man writes in favour of Christianity, he cannot but be a good man, and you are amazed at the arrogance which dares deny to such an one the title of a christian. Judging from the position which Christianity evidently occupies in your own minds, you seem to have the opinion that it is conferring a great obligation on the Gospel to write in defence of it. It is quite a condescension in so great a man as Lardner to have generously stepped forward to uphold it with his learning. No less condescending and praiseworthy is it in so great a man as Dr. Channing, a man, according to your own view of the requisite qualifications for a rational doubter, qualified to disbelieve, to have examined its merits and believed it, because on the whole he thought it was true and deserved his patronage. You speak of such men as Lardner and Priestley and Channing, as if you really thought their labors in defence of the mere outworks of Christianity had given them a title to heaven, which scarcely Almighty God himself would presume to question. And is it possible you can think the Gospel *needs* your advocacy? Has it nothing better than Lardner's *Credibility* to stand upon? Must Paley's *Evidences* accompany it in its weakness, to be a condescending voucher that it is worthy of belief? Must Dr. Channing stoop to examine its merits, and put upon it his seal of approbation, before it can stand in the face of an unbelieving world? Poor miserable apologists for Christianity! We pray you, remove your defences, and let the gospel itself, the word of God, quick and powerful, advance in its simplicity and majesty, to be its own witness, and to vindicate its Divine authority over the heart and conscience. Were all the proofs of revelation ever contrived by human ingenuity, and all the volumes of *Evidences* ever recorded by human learning, sunk in the bottom of the ocean, the gospel would have just as much power as it does now; nay, perhaps its divine authority would be felt more perfectly undeniable, and its divine efficacy be witnessed in a mightier display. We want no other proofs of its truth than awakened consciences, and humble, regenerated hearts; and these there always will be, in the goodness and power of the Divine Spirit, wherever it is faithfully preached. Helps to understand the Gospel are worth something; proofs of its credibility, little.

And yet behold the incongruous importance attached by Unitarians to labors on the external defences of the Gospel. It all proceeds from the same source with their proposition to evangelize the heathen by teaching them our systems of philosophy. It is because they have no experience or faith in the operations of the Holy Spirit, the Author of the Bible, and no conception of the spiritual power of God's word in the preaching of Christ and him crucified. It seems to have come to this, that the Gospel must be put in the standing-stool of Lardner's *Credibility*, or swaddled in

a band of Evidences, and carried a begging in a palanquin upon the shoulders of men's intellects. For our part, we cannot believe that the Gospel would have been ruined, even if the Credibility had never been written. We are disposed to think there would have been just as many believers, as there are now that it has been written. We say not this, from any desire to derogate from Lardner's merits, such as they were. We willingly admit, indeed it would be great folly in any one to deny, that so far as *mere* external things are concerned, "he was one of the ablest advocates for the authenticity and truth of the Christian Revelation that ever existed." And yet we do certainly know, that a man may very elaborately defend the outworks of Christianity, and still be totally ignorant and destitute of its spirit; nay, an enemy to vital godliness. There is no more essential piety in laboring on the Credibility, or writing letters to a philosophical unbeliever, than there was in the work of rafting the timbers, that were to build the great temple of Solomon for the worship of Jehovah. Lardner might devote his life to the first, and Priestley to the second, without a spark of vital piety; as any of king Hiram's diligent workmen might have put their shoulders to the last, without the least reverence for the God to whom the building was erecting.

Besides all this, we say there is infinitely more injury done to the world in Lardner's Socinianism, than twenty thousand Credibilities could have remedied or done good. His Socinianism was ruinous to the soul. His Credibility was a help only to the intellect. If in this, he was engaged in enlightening the understanding, in the other he was engaged in deceiving and hardening the heart. At the very same moment, he was employed, both in strengthening the impregnable outward defences of Christianity, and in undermining and destroying its internal power. He has moreover, greatly contributed to the power of the fatal delusion, which your whole system encourages, that a belief in the evidences of Christianity, is the reception of Christianity itself.

All the Credibilities, and Evidences, and Apologies, that Bishops, Archdeacons and Professors could write, to the end of time, without the savor of Christ and him crucified, would scarcely accomplish the conversion, of a solitary soul. Especially would they be lifeless to the heart and conscience in the hands of men so destitute of the living spirit of the Gospel as Lardner and Paley. Arguments in favor of Christianity come forth from the laboratory of such intellects, as clear as crystal, and as destitute of Christ; ready both to convince the understanding and lull the soul into indifference. And yet this mere scaffolding around the edifice of the Christian religion is what Unitarians have always been fond of working upon, and with much apparent complacency, intellectual and moral. Now, so far from being in reality in your favor, it is, in one important respect at least, a thing against you. It would really seem as if you were afraid to enter the

building; it is too solemn for you. Eternity is there, with all its dread realities. The justice and awful holiness of God are there, as well as his mercy, and you love not the exhibition of those attributes. The cross of Christ is there, and the blood of the slain Lamb, and you know not what to make of them; you meet them and contemn them. Regeneration and the experience of the heart are there; the infinite malignity of sin, conviction of entire depravity, and sanctification by the Holy Spirit; and your system of negations flees from the awful presence of these spiritual truths, these solemn, heart-searching principles of God's moral administration. You cannot endure them. They are the inevitable destruction of your whole frame of unbelief. When the soul is brought under their power, then ensue, in the glorious administration of the Spirit, conversions to a crucified Redeemer; and such results as these are the speedy and sure ruin of your truly ungodly system. For you, this ruin would be unspeakably happy and glorious, if it might be accomplished, (and oh that it might) by the conversion of every Unitarian now living, to the Lord Jesus Christ.

In regard to Dr. Priestley, we behold sad proof in all that you say of him, that the ideas of Christian character which you have formed, and by which you are accustomed to regulate your opinions, are totally different from those revealed in the Gospel of Christ. The article of justification by faith in Jesus, which Priestley rejected, is no part of your system, either theoretical or practical. Now in truth, with the rejection of this article, you cannot even form a conception of what a true Christian is, or what constitutes either the life or the death of a Christian.

That either Dr. Priestley's life or death was such, I do utterly deny. The very labors which you, in your disbelief of what be the very first principles of the Gospel of Christ, have enumerated, as if they gave him an undeniable title to heaven, were labors of an unbelieving heart, carried on in the very spirit of philosophical infidelity. What else but the spirit of powerful infidelity could it be, that could calmly and deliberately dictate the following sentiments? "As it is not pretended that there are any miracles adapted to prove that Christ made and support the world, *I do not see that we are under any obligation to believe it, merely because it was an opinion held by an Apostle!*"—"I might have urged another kind of argument *against both the divinity and pre-existence of Christ, viz. FROM THE DOCTRINE OF THE MATERIALITY OF MAN!*" *If Peter, James, and John had no preexistent state, it must be contrary to all analogy to suppose Jesus to have preexisted!*" If this be not infidelity, what is it? Dr. Priestley himself declares, in regard to those who embrace Unitarianism, "It cannot be denied, that many of those who judge so truly concerning particular tenets of religion, have attained to that cool, unbiassed temper of mind, *in consequence of becoming more indifferent to*

*religion in general, and to all the modes and doctrines of it."* This, we believe, was the philosophical indifference, in which Dr. Priestley, rejecting a regenerating Spirit and an atoning Saviour, and fortified in fatalism, lived and died. This was what you choose to call Christian resignation. Most emphatically, as a philosophic fool dieth, so died Dr. Priestley. Not one word of penitence, not one word of faith in the only Saviour of the soul;—in blind and dreadful confidence, he launched into eternity.

You accuse me of declamation instead of argument. Now, even supposing there were truth in this charge, I might answer, that argument is perfectly thrown away upon you. It has been demonstrated to you, over and over again, from God's own word, that your system is false. But you dare not meet the proofs. You fall to distorting the text of the Scriptures, and denying their infallible inspired authority, and preparing Improved Versions and proofs that this and that book are not to be considered parts of the sacred Canon. Indeed, instead of meeting our proofs, do you not openly and boldly declare that *no* proof would be sufficient to establish our doctrines, that they are not capable of proof, and that it is actually impossible that Christ should have taught them? In endeavoring to evade the proofs which we offer you from the Bible, in regard to the doctrines of Regeneration and the Atonement especially, you adopt principles of interpretation at war with all common sense, and such as would turn the New Testament itself, a book of the plainest prose, into a complete magazine of oriental metaphors.

Indeed, that you may not be forced to receive anything over and above your own favorite republication of Natural Religion, you interpret the whole Bible as if it had a mere local and temporary application; as if it were the mere organ and medium of a religion that is to be overruled, and laid aside at some future period, by a system better adapted to the increased dignity and perfectibility of the human character. It would not seem as if such an idea as this could ever enter the head of any man who has looked into his Bible; and yet it has; and on the ground of it, when hard pressed with the doctrine of Regeneration and its kindred truths, you are accustomed to declare that these things are parts of revelation that had exclusive reference to the Jews and Jewish peculiarities; and your art is, to refer those you are endeavoring to deceive, to a mass of external, historical, pretended criticism, under cover of which, your too palpable denial of plain revealed truth may be concealed. We say to you, that when Dr. Channing, or any other Unitarian whatever, dares meet Professor Stuart's Letters on principles that do not undermine the authority of the Scriptures, and turn them into a collection of temporary, imperfect records, and unnecessary hyperboles, then will it be time to

\* "This doctrine," (of two 'natures in Christ) *could not be established, even by the clearest declarations of the Scriptures. For the testimony of the Scriptures would not prove it to be true; on the contrary its occurrence in the Scriptures would prove them to be false.*" Yates.

confine ourselves to the powerful re-statement of the Scripture argument. At present we must bend our efforts to the preserving of the Scriptures themselves from the grasp and sweep of your reckless infidelity. Were we to let you go on, we should very soon have no Bible whatever to appeal to.

In more ways than one you have shown your jealousy and dislike of the sacred volume. The publications that have emanated from the presses and institutions of your system, both in this country and in Europe, contain either an effective rejection of revelation, or principles that lead to it. The works recommended by you, and the articles connected with them, are such as take the lowest theory in regard to the authority of God's word, or assert in plain terms "that the historians of Scripture were not inspired;" that there is "no need of supposing the apostles to have spoken and written under any other influence than that of truth and goodness,"—truth "not by them supernaturally taught;" and that the writings characterized as given by inspiration of God, "may have been nothing more than the works of men, whose minds were acted upon by the motives which he presents, and who had that sense of religion and duty, which his dispensations to the Jewish nation were adapted to produce."\* The whole course of your Examiner might be justly styled a covert attack against the influence and authority of the Scriptures; nor will any apologies or protestations you can make to the contrary alter this fact, for it is in the eye of the public. Your attempts at concealment, in one or two instances, by laboring to make it appear that you are more orthodox than has been represented in your views of the Scriptures, cannot alter the tenor of the articles you have written, nor repress the outbreking infidel tendency of your system. Those attempts remind us of the cunning, with which the insane are said sometimes to conceal their insanity; it may be hidden for a while, but when suspicion begins to be lulled, suddenly the buried fire breaks out. The fire of unbelief has been the ruling spirit in your system, and will continue to be so, as long as it remains to vex the church of God with its delusions. If any system can be read in the writings of its adherents and the course of the publications attached to it, your system does deny the Divine authority of the Bible; from Priestley down to yourselves, we can point you to plain declarations and articles that cannot be mistaken. Look at your own sacrilegious article "On the injudicious use of the Old Testament." Look at your pages entitled, "The Scriptures not a revelation, but the record of a revelation." Look at your articles on "The beginning and perfection of Christianity;" and mark what you have written on "The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews." Depend upon it, your demonstrations of infidelity in regard to the purity and sacredness and inspiration of the Holy Volume are more frequent and startling than yourselves are aware of.

\* Le Clerc, and Norton, and Christian Examiner. See on this subject the following references to the Examiner, Vol. 3. pp. 19, 106. Vol. 4. p. 347. Vol. 5. pp. 39, 59, 69. Vol. 6. p. 344. Vol. 7. pp. 347, 357. Vol. 8. pp. 138—143, 386.

We find you declaring explicitly that the Scriptures "were not produced under the miraculous supervision of the Deity:" and that "A DENIAL OF THE IMMEDIATE INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES DOES NOT IN THE SLIGHTEST DEGREE AFFECT THEIR AUTHORITY."\*

We find you declaring that the canonical books of the New Testament "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." You then go on to suppose a man like Cicero, "convinced that Christ was a messenger from God," but "neither called to be an apostle, *nor having his mind miraculously illuminated,*" but left by God to the exercise of his natural powers, "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 explanation and remarks;"—and you declare "The works of such a writer would, as far as we can judge, have been at least OF EQUAL VALUE WITH ANY BOOKS WHICH REMAIN TO US."†

You declare that "the proposition *does not admit of being believed,* that the whole Bible, including the historical books of the Old Testament, was a revelation." And in that profane article on the Old Testament, you denominate those sacred Scriptures, in which *holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,* "a broken and moss-grown cistern." We find you declaring that "by taking our lessons of morality from the Old Testament, WE LOWER OUR STANDARD OF DUTY:"—that "*superstition has found its strong hold in the Hebrew Scriptures:*"—that the "readers of the Old Testament *lose the consolations of religion:*"—that "men go to the Old Testament for that instruction which it was never meant to afford them, and return without benefit, though *not without injury:*"—and that "IT DOES NOT CONTAIN CHRISTIANITY, AND THAT MEN DO WRONG TO GO TO IT TO LEARN THE DUTIES, FEELINGS, AND CONSOLATIONS OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION!!"

Now I need not make a single remark on the impiety of these declarations, but would simply contrast them with the declarations of an inspired Apostle in regard to the Old Testament.—"From a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, *which are able to make thee wise unto salvation,* through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; *that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.*"

\* Vol. 8, pp. 138, 143.

† Vol. 6. p. 344.

You have not only attacked the divine authority of God's word, but you have written against his ordinances and positive institutions. You have attacked the divine authority and holiness of the Sabbath. You have written against it in such a manner as would effectually remove all restraint from men's consciences in regard to its observance. You have even ridiculed the idea that it is any more holy, or that religion has any thing more to do with it, than any other day in the week. You "*fear there is a superstition on this point, unworthy the illumination of Christianity!*" You "*earnestly recommend the Lord's day,*" "but you dare not esteem its duties above those of other days." Your very recommendations of it destroy its sacredness. You first remove from it the divine sanction, remove all revealed obligation for its observance, and then you deign to *recommend*, principally as a matter of convenience for the comfort and good order of society, that it be kept—just as each man's moral sense, recreations, and engagements may suggest or render agreeable. You would not be particular about the mode, only, you would be sure to avoid all "*puritanical strictness;*" you are determined you will have "*no demure looks nor gloomy penances, no unnecessary or severe restraints.*" If any individual finds it convenient to travel on that day, or important to cut his hay and be getting in his crop during the hours of divine service, you would not say aught against it; far be it from you to think so meanly of the free genius of Christianity as to suppose that it would descend to such vulgar minuteness in the regulation of men's lives. It would be "*unworthy the illumination of Christianity,*" and it would look too suspicious of the goodness and perfectibility of man's nature. You may be sure that your wishes in respect to the Sabbath will be faithfully regarded, by multitudes; the "lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God" would every where rejoice were the Sabbath, observed according to the principles you have laid down in regard to it.

We refer you on this subject to your own Examiner, vol. 7, pp. 128—135, and vol. 4, p. 115. In the first of these articles, we find the leading minister of Liberal Christianity, at one sweep, ridiculing revivals, jeering at the missionary efforts of the Orthodox, and laboring to remove the Scriptural authority and do away the strict observance of the holy Sabbath. The secret of Dr. Channing's liberality of feeling in regard to particular ordinances may be found in his "all-comprehensive" conceptions of the *free genius* of Christianity. Dr. Channing thinks that "*the Gospel is not a religion of precise rules,*" but "*leaves us to determine for ourselves in a great measure the discipline by which its noble ends are to be secured.*" His views of the Sabbath are a practical commentary on the following opinion of the authority of the Scriptures. "We are not among those, who consider the written word a statute book, by the letter of which every step in life must be governed. We believe, on the other hand, that one of the great

excellencies of Christianity is, that it does not deal in minute regulations, but that, having given broad views of duty, and enjoined a pure and disinterested spirit, *it leaves us to apply those rules and express this spirit according to the promptings of the divine monitor within us, and according to the claims and exigencies of the ever-varying conditions in which we are placed.*" \* That is, conscience and circumstances are the guide and interpreter of the Bible. The most depraved voluptuary would thank Dr. Channing for this declaration.

You have also written against the peculiar sacredness and solemnity of the Lord's Supper, endeavoring to break up and abolish the distinction between the church and congregation, and asserting that the Christian rites are no more holy than the weekly services of the sanctuary. You declare that there is no authority for excluding any of the congregation from the communion table, and that you might as properly exclude the worshippers from the house of God.† You evidently are aiming to do away all distinction between the converted and the unconverted, and to destroy the feeling that even yet manifestly troubles you, that none ought to be considered Christians until they are regenerated. One of your ministers has declared, "I am not to presume that any who contribute to the maintenance of Christian worship and a Christian ministry are unbelievers"‡

Now we do not wonder at your feelings in regard to the Communion; they are fearfully consistent with your system; the wonder is that you have not put them in practice long since, and rejected the awful symbols of our Lord's body and blood entirely. The system that rejects a SAVIOUR has no need or reason to commemorate his death. Nor is it surprising that to you those solemn and affecting rites have no peculiar sacredness; you *feel* that with your denial of the Atonement they are an incongruous exhibition. We know that you have not yet generally reached the point of "*illumination*" requisite for their entire abolition. One of your number has outstripped Dr. Channing himself in his conceptions of the free genius of your Christianity, and the proposition to abolish the sacred elements has been made. His advance into the regions of spiritual liberty was, however, too rapid even for the progressive spirit of your system; and the startling discovery of the consummation to which it is tending was hushed, even with the affirmation of a partial derangement of intellect in the individual who made it. It has been the fate of all bold adventurers and reformers to be esteemed insane, and we know not why your pioneers in the work of spiritual emancipation should be exempt from this lot. Nor can you hope to keep the actual nature and tendencies of your system much longer concealed. They will

\* Channing's Works. Vol. in octavo, p. 392.

† Christian Examiner, vol. 3, pp. 9, 10.

‡ Farley. Discourses on the Lord's Supper, pp. 21—26.

not be repressed. Your system is displaying itself, and you need not expect to restrain its freaks and sallies of infidelity. Perhaps ere long, some one of your number, some true champion of charity, elated with the consciousness of man's dignity, and perfectibility, and godlike human nature, will enter an action for libel against the minister of Jesus, who shall dare to call the impenitent in his congregation enemies against God. And would it be strange if, in some of your soaring aspirations after unshackled spiritual liberty, that disdains all rites, you should propose the utter abolition of the ordinance of Baptism? Unitarian writers have already attacked the formula of Baptism given by our Saviour, alleging that it was not intended as a prescribed form, and even pronouncing it a forgery, and "*admitting their strict disbelief that even Jesus Christ gave any such directions as to its mode.*"\*

You have attacked the word and ordinances of God; but your worst depredations successively have been committed against his particular revealed truths. We shall not attempt a regular catalogue and classification of your errors. Amidst all its inconsistencies, your system in one respect is consistent; it does not rest till it has made the clear sweep of infidelity over *all* the grand truths of revelation. You have denied the truths of human depravity. "Neither the sneers of a worldly scepticism, nor the groans of a gloomy theology can disturb your faith in *the godlike powers and tendencies*" of that human nature, which you "*do and must reverence.*" You say that "In Christianity particularly, you meet perpetual testimonies to **THE DIVINITY OF HUMAN NATURE!!**" You declare that God himself is but "*another name for human intelligence* raised above all error and imperfection, and extended to all possible truth." You affirm that "the divine attributes are first developed in ourselves, and thence transferred to our Creator;" and that "the idea of God, sublime and awful as it is, is *the idea of our own spiritual nature*, purified and enlarged to infinity. *In ourselves are the elements of the Divinity.*" † You declare, moreover, that "Religion and virtue, wherever they exist, are the mind itself, and *nothing else.* They are *human nature*, and **NOTHING ELSE.** A good man's piety and virtue are not distinct possessions; they are himself, and *all the glory which belongs to them, belongs to himself!!*" ‡ There is justice in the remark, that in Dr. Channing's theology God is made a mere caterer for human glory. Paul used to say, "By *grace* are ye saved, through faith; and *that NOT OF YOURSELVES*; it is *the gift of God.* Not of works, *lest any man should boast.*" Dr. Channing's deification of human nature and degradation of God, is one of the most abhorrent features and tendencies in your whole system.

You have denied the truths of Regeneration, asserting that conversion cannot be necessary to all, and that its enforcements on a

\* Unitarian Miscellany, vol. ii, p. 215, and Christian Pioneer, vol. i.

† Channing's Works, pp. 459, 461. ‡ The same, p. 194.

Christian assembly now is "*without meaning*." \* You have denied and reviled the Atonement. Your writers have actually blasphemed the truth of Christ's propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world, asserting it to be the expedient of "*a cruel, capricious, tyrannical being*," to involve "a principle that would disgrace any government on earth," to be a "central gallows" in the Universe, a "horrid spectacle," that holds up God as a "**MONSTER**," from a belief in whom you "would willingly take refuge in the less chilling creed of the atheist." † You have denied the truth of justification by faith in Christ, impiously asserting that "to build the hope of pardon on the independent and infinite sufficiency of Jesus Christ, is to build on *an unscriptural and false foundation*." ‡ You have utterly denied the existence and agency of the Holy Spirit. You have derogated from the character, and denied the Divine dignity of the Saviour. Your writers have denied his pre-existence, and asserted "*that Christ had no agency in the work of creation, and that he did not then exist*," § and that he was "constituted, in all respects, like other men, subject to the same frailties, infirmities, ignorance, and prejudices." || You have denied the truth of a general judgement. ¶ You have denied that Christ will judge the world. \*\* From the declarations of some of the adherents of your system, we find that the materialism, which, ever since the time of Priestley, has been a part of English Unitarianism, is also a part of the American scheme. †† You have asserted the innocence of error. From your own declarations, and from the article of Sismondi, translated and recommended in the Examiner, you appear to believe that even the errors of Pagan idolaters are a faith to be respected, being merely the mistaken worship of "*the same God that we all adore, Jews, Mussulmen and Christians*." You have ridiculed experimental religion. You declare that what constitutes a Christian, "so far as respects what he is to believe, must consist in one single article, *the divine mission and consequent authority of Jesus Christ*." ††† You declare, moreover, that to preclude such men as Socrates and the deist Herbert from the hope of heaven, "cannot be reconciled with the justice, much less with the goodness, of the Supreme Disposer." §§ You deny the existence and agency of Satan. You deny the truth of endless punishment, declaring it "beyond all question, the most horrible dogma ever conceived or uttered by man." ||| You pervert the attributes

\* Christian Disciple, Vol. 4. p. 420; and Colman's Sermons, p. 218.

† Unitarian Miscellany and Channing, Bancroft and Lamson.

‡ Channing, p. 575; and other writers, both in Periodicals and Sermons.

§ Bailey's Sermons p. 23.

|| Belsham's Calm Enquiry, p. 190.

¶ Examiner, Vol. 9. p. 30; also Norton's Statement.

\*\* Unitarian Advocate, Vol. 5. p. 149; Norton's Statement, 311, 312.

†† Cooper and Dabney.

††† Examiner, Vol. 3. p. 241.

§§ Examiner, Vol. 8. p. 257.

||| Examiner, Vol. 8. p. 262.

of God, and make him "altogether such an one as yourselves." Besides our other references, we call your attention to the tenor of your own pages on "The future state of man," "On erroneous views of death," "On belief and unbelief," "On the future condition of the wicked," on "the conditions of Divine forgiveness," and to all that you have written against Revivals and Missions, and on other connected topics.

We ask now, such being your own development of your own views, how can you possibly charge us with want of charity in refusing to extend to you the hand of Christian fellowship? We put it to your own conscience—Would it not be a burlesque upon all charity, should we, with this exhibition of your system and yourselves, accumulating, as it has been for years, receive you into Christian communion, either as individuals or Churches? Our religions are as opposite as light and darkness. We might as consistently be asked to receive the followers of Mahomet into Christian fellowship, as the followers of a system, which excludes a Regenerating Spirit, degrades the Divine Saviour of the world to a level with his sinful creatures, and denies that his expiatory sufferings and death had any more efficacy in taking away sin, than the sufferings and death of any of his Apostles. Our religion rests on that Divine Saviour and his expiatory sacrifice, as on its *only* foundation. Yours reject both him and it. We receive the Holy Scriptures as *in themselves* the inspired and infallible word of God. You reject them, and attach so little essential importance to a belief in them, as to declare that a man may *virtuously* reject Christianity. We hold that men are entirely depraved, and at enmity against God. You hold that they are naturally good, and assert that "*no such persons as mere sinners exist*,"\* and "that it is not in human nature to *hate* infinite purity," and that you "pity the man, who recognizes nothing *god-like* in his own nature."† We believe that all men are under the curse of the law, and, out of Christ, will perish everlastingly. You deny it utterly, and boldly assert that it would be unjust for God to exclude even what you call a "virtuous Deist" from heaven. We believe that all men, to be saved, must be regenerated by the Holy Spirit. You deny it. We believe that men can be justified and saved *only* through faith in, and dependence upon, a crucified Redeemer. You deny it, and "depend on *your own character* and the mercy of God."‡ We believe that the wicked will be eternally punished. You declare it to be the most horrible of all dogmas. We hold to the existence of an endless Hell as well as an endless Heaven. You deny it, and are in fact Universalists. You are ashamed, we well know, of this name; it is not consonant with your god-like and soaring aspirations; but if any sect could do it, you have declared yourselves Universalists. The doctrine of eternal punishment you have repeatedly caricatured and ridiculed. And the great body

\* Christian Disciple, Vol. 4. p. 453.

† Unitarian Tract, No. 23. p. 5.

‡ Channing, 474.

of Unitarians in this country, it has been truly asserted, believe in the final restoration of all men to happiness.

Again, our system is one of self-denial and separation from the world. Yours is one of self-indulgence and amusement *in* the world. On your own confession, "Unitarians form a large part of those who resort to doubtful or positively injurious amusements; who patronize theatres, and are averse to social meetings."\* Our system is a missionary system. Yours has nothing to do with the missionary spirit, but to jeer at it, or coolly question its utility. Our system is one of conversions and revivals, yours ridicule them, and for self-preservation must keep clear of them. But we need pursue the parallel no farther; you do yourselves allow, that to be consistent with our own system, we must be intolerant of yours.

We have in your system a scheme, advertised to the world as the pure Christianity and panacea of the soul, which absolutely rejects the idea of conversion, and is made up of such elements, that the admission of conversions and revivals would prove its immediate destruction. No sooner is an individual truly converted, than he finds that the very process of conversion is an admission and heart-felt experience of all the truths your system is ridiculing, and he sees with open eyes the place of ruin and guilt from which God's mercy has snatched him. For your own preservation, therefore, as a sect, you must carefully guard against evangelical conversion. If you sincerely advanced to the work of saving souls, you would throw your whole system out of its native infidelity into direct Orthodoxy. There could be no other result. You must not only deny the *necessity* of Regeneration, therefore, but you must avoid its *experience*, and warn your proselytes against it, if you and they would not be compelled to an immediate renunciation of your whole system, and an embrace of the same evangelical scheme, against which your whole efforts are directed. This being the case, it is no wonder that Unitarian preachers and writers so carefully guard their hearers against the "excitement," the revivals, the protracted meetings, of the Orthodox. Excitement, either intellectual or spiritual, is dangerous to you; and there are those who declare that they would rather have the pestilence visit their families, than that influence, which, in the preaching of the true Gospel, they behold convincing sinners of their sins and bringing them to the Saviour.

Now we say, let the world be on their guard against such a system as this; a system that is actually compelled, in self-preservation, to keep men out of the way to heaven, and lull them quietly in their sins; a system, that can no longer prevail, than while it can preserve the souls of those deluded by it, beyond the regenerating power of God's Holy Spirit. Let men beware of such a system as this. The father of lies has contrived it for the ruin of immortal beings; and that so ingeniously, that its advocates must shun the God of the Scriptures, and conviction of sin, and every situation that would expose them to the danger of conversion, and must unspiritualize and distort the Bible, and in some way or other provide

\* Review of a Letter to a Unitarian Clergyman, p. 16.

a shield against its regenerating power upon the soul. It is amazing that in an age of light such a system can so long have been endured. One would think that the outraged spiritual sense of the whole Community would be up in indignation against it.

When Rammohum Roy was said to have been converted, it produced among your sect a sort of convulsive effort towards the missionary enterprise; but you speedily found a prevailing practical conviction, even among your own people that liberal Christianity itself is not worth enough to pay the expense of offering it to the nation. Poor Rammohum Roy continued, with all his liberalization, a professed Hindoo, and you have kindly apologized for his continuance in heathenism, with the excuse that its abandonment would have exposed him to great persecution; and this, in the cause of liberal Christianity, it was not worth while to endure. Your system does not certainly occasion you much anxiety in behalf of those who are destitute of its blessings. So it always has been. "The faith, that you and I have," said Dr. Priestley to Mr. Lindsey "that even the wicked, after a state of wholesome discipline (and that not more severe than will be necessary) will be raised in due time to a state of happiness, greatly diminishes our concern on this account." And well it might; and your system is consistent in making no provisions for a missionary spirit or missionary efforts. It was not constructed with reference to the wants of a perishing world, but with reference to an advancement in liberality and refinement, which is to place men beyond the need of Regeneration and an atoning Saviour.

A missionary spirit in that system? The very existence of such a spirit is an admission and hearty belief of the very doctrines which that system scorns! There is, therefore, good reason why your system in all its imitation of evangelical measures, has not imitated this. Set out to convert the world with a system that rejects the very doctrines, in the application of which to the heart and conscience all the power of the Bible consists? Set out to convert the world with the denial of human depravity, the denial of Regeneration, the denial of the Atonement, the denial of future endless punishment to the wicked? Why! the very first step in the progress of such a mission would be the announcement that men do not need to be converted, and are in no danger! It is no wonder you shrink back from such an experiment. Nor is it wonderful that you should have *ridiculed* revivals and the cause of missions. A time is coming, if the church of Christ are in any measure faithful to their duty, when you will no longer be able to do this; and the manner in which you now stand aside, and scorn the manifestations of the presence and power of God's Spirit around you, reminds us forcibly and sadly of the application of that passage,—"*Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish.*"

The fact that your system of error is utterly repugnant to the spirit of missions ensures its speedy destruction. A period is coming, when it will no longer be possible for any system to stand, that does not produce the missionary spirit as its legitimate result. We are ad-

vancing to the time, when the Christian world will have for its one great object, and the point to which its gaze is directed, the whole world's regeneration. The tide is setting on in this mighty movement, and those things that do not move with it will be overwhelmed by it. There will be such a deep and universal conviction that the spirit of the Gospel is a missionary spirit, and the doctrines of the gospel missionary doctrines, that a religion, which, like liberal Christianity, professes to recognize neither the truth of the one, nor the necessity of the other, will be shamed out of existence. The wheels of the missionary enterprise will roll over it, and leave it despised and deserted in the distance. Nor have we in this case, any thing to fear from any putting on even of the form of godliness, and thus attempting to commend a false religion to the nations under the appearance of the truth. Neither revivals, nor the missionary enterprise can be imitated, by the sect that denies the doctrines, which are absolutely essential to both. It were easier to make mankind do anything most hard, than to make them believe that *that* religion came down from heaven.

You are indignant, because I have called your errors wilful. I acknowledge that wilful error indicates a corrupt heart; and sadly, seriously and solemnly do I assert, that along with all, who never have experienced the regenerating power of the Holy Spirit, you do possess hearts morally corrupt and at enmity against God; nor can your wilful errors be justly considered in any other light, than as one result among the consequences of your depravity. We know that you deny that depravity; we are grieved because you do; you deny that it exists in any of God's creatures. But your denial does not destroy the truth of revelation. "*Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God.*" What are your errors, we do earnestly ask, if they are not wilful? Is not your Unitarianism a voluntary thing? Were you compelled into it? Is not your disbelief just as voluntary, just as much a matter of choice, as our belief? If belief is the action of the heart, and not a mere speculation of the understanding, so is unbelief. Is not our belief wilful? Will you deny that it is? And is not your rejection of our belief just as wilful? After all, we see not how you can deny that your rejection of the doctrines of the Gospel is enlightened, deliberate, wilful. We doubt not you are, some of you, sincere in your disbelief. We read in the Bible of men given over to strong delusion to believe a lie. Now their belief of a lie was surely not the less criminal for being *belief*: nay, the *belief* arose out of the very height and extremity of their wickedness. And so it is possible that the long habit of rejection of the plainest doctrines of the Gospel may at length come to the firm *belief* of the *falsehood* of those doctrines, and of the truth of a system directly opposed to them. And then, the perverted mind and heart may proceed, in full, serious, sincere enmity against the truth of God, deliberately to revile and oppose

it. We are greatly mistaken, if this dreadful path be not the very course, which the leading Unitarians are now wilfully and sincerely pursuing. The contemplation is a melancholy one; indeed, it fills us with deep sorrow. We would seriously ask, Was not Dr. Channing sincere, when he declared the doctrine of Atonement the CENTRAL GALLOWS of the Universe? Did he compose and utter that paragraph carelessly, involuntarily? Or, does his sincerity blot out the guilt of that daring impiety? We think not. To be sincere in error, intelligent error, when the mind has been dwelling in the midst of light, we might well fear, is to be probably in the situation of one given over, on account of his great resistance to the Holy Ghost, to *believe* a lie. And surely, for a man of cultivated intellect and a "pure life," a man who can rule his body and do well (according to the world's standard at least) to his fellow beings,—for such an one deliberately to insult his God, and stand forth in contemptuous defiance and reproach of his chosen plan of salvation, with studied caricature and ridicule, is a spiritual wickedness, that in corporeal sins finds no parallel for its greatness. Oh, how little do the world consider, that unbelief, far from being innocent, is the greatest and most comprehensive of all sins.

In consideration of the review we have now taken of your course and system, we are constrained to notice the inconsistency of those, who, under the profession of friendship to evangelical religion, are accustomed to write and speak, as if a vigorous attack against Unitarianism were contrary to the nature of the 'kingdom of peace and righteousness.' "First PURE, then *peaceable*," is the maxim of an old writer, whom we have always been taught to revere, and by whose inspired wisdom we desire in this thing to be guided. And again, "the end of the commandment is charity *out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of FAITH unfeigned.*" And as to a revival of the evils of controversy, which you so much deprecate, and the breaking up of that spirit of quiet, which you assert had begun to reign in regard to your own errors, we believe it would be better for the churches to be rent asunder and scattered to the four winds of heaven, than to be left to slumber in false doctrine, or to give it a peaceable repose within their own bosom. It is most unscriptural and dangerous to be speculating on the question how much pernicious error the heart may live with, or to allow men to hope that unbelief may be innocent, or that God, after having warned them against it, will interpose to prevent its deadly consequences in those who indulge it. The cry is, that in the attack of error we are driving unbelievers still farther and farther from the truth. Surely, if under and amidst the truth they have become errorists, then, if we do nothing to disturb them, they are likely to continue such—entangled in the sophistry of Unitarianism; and since already, under pretence of receiving the Gospel of Christ, they do in effect deny the whole of it, it is most difficult to discover how they *could* be removed to a greater distance from it. On philosophical principles it might be proved that an open and declared infidel is more likely to be convicted and con-

verted, where a pungent appeal is made to the conscience, than the professors of the system of liberal Christianity.

To trace out all the consequences of that system, and to tell plainly those who embrace it that they are in fatal error, we contend is not only *not* contrary to the spirit of peace and righteousness, but is just one of the most legitimate results of that spirit. In that spirit Paul was speaking, when he declared (Gal. i. 7, 8, 9.) "There be some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, *let him be accursed*. As we said before, so say I now again, *If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.*" Now we do know *exactly* what gospel Paul preached. *We do know it was NOT that Gospel*, which denies the Deity of Christ, Regeneration, Atonement, Entire Depravity, Endless Punishment. We do solemnly believe that the preachers of this false Gospel are the very subjects of Paul's dreadful anathema.

We beseech you again to consider the results of your system, as in their accumulating development for years, they are spread out before you. There is not one article of our religion, it has been truly observed, of which your system does not overturn the foundation or destroy the essence. It declares that Christ was a mere man, a man of ignorance, prejudices and frailties, and not without sin; that he was only a highly endowed teacher and prophet; that he came into the world only to teach morality, and suffered only as a martyr to the truth, and died only to prove a resurrection from the grave; that he did *not* die for the sins of mankind, and therefore is *not* our Redeemer; that he was *not* the Lamb of God, offered as an expiatory sacrifice for the sins of his fallen creatures; that he is in truth neither our Advocate, nor Intercessor, nor Mediator; that he is *not* now present with his disciples, and has *not* gone to prepare a place for them in heaven; that all things were *not* made by him, and that, when the world was created, he had not even an existence; that he does *not* forgive sins in person, and has *not* personal agency in the conversion of the Gentiles; that he is *not* the Judge of all, and that indeed there is no general judgement and no day of judgement; that he has *not* now any superintendence over the concerns of his followers, and can neither be to us a Comforter, nor send the Holy Spirit to dwell among us; that justification by faith alone is unscriptural and absurd; that there is no Regeneration, no Holy Ghost, no Divine Son of God, no Trinity in Unity; that there is no Evil Spirit, no Satan, no Devil; that Hell is a mere metaphor without existence; that the soul cannot separately exist, and that the wicked will not be eternally punished; and finally, that a man may virtuously reject Christianity; that the Holy Scriptures are not infallibly inspired; that the Old Testament is an injurious book; that the writings of the Apostles are not to be regarded in every part as inspiration, but frequently mistake and error; and therefore that the Holy Spirit

did *not* guide them into all truth. We should think the slightest glance at the results of your system would be enough to warn you of its dangerous nature. Permit us affectionately to remind you of a very solemn passage, which we earnestly pray, by the mercy of God in your penitent acceptance of an injured Saviour, may never seal your destiny. "He that despised Moses' law died without mercy under two or three witnesses; of how much sorer punishment suppose ye shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace?"

In all that I have said, I have spoken with plainness. And though it may be with severity, yet I trust without anger. It is a solemn subject; nor would I treat it in any other than a solemn, calm, prayerful manner. If there be aught in these pages inconsistent with such a spirit, may God forgive it and prevent its evil influence. It is hard to write condemning truths in perfect freedom from a condemning temper; it is equally difficult to write them in energy, even with kindness and tenderness at heart, without *the appearance* of harshness and hostility of feeling. I think I can say, in the deepest sincerity, in regard to those against whose errors I am writing, "*my heart's desire and prayer to God for them is, that they may be saved.*" At the same time I know, *beyond all doubt, I know*, that neither you, nor I, nor any other sinful creature, *can* be saved without being regenerated by the Spirit of God, justified by the blood of Christ, reconciled to God by the death of his Son. I *know* that none can be saved without receiving Christ, and believing on him as "*the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth;*" none can, without justifying faith in that atoning Saviour, who "redeems us to God by his blood," but to "*build the hope of pardon, on whose independent and infinite sufficiency,*" the Leader of your sect has impiously declared, "IS TO BUILD ON AN UNSCRIPTURAL AND FALSE FOUNDATION." It is solemn, indeed, and most truly painful, faithfully to warn those, whose system excludes a Regenerating Spirit, and rejects a crucified Redeemer, and, if persisted in, cannot but prove to its advocates endless ruin to the soul. You may declare it arrogance, but indeed, it proceeds from love; and to yourselves and to all the adherents of that system, we say earnestly and imploringly, Awake from your false security. If conscience still tells you *there is danger*, if you be not fortified unapproachably against the power of conviction then be entreated to remain no longer in doubt in regard to a matter of such infinite importance as the question of your eternal salvation; flee, while you may, to the only place of known safety, to "the blood of sprinkling," to "the Lamb of God."

That this may be your choice, is the earnest prayer of one,

Respectfully and most sincerely,

Your friend and servant in the Gospel,

GEORGE B. CHEEVER.















