



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

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

JULY, 1833.

No. III.

ART. I.—*Hints on Colonization and Abolition; with reference to the black race.*

THEY who are wise enough to place implicit confidence in the statements of the Bible, as to the origin of the human race, find no difficulty in tracing the three distinct races of men who inhabit this vast continent to the patriarch Noah, as the second head and progenitor of mankind. Nor is the difficulty great, to reach the assurance that the three sons of that patriarch were respectively the heads of three races which surround us: all things concurring to prove that the North American Indians are of Asiatic, that is of Shemitish origin, whilst the origin of the white and black races is not only matter of familiar knowledge and full experience, but is stamped upon the very aspects and lineaments of the beings themselves, in characters which time is not able to erase. Indeed we think we see in the very state of things which are passing before us, the evidence of the truth of God, in the exact fulfilment of a prophecy, which, from the distance of forty-two centuries, seem to point steadfastly to us. "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his ser-

vant." This is very remarkable; and as far as we know, has been true no where else but here; and true no where, if its statements were reversed. Shem has not ruled Ham in the tents of Japheth; nor Ham either of them in the tents of the other; nor Japheth, been served by Ham in the tents of Shem, any where but in this western hemisphere. God enlarged Japheth, until he hath stretched him over the tents of Shem, and the liberties of Ham; the double plunderer of both his brethren.

With only one of these races, it is our purpose now to occupy these pages; having reference to a second race only so far as their high interests or close duties may implicate them in the discussion; and dismissing the third from our thoughts as not now particularly concerned. For, although the question of colonization has not only been made, but matured and executed as to considerable portions of the Indian race; it is obvious that it stands upon wholly different grounds from the same question as applied to the African race.

The African race in the United States, at this time, does not vary much in amount from two millions and a half of persons. Of these, something more than two millions are slaves, and the remainder admitted to a very limited state of freedom. This race is again capable of another division, which, though generally overlooked, is of no inconsiderable consequence; the division we mean into unmixed Africans, and coloured persons originally of African origin, but more or less mixed with the white race. No means have been used to ascertain the precise number of mulattoes in this country; but they undoubtedly amount to many thousands of people, scattered through all the States, varying through all possible grades of complexion between black and white, and yet forming unitedly a distinct, powerful, and remarkable class of beings. By the laws of the slaveholding States, any person whose veins contain as much as one quarter of African blood is technically called a mulatto, and is considered and treated in all respects as if he were black. The question, as to the right of freedom, upon the mere fact of having less than a fourth part of African blood; that is, being neither a black nor a mulatto but *a white man* (such are so by these laws), *and as such, per se, free*, has not, we believe, been yet made in our courts as a legal question. Nor is it our province to say how it will be decided when made; but if the law be construed to favour freedom, as all law pretends to do, there are multitudes of persons now held in bondage, who will go free. This whole class of mulattoes is to be considered and treated as distinct from the blacks. They consider themselves so; the blacks consider them so; and all who have opportunity of comparing the

two cannot doubt that the former are the more active, intelligent, and enterprising of the two. They look upwards, not downwards. They are constantly seeking, and acquiring too, the privileges of the whites; and cases are within our own knowledge where persons of respectability, in nearly every walk of life, have sprung within the memory of man from this mixed race. For all the purposes of this discussion therefore, this race may be left out of the question, or rather considered as united, for its ultimate destiny, with the whites rather than the blacks; to the former of which they are far the most assimilated in constitution and in character.

The unmixed race of coloured persons, may, as has been already indicated of the whole race, be divided into two very unequal masses, the smaller embracing free persons, the larger slaves; unitedly forming about a sixth part of the entire population of the republic. What is to be the destiny of these multitudes of human beings? What influence can we exert over their present and everlasting interest? What connexion has their destiny with ours? and with that of the world? These are questions which we cannot escape; which we ought to meet, and examine, and decide, with the carefulness, and candour, and firmness becoming free, enlightened, and Christian men.

In the discussion of these deep interests, let us as far as possible keep all jarring matters separate; and while we look at the whole subject in all its imposing magnitude, let us do it in such a manner as not to confound things which are essentially distinct. It is within the compass of possible events, for example, that the public sentiment may settle down unto just such a state as we should prefer on all the questions relating to free persons of colour, while the reverse occurred on all those relating to slaves; or the precise opposite might happen. The questions are separate, and should be separately discussed.

First, then, as to the free people of colour. We hazard nothing in asserting that the subsisting relations between this class of persons and the community cannot remain permanently as they are. In the year 1790 there were sixty-three whites to every single free coloured person in this nation: in 1830, there were only thirty-five to one. A similar rate of approximation for about two centuries and a half would make the free coloured persons equal to the whites, without taking slaves at all into the account. Neither the safety of the State nor the resources of any community would endure within its bosom such a nation of idle, profligate, and ignorant persons. There is a point beyond which the peace of society cannot permit the increase of the elements of commotion; for the moment that point is passed,

they who were the vagabonds of yesterday become the lords of the ascendant to-morrow; so that States, by a sort of self-adjusting process, purge away the grosser elements which compose them. True, the process is usually demoralizing, and always stern and bloody; but, in the long run, not therefore the less inevitable. So, on the other hand, there is a point beyond which no community can allow a system of pauperism to go; and whether this system exhibit itself in a useless and corrupt aristocracy, nominally above society, as in foreign States, or in a class of abandoned idlers below it, as with us, the result is sooner or later the same, and really from the same causes. Society can bear only such a rate of idle hands, to the mouths that must be fed; and whether the excess that cannot be borne is attempted to be fed by oppression under pretence of law, or by real theft, or by general mendicity, makes no difference as to the certainty that the body politic must re-act, and the excrescence slough off.

We may be allowed also to say, that in our age of Christian enterprise, such a condition as that which is generally exhibited by the free coloured population of this country cannot be permitted long to exist, under our daily observation. Their condition is no doubt represented to be comparatively worse than it really is, in some respects, as we may have occasion to show hereafter. But that it is really most degraded, destitute, pitiable, and full of bitterness, no man who will use his senses can for one moment doubt. And whatever their condition, that it has been brought upon them, chiefly if not entirely by our own policy and social state, is just as undeniable. They are victims to our fathers and to us; how, we pause not to ask. But they are victims: and every sentiment of religion impels us to regard their case with an eye of pity.

They, therefore, who are for doing nothing in reference to this great subject, are out of place, and behind the necessities and the feelings of the age. To do nothing, is to let the very worst be done. They who are prepared to do something, are divided between the plans; the first of which proposes to retain the free coloured people in this country, to admit them to all the privileges of the whites, and to discountenance and break down forever every sentiment, or feeling, or taste, or prejudice, which stands in the way of a perfect equality and complete mixture of the two races: the other plan proposes, to divide the two races totally, by colonizing the free blacks. Widely as these schemes differ, there is one point in which the enlightened and humane who advocate either, cordially agree; namely, that the moral and intellectual condition of these unhappy men, should be im-

mediately and greatly improved, whether they stay here, or go to whatever land their destinies may call them. It is a cause of deep thankfulness to God, that they who differ so widely about so many things should agree on this vital point. And yet what fruit has this concurrence of opinion yielded? Where are the evidences of Christian effort among these people, for their present instruction? The missionary, the Sabbath School, the temperance agent, the tract distributor! where are they all? Alas! how meager are the efforts of benevolence for the present advantage of these dying multitudes, who are left to perish, while we discuss questions relating to their future condition. For this at least, there can be no excuse; for we know well, that no people hear the gospel of God with more greediness than these neglected children of sorrow.

To return, however, to the first of the two plans indicated above, let us inquire, Is it the best? Is it practicable? Is it wise? To each of these questions, we think a negative must be given; and as the point here involved is also still more deeply implicated in a question touching the slave population of this country, to which we will come by and by, it is proper to examine it candidly and fully.

It must be admitted that no moral obligation would be violated by society, if this plan were executed fully, in all the details which are so revolting to the public taste. We do not mean to say that men are at liberty to violate, individually, the deep and settled public feeling on subjects of this kind; but only, that if society could be led into the scheme, there is nothing that morally forbids it. When we admit this, we admit all that the moral sense of every rightly constituted heart and mind can on this point demand. For surely no one will assert that the public taste which has so steadfastly, and for so long a period, revolted at this project of levelling and mixing the races, is, *per se*, morally wrong. We know not on what principle it can be judged criminal in us to shrink with aversion from the thought of contracting the tenderest relations of life, or allowing our near relatives to do it, with persons, who from their physical organization create disgust. It may be said these feelings result from the previous contempt and aversion for this race generated by the previous relations of the parties. But if this be so, how happens it, that in those States where slavery has long ceased, or where it never existed, yea, even among those who most deeply feel for the condition of the blacks, this repugnance to the levelling and mixing of the two people, still exists in full force? Who in any country of white men, selects his wife, his friend, his ruler from among the blacks? If rare cases

are found, men set them down to rare merit on the part of him who has arisen above the force of natural instincts, or to rare depravity on the part of him who falls below them. Now unless this strong and abiding repugnance of all cultivated societies, to pass over natural barriers of this kind, can be shown to be criminal in itself, it seems to be most preposterous to stake a whole plan of mighty good, upon the single point, of forcing men to give it up. We say preposterous: for such conduct would be most unwise, even if the thing complained of were morally wrong, so long as any other way existed of effecting the chief end in view, which in this case is the good of the blacks. But will any attempt to show that the black can never be happy and free, and wise, and Christian, unless he be a member of the same community, and on equal terms with the white man? Or, still worse, will any assert, that his present condition among us can never be improved by removing him to some other land unless we first agree to say and to prove, that he is now, physically intellectually and morally, our equal in all respects? It is manifest then, even if our feelings on this subject deserve no better name than local prejudice, that it is useless and foolish, and may we not add, criminal, to risk a great cause upon a point, which seems immoveably settled against us, and which is at any rate not indispensable to our main design.

It may be asked, why we have placed this matter on personal relation chiefly, or at all? We answer, because the best criterion is thus afforded, both of the nature and extent of the repugnance to the plan we are combating. Buonaparte asserted that the only possible way to place various castes and races of men, in any state, upon a footing of perfect equality, was to *allow polygamy*. This was the result of his reflections on the political state of Egypt; and he saw no method to secure peace among the multifarious classes of all eastern nations better than the violation of the fundamental principle of all Christian institutions. This opinion is certainly worth something; and the universal course of events which confirms it, is worth still more. For we believe it will be hard to find a community, in which races of men, materially different from each other, have lived in the enjoyment of equal privileges, where polygamy has not been tolerated. Now while this fully justifies the manner in which we have treated the subject, it presents us with a most instructive commentary on those schemes which it is our immediate purpose to confute. For what our race has uniformly exhibited in every stage of its existence, may be reasonably supposed to have a deeper location than in the prejudices of society, at least should not needlessly be brought into contest as an absurdity or

a crime, where its overthrow is not of necessity involved in the very success of the chief good to be obtained. Or, if that be really so, it would seem not utterly inconsistent with wisdom and humility, to call in question the facts and reasonings, which had brought us in conflict with the sentiments of so many generations.

For our part, we have never been able to see what good was to be effected, by reducing all the races of men to one homogeneous mass; mixing the white, the red, the tawny, the brown, the black, all together and thus reproducing throughout the world, or in any single State, a race different in some physical appearance from all that now exist. What would be gained by it that would be valuable? Nothing, absolutely nothing. For if such a state of things could be produced, it is manifest it could not be made permanent. The same causes that have made the European white, and the Asiatic tawny, and the African black—we care not, and inquire not, what those causes are—would beyond doubt produce again the very same effects; and with the outward appearance and corresponding habits, produce also the very same propensities and tastes and feelings which now irritate the thorough abolitionist. The object is *physically* not less than *morally* impossible. We have found in certain positions and latitudes, the man of one complexion and organization; and in another position and latitude we have found a different race; and this with a uniformity so surprising, that when the arrangement has been disturbed, it has been by causes operating against the common course of things, and counteracted at last themselves by the more enduring laws which God has stamped upon the universe. Who believes that the white man will possess western or central Africa, or southern Asia, or even that he will continue to hold the West India Islands? Or, who would not smile at the thought of the black man making permanent locations around the polar seas? If any portion of our broad land is best adapted to the black man, we rest assured, that He, who does all things well, will give it to him. But any attempt on our part to mix up, and give him what is not best for him, is as absurd as all effort to keep him from his own must finally be nugatory.

But it may be said, we care not for the amalgamation of the races, we ask only for equal privileges and rights; we reply, the things are inseparably united; united by universal experience; united in the feelings, the sentiments, the prejudices of mankind. The class out of which we choose our rulers, and teachers, and associates, is the same out of which our children choose their husbands and wives; *it is the class of our equals*,—whether we be all

equally free or equally slaves—it is the class of our equals only. All civil equality which begins not in such sentiments as will tolerate perfect personal equality, is idle and fictitious; and as to political without personal equality, it is every where impossible, but in a land of repeated and popular elevations, the notion is utterly absurd.

But suppose it were not so; what peculiar advantages would accrue to the free persons of colour by residing in this country, on terms of perfect equality, among the whites; that would not exist to an equal degree, if there were no white men here? Or if they were alone in some other land as good as this? Amalgamation with the whites, we think, has been shown to be out of the question, and not desirable if it could be attained. The attainment of equal civil or political rights here, without amalgamation, we think has been shown to be impossible. And we now demand again, if neither has been proved, in what is some other land, equal to this in soil, climate, and all other advantages, inferior to this, as the black man's home? Will he say, it is inferior simply because it is not his home? And does he really mean to say, that the place of his birth, though in no respect superior to other portions of the earth, is so dear to him, as to be preferred *with oppression and contempt*, and that in his own judgment, or with poverty and ignorance and nominal freedom, in the judgment of all, to a land not less lovely, with plenty and liberty and knowledge! And is this the evidence upon which he expects to be admitted to the privileges of citizenship, among a people who love liberty with idolatrous devotion! This however is mere pretence. And it seems as if every reason alleged to support the useless and unreasonable claims which have been set up for this unhappy race, flatly contradicted all human experience. What nation has ever yet located the permanent seat of its empire in the native land of its inhabitants? What people have not migrated from their original seats? The earliest monuments of our kind, show us a race of wanderers; and, at the hour in which we write, there is hardly a country, some of whose people are not going to and fro over the earth. And shall a despised and degraded race, who have been forced not only into exile, but into bondage, now arise and contradict the whole of human experience? And for what? To prevent their restoration from exile! their deliverance from ignorance and want! If there ever was a case, where every high and pure consideration conspired with the amplest personal advantage, to foster this migratory propensity of man, this undoubtedly is it. The black man possesses no single advantage here, which he will not retain in an equal or higher degree in Liberia; he abandons no

enjoyment here, which he will not be an hundred fold more likely to acquire there, than he ever can be here. Besides this, he is not only residing here, (as to the larger portion of North America assuredly) in a climate which is better fitted to us than to him; but the climate to which we desire to transfer him is perfectly fitted to him, and to nobody else on earth. Central and western Africa is the home of the black man, and the grave of all others. It is as if God called him with a voice the most imperative, issuing out of the bosom of the land of his ancestors, to come back to her laden with the trophies of civilization and religion, which he has reaped in the midst of tears. If he refuse, who shall set up the standard of the cross in Africa? It is the brightest hope of Africa which her own sons are trying to extinguish! It is the most effectual door for the entrance of the Gospel into that dark continent, which they, who profess to love the Lord Jesus, are trying to shut upon us!

It is therefore alike the interest of the free coloured people,—of their kindred in Africa—and the cause of Christ, that they should fall in with the plans of the Colonization Society, and remove to Liberia. That such is also the interest of this nation, is not less obvious; whether we consider the existing evils resulting from the presence of these people among us, or the advantages both interior and exterior, that would result from their removal. The same advantages that resulted to Europe from the settlement of the white man in this hemisphere, would, in a proportionate degree, result to all America, and more especially to ourselves, by the settlement of civilized communities in Africa. It is not improbable, that every year's commerce with Liberia will yield a net profit to this nation of greater amount than the entire expenses of the Colony to us, up to each period of accounting. And is it nothing to us to spread our laws, and acts, and language, and manners, and institutions, over one entire quarter of the earth, now covered with a darkness that may be felt? Is it nothing to these great interests, and to our love for them, to possess another habitation, against the time when the calamities that have overtaken in succession every portion of the earth, and every human institution, shall make us desolate? When we consider too that in obtaining results so valuable, we are actually delivering ourselves from a population, that in its present relations, is and must continue to be a great public calamity, it is unaccountable how any enlightened citizen can refuse to aid us. Great as the degradation of the free black population is, no friend of Colonization has ever said that their vices or crimes were of such a nature as to be incapable of reform. They result, so far as they are peculiar to them,

from the peculiarities of their condition; and when the condition is changed, the vices disappear. There is, therefore, nothing but sophistry and want of candour in the reproach which upbraids us for expecting to make men, who are degraded here, virtuous elsewhere. We expect nothing from change of place only, but every thing from change of place and condition also: and they who deride us, expect the same results as we look for, by change of condition merely. Then, surely, we have more reason to expect them than they. There is however a proneness in the public mind to aggravate the vices of the free blacks; and the abolitionists are not without grounds when they complain of it. It is true, that the proportion of convictions of free persons of colour is greater than that of white people. But this is to be taken with great allowance as an evidence of criminality. For their temptations are, usually, manifold greater and more pressing: their offences are more narrowly looked after, and therefore a greater proportion detected: and of those detected, a greater proportion are convicted by reason of their possessing less public sympathy, smaller opportunities of escaping, and less means of blinding, seducing, or bribing justice. In addition to all this, the very code of offences in all the slave States, is more stern as to them than the whites; and the very principles of evidence are altered by statute, so as to bear most rigorously against them. Or if we contrast them with the slaves, we have no means of forming a judgment; for the very nature of offences and punishments is different in the different classes. We have known a slave hanged for what a white man would hardly have been prosecuted for; and we have known free blacks put into the penitentiary for several years, upon evidence that was illegal by statute against a white man; and for offences for which a gentle tempered master would have rebuked his slave, and a hot tempered one have caned him. We admit the general corruption of the free blacks; but we deny that it is greater than that of the slaves; and we affirm that it is judged of by false methods, and is in a high degree exaggerated. We once thought differently; but we have seen reason to change our opinion.

There, is however, a danger here of an opposite kind, which is threatening the absolute ruin of the cause and the colony itself. We have spoken above in general terms, and of the general state of the free people of colour. That in many parts of our country there are portions of them who sink below that general state, wretched as it must be admitted to be, is certain. And the danger is, that the most ignorant and wicked and wretched of their class may become the chief emigrants to Liberia. The steps taken by the abolitionists have poisoned the minds of the free blacks, in an

extraordinary degree, against the plans of the Colonization Society. Just in this condition the regulations of several of the States, as Virginia and Maryland, in relation to these people, commenced their pinching operations upon them, tending, perhaps designed, to drive them from their borders, the strong, and the thrifty depart; and they depart exasperated, disposed and not unqualified to find means of annoyance. The weak, the ignorant, the idle, the irresolute, are unable to depart, ignorant how to act, overborne by a concentrated public odium, and accept, against their wills and with heavy hearts, the provisions for Africa. And when they arrive there, they weaken the settlement in fact, and weaken it by putting weapons into the hands of its enemies by their ill conduct there, and weaken it again by shaking the fervour of that zeal with which the purest hearts in this land have upheld this cause before men, and borne it up to the throne of God. We need not doubt as to the condition of those to whom we have reference, when the Governor of the Colony felt himself called on to state to the Board of Managers, that a few more cargoes like one that was composed of emigrants from the lower part of Virginia, would put it out of his power to carry on the offices of the Colony. No man could know better than Mr. Meehlin, that free vagabonds, forced to Africa, as really as if they had been fettered and carried there, are not the people by whose agency the philanthropists and Christians of America, expect to enlighten and redeem Africa. What can such people do for Africa? "The natives," says Mr. Pinney the Missionary, writing from Monrovia in February last, "are, as to wealth and intellectual cultivation, related to the Colonists, as the negro of America is to the white man; and this fact, added to their mode of dress, which consists of nothing, usually, but a handkerchief around the loins, leads to the same distinction, as exists in America between colours. A colonist of any dye (and many there are of a darker hue than the Vey, or Dey, or Kroo, or Basso) would, if at all respectable, think himself degraded by marrying a native. The natives are in fact menials, (I mean those in town,) and sorry am I to be obliged to say, that from my limited observation, it is evident, that as little effort is made by the colonists to elevate them, as is usually made by the higher classes in the United States to better the condition of the lower." Here is unexceptionable, disinterested, and friendly testimony. We confess it went like a bolt of ice through our hearts. May God deliver this cause, both at home and abroad, from any influence that is not thoroughly Christian. Instant and inevitable must be its ruin, if the Christians of this country awaken not to the mournful conviction, that it is in danger of being unchristian, or less than

Christian, in its management, effects, details and results, here and in Africa, as well as in its great conception, and mighty reach. Politicians have done and can do, almost nothing for this cause, but make speeches out of facts generally furnished to hand. It is Christ's cause, and his people must uphold it, and watch it, and pray for it, and direct it. And when they cease to do so, it is ruined, it ought to be ruined.

Now, if the free people of colour were solely or chiefly interested in this discussion, with the resulting effects upon America and Africa, which have been merely hinted at; its importance would be sufficient to engage the attention of the community. But, we have said, as is manifestly true, that the question here made between the two schemes for the melioration of the condition of the free blacks, is still more deeply involved in all the questions relating to our slave population. And it is perhaps true, that they who advocate the equality, legal and personal, among ourselves, of the black and white races, have taken their positions with reference especially to the condition of the slaves, and with the hope of aiding them. It is also true, that the most determined opposition to the plan of Colonization, has been manifested on the part of those who are favourable, not only to the amalgamation and levelling, one or both, but who are in favour of that, *instantly*; and who oppose Colonization, because they suppose it operates injuriously to *instant*, and, as they affirm, to *all emancipation*. Here is a point as much more interesting than the former, as the fate of millions of men is more important than that of thousands; as much more affecting, as the delivery from absolute and unqualified bondage is better than the melioration of a condition of qualified freedom: as much more imperative, as the claims of naked right and justice are above those of affection and benevolence. Let us therefore meet the question not only with fairness, but with alacrity.

What, it may be asked, have we to do with slavery? And to whom is such a question addressed? And of what slavery is it predicated? With the *legal* rights of the master, or the legal wrongs of the slave, in Georgia or the Carolinas, a citizen of Ohio has surely no leading right to interfere. So it is equally clear that no citizen of the United States has, as such, the right to interfere with the civil regulations of England, or the religious institutions of China. But will any man dispute our right to discuss the wrongs of English oppression, or pray and labour for the dispersion of Chinese darkness? There was not less true philosophy than touching pathos in that noble sentiment which drew down the plaudits even of heathen men, *Homo sum; nil humani alienum a me puto*. There is no state of

of the multitude at hand, we will state but two; the first is, that man, which might not have been ours, or may not be our children's. All that relates to men, relates to us; and the same rules by which our rights are established, are applicable to all who are enabled to enforce them; and the same pretexts upon which the rights of others are subverted are applicable to us, as soon as we are weak enough to be subdued. As men, then, we have a right to speak, and argue freely, on all that relates to man. As Christian men, this sacred right becomes high duty to our Master; and as free Christian men, it is among the noblest privileges and distinctions of our estate. But limit the privilege as you will, to me at least there is no restriction, if there be liberty to any.

What, then, is slavery? for the question relates to the action of certain principles on it, and to its probable and proper results; what is slavery as it exists among us? We reply, it is that condition enforced by the laws of one-half the States of this confederacy, in which one portion of the community, called masters, is allowed such power over another portion called slaves; as,

1. To deprive them of the entire earnings of their own labour, except only so much as is necessary to continue labour itself, by continuing healthful existence, thus committing clear robbery;

2. To reduce them to the necessity of universal concubinage, by denying to them the civil rights of marriage; thus breaking up the dearest relations of life, and encouraging universal prostitution;

3. To deprive them of the means and opportunities of moral and intellectual culture, in many States making it a high penal offence to teach them to read; thus perpetuating whatever of evil there is that proceeds from ignorance;

4. To set up between parents and their children an authority higher than the impulse of nature and the laws of God; which breaks up the authority of the father over his own offspring, and, at pleasure separates the mother at a returnless distance from her child; thus abrogating the clearest laws of nature; thus outraging all decency and justice, and degrading and oppressing thousands upon thousands of beings created like themselves in the image of the most high God!

This is slavery as it is daily exhibited in every slave State. This is that "dreadful but unavoidable necessity," for which you may hear so many mouths uttering excuses, in all parts of the land. And is it really so! If indeed it be; if that "*necessity*" which tolerates this condition be really "*unavoidable*"

in any such sense, that we are constrained for one moment, to put off the course of conduct which shall most certainly and most effectually subvert a system which is utterly indefensible on every correct human principle, and utterly abhorrent from every law of God,—then, indeed, let ICHABOD be graven in letters of terrific light upon our country! For God can no more sanction such perpetual wrong, than he can cease to be faithful to the glories of his own throne!

But it is not so. Slavery cannot be made perpetual. The progress of free and just opinions is sapping its foundations every where. In regard to this country, no political proposition is capable of clearer proof than that slavery must terminate. And the importance of the thing itself, and its direct relevancy to the matter in hand, demand a few words in illustration of this point.

We utter but the common sentiment of all mankind when we say, none ever continue slaves a moment after they are conscious of their ability to retrieve their freedom. The fact of the existence of that ability is matter of conjecture or calculation, and can never be solved but by experiment. It is possible, therefore, for men to err, and suppose they are not strong enough, long after they are so, and thus continue in bondage, when they are capable of being free. And on this idea proceed all the systems which require slaves to be kept in ignorance. But men seem to forget that all the natural impulses prompt us to err on the other extreme, and thus produce premature commotions, and partial and desperate insurrections. Under a higher state of knowledge on the part of the blacks, the Southampton affair would never have occurred. It is no part of our purpose to inquire as to the time when these principles would be mature, in this nation. But it is worthy of a moment's thought, that the constant tendency for fifty years has been to accumulate the black population upon the southern States; that already in some of them the blacks exceed the whites, and in most of them increase above the increase of the whites in the same States, with a ratio that is absolutely startling; that the slave population could bring into action a larger proportion of efficient men, perfectly inured to hardships, to the climate, and privations, than any other population in the world; and that they have in distant sections, and on various occasions, manifested already a desperate purpose to shake the yoke. It is our deliberate conviction, that if this Union were dissolved, in half a century, the sugar and rice and cotton growing country would be the black man's empire. In such an event—which

may God avert—and such a contest may it never come,—we ask not any heart to decide where would human sympathy and earthly glory stand; we ask not in the fearful words of Jefferson, what attribute of Jehovah would allow him to take part with us; we ask only—and the answer settles the argument—which is like to be the stronger side?

Slavery cannot endure. The just, and generous, and enlightened hearts and minds of those who own the slaves will not allow the system to endure. State after State, the example has caught and spread—New England—New York—the middle States on the sea board; one after another have taken the question up, and decided it, all alike. The state of slavery is ruinous to the community that tolerates it, under all possible circumstances; and is most cruel and unjust to its victims. No community, that can be induced to examine the question, will, if it be wise, allow such a canker in its vitals; nor, if it be just, will permit such wrong. We argue from the nature of the case, and the constitution of man; we speak from the experience of the States already named; we judge from what is passing before us in the range of States along the slave line, in Maryland, Virginia, and Kentucky; from the state of feeling on this subject in foreign countries, and from the existing state of opinion throughout the world. The very owners of slaves will themselves, and that, we hope at no distant day, put an end to the system.

But more than all, He who is higher than the highest, will, in his own good time and way, break the rod of the oppressor, and let all the oppressed go free. He has indeed commanded servants to be obedient to their masters; and it is their bounden duty to be so. We ask not now, what the servants were, nor who the masters were. It is enough that all masters are commanded to “give unto their servants that which is just and equal!” and to what feature of slavery may that description apply! Just and equal! what care I whether my pockets are picked, or the proceeds of my labour are taken from me? What matters it whether my horse is stolen or the value of him in my labour be taken from me? Do we talk of violating the rights of masters, and depriving them of their property in their slaves. And will some one tell us, if there be any thing in which a man has, or can have, so perfect a right of property, as in his own limbs, bones, and sinews? Out upon such folly! The man who cannot see that involuntary domestic slavery, as it exists among us, is founded upon the principle of taking by force that which is another’s, has simply no moral sense. And he who presumes that God will approve, and reward habitual injustice and wrong, is ignorant alike of God, and of his own heart. It is equally

easy to apply to the institution of slavery every law of Christianity, and show its repugnance to each and every one of them. Undeniably it is contrary to the revealed will of God; and so the General Assembly of our Church have solemnly, and righteously, and repeatedly ordained. "We consider," says that body in 1818, "the voluntary enslaving of one part of the human race by another, as a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature; *as utterly inconsistent with the law of God*, which requires us to love our neighbour as ourselves: and *as totally irreconcilable with the spirit and principles of the Gospel of Christ* which enjoins that all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." (1 Digest, pp. 341, 342.) And who will dare to say, that the Holy One of Israel will approve of and perpetuate that which is "inconsistent" with his own law, and "irreconcilable" in its repugnance to the Gospel of his Son? It cannot be; it will not be. Nature, and reason, and religion unite in their hostility to this system of folly and crime. How it will end time only can reveal; but the light of heaven is not clearer than that it must end.

Now just in this contingency the scheme of African Colonization comes forward; and, taking for granted, that slavery is an evil of enormous magnitude, both personal and social, it offers in the first place to relieve the country of one of the direst results of slavery, namely, the free black population, in a manner cheap, certain, and advantageous to all the parties; and in the second, it offers to the master of slaves, the highest possible inducements to free his slaves, by showing him how he may do it, in a manner at once humane, wise, and full of promise to the slave, the master, the country, and the whole world! Was ever a plan more timely? Was one ever more replete with wisdom, and forecast, and benevolence?

But it entered into the heads of the abolitionists, that the whole affair was meant only to perpetuate slavery, by acting as an outlet for its superfluous evils. Nor can it be denied that the conduct and declarations of many professed friends of the cause gave them some countenance. Here arose the conflict between the abolitionists and the colonists, upon a point which now admits of no doubt in any honest and enlightened mind: the question we mean as to the effects of colonization on the emancipation of slaves. Can any man doubt? Who emancipated the hundreds of slaves now in Liberia? Who gave the funds to carry out and sustain all the colonists who have gone out? It is needless however to reason, where the thing is proved by facts; and out

throughout all America ninety-nine in every hundred friends of colonization, who do any thing for the cause, are ardent friends of emancipation also; the second is, that the friends of colonization have done more in twelve years for the emancipation of the black race than the abolitionists have done for twelve centuries. For the truth of these two facts, on the first of which the author is willing to stake his reputation for veracity, and on the second for the least knowledge of the subject, he frankly appeals to the public.

But, (say the abolitionists,) your plan does not demand instant emancipation. Suppose it does not; can not they demand this, and leave us to do good in other ways to those whom their prudence and Christian love may induce masters or communities to set free? The missionary societies do not demand the civil abrogation of paganism, as a condition precedent to preaching Christ among the heathen. But the abolitionists have a different logic and benevolence, and object to all improvement of the condition of the slaves by colonizing; because all who favour this plan may not compassionate the slave as deeply as they ought; or because all of them will not demand the immediate abolition of slavery. We have proved their accusation, that our plan favours slavery, to be false; and as to the unfounded allegations about the unsuitableness and unhealthiness of the region to which we propose to send the coloured people, we pass them by as unworthy at this day of any reply.

They have demanded instant abolition; and pray consider to what issues their theories have brought them. The owners of the slaves replied, We have tried abolition, and really the results have been such as to shake our confidence. How very common is it to hear men of sense and humanity say that slavery itself is to be preferred as a permanent condition, to the evils of a free coloured population. Now we consider this sentiment false; and boldly say, that if the only alternative left to us, were the perpetuity of slavery, or the general and immediate abolition of it, it would be the duty of all men to choose the latter, and risk its present evils, rather than make the horrors of slavery eternal. But why need such a question as this ever arise, or even be discussed, when we have a method better than either side of that alternative, fully within our reach? Let the abolitionist, if he can, answer that question. But when the slave-owner has pressed this difficulty, the reply has been, not indeed without truth, that these very vices and crimes of the free blacks which operate to prevent us from liberating the slaves, are in truth the result of our own laws and institutions: and that therefore we ought at once to remedy the condition of the free

blacks, instead of making our own wrong an excuse for further injustice. True, most true. But how shall we proceed to remedy this condition? The abolitionist says, by levelling and mixing one or both; the colonizer says, by separation. In regard to the free blacks, we think we have proved the plan of the former to be absurd and impossible: that of the latter, to be wise and practicable. In relation to the slave, surely the argument cumulates with vast power. What! admit the slave to all the privileges, rights, and immunities, at which, in the case of the free blacks, the heart so steadfastly revolts, and revolts upon principles neither immoral, unfounded, nor of a temporary duration, but deeply seated in the very constitution of man! And demand this with acrimony and intolerance, as the foundation of all right action on the subject! It is really wonderful that any man should ever have expected to produce any emotion but disgust and rage by such conduct. The inference of the abolitionist is all false, and does not follow from his premises. It is undeniably our duty to do something, to do every thing, for the slave as well as the free blacks, that justice, humanity, and religion demand. But does it therefore follow that we are to make them our familiar friends, to intermarry with them, and to select our rulers from among them? We are bound to love our neighbour as ourself; but does it follow from thence, that every village and city shall constitute a single family, or, according to Mr. Owen, the whole fabric of society be fused down, and brought out, not only new, but homogeneous? Or is it not rather clear, that just in proportion to the conviction you are able to impress upon the mind of the slave holder, that the duty of liberating his slave is founded on some such principles, or lead to some such results as these, you disgust him, and set him more firmly against every scheme that tends towards emancipation? And this is the mode by which we are required to advance the cause of the blacks! We speak from the deepest conviction, when we say, that in our judgment, the abolitionists in America, have done more to rivet the chains of slavery, than all its open advocates have done!

What then, it may be demanded, is not immediate abolition of slavery a moral duty? We answer, this is far from being clear in the mode stated. That slavery is criminal, we fully believe; it ought, therefore, for this and a thousand other reasons, to be abolished. But how and when, are questions not perfectly clear on the side of the abolitionists.

It is an undeniable truth, that society has the right of restraining the liberty, and taking away the life of any citizen for the public good. And this right is exercised, without question, in a thousand forms, in all societies, every day. The powers vested

in the parent, the guardian, the master of the apprentice, the keeper of the poor, the idle, the dissolute, and the criminal, in the sheriff and jailer and hang-man, all rest for their sole foundation precisely here. We cannot perceive what there is that hinders society from exercising these powers in one way, more than in another; or that requires them to put them in one set of hands, rather than another, except such considerations as are merely prudential. If therefore, the good of society requires the personal liberty of a certain portion of its people to be restrained, why may they not be restrained? And what moral principle forbids the white man from being the agent of the body politic in restraining the black; or vice versa? Or again, what requires, that they who are restrained, should be put in prison like a thief, or within ideal prison-limits like a bankrupt; in gangs like prisoners, or by single individuals like apprentices? The right is most obvious, and the modifications are merely prudential. It is admitted, however, that before society can rightfully exercise this power, it must show that they who are restrained, cannot safely be allowed full liberty. And here, the whole question, as to the real condition of the blacks in this country, comes fully up; upon which we have only to say here, that we consider the case already clearly made out as to the free blacks, and still more so as to the slaves, that they are not, and can perhaps never be in a condition to dispense with some degree of unusual restraint, while they continue to reside among the whites.

But there is still a question of personal duty on the part of the slaveholder, distinct from the general duty of society. Suppose society push the restraint too far, or refuse to mitigate it, when we think it should be done: what are in that case my duties to my slave? If it is clear, or probable, that by refusing any longer to exercise ownership over him, we place him in a worse condition than he would be, if we continued to act as his master, would we be at liberty to turn him off? Our moral sense tells us, it would not; but on the other hand, that clear duty would compel us to continue the relation of master and slave, until we could place him in a better, or at least, not in a worse condition, than we found him. We omit for the present all consideration of duty to society itself; whether that of striving to enlighten it, or of abstaining from injuring it. Here again the whole question of the relative conditions of the slave and free coloured population in this country comes fully up. In relation to which, we shall only say, that cases are most numerous, in which masters have been prevented, for the time being, from liberating their slaves, by no other considerations than such as these. They were not yet fit for

Liberia, and the laws prohibited their enlargement here. It seems to us, then, that society not only has the right to permit the relation of master and servant, so far as the restraint of liberty is required by the public good; but even that (in an individual case) Providence may put me into such a relation to my slave, as to make it my duty to continue it for the time being.

We do not pretend to justify slavery. God forbid that we should make such an attempt. We only design to show that the abolitionists err in principle, as well as prudence, in all their violent and overwhelming denunciations. There is a view of the matter, however, which presents subjects, in relation to slavery, which require immediate action and union on the part of all who love God, or have a heart to feel for human wrongs! If society undertakes to say that one class of its members are not fit to be free, and proceeding a step further, to appoint another class to restrain them, it does this for the public good, not for the good of the keepers; and is therefore solemnly bound, to enact a system of laws, by which the owners shall be restrained from substituting their passions in the place of the authority of society, and the slaves shall be protected from being restrained beyond what the public good imperiously demands. It is as much the public duty and interest to prevent unfit masters from owning slaves, or to prevent fit persons who are masters, from exercising too much power, as to prevent improper persons from enjoying too great license. But when we apply these principles to the accessories of slavery, as they may be called, to what are set forth as its contingent results, the case becomes still closer and more imperative. Suppose it be right to deprive a man of liberty, in certain cases, for the public good, does that authorize society to stand by and see him robbed of his money; or does my being made his keeper, justify me in depriving him of the wages of his hard labour? Upon what possible ground can society, or any human creature, justify the act that compels me to labour without compensation for another individual? Every community is bound to administer justice between its citizens; and justice never can permit one man to take without return the labour of another, and that by force. Will the slaveholder say, he returns to his slaves in the long run, as much as he takes from them. If this were true, it is no answer; for society is bound to see the slave paid and righted, on fixed principles, and may not lawfully leave the subject to the owner's discretion. Again, justice has nothing to do with such lumping accounts, as those which place hundreds in a mass, and rob one healthy, strong labourer, to make up for

the deficiency in the cases of many weak and worthless. What excuse is it for him who would plunder us, that he has attempted before to rob others and failed? Society is bound, and that *now* and *always*, to see that every man in it is fairly dealt by, and justly paid by every other man in it; and every human being is bound to "do justice" always, to every body. Even the master who believes, and this he may in many cases believe wisely and righteously, that he ought not to set his slaves free in their existing condition, becomes thereby, only the trustee, for them, of the entire proceeds of their labour; and has no more right to put it in his pocket, than to apply to his own use the estates of his ward. This, the reader may say, would soon bring slavery to an end. Doubtless: and the remark shows that it is only for its supposed profits, and not from public or conscientious considerations, that slavery is so widely tolerated.*

* We throw into a note, the British project for the emancipation of the slaves in their West India Islands, which was submitted to Parliament by Ministers in May last. Several most interesting questions arise out of this movement. What will be its effects on the whites in the British Islands? And on the slaves, in all the other Islands? and upon our southern States? And upon our national sentiment, and public character, and estimation with posterity? Are we after all, to loose the race for human liberty and advancement? Let the plan speak for itself. It is as follows:

I. That every slave, upon the passing of this act, should be at liberty to claim, before the protector of slaves, custos of the parish, or such other officer as shall be named by his Majesty for that purpose, to be registered as an apprenticed labourer.

II. That the terms of such apprenticeship should be—

1st. That the power of corporal punishment should be altogether taken from the master and transferred to the magistrate.

2d. That in consideration of food and clothing, and such allowances as are now made by law to the slave, the labourer should work for his master three fourths of his time, leaving it to be settled by contract whether for three fourths of the week or of each day.

3d. That the labourer should have a right to claim employment of his master for the remaining one fourth of his time, according to a fixed scale of wages.

4th. That during such one fourth of his time, the labourer should be at liberty to employ himself elsewhere.

5th. That the master should fix a price upon the labourer at the time of his apprenticeship.

6th. That the wages to be paid by the master should bear such a proportion to the price fixed by him, that for the whole of the spare time, if given to the master the negro should receive 1-12th of his price annually; and in proportion for each lesser term.

7th. That every negro, on becoming an apprentice, shall be entitled to a money payment weekly, in lieu of food and clothing, should he prefer it, the amount to be fixed by a magistrate with reference to the actual cost of the legal provision.

8th. That every apprenticed labourer be bound to pay a portion, to be fixed, of his wages, half yearly, to an officer to be appointed by his Majesty.

9th. That in default of such payment, the master to be liable, and, in return, may exact an equivalent amount of labour without payment in the succeeding half year.

10th. That every apprenticed negro, on payment of the price fixed by his master, or such portion of it as may from time to time remain due, be absolutely free.

Again; upon what ground can slave-holding communities justify the denial of those civil rights to their slaves, the possession of which would make them better men, and the denial of which does not make them better slaves? We will specify but one; and that one ordained of God, and of universal use and necessity in all ages of the world. We allude to the rite of marriage. There was never born in this nation a legitimate slave. Every one, without exception, is, in the contemplation of law, "*filius neminis*," and by statute a bastard. Shall the master say, the religious rights of the parties still subsist? And to what end? Suppose the great State of New York were to repeal every law that forbids polygamy and divorce, every law that gives redress for the breach of marital rights, every one that makes marriage and its fruits subject of civil regulation, what corruption, bloodshed, and havoc would reign throughout that empire State! Yet this is the condition of the slaves in this land; forced on them by our institutions! And yet we marvel at their corruption. It is said however, that if the civil rights of marriage were allowed to be contracted between the parties, the rights of the master over them, and their issue, in that case legitimated, would be interfered with and curtailed. The wife could not be brutally chastised at pleasure, nor atrocities perpetrated, which while we think of our cheeks burn, nor the children of slaves be liable to such absolute dominion of the master. These are reasons for a Christian land to look upon; and then ask, can any system

11th. That every such apprentice may borrow the sum so required, and bind himself, by contract before a magistrate, for a limited period, as an apprenticed labourer to the leader.

III. That a loan to the amount of 15,000,000*l.* sterling be granted to the proprietors of West Indian estates and slaves, on such security as may be approved by commissioners appointed by the Lords Commissioners of his Majesty's Treasury.

IV. That such a loan be distributed among the different colonies, in a ratio compounded of the number of slaves, and the amount of exports.

V. That the half yearly payments hereinbefore authorized to be made by the apprenticed negroes be taken in liquidation of so much of the debt contracted by the planter to the public.

VI. That all children who at the time of the passing of this act shall be under the age of six years be free, and be maintained by their respective parents.

VII. That in a failure of such maintenance, they be deemed apprentices to the master of the parents, without receiving wages, the males till the age of 24, the females to the age of 20, at which period respectively they and their children, if any shall be absolutely free.

VIII. That this act shall not prevent his Majesty from assenting to such acts as may be passed by the colonial legislatures for the promotion of industry or the prevention of vagrancy, applicable to all classes of the community.

IX. That upon the recommendation of the local legislatures, his Majesty will be prepared to recommend to Parliament, out of the revenues of this country, to grant such aid as may be deemed necessary for the due support of the administration of justice, and of an efficient police establishment, and of a general system of religious and moral education.

which they are advanced to defend, be compatible with virtue and truth?

We have spoken of the children of slaves; and here lies one of the most abhorrent features of slavery. Men may become slaves, perhaps for life, for crimes lawfully proven. But no absurdity can be more inconceivably gross than to think of making slaves of the unborn; and no injustice more audacious, than that which makes misfortune and crime descend from father to son, and dooms the child of Africans to perpetual slavery for no better reason than that his parents had been thus doomed before him. He who is not born cannot be a slave. He cannot be made so by conquest, nor by prescription, before his existence. He cannot be made so for crime, or incapacity for freedom, before existence, and therefore before crime or incapacity. He cannot in that case, if ever, make himself a slave. His parents cannot make him a slave before he exists; nor during his minority; for his parents can part with no more right to govern him than they possess themselves, which goes no further than his arriving at the period when he can control himself. Hereditary slavery is, therefore, without pretence, except in avowed rapacity.

The conclusion of the matter then seems to be this: that society, and the owners of slaves by the consent of society, may righteously restrain the personal liberty of the slave, so far as is needful for the public good, or for the advantage of the slave; and hence that instant abolition is not more sound in morals, than it is hurtful if not impossible in practice. But it is equally clear that this construction justly extends no further, and can be continued no longer than the public good requires; and that it is the instant and pressing duty of the communities where slavery exists to put it on such a footing, that the slaves shall as soon as possible be prepared for freedom, and, while they are preparing, that they shall enjoy every right, natural, civil, social, and personal, not inconsistent with the public good, and their own permanent advantage, and that therefore the existing results and consequences of slavery are utterly indefensible, and such as no righteous man or community, should for a moment partake of or tolerate.

What then shall we say? Let the abolitionist give up his cause as impossible of execution, hateful to the community, ruinous to the cause of the blacks, and founded upon principles wrong in themselves. Let the colonizationists no longer make excuses for slavery, which too many have done; but acknowledging the evils of that wretched system, and taking for granted, as from the beginning, that it was so bad, men only needed to

see their way clear to break it up, let us lay open before the public in the practical operations of our cause, the great and effectual door which God has set for the deliverance of this country, for the regeneration of Africa, and for the redemption of the black race. The second of those great objects is, with ordinary faithfulness and prudence in conducting the affairs of the Society and the colony, already rendered nearly certain. Freedom and religion and civilized life have been transplanted in the persons of her own sons, into that desolate continent, and we commit to God the issue on which His own glory is so deeply staked. What the Colonization Society is *now doing*, would, at the end of a single century, if continued at the same rate, exhibit more than a million of persons in Liberia, as the fruits of its operations. I speak of course of the natural increase of the people sent there as well as the emigrants themselves, basing the calculation upon the rate of increase among ourselves. Let us take heart then, and go forward in the work, and the ends of the earth will call us blessed.

As for America, we are doing nothing; and for the black race here, alas! how little. The operations of the Society have not removed from the country perhaps one in many hundreds of the annual increase of the black population since its operations commenced. That the annual increase from 1830 to 1840, will not vary much from eighty thousand a year. At its rate of removal since the first of those periods, the Society has not removed yearly one out of every hundred of the increase. If its operations were much increased, that it would take off yearly one in forty of the annual increase, which would be a great augmentation, as compared with the past, the yearly increase would then be diminished only two per cent. Now if that advanced rate were attained, and preserved for a whole century, the result would be, that we should at the end of it have nearly sixteen millions of slaves left here, besides free coloured people, and exclusive of all that were carried abroad, supposing every one carried to have been a slave. This presents an aspect of the case which is most deplorable as it relates to America. Nor does it stop here. For before that century is one-half elapsed, if the spirit which now actuates the abolitionists towards the slave owners, or even that which is beginning to manifest itself in a portion of our people towards the lower classes of foreign emigrants into our country, should take possession of the colonists in Africa, all future transportation of coloured people thither would be at an end. Let them once be persuaded that to receive our manumitted slaves, is to retard the cause of freedom here; or that to receive our free vagabonds coerced away from

the slave States, is jeopardizing their own condition, and how long after that will they receive either? That colony will be a nation, powerful and respected, before this generation passes entirely away. Those are now alive, who will yet see her banner float proudly over the mighty outline of an empire. And where will then be an outlet for our slaves? Let us not deceive ourselves on this most vital point. Can any tell, by statistical tables, where the million of people who inhabit Ohio came from within fifty years? Or even where the thirty or forty millions of white people in the new world came from in the last few centuries? And so we may people Africa with nations of blacks, if we will only do it gradually, without seeming to diminish even their rate of increase among ourselves. We are actually doing this very thing; we are just doing enough to prevent our doing any thing hereafter to mitigate our condition.

Let us then arise, and do this work as becomes men sensible of the greatness of the obligation which rests upon us, and the imminency of the peril that impends over us. There is in reality but one question presented to us; do we prefer giving up the blacks alone, which we can do now, or waiting and then giving them up with some of the fairest portions of our republic as a recompense? Or, if we choose to vary the question, do we prefer giving fifty or an hundred millions of dollars to restore them to their native land: or a thousand millions to pay mercenaries to make them work, and finally to cut their throats? Our condition is like that of him who held a tiger by the ears until he was afraid to let him go, and was conscious he could not hold him much longer. Now a giant is passing by and offers to relieve us. Shall we wisely accept his aid and live; or shall we madly struggle on and take what chance may bring us? May God give us wisdom!

NOTE.—The conductors of the *Biblical Repertory* do not mean, by the insertion of the foregoing article, to express their unanimous assent to its positions; nor yet the reverse. It is published in order to procure, if possible, the agitation of the question.

ART. II.—*On the proper time for the admission of recent converts to the full communion of the Church.**

“ONE hundred and eighty have already united with the Second Church, and many have gone to other churches; *while numbers have so much reverence for the GOOD OLD WAY, that they prefer testing the genuineness of their hope by living a few months in disobedience to Christ, before they venture upon a public profession!*”

The above remarks are taken from “A narrative of the state of religion in the Second Presbyterian Church in Rochester, &c.” and they are quoted for the sake of calling the attention of our readers to a subject intimately connected with revivals of religion, viz. the proper time for the admission of young converts to the communion of the Church of Christ.

In glancing over the accounts of revivals in various parts of our country, we have been pained to notice many instances of a practice, which if persisted in and extended, we are persuaded will ultimately prove highly injurious to the estimation in which revivals are now held, and to the best interests of the Church.

In one instance, during the progress of a protracted meeting, fifty persons were admitted to the church, whose first serious impressions had been received since its commencement. In another, one hundred and one, in similar circumstances, were admitted within less than three weeks after supposed conversion. In another case, seventy-one, and in still another, more than eighty were admitted in similar circumstances. In another instance, a minister of the gospel, giving, under his own signature, an account of a protracted meeting which he aided in conducting, says, that forty-two, who professed to have experienced a change of heart during the meeting, were, on the fourth day of it, admitted to the church. Among this number was a young man, who four days before “was a deist”—who “denied the inspiration and authenticity of the Bible,” and despised the blood of the atonement,” &c. And yet, he was invited to the Lord’s table, and actually partook of the elements, without even the formality of being admitted to the church by the usual profession of faith in Christ! And this too by a minister who was a stranger in the place!

* Several valuable thoughts on this subject have been suggested by an article in the Connecticut Observer of March, 1833. If, in any instance, the phraseology of that article has been unwittingly adopted, it is because it was more appropriate than any that occurred to the mind of the writer.

Many other similar instances might be adduced ; but these are sufficient to give a distinct exhibition of the practice to which we allude, and upon the evil tendencies of which we design to offer some remarks.

A brief historical sketch of the practice of the Church in regard to the admission of its members, may serve as a preparatory introduction to the subject before us. The practice of the apostles will hereafter be discussed: at present, therefore, we would merely remark, that the whole New Testament does not furnish an instance of their admitting a single individual, immediately on the profession of his faith in Christ, to any thing more than the rite of baptism. In the early church, the order of catechumens shows that delay was then customary for the sake of instructing the converts, before they were admitted to church membership. When this order was instituted is now uncertain, though it existed as early as the second century. As to the Roman Catholic Church, it has ever, as now, (we believe) admitted to its communion all who are willing to acknowledge the Pope, no matter what their moral characters. From the time of the Reformation, the churches of Germany, Hungary, France, Scotland, and generally the European Reformed and Lutheran churches, have been in the practice of admitting all, (when arrived at suitable age) who had been baptized in infancy, and had afterward passed through a regular course of preparatory catechetical instruction. The custom of the Waldenses, &c. we have not been able to ascertain. The English Episcopal Church admitted all who wished to be united with its members, without distinction. The Independents who first arose in England, and who were unknown as a distinct sect until the time of Queen Elizabeth, were the first to introduce the custom of admitting none to church membership, who on examination did not give evidence of having been *regenerated* in the Calvinistic acceptance of that term. The American Protestant churches generally have practically adopted the same rule, allowing the candidate a proper period of delay for self-examination, &c., in which he may both find, and give to others, suitable evidence of genuine conversion. In New England, especially, great caution has been exercised in most of the churches, to admit none who were not believed to have been truly converted. The church of Northampton, indeed, is a well known exception ; and we are told, in reference to some of the glorious revivals of the early part of the last century, that it was "the opinion of Dr. Trumbull, that in many places the converts were received too soon into the communion of the Church."—(See American Quarterly Register, 1832, pp. 297.) But that, generally, the privileges of church

membership were granted with the utmost caution, may be seen from the following account of a single church, which however was equally applicable to most of the New England churches at the time of which we are speaking: "When a person," says the narrative, "desired to join the church, he visited his minister, declaring how the Lord had been pleased to work his conversion; if the minister found the smallest ground of hope, he propounded him to the *church*, after which some of the brethren, with the minister, examined him again, and reported their opinion to the church. After this, all the congregation had public notice of his design, and he publicly declared to them the manner of his conversion. All this was done, to prevent the polluting of the ordinance by such as walk scandalously, and to prevent men and women from eating and drinking their own condemnation." Some of the first cases of the "immediate admission" of supposed converts occurred in Tennessee, about five or six years since. The professed object of this innovation, was, to prevent the Methodists from gathering into their communion, the fruits of Presbyterian revivals. The Methodist custom, however, is not to receive young converts at once to Church membership, but merely to their "classes" of probationers. To these "classes," they admit "all who evince a desire to flee from the wrath to come—to be saved from their sins, &c." and "after three months, if found deserving, they are admitted as proper members" of the church. The course adopted by many of our foreign missionaries, has been somewhat in accordance with the old plan of catechumens; for we find them admitting some of the supposed heathen converts, first to the rite of baptism, and then after a long period of probationary delay, to the Lord's table.—(See Missionary reports, Ellis' journal, &c.) The same is true of the Indians in this country, among whom Eliot, the Mayhews, and Brainerd adopted the catechumen plan. It is to be observed here, that the praying Indians were not all members of the churches, but under that denomination were included all serious Indians who were inquirers or catechumens. Eliot had at one time fourteen towns of praying Indians, in all of which there were but two churches. And the aggregate number of praying Indians in New England in 1674, under the care of this missionary and others, was 3600, of whom only 300 or 400 were professors of religion. A far larger number of these Indians were baptized than were members of the church.

Such is a brief sketch of the practice of the Church as to the admission of its members. We regret that a deficiency of materials prevents us from rendering it more accurate and full.

In proceeding to the discussion of the subject before us, we

shall first, endeavour to show the advantages of having, *in general*, a suitable period of probation between hopeful conversion and admission to church membership and secondly, shall examine some of the objections to such a practice, which are also the arguments in favour of "immediate admission."

I. We proceed then, as proposed, to state some reasons, why, *as a general rule*, the admission of supposed converts to the privileges of church membership, should be deferred for a season, until during a suitable period of probation, they shall have given satisfactory evidence of their conversion from sin to holiness. And,

1. We remark, *that the proposed course is demanded by a regard to the best interests of the candidates themselves.* In times of revival, especially, the strong and ardent feelings of the supposed convert are often such as to satisfy the subject of them that there is no room to doubt as to the certainty of his conversion, and the more so, as his views of the value of religion, and his desire of personal safety, incline him to hope that such may be the case. But emotions of this kind, afford no evidence of true conversion. Long observation shows conclusively that multitudes in analogous circumstances have been deceived, and, by making a premature profession of religion, have been confined in a state of lamentable self-deception, in which they have remained through life. If, then, in seasons of revival, *all* supposed converts are immediately admitted to the Church, many of them will probably be of this class. And these are they who will be found to be a dead weight upon the Church of Christ, paralyzing her energies, impeding her onward progress, and disgracing her fellowship in the eyes of the world. The promises addressed to Christians will be appropriated to themselves, simply on the ground of their being in the Church, while, for the same reason, the warnings addressed to the impenitent will fall unheeded on their ears; and thus they will slumber on in unbroken security, until roused to a sense of their condition by the approach of the king of terrors, perhaps only by the sound of the archangel's trump. They will ever remain dead and withered branches, on the vine of the Saviour's planting, disfiguring its beauty and diminishing its fruitfulness, and destined at last to be broken off and cast into the fire. Now if such be the prospect before the supposed (but self-deceived) convert, it were better that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and that he were cast into the depths of the sea, than that he should, by a premature union with the Church of Christ, place himself in a situation of all others the most unfavourable to a knowledge

of his real character, and most unlikely to be the means of his conversion. Far better for him to remain *nominally*, as he is *really*, an unrenewed man, than to silence the voice of conscience, and to elude, as it were, the arrows of the Almighty's quiver, by marching *with* the ranks of God's elect, while in fact he is not *of* them. In the one case, his true situation being constantly in his view, might be the means of leading him to reflection and ultimate conversion. In the other, the fact of his being nominally a child of God, would render his case comparatively hopeless. For this reason, then, it is advisable to delay the approach of supposed converts to the table of the Lord. If they are self-deceived, a brief delay might enable them to discern their true characters, and thus save them from eating and drinking unworthily. If, on the contrary, they are in reality the children of God, still they themselves cannot be fully satisfied of the fact, unless some time shall have elapsed in which they may judge of their characters by the fruits of their lives. *Conduct* is the test of Christian character, the test pointed out by reason and the word of God; and to know this requires, in religion, as in other things, *time for observation*. A well-grounded, self-satisfying hope, a hope sufficiently definite and clear to warrant a desire for admission to the Church, and a belief that there is some degree of proper preparation for that solemn duty, is not *ordinarily* attained without a longer or shorter time, in which self-examination and prayer shall form a prominent part of the duties of the young convert. And this will require, *as a general rule*, the delay of a proper period of probation.

Nor will this delay be necessarily unprofitable or injurious. There is perhaps no period in the life of the Christian, which, by proper care, may be rendered more profitable, than that which intervenes between conversion and admission to the church. The conscience is then peculiarly tender, the memory is remarkably susceptible of truth, and retentive of its impressions, and the heart is disposed to listen with humble docility to the instructions of the word, and to enter with eagerness upon the discharge of every duty enjoined. At no period, in short, is the character more susceptible of correct religious formation, than immediately after conversion. By proper care, the spark which has just been kindled may quickly be blown into a flame. Self-examination by the word of God may result in satisfying evidence of conversion, a high standard of Christian character may be enjoined and adopted, the principles which are to be the guides of life may become deeply fixed, and clear and accurate views may be attained of what is *implied* and what is *required*

in a profession of Christ before men. Thus, while the converts are as carefully guarded from danger, as if they were within the visible fold of Christ; by instructions adapted to their peculiar wants, their graces may be constantly increasing, and they, in due time, may be prepared for the Church, with benefit to themselves, and with characters so tried and approved as to secure the unhesitating confidence of its members. But again, we remark,

2. *That the proposed period of probation is demanded by a regard to the purity and prosperity of the Church.* This department of our argument is intimately connected with that which has just been stated, and with one of the objections hereafter to be examined. Our remarks upon it in this place, will therefore be brief.

It is well known, as we have just seen, that, in times of revival especially, there are many "who run well for a season," "but by and bye are offended," many who "having no root in themselves," by and bye wither away. So has it been ever since revivals were known. "It appears plainly," says President Edwards, "to have been in the visible church of God, in times of great revival of religion, as it is with the fruit trees in the spring. There are a multitude of blossoms, all of which appear fair and beautiful, and there is a promising appearance of young fruit; *but many of them are of short continuance, they soon fall off, and never come to maturity.*" This might almost have been predicted from the constitution of the human mind, an acquaintance with which might teach us, that the more powerful and rapid the progress of a work of grace in a community, the more certain the existence, and the more powerful the operation of sympathy and all the causes of self-deception. It might have been expected from the known agency of the great adversary of souls, who, at such seasons, is peculiarly active in deceiving the souls of men. It is confirmed by the testimony of facts, which sometimes compel us to weep over the numbers of those whose goodness is "like the morning cloud and the early dew." Let any one bid memory recall the cases of this kind which have come under his own observation. How many hopes would be found quenched in darkness, but a few days after they had been lighted up by self-deception! How many premature joys, dying away at the rapid approach of apostasy! How many, one day confident of their conversion, undeceived the next! Now suppose that all who indulge hopes like these, had been admitted at once to the fellowship of the saints. What *must* have been the result to the Church? Inevitably one of the two following: Either, like the church of Sardis, she

would be replenished with members "having a name to live, while they are dead," with self-deceived hypocrites, who would cover her with shame in the eyes of the world; or else, she would continually be agitated and harassed by the exercise of stern discipline, while the wicked would continually reproach her for the apostasy of her professed members. Thus, instead of being the beauty and the glory of the earth, the daughter of Zion would be constantly clothed with sackcloth, while her Saviour would be wounded in the house of his friends.

Let it ever be remembered that the efficiency of the Church is to a great degree dependent upon her purity; that her great object should be to increase in *purity* as well as in *numbers*; and that whenever she aims to multiply the latter at the expense of the former, she is injuring the cause of her Redeemer, and treasuring up for herself bitter repentance and anguish. Let the members of a church be multiplied to any extent whatever, and "if it embrace a large amount of spurious religion, it will diffuse around it a feeble and uncertain light. Every such accession, is an accession of fresh weakness. Let the Church receive to her communion many who have deceived themselves with false hopes, and it will be strange if she does not find that her most formidable foes "are those of her own household." Hasty admissions may give a temporary addition of members; but if the "swelling list" be not soon reduced by necessary discipline, there is reason to fear that the character of revivals will be dishonoured in the estimation of Christians, and disgraced in the eyes of the world. A recent writer says, respecting the churches of New England, "There has been more anxiety that the Church should be purer as well as larger; and to this circumstance we attribute it, that while there has been a succession of powerful revivals, they have maintained their character, and been regarded as more and more desirable. Had all who have indulged the hope of having passed from death unto life in New England, during the last thirty years, and who appeared well to human view for one or two weeks, been admitted to the Church in that period, it is our deep conviction that revivals would ere this time have sunk into such discredit, that no sober, no rational man would desire their continuance. *We do not believe our churches could have borne the shock for thirty years. They would have come down to the level of the world, and been the laughing-stock of men!*"

In gratifying accordance with this view of the subject, is the testimony of some of the most distinguished and experienced living ministers of our country, the labours of many of whom

have been remarkably honoured and abundantly blessed by the reviving influences of the Holy Spirit.

The Rev. Dr. Beecher, in alluding to this subject says, "The more powerful and rapid a work of grace in a community, the more imperious the necessity of caution, unless we would replenish the Church with hypocrites, to keep her agitated by discipline, or covered with shame by the neglect of it."

The Rev. Dr. Dana, in noticing some of the causes by which the interests of pure religion are injured, mentions as one of them, "the evil of precipitate admissions of supposed converts into the Church."

The Rev. Dr. Green speaks with astonishment and regret, of "the measure of admitting to the full communion of the Church, persons whose supposed conversion has happened but a day or two, or perhaps but a few hours before their admission." "I can scarcely conceive," he adds, "of a practice more evidently calculated than this, eventually to bring dishonour on religion, by filling the Church with unsound professors, who will ultimately become open apostates, or at best demonstrate that they never possessed a spark of piety."

The Rev. Dr. Griffin, speaking of eight different revivals which he has witnessed, says, that to guard them against a false profession, hopeful converts have been "kept back from a profession about three months."

The Rev. Dr. Hawes states it as his opinion, that, "It is a great error to admit converts to the Church before time has been allowed to try the sincerity of their hopes." "This," he adds, "is an error into which I was betrayed during the first revival among my people, and it has cost me bitter repentance. And yet none were admitted to the church *under two months after they had indulged a hope*. It is of great importance that young converts, immediately after conversion, should be collected into a class by themselves, and brought under the direct and frequent instruction of the pastor. And *if they continued from four to six months in a course of judicious instruction, and then admitted to the Church, there is very little danger that they will afterwards fall away*, or that they will not continue to shine as lights in the world till the end of life."

The Rev. Dr. M'Dowell, speaking of several revivals which had taken place in the church of which he was the pastor, says, "We have carefully guarded against a speedy admission to the privileges of the church. Seldom, in times of revival, have we admitted persons to the communion *in less than six months after they first became serious*, &c."

The Rev. Dr. M'Ilvaine, now bishop of Ohio, after speaking of

the dangers of revivals, adds, "These remarks apply with more force to the dangerous practice of encouraging those who profess conversion to come forward, almost immediately, to the table of the Lord. The ambition of numbering the people, the desire of an exciting spectacle, may adopt this plan. Shallow views of religion and of human nature may approve it. Satan will subscribe to its wisdom in the signature of an angel of light. The winnowings of the last day will show that a large portion of such ingatherings was fit only to be cast into the fire, to be burned."

The Rev. Dr. Milledollar, speaking of those who profess to have a hope, says, "they are not unfrequently hurried into the communion of the Church, before they had time to acquire, either a competent knowledge of themselves, or of the person, offices, and benefit of Christ." And he warns ministers and ruling elders against the too early admission of such persons, unless they are willing "to run the risk of filling the Church with mere nominal professors, at the expense of diminishing its actual strength and purity."

The Rev. Dr. Neill, in noticing some things of an injurious tendency connected with revivals, mentions, "Hasty admissions to the communion of very young persons, or of those who have given but little proof of their knowledge of the Gospel, or of their having experienced a gracious change of heart." "A reasonable time of probation," he adds, "seems expedient, if not demanded by a proper regard for the persons admitted, and for the peace and purity of the Church."

The Rev. Dr. Proudfit says, "The great, shall I say fatal, error in the management of revivals, is the hasty admission of the subjects to the privileges of the Church, &c."

The Rev. Dr. Sprague says, "Where the custom prevails of admitting persons to the communion almost immediately after they are supposed to be converted, many must be received who are no better than the stony ground hearers. I know it is said in favour of this practice that it originated with the apostles; but I know too that that case cannot be pleaded as a precedent for a similar course now, because the circumstances by which it was marked do not exist at the present day. Let the Church then, as she values her own purity and efficiency, beware of *prematurely* receiving those whom she considers the fruits of revivals to her communion. Not that she will be able, at any period, to make an exact separation between the chaff and the wheat; but it is a duty that she owes, not only to herself, but to her exalted Head, to make that separation as accurately as she can."

But to turn from the testimony of individuals to that of church judicatories. The Presbytery of Niagara gives, as one of the reasons of the comparative coldness and apathy of the churches under its care, the hasty admission of supposed converts to the Church. Its language is, "Another evil we have to regret, and under which the churches suffer, is the effect of too great precipitancy in times past, in some instances at least, in receiving members into the communion of our churches;" from admitting them "so soon as they begin to indulge a hope, without waiting to impart to them previous and preparatory knowledge and instruction."

At the late General Association of Connecticut, a resolution was adopted, which is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That, in the opinion of the General Association, the admission to membership in our churches of such persons as have become the subjects of hopeful conversion, during revivals, until they have had some time to give evidence in their lives that they have experienced a genuine work of grace upon their hearts, is greatly calculated to introduce evils into the churches by multiplying the number of unsound and inefficient members, and especially, in many cases, to bring lasting and even fatal injury to the persons themselves."*

Again, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church at their annual meeting in 1832, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the purity and prosperity of the Church, as well as the best interests of those immediately concerned, demand great circumspection in the admission of persons to church privileges; and that *ordinarily* it is deemed improper to receive persons immediately upon their indulging a hope of reconciliation with God, and especially in the case of the young, and of persons of previously immoral lives, and lax principles, and of those concerning whom little is known."

And again, in the pastoral letter of the same Assembly to the churches under their care, which was unanimously adopted, they say, "*Let not apparent converts be hurried into the Church*, and brought to the table of the Lord without a careful examination; nor ordinarily without a suitable period of probation, by which the reality of their religion may be better judged of than it can be by any sudden indications however plausible. Nothing is more directly calculated to injure ultimately the cause of God, and the credit of our holy religion, *than urging or permitting individuals to make a public profession of religion as soon as*

* Connecticut Observer, June 8, 1832.

they have experienced some serious impressions, and flatter themselves that they have been renewed in the temper of their minds. All experience shows that such persons often and speedily dishonour their profession, and not unfrequently become open apostates, and sometimes avowed infidels. * * * * *

To use all proper means to preserve the purity of the Church, and save religion from reproach, is a sacred duty, incumbent on all church officers; and it is a duty which, when faithfully performed, will to a great extent secure its object; the Church will rarely be disgraced by self-deceived hypocrites, and eventual apostates."

We have thus briefly traced the history of admission to the privileges of church membership; have considered the advantages which might be expected to result from the adoption of the *general* rule of admitting none who have not, during a suitable period of probation, given good evidence of hopeful piety; and have endeavoured to fortify the position embraced in our conclusion, by the opinions of some of the most wise and experienced ministers of our country, as well as of ecclesiastical bodies.

II. We now proceed to examine some objections to the course which has been recommended. Of these objections, which in themselves constitute the arguments for immediate admission, there are but two, so far as we have heard them, which have any force or plausibility. These we shall now examine.

1. The first is, *that every duty is to be performed without the least delay; that joining the church is the duty of every hopeful convert, and therefore, that every such individual should immediately be admitted to church membership.* Let us analyze this argument. It can have but two meanings. The first is, that whatever *is* a man's *immediate* duty, *is* a man's *immediate* duty. This is merely an identical proposition, the abstract truth of which, no one ever dreamed of denying. But before it can have the least force, in application to the case before us, it must assume the very point in debate, viz: that duty *does* require every one to join the church, immediately upon indulging the hope of conversion. The only remaining meaning which can be attached to the argument is, that whatever may at some future time *become* one's duty, is *now* his duty; that whatever may hereafter, in different circumstances *become* obligatory, *is obligatory at the present moment.* Such a principle is too absurd for sober refutation. Let us look at the principle which it involves, in the light of a familiar illustration. It is the duty of every one who intends to enter the sacred ministry

to attend to the study of theology. A. B. who is just commencing his collegiate studies, intends ultimately to enter the sacred ministry. Now, on the principle before us, whatever is duty *at any time, is duty now*. Therefore, it is the duty of A. B., immediately to relinquish his collegiate course, to enter at once upon his theological studies. But further, he intends at some future time, in obedience to the dictates of duty, to preach the gospel to his fellow men, and therefore he must give up both collegiate and theological studies, and at once commence preaching! Such reasoning would confound all the duties which arise from the constantly changing circumstances, and various periods of life, and if reduced to practice, would make life a very Babel of confusion. It is evident then, that unless the argument from the duty of the supposed convert assumes the very point in question, it has not the slightest force. The truth is, that as the duty of A. B. does not require him to enter upon each successive stage of study, &c. until he is prepared for so doing by application to those which precede, so the duty of the hopeful convert does not require that he should join the church of Christ, until he has clear and definite views of the nature of that duty, and of the doctrines, in which, by that step, he avows his belief; and until he not only has for himself, but gives to others, satisfactory evidence of having been born again. In reply to the objection that perhaps there may be some Christians, who, even through life never obtain satisfactory evidence of their own piety, we simply say, that those who neither *have for themselves*, nor *give to others* such evidence, have no right to the privileges of that church, one of whose fundamental requirements is, that the existence of *faith* should be demonstrated *by its works*.

But we are still told, that the command of Christ, "Do this in remembrance of me," is as truly binding *at once*, as the command to repent, believe, &c.; and therefore that the supposed convert is to evince the reality of his conversion by immediately obeying it, and at once uniting with the church. But repentance is a duty, the performance of which has no reference to our fellow men. Not so however with admission to the church; for these previous members are concerned as well as the applicant. This statement of the objection, therefore, entirely leaves out of view the duty of the convert to the church, and especially the duty of the church to herself, which is of far more importance than the supposed duty of a single individual. "Keep thyself pure," is the spirit of all the inspired injunctions to the church; and obedience to them demands that she do not admit to her communion any in whom she does not witness satisfactory evidence of true discipleship. But how is her opinion to be formed?

“By their fruits shall ye know them,” is the only test, which either common sense or inspiration authorize her to apply in forming an estimate of their characters. And though the applicant for admission may find, in his own experience, evidence of his conversion, which to himself is perfectly satisfactory, yet the church, in the discharge of the duty which she owes to herself, is bound, before admitting him, to require that the existence of a sound doctrinal faith, shall have been evinced by the fruits of holiness in the life. But perhaps it may still be claimed, that the supposed convert is fully convinced that it is his duty to make an immediate profession, and that, therefore, it must be the duty of the church to receive him. This, however, would make the greater duty give way to the less, and would subordinate the interests of the great body of the church to the wishes of a single individual. And more than this, it would neutralize, or rather completely nullify the discretionary power of the church in the admission of members. It would take away her power of examining the candidate, which is not only her right, but her imperative and solemn duty. It would overthrow, in short, every barrier which now guards her from pollution, and throw open her doors to every one who should assert his belief that he had been converted, no matter what might be his feelings, his doctrines, or his moral character! Who is ready to advocate or practice principles which tend to consequences like these?

Even if it could be shown, therefore, that it is the duty of the supposed convert to join the church immediately, still it is evident that the church ought not to hazard her purity and safety by admitting him to her bosom, without evidence of his piety satisfactory to herself. This *must* require a longer or shorter period of probation, for though conversion is instantaneous, yet the evidence of its reality must be gradually developed in a subsequent course of exercises and actions.

2. The second objection urged by the advocates of “immediate admission,” against the plan which we have suggested, is *that which they derive from apostolical example*. In reply to this, we might repeat the remark already made, that the whole New Testament history does not furnish the slightest evidence that the apostles admitted to the Lord’s Supper any of the individuals so often adduced as instances of immediate admission, not the slightest evidence that they admitted them to any thing more than the rite of baptism, which, for aught we know with certainty, might have been followed by the delay of some probationary period, before admission to the Lord’s Supper. In the Jewish church, we know that those

proselytes of the gate, who desired to be circumcised and baptized in token of their wish to keep the whole law, were distinguished from the other, for some time before their circumcision, baptism, and admission to the paschal supper. So, too, in the early preachings of Christianity, there were the *audientes*, or those of the heathen who were willing to hear the Gospel; the *catechumens*, or those who began to approve it, and submit to a course of Christian instruction; and the *competentes*, or those who desired baptism, and were considered fit for it. Now the fact, that the Christian Church was modelled after the synagogue, taken in connection with the Jewish custom above mentioned; and this custom of the early church, which we think could scarcely have sprung up so soon, unless suggested by apostolic usage, afford much ground for the belief that the apostles recognised a similar distinction between those admitted to baptism, and those admitted to the Lord's table. And this opinion is confirmed by the absence of any thing to the contrary in the New Testament narrative. Here then we might at once take the ground that there is not the slightest evidence that the apostles even admitted a single supposed convert, immediately after his conversion, to the Lord's table, to any thing more than baptism; and throwing the burden of proof upon the advocates of immediate admission, we might deny that the example of the apostles, *in any one instance*, favoured the admission of recent converts to *all* the privileges of church membership. And here we might confidently rest our argument until they should adduce from the New Testament a single instance of the immediate admission of a recent convert to the Lord's Supper; or until they should show that admission to *that* ordinance uniformly accompanied the admission of baptism, a position, which the *advocates* of infant baptism will scarcely *assert*, and the *opposers* of it will scarcely *prove*.

But without insisting on this point, however well it would bear it, we are perfectly willing to meet the advocates of immediate admission on the ground of their own concessions, the instability of which we shall endeavour to show. The apostles, say they, *uniformly* admitted persons to all the privileges of church membership, immediately upon their declaring their belief in Christ. How they had ascertained this fact, they are not at the trouble to inform us. The truth is, that such wholesale assertions are entirely gratuitous. The evidence, that such was the *uniform* practice of the Apostles, is far from conclusive, unless three or four isolated cases is a sufficient warrant for so comprehensive a deduction. Let any one trace the New Testament history, and unless he possess a wonderful facility in

deriving general inferences from a very inadequate number of particular facts, he will scarcely be willing to make such an assertion with confidence. The case of Cornelius cannot be adduced as clearly in favour of immediate admission, for he is spoken of as having before been "a devout man, and one that feared God, &c.;" and the term here rendered "devout," is the same which is elsewhere rendered "holy," and a derivative of which (in Acts. iii 12.) is translated by the word "holiness," which is predicated of the apostles. Neither can it be shown that Crispus and the Corinthians, spoken of in Acts xviii. are instances of immediate admission; for it is certain that on this visit Paul remained at Corinth a year and six months, and all that is known is, that they were baptized, &c. while he was in the city. The case of Lydia is *probably* in favour of immediate admission. The cases of the converts on the day of Pentecost, of the Ethiopian eunuch, and of the Philippian jailor, *undoubtedly* are so. Of all the thousands then whom the Apostles admitted to the communion of the church, there are but three, or at most four cases of immediate admission; and yet these few are constantly and confidently appealed to, as affording conclusive evidence that the practice of the Apostles was *uniformly* the same as in these cases. But is this a sufficient basis for so general a proposition? Because a minister of the present day, is known, in peculiar circumstances, to admit a few individuals to the church, immediately upon their conversion, would it be reasonable to infer that such was *always* his practice? Because Paul charges Timothy to ordain no one to the office of a bishop suddenly, and to consecrate no one as a deacon whom he had not proved by a suitable period of probation, might we not show that the same caution would surely have been exercised in the case of young converts, and that *none* of them could have been admitted to the church without a similar season of probation, except in such peculiar circumstances as might be supposed to exist in the three or four cases adduced? Would not the argument be quite as plausible, as that by which our opponents endeavour to prove that the uniformity of apostolic practice, favours the custom of immediate admission?

But waving this consideration, (upon which we are far from insisting strongly, and which is merely suggested that each one may appreciate its force for himself) granting for a moment that the practice of the apostles *did* uniformly favour immediate admission, still it is contended that their practice in this respect is no guide for us. And this for various reasons. If they *were inspired* to read the motives and search the hearts of men, to *know* whether conversion was genuine or not, then it becomes

us to wait till the same prerogative is ours, before we plead their practice as a precedent for our own. If they *were not* thus inspired, then surely we are to be guided by their example, only so far as we are warranted by the different circumstances of the church and the world at the present day. That these circumstances are not such as to render the supposed custom of the Apostles a model for modern ministers, is evident from two considerations :

First. In the times of the Apostles, both ministers and churches were few and widely scattered. An Apostle might, (as in the case of Philip and the Eunuch) meet an individual on a journey, whom, after the passing bow, he might *never* see again. Or a mixed multitude might assemble (as at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost) to remain there for a few days, and then to separate and be dispersed throughout the land, never again perhaps to meet with a minister of the Gospel. Now in these and parallel cases, where the only opportunity which they might ever enjoy for connecting themselves with the people of God, would in a few hours pass away forever, no one could hesitate to admit them to church membership, if they desired it, and that, perhaps, without any other evidence than their own profession of belief in Christ. Now such, or similar, be it observed, were the circumstances in every one of the three or four cases mentioned in Scripture, which favour the principle of immediate admission. But where will similar circumstances be found to exist in modern times? And how, as though the cases were at all parallel, can an argument be drawn from them, which can be applicable to the present day? Now, churches are thickly scattered throughout the land. In some parts of our country, almost every village has its spire to point the thoughts to heaven. Ministers of the Gospel are multiplied, and may be found with comparatively little difficulty at almost any time. No one, therefore, as in the days of the Apostles, is obliged by the very circumstances in which he is placed, either to join the Church immediately upon conversion, or perhaps, never. But,

Secondly. There is another and still more important difference between the Apostolic times and our own. Those who *then* embraced Christ, did so, not only in opposition to all their former prejudices and habits, but at the probable sacrifice of all their worldly interests, and comforts, and prospects; and often in full view of the fagot and the stake, where they might speedily be called to seal their profession with a martyr's blood. Men would not then be in haste to "name the name of Christ," until they had deeply scrutinized the foundation of his hopes, and felt confident of their interest in the Saviour. When the reception of the

Gospel arrayed the world against its professor, the very existence of hope in Christ would afford no slight proof of the Christian principle. Indeed, it were well nigh impossible to conceive of any higher evidence of sincerity than the readiness to make all the sacrifices which the profession of such a hope would involve. But now, for the most part, a public profession of religion rarely exposes an individual to opposition, to a sacrifice of personal interests, or a hazard of personal feelings. On the contrary, such a profession is generally regarded as reputable, if not honourable. So that there is *now* every motive to urge, as there was *then* every motive to prevent, a hasty profession. Now, the path of religion, so far as public sentiment is concerned, is comparatively strewed with flowers; then, it was hedged up by every form of danger and persecution and death. This point of contrast then, alone, makes it evident that the cases are not analogous, and that the circumstances of the apostolic times were so entirely dissimilar from our own, that an argument from the former is entirely inapplicable to the latter. We see therefore that it is not absolutely certain that the practice of immediate admission is sanctioned by uniform apostolic example; and that, even if it were, the circumstances of the times were such, in various respects, that such an example cannot be fairly urged as a rule for practices of modern ministers and churches.

We have thus glanced at the history of the practice of the church in different ages, in regard to the admission of its members. We have considered the arguments in favour of allotting a proper season of probation to young converts who desire to unite with the church; have examined the two most plausible objections which have been advanced against the proposed plan.

As the result of our examination, we have come to the conclusion, that the practice of "immediate admission" &c. is unwarranted by the example of the most judicious and pious of past ages and of the present day—that it is unsanctioned by the dictates of sound judgment—that it is of no advantage to the individual admitted, but rather the reverse, and that it is ruinous to the best interests of the church. Moreover, we have seen that the objections from the plea of duty are fallacious—that it is not perfectly clear that the doctrine of immediate admission is uniformly favoured by apostolic example—that it is not sustained by the analogy of their admission of individuals to higher stations in the church, and that, even if it be granted that their practice did uniformly favour the immediate admission of supposed converts to church membership, still it could not, from the different circumstances, be a guide for us.

ART. III.—*Dangerous Innovations.*

WE are well aware of the misconstruction which may be put on the following remarks, and of the impeachment of motive to which the writer may be subjected. But there are crises in the Church when a candid and fearless expression of opinion may subserve the general interests of religion, although it may be attended with some personal inconvenience to him who will venture to resist the current of popular opinion. Such a crisis at present exists in the Presbyterian Church; and pregnant as it appears to be with desolating evils, it would be pusillanimous to decline a conflict with the causes which have brought on this crisis. To one particular class of these we propose, at present, to confine our attention. We refer to the novel proceedings which have been so currently adopted for the revival and extension of religion. The tendency of these we have with deep solicitude examined; and, from a sorrowful conviction of their deplorable effects, we are induced to assume the attitude of antagonists. That there are genuine revivals of religion, produced by the special agency of the Holy Ghost, with Christians in common, we have not a doubt; but that the revivals of the present time are *generally* of this character, is by no means conclusively demonstrated. Let not the reader be startled by the suggestion of such a doubt; facts of daily occurrence are giving a colourable pretence to it, if they are not positively verifying it. On this subject, rash and precipitate judgment should be avoided on the one hand, and that morbid sensitiveness which shrinks from examining and condemning, if necessary, what mistaken consciences regard as too sacred to be touched, should be equally avoided on the other. Religion never seeks auxiliaries in ignorance and concealment, but it authorizes us to bring every man and every measure to the test—"by their fruits ye shall know them." To do this candidly and boldly, is our present purpose; and in pursuing the subject, we will consider some of the popular measures which are relied upon for the promotion of revivals, and then advert to the evils which these measures are introducing into the Church. Here, however, we think it necessary to premise, that the blameworthiness of these objectionable measures, with their correspondent results, are not attributable to the people at large; they did not in the first instance conceive or broach them, but have in most instances adopted them with reluctance, through the force of persuasion, constantly plied by their religious instructors. Neither have these measures originated in any peculiar exigency in the Church, loudly demanding bold and adven-

turous experiments. Diseases of an anomalous character, and strangely modified, may indicate the necessity of bold experiment and deviation from the common rules of medical practice, but no parallel to this was observable in the Church, which could justify means of questionable propriety, and unsanctioned by precedent practice. How then have they originated? Ministers of the Gospel, the spiritual guides of the people, with indiscreet zeal have ushered them to the light, and nurtured them to their maturity. Now we wish it to be distinctly understood, that we question neither the piety nor the integrity of those who first introduced, or who still abet, these practices, but we feel persuaded, that they have given impetus to a machinery which, in its wild and frantic movements, will soon defy the control of any adjusting or regulating force. Human passions are much more easily aroused than allayed; they are to be appealed to cautiously, and with much judgment, in religious, as well as political matters; and a single indiscretion in their management may loosen the avalanche which, in its headlong career, may sweep all before it.

But there is another preliminary remark of some importance, and it is this:—The resistance of these measures cannot fairly be construed into hostility to revivals. The Spirit of God, giving efficacy to the word of truth, may convert a hundred souls as readily as one, and the dews of grace may be distilled upon a large community, with as much ease as upon a single family. There may be, and there have been revivals, genuine in their character and extensive in their benefits. But these are separable from new measures; they are things totally different in their nature, and should be distinguished. Revivals are from heaven, new measures are of the earth; God is the agent in the first, man the contriver of the latter. But it may be said, have not revivals of late resulted in connexion with these measures? Suppose this should be admitted, it is at least equally certain that revivals of an undoubted character have occurred without the intervention of these measures, and hence revivals are not so identified with these measures, that an objection against the latter implies discredit to the former. Upon this just distinction we would insist, because we are persuaded that many would openly condemn these objectionable novelties, but from the fear of being regarded as hostile to revivals. And this fear is not without foundation, for the spirit of the times has rendered it hazardous to separate what God has never put together.

At length we come to consider what these objectionable measures are. They do not consist in “praying without ceasing” for the outpouring of the Spirit of God; nor in the faithful,

earnest, and unwearied preaching of the Gospel, in which the doctrines of Christ are expounded, the danger of the sinner exposed, his duty fully unfolded, and his obligations earnestly pressed. These are scriptural measures. But, on the contrary, it seems to have become the settled conviction of many, that few or no conversions can be expected under the ordinary administration of these means of grace, and that a necessity exists for the adoption of certain plans, which are not found in the common routine. This suggestion has been eagerly embraced by many, and it has now, in a great measure, become the criterion of ministerial zeal and fidelity, to practise upon it by the introduction of novelties without limit. It has given rise to a class of ministers in the church who, by way of preeminence, are styled *revival men*, inasmuch as they are particularly successful in producing extraordinary excitement among an audience. These are generally itinerating in their habits, and are prepared to go where their services are solicited. They do not, as far as we have seen, occupy even a second rank as intellectual men or as judicious theologians, nor are they much distinguished for their prudence or their discrimination of character. On the other hand, their address is popular, earnest, impassioned, and even inflamed, directed principally to arouse the feelings, and tending but little to convince the judgment through the illumination of the understanding. Their discourses teem with all that is terrible and affrighting in language, and too exclusively regard man as a sensitive, rather than as an intellectual and reasonable being, whose feelings, to be right, must be regulated by an enlightened judgment. The point of doctrine upon which their chief reliance is placed, is, that every sinner has inherent ability to make for himself a new heart, and that he can, at any moment, become a Christian, if he wills it. The exclusive agency of the Holy Ghost in converting, is a topic which is frittered away, or studiously kept out of view, lest it should lull the sinner to sleep and prevent him from exerting his self-converting power. It may be said in addition, that these men, both in private and public discourse, secure a prominence for themselves, by rebuking the alleged formality, and calling in question the piety, of such ministers as will not keep an even pace with them in their measures. But to delineate a picture which may be taken in at a glance, we would describe one or more of these men in their efforts to revive a particular church. All the particulars enumerated may not be found in connexion on any one occasion, but on every occasion some, or most of them, may be detected.

Thus, then, notice is previously given to a congregation that

a *four days, or protracted meeting*, will commence on a given day, and that certain ministers, who have signalized themselves in many remarkable revivals, will be present to conduct the meeting. At the same time they are led to believe that great results must necessarily flow from the premeditated effort, and their curiosity is sharpened by the promise of remarkable preaching.* If the meeting is to be held in a city, *hand bills* are sometimes extensively distributed, and every other means employed, to secure a full attendance.

The long expected day at length arrives; gossip is busy; the people are upon the *qui vive*, and their exercises commence under the most auspicious circumstances. But what now appears to be the great aim of the leaders? Is it to enlighten the mind and to affect the heart by an intelligent and impressive exposition of Gospel truth? No; but their addresses, their hymns, and their tunes, are all adapted to work upon the feelings of the nervous and sanguine, until animal excitability is brought into full play. Other means are employed for the same end; as, for instance, they are told that Christians are assembled at a particular place to pray for them by name; the accounts of other revivals, highly coloured, are emphatically dwelt upon; notes from persons of various characters are read, requesting the prayers of the church; some one is called upon, or spontaneously arises to give an account of his or her recent conversion; the officiating minister is sometimes called upon to make a public confession of his unfaithfulness before his congregation, or even to acknowledge his long practised hypocrisy, by taking a seat among the newly awakened; prayer meetings are held in places which are rendered gloomy for the sake of effect, by a careful exclusion of the light; sinners are often told, that if they do not repent before they leave the house they will certainly be damned; sometimes their pride is appealed to, by being informed that men of high public standing, and great professional distinction have, at other places, been found on the *anxious seats*, and that it would be *honourable* to follow their example; and still further, meetings are multiplied and carried far into the night, and sometimes prolonged all night, until the powers of nature are wasted, and nervousness is superinduced, which is not infrequently so extreme, as to produce incurable alienation of mind. Such are some of those methods which are employed to awaken feeling in the first instance, and if they succeed, as they generally do for a time, then what may be called a second course of action is commenced.

* We have known a minister to express himself thus: that he would *insure* a revival in a particular place if a certain revival brother were invited to attend!

The leader calls upon Christians and sinners to separate and occupy different parts of the house; or Christians are directed to leave the house in a body and repair to some convenient place to pray for sinners; or those who are determined from the moment to become Christians, are required to rise in the face of the congregation, and their number is often ostentatiously counted and publicly announced; or, as a more usual plan, those who are anxious and wish the prayers of the church, are invited to come forward and occupy the *anxious seats* which are specially reserved for them. Here prayer is offered, often most irreverent in its style, hymns of an exciting character are sung, and the anxious are stunned with the perpetual reiteration of the command, *submit or be damned!* The mind by this time is often so powerfully excited, as not to admit calm instruction, and indeed, such instruction is seldom offered. The conversation consists in ringing changes upon cant phrases, it is frequently wild and fanatical, and is generally addressed to weak minds, which are not conversant with the elements of the Christian religion. The effect of all this preparation, and public display, and contagious enthusiasm, may easily be conceived. Many profess to submit, without any definite conception of the meaning of the term, and they are forthwith considered as candidates for the communion of the church. After the lapse of a day or two, and while their feelings are yet artificially heated, the Lord's Supper is celebrated, and members are precipitately admitted by fifties and hundreds.*

In the blind enthusiasm of such moments, we have known a general invitation to be given to all who wished to be baptized to present themselves and receive the ordinance, without previous question or examination. And we have heard of one who was an atheist on Friday, and who, presenting himself on the Sabbath, was admitted to the Lord's table without examination, and with the concurrence of the officiating minister. Such proceedings have been dignified with the name of revivals, and the accounts of them have been blazoned through the land, that the spirit of them might be diffused, and the example prove contagious.

* To induce sinners to commit themselves by some public act or promise, is considered as a point of great importance. It has even been avowed by some of these clerical innovators, that they would not hesitate to admit to the full communion of the church, those whose conversion was questionable, under the expectation, that the recollection of the awful vows they had thus hastily taken, would subsequently render them uneasy, and lead to their conversion. As we do not admit the justness of the maxim that "the end sanctifies the means," we must be permitted to indulge the opinion, that all such committals have but one uniform tendency, and that is, to encourage simulation and curse the church with hypocrites.

But we would next advert to the native tendencies of these measures, which we call *new*, not because they are so in fact, but because they have been recently revived. And,

1st. They tend to deceive people on the unspeakably interesting subject of personal religion. How this results is sufficiently obvious. Where they are practised, we have already seen, that neither time nor suitable opportunity is afforded, for ascertaining the nature of regeneration, and the evidences by which it is accompanied. Every thing is done hurriedly, and no time is allowed for the storm of feeling to subside. The assumed converts have been scarcely permitted to think, much less to deliberate. They have felt apprehensive of hell, and have been induced to believe that they have submitted to God; and this is about the amount of their experience. In a few days, from a state of carelessness they find themselves committed before God and men, as members of the visible Church. At this stage some will take advantage of the calm which has ensued, and reflect upon the scenes through which they have passed, and will come to the conclusion that they have been deceived, and that their religion has passed away with the occasion which produced it. But others, who, in ignorance, were first deceived, will through ignorance remain deceived, and to the end will be able to furnish no better account of their conversion, than that they once occupied the anxious seat, and then united with the Church. The nature of personal piety has thus been obscured, and the standard of personal religion has thus been lowered; and although large additions have been made to the *numbers* of the Church, it is seriously to be apprehended that but little addition has been made to its *graces*. The religion produced by these measures, generally assumes the features of its parent; it is noisy, bustling, talkative, but it is not a "charity which thinketh no evil," neither is it a "growth in grace and an increase of knowledge."

2d. They create the necessity for an extensive and disastrous exercise of discipline. We do not say that a necessary discipline is always exercised, but a necessity for discipline always exists after the use of these measures. We have been told that in a Church where these revivals have been frequent, many have not once been seen in the church, after the communion season at which they were admitted. They run at large, and the only discipline which can be exercised upon them, is to expunge their names from the church register, and to reckon them among the *missing*. But there are others, who from their relative situation, are not thus able to abscond. They find that they are destitute of religion; they review the scene of their conversion as a farce; they entertain angry feeling towards those who have compelled them to commit themselves by a religious profession; they

become reckless, and at length divest themselves of the incumbering forms of godliness, and plunge again into the world with renovated zest, or become flagrantly immoral. The Church must now act, and alas! how frequently of late, have they been constrained to act, in pronouncing their censures. Individuals who have been received in mass are dismissed in detail, and as one expressed it, the time is fast approaching when the *back* door of the Church must be equally wide with the *front*. Discipline, when thus frequent, becomes disastrous; the Church and the religious profession become the mockery of the ungodly, and the unholy ambition which has too much to do in the rapid increase of the numbers of the Church, is made to recoil fatally upon itself.

3d. They react in the production of general scepticism. True religion is brought into question by indiscreet zeal in its advancement. Those who have been the subjects of spurious revivals, are apt to conclude that as their religion was temporary there is no religion which is permanent; that as they have experienced nothing more than an ebullition of animal feeling, all religion consists in such excitement; and, whether they avow it or not, the tendency of their minds is to infidelity. They measure religion by their own experience, and as their experience has not been of the most favourable kind, religion must consequently sink in their esteem.

But there are many others who are calm and shrewd observers of all these transactions; they are disposed to scepticism, but still halt between two opinions, until they witness such a revival, and scrutinize it in its details and effects, and then they eagerly adopt the unhappy conclusion that all religion is a farce. Now although the abuse of a thing is no reason against its use, there is too much ground for infidelity to stand upon in the measures to which we object.

4th. They create painful doubts in the minds of many of God's people. All Christians are not capable of a just discrimination, and where this is the case, the unhappy results to which we have referred, stagger and perplex them. They have, perhaps, engaged in promoting such revivals; their hopes have been excited; their praises to God have ascended; they have exclaimed this is the finger of God, but the subsequent fruits are not what they had anticipated; the new converts turn back to the world, or speedily relapse into fatal listlessness; their despondency of mind is then proportional to their former elation, and Satan, taking advantage of their situation, will harass their minds with doubt. If this be not religion, they will say, what is religion? How could ministers of the Gospel be so much deceived? If all these religious appearances may occur without any genuine

religion, can there be any certainty in religion at all? Thus some have been exercised until their feet have well nigh slipped. It may be replied that such must be weak Christians indeed; it may be so, but that is no reason why stumbling blocks should be thrown in their path.

5th. They generate a spirit of slander and abuse which are dishonouring to the cause of Christ. All are loudly and bitterly proscribed who will not concur with them. The most envenomed assaults are directed against ministers and churches who stand aloof. Their piety is questioned; their motives are impeached; they are represented as profoundly slumbering; as indifferent to the cause of Christ and the eternal welfare of souls; as formalists; as hypocrites; as the blind leading the blind; they are held up as objects to be avoided, and even to be abhorred; and if they are not brought into discredit, it is certainly not from any lack of zeal in the attempt to bring odium upon them. Innumerable facts could be adduced to substantiate this statement, and if such be one of the invariable results of new measures, are these measures from God? We judge not.

6th. They lead to the dismissal of ministers from their pastoral charges. The unsettlement of ministers, since these measures have been in vogue, has been unprecedented in respect to frequency. Let any one extensively acquainted with the state of the Church examine for himself and he will soon be satisfied of the fact. Their operation in this respect is obvious. Where these measures have been introduced, parties will be formed against the minister, first, from among those who have heartily disapproved of these devices from the beginning; second, from among those who, through the agency of these measures, have been hurried into the Church without true conversion, and who have conceived an unfriendly and even hostile feeling against him who has forced them into the unpleasant dilemma; and third, from among those of his charge, who, having espoused these measures, wish to run on with delirious excitement, into greater excesses than their minister is prepared to countenance; while the pastor is, on this account, often denounced by his former idolaters, and prayed for as one yet unconverted. The discontent of these several classes will soon be expressed in loud complaints, and result in open opposition. Besides, these ministers cannot, in the nature of things, always keep up the artificial excitement, which they have so indiscreetly promoted, and when this becomes apparent their efforts flag and their reputation for zeal suffers. And once more, they generally find their new converts intractable after their admission to the church. Like a military force hastily collected together, compounded

of raw and heterogenous materials, and destitute of a sincere love for the service, they are not easily reduced to order. Troubles multiply; peace is at an end; and the only prospect of future comfort is in retreat.

But ministers of another class are unsettled. Those we mean who withstand these measures. The infection spreads among their people although they may remain untouched, and because they will not glide with the current they must be overpowered by struggling against it. As in the great convulsions of nature, the righteous with the wicked are often involved in one common calamity, so in these religious storms, the innocent are not exempt from the disasters which they had no instrumentality in producing. Many of the most judicious and pious divines, it is believed, have been shut out of their pulpits, because, in resisting these measures, they have been stigmatized and condemned as opposers of revivals and even of vital godliness.

7th. They tend to render people unimpressible by the ordinary means of grace, and thus augur unfavourably for the future prosperity of the Church.

Facts bear out this assertion. Novelties lose their effect by repetition, and where these innovations have been employed for any length of time, it has become matter of public notoriety, that they have lost their magic virtue. It is true that sinners may rise at the word of command, and come to the anxious seats for the hundredth time, and they may do it with improved quickness, but then they learn to do it with such mechanical indifference as to evince their heartlessness and chill the spirit of their leader.* Their feelings have been exercised even to callousness, and unless stronger measures of excitement be introduced they remain indifferent. Now if this be true, what hope is there, humanly speaking, of exciting an interest in their minds by the ordinary means of grace? Are they not, as it were, immove-

* A clergyman who had eagerly practised all the novelties of the day, honestly remarked, that their frequent repetition had so entirely destroyed their effect, that his people evidently regarded them as a kind of drill through which it was expected they were to go, without any regard to accompanying feeling. If called upon to rise, they would all promptly rise; if invited to the anxious seats, they would without any further persuasion approach; but they would do this with a smile upon their countenances, and with such utter heartlessness as to shock his sense of propriety, and convert the whole scene into a farce. This led to a change in his views; and there is reason to believe that his experience is not singular in this respect, although his candour in the acknowledgment may be. Another effect has also been observed where these measures have long been in use, and that is, that no entreaty can secure a full attendance upon protracted meetings, or their accustomed obedience from the people to the plans and devices which have been considered so effectual in promoting revivals. The *smiling* obedience in the one case, and the incorrigible disobedience in the other, alike prove the unhappy tendency of these measures.

ably fixed? They want nothing that is common; their appetite has become vitiated by high seasoning, until their taste for common food, and indeed for any food, has ceased. This pitiable spectacle is exhibited by some of our churches already, but we as yet see only the beginning of evils.

8th. They tend to lower the standard of preaching. This is a result intimately connected with the preceding. The taste for instructive preaching is fast declining; the people are listless if the doctrines of Scripture are explained and defended, or if the precepts of Scripture are enforced; they do not wish to be directed to the duty of tranquil meditation or of sober self-examination; excitement is to them pleasureable, but the study and practice of Christian duty, is irksome; they want pungent addresses, not well digested discourses; knowledge is without value, feeling is every thing, and hence, if God avert not the consequence, it will soon be seen that ignorance of the great system of the Gospel, will become the principal feature of our Church.

9th. They create an enthusiasm which, if not arrested or controlled will, and necessarily must, terminate in downright fanaticism. If reason be constrained to succumb to feeling, the consequences must be deplorable. Human passions are much more easily excited than allayed; any one may apply the impetus which puts them in motion; but who can curb or arrest their course when once commenced? The friends of new measures may easily kindle a fire which they cannot quench; they may open the sluices, but they cannot say with effect to the torrent which they have caused, "thus far shalt thou come but no farther." Contemplate the extravagancies which new measures have already originated, such as women praying in public; ministers praying publicly for persons by name, and enumerating all their supposed bad qualities in their prayers; and laymen meeting to pray for the conversion of ministers who are concluded to be destitute of piety, because they regard these measures with an unfriendly eye: we say look at these fruits, look at the predominance of feeling which characterizes new measure revivals, and then decide, whether in the lawlessness of enthusiasm, it would be at all wonderful, if some should set up a pretension to the gift of tongues and to the spirit of prophecy. Such fanaticism has occurred elsewhere, and why should it not occur here? We question not but if an example were once set, it would soon become popular to react the scenes which now disgrace the chapel of Mr. Irving in London.

10th. They tend to disparage the offices and work of the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost is the exclusive agent in the conversion of the soul. So say the Scriptures; but what are the pre-

vailing impressions among the advocates of new measures? How seldom is the Spirit of God acknowledged! Protracted meetings, revival ministers, and the sinner's own act in making for himself a new heart, are the favourite agencies; these are principally depended upon; these are applauded, and sinners might long attend to the application of these measures, as they are usually employed, without so much as knowing "whether there be any Holy Ghost." But is it credible that where God the Spirit is not acknowledged as all in all, he will effect any of the great and peculiar works of his power? To us it is not credible.

Thus we have briefly and imperfectly characterized modern innovations upon church order, and adverted to their consequences,—consequences already evincing themselves, and in the rapid course of developement. And shall it now be said, where is the utility of this exposure? We reply, the truth must be told; error must be resisted; the cause of Christ is suffering; the cause of revivals is in danger of contempt; and the only hope under God, which is left, is that ministers of the Gospel, who are sentinels on the walls of Zion, and the responsible guardians of the Church of Christ, will, in full view of the impending danger, rise and bear their testimony against the encroachments of indiscreet zeal, and the devices of misjudging innovators.

ART. IV.—*An apology for conforming to the Protestant Episcopal Church, contained in a series of Letters addressed to the Reverend Benjamin T. Onderdonk, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of New York.* By Thomas S. Brittan. Second edition, with additions. New York. Swords, Stanford & Co. 12mo. pp. 134. 1833.

THIS is, in every sense of the word, a small affair. We never heard of Mr. Brittan until our attention was very recently drawn to the volume before us. And even now we have no information concerning him but that which he here gives of himself. From this source we learn, that he is a native of England; that he was educated in that country among the "Independents," or "Congregationalists;" that he was trained and regularly set apart to the work of the Gospel ministry in that denomination, in his native land; that he came, a few months before the publication of these "Letters," to the United States in the character of an Independent minister; that on his arrival he was kindly received, and respectfully treated by Presbyterians; that he continued to minister, for a short time, in Presbyterian churches;

but that, after a while, new light broke in upon his mind, and his views respecting ecclesiastical matters became so far changed that he felt constrained by a conscientious regard to truth and duty, to unite himself with the Protestant Episcopal Church. Having taken this step, he thought proper, as has been common in all ages with recent converts, for the purpose either of evincing their sincerity, or propitiating their new friends, to write and print something against his former associates, and in favour of his adopted connexion. Such is a brief history of the little volume, the title of which stands at the head of this article. Of the source, circumstances, or amount of the new light which led to the change above stated, we know nothing. The honourable and Christian character of the *motives* by which he was governed in the whole affair, we do not feel at liberty so much as to question; though he allows himself so freely to assail the motives of others. We take for granted, in the absence of all evidence to the contrary, that his inquiries have been serious, his convictions honest, and the conclusions to which he has been brought, such as satisfy his own mind.

Of his views and feelings at an early period of his life, Mr. Brittan gives the following account:—

“I had learned to regard the Established Church as the beast in the Apocalypse, of which it is said, *“it had horns like a lamb, but it spake like a dragon.”* I regarded it as a system of spiritual tyranny only—an engine of State policy, by which the tools of party were to be rewarded; in fine, as an iron rod in the hands of bigotry, by which it attempted to crush and destroy all who had the honesty or the courage to think for themselves. This prejudice, by a natural consequence, (strange as to some it may appear,) extended itself to its ritual, its ceremonies, and even its sanctuaries; these were often the object of my ridicule and derision. The official garments of its clergy; the formulary of its devotions; and even its most solemn observances were regarded as worse than unmeaning; as partaking of the nature of an impious mockery of the Almighty. I looked upon its sacred edifices with much of the same class of feelings with which I should have regarded a Pagan temple; and though, in my boyhood, curiosity led me sometimes to visit them, that I might gaze upon their Gothic architecture, admire their painted windows, and feel what was imposing in their structure—whose “dim religious light” rendered them so suitable to aid devotion; yet I always felt as if by so doing, I had contracted a sort of guilt; that I had been treading upon forbidden ground.”

A mind capable of entertaining, as he tells us he did, until mature age, views so narrow, and prejudices so truly childish, might have been expected, on the slightest inducement, to verge with characteristic weakness to the opposite extreme, and to regard with the blindest admiration what had been before regarded with puerile abhorrence.

This little volume comprises nine Letters. The *first* is *introductory*; the *second* discusses the question of Episcopacy on the ground of *expediency*; the *third* is on Episcopacy sanctioned by the *Institutions of Judaism*; the *fourth* professes to exhibit

the testimony of Presbyterians and other anti-Episcopalians in favour of Episcopacy; the *fifth* relates to the testimony of the *Fathers*; the *sixth* to the testimony of *Scripture*; the *seventh* on prescribed *Forms of Prayer*; the *eighth* on the SURPASSING excellence of the *American Episcopal Liturgy*; and the *ninth* and last on several miscellaneous topics, such as the remarkable accordance of prelacy with every part of the creation, from the angel to the glow-worm; the abuse of Dr. Miller, against whom he seems to have a peculiar spite; the ignorance of Presbyterians and Presbyterian ministers on the subject of parity and episcopacy, &c.

On these subjects the reader must not expect any thing *new* in Mr. Brittan's pages. We are not aware that there is a single thought in the whole book which has not been more plausibly and powerfully presented by preceding writers. Mr. B. is, for the most part, a very humble copyist. And when he ventures to proceed without his guides, he generally betrays such a want of acquaintance with the subject as plainly evinces that he is a "raw recruit," who wishes to make up in zeal what may be lacking in knowledge.

Mr. B. in his second Letter gives a very gloomy picture of the want of union among the Independents in England, and selects, as a striking instance of their want of some uniting power among themselves, a particular circumstance attending the proceedings of the London Missionary Society, a body, the affairs of which are chiefly in the hands of that denomination. On this statement, and the inference in favour of Episcopacy which the author seems disposed to derive from it, two remarks may be made, which, long as he has occupied the place of instructor to others, he seems not yet duly to have considered.

The *first* is, that *Independency* is freely granted by us not to have been the apostolic form of Church government. It is essentially lacking in all those principles which are indispensable to ecclesiastical unity. All theory and all experience concur in pronouncing, that if a number of single churches are to be bound, and to act with harmony together as one Church, there must be some other tie or authority resorted to than the system of *Independency* furnishes. But does it follow that this resort must be to *Prelacy*? This gentleman seems to forget, or not to know, that *Independency* and *Presbyterianism* are not the same thing; that they are almost as far apart as *Independency* and *Prelacy*; and that *Presbyterianism* supplies quite as powerful means for securing ecclesiastical unity as *Prelacy* ever did. The history of *Presbyterianism* in Holland, in Scotland, in Geneva, in France, and in America, will satisfy every one who reads it intelligently,

that it has power to secure energy and unity, equal to any other form of ecclesiastical order.

Our *second* remark is, that Mr. Brittan seems entirely to forget that parties, controversy, division, and strife of the most painful character, have often occurred under Episcopal government. Has he never read of the divisions and strife which agitated the Church of England, with all her bishops, and with all the power of the secular arm to help them, in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth, James I., Charles I., Charles II., James II., William and Mary, and Queen Ann? And, when he was indelicate enough, in his second Letter, to reproach the Presbyterian Church in the United States with her divisions, as indicated by the proceedings of the General Assembly of 1832, had he entirely forgotten that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, at the very same time, as well as for several preceding years, exhibited a state of division quite as serious, and quite as threatening? Has he forgotten, or was he never informed, that Calvinism, Arminianism, and gross Pelagianism, are known to co-exist in that body of the unity of which he boasts so much, and that, if Unitarianism be not *now* found in her clerical ranks, it certainly *was* not many years since, unless public, uncontradicted rumour be very deceptive? Nay, does not the whole history of prelacy, whether found under Protestant auspices, or under the more rigid and energetic form of Romanism, furnish quite as many materials for the annalist of division and strife, as any other form of ecclesiastical government whatever? We are altogether at a loss to imagine how a conscientious, thinking man, such as we presume Mr. Brittan to be, could have allowed himself to employ an argument which the slightest reflection might have convinced him made full as much against his favourite Church as any other, Independency always excepted. Are there no "conflicting opinions," no "antipathies and animosities of its members," no "teaching of doctrines utterly opposed to their adopted standards," in his own beloved portion of Zion? If we did not take for granted that this gentleman is in a great measure ignorant of the real state of his newly adopted Church, and that he has been led astray by vain boasters in higher stations, who have imposed on his credulity, by speaking and writing in a similar manner before, it would be impossible to avoid conclusions derogatory to his candour. As it is, we counsel him to take another survey of his present connections a little more extensive and careful than he has heretofore done, before he sends forth another edition of his book.

We have just alluded to the fact, that even prelacy is not a sovereign preventive of divisions. And, of course, that all Mr.

B.'s reproaches of other denominations, as strikingly delinquent in respect to union, compared with his own body, are as unjust as they are indelicate. We do not deny that, under Presbyterian government, diversities of opinion and party conflicts have often arisen, and now exist. But is not this an evil incident to all governments of which depraved human beings are the subjects and the administrators? And we ask again, is there any Church in the United States, of considerable extent, LESS DIVIDED than the Presbyterian?

What individual in our country, except Mr. Brittan, does not know that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, has been for years, and is at this hour, labouring under *precisely the same sort of division and strife which exist in the Presbyterian Church?* Who does not know that that Church has been agitated to its very centre, (as appears from the publications of her own ministers,) by animosities between the *evangelical* and the *anti-evangelical* party; between *high-church* and *low-church*; between the advocates of *extempore prayer*, and those who would enforce an universal and exclusive adherence to the *liturgy* in every service; between the friends of *prayer-meetings*, and those who think such services injurious to the interests of "the Church"? The members of these respective parties, indeed, all call themselves "Episcopalians," and all agree in recognising and acting upon the prelatical principle, with more or less laxness, and in using the same liturgy, with more or less strictness; and this is *the exact amount of their unity*. That there are precisely analogous parties in the Presbyterian Church is not denied: but that they do not destroy unity more than in the case of our Episcopal neighbours, is well known to all excepting here and there "a stranger in Israel."

Besides, the Roman Catholics have every thing in prelacy that Protestant Episcopalians have; and over and above all this, they profess to have one supreme head, who, as Christ's vicar, they tell us, binds their whole body together, and thus secures universal unity. And yet, these very people, amidst all the boasted efficacy of their plan of government, have been for centuries torn with division and strife, as much as any Protestant denomination on earth. Those who have the slightest knowledge of their history, and more particularly of the 'distracting controversy and division respecting the *Jansenists*, which agitated their whole body, and raged for many years, will need no other evidence that their claim is utterly delusive, and that all their boasted allegations of superior unity are notoriously false. And yet it is amusing to find these same Roman Catholics denouncing none with more severity, as "out of the true Church," and

aliens from the "covenanted mercies of God" than Protestant Episcopalians, and that, among other considerations, on the very ground that they are divided into sects and parties, and have nothing like the unity of true Catholics. We believe there is just as much force in the argument when urged by Roman Catholics against Protestant Episcopalians, as when urged by the latter against Presbyterians. In other words, we believe it is a false and shameless cavil, wholly destitute of force in both cases, and that both the accusing parties are just as liable to the imputation in question as any of those whom they denounce and abuse.

If the Episcopal feature in church government be so infallible a sign of the true Church, and so potent in its efficacy to secure ecclesiastical unity, why did the Greek and Latin Church quarrel and denounce each other with irreconcilable acrimony, and finally become rent asunder, and a monument of prelati- cal warfare and strife to this day? Why did the "non-juring" party in England, toward the close of the seventeenth century, form a new body, and retire to North Britain, where they used a different Liturgy, and were not acknowledged by the English establishment, for about one hundred years? These, and a thousand other similar facts which have marked the history of prelacy in every age, show as plainly as demonstration itself, that the most energetic and boasted forms of ecclesiastical order are quite as liable to the distractions which human caprice and depravity generate as some which make less pretension; and that the chief difference is, that the former are content with a mere nominal unity, which the Bible no where recognises as the true bond of the body of Christ; and presumptuously reproach others for the want of that which Christ and his inspired apostles would have regarded as of no value.

It gives us real pain to make statements and appeals of this kind; but as long as there continue to be grave writers, who are not ashamed to repeat charges so unworthy of intelligent and candid minds, and which no man, we should think, who has eyes to see and ears to hear, can really believe, we shall feel bound to expose and refute them.

In fine, on this subject, we have only to say that Mr. Brittan's anecdote on page 26, about the London Missionary Society, betrays a narrowness of views, and a want of acquaintance with radical ecclesiastical principles, as amusing as they are disreputable. It proves nothing but that the writer is not competent to discuss with adequate intelligence the subject on which he writes. The New York Missionary Society, some twenty-seven years ago, after several missionaries had been for some time established

among the North Western Indians, sent a venerable minister of the Gospel, of known wisdom, piety, and learning, to visit the several stations, to inspect and report their condition; to counsel the missionaries in all matters relating to the complicated and delicate nature of the service in which they were engaged, and, in a word, like Timothy and Titus of old, if not to "ordain elders in every city," at least to "set in order the things which were wanting." The Society never imagined, however, that this mission constituted the gentleman in question a *bishop*. And if they had thought proper to continue his mission for several years, still the idea of constituting him a prelate, in the sense, or any thing like the sense, attached to that term by our Episcopal brethren, would never have entered into their minds. We know nothing of "Dr. Thom," of whom Mr. B. speaks in connexion with this affair of the London Missionary Society; but admitting that his relation of the story is correct, which we do not doubt, we cannot wonder that a man who lent himself to an "appeal," and an "indignation" so truly blind and silly, should now have "his name scarcely if ever mentioned."

On the subject of "Episcopacy sanctioned by the Institutions of Judaism," our author advances nothing new. He is, indeed, much less plausible and less forcible on this topic, than Dr. Bowden, Bishop Hobart, and several other writers on both sides of the Atlantic. When he attempts to prove that the whole of the Levitical economy was instituted by God himself; that in the sacred office in that economy there were three orders of men who ministered in holy things; that the New Testament Church is the same in substance with that of the Old Testament, having the same Head, the same design, the same hope, and the same way of salvation; in short, that the latter was the minority, and the former was the mature age of the Christian Church, he ought to know that he has no adversary among Presbyterians. These principles are all as cordially and zealously maintained by us as he can wish. But the Episcopal *inferences* from these premises, we have always thought to be as perfectly gratuitous, and even childish, as could well be imagined.

The grand principle assumed by them, upon which every thing depends, is, that the Christian ministry must be an exact copy of the Levitical priesthood. That the former must resemble the latter, not merely in its great design, but in its essential features, and more especially in the *number* of its orders. Upon the assumption of this principle, the slightest attention, we should think, to the following queries, would satisfy every mind not perfectly blinded by prejudice, that it can avail nothing to the cause which it is employed to support. For,

In the *first place*, do the Scriptures any where tell us that the parallel here supposed must exist? Do they give us any hint that the rank, the number of orders, or the functions of the ministry under the New Testament economy must correspond as *type* and *antitype*, with those of the ceremonial priesthood of the Jews? Nothing like it. Not a single passage to this amount has ever been produced, or can be produced. It is in vain to quote those passages from the New Testament which tell us that "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness," that "the law was a shadow of good things to come;" that the priests under the law served, or performed services which were "an example and shadow of heavenly things." There is not in all this an approach to the doctrine supposed. Now can it be imagined that the inspired writers should not be found to say one sentence on a point, which, if its advocates are to be believed, lies at the very foundation of the visible kingdom of Christ? But this is not all; for,

In the *second place*, while the New Testament says not one syllable which looks like the parallel contended for, does it not abundantly assert a doctrine which *destroys that parallel*, by establishing another altogether inconsistent with it? Let any man impartially read the New Testament, and especially the epistle to the Hebrews, and then say, whether the Saviour himself is not manifestly represented as the "great High Priest of our profession," and the only real and proper antitype of the Aaronic High Priest? The truth is, nothing but an utter disregard of Scripture could induce any body of men, Romish or Protestant, to advance the argument from the Aaronic priesthood in favour of their system. But further,

In the *third place*, is it not perfectly plain that there is not, *in fact*, even on the showing of Episcopalians themselves, *any such correspondence* between the Christian ministry and the Levitical priesthood, as their system demands, and as they assure us exists? In the Levitical priesthood there was a *single high priest* over the whole Jewish Church. But where is the antitype of this in the system of Protestant Episcopalians? Roman Catholics plead the very same parallel in support of their plan of ecclesiastical order; but *they* are, in regard to this point, consistent with themselves. *They* copy the Levitical plan with *some degree of exactness*. They have one Chief or High-Priest over the whole Catholic Church. And, truly, if the parallel of which we speak has any reality or significance among Christians, its serves the cause of Romanists alone, and not of any Protestant sect. To tell us that the Christian ministry must correspond with the Jewish priesthood; that the latter must be a

“shadow and a type” of the former; and, at the same time, to represent a single head as typifying a great number of co-ordinate heads, appear to us in the first rank of absurdities. Did any man ever hear of a single head casting a shadow of many scores of heads? No wonder that the Romanists exult over Protestants who adopt and attempt to make use of this argument, and yet apply it so inconsistently, and in a manner so much adapted to strengthen the hands of the adversary! But,

Finally; even admitting that there must be *three orders* in the New Testament ministry, in correspondence with the *three orders* in the ministry of the temple service, of which the Scriptures nowhere give the smallest intimation, and which never has been proved; yet, allowing for argument's sake, that some such parallel and correspondence must be maintained; is it not as faithfully maintained in the Presbyterian Church as in the Episcopal? Let it be borne in mind that Protestant Episcopalians do not contend that this parallel must be *exact as to every point*. For if they did, they would be obliged to show, as was before observed, one high priest over the whole Christian Church similar to the highest officer over the Old Testament Church. They seem so think that the single point to be regarded is, that there be *three orders* of ecclesiastical officers. But, in *this respect*, Presbyterians surely come quite as near as they do to the Levitical model. We have *Pastors*, (apostolical bishops,) *Elders*, and *Deacons*; *three* distinct classes of officers; all ecclesiastical men. We do not, indeed, assign to these respective classes the *same functions* which belonged to the High Priest, priests, and Levites under the ceremonial economy. But our Episcopal brethren, as every one knows, are just as far as ourselves, in this respect, from the Aaronic model. The parallel in our system is absolutely just as complete as theirs; and to represent it otherwise, is to insult the good sense of the community.

In Mr. Brittan's fourth Letter, which is devoted to the consideration of Presbyterian and other anti-episcopal testimonies in favour of prelacy, we see much to invite animadversion. But the limits to which we are confined must prevent our offering, on this branch of the argument, more than two general remarks.

The *first* is, that the greater part of these writers are most unfairly and disingenuously quoted. In most cases Mr. B. presents us with a few detached or garbled sentences, which, in the insulated form in which he exhibits them, seem to speak a language favourable to prelacy; when, if the context were fairly cited in its connexion, its whole aspect would be entirely different, and in some cases directly opposite. And especially when we come to examine those parts of the writings of these

men in which they express their opinions distinctly, fully, and unequivocally on the subject before us, it would be difficult to conceive of statements more irreconcilably opposed to the scraps here quoted. These remarks apply in all their force to Calvin, to Luther, to Beza, to Zanchy, to Pictet, and to several others from whom he presents citations. Never did men express themselves more clearly, strongly, and even zealously in favour of Presbyterian parity than these same men. If we supposed that Mr. Brittan had any other acquaintance with their writings than to take from second-hand the fragments which he so gravely and ostentatiously adduces, we should be compelled to put the most painful construction on his conduct. As it is, we excuse it as a mistake of ignorance. He has been led astray by guides who were unworthy of his confidence. Was it fair to vaunt Peter du Moulin as a man of great eminence and authority among Presbyterian divines, when it is well known that he was in part, at least, educated in one of the English Universities, which he could not have entered without conformity to the Church of England; and that he was afterwards a resident, and enjoyed preferment in that Church? Would not any man who could bring his mind to this, be likely to speak well of the ecclesiastical body to which he was attached? We ask further, Was it quite fair to bring forward as great champions of Presbytery, men who avow the belief, that there is no form of church government laid down in Scripture; that the order of the church may of course be modified according to the dictates of human prudence; and who, consequently, might without inconsistency represent prelacy as a *lawful* form of ecclesiastical order where it was preferred?

Our *second* remark on this branch of Mr. B.'s argument is, that the array of Presbyterian concessions in favour of the *early introduction* and the *lawfulness* of prelacy, which he exhibits with so much parade and confidence, may be more than met by a still greater number of decisive concessions from eminent Episcopalians. There is scarcely a single argument which he has urged in this little volume in support of the prelatial system, which some of the most learned and eminent Episcopalians that ever lived have not formally abandoned, and pronounced utterly untenable and worthless. And let it be remembered that these concessions are much more decisive and important than those which are usually produced from eminent Presbyterians; for the amount of almost all the latter is, either that Episcopacy, as a *human institution*, introduced *after* the days of the apostles, was brought in *earlier* than a majority of that denomination suppose; or that Episcopacy, though not resting on any scriptural authority, might be *lawfully* employed by those

who preferred it; in other words, that it may be better to submit to it, though it have no divine warrant, than to break the peace of the Church. These concessions, a reasonable man would think, are not such as either to gratify or to aid a *jure divino* prelatist. Yet such are, absolutely, the great majority, nay, almost the whole of the "anti-episcopal testimonies" of which so much boast is made. But very different from this in their bearing and force are the concessions of learned Episcopalians to which we have just referred. They have taken up successively and carefully the several arguments by which prelacy professes to sustain her claims, which have almost all, in their turn, been set aside by one or another of these mature and profound Episcopal judges, and declared to be wholly insufficient to sustain the weight laid upon them. Thus the argument drawn from the alleged fact, that the Episcopal bishops are the successors of the apostles, in their official pre-eminence, is rejected by Dr. Barrow, as wholly untenable. The argument drawn from the apocalyptic angels, on which Mr. Brittan, in imitation of many others, lays so much stress, is pronounced by Dr. Henry More, the learned Joseph Mede, Bishop Stillingfleet, and Henry Dodwell, four as learned Episcopalians as ever took pen in hand, and *at least* as well qualified to judge in this matter as our author, to be perfectly inapplicable and worthless. The learned and zealous Episcopal divine, Dr. Whitby, speaking of the question whether Timothy and Titus were made bishops, the one of Ephesus, and the other of Crete, says, "Now of this matter I confess I can find nothing in any writer of the *first three centuries*, nor *any intimation* that they bore that name; and afterwards adds, concerning the whole argument, "I confess that these two instances, absolutely taken, affords us no convincing arguments in favour of a settled diocesan episcopacy, because there is nothing which proves they did or were to exercise these acts of government rather as *bishops* than as *evangelists*." It is true, it is due to candour to say, that the Dr. still supposes that Timothy and Titus were prelates, of which he thinks he finds evidence elsewhere. And finally, Bishop Croft and Bishop Stillingfleet both express the most decisive conviction that the testimony of the *Fathers* will not bear out the Episcopal claim; and evidently entertained the opinion that no particular form of Church government can be shown to rest on the foundation of *divine right*.

Mr. Brittan's assertion, in the Letter in which he treats of anti-episcopal testimonies, that the illustrious reformer Luther was an Episcopalian in sentiment; that he would have been glad, had it been possible, to establish prelacy in the Lutheran

Church; and that he did introduce superintendents into the body which he founded, "who had every thing of the Episcopal character but their consecration" is one of the most bare-faced impositions on public credulity that ever was stated. We have no doubt that there is something altogether deceptive in the scraps which he professes to quote from the writings of that reformer, which if they were examined in their connexion, would be found to speak a very different language. But as he has given us no clew by which we can find them, we cannot, at present, make the examination. We do not, however, by any means charge Mr. Brittan with designed imposition in this matter. He has followed either dishonest or ignorant guides, and suffered himself to be made the dupe of his credulity. The following quotations will at once explain and confirm our meaning.

Luther, in his treatise "*De Abroganda Missa Privata*," remarking on *Titus* i. 5, makes the following decisive remarks: "Here, if we believe that the Spirit of Christ spake and directed by Paul, we must acknowledge that it is a *divine appointment*, that in every city there be a *plurality of bishops*, or at least *one*. It is manifest also, that *by the same divine authority*, he makes *Presbyters* and *Bishops* to be *one and the same thing*; for he says the Presbyters are to be ordained in every city, if any can be found who are blameless, because a bishop ought to be blameless."*

Again, in his treatise entitled "*Adversus Falso Nominatum Ordinem Episcoporum*," expounding the same passage of Scripture, we find him employing the following decisive language: "Paul writes to Titus that he should ordain elders in every city. Here, I think no one can deny that the apostle represents *bishops* and *elders* as *signifying the same thing*. Since he commands Titus to ordain elders in every city, and because a bishop ought to be blameless, he calls an elder by the same title.

"It is therefore plain what Paul means by the term *bishop*, viz. a man eminently good and upright, of proper age, who hath a virtuous wife and children, in subjection in the fear of God. He wills such an one to preside over the congregation, in the ministry of the word, and the administration of the sacraments. Is there any one who attends to these words of the apostle, together with those which precede and follow, so hardened as to deny this sense of them, or to pervert them to another meaning?"†

* *Lutheri Oper.* Tom. ii.

† *Tom.* ii. p. 342. In fact, the scope of the whole treatise from which this extract is made, is to show that the office of *bishop*, as a distinct and pre-eminent order, is altogether unscriptural. He speaks strongly and zealously against the doctrine that *bishops* are an order above pastors, as a *Popish* error.

In another part of the same work he thus speaks: "But let us hear Paul concerning this divine ordination. For Luke in the twentieth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, writes concerning it in this manner. *From Melitus, having sent messengers to Ephesus, he collected the elders of the church, to whom, when they had come to him, he thus said—Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, &c.* But what new thing is this? Is Paul insane? Ephesus was but a single city; and yet Paul openly calls all the presbyters, or elders, by the common style of *bishops*. But perhaps Paul had never read the legends, the miserably patched up fables, and the sacred decretals of the Papists; for how otherwise would he have dared to place a plurality of bishops over one city, and to denominate all the *presbyters* of that one city, *bishops*; when they were not all prelates, nor supported a train of dependants and pack-horses, but were poor and humble men. But to be serious; you see plainly that the apostle Paul calls those alone bishops, who *preach the Gospel to the people, and administer the sacraments*, as in our times parish ministers and preachers are wont to do. These, therefore, though they preach the Gospel in small villages and hamlets, yet, as faithful ministers of the word, I believe, beyond all doubt, possess of right the title and name of bishop."*

A little after, in the same work, in a commentary on *Philip. i. 1*, he says, "Behold Paul, speaking of Philippi, which was a single city, salutes all the believers, together with the *bishops*. These were, beyond all doubt, the Presbyters, whom he had been wont to appoint in every city. This is now the third instance in the writings of Paul, in which we see what God, and the Holy Spirit hath appointed, viz. that those *alone* truly and *of right*, are to be called *bishops*, who have the *care of a flock* in the ministry of the word, the care of the poor, and the administration of the sacraments, as is the case with *parish ministers* in our age."

In the same work, commenting on *1 Peter v. 1*, he says, "Here you see that Peter, in the same manner as Paul had done, uses the terms presbyter and bishop to signify the same thing. He represents those as bishops, who teach the people, and preach the word of God; and he makes them *all of equal power*, and forbids them to conduct themselves as if they were lords, or to indulge a spirit of domination over their flocks. He calls himself a *fellow-presbyter*, plainly teaching by this expression that *all parish ministers and bishops of cities* were of equal author-

* *Tom. ii. p. 344, 345.*

ity among themselves; that in what pertained to the office of *bishop*, no one could claim *any authority over another*, having no more power in his own city than others had in theirs, or than every one of them had in his own congregation.”*

Finally; in his commentary on 1 *Peter* v. 1, he expresses himself thus: “The word *Presbyter* signifies *Elder*. It has the same meaning as the term *Senators*, that is, men who, on account of their age, prudence, and experience, bear sway in society. In the same manner Christ calls his ministers and his senate, whose duty it is to administer spiritual government, to preach the word, and to watch over the Church, he calls them *Elders*. Wherefore, let it not surprise you if this name is *now* very differently applied; for of those who are *at present* called by this name, *the Scriptures say nothing*. Therefore banish the present order of things from your eyes, and you will be able to conceive of the fact as it was. When Peter, or either of the other apostles, came to any city where there were Christians, out of the number he chose one or more aged men, of blameless lives, who had wives and children, and were well acquainted with the Scriptures, to be set over the rest. These were called *Presbyters*, that is *Elders*, whom both Peter and Paul also style *Bishops*, that we may know that *bishops* and *presbyters* were *the same*.†

With the *sentiments* of Luther, thus expressed, which no candid reader can mistake, his *practice* uniformly coincided. He was ordained a *Presbyter* in the Romish Church in 1507, ten years before he commenced the work of Reformation; and he never received any other ordination or consecration. Yet he ordained ministers freely and frequently, and never doubted his right to do so. Nay, a few hours before his death, on the last Sabbath that he lived, when he was exceedingly feeble, and expected soon to appear before his Almighty Judge, his friend and biographer *Justus Jonas* tells us “he ordained two ministers of the word of God, after the apostles’ manner.” And even when one of the *superintendents* of his church was to be inducted into office, Luther, it would appear, *alone*, set him apart to his new office.

It is true, Luther did, in 1530, say *something like* what Mr. Brittan has ascribed to him. He said concerning the Popish bishops, “We assure them that, if they will in future tolerate our doctrine, and abstain from persecuting, and seeking to exterminate us, they shall suffer no loss of their jurisdiction from *us*. We aspire at no episcopal or any other dignity: we only desire to be Christians, whose condition ought to be a despised and af-

* *Tom.* ii. p. 346.† LUTHERI, *Oper.* Tom. v. p. 481.

flicted one.”* In the same manner Melancthon, in the spirit of indiscreet concession, declared in a note prefixed to his subscription to the articles of *Smalcald*, “I approve the foregoing articles as pious and Christian. As for the *Pope*, my opinion is, that if he would admit the Gospel, he might, for the peace and common tranquillity of Christians, who are, or shall hereafter be under him, *be allowed by us that superiority over the bishops which he otherwise enjoys by human right.*” Yet no one in his senses, who knows any thing of the history and writings of Melancthon, would consider him, for a moment, as friendly to the pope’s supremacy. The whole is to be considered as an occasional, but inconsistent concession. So it was in the case of Luther. He expressed himself, in 1530, in the conceding language just quoted. But three years afterwards, (1533) when he re-published his work on “private masses,” he expressly advocates the *parity of ministers by divine right*, and observes that “though, for the sake of peace, they had been willing at Augsburgh, to assign ordination to the bishops; yet this offer would not be repeated.” Of all this, we have no doubt that Mr. Brittan was entirely ignorant. Were it otherwise, we could not avoid regarding his statement with sentiments much more unfavourable than those of astonishment!

When Mr. Brittan tells his readers that the office of *Superintendent* as established by Luther, “had every thing of the Episcopal character but their consecration,” he manifests a want of knowledge of that office equally disreputable to himself and his diocesan; to *himself*, for undertaking to write on a subject which he did not understand; and to his *diocesan*, for allowing a blunder of this kind to be addressed to him, and afterwards printed, and subsequently to reach a second edition, without being corrected.

The truth is, the *Seniors*, or *Superintendents*, established by Luther, differed essentially in a variety of respects from *Bishops*, as that term is understood by prelatists. To mention but one point of difference, which, in fact, includes all. The function of *ordaining* was not *confined* to them. Nay, it was not necessary that a superintendent should *be present* at an ordination. It might proceed just as well without him as with him. Even in Sweden and Denmark, where the Lutheran Superintendents take the name of *Bishops*, this fact also exists. They are not the *only* or the *necessary* ordainers. And, to crown all, the most accredited writings, and the symbolical books of the Lutherans, from Luther to the present day, uniformly represent this office

* *Melchior Adam*, i. 161. *Seckendorf*, ii. 192.

as resting entirely on the ground of *human prudence*, and that the identity of Bishop and Presbyter was the primitive and apostolic plan.

So much for Mr. B.'s statement concerning Luther. A more gross abuse of public credulity hardly ever occurred. But we do not accuse him of knowingly departing from historical verity. We have no doubt that it was a sin of ignorance.

Further examples might be given, from the same letter, of shameful misrepresentations; not, we are sure, intended, but arising from a deplorable want of information; but we must hasten to consider some other of the lucubrations of this superficial and confident neophyte.

In representing Episcopacy as "sustained by the testimony of the Fathers," which is the subject of his *fifth* letter, Mr. B. has laid himself open to strictures, a few of which (for to notice them all would require a discussion more than equal in extent to his whole volume) we shall attempt to exhibit in a very cursory manner.

The Rev. Dr. Bowden, of New York, some five and twenty years ago, in his Letters to Dr. Miller, on the Episcopal controversy, excited some attention among serious and thinking people by the *manner in which he arranged his testimony* in favour of Episcopacy. Instead of *beginning* with the SCRIPTURES, as the primary rule in every thing, and the only infallible one, he *began with the Fathers*, as if afraid to enter on an examination of the word of God, without having the mind so pre-occupied and biased by the language of the Fathers, as to lean naturally to a prelatical interpretation of every thing. Nor was he content even with this. As if he were afraid of examining the testimony of the Fathers *in their natural order*, beginning with those nearest to the apostolic age, and proceeding to those more remote from that age, he directly *inverted that order*; began with the Fathers of the fourth century; argued and traced authorities *backward*; assumed the principles and the language of the fourth century as truly scriptural; and then employed them to interpret the language of the earlier Fathers; thus endeavouring to make his readers believe that the order of the Church was *precisely the same* in the *fourth* that it had been in the *first* century; and, of course, that the words *bishop*, *eldèr*, and *deacon* were titles of exactly the same import in the days of *Jerome*, *Chrysostom*, *Augustine*, and *Basil*, that they had been in the days of the apostles. This artful procedure was noticed by many at that time, besides Presbyterians, as by no means an example of that direct and candid policy which is always the best. Mr. Brittan seems to have been greatly smitten with the

wisdom of this plan. He has servilely adopted it; and, no doubt, considered it as a master stroke in ecclesiastical tactics. The argument from *Scripture* he postpones to the very close of the discussion, intending, we presume, in his *a posteriori* march, to bring his readers to the New Testament deeply imbued with prelatival prepossessions and phraseology, and ready to take for granted that the apostolical writings could not possibly contradict those records, which, though really of long *later date*, he had made to PRECEDE THE BIBLE IN ORDER AND IN INFLUENCE! The bare statement of this fact is enough for reflecting readers. We leave it without one word of comment, excepting to say, that we do hope, in time to come, that new converts to the prelatival ranks will wait at least a few months, if not years, before they undertake to turn preachers and writers on this delicate controversy. If they would consent to "tarry at Jericho until their beards be grown," they might possibly do more credit to their cause, and find less reason for subsequent regret and self-reproach.

In arranging the testimony of the Fathers, Mr. Brittan, like his file-leader, Dr. Bowden, begins with *Jerome*. He arrays, with much parade some seven or eight quotations from that father, which he considers as speaking a language decisively prelatival; just as if every intelligent reader did not know that prelacy is acknowledged on all hands to have existed in the days of Jerome, who flourished in the first quarter of the fifth century, dying about the year 420. Of course, when he wrote about the state of things which *then existed*, every one would expect him to speak the language, and refer to the facts of his day. But has our author produced one quotation from Jerome which represents prelacy as a divine appointment, or as resting on apostolical authority? He has not, nor can he do it. We have never found such a passage in all his works. Accordingly, bishop Stillingfleet declares, (*Irenicum*, part ii. ch. 6,) "Among all the fifteen testimonies produced by a learned writer out of Jerome, for the superiority of bishops above presbyters, I cannot find one that does found it upon *divine right*; but only on the *convenience* of such an order for the peace and unity of the Church." This is, undoubtedly, a true verdict. So much, then, for the testimony produced with so much confidence from this learned father.

But why did Mr. Brittan so carefully withhold from his readers some OTHER testimony of a very different character from Jerome, which he must have known to exist, and which has led some of the most learned Episcopal writers that ever lived, to consider that father as a most formidable opponent of the divine right of prelacy? Why did he not give his

readers *more* of Jerome's epistle to Evagrius, as well as some pithy extracts from his commentary on the epistle to Titus? In those passages Jerome expressly declares that *in the beginning* bishop and presbyter were the *very same*; that the superiority of bishops to presbyters came in (*paulatim*) by little and little; that disorders in the Church, and ambition among the clergy gave rise to it; and that, although it then existed, yet that bishops ought to know that they were above presbyters more *by the custom of the Church*, than by any *real appointment of Jesus Christ*. This is a plain and perfectly unexaggerated statement of Jerome's testimony. He *no where* speaks of Episcopacy, in the prelatical sense of the word, as a divine institution; and when he undertakes to speak of its *real origin*, he explicitly declares that it came in *gradually*, and more by the *custom of the Church*, than by the *authority of Christ*. This Mr. Brittan knew; or else he is more grossly ignorant of the controversy than even *we* suppose him to be. Why did he conceal it? Why did he vaunt this father as a decisive and unquestionable witness in his favour? We have seldom seen a more strange example of unfairness and infatuation.

This view of the testimony of Jerome is not a Presbyterian perversion or prejudice. So he has been understood for centuries by the great mass of the most learned prelatists, both Popish and Protestant. Bishop Jewel, Archbishop Whitgift, Bishop Bilson, Professor Whitaker, Bishop Stillingfleet, Bishop Croft, Dr. William Nichols, and scores of other eminent Episcopal writers, with one consent tell us, that Jerome agreed with Aerius; and that his avowed object is to show that Episcopacy is a *human* not a *divine* institution. It may not be improper also to state, that even the truly learned and able advocate of Episcopacy, the celebrated Hooker, after giving that gloss of Jerome's testimony which is not uncommon among high-toned prelatists, in order to make it speak more in their favour than its natural interpretation will admit, adds the following remarkable words: "This answer to St. Jerome seemeth dangerous; I have qualified it as I may by addition of some words of restraint; yet I satisfy not myself; in my judgment it would be altered." There seems to be no rational interpretation of these words of Hooker but that which represents him as meaning to say, that, although he adopted, and thought proper to present the usual gloss, he was by no means satisfied with it.

That our interpretation of the judgment of Jerome is correct, there is a fair presumption arising from the testimony of contemporary writers, who unequivocally testify to the same amount. Hilary, (sometimes called Ambrose,) who wrote about the year

376, has the following passage in his commentary on *Ephes.* iv. 2, "After that churches were planted in all places, and officers ordained, matters were settled *otherwise than they were in the beginning*. And hence it is, that the apostles' writings *do not in all things agree with the present constitution of the Church*; because they were written under the first rise of the Church: *for he calls Timothy, who was ordained a PRESBYTER by him, a BISHOP, for so at first the Presbyters were called*; among whom this was the course of governing churches, that as one withdrew another took his place: and in Egypt, at, present, the Presbyters ordain (or *consecrate, consignant*) in the bishop's absence. But because the following Presbyters began to be found unworthy to hold the first place, the method was *changed*, the council providing that not *order* but *merit* should create a bishop." If language CAN express the idea of a *change*, brought in *after the apostles' days*, and by *human prudence and authority*, here it is undoubtedly stated.

Augustine, in writing to Jerome, conveys most distinctly the same idea. "I entreat you," says he, "to correct me faithfully when you see I need it: for although, according to *the names of honour which the CUSTOM OF THE CHURCH has now brought into use*, the office of *bishop* is greater than that of *presbyter*, nevertheless, in many respects, Augustine is inferior to Jerome." *Oper. Tom. ii. Epist. 19, ad Hieron.*

It may not be amiss to state, that this construction of Augustine is not confined to Presbyterians. Bishop Jewel, in the "Defence" of his "Apology for the Church of England," quotes the passage just cited, in order to show the original identity of bishop and presbyter, and translates it thus: "The office of a bishop is above that of a priest, not by the authority of the Scriptures, but after the names of honour which the *custom of the Church* hath now introduced." *Defence*, p. 122, 123.

Of the same general idea, Chrysostom, with all his prelatical claims, gives a very significant intimation. In speaking on the same subject, he expresses himself thus: "Having spoken of *bishops*, and described them, declaring both what they ought to possess, and from what they ought to abstain, omitting the order *presbyters*, Paul passes on to the *deacons*. But why is this? Because *between bishop and presbyter there is not much difference*; for these also in like manner have had committed to them both the *instruction and government* of the Church; and what things he has said concerning *bishops*, the same also he intended for *presbyters*; for they have *gained the ascendancy over them only in respect to ordination, and of this they seem to have defrauded* (*πλεονεξτειν*) the presbyters." *In Epist.*

ad Tim. Hom. ii. This passage is very significant. The eloquent father distinctly conveys the idea, not only that *ordination* was the only point concerning which they had gained the ascendancy over Presbyters; but that they had gained this by *fraudulent means*. This is, undoubtedly, the idea conveyed by the word *κλεονεκτησειν*. See 1 *Thessalonians*, iv. 6. *That no man go beyond and defraud his brother in any matter.* And also 2 *Cor.* vii. 2. *Receive us; we have wronged no man, we have defrauded no man.* See also 2 *Cor.* ii. 11. *Lest Satan should get an advantage of us.* See further, 2 *Cor.* xii. 17, 18. *Did I make a gain of you, &c.? Did Titus make a gain of you?* In all these places the same word is employed, and very plainly conveys the idea of taking a *fraudulent advantage*,—*gaining more than one has a right to.*

It is not our intention to enter, in the present article, into the general examination of the testimony of the Fathers in reference to prelacy. We will venture, however, fearlessly to assert, that there is not to be found in all the writings of the Fathers of the *first two hundred years after Christ*, one sentence which so much as *intimates* that *Bishops*, as an order above *Presbyters* who laboured in the word and doctrine, had any existence during that period; nor a single sentence within the first *three hundred*, we believe we might say *four hundred years*, after Christ, which gives the least intimation that prelacy was *an appointment of Jesus Christ*. The assertion with which we so frequently meet in Episcopal writers, that the Fathers clearly, unanimously, and decisively declare in their favour, is an assertion so destitute of truth, that we are very sure nothing but the blindest prejudice could allow any honest, intelligent man to make it. Nor is this the opinion of Presbyterians only. Bishop Herbert Croft, in his work entitled "*Naked Truth*," after a considerable induction of the articles of evidence usually produced by the advocates of prelacy, expresses himself thus, "I hope my readers will now see what weak proofs are brought for this distinction and superiority of order. No Scripture; no primitive general council; no general consent of primitive doctors and fathers; no, not *one* primitive father of note speaking particularly and home to their purpose." *Naked Truth*, p. 47.

In the notice which he takes of the testimony of *Ignatius*, Mr. Brittan assails Dr. Miller in the following language:

"Still less was I pleased with the Letters of a learned Presbyterian Professor on the same side of the question. They appear to me to be written so ungraciously—to manifest such an overweening conceit of self—to be characterized with such an air of pedantry—to enforce the "dieta" of their author with such an *ex cathedra* tone—to abound with so many subterfuges—to present such mutilated, garbled quo-

tations from the fathers—in a word, to be so replete with Jesuitical “*finesse*,” that I could not but feel disgust at the exhibition. Whatever may be the state of my head I trust I have an honest heart; I was early taught to despise duplicity; and hope I almost instinctively revolt from it; but when I find this author, because it would serve his turn against Episcopalians, denouncing the shorter Epistles of Ignatius as spurious productions; and, at the same time, in another book which lay before me, found the same man, because it would serve his purpose against the Unitarians, vindicating the very same Epistles of Ignatius as genuine, I say, when I saw this, I felt that he could hardly claim my confidence; I could not repress the risings of honest indignation. If this be not verifying the old fable of blowing hot and cold with the same mouth, what is it? I was convinced that, whatever powers of reasoning he might possess, he was deficient in that candour and consistency which would alone command my respect; that, however I might view him as a subtle and wily sophist, I ought not to regard him as a sound and honest reasoner.” p. 19.

A little onward, in canvassing the testimony of Ignatius, he gives vent to his feelings against the Professor at Princeton in the following language:—

“The testimony of Dr. Miller, yes, of that very Dr. Miller, who, when writing against the Episcopalians, said, *that the shorter Epistles of Ignatius were unworthy of confidence as the genuine works of the father whose name they bear, is the opinion of many of the ablest judges in the Protestant world.* The same person, “Eheu, quantum mutatus ab illo!” in writing subsequently against the Unitarians, and wishing to urge the sentiments of the same father against them, says in words as follow: “*The great body of learned men consider the smaller Epistles of Ignatius as, in the main, the real works of the writer whose name they bear.*” Thus his real opinion has been wrung from him, if indeed, such an opinion, given under such circumstances, be of any importance at all.” p. 66.

And again, in his concluding letter, as if unwilling to lose another chance of pouring out his ire against this gentleman, who really seems very much to discompose his temper, he finally discharges his bile in the following form:—

“If of the writings of one individual I have spoken in terms which may to some appear too strong, allow me to say, I have of him no personal knowledge, and, consequently, entertain towards him no personal ill-will. I never heard his name till I became acquainted with his writings. But when I saw such unfairness in his quotations, such gross misrepresentations of historical facts, such needless vituperations of his opponents, (who seemed to me to be writing with warmth, yet not without courtesousness) that by this “*ruse de guerre*,” he might awaken the sympathy of his Presbyterian readers, of whom he knew not one in a hundred would ever read the opposite party’s statements, I confess I felt it my duty to speak plainly upon the subject. If Moses felt indignant at witnessing the misconduct of Aaron in the matter of the golden calf; if a greater than he expressed a similar feeling at the desecration of the temple; if Protestants all join in expressions of indignation at the impositions of the Romish clergy, which have been called “*pious frauds*,” then I cannot think I have acted unchristianly, in speaking in the softest terms which honesty would allow, of one who, if he be a learned man, should never have so represented facts; or, if he be not, should not so dogmatically have pretended to be master of the subject.” p. 132, 133.

The coarse and ungentlemanly character of some of this language, involving a direct charge of *dishonesty*, and evidently

intended to injure moral character, we pass over without remark, excepting to observe, that, notwithstanding the charge of “needless vituperation” brought against Dr. Miller by our author, we have searched in vain in all that gentleman’s replies to his numerous and fierce assailants, for any sentence half so worthy of censure, on the score of vituperation, as more than one of those which we have just cited. The man and the cause are worthy of compassion which find it necessary to resort to such weapons.

As to the charge against Dr. Miller of speaking of the Epistles of Ignatius on two different occasions, in what our author is pleased to pronounce directly opposite language, it is evidently founded on a total want of acquaintance with the history of those Epistles, and their posture before the literary and ecclesiastical public. We shall not trouble our readers with this history at present, especially as our purpose is to take an early opportunity of giving it somewhat at large. We shall now only state enough to justify what we suppose to have been Dr. Miller’s meaning in these two seemingly opposite, but perfectly reconcilable representations.

That the Epistles of Ignatius have been corrupted, that is grossly interpolated, has been the opinion, for nearly two hundred years, of the great mass of Protestant divines, and, among the rest, of some of the most learned Episcopal writers who have expressed a judgment on the subject. This interpolation, however, is generally supposed to have been *chiefly*, if not solely directed to the undue exaltation of the BISHOP’S OFFICE. We do not at present recollect to have met with a single writer of reputation who charged them with having been corrupted *as to our Lord’s divinity*, in other words, as to the points in controversy with *Unitarians*, as such. In short, our views of this matter are precisely expressed by a zealous Episcopalian, who writes in the “Christian Observer,” of London, and who expresses himself thus: “In these Epistles we have the three orders of bishops, priests, and deacons marshalled with unseasonable exactness, and repeated with importunate anxiety. There appear, moreover, so many symptoms of contrivance, and such studied uniformity of expression, that these compositions will surely not be alleged by any *capable* and *candid* advocate for primitive Episcopacy, without great hesitation; by many they will be *entirely rejected*. I do not mean to insinuate that the whole of these Epistles is a forgery. On the contrary, many parts of them afford strong internal evidence of their own genuineness: but with respect to the particular passages which affect the present (the Episcopal) dispute, *there is not a single passage which I would venture to allege. The language at the earliest, is that of the fourth century.*” Christian Observer ii. 723.

We are very willing to adopt as our own the language of this writer. We do not doubt that Ignatius wrote a number of Epistles. We do not doubt that the "Shorter Epistles" are, *substantially*, the work of that father. We should not scruple to quote what they contain concerning the leading doctrines of the Gospel, confiding that, "*in the main*," as to these points, they may be considered as the real productions of the venerable man whose name they bear. But in what he writes respecting bishops and presbyters, we think, with the Episcopal writer just quoted, that there are so many marks of corrupt, unseasonable, and fulsome interpolation, that we could not venture to cite, as legitimate testimony, a single sentence.

The same view of the subject seems to have been taken by Professor Neander, an illustrious Lutheran, of Berlin, probably the most accurately learned Christian antiquary now living. While he pronounces that the Epistles of Ignatius "have *certainly* been interpolated IN FAVOUR OF THE HIERARCHY," yet, on *other subjects*, he appeals to them without reserve, as affording safe testimony. *Hist. of the Christian Religion, and Church*, I. p. 199.

Now, we presume that this was the view taken of the subject by Dr. Miller. If so, where, we ask, is the inconsistency between the two judgments which he delivers? We should be perfectly willing to adopt them both, in the connexion in which they were delivered respectively, and make them our own, precisely as they stand. Of this view of the subject, however, it is probable that Mr. Brittan was entirely ignorant. Of course, we are more disposed to pity than to upbraid him; and think that for this he ought to be "beaten with few stripes." But while we bring no imputation against his *honesty*, the account of his *presumption* and *folly* in writing with so much oracular confidence on a subject which, it would appear, he had but recently begun to study, he must adjust as he can. After all, Presbyterians have no fear of the Epistles of Ignatius. Our author seems to think that if their authenticity be acknowledged, his cause is gained. No such thing. Let any thinking man take those Epistles into his hands, and read them from beginning to end, keeping in his mind the *Bishop, Elders, and Deacons* which are found in every regularly constituted and furnished Presbyterian Church; and, if he be not blinded by prejudice, he will perceive that *all* the language of the venerable father applies to our system as perfectly as to any other; and that *some* of it cannot possibly apply to any other than *parochial*, or, in other words, *Presbyterian* Episcopacy.

The extent which our remarks have unwarily reached, forbid

our entering further into the testimony of the other fathers. We may take up this branch of the controversy before long, more at large. In the mean while, we will say, that if any enlightened, impartial reader will take up the New Testament and give it, in reference to this controversy, a serious and attentive perusal; and then go on with the fathers, *in order*, from *Clemens Romanus* to *Augustine*, he will be amazed to find how little is said at all, (out of the Epistles of Ignatius,) in reference to this subject; and how complete is the evidence that prelacy was brought into the Church, *gradually*, within the first four hundred years, *by human ambition*.

Mr. Brittan's *sixth* Letter is on "Episcopacy sustained by Scripture." This stands *at the close* in his array of proof. We shall not again recur to the *strangeness of this order* for a *Protestant*, excepting to say, that we leave it to the judgment of reflecting readers.

Our remarks on the scriptural branch of the testimony shall be short. We must again defer to a future occasion more extended strictures. Suffice it to say, that Mr. B., treading in the steps of his predecessors, asserts with confidence, as facts taught in Scripture, that Episcopal prelates succeed the apostles in their peculiar pre-eminence and authority as such; that Timothy was sent to Ephesus, and Titus to Crete, as prelatial bishops, and that this alone gave them power to ordain elders in the churches to which they were sent; that in the ordination of Timothy as a prelate, the hands of Paul *only* were imposed upon him; that there were already Elders in the churches of Ephesus and Crete, who might have ordained, on Presbyterian principles, without the interposition of Timothy and Titus; that Timothy and Titus, in their ordinations, acted *alone*; and that the "angels" of the seven churches of Asia, mentioned in the second and third chapters of the Apocalypse, were undoubtedly diocesan bishops. Now, we will venture to say, that all these alleged facts are *gratuitously* alleged. He has not produced even plausible proof of one of them, nor can he produce it. The apostles were extraordinary officers. Their inspiration, and their miraculous powers marked this so distinctly and unequivocally as to preclude the necessity of other proof. They were to the primitive Church, while they lived, (at which time the New Testament was not yet collected into a volume) what the New Testament is to us; the unerring counsellors and guide of the Christian community. In this pre-eminence they had, and could have no successors. While in the ordinary office of the ministry, all were their successors who were commissioned to preach the Gospel, administer the sacraments, and govern the Church.

There is not a hint, we will be bold to say, in the whole New Testament which holds forth any thing further, or other than this. As to Timothy and Titus, the whole argument founded on them by our Episcopal brethren, is a mere and a most bare-faced begging of the whole question in dispute. They first *assume* that none but prelates can ordain, and *then* infer that Timothy and Titus being sent on an important ordaining and arranging mission, must have been, of course, prelates! But this, every one sees, is precisely the question in controversy. Why they might not have gone, and done all that they did as Presbyterian *evangelists*, no mortal can tell, except by saying that such a supposition would be contrary to the Episcopal system, and *therefore* cannot be true! Mr. Brittan too, in assuming as he does with so much confidence, that there were Presbyters already ordained at Ephesus and Crete, before Timothy and Titus went thither, who might, on Presbyterian principles, have ordained others, without the aid of those special missionaries, has not a shadow of Scripture to sustain him, and is opposed by archbishop Potter, and some other of the very highest Episcopal authorities. It is in the highest degree probable that there were no such Presbyters already there. Neither can he prove that either Timothy or Titus ever ordained a single Elder *alone*. We know, from the inspired history, that *Mark* was with Timothy, and *Zenas* and *Apollos* with Titus. Who can tell that *they* did not officiate as co-ordainers in every investiture with sacred office? Once more; Mr. B.'s assumption is equally gratuitous that the apocalyptic angels were diocesan bishops. There is not a word in the sacred volume which renders it probable; and several of the most eminently learned Episcopal divines, as before stated, have decisively rejected the supposition. In short, Mr. Brittan and his friends, with one accord, acknowledge that the term Bishop, as used in the New Testament, does not mean a prelate, but is a title applied to all ministers empowered to preach and administer sacraments, and having pastoral charges. They have never yet produced a shadow of proof that the apostles, when they withdrew from the Church, left in office any ministers of higher power than these Scripture bishops. And all their confident assertions to the contrary are absolutely nothing less than imposition on the credulity of the public. We call for PROOF, even *probable* proof—that any one of the leading facts which they allege on this subject, and which they advance with so much confidence, is a real, supported fact. They never *have* yet produced it, and they never *can* produce it. But we must postpone to another opportunity this whole argument. Our limits will not allow us to pursue it at present.

Mr. Brittan is very fond of using the term *Dissenter*, to designate all the non-episcopal professors of religion in the United States. He very gravely tells us in a note (p. 21,) that "he has LEARNED, *since his arrival in this country*, that *here* the application of the word to those who differ from the Episcopal Church is objected to; but that he has naturally adopted a mode of speech familiar to him from long habit, and has deemed it best to retain it." Really we should have thought that a man of common intelligence might have "learned," even while in England, that in ecclesiastical language, the word "dissenter" can only be used with propriety as correlate with an established Church. We can assure Mr. B., however, that his use of this term gives not the least offence to us. It only puts us in mind of the ludicrous habit of an illiterate Englishman, with whom we fell in many years ago, who had been so long accustomed to a cap-in-hand servility in approaching the noblemen of his native land, that he could never accost any respectable gentleman without saying "My Lord," and "your Lordship;" and though often reminded that there were no orders of nobility in this country, and that his mode of address was not only improper, but superlatively ridiculous, he could never be cured of his harmless but contemptible habit to the end of life.

We should be glad to make some remarks on the remaining three Letters, which afford quite as much matter for animadversion as those which we have examined. But the limits to which we are confined compel us here to take leave of our author. We can assure our readers, however, that on the subject of Liturgies he is quite as uninformed, superficial, and deceptive a guide as we have shown him to be in other matters.

ART. V.—*Remarks on Independence of Thought, addressed to Candidates for the Ministry.*

AMONG the many definitions given of man, to distinguish him from other animals, some have thought few more free from objection than that which defines him to be a *thinking animal*. But if it be intended by this that he is a being who originates thoughts of his own, and gives to them a shape, track, or course before unknown, we are all aware, that is inapplicable as a definition, to the mass of men. To a few in every age, men of invention, men of genius, men of penetrant minds, it will apply; but

of the rest it must be said, that though they thought, their thoughts and views and desires were like those of their progenitors, or, at most, extended but little further. They adopted their modes of thinking, and their prejudices; followed their pursuits, and occupied their habitations. Their views were bounded by the same horizon. The same celestial concave was above them, with its gilded specks, and brilliant lights, now obscured by some passing cloud, and now appearing with their wonted lustre; and like their fathers they verily believed that in their little gaze they well nigh took in all creation; that their glance at shining specks and bright orbs above, together with the little spot of earth on which their fathers walked, and toiled, and died, and were inhumed, was on the utmost verge of the world.

A few there have been, it is true, who have travelled farther physically, who can scarce be said to have travelled farther in thought. They have visited, it may be, some distant wild or city, to see and breathe; or perchance, urged on by avarice or by penury; and have come back to astonish their neighbours with accounts of forests heavy and large and tall, and of wild beasts; or of the city, with houses high and fine beyond description, and crowded with people thick as grasshoppers; or perhaps they may have looked out upon the broad blue sea, and stolen like the ancient mariners a few leagues just along the shore,—seen a few high waves and breakers, and experienced some gentle gales, thinking, forsooth, that they had learned all the wonders of the world. Some indeed may have crossed the ocean, and become conversant with men and the manners of other climes, or even have gone round the globe, and passed through all the varieties of horizontal change and of terrestrial scenery, and still may scarcely be entitled to the distinction of thinking men; men who have seen, and heard, and thought only from constraint; only because they could not help it without some effort too great for them to attempt. Such have been the mass of men in every age, and still it remains the same. The mass are elevated but little above brutal stupidity, or emptiness of thought. Some seem less gifted with sense, skill, or cunning than even they, being less the creatures of instinct. Their minds, (if it is proper to speak of their existence,) are so like material masses, that they do not appear to have advanced even to the level of the more sagacious of the brute kind. These remarks are not too strong, when applied to such beings as inhabit the Australasian or the South Sea islands, or other countries in a like savage state.

Some there are who have gone still farther, to whom this definition will hardly apply. We allude to the majority of the

learned, as they are improperly called; to those who have sat down in the halls of science, have read the fictions of the poets, the maxims of the philosophers, the mythology of ancient Greece and Rome; have travelled over the lines, or measured the angles indicated to the world by Euclid or Archimedes, have gone over the thoughts of others on some parts of mechanical, metaphysical, or natural science, without venturing to think whether those things were really so, or presuming to push their thoughts or investigations farther; in a word, have taken the mere *ipse dixit*s of others as absolute and unquestionable verities. Are such persons entitled to the appellation of thinking beings; men, whose thoughts, imaginations, and recollections have only passed along the lines which others have travelled. Should one from reading, study, and the cultivation of memory, even attain to the knowledge of Newton or Bacon, would he be entitled to this appellation, if his mind was but the mere repository of others thoughts,—any more than his library might be thus dignified? No; such are not men of independent thought; not the men that advance upon the stores of their predecessors; not the men that will bring to light any of the mysterious causes of nature's operations. These are men who (in the sentiment of Cicero,) “gather a forest of ideas from every shrub and tree that ever has grown, and still have nothing of *their own*.” Such, at best, are but bookworms, that gorge the productions of other's intellects to their own repletion and mental stagnation, and still, like the “daughters of the horse-leech” continue crying, “give, give,” when already filled to satiety. Of this class generally are those who produce the ephemeral productions with which the press in our country is teeming at the present day; men of narrow minds, of intellects so shallow as to be soon filled from the rills that are flowing in upon them, and which of necessity must flow out again, to make room for more, just as the cistern must flow over into which the water is constantly running. Such are the mere pores out of which the thoughts of others issue; the mere retailers of the stores which others have accumulated by hard toil and unceasing diligence. Such are the men, too, bloated with conceit, rather than inspired with wisdom, who substitute the tinsel of verbiage for the sterling gold of perspicuous argument and fair induction; and to such will the prediction of the Egyptian prophet in regard to the Greeks ever be applicable “that they should always continue boys, nor possess either the antiquity of science, or the science of antiquity.”

Let it not be supposed from this, that we disparage, or do not highly appreciate, the importance of extensive learning.

We would, however, suggest it as a query for the consideration of our readers, whether the unprecedented multiplication of books at the present time, is not to be viewed rather as a disadvantage than an advantage; whether the number of books thrown upon our hands does not foster superficial, rather than solid thinking, and promote the habit of reading with inattention, since there is so much to be read? And this especially in regard to the books which are appearing at the present time. In style, indeed, pleasing—beautiful—fascinating—a mere collection of short-lived flowers; while of substance they have none, and of sterling, original, elaborate thought there appears nothing, unless, indeed, (which is not a very rare thing,) it be gold wantonly stolen from some who gave to the world the precious legacy of their own thoughts.

But in regard to independent thinking, as to what it consists in, opinion is various, and the majority, especially of the youthful aspirants for the fame of originality, are in error. Such often imagine it to consist in departing altogether from ancient dogmas of faith and practice, from all received theories and doctrines, and bringing something forth to light different from all that has gone before. Such seems to have been the sentiment of Des Cartes, who, commencing with a denial of all first principles, and like the ancient Pyrrhonists, in doubt of every thing, even of his own existence, and discarding at once all the refined distinctions of the schoolmen, or of the scholastic philosophy prevalent in his age, in the principles of which he had been carefully instructed, produced by going on in his eccentric round a series of the most astonishing hypotheses; accounting for all existences, material and spiritual, all effects and their cause, in a manner as fanciful as new.

In this way may we account for the insane vagaries of Berkeley, the impious speculations of Hume, the controversies of the Scotists and Thomists, and indeed, almost all the dissensions respecting doctrines and forms of worship, that have rent asunder or distracted the Church in every age. It is this same propensity, this same fondness for the reputation of invention, and of independent thinking, to which we must in a great measure impute the departures from the generally received doctrines of the present day. It is not that some new light has darted upon such persons. It is not that, having outwitted their fathers, Prometheus-like, they have climbed up to heaven, and stolen some new fire, which had been before denied to the world. It is not that their eyes, like those of the young man with the prophet Elisha, have been opened to see new chariots of fire round about them. It is not that the word of God speaks a new language, or that its

page is more radiant than in the days of their fathers; but it is rather that they desire to pass, in the acclamations of a world eager of novelty, for those that are original and think for themselves, though it be by the revival or modification of doctrines which obtained prior to the dark ages. This is not to be considered independent thinking, but rather the erratic flight of minds that have lost their proper equilibrium, though we do not mean by this to assert that all such men are destitute of this quality of mind.

No more is that, as we have intimated above, to be dignified with the character of independent thought, which embraces without hesitation any doctrines or sentiments, because others have received them, or because they are embodied in the symbolical books or standards of their persuasions. The independent thinker neither rejects nor receives, till he has examined for himself, unswayed by the sentiments or creeds of others, however ancient or learned. He probes to the bottom for himself; ascertains what is stable, what well founded, and what has but a tottering or unsubstantial base. Such was Thomas Scott, when, through the instrumentality of John Newton, he became a serious inquirer after truth. He received no doctrine or sentiment of others, till he had examined it, till he had weighed it, till he had sifted it through and through for himself. He studied the Bible for himself, and the result was, as we all know, his radical conviction, and cordial reception of those doctrines usually termed Calvinistic.

It is not, then, the discarding or embracing of others' tenets, in which true independence of mind is manifested. It is neither in receiving the Cartesian, or Berkelian, or Newtonian theory in physics, nor in throwing them all aside. It is neither in taking Aristotle, or Bacon, or Locke for our guide, nor in refusing them all. It is neither in adopting the theological creed of Calvin, or Arminius, or Pelagius, nor in departing from them all. But it is, in the admission of first principles, and of every revealed truth, and in arriving for ourselves, with all the light we enjoy, or can consistently have, at the point or doctrine in question; meanwhile praying for light to shine upon our darkened understandings, and for the Spirit of all grace to teach us, and to lead and guide us into all truth. Such, then, are some of the characteristics, feelings, and desires of that mind that is truly free, and uses its freedom.

Of the results of independent thinking, we need not speak, as they are mainly spread out in the pages of history, or in those works which our own hands can handle, which the generations that have preceded us have been loth to let pass into oblivion.

As to the wreck of learning produced by the Saracens, and by the barbarians, in their burning or destruction of books wherever they could find them, of which some have made such lamentation, it may be considered as of little loss to the world, as it was rather the funeral pile of the vast rubbish of heathen mythology, than the occasion of the interment of any true stores of thought and learning. A few volumes, indeed, of the elegant classic writers, perished. But maugre the loss of the works of Thucydides, Xenophon, Sophocles, Cicero, Cæsar, Tacitus, Longinus, and others, there is enough remaining for our perusal; enough with elegant, vigorous, sublime, finished thought in every line, to satisfy the true lovers of science, literature, and the arts, as they then existed. As to Plato, Pythagoras, Epicurus, Zeno, the Stoics—as, in fine, to the ancient poets, historians, mathematicians, astronomers, or philosophers, we have their systems entire, or in sufficient portions before us; we have the hypotheses on which they started, the results to which they came, the ballads they sang, the histories they wrote. Yes, all the productions of *thinking men*, in all past time, that are needful, have come down to us, each affording us its appropriate motives to excite us to diligence, to assiduity, in imitation of their toil, and with hopes of similar or even of far greater success.

Who, in considering the unparalleled influence of Aristotle, and the predominance of his philosophical sentiments in all the schools of theology and philosophy, for more than a thousand years, will not be excited like him to put forth every energy of mind and body, in devising and planning, so that he may influence men to a great degree, and that too, in a nobler, holier, and purer cause? And why was his influence so great, and so lasting? Was it because he surpassed all others that preceded or followed him in the correctness, grandeur, or sublimity of his sentiments? Was it because he was unsparing in his intellectual diligence or mental toil? To this truly it may be in a great measure ascribed, but must it not be imputed in a greater degree to his bringing up his thoughts from the deep recesses of his ardent and powerful mind, and expressing the very breathing lineaments of his soul in the pages he wrote? For Bacon says of him, “he wished,—he longed to establish the same dominion over the minds of men, that his pupil Alexander had established over nations;” and another, in speaking of him, says, that when writing “he dipped his pen in his soul.” Yes, his soul—his soul was in the work; its workings, its feeling, its conceptions, its devisings, yea, its very image, its agony, its panting for mental domination, its grasping as if for life at the very faintest

ray of light or truth afforded by the works of nature, appear in every line, in every thought, in the whole texture of his sentences. Here, here, aside from his diligence, is the secret of his power—the solution of the enigma of his extended reign; and if the lover of Jesus would imitate him, not in his bold fearless thinking, not in his incredible diligence merely, but in his soul's devotion; if, like him, he would "dip his pen in his soul," and write like one of old "for eternity;" if he would infuse his soul into his every thought; if he would speak by it in his every motion for the holiest of causes, then might he, like one in our own day, who is said to have imitated Aristotle in this respect, put into operation a moral power, that should be felt not only while he lived, but that should extend round the globe, and tell on the future weal and destinies of generations yet unborn.

After this digression we need not here stop to speak of Bacon, who succeeded this prince in an age of greater light, nor of his power in the world of mind; nor of Newton, who, in the majesty of thought, yet as the simple "interpreter of nature," raised his mind from the falling of an apple to those laws which govern the revolutions of the planets in their orbits, and perhaps all worlds. We need not name productions like those of Milton and many others, whose names are enshrined in works more enduring than monumental marble, yea, in works that no distant age or clime can ever "let die." Neither need we glance at the independence of mind displayed by John Locke in his imperishable work on the Human Understanding, in which he fearlessly dissented from all the received and popular systems of metaphysical science, and "overleaping at once the Cartesian toll-gate of doubting, was content to take the knowledge of our own existence, upon the authority of intuition, that of God upon the authority of demonstration, and that of external objects upon the authority of our senses." Before him the received systems were either ground to powder, or broken into fragments, that were driven so far apart, as if by some power of repulsion, that there is no chance of their ever coming together again.

In this connexion we might mention Martin Luther, that "miracle of a man," that man possessed "omnium in omnibus,"* who appeared at the very morning twilight of the arts and sciences, when the light was just beginning to interfuse itself with the thick darkness; when superstition every where bore sway; when all called the Pope, Lord, and bowed to his *Holiness*; when corruption was in every rank, from the supreme pontiff down to the meanest mendicant; when alluring baits of vice

* Melancthon.

were venal, not only at Rome but every where; when even the German language (his native tongue) had nought of its raciness, dignity or beauty, but was the mere broken speech of peasants. Of this man, who, though penniless and despised, in humble reliance on the aid of heaven, disenthralled one half the world from popery, the despotism of superstition, and the servile devotion of ignorance, who, by his numerous polemical writings, and by his theological works enriched the language of the learned, and furnished matter for the employment of all the reading world; and who, by his translation of the Bible from the original, (his helps in this work being simply counsellors,) gave form, expressiveness, strength, and beauty to a language that was rude, barbarous, unpolished, and hardly deemed fit to be employed, except by the vulgar. Yea, of this man of bold, independent thought, who in bringing the light of truth to shine on the darkness of error, not only brought the world to see that light, but actually formed a language for *thinking men*, which has remained peculiarly that of such men down to the present day. There are others, on whom we might dwell, who with incredible toil, with untiring assiduity, even to the sacrifice of life, have pursued the study of the Bible, and of whose labours the hard-earned fruits remain to us in many a ponderous volume; as also we might enlarge on that "even diligence" and elaborate biblical investigation, with which many in our own day are reaching and expounding the word of God, whose souls are governed by its pure morality and hallowed precepts.

To these names, these happy results of independent thinking, we have merely adverted as a transition to another topic, which is the *importance, the necessity of this trait of character to ministers of the gospel in our day*; the need of religious teachers, who think for themselves. But who are they that think for themselves, in the sense we have attached to the phrase? Not in general the unpolished rustic, the simple-hearted peasant, or the ignorant heathen; but he who is disciplined, whose mind has been often chained down to sober investigation, whose veneration for names and systems, however great it may be, is lost in the grand determination of examining for himself, of endeavouring alone to view things as they are; in a word, who investigates and balances the opinions of others in his own mind, who does not appeal to men, brethren, and fathers, to ascertain whether these things are so, but who compares them with the standard of everlasting truth, with a readiness and determination to receive them so far as they accord with it, and to reject them, if at variance with its teachings. Such should be the spirit, the inflexible purpose, of every minister of the gospel; and such

must it be with all who would not succumb to popish dictation, or that which is very analogous, even to church standards *without full conviction of their truth*; not indeed relying on the febleness of his own understanding, as if infallible, but seeking the clear light of revelation, and the illuminations and teachings of the Holy Spirit, and using what others have written on points of doctrine and other subjects, with all proper veneration for their memory and learning, simply as helps, not as infallible guides.

This is necessary for every man who expects to expound the word of God, and who would be taught himself, that he may, in humble reliance on Divine goodness, teach others. And the man who does not thus form his own opinions, who does not habituate himself to think thus freely and independently, must expect to meet with insuperable and constant difficulty in his ministerial labours; to be troubled in answering in a manner satisfactory to himself and to others, the various difficult and unexpected questions that may be proposed to him, and for which he had made no provision. To acquire, then, this facility in solving difficulties on the many, many points that come up in theology, on the numerous conflicting passages in the Bible, which the minister professes himself (in being invested with his sacred office) able to teach and explain, we see the necessity of a long course of thorough training.

Aristotle, of whom we before spoke, that prince of philosophers, spent twenty years under the direct instruction of Plato, the wisest man of his age, and subsequently a period of at least ten years in teaching Alexander the Great and others; a method accounted among the best for acquiring thorough learning. Plato himself, styled the divine by ancients, was a pupil to Socrates for about as many as eight years, after attaining to the age of twenty.

Cicero, after having completed his education in his own country and in Greece, is said to have devoted two years to recitation under the tuition of Roscius, the most accomplished tragedian of antiquity.

Demosthenes, after having cultivated his voice for a long time with incredible assiduity on the sea-shore, living in a cave, with his head half shaven, that he might be ashamed to go abroad, is said to have expended a sum amounting to several thousand dollars in the payment of a master of elocution.

The physician and the lawyer spend a number of years in the study of their profession. The skilful mechanic has passed through several years of training, directly for his employment.

And should the minister of Jesus, the teacher of the religion

that came from heaven, not be prepared, not be trained, not be indoctrinated, in *all* that pertains to his profession, as fully as the orator, the physician, the mechanic? yea, at immensely more pains and expense and toil; he that is to direct sin-diseased souls to the balm of Gilead, and the physician that is there, more than the mere applier of remedies to bodily maladies?—he that, by a touch, a movement, a word, may influence the future weal or wo of millions—should not his preparation be most laborious and thorough?

Some say no; he does not need it, he must follow the suggestions of the Spirit; is an argument that could be properly urged only in the age of miracles, though it must be acknowledged that it accords in too great a degree with the practice and sentiments of some Christian denominations.

But in regard to this training, there is a mistake on the minds of many—and that too even of theological students. Some seem to think, that by a mere residence at the college and at the theological seminary, this preparation will be of course acquired; that they are able, by a power inherent in themselves, to fill the mind with learning, or that it is to be received there inertly like the influence of the atmosphere; that it will necessarily come from the oral instructions they receive; from the various authors to which their attention will be directed. This is a sad mistake; something in this way may doubtless be effected, something may thus be insensibly inibited; a person cannot pass his time for years without catching something from the inspiration of the place. But this after all is but little, and too vague to be of any practical value. The truth is, the best teachers, the most elaborate apparatus for instruction, can impart nothing of importance to the passive or inert mind. As means, facilities, they are of immense importance; they may afford us the light of experience to direct our efforts; they may point out our defects, and show the method of correcting them; they may teach us when to study, how to study, what to study, and wherefore to study; but after all, study is the mind's own work; another cannot do it for us, another cannot teach us, without our own co-operation, without our thinking for ourselves; another cannot carry us triumphantly up the hill of science; no, it must be done, if ever done, by our own effort, by the wrenching of our own muscles, by the blood of toil from our own feet, by the indomitable resolution of our own wills, by the independent, vigorous, manly, well directed thought. Nothing short of a miracle can learn us any thing short of this, can advance us a single step, can prepare us in the smallest degree for our work.

But though we might dwell on this part of our subject, and de-

monstrate it to be in accordance both with truth and experience in relation to this matter, by adducing the names, and relating the habits of successful students, our limits admonish us to forbear and draw our remarks to a close. In conclusion, therefore, we would simply say, that with every man it rests, under God, to make himself, or fit himself for what he will—with students of Divinity the whole work of their preparation rests, their entire fitness to contend with the enemy, and to defend the precious legacy of their own and their father's faith—the truth of revelation. The character of the age requires uncommon preparation in the ministers of the gospel. This is an age in which mind has thrown off its shackles, and asserted its freedom; an age more than any other, in which men are thinking freely, and seem fond of being singular; an age when mind is conflicting with mind; a time when infidelity is rallying her troops, and thickening her ranks, and gathering all her forces, for tremendous conflict with the champions of the king of heaven; not the infidelity of a Hobbes or Hume; not the cynical ribaldry of Voltaire, nor the fanatical ravings of Rousseau, nor the sneering of Gibbon, nor the vulgar blasphemy of Paine. It is all these combined, yea, more. It calls in literature and philosophy, astronomy and geology; in fine, all science, and even the Bible itself to its aid. It quotes from the writings of the fathers, from ecclesiastical history, from church canons and civil statutes. It is heard in the cry of union of church and state, and of ecclesiastical bigotry. To compete with this hydra, and cut off his hundred heads does not the minister of Jesus need more than herculean strength?

The Jesuit too has come—learned, subtle, mild, eloquent, long schooled in the nurseries of delusive arts, he has entered our cities, has muttered his religious jargon in the halls of our congress, has followed on, with the rolling tide of our emigration, to the west, and has sat down in the seats of learning there, and imbued the youth with his superstitious mummary; and who is to contend with this commissary of the Old Serpent, who can throw himself into all *his* serpentine windings?—who, do we say—but the minister of the gospel—he, who is now preparing for the sacred office.

The world itself, that has long been slumbering in the darkness of ages, is awaking to see or admire the light of life—its portals on the continents, countries, and islands of our globe, are thrown open, and are extensively inviting the approach of the heralds of life; and who shall respond to the invitation? but the ministers of the gospel, or rather those in a course of preparation for it; yes, brethren, in the gospel ministry, and

preparations for it, yes, brethren in the gospel ministry, and brethren in expectation of it, and more especially of the latter would we inquire, in the view of our responsibility, do we not need strength of body, independence of mind, and singleness and grandeur and devotion of purpose?

ART. IV.—*Standard Works of the Rev. William Jay, of Argyle Chapel, Bath. Comprising all his works known in this country; and also, several which have not heretofore been presented to the American public; from a copy furnished by the Author to the Publishers. In three volumes. Baltimore, Plaskitt & Co. and Armstrong & Plaskitt. 1832.*

THERE is, perhaps, no living preacher who has attracted more attention, and been heard with more pleasure, than the Rev. Mr. Jay. His popularity has not been, like that of some other preachers, a transient burst of applause, but has continued through a long series of years, in a place celebrated, above most, for the refinement of its inhabitants, and visited by multitudes of the highest rank. Mr. Jay's reputation as a pulpit orator, suffers no perceptible diminution. Most persons who visit Bath, though of a different persuasion from the preacher of Argyle chapel, are desirous of gratifying their curiosity, even when there is no higher motive, by hearing this Christian orator; and many of these are persons who, perhaps, have never attended the ministry of any other dissenter. And, indeed, his discourses are so little tinged with any of the peculiarities of his own sect, and so replete with the sentiments of our common Christianity, that none need wonder to find him a favourite preacher with the pious of almost all denominations. His situation, too, as a pastor, in the city of Bath, has rendered his preaching accessible to many who otherwise would not have been likely to attend on his ministry, or on that of any other dissenter.

It often happens, however, that the popularity which eloquent preachers obtain in the pulpit is by no means maintained in their discourses as published from the press. This was remarkably the fact in regard to Whitefield, Kirwan, and other famous orators. Indeed, where the effect on the audience is in a great degree produced by an attractive and impressive delivery, it

cannot be otherwise. The impassioned and penetrating tones, the various expressions of countenance, especially of the eye, the significant and striking gesture, and the emphatic pauses of the orator, are all absent from his discourse, when it appears in print; and these are the circumstances which gave such wonderful effect to the sentiments uttered.

From what we have heard of the simple but fascinating manner, and the mellow and impressive tones of Mr. Jay, we entertain no doubt that his sermons suffer much diminution of force by being transferred to paper; and that we, who only have the opportunity of reading them in print, can form no adequate conception of the charm and power which accompanied them, as delivered by their author from the pulpit. If an orator regarded nothing but his own reputation, he should never permit, if he could avoid it, a single sermon to go to press; since to those who have heard the discourse from his living voice, it will appear flat and insipid; while they who have not heard will be able to form no correct idea of it, as delivered. The truth is, that on paper we have a mere *skeleton* of an impassioned oration as little like the original, pronounced with oratorical expression, as the mere bones of the human frame are like the animated subject.

But we are persuaded that Mr. Jay has been actuated by far higher motives than a regard to his own celebrity as an orator. Having enjoyed the unspeakable privilege of proclaiming the truths of the Gospel, for a long series of years, to every class of society, and having been made an instrument of good to multitudes, he has been led by that pious benevolence which is the animating principle of his life, to aim at the extension of the influence far beyond the narrow sphere which his voice can reach, and to seek usefulness, not only in the present generation of men, but among those also who may come after him.

To enable our readers to form a correct judgment of the character of Mr. Jay, as a public preacher, we subjoin two sketches, the first taken from a recent English publication, entitled "THE GEORGIAN ERA;" the other extracted from an unpublished letter of a distinguished American preacher, who, while on a visit to Europe, became intimately acquainted with Mr. Jay.

The anonymous writer, just referred to, furnishes us with the following striking sketch:

"This celebrated pastor was born at Tisbury, Wiltshire, on the 8th of May, 1769. Being of humble parentage, he was educated at a school in his native village, until having, through the avidity displayed in the pursuit of knowledge, obtained an intro-

duction to the Rev. Cornelius Winter, as a youth possessing abilities, which, if they could be improved, might render him useful, he was admitted to that gentleman's establishment for young men intended for the dissenting ministry. In this seminary his progress as a student was so rapid, that at the age of sixteen, he was encouraged to enter the pulpit; and so successful were his juvenile efforts as a preacher, that he was invited to the metropolis, where he officiated for two months, at Rowland Hill's chapel, in Blackfriar's-road.

“Modestly declining a regular pastoral charge, on account of his youth and inexperience, he now retired to a village near Chippenham, where he zealously prosecuted his theological studies, and occasionally preached to the poor inhabitants, for about two years; at the end of which period, having then, although scarcely of age, delivered upwards of one thousand discourses, he was with some difficulty persuaded to officiate at Hope chapel, Stotwells; when after the expiration of a few months he removed to Bath, having, at the earnest recommendation of his predecessor, when at the point of death, been chosen minister of the Independent congregation in that city, on the 31st of January, 1793. Argyle chapel, the meeting-house of his hearers, has, since that period, on account of his popularity, been repeatedly enlarged; and whenever he has officiated at other places, great crowds have invariably been attracted to his pulpit.

“In 1798, at the request of the Evangelical Society, he preached for a few weeks in Ireland; and it appears to have been his custom, since his first essay in Rowland Hill's chapel, to officiate there regularly once a year. On these occasions, it is said, that above sixty ministers and students in divinity have sometimes been counted among his hearers. In 1810, the College of Princeton, in America, conferred on him the degree of D.D. on account of his reputation as a pulpit orator, and the great merit of his literary productions. Mr. Jay has attained a high degree of reputation, both as a preacher and an author. In his discourses, many of which have been frequently reprinted, he is said to display a deep and chastened spirit of piety, combined with an extraordinary power of so revealing the deceitfulness of the human heart, as to arrest the progress of religious delusion. He always brings home his subjects to every man's business and bosom; and never leaves truth in a state of speculation, but renders it practical and experimental in all its bearings. According to a writer in the *European Magazine*, his eloquence is sometimes highly animated, but more commonly tender and pathetic.

“His voice is described by the same writer, as possessing such

peculiar 'witcherics,' that by the enunciation of a single sentence, he has often been known to produce the most singular emotions in his hearers; yet he appears to be so utterly destitute of affectation, that Sheridan characterized him as being the most perfectly natural orator he had ever heard.

"His general observations are, an account of the practical and perspicuous style of his preaching, so frequently applicable to individuals among his congregation, that he has been accused of descending to undignified personalities; a charge totally destitute of foundation, nothing being at greater variance with the tenor of his conduct and life than such a practice. It has also been excepted against him that he is too *textual* in his sermons; but in reply, it has been triumphantly observed, that his intimate knowledge of the sacred writings enabled him to clothe his ideas, in scriptural language, than which nothing, under such circumstances, from the lips of a divine, can be more powerful, or in better taste. His sermons, of which he merely sketches the outline in manuscript, and adds the details extemporaneously, are frequently embellished with appropriate anecdotes. In the Monthly Review, it is observed, 'that his discourses are regular without being formal; animated without being rhapsodical; and explanatory without being paraphractical.' 'His principles,' says the same writer, 'are tinged with Calvinism, rather than rigidly Calvinistic; and while he boldly avows his own convictions, he evinces the greatest liberality of sentiment.'"

The American divine, whose letter we are permitted to publish, writes thus:

"Your letter making inquiries respecting the Reverend Mr. Jay, I have just received. When I was in England I had the pleasure of visiting him at his residence in Bath, and afterwards passed several days in his company at Bristol; and I can truly say that few persons of whom I have known little or much, have ever left on my mind so delightful an impression respecting their character. Nevertheless I fear I shall be able but very imperfectly to meet the object of your request. The few facts which I know respecting him, and the general impressions which I collected from the short acquaintance to which I have referred, I will give you as they occur to me.

"Mr. Jay, if I have been correctly informed, was born of very obscure parentage, in a town, the name of which I do not now recollect, not very remote from the place of his present residence. The earliest incident of his life that I have heard, was his being taken up and educated by the Rev. Cornelius Winter. This venerable man, as has been represented to me, was preach-

ing before an association of ministers, and was particularly attracted by the uncommonly interesting and devout appearance of a little boy whom he observed in the congregation. This boy proved to be William Jay; and Mr. Winter immediately resolved that, if providence should seem to favour it, he would make an effort to bring him into the ministry. The boy was delighted with the proposal, and his parents readily consented to it; and he was immediately taken into Mr. Winter's family, with a view to be trained for the sacred office. Winter is said to have regarded him with more than parental fondness; and to have been impressed from the beginning with the conviction, that in educating this youth he was rendering a most important service to the church. Jay has fully reciprocated the warm attachment of his venerable friend and benefactor, and never speaks of him but with filial gratitude and veneration. I remember to have heard him say, that he had known but one man who had apparently so much of heavenly-mindedness as Mr. Winter, and that was John Newton. Mr. Jay began to preach while he was a mere boy; for Robert Hall informed me that at the age of sixteen, his popularity as a preacher was so great, that he was advertised in the public papers as 'the prodigy.' At an early period he was settled in Bath, where he has remained, the pastor of a large and flourishing independent church, ever since. There is no minister of any denomination in that part of England, perhaps not in any part of it, who is equally popular, both in the established church and with dissenters; and no one, I presume, who is so often called from home to preach on special occasions. He is a great favourite with Wilberforce and Mrs. Hannah More, both of whom have at different periods attended upon his ministry, and have often expressed the highest admiration of his talents and character. The same admirable spirit of Christian liberality which pervades all his writings, comes out in every thing that he says and does; and I am sure that no Christian, let his denomination be what it may, who is not bound hand and foot with the cords of bigotry, can hear him converse without being strongly attracted towards him as a brother in the liberal and holy fellowship of the Gospel.

"The preparation which Mr. Jay makes for the pulpit is substantially the same with that of most of the English dissenters. He carefully arranges his thoughts, and writes a full outline, trusting to the suggestions of the moment for appropriate language. The sermon which I heard from him (and I had the pleasure of hearing *but* one) was of this character; but he spoke with such perfect correctness, that I could not imagine that the language could have been at all improved if the discourse had

been carefully written. His manner in the pulpit is altogether attractive. His person is dignified; his countenance singularly expressive, combining at once mildness and energy; his voice melodious and sufficiently commanding; his gesture natural and graceful, without the least attempt at parade: in short, I can conceive of nothing that is wanting to render him a fine model of public speaking. At the same time I ought to say that neither the matter nor the manner of his preaching seemed to me adapted to awaken the strongest and deepest emotions: no one, I imagine, could hear him without being delighted and edified; and yet I do not suppose he ever takes his audience up, and bears them away as Robert Hall sometimes did with the rapidity of a whirlwind and the majesty of a storm. The sermons which he has given to the public, are, I understand, a fair specimen of his ordinary preaching; and I remember to have heard it remarked by one of his constant hearers, that his weekly lectures on which he bestowed little or no effort in the way of preparation, were frequently of a much higher order than his sermons on the Sabbath. He is about sixty-three years old, has unusually vigorous health, and for aught that appears, may retain his activity and usefulness for many years to come.

“Few men can render themselves so interesting as Mr. Jay, in all the intercourse of life. His inventive mind, and fine spirit, and good humour, throw a charm over his conversation which every one feels who is privileged with his acquaintance. You discover in his remarks in private the same aptness of expression and felicity of illustration for which he is so much distinguished in the pulpit. For instance, to an inquiry which I made of him respecting the state of his family, he replied that he had one child *with* Christ, three *in* Christ, and two *near* Christ. Speaking of hearing three sermons on the Sabbath, he remarked that they rather *battered* the mind than *impressed* it. He is exceedingly charitable in the judgments which he forms of others, and keeps you constantly impressed with the conviction, that while he is really a great man, he is utterly unconscious of it. It is hardly necessary to add that his conversation, while it is uncommonly free from religious cant, exhibits a most familiar acquaintance with the word of God, and a deep and earnest piety. In short, I think I may say with the consent of all who know him, that he is equally attractive as a man, exemplary as a Christian, and engaging and eloquent as a preacher.”

But the works of Mr. Jay, contained in the volumes now presented to the American public through the press, do not consist chiefly of sermons, but of meditations and prayers, intended to

aid the devotions of the pious, and of some pieces of interesting Christian biography.

The writings of the Rev. Mr. Jay are remarkably adapted to be useful to professing Christians. They do, in fact, supply an important *desideratum* in our system of practical instruction. It has long been a subject of regret, that the Christian public has been so poorly supplied with aids to devotion; especially, the devotions of the closet. The necessity of works of this description can scarcely be doubted by any one, who knows how difficult it is for common Christians to confine their thoughts, or to recollect such scriptural truths, as are needful for meditation. These impediments to the pleasant and profitable attendance on devotional exercises, have proved a great discouragement and hinderance to many serious Christians. Now, if such persons are supplied with judicious and evangelical manuals, containing appropriate reflections and meditations, and also forms of prayer couched in scriptural language, and adapted to the various conditions in which believers are found, there is reason to think, that the time devoted to the exercises of the closet would not only be spent much more pleasantly, but that there would be a much more rapid advancement in the divine life.

It has, indeed, been admitted by all judicious persons, that the composition of such works as have been referred to, is no easy task; and it must have been confessed, that most of the attempts to prepare such helps for the pious, have not been altogether successful. They have, sometimes, been written in a style too florid or artificial; or they have been wanting in vivacity; or deficient in that pure fervour, which is the essence of all devotional compositions. How seldom do we meet with a prayer, in print, which combines gravity with perspicuity and simplicity; evangelical fervour with exact propriety of expression, and which contains no allusion unsuitable to the solemnity of an address to the Deity, and nothing so quaint and low, as to create disgust in the minds of the greatest refinement. In pious meditations and reflections, it is a rare thing to meet with an author, who has been able to hit that peculiar style which properly belongs to devotional compositions: for, often, while we approve the sentiments and piety of the discourse, we cannot but be sensible, that on account of its dullness, or some other defect, we soon grow weary of it; so that we find it to require an effort to finish what is intended for one occasion. There may, indeed, be a fault in the reader, a want of spiritual appetite, which renders him fastidious, and causes him soon to become weary of these holy exercises; but what we need, is something which may prove a remedy for this very disease; and something, which by

its pungency will penetrate the stupid mind; by its vivacity will enliven the dull feelings; and by its heavenly matter elevate the grovelling affections of the heart. Now, it seems to us that Mr. Jay has come nigher to what is needful in such compositions, than most of his predecessors. There are, indeed, a few devotional pieces in the English language, which possess so much of the simple dignity, and pure, pious aspiration, which should characterise devotional compositions, that we almost despair of seeing any thing equal to them. Of this kind are the *SACRA PRIVATA* of bishop Wilson; and various prose compositions in *HICK'S DEVOTIONS*. Dr. Watts, who excelled so much in infusing the genuine spirit of devotion into his poetical compositions, has availed himself freely of the last mentioned collection. Some of his sweetest and most experimental hymns, are nothing more than a version of some of the pieces referred to.

It is a pleasing fact, that such works as these are in demand, and have the prospect of being widely circulated; and as far as there has been an expression of public opinion, it is altogether favourable to these devotional compositions of Mr. Jay. Already, have several of these volumes been stereotyped in this country; and in this edition the whole of Mr. Jay's works now, for the first time, offered to the American public, prepared from stereotype plates, and in such a form, as will render the work attractive in its exterior appearance. The zeal and enterprise of our booksellers, in furnishing the public with cheap and handsome editions of the best European productions, is deserving of high commendation. We think, however, that they frequently err, by too rigidly consulting economy. The fashion of condensing two or three volumes into one, may bring the work to purchasers at a lower price, and thus the number of copies put into circulation may be greater; but a book is only useful so far as it is read; and if we do not greatly mistake the state of the fact, this method of publishing books has the effect of diminishing the number of readers: for it is a painful task for aged and weak eyes, to peruse a volume, in which so much matter is condensed in a page. We are happy to observe that the publishers have wisely avoided the error of which we speak, by selecting a type sufficiently large for all eyes.

To return to Mr. Jay, we would observe, that he excels in vivacity, perspicuity, and point. His sentences are commonly very short, and he adopts words which are familiar to the common reader. There is often also an original turn of thought which serves to keep attention awake; and, uniformly, the exhibition of an excellent spirit. No man can read these volumes without being deeply impressed with the conviction, that the

heart of the author is deeply imbued with piety and benevolence; and that his temper is in all respects benign and amiable. But that, which, above every other property, characterizes the style of these compositions, is, the frequent and felicitous introduction of Scripture language. It is easy for any man to quote a multitude of texts from the Bible, which have some relation to the subject in hand; but it is not common for a writer to cite passages of Scripture as frequently as is done by Mr. Jay, and yet always avoid a strained and unnatural application. This single trait in the character of the style of these volumes is of inestimable value, and will go far to secure their continued popularity; and it is an excellence which no man could attain without a long and thorough acquaintance with the Bible; not merely with its doctrines and sentiments, but with the very words, which have been selected to convey to us the mind of the Spirit, speaking in the Scriptures. Another thing in which this pious and amiable writer has been successful in overcoming an obvious difficulty, is in maintaining an agreeable variety in his remarks. In works where something was required to be said for every day in the year, twice over, it was no easy task to avoid falling into a frequent sameness of thought and expression; for what would be suitable for one day would be so for another, and the best memory cannot recollect all that has been said in the composition of so many pieces. No doubt, a very exact scrutiny might lead to the detection of some repetitions; and it might be shown that the same train of thought and mode of expression can be found in different parts of these EXERCISES; but it is rather remarkable, that sameness has been so successfully avoided; and that so great a variety of thought and illustration has been exhibited, by the ingenious author. Undoubtedly this has been an object constantly kept in view, and assiduously prosecuted; and that deservedly, for in a work of this kind, variety is absolutely necessary, to keep up attention.

It may be a question, whether Mr. Jay, in his CLOSET EXERCISES for every day in the year, and in his EVENING EXERCISES for every day in the year, has not furnished us with more matter than was needed. At first view, we were inclined to adopt this opinion; but upon second thoughts, we have been more disposed to acquiesce in the plan of the judicious author. For, if the pious find themselves instructed and edified by the reflections which he has prepared for the morning, will they not wish to enjoy a similar aid and benefit, at their evening devotions? Certainly, helps are as much needed at one period as the other; and what objection can there be to the plan of having a devout medi-

tation, associated not only with every day in the year, but with every season of regular devotion?

And this leads us to remark, that this method of associating certain instructions with each day, has a sensibly good effect on all minds. Every person, when he takes up such a book, prefers reading the lesson for the day, rather than any other; and with the common people, all books founded on this plan are pleasing and popular.

Indeed, this method of associating particular lessons, prayers, and meditations for every day, must be founded on some common principles of our nature; for, from the earliest times of Christianity, certain portions of Scripture were appropriated to certain days; and the custom seems to have been universal, as appears by the directions which are found in the most ancient versions of the New Testament; and from the ancient tables of lessons, to be read, on Sundays and other days. If this method had no other advantage than that of fixing the attention at once, it would be a recommendation of it; for, often, the mind for want of some circumstance to decide its choice of a passage, wanders from thing to thing, and thus time is lost, and the thoughts are scattered.

The intelligent reader will observe a considerable difference of style in these several works. In the volume of sermons, which Mr. Jay first published, there is much more study of elegance, than in his later writings. Indeed, the style of these sermons some would call ambitious; but every thing is in good taste; and beauties of this kind may have the effect of attracting and charming the youthful reader; and nothing should be neglected which can be turned to advantage in winning souls to Christ. The preacher should choose out acceptable words, that his salutary doctrines may be conveyed to the hearts of his hearers, so as to produce their proper effect. Paul became all things to all men, that he might gain some. Ministers of the Gospel are fishers of men, and he would be considered an unskilful or careless fisherman, who neglected to bait his hook. We should not therefore condemn all attentions to the decorations of style, if these be sought, not for vainglory, but with a view to benefit certain classes of hearers. The other sermons contained in these volumes, entitled "THE CHRISTIAN CONTEMPLATED," are, in our opinion, among the happiest efforts of the author's pen. The design is simple, yet beautiful. A comprehensive but just view is taken of the Christian, as being *in Christ*, as he appears in the closet—in the family—in the church—in the world—in prosperity—in adversity—in spiritual sorrows—in spiritual joys—in death—in the grave—and in heaven. This outline is filled

Up by the ingenious author with great felicity of thought and expression. A rich vein of practical and experimental piety pervades these discourses; and they are well adapted to persons in every condition of life. These lectures, we would, therefore, cordially recommend to the perusal of all who wish to read for edification; and we can scarcely conceive how any serious reader can arise from the perusal of these short and pithy discourses, without deriving from them, real benefit, as well as experience sensible pleasure. And this leads us to remark, that all the compositions of Mr. Jay are so carefully guarded, that nothing can be found in them calculated to wound the feelings of pious persons, who do not agree with him in all points of doctrine, or church order. These devotional helps may with pleasure and profit be used by all sincere Christians. There is, however, no disingenuous concealment of the truth, nor any indifference to it; but when evangelical truth is viewed in its connexion with the feelings of devotion, it has nothing in it which can be offensive to any mind imbued with genuine piety.

Mr. Jay's 'Life of Winter,' which I believe was his first publication, is a very interesting piece of biography, and brings us into acquaintance with one of the best men who ever lived. This work acquires also a peculiar interest from the relation which subsisted between the subject of the Memoir, and the writer; and from the facts here disclosed, relative to the early history of Mr. Jay, and the circumstances connected with his youthful piety and preparation for the Gospel ministry. How wonderful are the dispensations of God's Providence! A little boy, in the most humble circumstances, is raised up to be an eminent minister of the Gospel, enlightening and blessing thousands by his popular and evangelical preaching, in one of the gayest societies in the world; and, now, by his published works, diffusing the light of truth still more extensively, and enjoying the rare privilege of fanning the flame of devotion at ten thousand altars, on both sides of the Atlantic. Such a man must enjoy a sweet satisfaction in contemplating the providence of God towards himself; and in a mind so thoroughly imbued with the spirit of piety as that of Mr. Jay, the consideration of what God has wrought by his instrumentality, will not so much tend to elevation, as to deep humility, and unfeigned gratitude. For, the interrogatory, "who maketh thee to differ?" will be ever present, and also that "what hast thou, which thou hast not received?" His *Life of Clark* is also an interesting work.

Mr. Jay's 'Prayers for the use of families' is a useful book. Many ought to pray in their families, who have neither the confidence nor the readiness of conception and utterance, requisite

to lead in prayer, to the edification of others. Such persons should feel no scruple about making use of such forms of prayer as are here provided. If the heart be sincere, it matters not whether we pray in our own words, or those of another. And there are few persons who may not at times derive benefit from the perusal of well-composed forms of prayer; pertinent and seasonable petitions, happily expressed, often have the effect of exciting the desires of which they are the expression.

As to the matter of these prayers, there is scarcely any room to find fault, for they are almost entirely made up of the language of Scripture. This book may also serve as an excellent manual for candidates for the ministry, who wish to get their minds enriched with Scripture phrases, suitable to be used in prayer. And here, we would remark, that, considering how much the edification of the people of God depends on the manner in which this part of public worship is performed, too little attention is given to the preparation. Clergymen will spend many days in the composition of a sermon, to be delivered to the people, and scarcely allow as many minutes to the preparation of a prayer, to be addressed to God, in the name of the whole congregation.

We are pleased to find, in these volumes also, several valuable discourses on the subject of marriage. The duty of Christians to marry "in the Lord," and not to be "unequally yoked with unbelievers," is urged by many weighty considerations. The chief difficulty on this subject is to ascertain the extent of the prohibition; but when there is a doubt, it is always best to lean to the safe side.

The discourse on *the duties of husbands and wives* is deserving of attention. It is a judicious and seasonable admonition on a subject not often treated in sermons. And the discourse entitled "THE WIFE'S ADVOCATE," contains a solemn, tender, and faithful expostulation with husbands in relation to the treatment of their wives. There is, perhaps, no more cruel tyranny in the world than that which is exercised by husbands towards those whom they have solemnly vowed to love and honour. A faithful notice of secret crimes from the pulpit, and from the press is peculiarly necessary. It is but a small part of the crimes which are committed by men, which can be reached by the civil law. It is highly important, therefore, that religious teachers should endeavour to prevent such crimes by representing them in their public discourses so clearly and pointedly as to affect the consciences of the guilty.

The friendly relation and affectionate regard which is often found to subsist between eminent and pious men, who belong to different denominations, and occupy widely different stations in

society, is a subject of pleasing contemplation. This remark has been elicited by observing that Mr. Jay has dedicated his "EVENING EXERCISES" to WILLIAM WILBERFORCE, Esq.; in which he gave us to understand, that this eminent philanthropist and Christian had acted the part of a faithful friend and counsellor towards him when he first appeared before the public as a preacher of the Gospel; and that the friendly relations then formed, had not, in the space of forty years, been interrupted. There are few living men in the world, to whom more of the good influence at this time pervading the world can be traced, than to that of this patriarch of liberty, who now totters on the verge of the grave—or ought we not rather to say, of heaven? This eminent civilian will stand up in strong relief, in the history of the age, and his character will be more approved and admired, than any of the mighty men who wielded the sceptre of power, or who contended for empire in the grand arena, amidst garments rolled in blood. WILBERFORCE, the friend of liberty, the friend of man, the advocate of the truth, and the humble disciple of the meek and lowly Saviour, is a name that will be in everlasting remembrance, and will be pronounced with veneration and gratitude, in the four quarters of the world, until time shall be no more.

ARTICLE VII.—*A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, with a translation and various Excursus. By Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover.* Andover: printed and published by Flagg & Gould. New York: J. Leavitt, No. 182, Broadway. 1832. *pp. 576.

PROFESSOR Stuart's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans is, undoubtedly, one of the most important productions of the American press. Whether we consider the importance of the subjects which it discusses, or the research and learning which it displays, it is clearly entitled to this elevated rank. Every reader must observe that the author is familiar with all the usual sources of modern criticism, that he has been long trained in the school of philological interpretation, that he is habituated to minute examination, and that, on all ordinary matters, he has a clearness of view, and a perspicuity and order of style and method which confer on his work a great and lasting value. This value

is greatly enhanced by the consideration, that Professor Stuart, having formed himself on the modern German school of expositors, has produced a work very different from the usual productions of the English school. These latter are generally doctrinal and practical, rather than philological. However important works constructed after the English model may be to the general, and even the professional reader, yet, for the careful student of the Scriptures, who is desirous of ascertaining with accuracy and certainty, the meaning of the word of God, there can be no question, that the German is immeasurably the better and the safer plan. There can be no solid foundation for theological opinion, but the original text of Scripture fairly interpreted. We have, therefore, long been in the habit of regarding Professor Stuart as one of the greatest benefactors of the Church in our country, because he has been the principal means of turning the attention of the rising generation of ministers to this method of studying the Bible. This, we doubt not, is the great service of his life; a service for which the whole Church owes him gratitude and honour, and which will be remembered when present differences and difficulties are all forgotten. We do him, therefore, unfeigned homage as the great American reformer of biblical study, as the introducer of a new æra, and the most efficient opponent of metaphysical theology. Alas, that he should himself have fallen on that very enchanted ground, from which it was the business and the glory of his life to withcall his younger brethren!

In perfect consistency with this high opinion of Professor Stuart's services, and of the value of his work, we still think the latter has very numerous and very serious faults. The first and most fatal seem to have arisen from his not having discovered, before writing the 542d page, "that his main design was *commentary*, and not *didactic theology*." The work is too theological. The frequent discussions of this nature, in which the author indulges, are rather out of place, in a work of this kind, and are, moreover, singularly unfortunate. It is in these discussions the writer has most signally failed; misapprehended the subject in debate; misconceived the meaning of the authors whom he quotes; contradicted himself; done violence to his own theoretical rules of interpretation, and gratuitously denounced doctrines, which have not only always been regarded as part of the common faith of Protestant christendom, but which he himself over and over either asserts or implies. Evidence of the justice of these remarks will be given as we proceed.

A second fault in the work is, that the author is not sufficiently independent. We are by no means fastidious on this subject.

We think that any man, who addresses himself to write a commentary, would be very unwise to turn his back on all that has been done, and commence by running over the immense field of classical, oriental, and rabbinical literature collecting materials for himself. It is enough, if he is acquainted with the storehouses already provided, and is able from these resources to bring to bear on the interpretation which he adopts, all the scattered lights which they afford. It is, therefore, no just ground of complaint that Professor Stuart has contented himself with arranging the materials prepared to his hands. In this he does nothing more than Koppe, Rosenmüller, and most others of the same class have done before him. But we think he has allowed himself to be too much indebted to a few favourite authors. So large a portion of the critical remarks, the literature, illustrations, and general views contained in his work is to be found in theirs, (especially in Tholuck's,) as to furnish evidence of their undue ascendancy over his mind.

There is another evidence of this fault to be found in the opinions which are advocated in this work. These opinions are not only different, at least on some points, from those which Professor Stuart has been commonly considered as entertaining, but the manner in which they are presented, and the grounds on which they are supported, evince that they have been adopted under external influence. Some years ago Professor Stuart was led to present as correct, the lowest of the modern views of the nature of the sonship of Christ. This, we are happy to see, he has rejected. But that he should make the apostle say, Rom. i. 4, Christ was constituted the Son of God "*according to his pneumatic state or condition,*" (*κατα πνευμα ἀγιωσυνης*), on the reasons which he assigns, is, as we think, sufficiently strange. His fondness for such authors as Döderlein and Bretschneider seem to have moulded very much his views on the doctrines of sin, imputation, and depravity. Such writers, halfway between orthodox and neological, are very unsafe guides for a Calvinist to follow. To adopt the views of such men, is like putting a piece of new cloth into an old garment, or new wine into old bottles. There is an entire want of coherence between the old views on *grace, regeneration, and election*; and these new views on *sin, ability, and depravity*. And we should consider it impossible that Professor Stuart, retaining the former, as he no doubt does, should ever, if left to himself, have adopted the latter. He has come by them, not from the careful interpretation of Scripture, nor from independent ratiocination, but from being captivated by the plausible presentation of them in his favourite authors. Evidence of this, as before remarked, is to be found in the man-

ner in which they are presented and supported, and the concomitants with which they are held. The force of these remarks will be felt only by those who will take the trouble to read both sides, and to examine these authors for themselves. These remarks may appear to Professor Stuart to be unkind and perhaps unjust. In our judgment they are neither the one nor the other; and yet it is natural that he should think them to be both. He, no doubt, is unconscious of the influence of certain works over his mind. Men of ardent temperament are generally very little aware of the extent to which they are governed. Views, which they either read or hear, appear so plain, and affect them so strongly, that they seize them with an avidity, which makes them feel that they are their own, in every sense of the word; that they never thought differently, and never can. And yet, a week, perhaps, has not passed before different views are presented, which, if they come from a source which excites no prejudice, are in their turn, embraced with the same confidence, and with the same conviction that the contrary never was believed. This mental temperament, though it is attended by the evil of instability, and a liability to be governed, and even duped, when we least expect it, is associated with many excellencies. These Professor Stuart has. To these he is indebted for his fame and his usefulness; these have made him instead of dully erudite, the inspiring and eloquent leader of American biblical scholars.

There is another result of the temperament to which we have referred, the evils of which are visible in the work before us. Opinions are matters of feeling, instead of being founded on evidence and argument. Hence they are rejected as soon as the feeling subsides, or is changed, unless some permanent feeling, such as pride of character, or *esprit du corps*, be enlisted in their behalf. In all such cases, therefore, there is not only a want of independence on the influence of others, but peculiarly on one's own prejudices and prepossessions. A thing is true or false to such a mind, as it is agreeable, or the reverse. And if, as Professor Stuart strongly expresses it, a man feels that he must be made over again, before he can believe a certain doctrine, the only way is to make him over, reason and argument will never alter his opinion. We think that no man can fail to observe that Professor Stuart's rejection of certain doctrines, is the result of a mere prejudice awakened in his mind, and strengthened into an antipathy. That he was never led to it by the process of interpretation is clear, in the first place, from the evident labour which it has cost him to force even his own mind to accede to his interpretations; and in the second, that he admits propositions which involve every one of the offensive

principles involved in the doctrines, which he rejects. Here then is precisely the point where Professor Stuart is most deceived. Just when he thinks himself most independent, because he differs from his former self and his present friends, is he most obviously led by other writers, and his own prejudices.

Again; this work is, in many of its parts, altogether too prolix. The reader becomes fatigued before he reaches any definite conclusion, or he is offended by having more said than is necessary for his satisfaction. This fault may arise from a desire of saying all that ever has been said, or that can be said, upon a given subject; or from a writer's having no clear idea of what it is he wishes to say. He is thus led to a tiresome repetition of efforts, in hopes that each succeeding trial may bring him nearer to the point.

But it is not our purpose to dwell on such matters. We should not, indeed, have thought it worth while to say even thus much on the general character of the work, if we did not consider it important that students of theology should be put a little on their guard, and not take it for granted that every thing written in a commentary is correct. The fact is, there is more danger of receiving on authority what is presented in this form, than in any other. A commentary is like a dictionary; a book to be consulted rather than read;* to which one goes to ask a question and receive an answer; to see, in the one case, what a word, and in the other, what a passage means. The mind thus places itself in the posture of a mere passive recipient. From this condition it should be roused, and made to feel that the statements of such works are not to be received, without examination.

It is a difficult task to review a commentary satisfactorily. It would be of little use to go over the chapters in detail, and commend the instances of happy interpretation. And to attempt to refute those of a contrary character, would require us to write a commentary ourselves. We intend, therefore, to pass by much that we think excellent, and much that we think erroneous, and to confine our attention, at least for the present, to Professor Stuart's exposition of Rom. v. 12—19, and the Excursus therewith connected. This is the most characteristic and important part of his work.

It cannot be denied that this passage is a very difficult portion of the word of God. As such it has always been regarded, and

* And this, we may remark in passing, is the main reason why we have not before noticed Professor Stuart's book. Not having had occasion to attend especially to the Epistle to the Romans, since the publication of this commentary, we never read more than a few pages of it until within these few days.

must still be considered, after all that has been written on the subject. Still, we have no hesitation in saying, the grand difficulty is to get round it. It inculcates a doctrine which many men are very unwilling to admit. To get rid of this doctrine, is the difficulty. *Hinc illae lachrymae.* Hence these lamentations over its obscurity. A similar obscurity rests, in view of many, over the ninth chapter of this epistle; and for a similar reason. Now, we venture to assert, that those who have no special prejudice against the doctrine of imputation, and the federal headship of Adam and Christ, are not so much disposed to complain of the obscurity of the passage before us. It is only when a man is predetermined that it does not, and that it *shall* not, teach either these doctrines, or that of the transmission of a corrupt nature, that he is so much at a loss to know what it does teach; and it is really enough to move any one's commiseration, to see such a man as Professor Stuart so obviously and hopelessly in conflict with the plain meaning and argument of the Apostle; fruitlessly struggling to disengage himself from its toils, forced to admit what he denies, and teach what he rejects, travelling backwards and forwards bewildered in the mazes of own exposition. We feel entitled to express this confidence, in the first place, because we feel it; in the second, because the great body of impartial commentators, not merely Calvinistic, but Pelagian, Neological and Infidel, agree in every essential part of the ordinary view; and thirdly, because the objections to this interpretation are all *theological*: we say all, because those of an exegetical character are hardly worthy of consideration. But let us proceed.

According to the common view of this passage, it naturally resolves itself into four parts:—

I. Verse 12, which contains this general proposition: All men die, or are regarded and treated as sinners, on account of Adam—*i. e.* of his sin.

II. Verses 13 and 14, which prove this proposition. The proof is this: the *universality* of death, can in no other way be accounted for. Neither the law of Moses, nor the law of nature, is sufficiently extensive to account for *all* bearing this penalty; therefore it must be, that men are subject to death, on account of Adam.

He is therefore a type of Christ—that is, there is this striking point of resemblance between them: as we are condemned on account of the one, so are we justified on account of the other.

III. Verses 15, 16, 17, are a commentary on this proposition, by which it is at once illustrated and limited.

1. In the first place, if it is consistent with the divine character, that we should die for the offence of one, *how much more*, that we should live for the righteousness of one.

2. We are condemned in Adam, for *one* sin only; Christ saves us from *many*.

3. Christ not only saves us from evil, but advances us to a state of endless life and glory; (or this verse 17 may be considered as a repetition and amplification of the 15th.)

IV. Verses 18, 19, resume and carry out the sentiment and comparison of verse 12th. As we are condemned for the offence of one, so are we justified by the righteousness of another; for, if on account of the disobedience of one, we are regarded and treated as sinners, so on account of the obedience of the other, we are regarded and treated as righteous.

Verses 20 and 21 form the conclusion of the chapter, and are designed—1st. to answer the natural objection, that this view of the method of salvation makes the law useless; and, 2d. that the grace of God in the gospel of his Son, superabounds and triumphs over sin, however produced or increased.

In this analysis, we have stated in general terms the meaning of the several portions of the passage. The correctness of this statement, and the force of the several subordinate clauses, we shall endeavour to exhibit as we proceed.

Professor Stuart, in his introduction to chap. vi., viii., properly remarks, that correct views as to the general course of a writer's thoughts in a given passage, "is a *sine qua non* to a right exegesis of the whole. How can we correctly explain a writer, unless we rightly apprehend his aim, and the scope of his discourse? It is impossible," &c. p. 249. It will, therefore, not be questioned, that it is a matter of no little importance, to ascertain the design and scope of the Apostle in the passage before us. On this subject, there are various opinions: we shall give but three—

1. Some say the Apostle's main design is, to exalt our views of the blessings procured by Christ, and to show that these blessings superabound over all the evils of the fall.

2. Others say, that his object is, to counteract the narrow-minded prejudices of the Jews, by showing, that as the evils of the fall extended to all, Gentiles as well as Jews, so do the blessings of the gospel.

3. Others think, that his design is, to illustrate the great gospel truth of justification on the grounds of the merits of Jesus Christ, by a reference to the other grand analogous fact in the history of our race—the condemnation of men, on the ground of the demerit of Adam; and thus answer the natural objection, How can the merit of one man justify others?

Professor Stuart says, p. 200, that the first view here given is so obviously correct, that "the most unpractised critic can hardly fail to discern the general object, as thus stated." If he is wrong

here, it will, on his own principles, be no wonder that he is wrong all the way through; and that he is wrong, we think no critic, practised or unpractised, can fail to discern, who will attend to the few following considerations. In the first place, the idea of the superabounding of the blessings of the gospel over the evils of the fall, is not expressly stated until the 21st verse, (that is, until the whole comparison is gone through with); and then, in immediate connexion with the question, For what purpose did the law enter? Secondly, although this idea is contained in verses 15, 16, 17, yet, as Professor Stuart admits, these verses are parenthetical, and, of course, might be left out, and still the main design be expressed. As verses 13, 14, are subordinate to verse 12, and verses 15, 16, 17, to the last clause of verse 14, it is evident that verses 12, 18 and 19 must contain the main idea of the passage. In these verses, the idea of the superabounding of grace is not included at all. Professor Stuart has exalted a mere corollary into the main design and scope of the passage.

2. More might be said in favour of the second view; but this also, as will appear in the sequel, is inconsistent with the course of the argument. Paul is not yet speaking of the applicability of the gospel to the case of the Gentiles.

3. That the third view mentioned above is the only correct one, we think will appear from the following considerations: Let it be remembered, that there are two grand subjects of discussion in this epistle, viz.—the doctrine of justification, and the calling of the Gentiles; in other words, the method of salvation, and the persons to whom that method is to be proposed. The consideration of the first extends to the close of the viii. ch.; the discussion of the second commences with the ix. From the 18th v. of the first ch. Paul, argues against the possibility of justification by works, because all men, Gentiles and Jews, are sinners, and guilty before God. Having, in verses 19 and 20 of ch. iii. arrived at that conclusion, from the 21st v. he unfolds the gospel method. This he confirms throughout the fourth ch. from the case of Abraham, the declaration of David, the nature of the law, &c. In the fifth, he commences by stating some of the consequences of this method of justification: we have peace with God, access to him, confidence in his favour, and assurance of eternal life founded on the love of God, and the fact that we are justified (not for any thing in us, or done by us,) but by the blood of his son. WHEREFORE, v. 12, (that is, since we are justified for what one man has done,) as we have been brought into a state of condemnation by one man, so by one man are we justified and saved. There is nothing more wonderful in the obedience of one saving many, than in the disobedience of one destroying many: nor so

much. If the one has happened, *much more* may the other.* This is a brief, but, as we believe, correct view of the context, and shows clearly enough the design of the Apostle in the passage before us.

As the general context requires this view of the Apostle's object, so it is the only one with which the course of the argument can be made to agree. The fact is, that the whole argument bears so lucidly and conclusively on this point, that it is no wonder that men are involved in perplexity, when they wish to make it bear on any other. What the course of argument is, we have stated above. All men are subject to death, on account of Adam. This is proved in verses 13, 14; and being proved, is all the way through assumed to illustrate the other great truth. If we *thus* die, are *thus* condemned, much more may we, by a similar arrangement, be saved. This is so clearly the prominent idea of the Apostle, that Professor Stuart cannot avoid seeing and admitting it, before he gets through.

Thirdly, not only the general context and the course of argument require this view of the Apostle's object, but also all the leading clauses separately considered. This point, therefore, will become clearer at every step, as we advance. The delightful fact, that the grace of the gospel superabounds over the evils of the fall, is, however, not the less true, because its exhibition is not the main object of the passage before us.

As Professor Stuart takes a false view of the design of this passage, we are not surprised to find him involved in perplexity, at the very first step in his exposition. He is very much at a loss about the connexion, as indicated by the words *διὰ τοῦτο*, in the beginning of the 12th verse, which he says "are so difficult," in this connexion. He devotes more than two pages to this point. We suspect his readers see very little difficulty in the case. The whole doctrine of the preceding part of the epistle, and the assertion of the immediately preceding verses, is, that by one man, not by our merits, we are justified. What more natural association, or what plainer inference, than the analogy between this and the other grand fact in the history of men. Tholuck and Flatt, Professor Stuart remarks, both represent these words as *illative*, "but they do not show *how* the sequel is a *deduction* from what precedes." Neither of these writers seems to have felt any difficulty in the case. Tholuck dismisses the words in two lines, explaining them thus, "*Aus dem bisher Gesagten geht hervor*"—*i. e.* "It follows from what has been said."

* In ch. vi. and vii. the Apostle answers the standing objection, that this method of justification leads to licentiousness, by proving that it is the only effectual means of sanctification; the law being as incompetent for the one purpose as the other. Then comes the swelling grandeur of the viii. ch. in which he exults in the certainty and security of this method of salvation.

So much for the scope of the passage and its connexion. Let us now inquire into the meaning of

VERSE XII.

“Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed on all men, for that all have sinned.”

Every reader feels that something is wanting to complete the sense in this verse. We have here only one half of the comparison. The question is, where are we to seek the other. We think with Professor Stuart, that the majority of interpreters are right, “in regarding verses 13—17, as substantially a parenthesis, (thrown in to illustrate a sentiment brought to view in the protasis verse 12); and I find,” he continues, “a full apodosis only in verses 18, 19, where the sentiment of verse 12 is virtually resumed and repeated, and where the apodosis regularly follows, after an *οὕτω καί*.” As this is the only satisfactory view of the passage, it is important that it should be borne in mind. Verses 18, 19, then, it is admitted, resume and repeat the sentiment of verse 12: of course, whatever is obscure in verse 12, may fairly be illustrated from verses 18 and 19.

It is by no means unusual for the Apostle thus to interrupt himself; and, after qualifying or confirming a position, resume and carry out his original idea. In the present instance, Paul, intending to run a parallel between the fall and the restoration of men, begins with the usual sign of a comparison—*as* by one man sin and death entered into the world, *so* by one man justification and life. But the protasis needed confirmation, and he therefore gives it, before fully expressing the apodosis; and, as at the close of this confirmation, the idea of the correspondence, which he had in his mind, is really expressed by calling Adam a type of Christ, he feels that this position needed limitation and illustration, and he, therefore, gives both in verses 15, 16 and 17, and then resumes and states fully the main idea.

There is considerable diversity of opinion, as to the meaning of the clause, *sin entered into the world, and death by sin*.

1. By *ἁμαρτία*, or sin, in this case, Calvin and a host of commentators, ancient and modern, understand *corruption, depravity, vitiositas*; and by *entered into the world*, not simply commenced, but was spread over the world: so that the idea is, all men became corrupt, and, consequently, subject to death through Adam.

2. Others, suppose that the meaning is merely, *sin* commenced with Adam, and death as its necessary consequence. He was the first sinner, and the first sufferer of death.

3. Others understand the Apostle as saying—through Adam,

men became sinners. Adam was the cause of sin and death—*εἰς κόσμον* being equivalent with *εἰς παντας ἀνθρώπους*. Hence the phrase, sin entered into the world, is equivalent with *all sinned, or became sinners*.

We think the last is the true sense, because the second leaves out of view, the main idea expressed by *δι' ἑνός*, and because Paul evidently intended to express a comparison, which is not, as Adam died for his sin, so all men die for theirs; but, as Adam was the cause of sin and death, so Christ of righteousness and life. We shall not, however, discuss this point here, as the whole matter will come up more advantageously when we come to the latter part of the verse.

Another interesting inquiry is, as to the meaning of the word *death* in this passage. And here again we are happy to be able to agree with Professor Stuart, who, in accordance with the views of the great body of evangelical commentators, understands the word in its ordinary biblical sense, when connected with sin. The death which is *on account* of sin, is surely the death which is the wages of sin. All the penal consequences of sin are, therefore, included in the term. "Indeed," says Professor Stuart, "I see no philological escape from the conclusion, that death in the sense of *penalty for sin in its full measure*, must be regarded as the meaning of the writer here"—p. 208. As it is not our purpose to write a commentary on this passage, we do not adduce the grounds of this conclusion. They may be seen in Professor Stuart, and other commentators. Where we agree, there is no necessity for argument.

An important inquiry, Professor Stuart says, arises, respecting the words *καὶ οὕτως*, viz., does the Apostle mean to say, that *in consequence* of Adam's sin, sin and death came upon all men? Or, does he mean, that as Adam died on account of his sin, so, in like manner, all men die, because all sin? In other words, do these words intimate a connexion between the sin of Adam, and the sin and condemnation of his race? or, merely the invariable connexion between sin and death? Professor Stuart decides for the latter. On p. 215, he says, "consider what the writer asserts: 'Death came on Adam *on account of sin*, and *in like manner* death came upon all men, because all have sinned.'" But what becomes of the *δι' ἑνός*, if this be a correct view of the substance of the verse? Surely, these words are too prominent here, and in their frequent repetition throughout the passage, to be thus left out of view. It was *through one man*, that sin came upon all men, and that all die. Besides, as remarked above, it was confessedly not the object of the Apostle to compare the case of Adam with that of other men, and say, as Adam died, *so* all men

die; but to compare Adam and Christ, as the one caused death, so the other caused life. Again, Professor S. himself, admits that verses 18, 19, resume and repeat the sentiment of verse 12, and that those verses clearly convey the idea, that Adam's sin is the cause of the condemnation of his race. Of course, then, verse 12 must express this idea. He says, indeed, it is "*hinted*" in the words εἰσῆλθε and διῆλθε; but if the comparison between Adam and Christ be the design of the whole passage, this, which is the main idea, should be something more than "*hinted at*," in this verse which is acknowledged to contain the first half of the comparison.* This matter, however, will appear clearer when we have considered the last clause in the verse, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον.

We agree with Professor Stuart in thinking, that rendering ἐφ' ᾧ, *in whom*, is inconsistent, if not absolutely with usage, yet with the construction of the sentence, and therefore cheerfully accede to the rendering *in that*, or *because that*. The important question now presents itself, what is meant by πάντες ἥμαρτον? On this subject, there are three opinions.

1st. That it means, all have actually and personally sinned.

2d. All have become corrupt or depraved; and

3d. All became guilty, *i. e.* were regarded and treated as sinners.

Professor Stuart and a multitude of others adopt the first view. Then, the sentiment of the verse is, "As by one man sin invaded the world and death on account of sin, so in like manner, death has passed on all men, because all sin." Sin began with Adam, and as he died for his sin, so all men die for theirs. The connexion between Adam's offence and the sin and condemnation of men, is not *expressed*: it is merely "*hinted at*."

The second view is given by Calvin, and by a large body of

* We have found considerable difficulty, in getting a clear idea of Professor Stuart's view of this passage. On p. 200, he says, that verses 18, 19, virtually resume and repeat the sentiment of verse 12; and yet, on p. 213, he says, "But it does not follow, because verse 19 asserts an influence of Adam upon the sinfulness of men, that the same sentiment must therefore be affirmed in verse 12; certainly not, that it should be directly asserted in the same manner."

On the same page, he says, "It is possible, that καὶ οὕτως may imply this; (the connexion between Adam's offence and the sinfulness of his posterity,) which, with Erasmus and Tholuck, we might construe, *et ita factum est*, *i. e.* and so it happened, or and thus it was brought about, viz. thus it was brought about, that all men came under sentence of death, and also became sinners, &c. * * Yet I am not persuaded, that this is the true method of interpreting the words καὶ οὕτως." What here is admitted as possible, is declared in p. 215, "to be wholly inadmissible."

We suspect, by the way, that Tholuck would hardly recognise, "so it happened that all men sinned in Adam, and were sentenced to death, by reason of this sin," as a correct exposition of his, "Insofern in Jenem Ersten Sünde und Uebel hervortrat, ging es auch auf alle Theile des Geschlechts über."

the most respectable commentators, ancient and modern. The meaning of the verse, according to them, is, "As by Adam depravity or corruption entered the world, and death as its consequence, and hence death has passed on all men, since all are corrupt," so, &c. This, although it expresses a truth, is a view of the passage which, as we shall see, cannot be carried consistently through; and it misses the real point of comparison between Christ and Adam. Paul does not mean to say, that as Adam was the source, or cause of corruption, so Christ is the cause of holiness; but as the offence of the one was the ground of our condemnation, so the righteousness of the other, is the ground of our justification.

According to the third view, the sentiment of the verse is, "As through one man men became sinners, and consequently exposed to death, and thus death has passed on all men, because all are regarded and treated as sinners, (on his account)," (so, on account of one are they regarded and treated as righteous.) In favour of this view, the authority of a large number of commentators might be adduced. To us, it appears decidedly the correct one, and that which alone harmonizes with the rest of the passage. In support of this interpretation, we would remark :

1. That it is on all hands admitted, that the *usus loquendi* admits of this sense of the words "all have sinned." Thus in Gen. xliii. 9, Judah says to Jacob, "If I bring him not again, *let me bear the blame.*" In Hebrew and Greek, it is "I will be a sinner," *i. e.* let me be so regarded and treated. The same form of expression occurs in ch. xlv. 34. Bethsheba says, "I and thy son Solomon, shall be sinners," 1 Kings, ch. i. 21; according to our version, which expresses the sense correctly, "shall be counted offenders." This usage, indeed, is familiar and acknowledged.

2. Professor Stuart himself admits, that verses 18 and 19 expresses the same idea with verse 12. But in those verses, the Apostle teaches, that the offence of Adam was the ground of our condemnation, *i. e.* that on his account, we are regarded and treated as sinners. This Professor Stuart is forced to admit.* He over and over acknowledges, that the Apostle, in various parts of this passage, represents *death* as coming on all men, on account of the sin of Adam, antecedently to any act of their own. Thus on page 226, he says, "verse 15 asserts, the many were brought under sentence of death by the offence of Adam." This he explains as meaning, not that this offence was the occasion of our

* With regard to verse 19, he gives indeed a different view; but, as we shall show, at the expense of consistency.

becoming sinners, and thus incurring death; but this offence was the ground of the infliction of death antecedent to any act of our own. "In like manner," he adds, "all receive some important benefits from Christ, even without any concurrence of their own." see p. 228. Verse 16, he tells us, repeats the same sentiment in a more specific manner, and "adds an explanation, or rather a confirmation of it," p. 229. He, therefore, renders this verse, "The sentence by reason of one (offence) was unto condemnation (was a condemning sentence,) &c." As this is a confirmation of the preceding sentiment, it can only mean "this sentence of condemnation was passed on all men on account of Adam's one offence." The 17th verse repeats again, he tells us, p. 226, the sentiment of the two preceding; and in commenting on this verse, p. 234, he teaches, in express terms, that "all are in a state of condemnation by reason of the offence of one;"—*i. e.* on the ground of the offence of one, antecedent to any act of their own, as his words *must* mean in connexion with what he had just before asserted. Here then it is expressly taught, that men are condemned, *i. e.* regarded and treated as sinners, on account of Adam's sin. The 18th verse contains the same doctrine, because the identical words of verse 16 are therein repeated, and, according to Professor Stuart, verse 18 resumes and repeats the sentiment of verse 12. If, therefore, things which are equal to the same thing are any longer equal to each other, verse 12 must express the idea, that all men are regarded and treated as sinners, on account of Adam's sin.

Again, in the 19th verse it is said "As we are constituted sinners by the disobedience of Adam, so we are constituted righteous by the obedience of Christ." And as it is admitted, that this verse carries out the comparison commenced in the 12th, if we can ascertain what Paul means by saying, "we are constituted sinners," we may be certain of what he intended when he said, through Adam, "all sinned." But in the 19th verse, as we shall endeavour to prove, the words will admit of no other interpretation, than the one mentioned above, *viz.* we are regarded and treated as sinners, this, therefore, must be the meaning of the other expression in verse 12.

Now, we would request any impartial reader to review these passages. Let him remember, that we have given Professor Stuart's own exposition of them, (except of verse 19): that he even cannot fail to see, that Paul says, *for one offence we die—for one offence we are condemned—for one offence death reigns over all—for the disobedience of one we are treated as sinners*—and we see not how any can resist the conclusion, that verse 12 (which it is admitted, expresses the same sentiment,) teaches, not the frigid doctrine, that, as Adam sinned and died, in like manner all

sin and die; nor yet, that Adam's sin was the occasion of our sinning; nor yet, again, that through Adam we are all corrupt; but, that on his account we are subject to death, or are regarded and treated as sinners.

3. As the phrases to which reference has just been made, are admitted to mean, that the sin of Adam was not the mere occasion, but the ground of condemnation to death, it must be remembered that in verses 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19, this idea is *assumed as already proved*. In each case, it is introduced by a "for if," or some equivalent expression. This, of course, implies, that verse 12 contains this proposition, and that verses 13 and 14 (which it is admitted, establish the sentiment of verse 12,) prove it; for, how could the Apostle at every turn say, "*for if* we die for Adam's sin," if nothing had been said beforehand of our being subject to death on his account? But, according to Professor Stuart, verse 12 expresses no such idea.

4. Unless this be the meaning of the 12th verse, no satisfactory explanation can be given of verses 13 and 14. They are introduced by *γὰρ*, and are obviously intended to establish the doctrine of the preceding verse. Now, if the doctrine of the 12th verse be only that all have personally sinned, and are, therefore, subject to death, then verse 13 and 14 are designed to prove that men were sinners before the time of Moses; and this, in fact, is the view which Professor Stuart and others adopt. But who, in all the world, denied this? Did the Jews, who called the Gentiles "sinners," as a name, and whose scriptures are filled with denunciations of the vices of the heathen living before, as well as after, the law? Besides, how utterly frigid and destitute of all point and purpose, in this connexion, is such a sentiment. It is most unnatural to suppose that the Apostle should stop in the midst of such a passage to answer the cavil—'as sin is the transgression of a law, there was no sin in the world before the time of Moses, and therefore it is not true, that all have sinned'—when the very persons for whose benefit this cavil is answered, believed that men were then not only sinners, but most peculiarly and atrociously such. We do not believe an instance can be found in all of Paul's writings, in which he takes the trouble to answer an objection, which the objector himself is supposed to know to be futile. Yet, such Professor Stuart supposes is the object of these verses. He might well remark, "that no intelligent or candid man" could make such an objection.

Those who cannot receive this view of these two verses, and yet reject the interpretation of verse 12, which we are endeavouring to support, are very much at a loss how to explain them. The unsuccessful attempts to derive any pertinent meaning from them,

are almost numberless. On the other hand, if we regard the 12th verse as teaching that all men sin in Adam, or, to express the same idea in different words, are regarded and treated as sinners on his account, then how natural and obvious the connexion and reasoning. All men die on account of Adam's sin, is the proposition to be proved. The universality of death, (the infliction of penal evils,) is the medium of proof. How is this universality to be accounted for? You may account for the fact, that some men die by the violation of the divine law, given to Moses; and for the fact, that multitudes of others die from the violation of the divine law written upon their hearts; but this will not account for *all* dying. Thousands die who have never personally sinned, and, consequently, if death be *on account* of sin, if it be penal, they must be accounted as sinners for the offence of Adam.*

5. It need hardly be repeated, that this interpretation is alone consistent with the main design of the Apostle. It is not, as before remarked, his object to illustrate the fact, that Christ is the author of holiness, from the fact that Adam was the occasion of leading men to sin; but he is treating the subject of justification, and illustrating the great gospel truth, that men may be treated as righteous, on account of what Christ has done, from the fact that they have been treated as sinners on account of what Adam did.

And, finally, as a further confirmation of this exposition, it may be remarked, that the doctrine of the whole race being involved in the sin and condemnation of Adam, was clearly and frequently taught by the Jewish doctors; and, there is little reason to doubt, it was the prevalent opinion of the Jews at this period. If this

* We are gratified to find, from p. 212, that even Professor Stuart has no objection to the "sentiment," *all have sinned in Adam*. "It must be confessed," he says, "that there is no more ground for objection to the *sentiment* which the expression ("all have sinned") thus construed would convey, than there is to the sentiment in verses 17 and 19. It is not on this ground that I hesitate to receive this interpretation." His difficulties are philological; yet, there is no philology in what follows, as far as we can perceive. The difficulty stated, is this: Paul says, men die who have never sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression; but how, it is asked, is their sin different from his, when it is the *very same* sin imputed to them, or propagated to them. But cannot men be said to be treated as sinners on account of Adam's sin, and it still be true, that they did not sin as he did? Is it not involved in the very terms of the proposition, that they did not sin *as* Adam did, *i. e.* personally, if they are only (quoad hoc) treated as sinners on his account? So Christ is declared to be without sin, and yet treated as a sinner. We are persuaded this objection will prevent no one, besides Professor S., from receiving the sentiment of verse 12, as thus explained, if this be all. It is equally destitute of weight when directed against the idea of a vitiated nature derived from Adam being the ground of men's dying; for this vitiated nature is not Adam's *act*: his *first* sin propagated to all men.

It is well to remark here, that on this page Professor Stuart uses the phrases *treated as sinners* on account of Adam, and *sinners in him*, as equivalent. It would have been a great comfort to his readers, had he continued thus to regard them.

were the case, we cannot refuse to admit, that Paul designed to teach what his readers could hardly fail to understand him to assert. Accordingly, impartial men, who do not themselves hold the doctrine of imputation, do not hesitate to acknowledge that Paul teaches it in this passage. This is the case with Knapp, as quoted in a former number of this work.

VERSES XIII—XIV.

We have, necessarily, anticipated most of the remarks which we deem it requisite to make, respecting these verses. They are evidently designed to confirm the sentiment of verse 12. If that verse teaches, as we have endeavoured to show it does, that all men are regarded and treated as sinners on account of the sin of Adam, there can be little difficulty in understanding them.

The phrase "*sin was in the world*" is evidently of the same import with, "men were sinners"—sinners, in the sense of πάντες ἡμαρτον of verse 12; either actual sinners, or corrupt, or were regarded and treated as sinners. The last is, of course, the true meaning, if our exegesis of the preceding verse is correct. All men are so regarded, Paul says, on account of Adam; *for*, they were so treated before the time of Moses, and, consequently, not for the violation of his law, &c.

The words, "*sin is not imputed where there is no law*," are interpreted by Professor Stuart after Calvin and others, as meaning, *is not imputed by men, as sin*—that is, men do not regard it, or consider it as sin. But, in the first place, it is, to say the least, very doubtful, whether the word ἐλλογείται can be properly so rendered; and, in the second, the phrase, *to impute sin*, spoken in reference to God, is so common in the scriptures, that there can be little doubt the words are here to be understood in the ordinary way. The only reason for departing from this sense here, is the supposed difficulty of interpreting the passage, when the words are so explained; but this difficulty vanishes, as we have already seen, if the sense of verse 12 be rightly apprehended.

Professor Stuart, in commenting on this verse, says, p. 217, et seq. there are some, "who state the whole of the Apostle's reasoning in the following manner, viz. 'Men's own sins were not imputed to them on the ground of their transgressing any law, until the law of Moses was given; yet, they were counted sinners, (ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ); consequently, it must have been by reason of Adam's sin imputed to them, inasmuch as their own offences were not imputed.'" We should not notice this passage, if Professor Stuart did not seem to ascribe this revolting doctrine to all who believe in the imputation of Adam's sin. It is perfectly plain, from what follows, that he has no reference to the

opinion of such men as Whitby, who understand the Apostle as teaching that men did not, anterior to the time of Moses, incur the specific evil of natural death by their own transgressions. Though sinners in the sight of God, and so regarded and punished, yet their sins were not imputed to death: This was a punishment all incurred in Adam. This is altogether a different view from that which Professor Stuart here has in his mind. He argues to show, that men were accountable for their own transgressions, and that men never were counted of God as without actual sin; of course, he ascribes the negative of these propositions to those whom he opposes. Now, who are they, who thus teach that "men's personal sins were not at all reckoned" until the law of Moses? He tells us, they are those who say, "men have only original or imputed sin charged to their account." He names Augustine and President Edwards, as though they held this opinion. He asks, "How can the sin of Adam be imputed to all his posterity, and yet their own personal sins be not at all reckoned;" and on page 223, he seems to make all who suppose the dissimilitude referred to in the 14th verse, consists in the fact, that Adam was an actual sinner, and others to whom reference is here made, sinners only by imputation," hold this doctrine. For this is the interpretation he says he has proved to be contrary to the declarations of the Old and New Testaments. From all this, it would really appear, that Professor Stuart means to represent all who hold the doctrine of imputation, as teaching that men were not accountable for their own sins, before the time of Moses. It would be an easy matter for any one to refute the doctrine, if he is permitted to state it in this manner, provided he can find readers ignorant enough to receive such statements.

It is hardly necessary to state, that no such absurdity is involved in the interpretation given above. When Professor Stuart says, that men die on account of Adam's sin, verse 16, does he mean to say they do not die on account of their own? Or, when he says that for "one offence" they are condemned, would he admit they are not condemned for their own multiplied transgressions? We presume not. In like manner, when we represent the Apostle as arguing, that men are regarded as sinners on account of Adam's sin, because the *universality* of death cannot be accounted for in any other way, we leave the full accountability of men for their own sins of thought, word, and deed, completely unimpaired.

It is not only unjust to ascribe the opinion in question to those who hold the doctrine of imputation, but we know no class of men to whom it can be fairly attributed, as Professor Stuart states it. He certainly does Tholuck and Schott, especially the former,

injustice, in ascribing the substance of this opinion to them. Tholuck says expressly, "This non-imputation does *by no means* remove guilt, since Paul has expressly asserted, that men (without a revelation) were without excuse." He says, indeed, that the accountability of men for their individual transgressions, decreases in proportion to their ignorance and insensibility, (when this is not the result of their own conduct,) but he does not, even in substance, assert that men are chargeable only with imputed sin before the time of Moses. The phrase, "Sin is not imputed where there is no law," interpreted inreference to God, Tholuck understands comparatively. Professor Stuart makes it mean, "sin is not regarded:" this he also must take in a comparative sense, since it is not true, that men without a written law have *no* sense of sin. If Professor Stuart will allow Tholuck and Schott the liberty he assumes himself, the whole absurdity of the opinion he opposes is gone. That these writers make the Apostle reason inconclusively, we think true; but we do not think Professor Stuart has done them justice. It appears to us, indeed, very strange, that he should represent them as holding in substance, that men were counted sinners before the time of Moses, "by reason of Adam's sin being imputed to them," when neither of these writers hold the doctrine of imputation at all. It seems, in fact, to be the main design of Schott's dissertation to disprove it. On p. 335, he says, "vidimus hucusque, verbis v. 12, nulla inesse vestigia dogmatis de imputatione peccati Adamitici." And as to Tholuck, his whole exposition is founded upon a different principle. It would really be worth Professor Stuart's while to make a distinction between the imputation of Adam's sin, and the transmission of a vitiated nature from him to his posterity. As all other theological writers make this distinction, he might as well do so. We are sure the works of such writers would be clearer to him, than they can be at present; for it must seem strange to him to hear them saying in one breath, that corruption, or vitiositas, has been propagated to all Adam's posterity, and in the next, deny that his sin is imputed to them, if these two things are the same.

But to return from this long digression. The next clause of any difficulty in these verses, is "*even over them who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.*" The simple question is, what is the point of difference intended by the Apostle? Is it, that those referred to had not broken any positive, or any externally revealed, law? Or is it, that they had not sinned personally? As there is no doubt the words may express either idea, the only question is, which best suits the context? And here we may remark, that there can be little doubt on this

point, if our exegesis of the preceding verses is correct. If it is Paul's object to prove, that men are treated as sinners, (*i. e.* die,) on account of Adam, then is it essential that he should show that there is a class which die, who are not personally sinners. This class is not the whole mass of men, (even from Adam to Moses,) but a certain set only out of this general class. Hence, secondly, it is to be noticed, that the very construction of the passage would seem to require this interpretation. Paul says, death reigned over all, from Adam to Moses, *even* over those who had not sinned as Adam did. Here an evident distinction is marked between two classes of the victims of death; one general, and the other a subdivision under it. But if the latter clause be descriptive of the general class from Adam to Moses, this distinction is entirely lost. It, of course, would not do to say, death reigned over all who had not broken any positive law, *even* over those who had not broken any positive law. The second clause must mark a peculiar class. Death reigned over all men, *even* over those whose death cannot be accounted for on the ground of their personal transgressions. Another great objection to the opposite view is, that if it be adopted, no satisfactory explanation can be given of the connexion of these verses with the preceding, nor of the Apostle's argument. According to the view adopted by Professor Stuart, we must assume what we know to be incorrect, that the Jews thought the Gentiles were not sinners; and that Paul argues to prove they were, even though they had no written law. According to Tholuck's view, the Apostle's argument, as Professor Stuart correctly remarks, is entirely inconclusive. He would make the Apostle reason virtually thus, "As men were, comparatively speaking, not responsible for their offences, when involved in ignorance and destitute of a revelation, the cause of their death is to be sought in their participation of the corrupt nature of Adam." In this argument there is no force, unless it be assumed that men were entirely free from responsibility for actual sin, before the time of Moses—an assumption which Tholuck rejects, as inconsistent with truth and the Apostle's doctrine. In short, we know no interpretation of this passage, but the ordinary one given above, which makes the Apostle argue conclusively, and express a sentiment at once pertinent and important.

In what sense, then, is Adam a type of Christ? According to our view, the answer is plain: The point of resemblance is, that as Adam's sin was the ground of the condemnation of many, so Christ's righteousness is the ground of their justification. That this is the correct view, we think evident from what has already been said, and will become more so from what follows.

VERSES XV. XVI. XVII.

These verses are a commentary on the last clause of the 14th verse—Adam is a type of Christ. There is a strong analogy between them; and yet, there are striking and instructive points of difference. The first (verse 15,) is derived from the diversity of the results they produce, viewed in connexion with the character of God. The one brought death, the other life: if, then, we die on account of what one man did, *how much more* shall we live on account of what one has done. If the one fact is consistent with the divine character, how much more the other. It is clear, therefore, that the Apostle designs to illustrate the cardinal idea of the gospel, viz. to the imputation of the merit of one to a multitude, or the justification of many on the ground of the righteousness of one.

The most important phrase in this verse, and that on which the interpretation of the whole depends, is the second clause—“*For if by the offence of one the many die.*” That there is a *causal* connexion between the sin of Adam and the death of his posterity here asserted, must of course be admitted. The only question is, as to its nature. Does Paul mean to say, that Adam’s offence was the occasion of men’s becoming sinful, or of their committing sin; and that thus, on this account, they become subject to death? Or, does he mean, that it was the ground of their exposure to death, antecedent to any transgressions of their own? That the latter is his meaning, we think very evident, for the following reasons:

1. It is not to be questioned that the words admit as naturally of this explanation as the other. “By the offence of one, many die,” is the assertion: whether the offence is the mere occasional cause, or the judicial ground, of their dying, must be determined from the context. No violence is done the words, by this interpretation.

2. This interpretation is not only possible, but necessary, in this connexion, because the sentiment expressed in this verse is confessedly the same as that taught in those which follow; and they, as we shall endeavour to show, admit of no other exposition. The sentence of condemnation, it is there said, has passed on all men for one offence of one man.

3. The whole drift and design of the Apostle’s argument requires this interpretation. As it was not his design to teach, that Christ was either the source of sanctification, or the occasion of men securing eternal life by their own goodness; so it would be nothing to his purpose to show, that Adam was the occasion of men becoming wicked, and thus incurring death for their own offences.

Happily, there is no necessity for arguing this point at present. Professor Stuart interprets the phrase precisely as we do. He teaches very explicitly, that the Apostle does not make the offence of Adam the mere occasion of the death of his posterity, but that it was the ground of its infliction. They die *on account of his sin*, independently of, and antecedent to, any offence of their own. This, which we submit is the true unsophisticated doctrine of imputation, is, according to Professor Stuart, the doctrine of Paul. It will, therefore, not do for him any longer, either to disclaim the doctrine, or condemn its advocates. Lest the reader should be incredulous on this point, and deem it impossible that so warm an opposer of a doctrine should thus expressly himself teach it, we refer him to the analysis of verses 15, 16, 17, on p. 226, and to all that is said on verse 15. We can here give a few specimens only of his language. "Adam did by his offence cause *θανατος* to come on all without exception, inasmuch as all his race are born destitute of holiness, and in such a state that their passions will, whenever they are moral agents, lead them to sin. All too are heirs of more or less suffering. It is true then, that all suffer on Adam's account; that all are brought under more or less of the sentence of death," p. 227. Of course, a man's being born destitute of holiness, exposed to a certainty of sinning, is not on account of any thing in himself. It is not on account of his own sins, that this evil (*θανατος*) comes upon him: its infliction is antecedent to any act of his own. This is imputation. This is what Professor Stuart says, has happened to all the posterity of Adam; although it is precisely what he affirms, p. 239, is entirely repugnant to scripture, in opposition to justice, and to the first principles of moral consciousness.

Again, "To say that *οι πολλοι απεθανον δια Αδαμ*, is not to say, that all have the sentence *executed* on them in its highest sense, (which is contradicted by fact;) but it is to say, that in some respect or other, all are involved in it; that, as to more or less of it, all are subjected to it; and that all are exposed to the whole of the evil which death includes," p. 228. We presume, few believe that death in its highest sense, eternal misery, is actually "executed" on all men, on account of Adam's sin. We readily admit, Paul teaches no such doctrine; but, according to Professor Stuart, he does teach that *death*, (penal evil, according to his own subsequent explanation,) comes on all men antecedently "to any voluntary act of their own." This is the whole doctrine of imputation. It is but putting this idea into other words, to say, "that men are regarded and treated as sinners on Adam's account;" for, to be treated as a sinner, is to be made subject to

the *ḡavatos* threatened against sin. It matters not what this *ḡavatos* is. Professor Stuart himself says, it is "*evil of any kind.*" The mere degree of evil surely does not alter the principle. It never entered any one's mind, that the death threatened against all sin and all sinners, was the same precise form and amount of evil. It is evil of any and every kind consequent on sin, and differs, in character and amount, in every individual case of its infliction. Taken, therefore, as Professor Stuart explains it, in this general sense, it is mere trifling to maintain that the doctrine of imputation is rejected by one man, who holds that it involves, in a given case, so much suffering, and retained by another who holds it involves either less or more. Zachariae makes it include, in this case, only natural death, and yet avows the doctrine of imputation; Professor Stuart makes it include a thousand-fold more, yet says he rejects it. According to him, it includes the loss of original righteousness, the certainty of actual sin, and temporal sufferings. Now, these are tremendous evils: viewed in connexion with the moral and immortal interests of men, they are inconceivable and infinite. All this evil comes on men, not for any offence of their own, but solely on account of Adam's sin.

We are at a loss to conceive what Professor Stuart can object to in the common doctrine, that all men are subject to death, *i. e.* penal evil, on account of the sin of Adam? Will he say, that it is shocking to think of myriads of men suffering forever, simply for what one man has done? Happily, we hold no such doctrine. We believe as fully and joyfully as he does, that the grace, which is in Christ Jesus, secures the salvation of all who have no personal sins to answer for. Will he say, that it is inconsistent with the divine goodness and justice, that men should be condemned for the sin of another? But this is his own doctrine, taught too plainly and frequently, to be either mistaken or forgotten. Will he say, I do not hold the penalty to be so severe as you do? Loss of holiness, temporal suffering, certainty of sinning, and a consequent exposure to eternal death—this is a heavier penalty, than that which Turretin supposes to be directly inflicted on account of Adam's sin. Will he further answer, I hold that Christ has more than made up the evils of the fall? For whom? For all who have no personal sins? So say we. Yea, for all who will accept of his grace: so say we again.

We would fain hope that no film of prejudice or prepossession, is so thick as to prevent any reader from perceiving, that Professor Stuart teaches the doctrine of imputation as fully as any one holds or teaches it; and secondly, that his objections are either founded

in misconception, or directed against what he admits to be a doctrine of the Bible. If he is so constituted as to believe, that the evils, above referred to, come upon us on account of the sin of Adam, and yet be horrified at the idea that one man should die for the iniquity of another, we must console ourselves with the conviction, that it is an idiosyncrasy, with which no other man can sympathize.

The second point of difference between Christ and Adam which the Apostle mentions, is stated in the 16th verse, viz. Adam brings on us the guilt of but one sin; Christ frees us from the guilt of many. In other words, in Adam we are condemned for one offence; in Christ, we are justified from many. We give this verse in the translation, and with the explanatory clauses of Professor Stuart, as it appears on p. 230: "Yea, [the sentence,] by one who sinned, is not like the free gift; for the sentence by reason of one [offence] was unto condemnation [was a condemning sentence]; but the free gift [pardon] is of *many* offences, unto justification, *i. e.* is a sentence of acquittal from condemnation." We think this a correct exhibition of the meaning of the original. The most interesting clause in the verse, is the second, "the sentence was for one offence unto condemnation,"—*κριμα ἐξ ἑνος εἰς κατακριμα*. The same question presents itself with regard to these words, as in relation to the corresponding clause in the preceding verse. Does Paul mean to say, that the one offence of Adam was the occasion of our being brought into condemnation, inasmuch as it occasioned our becoming sinners? Or, does he mean that his offence was the ground of our condemnation? The latter is, as we think, the only interpretation which the words in this connexion can possibly bear. This seems evident in the first place, from the ordinary meaning of the terms. It is admitted on all hands, that *κριμα* means properly a judicial decision; and we are willing to admit, that it often by metonymy means, punishment or condemnation. But it cannot have that meaning, here; for it is connected with *κατακριμα*, since the Apostle would then say, *condemnation or punishment leading to condemnation*, has come on all men. Besides, every one here recognises the common Hellenistic construction of *εἰς* with the accusative after verbs, signifying *to be, to become, to regard*, instead of the nominative. The sentence was *to* condemnation, is, therefore, the same as saying *the sentence was condemnation*, or, as Professor Stuart correctly renders it, "a condemning sentence." This condemning sentence is said to be, *by, or for*, one offence. What is the natural meaning of such an expression? Is it, that the offence was the occasion of men's sinning? Or, that it was the ground of the sentence? Surely, the latter.

But, secondly, in this place we have the idea of pardon on the one hand, which supposes that of condemnation on the other. If, as Professor Stuart says, the latter part of the verse means, we are pardoned for *many* offences, the former must mean we are condemned for *one*. Hence, thirdly, we remark, that the whole point, meaning and truth, of the passage is lost, unless this interpretation be adopted. The antithesis in this verse, is evidently between *the one offence*, and *the many offences*. To make Paul, therefore, say that the offence of Adam was the occasion of our being involved in a multitude of crimes, from all of which Christ saves us, is to make the evil and the benefit perfectly tantamount. Adam leads us in offences, from which Christ saves us. Where, then, is the contrast, if the evil incurred through Adam is identical with the evil from which Christ saves us? Paul evidently means to assert, that the evil from which Christ saves us is far greater than that which Adam has brought upon us. He brought the condemnation of *one* offence only : Christ saved us from *many*.

Fourthly ; this interpretation is so obviously the correct one, that Professor Stuart himself fully admits it. It is involved in the translation of the verse, which we just quoted from him, "the condemning sentence was by reason of one offence ;" and still plainer on p. 226, "The condemnation which comes upon us through Adam, has respect only to *one* offence ; while the justification effected by Christ, has respect to many offences." To say that our condemnation "has respect to one offence," is to say, we are condemned for one offence. And again, on the same page, he tells us, that "verse 16 repeats the same sentiment, (*i. e.* with 15th verse,) but in a more specific manner." What is, according to Professor Stuart, the sentiment of verse 15? Not that Adam's offence was the *occasion*, but *the ground*, of our being subject to *θανατος*, *i. e.* condemned.* Of course then, verse 16, which repeats this sentiment in a more specific manner, must mean that the one offence is the ground of our condemnation.

We may remark here, as the words under consideration will, in their connexion, admit of no other interpretation than that just given, so the idea which they express being the same as that contained in verses 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, may fairly be applied to explain the equivalent clauses in those verses which, in themselves, may be less definite and perspicuous. To explain, therefore, verse 12, as teaching either that the corrupt nature

* We shall show directly, that Professor Stuart admits, that *being subject to death for Adam's sin*, and *being condemned on account of it*, are equivalent expressions.

derived from Adam, or the actual sins of which he was the occasion of our committing, are the grounds of death, or condemnation, coming upon us, is inconsistent with the plain and admitted meaning of this clause, which asserts that the ground of condemnation *here contemplated* is neither our corrupt nature, nor our actual sins, but the one offence of Adam. Consequently, the interpretation given above of verses 12, 13 and 14, is the only one which can be carried consistently through.

We must here pause to notice as remarkable an example of inconsistency, on the part of Professor Stuart, as we remember ever to have met with. On p. 230, he tells us, *κριμα εις κατακριμα* means "a condemning sentence," and on the next page, after remarking that *κριμα* means either *a sentence of condemnation* or *punishment*, he asks, how the phrase is to be understood here? "The very expression," he says, "shows that *κριμα* is to be taken as explained above, viz. as meaning the *evils inflicted* by Adam's sin:" and then adds, whether this evil be loss of original righteousness, or a disposition in itself sinful, "it is true in either case, that the *κριμα*, the evil *inflicted* or *suffered*, is of such a nature as to lead the way to *κατακριμα*, *condemnation*, i. e. *θανατος*, in its highest and most dreadful sense." That is, on one page, we are told the words mean "a sentence of condemnation," and on the next, "certain evils which lead to condemnation"—two inconsistent and opposite interpretations. Need this be proved? Need it be argued, that a sentence of condemnation is one thing, punishment another? If *κριμα here* means the former, it cannot *here* mean the latter. It is surely one thing to say, that a sentence of condemnation has come upon us for Adam's sin, and a very different one to say, that certain evils have come upon us which lead the way to our incurring condemnation ourselves. Let it be remembered, that this is one of the most important clauses in this whole passage; one on which, perhaps more than any other, the interpretation of the whole depends; and we think our readers will share our surprise, that Professor Stuart's views should be so little settled as to allow him to give such opposite views of its meaning in two consecutive pages. This surprise will be increased, when they observe on p. 235, when speaking of the 18th verse, he reverts to his first interpretation, and makes it mean, a sentence of condemnation. This too is the interpretation of Tholuck, Flatt, Koppe, (verse 15,) Turretin, and, in fact, of almost all commentators.

The verse 17 either contains an amplification merely of verse 15, or peculiar emphasis is to be laid on the word *λαμβάνοντες*, or, as Flatt and Professor Stuart suppose, it expresses the idea, that Christ not only secures the pardon of our many offences, as sta-

ted in verse 16, but confers upon us positive happiness and glory. "The sentiment," Professor Stuart says, "runs thus: 'For if all are in a state of condemnation by reason of the offence of one, much more shall those towards whom abundance of mercy and pardoning grace are shown, be redeemed from a state of condemnation, and advanced to a state of happiness.'" Here, we wish the reader to remark, 1st. That Professor Stuart says, the phrase "death reigns," designates a *state of condemnation*. This is expressly asserted on p. 233. 2d. That all are brought into this state of condemnation, by the offence of one. The first clause of the verse he thus translates, "*For if by the offence of one, death reigned by means of one.*" By this he means, not that the offence of Adam was the occasion merely of death reigning over all, or of all being brought into a state of condemnation, but that this offence was the ground of their condemnation, antecedent to any act of their own. This *must* be his meaning; for he thus explains the words "by the offence of one many die," in verse 15; and he can hardly maintain that the words, "by the offence of one death reigns," expresses a different idea. Besides, he tells us expressly, that this verse, (verse 17,) repeats the sentiment of verse 15—see p. 226. We wish the reader, 3d. To remark, that if verse 17 expresses the sentiment, 'all men are in a state of condemnation on account of the offence of Adam,' and if it repeats the sentiment of verses 15, 16, and if verse 18, (containing the identical words and expressing the same idea with verse 16,) repeats the sentiment of verse 12, then does verse 12, by Professor Stuart's own showing, express the idea that all men are condemned on account of Adam's sin, antecedent to any act of their own. Thus we have our interpretation of that verse confirmed, and Mr. Stuart's overthrown by the Professor himself. 4th. The reader should notice, that Mr. Stuart was led to the correct, though, for him, inconsistent, interpretation of verse 17, by objecting to Tholuck's rendering *δικαιοσύνη* *holiness*, instead of *justification*. He very properly remarks, that such an interpretation is inconsistent with "the antithesis to the state of condemnation indicated by *ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσε* in the preceding clause." He insists, very reasonably, that the two parts of the sentence should be made to correspond. If the former speaks of condemnation, the latter must of justification. This obvious principle of interpretation, the reader will find Professor Stuart forgets, when he comes to the 19th verse. There is another important admission which must be noticed, and that is, that the *all* who suffer for Adam's sin, are not the *all* who are benefitted by Christ: the two classes are not necessarily coextensive. "If *all* are in a state of condemnation by reason of the offence of one,

much more shall *those towards whom abundance of mercy and pardoning grace are shown*, be redeemed from a state of condemnation, and advanced to a state of happiness." All are not thus redeemed from condemnation, and advanced to a state of happiness. This too Professor Stuart, it will be seen, forgets.

VERSES XVIII. XIX.

We come now to those verses, in which, as we have already seen, the comparison, commenced in verse 12 is resumed, and carried through. Professor Stuart thus translates the 18th verse: "Wherefore as by the offence of one (sentence) came upon all men unto condemnation; so also by the righteousness of one (the free gift) came upon all unto justification of life." Does it require any argument to prove, that this verse means, "As men are condemned on account of the offence of one man, so they are justified on account of the righteousness of one man"? We hardly know how the Apostle could have spoken in plainer terms. To make him here say, that the offence of Adam was the mere occasion of our condemnation, is to do the most obvious violence to the passage; because, 1. We have shown that this cannot be the meaning of these identical words, as they occur in the 16th verse. 2. Because, such an interpretation is inconsistent with the whole scope and design of the passage. 3. Especially, because it violates the pointed antithesis in this verse, or forces us to suppose that Paul teaches, that the righteousness of Christ was the mere occasion of men becoming holy. Surely, if *δία* expresses the occasional cause in the one member of the sentence, it must in the other. But, if we are not prepared to admit that Christ's righteousness is the mere occasion (and not the ground) of our justification, then we cannot maintain that Adam's sin is the mere occasion of our condemnation. 4. We may remark, *ad hominem*, that Professor Stuart admits that the corresponding clauses in the preceding verses, express the idea, that the offence of Adam was the ground of the condemnation of men. On account of that offence, antecedent to any act of their own, death reigns over them, or they are (as he expresses it,) "in a state of condemnation." Of course, then, he cannot be permitted to turn round, and say that the same words, in the same connexion, teach here a different doctrine. There is no escaping the plain meaning of this verse. The very form of introduction proves that Paul is repeating an idea previously presented and established, "*Wherefore us;*" and this idea, as we have abundantly shown, Professor Stuart himself admits, is, that all men die, all are condemned, on account of Adam's sin.

The expression "*justification of life,*" Professor Stuart justly

remarks, means, that "justification which is connected with eternal life."

It need hardly be stated, that to say, "justification comes on all men," is equivalent to saying, "all men are justified," or, "all are constituted righteous." The Apostle, therefore, does here assert, that, "as *all* are condemned for Adam's sin, so *all* are justified on account of the righteousness of Christ." To say, as Professor Stuart says, that the latter clause of this verse means that salvation is merely provided and offered to all, is to give all exegesis to the winds. When it is affirmed, that a man is condemned, or that he is pardoned, how can this mean that he is *not* condemned, or *not* pardoned, but merely that an opportunity is offered, or an occasion presented, for the one or the other? At this rate, we may say that all men are condemned for murder, as all have opportunities to secure this result. Whatever, therefore, "justification of life" may mean, Paul does assert that all men (of whom he is speaking) do receive it. It is at utter variance with all Bible, and all common, usage, to make the words mean any thing else. Who ever announces to a congregation of sinners, that they are all justified—they are all constituted righteous—they all have the justification of eternal life? No one. Neither does Paul.

But does not this necessarily make the Apostle teach universal salvation? Must not the *all men* of the second clause, be coextensive with the *all men* of the first? We confidently answer, No. And it is a matter of surprise how Professor Stuart can urge such an objection, when he knows it admits so easily of a complete refutation; and that too, by his own admission. The plain meaning of the passage is, "as *all* connected with Adam are condemned, so *all* connected with Christ are justified." The first *all* includes all the natural descendants of Adam, (Christ, who was a man, is not included;) the second *all* includes the people of Christ, *all* connected with him by faith. Is this inconsistent with usage? Look at 1 Corinthians, xv. 21—"As in Adam *all* die, so in Christ shall *all* be made partakers of a glorious resurrection," as the last clause there confessedly means. Is the second *all*, in this case, coextensive with the first? Certainly not. "All connected with Adam die; all connected with Christ live." How can any man, who admits, as Professor Stuart does, (see p. 524,) that Paul, in this passage, is speaking only of Christians, and, consequently, that the *all* of the second clause must be confined to them, be serious, in objecting to the same interpretation in the perfectly analogous passage before us? But, secondly, Paul himself clearly intimates, or rather states in so many words, that the *all men* who are justified by Christ, are

the all "who receive the abundance of mercy and pardoning grace," verse 17. This, as we understand him, Professor Stuart admits; for he surely does not mean to say, that all men absolutely do receive this gift, and do reign in life with Jesus Christ. Finally, it is impossible to carry the opposite interpretation through. There are two classes opposed, or contrasted, in verses 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19, and these are the same throughout. Now, is it true, that the grace of God abounds to *all men* absolutely, in the meaning of verse 15; that *all* are gratuitously pardoned for their many offences, as asserted in verse 16; that *all* reign in life with Christ, as is said in verse 17; that *all* are justified with the justification of eternal life, as stated in verse 18; that *all* are "constituted righteous," that is, as Professor Stuart explains it, "justified, pardoned, accepted, and treated as righteous," as taught in verse 19? This is plainly out of the question. Neither Professor Stuart, nor any other man, except an Universalist, can say all this. We are persuaded, there must be an end to all interpretation of Scripture, and to all understanding of language, if we are to be made to believe, that, being forgiven for many offences, being justified, being regarded and treated as righteous, mean merely, that the offer and opportunity of salvation is afforded to all men. We may as well shut up the Bible at once, and go bow at the footstool of the Pope, if this be exegesis. Is it not clear, then, the objection to the common view of these passages cannot be sustained, unless violence be done to every just principle of language.

We have arrived at last at verse 19—"For as by the disobedience of one man, the many were constituted sinners, so by the obedience of one, shall many be constituted righteous." The first question of interest on this verse is, what is its relation to the 18th? Is it a mere amplification? Or, does it assign a reason for the preceding declaration? Or, may we adopt Storr's view of the 18th, and make the Apostle there say, "as in the condemnation of one man, all were condemned, so in the justification of one all are justified;"* and then understand the 17th verse, as assigning the ground of the truth thus presented. As it does not essentially alter the meaning of the verse before us, which of these views is adopted, we need not stop to discuss this point.

A more important question is, What does Paul mean by saying, *by the disobedience of one man the many were constituted sinners*? Here we meet the three interpretations, before noticed when speaking of the 12th verse. 1. Adam's sin was the occa-

* This is, make *παραπτωμα* and *δικαιωμα* mean, not *offence* and *righteousness*, but *condemnation* and *justification*.

sion of our becoming actually sinners. 2. By the transmission of his depraved nature, we are rendered corrupt. 3. On account of his sin, we are regarded and treated as sinners. Professor Stuart adopts the first, many Calvinistic and modern commentators the second; the majority, we presume, of all classes, the third. That this last is the correct, and, indeed, the only possible one in this connexion, we think very plain, for the following reasons: 1. Usage, as is on all hands acknowledged, admits of this interpretation as naturally, to say the least, as either of the others. 2. With no show of reason can it be denied, that "to constitute sinners," and "to constitute righteous," are here correlative expressions. If the former means, "to make corrupt, or actual sinners," then the latter must mean, "to render holy." But this the phrase cannot here mean,—*a.* because, "to constitute righteous," is substituted for the phrase, "free gift of justification" of the preceding verse; the *δικαιοσύνη* of the 17th, and the *δικαιωθέντες* of the first part of the chapter; *b.* Because such an interpretation is entirely inconsistent with the scriptural use of the terms, justify and justification, and would overturn the very foundation of the doctrine of justification by faith, as taught by Paul and the other sacred writers. We are never said to be constituted personally holy, by the righteousness of Christ. *c.* And finally, *ad hominem*, Professor Stuart tells us, "constituted righteous" means, "justified, pardoned, accepted and treated as righteous." With what semblance of consistency, then, can he deny that "constituted sinners" means "regarded and treated as sinners?" Has he forgotten what he said on the 17th verse, that if the one part of the verse speaks of condemnation, the other must speak of justification, and *vice versa*? But, 3. Not only does the antithesis here demand this interpretation, but it is no less imperiously demanded, in order to maintain any consistency in the exposition of the whole passage. We have seen, that Professor Stuart admits, that verse 15, 16, 17 and 18, all speak of our being condemned, or dying, on account of Adam's sin, and justified on account of Christ's righteousness. Shall, then, the 19th verse alone assert a different, and, in this connexion, an incoherent idea. And 4. The design and scope of the whole comparison, requires this interpretation. As we have so frequently remarked, the Apostle is not contrasting sin and holiness, but condemnation and justification. He is not illustrating the way, in which men become holy, by the way in which they become corrupt; but the fact that we are regarded and treated as righteous on account of one man, by the fact that we have been regarded and treated as sinners, on account of another. It is, therefore, not only in violation of the plainest principles of interpretation, but

at the expense of all consistency, that Professor Stuart makes the clause under consideration mean, the 'disobedience of Adam was the occasion of men becoming personally and actually sinners.'

In reviewing the ground we have now gone over, how simple, natural, and conclusive, is the argument of the Apostle, according to the common interpretation; and how forced, incoherent, and contradictory the view Professor Stuart would have us to adopt. Paul tells us, (verse 12,) that *by one man* sin entered into the world, or men were brought to stand in the relation of sinners before God; death, consequently, passed on all, because for the one offence of that one man, all were regarded and treated as sinners. That this is really the case, is plain; because, the execution of the penalty of a law cannot be more extensive than its violation; and, consequently, if all men are subject to penal evils, all are regarded as sinners in the sight of God. This *universality* in the infliction of penal evil, cannot be accounted for on the ground of the violation of the law of Moses, since many died before that law was given; nor yet, on account of the more general law written on the heart, since *even* they die who have never personally sinned at all. We must conclude, therefore, that men are regarded and treated as sinners on account of the sin of Adam.

He is, therefore, a type of Christ; and yet, the cases are not entirely analogous; for if it be consistent, that we should suffer for what Adam did, how much more may we expect to be made happy for what Christ has done. Besides, we are condemned for one sin only on Adam's account; whereas, Christ saves us not only from the evils consequent on that transgression, but from the punishment of our own innumerable offences. Now, if for the offence of one, death thus triumphs over all, how much more shall those who receive the grace of the Gospel, (not only be saved from evil,) but reign in life, through Christ Jesus.

Wherefore, as on account of the offence of one, the condemnatory sentence has passed on all the descendants of Adam, so on account of the righteousness of one, gratuitous justification comes on all who receive the grace of Christ; for, as on account of the disobedience of the one, we are treated as sinners, so on account of the obedience of the other, we are treated as righteous.

Let it be remarked, that there is not a *sentiment* (to the best of our knowledge) contained in this general analysis, which has not the sanction, in one place or other, of Professor Stuart's authority.

We will now very briefly attend to his objections to the doctrine of imputation as presented in his commentary on the 19th

verse. After stating, p. 237, that the doctrine does not lie in the word *κατεσταθησαν*; nor in that word in connexion with *δια παρανομίας του ενος*; and arguing well to show that *δια* with a genitive may express an *occasional*, or *instrumental* cause, as well as an *efficient* one, he says, "we must come then to the examination of the whole phrase, in order to get the satisfaction which is required. And if now, 'the many became sinners *by the disobedience of Adam*,' must it not follow that his sin is imputed to them, *i. e.* reckoned as theirs? In reply, I would ask, Why should this be a necessary consequence of admitting the apostle's assertion? If a writer should say, that millions in Europe have become or been constituted profligates, by Voltaire, would the necessary meaning be, that the sin of Voltaire was put to their account? Certainly not; it would be enough to say, in order fully to explain and justify such an expression, that Voltaire had been an *instrument*, a *means*, or *occasion* of their profligacy." It is perfectly apparent that Professor Stuart had not, in writing this paragraph, the slightest conception of the argument for imputation founded on this passage. He admits, what cannot be denied, that the words will bear either of these two senses, 'we are treated as sinners,' or, 'become sinners' personally. The question is, what is their meaning here? Now if Paul says, that all men die for Adam's offence antecedent to any act of their own; if on account of that offence they are condemned; (as Professor Stuart admits he does say,) and then that "we are constituted sinners" by his disobedience, as 'we are constituted righteous, (that is, confessedly, treated as such) for the obedience of Christ;' we think it very hard to disprove that he means to say, that we are treated as sinners on his account, or, in other words, have his sin put to our account.

The next paragraph is still more strange. "I will select," says Professor Stuart, "a case more directly in point still; one taken from the very epistle under consideration, and which, therefore, must serve to cast direct light on the *usus loquendi* of Paul. In Rom. vii. 6, this apostle says, 'Our sinful passions are *BY* the law.' Again, in v. 7, 'I had not known sin, except *BY* the law.' Again, in v. 8, 'Sin taking occasion, *BY* the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence;' and so again in v. 11." He then asks whether it can be inferred from these passages, that the law is "the efficient cause of all sin," or, that "there is evil in the law, which evil is put to our account, *i. e.* merely imputed to us?" We confess we can scarcely see how such reasoning, or rather such writing, can be answered. If it needs refutation, we almost despair of giving it. We can only say, we know no two propositions more diverse, than, 'Adam

is the efficient cause of our sins,' and 'Adam's sin is put to our account.' How any mind can regard them as equivalent, is to us a marvel. We as much believe that "the law is the efficient cause of all sin," as that Adam is. And when asked whether the passages quoted prove 'there is evil in the law, which evil is put to our account?' we answer, No, without the least idea what bearing it has on the point in hand. Did any one imagine, that the argument for imputation was founded simply on the use of the word *δία*, such reasoning might be sufficient; but this is not the case. The real argument we have repeatedly stated above. Is it not lamentable to see important doctrines rejected, and long received interpretations spurned by *such* a man, for *such* reasons? Yet these are his exegetical reasons as here presented. The theological ones are such as follow:

"We must then examine," says Professor Stuart, "the nature of the case. It is, (according to the *common* theory of imputation,) that the sin of one man is charged upon all his posterity, who are condemned to everlasting death because of it, antecedent to it, and independently of any voluntary emotion or action on their part." We object to the accuracy of this definition. The words "to everlasting death" should be left out, because it matters not what men are condemned to, as far as the doctrine is concerned. The doctrine is this, 'The sin of Adam is so put to the account of his posterity, that they are condemned on account of it, antecedent to any act of their own.' This is our doctrine; and as we have seen, it is *totidem verbis*, what Professor Stuart says Paul teaches in verses 15, 16, 17 of this chapter, although it is also the doctrine which he now argues against with so much vehemence. (The reader will see that Mr. Stuart's objections are not directed against the clause "everlasting death," and consequently its omission does not alter the case.) His first objection is, that the doctrine "appears to contradict the essential principles of our moral consciousness." "We never can force ourselves into a consciousness that any act is really our own, except one in which we have had a personal and voluntary concern." "A transfer of moral turpitude is just as impossible as a transfer of souls." "To repent, in the strict sense of the word, of another's personal act, is plainly an utter impossibility." We, in our simplicity, had hoped never to hear again, at least from Professor Stuart, these objections against this doctrine. They have so abundantly and frequently been proved to be founded in an entire misconception of its nature, that it is useless, because hopeless, to go over the proof again, for those who still refuse to see it. We can therefore, only say we no more believe in "the transfer of moral turpitude," than "in

the transfer of souls." Nor do we believe it possible "to repent, in the strict sense of the word, of another's personal act." Nor yet again, do we believe that two and two make twenty, and still we, not a whit the less, believe the doctrine of imputation. If it be any amusement to Professor Stuart to write thus, we cannot object; but to call it arguing against imputation, is a strange solecism.

But secondly; "Such an imputation as that in question, [viz. such as includes the idea of "a transfer of moral turpitude," and that "an act is really our own in which we have had no personal concern,"] would be in direct opposition to the first principles of moral justice as conceived of by us, or as represented in the Bible. That 'the son shall not die for the iniquity of the father,' is as true as that 'the father shall not die for the iniquity of the son,' as God has most fully declared in Ezek. xviii." It would really seem that Professor Stuart is some how infatuated on this subject; that he is unable to keep the same idea in his mind long enough to write two consecutive paragraphs. How is it, he does not see that the idea of imputation, on which this sentence is founded, is as different as day from night, from that involved in the preceding? In the one, 'the transfer of moral turpitude,' and identity of act, are included; in the other both of these ideas are necessarily excluded, and the whole doctrine is, that 'one should die for the iniquity of another.' It is not within the limits of possibility that he should understand the prophet as saying 'the moral turpitude of the father shall not be transferred to the son, nor his act be really the act of his offspring.' This cannot be; of course Professor Stuart's idea of imputation, when writing this paragraph, was the opposite of the one he had when writing the preceding.

But again; 'that a son should die for the iniquity of his father,' "is," he says, "in direct opposition to the first principles of moral justice." He wonders how President Edwards could imagine that the declaration of the Prophet was meant to be confined to the several individuals of the race of Adam, and not to be applied to the peculiar covenant relation between him and his posterity. And yet, as we have seen, Professor Stuart himself teaches, yea, on the very next page re-affirms, that *all men do die on account of the iniquity of Adam*. Such inconsistency is wonderful.

He seems to feel, notwithstanding the warmth with which he argues, that all is not quite right, for he introduces an objector as suggesting to him, "But still you admit that the whole human race became degenerate and degraded, in consequence of the act of Adam." To which he replies, "I do so: I fully believe it.

I reject all attempts to explain away this. I go further: I admit not only the loss of an original state of righteousness, in consequence of Adam's first sin, but that temporal evils and death have come on all by means of it." &c. Yes, respected Sir, you admit what you deny, and deny what you admit, in such rapid succession, your readers are bewildered. That, 'one should die for the iniquity of another' is, on one page opposed to all justice, and on the next, we not only 'all die for Adam's sin,' but we are born destitute of holiness, with "a nature *degraded* and *degenerated*, in itself considered;" we are involved in a certainty of sinning, and "are in imminent hazard of everlasting death." Of all this, you teach that Adam's sin is not the occasion, merely but that these evils come upon us antecedent to any voluntary emotion of our own. Nay, more, they are all in their nature *penal*, for in the next page you tell us, they are "*part of the penalty of the law*;" a small part, as you are pleased to think, though a much larger part than Turretin and other strenuous advocates of the doctrine of imputation, believe to be directly "inflicted on our race" for Adam's offence.

We have now, surely, seen enough to convince the reader of two things: First, that the doctrine of imputation is not touched either by Professor Stuart's exegesis or metaphysics. It is precisely where it was before; and second: That his whole exposition of this passage (Rom. v. 12—19,) is so inconsistent with itself that it cannot by possibility be correct. In reading this portion of his commentary we have been reminded of a remark of Lord Erskine in reference to one of Burke's efforts in the House of Commons, "It was a sad failure, but Burke could bear it."

It was our intention to extend these remarks to the *Excursus* on Rom. v. at the end of the volume. But we have made this article much too long already. We must, therefore, defer the execution of this purpose, to another occasion, should such be granted us. We think it will then appear, that if our New Haven brethren can claim one-half of what Professor Stuart says, we can establish our right to the other.

