



THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

OCTOBER, 1835.

No. IV.

Ashbel Green

ART. I.—*Address delivered to the Theological Students of the Princeton Seminary, N. J., at the close of the semi-annual Examination in May, 1835.* By ASHBEL GREEN, D.D.

MY BELOVED YOUNG BRETHREN—*Candidates for the Gospel Ministry:*

For the fourth, and probably the last time, it has become my duty to address you—on your retiring, for a short period, from this Seminary. On a former occasion, when this service was allotted to me, I endeavoured to show, among other things, that it is erroneous and idle to expect that improvements may be made in revealed or Christian Theology, similar to those which have been, and still may be made, in the secular sciences. This opinion has since been controverted in this place; and, as I am persuaded, not only of the justness of the opinion, but of its great importance, I propose at this time to offer something in its vindication, and something to expose what I apprehend to be the dangerous tendency of its opposite.

The whole argument opposed to the sentiments I have heretofore advocated, and am still disposed to maintain, so far as I have seen or heard, is one of analogy. It may be summarily stated thus:—Since it is undeniable that, in modern times, great discoveries and improvements have been

made in some important secular sciences, it is reasonable to suppose that similar discoveries and improvements may be made, and therefore ought to be attempted, in the important science of Christian Theology. Now, it is readily admitted, that analogical reasoning is sometimes lawful, and, when properly applied and fairly conducted, may be exceedingly powerful. Bishop Butler, you are aware, has, in this way, shown demonstratively, the utter irrelevancy and futility of the most formidable objections which infidelity has ever promulged against the great truths of divine revelation. But it is to be observed, and ought constantly to be kept in mind, that all analogical reasoning proceeds on a comparison of two subjects; which, although they may be considerably different in their general nature, still possess certain points or features of strong resemblance, often of exact similarity; so that whatever, in these resembling particulars, is true of the one subject, must also be equally true of the other. Dr. Reed, with his usual acumen, remarks, that "all arguments drawn from analogy are still the weaker the greater disparity there is between the things compared."* Of course, if the disparity be total, there can be no ground whatever for fair analogical argument. I propose, therefore, to make some remarks—

I. On the disparity which exists between the science of revealed or Christian Theology, and all merely secular science.

II. On the legitimate aid which Christian Theology may derive from secular knowledge.

"Christian Theology," says a writer of some note,† "may be divided into two parts, *natural* and *revealed*; the former comprehending what may be known of God from the creation of the world, even his eternal power and Godhead; the latter, which is discovered to man nowhere, but in the sacred volume of the Old and New Testaments." Against what is here called *Natural Theology*, I have nothing to object; believing, as I do, that it is the basis on which Revealed Theology must rest; since we have no formal argument in the Bible to prove the being, providence, and perfections of God. Still, I maintain, with another eminent writer,‡ that "Revealed religion embraces all that is claimed for natural

* Intellectual Essays—Essay I. Chap. IV. See the whole Chapter.

† Encyclopædia Britannica—Article Theology.

‡ New Edinburgh Encyclopædia—Article Theology.

religion, and a great deal more; and whilst we are at no loss to point out doctrines peculiar to revelation, we cannot point out a single doctrine which we can pronounce to be peculiar to natural religion." Revealed or Christian Theology, then, I would say, is that system of truth which God has made known to man in the Holy Scriptures. And I shall now endeavour to show that this system is, in several most important respects, wholly unlike every system and subject of secular science; and consequently that there can be no fair analogy, on which it may be argued and concluded that the same, or similar improvements, may be made in each of these departments of human knowledge.

In support of this allegation, my first remark is, that the AUTHORITY on which we receive instruction, in revealed or Christian Theology, is the authority of God; and that in secular science, it is human authority only—the teachings of our fellow men, and the conclusions of our own minds. Here, you perceive at once, is a disparity literally infinite. In divine revelation, He who is essential and eternal truth utters his sacred oracles; and to know and understand what he says, is all that is left to man. To question the veracity of a divine announcement, admitting it to be such, is blasphemy. Great care certainly ought to be used, to see that what we receive as a revelation from God is truly such, and that we understand its import. But when we are satisfied that we correctly understand a declaration, ascertained to be of divine origin, nothing remains for us but to bow and adore. Our reason may not be able fully to grasp the revealed truth, or accurately to analyze it, or, in some instances, even to reconcile it with certain conclusions previously and confidently entertained. But, surely, it is infinitely more reasonable to give up any of our conclusions, as false or mistaken, than to retain them in opposition to an inspired declaration; because we know that our reason is always fallible and often erroneous, but that infinite wisdom never can mistake, and infinite goodness never can deceive. In every instance, therefore, to set our own reason, or what we call philosophy, in opposition to a plain declaration of God, or to endeavour to give such a declaration a perverted import, is the extreme both of folly and impiety.

On the other hand, as has been stated, the authority on which we receive the instructions, deductions, or doctrines of merely secular science, is human authority solely. To question this, is not unlawful—it is lawful to question it even

in the exact sciences; for mistakes may be made, and sometimes have been made, in what purported to be strict demonstration—mistakes, either in the reasoning process, or in the data on which the pretended demonstration commenced, and an error in which has vitiated the whole proceeding, and rendered the conclusion essentially fallacious. We readily admit, indeed, that in the exact sciences, any error is likely to be soon exposed, and effectually corrected. Still, it is to our purpose, and precisely to the point before us, to remark, that their results may be questioned; and and that herein they differ entirely from decisions and truths, resting on the authority—the admitted authority—of the God who cannot lie.

But in every other science, or source of knowledge, than that to which we have just adverted—in every investigation, except in the exact sciences—as soon as we advance beyond a few plain facts and principles, obvious to common sense, or necessary to the preservation and comfort of human life and human society, we enter on debateable ground; where system has succeeded to system, and hypothesis to hypothesis, and solid, incontrovertible truth, if reached at all, has seldom been overtaken, till after a long and dubious pursuit. And in no science whatever has this been more conspicuously and strikingly apparent, than in that which is denominated *the philosophy of mind*. Here, the number of systems has been unusually great—each successive one decrying its predecessor, and hastening to be decried in its turn, by an opponent, which, for its own brief period, has gained the ascendant. At the present hour, while we are hearing much about the protestant Reformers having mixed their theology too much with the false philosophy of their day, those from whom the clamour comes are mixing their own philosophy with the truths of God's holy word, to an extent and an effect unspeakably more injurious than any thing that was done, in this way, by the venerable men of whom they complain. From the time of the apostle Paul to that in which we live, “the oppositions of science, falsely so called,” have been the great corrupters of the gospel—the chief spoilers of “the simplicity that is in Christ.”

In the philosophy of physics, too, the changes have not been few, nor of small importance. How many speculations and hypotheses were there, for example, about the causes of the tides, before the system which Newton established on this subject? And before the discovery of Frank-

lin, that the lightning and thunder of the heavens are only, on a larger scale, the electric phenomena of the Leyden phial, what a multitude of guesses were there, about the causes of these terrific aerial appearances and noises—the very best of which, at present, seem scarcely less than ludicrous. The system of natural philosophy which was taught in yonder college, when I was a student in it, was published a little before Franklin's discovery. Its author was Benjamin Martin, highly distinguished as a teacher of mathematics and philosophy in the city of London, and a strict and even enthusiastic Newtonian. Martin's theory of thunder and lightning, as laid down in the book that we studied, (omitting this article, of course,) was, as well as I recollect, that the vapours which ascend from the earth often possess qualities similar to those of iron filings and sulphur; and as we know that these substances, when mixed, and moistened, and exposed to an ardent sun, take fire and explode; so the humid vapours, which possess the same qualities, ignite and explode, when acted on by the sun in the region of the air, and then follow the vivid flashes of fire, and the tremendous roarings, which we call lightning and thunder. You smile, my young friends, but this was once very good and very serious philosophy. Now, it certainly was neither unlawful nor useless, for Newton and Franklin both to question and confute all that had been said by the philosophers who preceded them, on the tides and on lightning and thunder. They only questioned what had been said by fallible men like themselves, and which was fairly open to have its pretensions examined, and its inanity fully exposed.

My first remark, then, on the dissimilarity which exists between revealed Theology and all merely secular science, is summarily this—that in revealed Theology God speaks; and that when we understand his declarations, it is to the last degree impious to question what he says: but that in all merely secular science man speaks, and we not only may question what he says, but in many instances ought, after examining his teachings, to reject them altogether.

My second remark on the point before us, is nearly related to that which you have just heard. It is, that the manner, or way, in which we ascertain or arrive at truth, in Christian Theology, is exceedingly dissimilar to that in which it is reached in all merely secular science. How is it that you ascertain the truths of your Bible? Is it in any other way than by carefully and attentively reading the sacred

pages, scanning the language—the original language, I mean—pondering on and praying over what you read, and accurately comparing one part or portion of the inspired volume with another? Can all the interpreters, critics and commentators in the world, do any thing more—more, I mean, that is really useful—than help you to get at the true and genuine meaning of the Holy Spirit, in the words of his own inditing? Certainly not. “How readeſt thou?” and “Underſtandeſt thou what thou readeſt?” are the two great questions, which, answered ſatisfactorily, comprehend the whole reſult of biblical investigations, ſo far as intellectual truth is concerned. In this matter—in aſcertaining the mind of the Spirit in his own word—we ſay, that the inquiry ſimply and ſolely is, about *the true and full import of language*; that farther than this, human reaſon has nothing to do with the ſubject; that it is not to be applied to the ſubject one hair's breadth, farther than it is purely auxiliary, in obtaining the genuine ſenſe of the ſacred record; for then we have arrived at the divine *dictum*, and human reaſon, as already ſhown, is not to queſtion, but to ſubmit and adore.

That men, even learned men, have often diſputed, and do ſtill diſpute, about the real import of ſome of the plainest paſſages of holy ſcripture, muſt, indeed, be admitted—admitted as a lamentable fact. But this fact nevertheless, to ſuppoſe that the true and genuine meaning of ſcripture, on all important points of faith and practice, cannot be aſcertained—yea, clearly and ſatisfactorily aſcertained—by all, who, with the Bible in their hands, honeſtly deſire, diligently inquire after, and prayerfully ſeek to know the truth—to ſuppoſe this, is virtually to deny the uſe of revelation altogether; and is, in fact, only a particular form of the very worſt kind of infidelity. It is to deny that we have any revelation, that is definite in its meaning, and clear in its practical application.

In a word, then, revealed or Chriſtian Theology, is contained in one book, which God has given us; and is to be acquired by *reading that book underſtandingly*.

Now, nothing can be more unlike this, than the way and manner in which we acquire knowledge, and make improvements, in ſecular ſcience.

In the firſt place, we have no book in any of theſe ſciences, which has been given by a revelation from God; and which, if rightly read and fully underſtood, would give

us all the knowledge which could ever be obtained, of the particular science treated of in that book. The divine wisdom and benevolence have doubtless made the difference which we here contemplate, between theological and secular science, because what relates to our eternal well-being is infinitely more important, than any thing that has a bearing only on temporal concerns; and because, moreover, there are certain things essential in the plan of redemption, which we never could discover or know, without a direct revelation from God; and because, in fine, even in things in which uncorrupted human reason might have guided us right, our native depravity puts us wrong, by its influence in shutting out the light, rendering us averse to holy exercises, and perverting reason itself. We have a striking and most melancholy exhibition of this fact, in the first chapter of the epistle to the Romans.

But in all that relates to our temporal concerns, as far as they are unconnected with our future destiny—in all science that comprises knowledge which we may either possess or want, and yet our souls be safe—our Creator has left us to the operation, and cultivation, and exertion, of our own natural powers, and the improvement that results from their industrious and persevering exercise and employment. Hence we have no divinely inspired system of astronomy, or botany, or chemistry, or anatomy. We must get our knowledge of each of these sciences, not out of one book which God has given us, but out of many books which men have given us; together with our own observations, experiments, and inferences.

Again. The previous preparation, or attainments, that must be made, in order to become skilful in investigating the meaning of a record, and those which are indispensable, if we are to become adepts in, at least, some of the sciences, are as *unlike* as any two kinds of knowledge can possibly be. The Bible is simply a *record*—a record of God's revealed will; and as already shown, it is only necessary to be able to read and understand what is written, in order to become skilful in the knowledge of this record. How different from this must be the previous knowledge—the auxiliary apparatus—by which a man is to become an eminent astronomer, for example. Before he can proceed a single step—if he aspires to be a man of true science, and not to take on trust the results of the investigations of others—he must prepare, with great labour and pains, a curious and

complicated frame-work, or scaffolding, to bear him up, at every advance in his ascending progress. In other words, he must become a profound scholar in the endless science of Mathematics—he must have skill to apply the most recondite principles of this science, at every gradation of his advance. He must follow Newton through his *Principia*, and La Place through his *Mechanique Celeste*: and it is to be observed, that there are but a few human minds that can follow in the track of these extraordinary men, even after they have delineated it clearly. Now, how different are the previous knowledge, and preparations, and mental powers, necessary to become eminent in this science, from those which are demanded in order to understand *a book*—a book whose essential parts and principles are so plain, if we believe the book itself, that “he may run that readeth,” and that “wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein.”

In saying this, however, I by no means wish to intimate, that there is no such thing as eminence, and a most desirable eminence, in a knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, beyond that which is indispensable to salvation. That there is such an eminence, and that it is earnestly to be sought, your very presence in this institution implies and proclaims; and I hope, before I close this address, to show, briefly, how this eminence is to be attained. But I do deny, most unequivocally, that there is any such similarity between the study of Christian Theology, and the study of astronomy, or between the means and facilities by which men become skilful in these sciences, severally, as that we can fairly argue that because improvements are constantly going on in the one, they ought to be going on in the other, *pari passu*. What similarity, I desire to know, is there between a science, in which we are to learn exclusively from a revelation given us by God, and any science in which he has given us no revelation—between Christian Theology, in which the Holy Ghost is the teacher, and astronomy, in which Newton and La Place are the teachers? Is there, I also ask, any such likeness between fluxions and hermaneutics, that we may justly conclude that because improvements have been made in the one, they may also, and equally, be made in the other? or do calculations of the path and periodical revolution of a comet, bear any resemblance to a critical inquiry whether Jephtha did, or did not, sacrifice his daughter? or in what manner the differing genealogies of Matthew and Luke, relative to the descent of the Messiah, in his human nature, may be fairly reconciled?

It seems to have been supposed, that it was a confounding and conclusive observation, which was made in opposition to what I have heretofore very briefly stated and now maintain, that inasmuch as the works of God in the starry heavens all existed, and were open to human view and observation, for ages before the true nature and laws of the celestial luminaries were discovered and explained; so it may be, that the truths of revelation recorded in the Bible may have existed for ages, and be only waiting for some biblical Newton or La Place to develop them, and set them in a light in which they were never seen before. This, I think, is a fair representation of what is taught in the following quotation, in which the author,* after referring to a number of modern discoveries and improvements in several sciences, and naming their authors, proceeds thus—"Nor is it demonstrated that the limit of advancement is yet reached; or, that the human mind must here pause, and hope to proceed no farther. These men have just opened illimitable fields of thought before the mind. *And just so it may be in Theology.* The system was as perfect in the Scriptures, as astronomy was before Newton lived; yet it is possible that there are truths, and relations of truths, which the mind has not yet contemplated." These sentences seem plainly to intimate, that it may be that "just such" new views will yet be given of Bible truths, as Newton has given of astronomical truths. Now, if this should ever take place in fact, you perceive at once that we should have an essentially new Bible; that is, a Bible as different from the old Bible, as the new astronomy is different from the old astronomy: and this is a difference which every scholar knows is systematic, radical, and essential. Is it necessary to reason against such extravagance as this? Can any man soberly think, that a printed book, which has been profoundly studied and commented on for ages, by men of the most powerful minds, and among others by Sir Isaac Newton himself—a book on which the greatest masters of philology and exegesis have expended all the treasures of their learning, their skill, and their intellectual energies—that of such a book we may yet obtain as new views of its contents, as we have obtained of the starry heavens, since it has been demonstrated that the earth is not the centre of

* Rev. Albert Barnes, in a sermon delivered before the directors and students of the Seminary, in September, 1834, and afterwards published.

the solar and sidereal system, but only a little speck in the boundless universe of God? On this interrogatory, answer for yourselves.

But be assured, my dear young brethren, I would not have consumed so much of your time and of my own, in exposing the gross absurdity of the strange notions, on which I have animadverted, but for their dangerous tendency. For only concede to an innovator that Christian Theology, or a knowledge of the true Biblical system, (which is the same thing,) is as capable of improvement as the sciences of astronomy, and botany, and chemistry, and anatomy, and you have granted, in favour of the theological projector, the postulate of Archimedes for moving the earth—*δος μου ζω*—you have given him a position, on which he can stand and work a lever, that may heave from their deep foundations the very corner-stones of “the faith once delivered to the saints,” and lay in ruins all that the saints have built thereon in past ages. No wonder, that it has become the favourite dogma of all innovators in Theology, that this sacred science ought to be considered as just as much open to improvements, and to a like extent, as are the merely secular sciences; and that they should so earnestly advocate this dogma, whenever they find a favourable opportunity for the purpose: and hence, too, the importance of not admitting their claim for a single moment.

But in refusing this claim, do we virtually say, that nothing more can ever be learned from the Bible than has already been learned from it? We say no such thing. We know that there is a large part, and a most important part, of scriptural prophecy yet to be fulfilled; and that the true and full purport of this prophecy never can be learned, till it shall be developed in its fulfilment. We are also ready to admit, that some new light may be thrown on certain passages or portions of scripture, by a more perfect acquaintance with oriental customs, by geographical improvements and the discoveries of travellers, and, to a small extent, even by more accurate verbal criticism, on the original languages of the Bible. But what bearing will all this have on *the doctrinal truths* of the sacred oracles? Will it materially affect a single fundamental point, or a single important principle? It will not. The fulfilment of prophecy, surely, will alter no doctrine; and a new translation of a few words, or even the omission or insertion of a few words, although affecting the import of a single passage, will not

affect any leading truth of the sacred canon; which will always appear from the plain sense of other passages, and from the scope of many passages when carefully compared. Griesbach, whose authority on several points I by no means consider as commanding, yet on this I think it ought to be considered as weighty; because his learning was unquestionable, and his leanings have always been regarded as being towards a licentiousness of interpretation—Griesbach, in his Prolegomena to his edition, with various readings, of the New Testament, says:* “The word of God is not changed, when a term or two is expunged, or added, or changed for another in the vulgar text. That which is usually called the word of God, agreeably to a Hebrew rather than a Latin appellation, is contained in the SENSE of the sacred scripture; and does not so depend on syllables and letters, as that the real word of God, that is, the doctrine of Christ and the apostles, is destroyed, when (on the best reason and authority, and with a perfect preservation of the sense,) a particular term is changed. THE WORD OF GOD *endureth for ever!* Nor is it rendered *uncertain* by the labours of modest and pious critics, whose sole aim it is, that, by the help of God, they may render the divine word as certain as possible.” Thus Griesbach; and with him we confidently believe, that if all the various readings of the New Testament which exist should be collected and collated; and I will add, that if all the just verbal criticism and just reasoning that the learning and ingenuity of man can ever employ, should be applied to translate and elucidate the sacred text, it would not alter the *sense* of the word of God, on a single point of importance: that is, every important doctrine and principle of the New Testament would stand unshaken, on the same solid ground that it now occupies. We should not have a new Bible, but still the old Bible, cleared of a few *maculæ*, which for the present are just like the spots on the sun, discoverable on a critical inspection, but which have no

* Deinde non ideo *verbum Dei* mutatur, quia in textu vulgari unum alterumve vocabulum deletur aut additur aut cum alio permutatur. Quod, hebraico magis quam latino nomine, *verbum Dei* appellare solent, continetur *sensu* scripturæ sacræ; non autem ita in ipsis syllabis atque literis consistit, ut mutato (ob gravissimas rationes et auctoritates, ac salvo sensu,) vocabulo quodam, *impsum Dei verbum*, hoc est doctrina Christi ac apostolorum, pereat. * * * *Verbum Dei manet in æternum*. Nec incertum sit studiis criticorum modestorum atque piorum, qui unice id agunt, ut, Deo auxiliante, quam possunt maxime *verbum divinum* reddunt certissimum.—*Proleg.* sect. 1.

sensible influence in dimming its essential splendour, or diminishing the useful and glorious light which it sheds on the universe.

I now proceed to speak—and it will be very briefly—

II. On the legitimate aid which Christian Theology may derive from secular knowledge. Here, I avail myself, in the first instance, of the remark of a heathen. Cicero, in his oration for the poet Archias, who, he tells us, had been his early teacher, and to whom he declares he was indebted for all his attainments in the art of eloquence, makes this observation: **“All the arts which pertain to liberal knowledge have a kind of common bond, and are held together, as it were, by a sort of congeniality among themselves.”* This observation is peculiarly applicable to the point before us. Every kind of liberal knowledge may prove auxiliary, and sometimes highly advantageous, to the theologian and the preacher of the gospel. Theology, doubtless, is more directly connected with some departments of secular knowledge than with others; but there is not one that may not come into demand. Martyn found the high attainments he had made in mathematical and philosophical science, as well as his eminence in philology, of the greatest use in his missionary life. And how much more extensively useful were the missionaries Vanderkemp, and Carey, and Marshman, and Morrison, and Milne, not to mention others, than they could have been, if they had been only ordinary scholars? What would that wonderful man Gutzlaff have accomplished, in comparison with what he has already achieved, and is still doing, but for his various erudition, and his medical skill? And it delights me to think, that it is not improbable I may now be addressing some future Brainerd, or Martyn—or some companion of Pinney or Lowry—and if I am, let him know, that the greater measure of secular knowledge of every kind and character he acquires, the better furnished will he be for extensive usefulness in the missionary field.

But although various and profound erudition is peculiarly desirable in foreign missionaries, solid and accurate learning, to a considerable extent, is of vast use to every pastor. It is on this account that, in our church, liberal knowledge is made an indispensable prerequisite in every candi-

* *Omnes artes quæ ad humanitatem pertinent, habent quoddam commune vinculum, et quasi cognatione quâdam inter se continentur.*

date for the gospel ministry; and greatly to the advantage of our church would it be, if the scholarship of ministerial candidates were of a higher order, than in many instances it unhappily and manifestly is. There is reason seriously to fear, that in general learning we are rather retrograde than advancing, in our demands on candidates for licensure. That such is the fact in some parts of our church, is beyond a question; and recently we have had open apologists, and even advocates, for setting aside, *as general requisitions*, the study of Latin and Greek, and some other parts of the usual academical course. Verily, it would seem, that between the asserted omnipotence of science on the one hand, and the pleas for ignorance on the other, our church has a dangerous navigation in prospect. Be cautious, my young brethren, and for yourselves avoid both Scilla and Charibdis, and keep the safe middle course.

Without a figure, permit me earnestly to advise you to make it an object, in the whole of your preparatory course in this Seminary, and for years after you are settled in the ministry, not only to endeavour, as far as possible, to retain in its freshness all the liberal knowledge you have ever acquired, but to be constantly making gradual additions to it. Leave it to sciolists, and the advocates of Vandalism, to ask what good a knowledge of Latin, and Greek, and Hebrew, and French, and German, and mathematics, and natural philosophy, and belles-lettres, will do a preacher of the gospel? Every well taught man knows, that all these may occasionally be of *direct* use, even to a secluded country clergyman; and that their *indirect* use is indescribably great; that all of them contribute to enlarge the mind, and improve its various powers; that some of them cherish the love of conclusive argument, and improve the capacity for it, and create dissatisfaction with every thing that is loose and inconclusive; that belles-lettres lore qualifies its possessor to give spirit and polish to solid matter, that might otherwise appear dry, harsh and repulsive; that the Greek and Latin classics are better adapted than any thing beside, to teach and cultivate a love for that chaste simplicity in writing, which is more important in all religious compositions than in those of any other description, besides being of essential importance as the key to many rich treasures of theological knowledge; and in fine, that the union of all the acquisitions mentioned invigorates and liberalizes the mind, furnishes an inexhaustible source of illustration, both

for writing and oral discourse, and gives a richness, ease and grace to compositions and communications, of whatever kind. Nor is it to be overlooked, that real and acknowledged scholarship gives great weight to character; and in this age of diffusive knowledge, is peculiarly important, to place the divine on equal ground with learned sceptics, Jesuits and heretics.

But having said this, I feel it to be incumbent immediately to remind you, that there is a danger here—a danger against which you ought carefully to guard—the danger of cultivating science and general literature, to the neglect of theology and practical piety. You ought to keep in constant recollection, that all your powers and all your time are solemnly consecrated to God, for the work of the gospel ministry. That the salvation of souls—the conversion of sinners, the edification of saints, the promotion of the cause and kingdom of the Redeemer—that these are to form the great and commanding objects, which are to influence the whole of your conduct through life; and of course, that to these objects every other pursuit is to be either directly or indirectly auxiliary, and strictly tributary. The minister of the gospel, therefore, who employs his talents and his time chiefly in the cultivation of mere secular science, is as really criminal, though he may not be as disreputably so, as if he devoted himself to the getting and hoarding of money; and made his ministerial duties a by-business, a mere subordinate concern. And such men there have been in the sacred office, not only in Europe, but in our own country, and in our own church—men who gave all their mental energies to scientific researches and pursuits; and once a week repeated a dull sermon or two, perhaps for the tenth or twentieth time, to a congregation made up of *like people like priest*.

But this is by no means a necessary result of the love and cultivation of literature and science, in ministers of the gospel. Calvin was declared by Scaliger to be, in his day, the first scholar in Europe. The protestant Reformers and their friends were certainly the most erudite men of their age, unless Erasmus, who was half a Reformer, be considered as an exception. And yet, for eminent piety, and the laborious performance of ministerial duties, these men have had no superiors since the time of the apostles. At a much later period, I cannot forbear to mention Dr. Watts, as a shining example of the happy union of eminent piety with distinc-

tion in literature and science. "Whatsoever he took in hand (says Johnson, in his life,) was, by his incessant solicitude for souls, converted to theology. As piety predominated in his mind, it is diffused over his works. Under his direction, it may be truly said *Theologicæ Philosophiæ ancillatur*, philosophy is subservient to evangelical instruction; it is difficult to read a page without learning, or at least wishing to be better. The attention is caught by indirect instruction, and he that sat down only to reason, is on a sudden compelled to pray. Few men have left behind such purity of character, or such monuments of laborious piety. He has provided instruction for all ages, from those who are lisping their first lessons to the enlightened readers of Malbranche and Locke; he has left neither corporeal nor spiritual nature unexamined; he has taught the art of reasoning and the science of the stars." Such are the examples, my young brethren, which you will do well to emulate, and, within the compass of your powers, to imitate. And if you shall imitate them with some good degree of success, you may not only be instrumental in saving souls by preaching the gospel, but, as *authors*, you may teach and profit unborn millions.

But beside the happy influence of general science, in forming an accomplished theologian and preacher of the gospel, there are certain branches, as already intimated, which have a more direct bearing on ministerial qualifications and usefulness. These are sufficiently indicated in the **PLAN** of this Seminary, in the article which relates to *study and attainments*. It would therefore be unnecessary for me to dwell much upon them, even if I had not already too heavily taxed your patience by the length of this Address. There are, however, two subjects—mental philosophy and the study of the original languages of the sacred scriptures—on which it was my original intention to have submitted a few thoughts: to have admitted and inculcated the importance of adopting and understanding a right system of mental philosophy, as necessary to detect and expose every false system, and as a qualification for meeting infidels, and other errorists, on their own ground; and as auxiliary to a defence of genuine Christian Theology, and a just interpretation of Holy Scripture: to have insisted, in reference to this last particular, on the great Baconian principle, namely, that in true philosophy we are to abandon all hypotheses, and simply to take facts as we find them, as the

ground of every inference or induction: to show that this principle ought to be strictly applied in the study of the Bible, so that no passage should be interpreted by any previous philosophical dogma, but simply and solely by a sound exegesis of the language, or the *usus loquendi*, in the passage concerned: to remind you that the meaning of the passage, thus ascertained, ought to be treated as a FACT, resting on the truth and authority of God, and not to be modified a single iota by any philosophical reasoning, but before which all such reasonings are to bow and submit—just as, according to the Baconian system, all philosophical hypotheses and deductions are immediately and implicitly to yield to opposing facts or phenomena; not attempting to controvert or pervert them, but allowing them, forthwith and absolutely, to control every previous hypothesis, or militating principle or doctrine: and to inculcate that any other application of philosophy than this to the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, is fraught with incalculable injury to revealed truth, as the history of the church in past ages demonstrates, and which is not less mournfully manifest at the present time than at any former period.

As to the study of the original languages of the sacred writings, I wanted to urge, as I did on a former occasion, an early, constant, and continued attention to them, and even to the cognate dialects of the Old Testament; and to have recommended earnestly the practice of committing to memory texts, and even considerable portions of scripture, especially of the New Testament, in the *ipsissima verba* of the sacred writers, or rather of the Holy Spirit.

But all this I must pass, and conclude my address, by exhorting you, affectionately and solemnly, to read your Bibles much, not merely as critics but as Christians; seeking to have your souls fed with “the sincere milk of the word.” It is this, after all, that will do more to make you able ministers of the New Testament, than every thing you can possess, if in this—mark the qualification—*if in this you be deficient*. This is essential to your growth in grace and your personal comfort; and your personal comfort and growth in grace are intimately and closely connected with your ministerial fidelity and usefulness. The more experience you have of the sweetness of communion with God, in reading and meditating on his holy word, accompanied, as it always should be, with breathing out the desires and emotions of the soul, in prayer and praise—the more easy and de-

lightful it will be to preach; and the greater, of course, will be your desire to preach, and in every way you can devise, to bring others to partake with you, in the pure, and sublime, and heavenly pleasure, of contemplating the grace and the glory which you see shining in the plan of redemption by Jesus Christ. In a word, these views, and the effect they will produce on your own hearts, will dispose and enable you to make full proof of your ministry; and to do it, not reluctantly, but with holy animation in your Master's service, and gratitude to him for making you his ambassadors—the bearers of his messages of mercy to your perishing fellow sinners.

It is in this way, believe me, that you will get such a knowledge of the Bible as you can obtain by no other means. Your eyes will be opened, to behold wondrous things out of the divine word. John Bunyan, who could read the pages of inspiration in no other than his mother tongue, but who read them much on his knees, and meditated on them by day and by night, made this declaration—“I have sometimes seen more in a line of the Bible, than I could well tell how to stand under.” Behold! here is the blessed method of making *new discoveries* in divine revelation.—New discoveries indeed!—such discoveries as no unsanctified man ever makes—discoveries of no new doctrines, but new discoveries of the spiritual import and the “riches of glory” of the old doctrines, which apostles, and martyrs, and confessors, and fathers, and reformers of the church, all beheld in their day; beheld and meditated on, till they were filled with “joy in the Holy Ghost,” and could find no language adequately to express the perceptions, which these bright visions of the truths of God's holy word poured upon their minds.

O may you make many discoveries such as these! for these are the discoveries, my dear young brethren, that will, in very deed, make you “not count your life dear unto yourselves, so that you may finish your course with joy, and the ministry, which you have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.” These discoveries will fill many of you with an inextinguishable desire to go on missions to the heathen; and will qualify all of you to preach the gospel, wherever you shall be called, with a holy unction, and with a far better prospect of success in the conversion of sinners and the edification of saints, than if, without this unction, you had at command all the learning and

all the eloquence which mortals or angels ever possessed. God grant, therefore, that you may have a large measure of this holy anointing—grant that you may be able “to comprehend with all saints, what is the breadth and length, and depth and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye may be filled with all the fulness of God.” Thus will you have the sure prospect of success in your ministry, of comfort in life, of joy in death, and of a crown of glory in that day when you shall stand with your spiritual children to receive the reward of those “who turn many to righteousness,” and who shall “shine as the stars for ever and ever.” Amen.

Erskine Alexander

ART. II.—*An Essay on Native Depravity.* By LEONARD WOODS, D. D. Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary of Andover. Boston: published by W. Pierce, 1835.

THE above is the title of a prize essay, to the author of which a premium of three hundred dollars was awarded. This premium was offered by Mr. John Dunlop of Edinburgh, Scotland. The persons appointed to judge of such pieces as might be offered, were, the Reverend Jeremiah Day, D. D. LL. D. president of Yale college; The Reverend Edward Griffin, D. D. president of Williams college; and the Rev. Heman Humphrey, D. D. president of Amherst college.

Whether this method of eliciting the talents and stimulating the exertions of distinguished men, redounds to the honour of learning and religion, may, perhaps, be doubted. The motive addressed by such premiums seems to be of a nature too mercenary and sordid, to be associated with the high and disinterested feelings by which the person should be actuated, who takes up his pen to elucidate, or defend, the cardinal doctrines of Christianity. But if experience teaches, that by this means talents are actually brought into exercise for the public benefit, and the cause of truth is promoted, we ought to rejoice; and it may be admitted, that the prospect of obtaining a premium, does not neutralize necessarily, those more noble motives, which may after all have the governing influence, on leading able men to

come forward in the defence of truth. To which we would add, that the successful display of intellectual power is not so dependent on the purity of the motive of the writer, as that his reasonings and arguments will be vitiated, even if the motive which led to the exertion, should be no higher than a regard to emolument or reputation. It is true, however, that not many prize-essays have arisen to be standard works, and some of them have perished almost as speedily as the advertisement which announced their publication: but the literary world are laid under lasting obligations by the publication of the "Bridgewater Essays," which have been produced by the offer of a munificent premium.

In the present case, we are gratified that any considerations have been effectual to put in requisition the knowledge and talents of a writer so sound and able, as Dr. Woods. His reputation as a theologian and as a good writer, is fully established; and there can be no doubt, that his essay, coming as it does before the public, under such favourable auspices, as the one which has been successful in gaining so high a prize, by the judgment of men so highly distinguished among the American *literati*, will ensure for it a wide circulation and general perusal; which we wish as far as our influence extends, to promote.

The first chapter is occupied with general preliminary observations of great weight, and very important to the discussion which follows.

In the second chapter, the learned professor enters on the proof of depravity; first, from human conduct; and next, from the testimony of the Holy Scriptures.

Having established the universality of human depravity, the author proceeds to explain what is to be understood by *total depravity*, and then enters into the proof of the doctrine; and answers the objection derived from the existence of useful and amiable qualities, which are found amongst men in a natural, or unrenewed state.

The topics from which he endeavours to establish the doctrine of total depravity are, first, "passages of Scripture in which it is affirmed, or implied;" secondly, "from the necessity of regeneration," which necessity is universal; and thirdly, "from the experience, or consciousness of enlightened Christians."

In the fourth chapter, Dr. Woods enters on the difficult subject of hereditary, or *native depravity*. He commences by remarking, that this doctrine has been almost universally

believed, in ancient and modern times; and by sects who differ widely from each other, in other points.

The arguments on which he depends are, first, *the universality of depravity*, already proved. Secondly, "its early developement." Thirdly, "that it is not owing to any change which takes place, after birth." Fourthly, "its free and spontaneous operation." Fifthly, "the difficulty of resisting and overcoming it." And sixthly, "that it can be certainly predicted, *that it will act itself out.*"

In the fifth chapter, the Scriptural evidences of native depravity are given; and the consequences of denying the doctrine, considered.

The sixth and seventh chapters are occupied with the objections, which are commonly made to the doctrine of native depravity. In considering these, the learned professor is obliged to travel over much of the same ground, already trodden. As we have not room to give even a condensed view of his answers, it will be inexpedient to state in detail, the popular objections. Whether these can be satisfactorily answered or not, they cannot invalidate the body of evidence which can be adduced in support of the doctrine. Objections can be made to the doctrine of a particular providence, which no human wisdom is sufficient entirely to remove; they are most successfully obviated, not by a direct and demonstrative answer, but by showing that we are incompetent to judge what is suitable and proper for God to do; and the same method of meeting objections, is often found to be necessary, in regard to other doctrines of divine revelation.

In the eighth chapter, Dr. Woods undertakes to discuss a subject which is so dark and difficult, that we feel some degree of regret, when it is brought forward. It is, "*The state of the infant mind.*" The object of the inquiry is, to ascertain wherein native depravity consists; whether it is merely a latent principle, a corrupt nature, an evil disposition, which is the fountain from which the streams of depravity will issue at a future period; or whether *actual transgression* commences, from the time of our nativity. Dr. Woods adopts the latter opinion, and with much modesty and caution, endeavours to render it probable. As our views are different, we propose to enter, at some length, into a consideration of his statements and arguments.

There is so much that is excellent in this treatise on depravity, and the true doctrine is so clearly stated and ably

defended, that we feel reluctant to dissent from any thing which the excellent author has said ; and especially, because his amiable candour and undissembled modesty in stating his opinions, where they differ from those which have commonly been received by Calvinists, are such that we cannot entertain the least wish to indulge in severity of criticism, in our remarks on what appears to us to be erroneous. Besides, we are candidly of opinion, that the integrity of the doctrine of original sin, as held by Augustine and by the reformers, is not affected by the peculiarities of the Andover school. Dr. Woods cannot be accused of not holding the whole orthodox doctrine, as it relates to depravity; he has only laid himself liable to the charge of holding, *more than the truth*. He has so clearly and forcibly stated and defended the Scriptural doctrine, that we think that the whole Christian church is laid under obligations to him ; but he has added an appendage to the doctrine, totally unknown to the fathers and the reformers, which he thinks necessary to a complete view of the subject. He maintains, not only that man is born with a sinful nature, and that the infant is totally depraved, *in disposition* ; but that, as soon as born, it puts forth moral acts; so that *actual sin* commences from the moment of our birth. Of course, the new-born infant is a moral agent, and possesses every constituent of moral agency. We cannot but regret, that this view of the subject has been introduced into this valuable work. In all other points, there would have been unanimity among those denominated orthodox. Even on the subject of *imputation*, Dr. Woods concedes so much, and expresses himself so modestly and candidly, that although his views do not entirely come up to our standard, we should not have felt it necessary, in this review, to make a single remark. But the sentiments expressed in his eighth chapter, are so foreign from our notions, that we cannot pass them by without a few remarks, which we hope to make in the same spirit of kindness, in which Dr. Woods writes.

If the respected author had given a more definite form to his opinion, it would be more easy to join issue on the subject. What we feel the want of, is, a distinct idea of his notion of moral agency, and of what is necessary to constitute a moral agent. The doubt which we feel, rests on this point: does Dr. Woods suppose, that the infant of a day old has the exercise of reason and conscience, and some knowledge of God and his law; or, that, moral exercises

may take place in a mind destitute of all these? In some passages of this eighth chapter, he seems to lean to the first opinion; but for the most part, it seems to be implied, that the moral acts attributed to infants are mere *emotions*, or sensations, which possess a moral character, without any exercise of reason.

In stating and defending his opinion, Dr. Woods proceeds with much caution, standing for the most part on the defensive, and alleging that the contrary doctrine cannot be demonstrated. Thus, he says, "The fact, that moral affection is *not apparent* at the beginning of human existence is no certain proof that it does not exist." Because if it did exist, "the infant could not make it visible before arriving at such mental and bodily improvement and activity, as to be able to make known inward feeling by significant outward signs." Now we profess that this mode of reasoning is very unsatisfactory to us. It throws the burden of proof in the wrong place. But waiving this; we suppose, that if the new-born infant had the exercise of reason and conscience, it would know how to give expression to the sentiments of the mind. We respectfully ask, whether the same thing might not be said of brutes? we know not what passes within them, and how can we be certain that they are not moral agents? But a case more in point, will be that of the adult idiot. Suppose it be inquired, whether he is a moral agent: the common opinion of men has been, that such an one is no moral agent, because he has no exercise of reason; but according to the remarks made about infants, we cannot be certain, that he has not moral affections, although he can give no evidence of their existence. There is just as much reason for supposing that the idiot is a moral agent, as that the new-born infant is: for although the infant will, by the developement of its faculties, come to the exercise of reason; yet, we think that when first born, it has less exercise of reason, and less knowledge, than any idiot that we have ever seen.

The learned professor proceeds again to say, "That the *incapacity* of the infant child, to receive particular instruction from parents and others, respecting moral and religious subjects, is no certain proof that he is incapable of moral feeling." The very constitution of his mind, the "law written on his heart," may without any instruction from others, render him capable of moral feeling. We cannot help being surprised at what is expressed, and implied, in this

paragraph. Does Dr. Woods suppose, that the mere constitution of a child teaches it any thing, prior to all instruction? Or, does he think, that the infant of a day, knows any thing about the, "law written on the heart"? The young lamb has just as much knowledge of the moral law as the new-born infant. But what does this law require of the infant? If he is a moral agent, it requires him to love God his Creator with all his heart. But does the infant know that there is a God, and is it capable of feeling the obligation to love him supremely? Certainly it knows no more of God as yet, than the young of the sheep or the cow. If it does, we have something more than the old doctrine of innate ideas revived. But we do not suspect Dr. Woods, who is distinguished for his skill in the philosophy of the mind, of holding any such opinion, as that the new-born infant possesses any knowledge, whatever, of God or his law; yet the necessity of some kind or degree of knowledge to constitute a moral agent, seems to have been felt by the Doctor, in this place. It was a correct feeling, and if carried out, would have entirely changed the character of the sentiments defended in this chapter. Dr. Woods proceeds thus, "No one is authorized to say that the infant mind cannot have such emotions, because it is incapable of instruction from without. Indeed, the elements of knowledge must exist in the mind, before it can receive instruction." We must stop to ask, what does this mean? If by the elements of knowledge, the learned professor means, the capacity of acquiring knowledge, we are all agreed; but it is nothing to the purpose for which it was adduced; but if by "elements of knowledge," Dr. Woods means, "ideas," or the knowledge of certain truths, on which other knowledge must be engrafted, we have the old exploded doctrine of *innate ideas* revived, in all its force. He goes on to say: "Instruction on intellectual subjects does not originate the first intellectual acts, but presupposes them, refers to them, and makes use of them." Now this is a philosophy entirely new to us, or rather belongs to a system, which for want of evidence, we supposed, all the moderns viewed as properly exploded.

Again, he says, "The same is true of moral instruction. It does not originate the first moral emotions, nor communicate the first moral perceptions; but evidently proceeds on the supposition that they already exist."- - - "Much is to be done in the mind before *our* work can begin. There

must be various intellectual and moral acts, as elements of knowledge, as materials for us to operate upon. Surely then, we cannot prove that an infant child has no moral emotions, because he is incapable of receiving instruction from human teachers. He has not yet learned the use of words, nor the meaning of other signs. But his mind itself, though not capable of receiving instruction in these ways, may be capable of intellectual perceptions, and consequently of moral emotions, in regard to the objects perceived; and as these intellectual perceptions are the elements of knowledge, the moral emotions attending them, are the elements of moral character."

Now in regard to all this, we scarcely know what to say, except to express our surprise. But we wish that Dr. Woods had told us particularly, what those intellectual perceptions are, which the infant mind obtains independently of instruction from without. What is that knowledge which constitutes the infant a moral agent prior to all instruction? The new-born infant has perception by the senses, has the feelings of appetite, and the emotions of pleasure and pain; but in all these respects, its perceptions and emotions are the same as those experienced by the young of every animal; except that animals appear to have the exercise of their senses, as well as their other organs, more perfectly than infants. Dr. Woods sometimes reasons, as if the question were, whether infants are the subjects of feelings or emotions, and he proceeds, as if proving that they did experience these, proved that their exercises were of a moral nature. Thus, he says, p. 170. "It agrees with common analogy to suppose, that feeling begins very early, and in a very low and imperceptible degree."—"But a very short time passes, after the commencement of life, before a child becomes capable of showing some signs of feeling, and have we not reason to suppose, that reason as well as thought exists some time before? A child gives early and frequent indications of strong emotions, and strives to utter them, long before he is able to do it in the usual way," &c. All this we fully agree to, and believe, that such emotions or sensations, may reasonably be supposed to exist, not only from the moment of birth, but from the first existence of the soul. It is no part of our theory to deny the activity of the soul; or, that it is the subject of strong emotions from its birth, at least.—But this is not the question at issue. The question is, are these feelings of a moral nature? Their existence needs

no proof, it is equally held by both sides; but in these exercises of early infancy, is the young child a moral agent? If so, we see not why brutes may not all be moral agents. We are acquainted with no exercises of new-born infants which appear to have any more the character of moral acts, than what is observed in the young of animals: and we do not believe, that the emotions or feelings of the one, are any more moral, than those of the other. Examine the infant of a day or week old, and see whether you can find any evidence of such knowledge as to constitute it accountable for its present exercises. What would be the nature of the account to be rendered at the day of judgment? It must, if condemned for its acts, be found guilty of transgressing the law of God. What did that law require this young agent to do? It could be no external act, for it has no physical powers to perform such. The law of God, certainly requires of every moral agent and accountable being, to love him supremely as was before mentioned, and to exercise right affections to others. Is it the fact then, that God does require the infant of a day to love him? Impossible. It has no more knowledge of God than the young lamb has: it cannot obey such a law. Then a moral agent may be under no obligation to obey the law which requires love to God and our neighbour. What law then does it violate? It may be said, that the emotions may be sinful, when there is no knowledge; then creatures, which are, and continue to be irrational, through the whole period of their existence, may be moral agents. For aught we know then, all animals are moral agents. But how can it be supposed that the infant is a moral agent, or can put forth moral acts, without the possibility of discerning between right and wrong; and without the least feeling of moral obligation? But we are asked how we know that the infant does not discern the difference between right and wrong? We would answer, with respect, how do we know that the infant is not perfectly acquainted with the Newtonian theory of the universe? It certainly knows as much of the latter, as the former.

But we cannot consent to reason on this case: the subject does not admit of it. If any man, after impartial consideration, can persuade himself, that a new-born infant is accountable for the emotions of its mind, without any knowledge of God or his law; or that it possesses the requisite knowledge to render it accountable, prior to all instruction,

he must have habits of thinking and judging, very different from ours.

But Dr. Woods alleges, "That the infant is considered by all sober men as having a rational soul, a mind endued with intellectual and moral powers." And he asks, "Is not such a mind, from its very nature, capable of intelligence and moral affection?" To this we reply, that when we say, that an infant has a rational soul, *we* do not mean, that it has reason in present exercise: our meaning is, and we presume that of most "sober men," is, that it possesses faculties, which, *when developed*, will constitute it rational; but in no other sense is it rational when first it comes into the world. To the question, "is not such a mind capable of intelligence and moral affection?" We answer, not at present; not in the earliest stage of infancy. The new-born infant has perception by the senses, the feeling called appetite, and various emotions of pleasure and pain, just as other animals have, but has neither intelligence nor moral affection, at the present moment. A capacity of becoming intelligent and of exercising moral affection, when by instruction its powers are developed, it has; and it has moral dispositions, or the latent principles of depravity within it; as Dr. Woods has shown clearly in the ninth chapter of his essay.

Dr. Woods supposes, that his views of infant depravity, and of the moral agency of infants, agree best with the general representations of Scripture, and the general aspect of things in divine providence. But he has adduced no express passages; and most that he says is as much in accordance with our theory as his own. Indeed, there are a number of remarks, in this chapter, which are intended particularly to have a bearing on the theory, which maintains that there is no sin in infants, until some considerable time after their birth; and that when they become moral agents, they become sinful by their own voluntary acts. This doctrine we utterly reject, as believing that original sin exists in the soul from the commencement of its existence; and that depravity is hereditary, or derived by our natural birth, from the corrupt and degenerate nature of our first parents. Dr. Woods has, in the ninth chapter, given a correct view of the doctrine which we hold to be true. After giving a clear statement of this doctrine, and illustrating it in a very satisfactory manner, he proceeds to say, "That such a propensity to sin as I have described, exists in all men from the beginning of life, and that this consti-

tutes the essence of depravity, has been maintained almost universally by men who have embraced the other doctrines of the orthodox faith. It was held by the ancient fathers, except one sect, that of the Pelagians. It was contained in all the creeds of the reformed churches, in Europe and America. It was held by Arminius, and is now maintained by the Wesleyan Methodists. Even those in our country who object to some of the expressions and modes of reasoning used by the older Calvinists, still believe it to be a fact, that a disposition or propensity to sin exists in man from the beginning." He then adduces various authorities to show, that this doctrine has been held by all denominated orthodox in New England. He then proceeds to demonstrate, that this propensity, or corrupt disposition, is of the nature of sin; and answers the objections of those who confine all sin to voluntary acts, or actual transgression. In all these views and reasonings, we heartily concur: and, also, in the following just remarks. "The view which has been presented, is the one which has generally been entertained by orthodox divines. And does it not agree with plain common sense? Ask any one who has learnt the use of language and who judges of things naturally, whether a disposition to do wrong, is not a *wrong disposition*? Inquire what he means, when he says a man has a *bad disposition*; and you will find his meaning to be, that the man has a disposition to do *bad actions*. The disposition is characterized by the actions to which it leads."

Dr. Woods seems to be aware that there would seem to be some inconsistency between what is here said, and the doctrine of the preceding chapter. But he says, "the inconsistency may be only apparent," and he proceeds to make various remarks intended to show that the two sets of opinions may be reconciled. Now, we are not disposed to make the appearance of inconsistency the ground of our objection. Our objections rise much higher. We are seriously of opinion, that this novel appendage to the doctrine of original sin is contrary to the intuitive judgment of all impartial men, and will have no small influence in bringing the whole doctrine into discredit. And in regard to ourselves, we are constrained to confess, that if, in order to receive the doctrine of *native depravity*, we must also swallow this of the *actual transgression* of the new-born, speechless infant, we would be under the necessity of rejecting the whole. This is a doctrine to which we are confident we

never can yield assent; and as far as we are acquainted with the views and feelings of sober-minded Christians, there exists in most of them a strong repugnance to this opinion. It is, therefore, with us, a matter of deep regret, that Dr. Woods, whose influence in the theological world is deservedly so great, has been induced to introduce this sentiment into his otherwise excellent Essay; and we do hope to live to see an edition of this work, from which the whole of the eighth chapter will be expunged, and that part of the ninth which reiterates the same opinion. We are aware, that Dr. Woods thinks, that the reception of this opinion will relieve the doctrine of original sin from some of its most embarrassing difficulties. For, although he admits and proves, that an evil disposition, prior to all acts, is sinful, and consequently punishable; yet he adopts the following train of thought,—we will not call it *reasoning*, for it hardly seems intended to be such. “The *moral nature* or *disposition* of man, though in our way of contemplating it, *distinct* from action, mental as well as bodily, and though evidently presupposed in action, does not exist in such a manner that it can be considered and treated as *in fact separate from action*. What I mean is, that *there is no such thing as a moral being who is actually treated as a subject of retribution, while his moral nature is not in any way developed in holy or unholy action*. The very idea of a moral agent receiving retribution, implies the exercise of his moral faculties, the acting out of his disposition. That any one can enjoy good or suffer evil, without mental action, is inconceivable. I say then, that there can be no such thing as reward or punishment actually dispensed to a moral being, whose heart is not developed in some kind of exercise. The disposition, the moral nature does indeed exist; it is a reality; and God is perfectly acquainted with it, before it is made known by action. But it cannot be known to created beings, not even to him who is the subject of it, except as *manifested in external or internal action*. It cannot, any other way, become a matter of consciousness. And as it can never be known, it can never be recompensed, aside from its outgoing in action.” Then the Doctor, contrary to his usual caution and reserve, enters upon a curious speculation, which he doubtless intends to be received as a mere hypothesis. He asks, “But what if a human being dies, before his moral nature is in any degree developed? I answer: if he exists in another state, he will doubtless act

out his disposition there. As soon as he has opportunity, he will, if unrenewed, show himself to be a sinner, and will thus make it manifest, that his character was stamped from eternity by his descent from apostate Adam."—"Soon after death—no one can tell how soon—the character of the unrenewed mind is exhibited in sinful feelings and actions."—"If regeneration takes place - - - then the new-born child, dying before there is any opportunity to develop his renewed nature in moral exercises, will doubtless have a speedy opportunity to develop them after death, and will spontaneously love what is holy, and hate what is sinful." When we perused this paragraph, we could not repress the thought, O when will theologians cease from being wise above what is written! But it appears to us, that the whole of this speculation is far more suitable to illustrate our theory than that of Dr. Woods. Indeed, we do not see any danger of infants dying before their moral powers are developed, upon his theory, for they are moral agents as soon as they are born, and if they live only a moment, yet even in that time, they may commit a sin which deserves eternal death. But if the hypothesis is designed to meet the case of infants who die before birth, the difficulty can readily be disposed of, by extending moral agency and moral exercises to the very commencement of existence, which undoubtedly the scheme requires.

We would respectfully ask Dr. Woods to consider, whether it relieves any difficulty to suppose that infants are condemned to eternal misery for the first emotions which arise in their minds, after their birth? Why would it not be as reasonable to suppose that they are condemned for a corrupt nature, or evil disposition, which he acknowledges partakes of the nature of sin, and is the bitter root from which all actual sins proceed? There is certainly an inconsistency in admitting that the nature is sinful, and yet maintaining, as Dr. Woods seems to do, in the foregoing extract, that unless they actually transgress they cannot be the proper subjects of retribution. The very idea of sin involves the desert of punishment, whether it be active or inactive. A sin, or sinful temper, which cannot be justly punished, is a solecism. But here we see that the old divinity is attended with fewer difficulties than the new. The old theologians maintained, that the death and sufferings of infants were the punishment of Adam's sin *imputed*—the punishment of the children for the offence of their father, who was ap-

pointed their representative, in the first covenant: the new divinity rejects imputation, and attributes the death and sufferings of infants to their own personal sins. The very first act of the new-born infant incurs the sentence of death; for death cannot be the punishment of many acts. If one does not incur this sentence, the next would not, and so of any number. Death must then be incurred by the very first actual sin. And now the question between these two systems is, whether it is easier to believe that condemnation is to the whole human race, in consequence of the sin of one man, who was amply endued with all the knowledge and power and freedom necessary to his responsible station; or to attribute this condemnation to the obscure emotions of a sinful nature, which are supposed to arise in the infant mind, the moment after its birth; for, as we have shown, death, if incurred at all by infant acts of transgression, is incurred by the first, however feeble the emotion, or trivial the transgression. The old Calvinists, it is true, were careful to guard against the objection, that by imputation of Adam's sin God punished the innocent, that is, persons free from depravity. They insisted that this was not a correct view of their opinion. They distinctly maintained that death and sufferings fall only on depraved beings. But if asked why these children were born depraved, they would answer, that this was the consequence of the imputation of Adam's sin, and the very essence of that death which was threatened, and which was literally inflicted on the very day of the transgression, in conformity with the threatening of the Almighty. But if asked whether the punishment endured by infants might not also be considered the penalty of their own inherent corruption, they will be found divided in opinion; for while some attribute the whole to the one offence of Adam, as Paul seems to do; others, perceiving that original sin, inherent, must deserve punishment, united this with the first sin of Adam. Among the latter, Calvin himself takes his stand, while John Markius strongly maintains that all these sufferings are to be attributed only to the sin of Adam; and that inherent corruption is punished only negatively, or by a privation of blessings, until moral agency commences, and then every actual transgression has a distinct penalty according to its nature.

Upon the whole, we feel much disposed to recommend this Essay to the careful perusal of our readers. The points in which we agree with Dr. Woods are so important, and

defended by him so ably, and those in which we differ so comparatively unimportant, and so candidly and modestly brought forward, that we cannot but feel that we are essentially with him on the great doctrine of original sin, against all descriptions of Pelagians and semi-Pelagians. When the foundation is attacked, it is no time for the friends of truth to waste their energies and time in disputing about the precise shape and position of every stone which composes it.

But as Dr. Woods comes up so very near to what we deem the true standard of orthodoxy, it would afford us real pleasure to find him casting off entirely this novel opinion of the *actual transgression* of new-born infants. Most of those—we did think all—who hold this doctrine, deny altogether the existence of latent sin, consisting merely in disposition, and maintain that all sin consists in *voluntary action*; but as Dr. Woods rejects and confutes this doctrine, his system has no need of this appendage: it is in fact only an incumbrance to it. To us it appears to be as inconvenient to the consistency of the system, as a fifth wheel would be to a wagon; and we are persuaded, that at present it is held by a very feeble tenure; more as the relic of a theory embraced in very early life, than from any present conviction of its importance or certain truth. We cannot help, therefore, again expressing the wish, that Dr. Woods would give us a new edition of his "Essay on Native Depravity," divested of this, to us, offensive feature; and we will promise to use what little influence we possess to give it extensive circulation.

ART. III.—*Bible Natural History; or a Description of the Animals, Plants, and Minerals, mentioned in the Sacred Scriptures, with copious references and explanations of Texts.* By FRANCIS A. EWING, M. D. Written for the American Sunday School Union. Philadelphia: 1835. pp. 396.

J. W. Alexander

THE connexion between natural history and theological science is not at first sight apparent. Yet without any fanciful association it may be made to appear, that no man can satisfy the claims of theology without some familiarity with

this branch of knowledge, and that sound exposition especially demands an acquaintance with the physical properties of the objects mentioned in the Bible. Some of the darkest texts have had no obscurity except from the ignorance of facts in this department. Some of the most startling objections urged by infidels lose all force, when the natural history of the subjects is cleared up. Some of the choicest beauties of sacred rhetoric lie involved in allusions to natural phenomena, unknown to the multitude. And even bright predictions, and binding precepts, and indispensable doctrines, may be conveyed in language unintelligible save to him who knows the facts which they presuppose.

The whole matter of archaeology has assumed a new importance, as the art of interpretation has acquired its due form. The classical scholar finds his research into antiquities the clew to an otherwise disheartening labyrinth. He can make no progress among the inextricable windings of ancient history or song, until he has projected himself, by a regulated imagination, into the very site and scenes of those who wrote. The obscure rhapsodies and quick transitions of Pindar, for example, are but a beautiful, ever-varying cloud, until by an effort of mind he conjures about him the games of Greece, the concourse, the combat, the vaunting competitors, the national clamours, the ensigns, the wreaths, the paroxysm of triumph. To accomplish this, to make this mental effort, to attain this seeming transfer of identity, there is wanting such a knowledge of the history, the geography, the natural objects, the ensemble of the scene, as shall make him for the time a Greek in Greece, or a Roman in Italy. As aids in this, antiquaries have digested the results of their inquiries, reading, and travel, and this fund of knowledge is daily increasing. We have not only descriptions and summaries, but charts, maps, pictures, and models. Every hour the debt of the recluse student to the antiquary is becoming greater.

Biblical archaeology is on the very same grounds established as an essential part of the scholar's furniture. A more delightful subject can scarcely be laid before the youthful mind. How dry, how cold, how spiritless, yea, how utterly unmeaning, are many transcendent passages of the Bible, to one who is in this respect unprepared and rude. And how does the prospect brighten, when this enchantment peoples the waste and spreads verdure over

the blank desolation. Some of the chapters in the beginning of Joshua are to the uninitiated little more than lists of hard words; perhaps are skipped by many a devout reader. But let this reader be only prepared by a little geographical or topographical knowledge, and associations the most pleasing and vivid cluster around the very names. In process of time, the biblical scholar cannot cast his eye upon the sacred maps which decorate his walls without a glow of interest. The *Great Sea* is to his fervent spirit more, far more than the *Mediterranean*. *Gennesaret*, though less, and peradventure less beautiful, than some of our own beloved lakes, becomes a centre of hallowed recollections. Its encircling mountains were honoured of God. Its waves were trodden by the feet of Christ. Its very products were the sustenance of his disciples, the occasion of his miracles. Its beach was his place of divine discourse. Its overhanging eminences and solitudes were his holy resorts. Its surrounding hamlets were signalized by his converse, example, and mercies. And what shall we say of the stream which traverses the land, or of the acrid sea into which it falls; of the mountain chains at the north, the deserts at the south, the fresh champaign of the eastern nomades; the hill-country of Judah, the valley of Aijalon; of Ebal, of Gerizim, of Bethlehem, of Olivet, of Zion?

Nor is it in a merely aesthetic view, that we prize geography. We could show, that the very sense of innumerable passages lies closed under the seal of geographical lore.

What has been said of one branch of sacred antiquities may be said of all. They are all indispensable for the right understanding of the scriptures. The biblical student, whether clerical or laic, must be informed of all those things in which the ancient differed from the recent world. He must forget, over his Bible, these modern artificial phases of society; these western skies and fields and products; these utilitarian and commercial modes of life; these buckram and succinct dresses; these thousand fruits of exuberant civilization and capricious fashion; and closing his eyes on what is present and near, feel himself beneath a torrid heaven, among the vine, the olive, and the palm; conversing with the fervid, uncalculating Oriental, and surrounded by the complete panorama of the ancient East.

We could wish to say more fully what our judgment is respecting the study of natural history, even as unconnect-

ed with interpretation. But, at present, we are concerned with the subject in its latter aspect. No one can turn over the pages of the volume before us, without seeing at a glance that it is a very important help to the understanding of the English Bible. Indeed we wonder how readers have done so long without it, and marvel at the incurious minds of Bible-students. Teachers of the Scripture, whether ministers or Sunday-school instructors, cannot explain any book of the sacred volume without some knowledge of natural history in its scriptural connexions. To get this knowledge has not heretofore been easy. The ponderous tome of Bochart, treasure-house though it be for every modern plagiary, is a dark book even to some of the learned. Its Hebrew and Arabic and Persian paragraphs are any thing but instructive. Its volume is alarmingly great, its crudities are evident even to admirers, and, more than all, few can get access to it. To the common reader it is of course a clasped book. Modern epitomes and abridgments, while they have had the new lights of science and discovery, have not been accessible to Americans, or are not adapted to ordinary students, or are too costly for family use. The learned work of Dr. Harris is an honour to American scholarship, science, and industry, but it suits the interpreter better than the humble scholar. Its rich stores have been liberally extracted, and variously disguised, and in more than one noted instance, presented, with ambiguous acknowledgment, to English and to American readers. There are voluminous collections, such as Rosenmueller's and Jahn's, in which the natural history of the Bible has been treated of, among other allied subjects; and many foreign treatises; but these we cannot presume our countrymen to have used. We may therefore say freely, that Dr. Ewing has presented a work, which is, in its plan a desideratum; and which, if its execution shall be found approaching its promise, is a precious gift to American Sunday-schools. It is compendious and brief. Its plan is alphabetical, and the arrangement is made in the highest degree to conduce to easy reference, by clearness of method and typographical neatness.

We might take any ten pages of this unpretending volume, and find in them abundant evidence of the light which is cast upon the sacred scriptures from the fields of natural history. Two or three instances must suffice, in our present want of space, and the first text which we adduce is

Jer. ii. 22. "For though thou wash thee with *nitre*, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord God."—Although any intelligent reader may gather from the context, and especially from the mention of *soap*, that this *nitre* was a purifying agent, yet his conception must needs be vague, until he learns such particulars as the following.

"The *nitre* of the ancients, or *natron*, is entirely different from what is now called *nitre*, or *saltpetre*; it is the *soda* of commerce. It is found on the bottom and shores of certain lakes containing salt water, in Egypt and other eastern countries. When thus procured, mixed more or less with the soil, it is called *soap-earth*, from its cleansing properties. Another mode of obtaining it, common in Spain and the coasts of the Levant, is by burning certain plants, as *salt-wort* and *samphire*, which, growing in the salt atmosphere of the sea, contain much of this substance. The *soda*, or *barilla*, is found in the ashes, in the form of a hard, dry, heavy mass.

"*Soda*, like the other alkalies, has the property of uniting with all greasy substances, and so is very useful for cleansing. But by itself it is rather corrosive; it is therefore combined with oil, and thus forms *soap*.

"The Jews were acquainted with the uses of *soda* for taking stains and grease out of garments, and for cleansing the skin; but it is probable they used it more in the form of a ley, by pouring water upon the ashes of the plants, or by dissolving the earthy *soda* in water. Both kinds seem to be alluded to in Jer. ii. 22: 'Though thou wash thee with *nitre*, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord God;' that is, no external means can remove sin, or conceal it from the eye of God.

"The art of cleansing woollen by means of *soap*, or fullers' earth, is called *fulling*: it is alluded to in the account of our Saviour's transfiguration. Mark ix. 3.

"When *vinegar* is poured upon *soda*, the latter is decomposed, and, according to a chemical law, one of the ingredients of it forms a new compound with the *vinegar*, while the other escapes in the form of numerous bubbles, with a quick crackling noise. To this Solomon compares the effect of ill-timed merriment upon one that is in trouble, 'as *vinegar* upon *nitre*, (*soda*) so is he that singeth songs to an heavy heart.' Prov. xxv. 20."

So also several passages in which the *moth* is named, are rather obscure. Of these Dr. Ewing gives us the following satisfactory explanation.

"**МОТН.** (Matt. vi. 19.) This is the name of a large variety of insects, having four wings covered with fine dust or down, like those of butterflies. From these they are distinguished by their *antennae*, which are thread-like and pointed, or sometimes fringed; while those of butterflies end in a knob; by their colour being not so beautifully variegated; by the position of their wings at rest being nearly flat instead of upright; and by their flying mostly by night. They are produced from eggs, and pass through three usual states of the worm or caterpillar, chrysalis, and the perfect winged insect; in the first they are very troublesome and destructive. The different kinds seek different substances in which to deposit

their eggs; some of them always fixing upon furs, woollen cloths, silk, and other materials of raiment. These, called clothes-moths, are very small, and make their way through the smallest hole, so that it is often difficult to preserve garments from their attacks. From an egg thus placed in a proper situation, a small silvery caterpillar comes forth and immediately begins to make itself a covering, by cutting off the fine threads of the cloth, laying and binding them together around its body until a case is formed large enough to turn in, and open at the ends. When its case is finished, it proceeds to feed on the cloth within its reach. As it increases in size it enlarges its building both in length and thickness, in a very curious manner.

“Of this kind is the moth mentioned in the Bible, commonly with reference to the mischief it does to garments. The effect of God’s judgments upon men is compared to it. ‘When thou with rebukes dost correct man for his iniquity, thou makest his beauty to consume away like a moth.’ Ps. xxxix. 11. ‘Therefore will I be unto Ephraim as a moth, and to the house of Judah as rottenness.’ Hos. v. 12. The state of an old garment eaten through and destroyed, is used to represent the feebleness of man, ‘crushed before the moth,’ (Job iv. 19,) and his ruined condition on account of sin; ‘he like a rotten thing consumeth, as a garment that is moth-eaten.’ Job xiii. 28. ‘The moth shall eat them up as a garment, and the worm shall eat them like wool.’ Isa. l. 9; li. 8.

“Job says of the wicked man, ‘he buildeth his house as the moth,’ (xxvii. 18;) that is, as weak and easily destroyed.”

The use of *hyssop* is thus presented, so as to clear several places which would baffle an unobserving reader.

“Among the Hebrews, hyssop was commonly used in purifications as a sprinkler, for which it was well fitted by its bushy growth. When the people were about to leave Egypt, they were directed to dip a bunch of hyssop in the blood of the paschal lamb, and strike against the door-posts of every house, which was a sign for the destroying angel to pass over. Ex. xii. 22. It was used also in cleansing the leper, and the house in which leprosy had been, (Lev. xiv. 6, 51;) and in preparing and sprinkling the water of separation, (Num. xix. 6, 18;) and probably in all other sprinklings, as intimated by the apostle, (Heb. ix. 19;) and devoutly referred to by David, ‘Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean.’ Ps. li. 7.

“When our Saviour was on the cross, just before he expired, a sponge filled with vinegar was put on a reed and held to his mouth. Matt. xxvii. 48; Mark xv. 36. According to John xix. 29, it was put upon hyssop. Either the sponge was placed on a long stalk or reed of hyssop and thus held up, or it was joined with hyssop and then put on a reed. The first seems to agree best with the text, for in both places the Greek word means ‘placed round,’ just as one would tie a sponge round a stick; and a stalk of hyssop would be quite long enough to reach the mouth of a person on a cross, which was not so high as is commonly supposed. Either way, however, there is no contradiction in the two statements.”

And even so familiar an object as the dog, is placed in a new light, so as to aid our interpretations, by this statement.

“According to the Mosaic laws, dogs were unclean, and flesh which had been torn by beasts was directed to be thrown to them. Ex. xxii. 31.

Wherever the name dog occurs in the Bible, applied to any person, it is a term of the utmost contempt and reproach. It was so used in Deut. xxiii. 18; by Goliath, (1 Sam. xvii. 43;) by David, (1 Sam. xxiv. 14;) by Mephibosheth, (2 Sam. ix. 8;) by Hazael, (2 Kings viii. 13;) see also Phil. iii. 2. Rev. xxii. 15. At the present day a Turk expresses his hatred and contempt towards a Christian by calling him dog. Unfaithful and wicked ministers are called 'dumb dogs,' and 'greedy dogs,' (Isa. lvi. 10, 11;) because, while indulging their own selfish desires, they pay no regard to those whom they are appointed to watch and guard. Solomon says, 'He that meddleth with strife belonging not to him, is like one that taketh a dog by the ears,' (Prov. xxvi. 17;) that is, needlessly exposes himself to danger. Again, 'As a dog returneth to his vomit, so a fool returneth to his folly,' Prov. xxvi. 11. This allusion to a very common habit of the animal is also used by Peter, to represent the condition of those who, after professing repentance, turned back to their sins. 2 Pet. ii. 22. The instruction of our Lord, 'give not that which is holy to the dogs, lest they turn again and rend you,' (Matt. vii. 6,) was probably intended to teach prudence in speaking of holy things before those whose wicked passions might be roused to do injury. In the conversation between our Lord and the Syro-phoenician woman, (Matt. xv. 27; Mark vii. 27,) he speaks of the Gentiles as dogs, to whom the children's bread was not to be given. This was a great trial of her faith, for she herself was one of them. But she still humbly persisted, and at last her petition was granted: thus affording an encouraging example to all who are earnestly seeking the favour of the Lord."

These extracts are made almost at random, and do not serve in any degree to characterize the work. This it would be unfair to attempt by the method of citation; for the condensation of matter being great, a false impression of its comprehensiveness could not fail to be made, by insulated fragments. It is no small acquisition to a Bible reader, to have in a portable volume the quintessence of all that has been written on this topic. Omissions and errors there doubtless are, though after a careful search we have discerned but a few; so that there may be predicated of the work all the completeness which is compatible with brevity. We regard it for our own reference as being at once lexicon and concordance, and for these ends scarcely inferior to the best books on the subject, such as the *Biblisches Naturgeschichte* of Rosenmueller. At the same time, it is plainly written with reference to the wants of the young and uninstructed; being every where perspicuous, abounding in familiar illustration, and in all respects flowing and popular. These points are gained, and the merit of this is not small, without infringing upon technical accuracy, or becoming superficial and empty, as is the case with too many religious manuals. While the book is full, so that scarcely any item is omitted in the register, and no

one treated in a perfunctory manner, it is free from those prickles of barbarous terminology which are apt to grow out of scientific labour; and which we are sure the author must have tasked himself to shun. For the details, where most simple, evince a close acquaintance even with the more recondite branches of physics. This appears every where, and such being the fact, it is evident that the store of matter before his mind, would have enabled the writer to prepare, with perhaps less cost of thought, a larger and more ambitious work. To become level to the common mind is not the attainment of an hour.

The reader may confidently look to the book for copious explanations of a thousand figurative allusions with which the Bible abounds, and which give all the colours to many of the richest prophetic paintings. It would detain us, and be out of place, even to decimate the striking passages which might be selected in proof of this. Where scriptural texts are explained, this is done, for the most part, with caution, modesty, and research, and often very happily. The book is singularly free from paradox and unseasonable novelty. And we cannot but state as a very great excellence, that with all the studied conciseness of the writer, he has found space for a gentle insinuation of evangelical truth, in agreeable association with important facts; so that we are not sure that a little body of saving doctrine might not be digested from these pages. There is one characteristic of this dictionary, to which we would invite, in a special manner, the notice of teachers. It is the introduction of numerous and pertinent references to Scripture texts. These are arranged with surprising care, and so as to give each gem a new value from its appropriate setting. Nothing in the volume has more gratified us than the art of the writer in this particular. To discover the full import of what we mean, every passage, thus referred to, should be sought out in the Scriptures, and carefully read in its connexion. The size of the manual would be doubled, if every such text were added at large.

The wood-cuts which adorn the book greatly enhance its value. They strike us as much superior to anything which has issued from the Sunday School presses. And they are not servile copies from previous publications, but in a number of cases have been the fruit of the author's own taste and art.

The alphabetical arrangement has sometimes been ob-

jected to, in works of this kind. With us it has great merit, and we are willing, in a manual for constant handling, to sacrifice every peculiar advantage of continuity, for the ease of reference, which the arrangement here adopted secures. At the same time, it must be conceded, that this method renders necessary, what we should be pleased to see prefixed to any future edition of the "Bible Natural History," a synopsis of the articles, according to some scientific method, so that the work might be used, not simply for reference, but in systematic study.

In a work of this description, it is always difficult to draw the line precisely between facts which are indispensable to exposition, and those which, however interesting, illustrate nothing in the Bible. For instance, the sole use of the cormorant and the bittern is to denote solitude, and therefore a word or two concerning these animals might, in a severe scrutiny, be deemed sufficient; yet the information given by our author is so valuable, and is so agreeably communicated, that our remark is intended to have the aspect rather of praise than blame. In many cases, the philosophical correction of vulgar errors, by the light of modern discoveries, though incidentally brought in, is satisfactory in a high degree, and indicates a well-furnished mind. See the articles *Dew, Ant, Ostrich, Salt, Spider, Bud, Birds, Locust, Bee.*

A few cases may be noted where the English version has not been duly corrected. One of these is the article under the title *Dragon*. This word is employed in our Bibles indiscriminately, for the translation of two Hebrew words which are entirely distinct, though of like sound, viz. TANNIN, and TANNIM, the plural of TAN. The former signifies sometimes a *serpent*, (Ex. vii. 9. Deut. xxxii. 33. Ps. xci. 13.) but generally a large marine animal; and, indeed, it is translated *whale* in Genesis i. 21, and Job vii. 12, but elsewhere *dragon*. Isaiah xxvii. 1, &c. TAN, on the other hand, means some creature inhabiting the wilderness, and is therefore used in connexion with owls and other solitary animals, to indicate desolation. Thus, in one of the most affecting pictures of Hebrew poetry, Isaiah xxxiv. 13: "And thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortresses thereof, and it shall be a habitation of dragons, *tannim*, and a court for owls; the wild beasts of the desert shall also meet with [*Ijim*] the wild beasts of the island, and the satyr shall cry to his fellow; the screech-owl also shall rest there, and find for herself a place of rest. There shall the great owl make

her nest, and lay, and hatch, and gather under her shadow; there shall the vultures also be gathered, every one with her mate." See, likewise, Isaiah xiii. 22; xliii. 20; Malachi i. 3. Hence, also, the phrases "place of dragons," Ps. xlv. 19; "den of dragons," Jer. ix. 11; meaning solitude: "brother to dragons," Job xxx. 29; meaning solitary, desolate. This animal is described as uttering a wailing cry, Mic. i. 8; and as giving suck, Lam. iv. 3. These two animals, thus distinct in character and habits, and in their Hebrew names, are, in our version, confounded under a name which is worse than unmeaning. For the word *dragon* undoubtedly comes over many simple minds with associations of a fabulous kind. There are other terms, in the incomparable translation we inherit, which are open to the same objection. They invest the passages in which they occur with the garb of mythology, and throw a shadow over the authenticity of holy oracles. Such are the words *satyr*, *cockatrice*, &c.

The author, in another instance, has fallen into a very natural error, where, under the title *Kite*, he treats *Ijim* translated "wild beasts of the islands," as the plural of *Ayyah*, *the Kite*. Dr. Harris makes the same mistake, in his *Natural History of the Bible*, p. 240, where he also rejects the opinion that the *Ijim* are jackals, though the latter is very plausibly supported by Bochart, Gesenius, and Rosenmueller. The last of these critics has a long, erudite, and entertaining chapter upon this head.

The *unicorn*, so long a stumbling stone to scriptural students, is regarded by Dr. Ewing as an animal nowhere existing at this day; and he inclines to render the original either by the *rhinoceros* or the *buffalo*. The latter would seem to be the conclusion of Gesenius, who herein follows Albert Schultens and De Wette. If, however, we may credit modern travellers, there has been found in the deserts of Tibet a creature answering in some degree to the one-horned monster of the ancients. See *London Quarterly Review*, No. XLVII. and Rosenmueller's *alt. und n. Morganland*, vol. ii. p. 269.

And since we have named one work of this celebrated interpreter, we must add a word concerning another, perhaps the most valuable of his wonderfully numerous literary progeny, to wit, his *Manual of Biblical Archaeology*. This great work, of which the fourth volume, in more than eight hundred pages, treats of the specific subject of our article, has been issuing, at intervals, from the Leipsick press, since

1823. It is the most complete treasury which we have in this department. The *text* is adapted to the wants of common readers, and is pleasant reading for any intelligent person. The *margin* contains philological, critical, and scientific notes. The various Semitic dialects, in which the author is universally known to be proficient, are here found to yield elucidation to the original passages; and great use is made of the books of Travels in the East, which have been so multiplied since the beginning of the present century. Both in geography and natural history this collection surpasses all which have preceded it. A translation of its prolegomenon may be found in our volume for 1828, p. 447, but it is as yet too little known in America.

In the way of fault-finding, however, there is little opening for the critical art in Dr. Ewing's modest and satisfactory volume. We could, indeed, wish it were larger, and we are sure many readers, and, perhaps, also the writer himself, unite in the same desire. For we are aware how impossible it is, within limits so strait, to do justice to one's subject or conceptions. And therefore we should rejoice to welcome from the same hand, and for a different class of readers, a copious treatise on the same branch of archaeology, with a more liberal introduction of such matters as would be too scientific or abstruse for the common reader. Even in a manual, such as this, we should think it an advantage to have on several points, especially in the mineralogical and botanical branches, a more copious explanation of such things as are susceptible of it from modern science. As, for example, the identity of carbon and the *diamond*, might be added; or the distinction of the two substances, known by the common name of *alabaster*; or the etymology of the *amethyst*; and, indeed, we could not object to the introduction, in the margin at least, of all the botanical names of plants, or any similar aids from scientific terminology. As it is, we hope the present work will remain unchanged in substantial. And if parents wisely regard the advancement of their families, they will hasten to afford this, and all similar helps to their children. It is time that the Bible were made our great classic. It is time that youth, pursuing liberal studies, were enlightened to see that every noble science, every intellectual attainment has its point of natural connexion with the system of divine truth. Theological students have long needed such a manual as this.

Until something better appears, we cordially recommend it to them, believing that they have learned not to overlook valuable instruction, even though ostensibly dedicated to the humble Sunday-school child.

Before we leave the subject of this article, we must take occasion to add something upon an allied theme, if indeed it is not another aspect of the same. The study of natural history, whether in general, or as it is narrowed down to the objects named in the Scriptures, merits the special consideration of every serious mind. To pass by its ample fund of entertainment to the mere physical inquirer, and its near relation to all other science, it has intimate connexion with natural theology, as is apparent from every work where an induction is made of instances to prove the being and perfections of God. It is a branch of knowledge which cannot be adequately investigated, without a constant reference to the doctrine of final causes, or in other words, to the proofs of benevolent design in the creation. Since we grant that the undevout astronomer is mad, we cannot deny that the naturalist, who loses sight of God in those of his works which are thrown under our closer observation, is a monster or a fool. It has struck us as being a most remarkable attestation to the validity and pertinence of such argument, that it is employed on most solemn occasions by Jehovah himself. To take a single instance from one of the oldest sacred relics. When God, offended by the perverseness of Job's friends, and about to humble the patriarch himself, addresses him from the whirlwind—what considerations does he present? Those, we answer, almost without exception, which are gathered from the realm of nature. The 38th, 39th, 40th and 41st chapters of Job may be called so many chapters of inspired natural theology. From the awful recesses of his veiled glory, the Almighty declares his majesty and glory, by sublime references to his power in creation. Mark how he accumulates argument on argument, from nature, and especially from natural history, how he points, in abasing interrogations, to the earth, the stars, the ocean, to all the phenomena of meteorology, to the tribes of lower creatures, the wild goats of the rock, the wild ass, the peacock, the ostrich, the hawk, the eagle; to the horse whose neck is clothed with thunder, to behemoth and leviathan. And mark how the prostrate sinner cries, under the due impression of the argument, "I know that thou canst do every thing, and that no thought can be withholden from thee.

Who is he that hideth counsel without knowledge? therefore have I uttered that I understood not; things too wonderful for me, which I knew not."

We are authorized to extend the argument to the goodness, no less than to the power of God; goodness, which strikes us at every opening of our eyes upon nature, and most of all in living creatures. There has probably never been a student of Paley's works, who has not felt something like personal affection for the man, mingling with admiration of the philosopher, in reading his incomparably beautiful chapter on the "Goodness of the Deity." It is all delightful and edifying, fruitful of holy musing, but one passage we cannot but insert, for it opens windows of joy upon the world in which we make our pilgrimage. "It is," says this good man "a happy world after all. The air, the earth, the water, teem with delighted existence. In a spring noon, or a summer evening, on whichever side I turn my eyes, myriads of happy beings crowd upon my view. 'The insect youth are on the wing.' Swarms of new-born flies are trying their pinions in the air. Their sportive motions, their wanton mazes, their gratuitous activity, their continual change of place without use or purpose, testify their joy, and the exultation which they feel in their lately discovered faculties. A bee among the flowers in spring is one of the most cheerful objects that can be looked upon. Its life appears to be all enjoyment; so busy and so pleased: yet it is only a specimen of insect life, with which, by reason of the animal being half domesticated, we happen to be better acquainted than we are with that of others. The whole winged insect tribe, it is probable, are equally intent upon their proper enjoyments, and under every variety of constitution, gratified, and perhaps equally gratified, by the offices which the author of their nature has assigned to them. But the atmosphere is not the only scene of enjoyment for the insect race. Plants are covered with aphides, greedily sucking their juices, and constantly it should seem, in the act of sucking. It cannot be doubted but that this is a state of gratification. What else should fix them so close to the operation, and so long? Other species are running about, with an alacrity in their motions, which carries with it every mark of pleasure. Large patches of ground are sometimes half covered with these brisk and sprightly creatures. If we look to what the waters produce, shoals of the fry of fish frequent the margins of rivers, of lakes, and of the sea itself. These are so happy,

that they know not what to do with themselves. Their attitudes, their vivacity, their leaps out of the water, their frolics in it, (which I have noticed a thousand times, with equal attention and amusement,) all conduce to show their excess of spirits, and are simply the effects of that excess. Walking by the sea-side in a calm evening, upon a sandy shore, and with an ebbing tide, I have frequently remarked the appearance of a dark cloud, or rather, very thick mist, hanging over the edge of the water, to the height, perhaps, of a yard, and of the breadth of two or three yards, stretching along the coast as far as the eye can reach, and always retiring with the water. When this cloud came to be examined, it proved to be nothing else than so much space filled with young shrimps, in the act of bounding into the air from the shallow margin of the water, or from the wet sand. If any motion of a mute animal could express delight, it was this; if they had meant to make signs of their happiness, they could not have done it more intelligibly. Suppose, then, what I have no doubt of, each individual of this number to be in a state of positive enjoyment, what a sum, collectively, of gratification and pleasure have we here before our view!"

And, we may subjoin, what a sum of gratification and pleasure is here offered to the christian student of natural theology. There are some who are ignorant of the instructive books of Derham, Ray, Boyle, and Nieuwentyt, who may be directed to such inquiries as these by the more potent name of Brougham; and we trust the noble work of this great statesman and philosopher will lead the way for new inquiries into this large domain. For it is as true as when it was written by Galen, "Many neglect such works of nature, admiring only those spectacles which are novel or surprising."*

In colleges, schools, and families, youth ought to be disciplined to seek everywhere for the traces of the divine hand. They may thus be furnished with cheering contemplations in every excursion, and thousands of memorials to bring the great object of supreme love before their minds. The rising race may thus be armed against the insinuations of atheism, and bred, even from tender years in those methods of devout meditation which shall make all nature

* See the whole passage concerning the author's experiment with a kid which had never seen its dam.—*Galen. de locis affectis*. vi. c. 6.

a temple of Jehovah, hung round with trophies of his power, and pledges of his beneficence, at once great and beautiful; so that in every prospect, animal, insect, or mite, they may find cause delightfully to exclaim, "*How manifold are thy works, O Lord! in wisdom hast thou made them all.*"

ART. IV.—1. *A Discourse on the Apostolic Office, delivered in St. John's Church, in the city of Providence, and State of Rhode Island, November 13th, 1833, on occasion of the ordination of the Rev. James C. Richmond.* By ALEXANDER V. GRISWOLD, Bishop of the Eastern Diocess. 12mo. pp. 12. Philadelphia, 1835.

2. *Answer to a Review of "Episcopacy tested by Scripture," in the Biblical Repertory for April 1835.* [An article signed H. U. O. in the *Protestant Episcopalian*, for July.]

J. Addison Alexander
 IT is no safe thing to meddle with our ancient friends the prelatists, since their last discovery. As might have been expected from its magnitude and value, they have grown exceeding techy with respect to the treatment of their great arcanum by the uninitiated. They seem to imagine, like the alchemists of old, that the whole world is waiting in suspense for the result of their experiments; holding its breath till the universal menstruum or elixir is discovered. No one is allowed either to feel or feign indifference. And even when the mystery is divulged, what can we do? If we let it alone, we are enrolled as converts; if we handle it at all, it is always too roughly. High church episcopacy is indeed, botanically speaking, a most tender herb, liable not only to be crushed by the broad foot of vulgar 'non-conformity,' but also to be blasted by the merest breath of argument. It cannot bear the east wind of discussion, but must have an atmosphere created for it, like a rare plant in a hot-house, to be looked at, but not touched. To this discreet arrangement we have no objection; but are heartily content to stand at any distance not entirely out of sight, craving no other privilege than that of furnishing a brief description, now and then, for the gratification of the 'less informed.' This latter phrase appears to have puzzled Bishop Onderdonk immensely, in consequence of an amiable error of his own. We are sorry to inform him that our Presbyterian readers are by no means so enlightened as he

seems to think, with respect to the doctrines and the doings of himself and his compeers. We are ashamed to acknowledge our belief that some even of those who read the *Repertory*, far from knowing all about *THE TRACT*, before we introduced it to their notice, had never yet discovered its existence. 'Not to know me argues thyself unknown,' would be a keen retort, and we are far from justifying our poor friends from the charge of guilty ignorance, the rather as it has not been for want of faithful efforts on the part of zealous 'churchmen' to apprise the world that they and their superiors are *in esse*. But as the eastern proverb says, 'the hen may lay a thousand eggs and the owl never know it,' however loud the hen may cackle. It is indeed the sober truth, that after all the measures used by bishops, priests, and deacons, there are still very many Presbyterians who persist in studying their Bible and even the Westminster Catechism, to the sad neglect of 'our excellent liturgy,' 'our canons,' and 'our tract.' Such as these need information, and we feel that we are bound to give it. In doing so, however, we shall be careful to assume the posture, not of controvertists, but of mere historians. Far be it from us to grapple either with a bishop or his 'man of straw.' If we do hazard any thing by way of argument, it will be in attempting to complete the process which our betters have begun.

Two circumstances must be borne in mind, as essential to a just appreciation of the subject. The first is, that this theory is a new one. We do not know how old some parts of it may be; but as a whole, as a system, it is new, and boasted of as such. The other is, that this new theory is not put forward as a matter for discussion, a provisional suggestion to be subsequently verified; but as a binding doctrine of the word of God, as a part of his revealed will so self-evident that no one can dispute it and be guiltless. This is the spirit and almost the language of its advocates, some* of whom, without regard to the credit of their own ecclesiastical progenitors, talk of this discovery in almost as high a key as the apostles talked of the resurrection, and thrust it upon the notice of the 'less informed,' in a manner which, if practised by a Presbyterian, would be justly branded as a matchless sample of conceit and arrogance; but, coming whence it does, is nothing more than zeal for truth, with an agreeable tincture of prelatical majesty, to awe the unbe-

* We desire that this limitation of the censure may be borne in mind.

lievers. We mention these two facts, and wish the reader to retain them in his mind at every step, because they alter the whole state of the case. Were this precious doctrine the untimely birth of some precocious deacon, still in love with the externals of his office, we should dismiss it with infinitely greater nonchalance than that discovery of Hammond's, which the Assistant Bishop has ordained a man of straw* for his own private amusement. Or even if it emanated from the House of Bishops, but only as the offspring of their *tempora subseciva*, an ingenious speculation and a plausible conjecture with respect to certain texts, we should have taken a momentary pleasure in it, as a proof that the mitre is by no means an extinguisher of fancy, and then have let it pass. But since by a sort of *ex post facto* process, this new-born doctrine is discovered to have been all along a fundamental truth, we feel ourselves called upon to make it known, that the 'dissenting brethren' may be prepared for what awaits them. Let it be recollected, then, that the question is not about a plausible conjectural interpretation, but about the very pillar and ground of the church, the very law by which we are to answer, at the judgment, for the crime of non-episcopacy.

But we are keeping the less informed too long in ignorance of this mystery, hidden since the world began, but now auspiciously revealed. It consists in the simple and obvious proposition, that the apostles were not only prelatical bishops, in the proper sense, but that they attained this good degree by an orderly ascent through the diaconry and priesthood. But lest the truth should suffer from having been clothed in phraseology of ours, we choose to give the doctrine in the language of its sponsors. And among these we select Bishop Griswold, first, because his statement is direct and plain, and free from pompous verbiage; secondly, because Bishop Griswold is, for aught we know, the inventor of the doctrine, though by no means one of its offensive advocates; and lastly, because he is, at all events, to us the most respectable authority.

"It appears from the Evangelists, that our Saviour Christ, soon after the commencement of his public ministry, elected twelve persons, whom

* The Bishop, in his 'Answer,' charges our reviewer with 'creating men of straw,' and with 'knocking to pieces a puppet of his own invention.' We have surely no temptation to engage in the manufacture of these profitable playthings, when the market is already overstocked from other workshops. We desire no better puppets than the Bishop's own.

he named Apostles, and he commissioned them, at different times, to preach his Gospel and minister the ordinances of his Church.

“From the Evangelists Mark and Luke, it appears to me that they were commissioned at three different times, each subsequent ordination investing them with additional power. Their first ordination is mentioned by St. Mark in his 3d chapter: and by St. Luke in his 6th chapter. At this first ordination, we are told that Christ chose twelve disciples, named them Apostles, and *ordained them* to ‘be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have power to heal sicknesses and to cast out devils.’

“Their second ordination is recorded in the 6th chapter of Mark, and the 9th chapter of Luke: where we are told that at a subsequent period, ‘*he gave them power and authority over all devils,*’ and ‘*over unclean spirits,*’ and ‘*to cure diseases;*’ and he *sent them to preach the kingdom of God,* and to heal the sick;’ and he gave them, at this second ordination, instructions how to execute their ministry.

“It is evident that some considerable time elapsed between the first and second ordination, during which, Christ wrought several miracles, and spake a number of parables, and gave his disciples much instruction. Surely these words, ‘He called unto him the twelve; he gave them power and authority over devils, and to cure diseases, and over unclean spirits; and he sent them to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick,’ and the directions he gave them how they should conduct themselves, and exercise their ministry, imply and express authority and power actually given them at the time.

“Of the third ordination of the Apostles, we read in the latter part of Matthew, Mark and John; then he commissioned them to exercise the highest ecclesiastical authority.

“Soon after the second ordination of the twelve, ‘the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them’ forth to teach. Thus it appears that during Christ’s ministry; there were three different orders or grades of preachers. First, himself, acting as the High Priest or Bishop, in his own person, and governing the Church. Secondly, the twelve: and thirdly, the other seventy.

“The law given by Moses was a shadow of good things to come; it in all things typified the Gospel state, and is called ‘a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ.’ And accordingly, it had the three orders of the ministry—the High Priest, the Priests and the Levites—with different and distinct powers and duties.

“These facts prepare us to expect, that the like number of grades in the ministerial office would be continued in the Church after Christ had ascended into heaven. And this expectation is very much confirmed by two other facts, which from the Scriptures are evident. First, that Christ, immediately before he left the earth, advanced his Apostles to that rank in his Church which he was leaving. ‘As (he says) my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.’ And the Apostles so understood their commission; they claimed to be ambassadors for Christ, as though God besought men by them; they prayed men in Christ’s stead. The other fact is, that not long after, ministers of a new order were ordained by the Apostles, called Deacons.”—*Griswold*, pp. 1, 2.

It may be said of this doctrine, as of most great fundamental principles, that if it does not at once command belief, very little can be gained by ratiocination. If any of our readers is not convinced already, we despair of being

able to dispel his darkness. As the only means of aiding the effect of the quotation, we shall insert those portions of the sacred text which are cited to confirm it. These are the narrative of the 'first and second ordination' by Mark and Luke, and of the 'third ordination' by Matthew, Mark, and John. Matthew and John, it seems, were so absorbed in their episcopal promotion, that they did not recollect the previous steps of their advancement; or to speak with more exactness, John omits them altogether, and Matthew uncanonically blends the diaconal and priestly ordination, a blunder into which no modern prelate has been known to fall. When it is considered that the careful distinguishing of the three orders is essential to the theory of prelacy, and that the confounding of them is the very essence of the sin called *parity*, and also that the two evangelists, who fail to make the canonical distinction, are the very two who were themselves eye-witnesses and subjects of this triple ordination, we are lost in wonder at the degree of probability belonging to the doctrine of our worthy bishops. But let us examine the record, and compare its precision in distinguishing the orders, with that of the ordinal of the church of England.

1. *The Apostles ordained Deacons.*

"And he goeth up into a mountain, and calleth *unto him* whom he would: and they came unto him. And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils. And Simon he surnamed Peter; and James *the son* of Zebedee, and John the brother of James, (and he surnamed them Boanerges, which is, The sons of thunder;) and Andrew, and Philip, and Bartholomew, and Matthew, and Thomas, and James *the son* of Alpheus and Thaddeus, and Simon the Canaanite, and Judas Iscariot, which also betrayed him: and they went into an house."—*Mark*, iii. 13—19.

"And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples; and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named Apostles; Simon, (whom he also named Peter) and Andrew his brother, James and John, Philip and Bartholomew, Matthew and Thomas, James *the son* of Alpheus, and Simon called Zelotes, and Judas *the brother* of James, and Judas Iscariot, which also was the traitor."—*Luke*, vi. 13—16.

2. *The Apostles ordained Priests.*

"And he called *unto him* the twelve and began to send them forth by two and two; and gave them power over unclean spirits; and commanded them that they should take nothing for *their* journey, save a staff only; no scrip, no bread, no money in *their* purse: but *be shod* with sandals; and not put on two coats. And he said unto them, In what

place soever ye enter into an house, there abide till ye depart from that place. And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence, shake off the dust under your feet for a testimony against them. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah, in the day of judgment, than for that city. And they went out, and preached that men should repent. And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed *them*."—*Mark*, vi. 7—13.

"Then he called his twelve disciples together, and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases. And he sent them to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick. And he said unto them, Take nothing for *your* journey, neither staves, nor scrip, neither bread; neither money; neither have two coats apiece. And whatsoever house ye enter into, there abide, and thence depart. And whosoever will not receive you, when ye go out of that city, shake off the very dust from your feet for a testimony against them. And they departed, and went through the towns, preaching the gospel, and healing every where."—*Luke*, ix. 1—6.

3. *The Apostles ordained Bishops.*

"Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him they worshipped him: but some doubted. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you *always*, even unto the end of the world. Amen."—*Matthew*, xxviii. 16—20.

"Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents: and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them: they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. So then, after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with *them*, and confirming the word with signs following. Amen."—*Mark*, xvi. 14—20.

"Then said Jesus to them again, Peace *be* unto you: as *my* Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this he breathed on *them*, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."—*John*, xx. 21—23.*

No one will impute to Episcopalians, and least of all to Bishops, the absurdity of insisting on a distinction without a difference; which would be the case if they supposed

* Did St. Thomas receive a separate ordination, or was he ordained by proxy, or did he continue a *Priest* for ever?

a mere numerical plurality of orders in the ministry, without distinctive rights and duties. And this distinction in their functions must be co-essential with the numerical distinction. The orders can no more interchange their powers than be merged in one. We have a right to conclude, therefore, that the distinction drawn between the orders of the clergy, in the 'Form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons' is the essential and immutable distinction, held by Bishop Griswold to be taught in Scripture. In this point of view, let the skeptical reader compare the texts already quoted with the American ordinal, 'as established by the Bishops, the Clergy, and Laity of said Church, in General Convention, in the month of September, A. D. 1792.' As the only part admitting of convenient quotation, we insert the definition of a Deacon there laid down.

"It appertaineth to the office of a Deacon in the church where he shall be appointed to serve, to assist the Priest in Divine Service, and specially when he ministereth the Holy Communion, and to help him in the distribution thereof; and to read Holy Scriptures and Homilies in the church; and to instruct the youth in the Catechism; in the absence of the Priest to baptize infants; and to preach if he be admitted thereto by the Bishop. And furthermore it is his office, where provision is so made, to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the Parish, to intimate their estates, names, and places, where they dwell, unto the Curate, that by his exhortation they may be relieved with the alms of the Parishioners, or others."

These words are addressed by the Bishop to the candidate at every ordination, and we strongly recommend the insertion, in that service, of the authoritative record in the third of Mark, and sixth of Luke, as the remarkable coincidence between the Bible and the Prayer Book will then be made apparent, and the inchoate Deacon will be able to perceive (if he have the least fertility of fancy) that the office, upon which he is entering, is identical with that which Christ conferred upon the twelve at their first appointment. In like manner, when the Deacons become Priests, it is very desirable that they should be impressed with the length of the step which they have taken, and be carefully forewarned against the error of supposing, that a Deacon and a Priest are pretty much the same. This would be best accomplished by the solemn recitation of the words of Mark and Luke, in which they have recorded the 'second ordination' of the twelve. The candidate would then be taught, in the most

impressive manner, that the primitive Deacons were only authorized 'to preach' (Mark, iii. 14,) whereas the primitive Priests 'preached that men should repent' (vi. 12;) the Deacons merely had 'power to heal sicknesses' (iii. 15,) whereas the Priests 'anointed the sick with oil and healed them' (vi. 13;) the Priests had 'power over unclean spirits' (vi. 7,) whereas the poor Deacons could do no more than 'cast out devils' (iii. 15.) Contrasts so pointed and abrupt as these could scarcely fail to rivet the conviction of episcopacy upon all concerned; the passages in question would, therefore, be in every sense of the term a '*proper lesson*,' which is more than can be said of the parallel passage in the tenth of Matthew, where the orders seem to be a little mixed together.

We must now assume that our readers are convinced, and converted to the doctrine of 'apostle-deacons,' 'apostle-priests,' and 'apostle-bishops.' By the way, no feature of this scheme is more imposing, than its magical power over names. It used to be supposed that when our Saviour 'chose twelve, whom also he named apostles,' (Luke vi. 13,) there was something significant in the name bestowed, something which rendered it peculiarly appropriate to the office then conferred. But the darkness is past and the true light now shineth. The name apostle, when first given, meant a *deacon*; after the 'second ordination,' it signified a *priest*; and after the third, it was synonymous with *bishop*. Some may perhaps imagine that *apostle* was a generic term including the three orders; but our bishops have carefully precluded such a notion, by arguing that Epaphroditus was a bishop proper, because he is called an apostle. If *apostle*, at that time, denoted all three orders, Epaphroditus may have been a deacon or a priest, *which is of course absurd*, and therefore we must, to save the credit of our prelates, suppose that at the 'second and third ordinations,' the name apostle lost its previous meaning and assumed a new one; in other words it was ordained itself to a new degree in the vocabulary. Our bishops are too modest, therefore, when they are pleased to say, 'We contend not for names but things.' Things are perhaps their favourites; but names have certainly no reason to complain.

The establishment of this great truth must of course be regarded, by all zealous prelatists as a most auspicious circumstance. It cannot be denied that the apostles have hitherto set a bad example to the candidates for orders, by their sudden

elevation to the highest rank, without a previous novitiate. It was highly important that this rock of offence should be rolled away, and we congratulate our neighbours on its sudden disappearance. But there are other stumbling stones to be removed; and we respectfully submit it to the House of Bishops, whether there can be any hearty acquiescence in the divine right of episcopacy, till the entire system, both at large and in detail, is finally settled on as firm a base as that which now supports the doctrine of apostle-deacons and apostle-priests. It would certainly be easy, by a similar mode of reasoning, not only to provide church-wardens with a *jus divinum*, but to enlarge the existing apparatus of the P. E. church, relieve it from the odious charge of nakedness and poverty, alleged against it by its English mother, and introduce, *on scriptural authority*, a beautiful subordination of principalities and powers, not a whit less various and complex than the one which is known to exist among the angels, on the respectable authority of that eminent hierarchist who is called by courtesy Dionysius the Areopagite. There is certainly a talent in the church for such discoveries; and if, as we suppose, it only needs to be encouraged and incited to new efforts, we indulge the hope that even our suggestions may promote a consummation so devoutly to be wished. With this desire we shall attempt to show that our modest friends the prelatists have done themselves injustice by the unreasonable poverty of their pretensions, and that they have but a glimpse of that magnificent vista which is yet to burst upon them. We can of course do no more than offer hints, but in so doing we shall sedulously follow the canonical mode of reasoning on the subject. In general, we plead guilty to a want of docile reverence for 'bishops and other chief ministers' in intellectual matters; but when we enter on a field so exclusively episcopal as that which lies before us, we follow, with a glad mind and will, the good example of two venerable prelates, from whose practice we deduce our rules for proving the *jus divinum* in any given case, as Aristotle deduced his rules of epic composition from the practice of a Homer.

The reader will have observed, that one of the most beautiful peculiarities of this fine invention, is the gradual thrusting forward of the orders of the ministry, in exact proportion; the seventy becoming deacons when the twelve became priests, and priests when the twelve became bishops. Now the improvement of the theory which we propose, is

to set the machine a-going at a lower point in the hierarchical scale, and to carry it up higher, still preserving the ratio of progression, so as to extend the demonstration to a greater variety of cases, without at all disturbing those which are already settled. The progress of improvement in this department may be compared to that in chemistry after Dalton's discovery of atomical proportions. As the chemist, from the analogy of combinations already ascertained, is able to infer, even prior to experiment, the existence of others which are needed to supply the chasms and complete the series, so in the science of hierarchy, we are now provided with the means of ascertaining all the 'orders' and fractions of an order, which are essential to the composition of an episcopal apostolical church. Some may object that this is a mere conceit, too unsubstantial to be made the basis of a serious argument, much less of a pretext for unchurching others. But this is obviously a Presbyterian cavil, one that smells of the conventicle, one that never could have lived beneath the folds of a surplice or lurked in sleeves of lawn. What could, at first sight, be more immaterial in its structure, than the doctrine of the triple ordination of the twelve? What roundhead would have failed to protest against it as a most impalpable and visionary ground for all exclusive claims? And yet it may now be regarded as a settled truth, not a jot less certain than that bishops cannot err. Such indeed is the importance which appears to be attached to it by its fathers and godfathers, that we are determined not to be at all astonished when we see it made a part of the Apostle's Creed. As it cannot be supposed that the apostles would have overlooked a doctrine so immeasurably prized by their 'successors,' we are under the necessity of humbly trusting that it is still latent in some pregnant phrase of that venerable symbol, and we earnestly call upon Assistant Bishop Onderdonk to elicit and extract it, or at least to demonstrate that it is only 'apparently' not 'really out of sight,'* a philosophical distinction for which we are entirely indebted to him himself, and which is entirely beyond the ken of any other vision;

For optics sharp it takes, we ween,
To see what is not to be seen.

* "Are we to suppose that they [the seventy] are really, as well as apparently, out of sight, in the subsequent parts of the inspired history?" *Prot. Episc.* p. 247.

The subject makes us garrulous, an effect by no means confined to Presbyterians, nor to the lower orders of the clergy. But to proceed with our suggestions, which must be concise, and aim at nothing more than outlines of the system recommended. We submit, then, first of all, to calm consideration, the inquiry, whether enough has yet been made of minor incidents in the New Testament history. A cursory reader might have been excused for supposing that the statements in the 3d and 6th of Mark related merely to the sending out of the same functionaries, on different occasions, with unaugmented powers, and for an unaltered purpose. This was indeed the uniform opinion, we believe, of all interpreters during the dark ages, that is till THE discovery was made. How do we know then but that every incident, in which our Lord and his disciples are concerned, was intended to throw light upon church-government? Who shall pretend to draw the line between those passages which have, and those which have not, any bearing on the subject? Is it not safest to put them indiscriminately into a retort and then apply the blow-pipe of prelatial logic? If there is any episcopacy in them, we will insure its being all evolved; for since we came in contact with a bishop's dialectics, we have less faith in the principle, that *ex nihilo nihil fit*.

The principle on which we must proceed, in imitation of our models, is that whenever we read of Christ's calling, choosing, or commissioning disciples, we are entitled to assume that the passage involves the creation or collation of a specific office. What right has Bishop Onderdonk or Bishop Griswold to restrict this sort of reasoning to the three particular cases which they have selected? There is nothing said of ordination, in any peculiar or emphatic sense, that should distinguish those three instances from many others. It is true that Bishop Griswold prints the word *ordained* (Mark iii. 14) in italics, to increase the faith of all believers in the doctrine; but the corresponding Greek word (*ἐποίησε*) is a very harmless one; and even if it did mean to *ordain* in its technical and canonical sense, it would only serve to cast suspicion on the 'second and third ordination,' in which the word does not occur. But with all our deference for bishops and zeal for their discoveries, we cannot deny that the *ἐποίησε* of Mark (iii. 14) is simply equivalent to the *ἐκλεξάμενος* of Luke (vi. 15,) and that we can no more find an ordination in these terms than in the

προσκαλείται of the one and the προσεφώνησε of the other. At all events, we insist upon our right to find as many ordinations in the Bible as we please; and if our worthy bishops can discover only three, because their previous theory recognised but three, we who are determined to amplify and multiply the pillars of the church, must be allowed the privilege of infringing on their patent.

As Mark is the only evangelist who has fully recorded the triple ordination of the twelve, as deacons, priests, and bishops, our safest course will be to make his gospel the field of our research. And it is a fact, that as soon as we begin to apply the principle of exegesis which our bishops have established, light seems to radiate from almost every point upon the darkness of ecclesiastical polity, and 'orders' without number start at once into existence. As early as the fifteenth verse of chapter first, we read that our Saviour began to preach, saying 'The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand.' On episcopal principles nothing can be clearer than that this was intended to prepare the way for the immediate organization of the Christian church, by the creation of a ministry; and when we find that in the very next verses, the first calling of disciples is recorded, who can doubt that this was in fact the 'first ordination?' It has in all points the advantage over that which Bishop Griswold has selected as the first. There is nothing at all in the other case to distinguish it from this, as being a more solemn or important ceremony; and to set the matter beyond doubt, the very word 'ordain' on which Bishop Griswold, or his printer, lays such stress, is common to both passages, not in English but in Greek. The *εποίησε* of Mark iii: 14 is certainly no stronger than the *ποίησω* of Mark i. 17. It is therefore clear, according to the canons of the new episcopal system, that the incident recorded in Mark i. 16—18 was a regular ordination to an office in the church. What that office was, is not so clear, and depends in some measure on a question in relation to the connexion of these verses with the two which follow. If it be allowable to regard the two callings here distinctly recorded as successive parts of one and the same ceremony, then Simon, Andrew, James, and John; were all ordained to the same office. But as we read that he went 'a little further thence' before he ordained James and John, it is safer to conclude that there are two distinct orders here successively established, and we have only to go to the ritual of the Holy Mother Church

to ascertain their names. No one who has the least regard for the 'tradition of the elders,' can find any difficulty in believing that Simon and Andrew were at first admitted to the holy order of *sub-deacons*, and that when James and John were exalted to that station, the former two were promoted to the rank of *archisubdiaconi* or, as it is sometimes called in popish registers, *subarchidiaconi*. But as the reasoning of our bishops clearly tends to the conclusion, that we must always shape our exegesis so as to keep *parity* at a distance, it may be laid down as a general rule that a plurality of orders and of ordinations must be constantly affirmed in every doubtful case. On this 'broad principle,' we hasten to improve upon our own improvement, by suggesting that as Simon is always more conspicuous than Andrew, it can hardly be supposed that they were admitted at once to the very same order. And how can this doubt be more happily relieved than by supposing, or rather triumphantly concluding, that St. Andrew received the 'minor orders' (not the tonsure we presume) as an ἀκόλουθος or *acolyte*, while his brother was admitted to the rank of a *sub-deacon*? In this way we secure a most beautiful precession or progression of the orders, in perfect harmony with that developed by our guides the bishops. When Simon becomes an arch-sub-deacon, Andrew becomes a sub-deacon, and James and John supply his place as acolytes, until they are all together admitted to the holy order of deacons. That Andrew was in fact the first *acolyte*, must even by Bishop Onderdonk be looked upon as probable, when he adverts to the circumstance recorded John vi. 8, where that disciple appears to have taken a special interest in those arrangements with which as an ἀκόλουθος he had been much conversant; and 'if fanciful it is nothing worse' to believe that the 'lad,' who is mentioned in that passage, had received the 'minor orders' and was himself an *acolyte*.*

'And now,' as Bishop Onderdonk says,† 'this portion of our argument advances rapidly.' We thank him for this ingenious mode of throwing the log, to apprise his sea-sick readers of the speed with which they sail, as they might otherwise imagine that they made no progress, or were even going

* "There being as yet no occasion, they [the twelve] did not act as almoners; or rather, *if fanciful, it is nothing worse* to allege, that this diaconal function was adumbrated in their distributing the provisions, when Jesus fed the multitudes."—*Bishop Onderdonk's Answer*, p. 252.

† Answer, p. 247.

backwards. With diffidence equal to his own, we beg to say, that we too are rapidly advancing; for we have now established the three minor orders, and are ready for the rest.

According to Bishops Griswold and Onderdonk, the twelve were all admitted at the same time to the holy order of deacons. What hierarchist can suppose, however, that they long continued to hold the self same rank? Who will pretend to say that there was not *instante* a selection of some to fill the important office of archdeacon? The arguments in favour of this supposition are, 1. That *parity* of any sort is not to be assumed or recognised, except in case of the most extreme necessity. 2. The previous progression of the orders indicates a corresponding subsequent progression. The supposition, therefore, that some of the twelve, after being ordained deacons, were raised to the archdeaconry, is so agreeable to the analogy of the system, that the *onus refutandi* lies on Presbyterians. But the case is stronger still; for we read in Mark v. 37, between Bishop Griswold's 'first' and 'second ordination,' that on a certain occasion, Peter, and James, and John, were selected from the twelve, without any reason being given for the preference. Why these three? Why the very three who are already shown to have taken the lead in the 'bright succession?' Can this be fortuitous? Is it not plain that they must have been archdeacons, i. e. superior in rank and power to deacons, though not yet ordained priests? If the official superiority is manifest, 'what's in a name?' It is not for names but things that we contend. This demonstration loses nothing of its strength, from the fact, that St. Andrew seems to have remained, for the time, in *statu quo*. All could not, of course, become archdeacons, and if Andrew had been added, the jurisdiction of each would have resembled that of some American prelates, who fulminate orders to their little committee of clerks, with as much official grandeur as the apostle-bishop of Rome.

A train of reasoning, similar to that just finished, will suffice to make it no less certain, that after the 'second ordination,' as our neighbours call it, but the sixth, according to our computation, Peter, and James, and John, were immediately, or very soon, advanced to be archpresbyters. This is, indeed, an almost necessary 'corollary' from our demonstration; the want of it would throw the whole machine into disorder, or at least destroy its symmetry. As deacon is to archdeacon, so is priest to archpriest; no proportion can be

plainer. And if any should object, that, in our argument, we have departed from the usual acceptation of the term *archdeacon*, in the church of England, or the *minor orders* in the church of Rome, we reply that we have nothing at all to do with any modern systems. They must accommodate themselves to us, not we to them. Some bishop will probably be able to assist the mother churches in defending their departures from the primitive form, by means of a scriptural argument founded on Theodoret.*

For some time after the seventh ordination, Peter, James, and John, may be supposed to have maintained an equal rank. Such parity, however, could not long exist; and we find accordingly, in Mark viii. 29, sufficient authority, on hierarchical principles, for concluding that Peter, if not admitted to a higher 'order' in the ministry, was at least promoted to an official station of superior power. All must be struck with the familiar tone in which, at this time (Mark viii. 32,) he addressed his master, and it is notorious that from this time onward he was always with him, followed him when the rest were scattered, and attended at his trial. This is at least as good a reason for inferring some promotion, as the simple sending out of the twelve a second time, and it would not be incongruous, therefore, to create an 'order' for the occasion. But to own the truth, our orders are becoming rather onerous and complex, not unlike the 'orders' of a distinguished British peer, at a royal funeral or a coronation. If, then, we can dispense with an addition to the orders, and yet account for Peter's obvious elevation, it will at least save our argument from breaking down before we get to the conclusion. Now this can be effected, in the neatest manner, by assuming (*jure divino*) the solemn institution of a dean and chapter, to serve as a model for that glorious feature in the church of England, its cathedral institutions. As we wish to leave something for our followers to glean, we shall not at present undertake to identify the prebendaries, canons residentiary, choristers, and singing men, nor eke the singing boys, who must have been installed and qualified to perform cathedral service. The supposition, we may say *en passant*, that the loosing of the ass (Mark xi. 4.) contains a subtle reference to preben-

* This worthy saint has been ordained by Bishop Onderdonk as a witness in the cause of Scripture vs. Episcopacy. One of the Rabbins says, that Romulus waged war with David; upon which a witty Frenchman well remarks, that the former must have got up very early in the morning.

daries' *stalls*, is 'if fanciful no worse.' But all this we leave to be evinced by others from the inspired writers, not forgetting St. Theodoret. We are satisfied with having brought the twelve apostles to the episcopal throne, not by a crazy ladder of three rounds, but by an ample staircase of seven or eight steps; and there are more to come. For we hardly think it necessary even to assert, much less to prove, that the pre-eminence of Peter, James, and John, must have survived their consecration. The parts of the system would not tally if we left the apostle-bishops undistinguished from each other. It is, indeed, a crying sin of American episcopacy, that while it wages war against the parity of presbyters, not merely on authority, but from considerations of reason and expediency, it lays itself open to the very same charge against the parity of bishops. This evil we propose to remedy, by boldly saying, in despite of all objection, that Peter, James, and John, must have become archbishops. One argument *instar omnium*, in favour of this doctrine, is that the previous demonstration makes it necessary. Subordinate details of proof we leave to the reader's industry, and to that too much slighted faculty, imagination. It is the glory of this system, that it does not exercise the intellect alone, but tempers its exertion with a chastened play of fancy, so delightful that the reader is ready to mistake the demonstration for a page of some romance. Hence, we presume, it sometimes happens that a youth endowed with more than ordinary softness, such as neither presbyterian rudeness nor presbyterian discipline can indurate, is insensibly attracted by this fascinating system, till he loses all his prejudice, abjures the historical repulsiveness of *parity*, sighs for a surplice, and takes holy orders.

Here we must let the twelve alone in their ascent; for there is no branch of science in which the logical figure called *stopping short* is more essential, than in the philosophy of episcopacy. Our reasons for this *aposiopesis* we shall forbear to mention, notwithstanding the surmises which it may engender. Let no one suppose, however, that it is because the prosecution of the argument would prove at all unfavourable to the new opinions. Some may be so uncandid as to object that, on the same grounds, the *primacy* of Peter might be made out far more clearly than his three-fold ordination; and that the doctrine of our bishops is, in fact, no more than a mutilation of the popish hierarchy. But against such cavillers we do not choose to argue, and con-

tent ourselves with solemnly appealing to the common sense of every honest reader for the truth of the assertion, that while bishops, priests, and deacons, are most carefully distinguished in the gospels, Peter is nowhere singled out among the twelve, or made pre-eminent above them. The proper reply to such objections is the argument *ad hominem*. If any one maintain that the theory of prelatists irresistibly establishes the doctrine of one universal head, the obvious answer is, you are a papist. If any, on the other hand, contend that this necessary issue of the argument shows it to be altogether null and void, the no less satisfactory reply is, you are a presbyterian.

Our deductions have been wholly drawn, excepting one collateral illustration, from the gospel of Mark. A collation of the others, and of the Acts and the Epistles, would undoubtedly afford an ample harvest of church-dignitaries, rites, and ordinations. There might, at first sight, seem to be some little danger of confusion and discrepance on this important subject; but our *novum organum* is an universal solvent. However numerous the 'orders' gathered by induction from the Scriptures, they can all, by a simple process, be reduced to system. Those which at all resemble one another are to be identified; those which differ must be introduced as independent orders; the more the merrier. As to titles, they no longer give the slightest trouble. As *bishop* means two things, and *apostle* every thing, so any other titles may be melted and transmuted by a little skilful alchemy. After these directions to our followers in the work of hierarchical invention, we conclude our argument by asking Bishop Onderdonk, or any other candid investigator of Scripture who finds there the *three* commissions, whether he does not rather find the *ten* that we have described.*

We are not aware how these discoveries of ours will please the fastidious taste of our episcopal contemporaries. The shame of having been anticipated, may, at first, betray them into an affectation of indifference and contempt; but in time, they must perceive that our suggestions are quite as much entitled to respect as the vaunted revelations of our Pennsylvanian brother. When this conviction has been

* "This done, we ask him, or any other candid investigator of Scripture, who finds there the *two* commissions, whether he does not rather find the *three* that we have described."—*Bishop Onderdonk's Answer*.—(*Prot. Episc.* p. 253.)

fully wrought, we may expect to see the 'laity and clergy,' in convention, as much engaged with our *ten orders*, as they have lately been with the recipe or rule for fixing Easter; and as the papers tell us that a motion was then made for considering an omission in the Prayer Book on that vital subject, as a mere typographical error, we propose that the same indulgence may be exercised towards the unhappy chasms which we have exposed. Nothing can be more certain than that the Liturgy is falling very far behind the march, not of mind, but of bishops. The sixth of Acts is still read at a deacon's ordination instead of the sixth of Luke, or third of Mark; and at a bishop's consecration, he receives as his commission, not the promise of our Saviour to the twelve at their 'consecration,' but St. Paul's description of a 'presbyter-bishop,' that is to say, a presbyter! There are two strong reasons for reforming this at once. The first is, because it gives 'dissenters' an occasion to reproach the Protestant Episcopal Church with a dishonest use of Scripture. When Presbyterians cause the third chapter of 1st Timothy to be read at ordinations, they cause to be read what they really believe to be descriptive of the offices about to be conferred. But when Bishop Onderdonk or Bishop Griswold assists at a consecration, he must know that this lesson is entirely irrelevant, *se ipso judice*, unless it be made use of, as the zealous Baptist minister used another text, when he said, 'You see, my brethren, that our Lord's forerunner was not John the Methodist, or John the Presbyterian, but honest John the Baptist.' The other reason for amending the form of consecration is, because it might unhappily lead people to imagine that the fathers of the English church, (those noble souls whom we, as well as prelatists, delight to honour,) were of another mind upon these essential subjects, and really believed, like so many 'dissenters,' that Stephen and his colleagues were the first christian deacons, or, like Dr. Hammond, that the 'bishops' in 1st Timothy were regular diocesans. Episcopalians often speak of their advantages in having a fixed liturgy to indicate and check all aberrations from the faith. It is highly important, therefore, that the liturgy itself should be amended, quoad hoc, with all convenient speed, or Bishop Onderdonk will begin to blush that he is a successor of Thomas Cranmer and John Jewell.*

* We exhort the younger clergy not to be hasty in swallowing our system, as it may not all prove true. We say this, lest their appetite for

We need not take the trouble to point out the advantages likely to ensue from this extension of the *jus divinum*. May it not be hoped, however, that it will contribute to increase that apostolical humility and meekness which distinguishes the sticklers for exclusive high-church prelacy? If, in addition to this general effect, it should enhance the self-abasement of those among the number who attain the bench of bishops, the only danger then will be, that their excessive modesty may render them incapable of handling the crosier with becoming grace. Nothing more will be wanting to complete the happy consequences of this great improvement, than its obvious tendency to foster that spirit of indifference to matters of mere form, which is characteristic of the younger clergy. If it should be found to favour the opposite extreme, and to excite too much attention to the weightier matters of the law and gospel, it will then be proper to exhort young deacons to be careful of their vestments, and to meditate more upon the rubrics and the calendar. But these are dark forebodings which are not to be indulged. We turn from them, therefore, to the pleasing prospect of another great result, which is to follow from the complete establishment of this exclusive system. We mean the introduction of a gulf, still more impassable, between the gentility of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the rude simplicity of other sects, and, as a necessary consequence, a better state of feeling towards her, on the part of her good mother beyond the sea. Our readers are not, perhaps, aware of the disinterested nature of the love which is indulged by cisatlantic ‘churchmen’ towards their venerable parent. It is well known, indeed, that the former are not only cordial but importunate in their displays of fondness, almost stifling with adulation and caresses whatever claims kindred with the Church of England, and sometimes, in the ardour of their filial piety, forgetting their social and municipal relations, so as to stickle fiercely for those very things about the mother church, which they themselves reject, professedly on principle. This generous devotion, we are sorry to say, meets a very poor return; for, after all the

fiction should by any chance be equal to their powers of deglutition. We also warn them not to be rash in volunteering their assistance with respect to Scripture proofs, lest they receive no better thanks for their pains than the French ecclesiastic who offered to bring forty texts in proof of purgatory. “Il me fera bien aise,” said Cardinal Perron, when he heard of it, “il me fera bien aise s’il m’en montre une couple.”

civilities extorted by stray bishops from the 'spiritual peerage,' it must be admitted that the old church treats the young one less like a daughter than a country cousin, whose acquaintance, if she could, she would be glad to cut. This unhappy disproportion in the feelings of the parties cannot be more effectually rectified than by a judicious use of our discoveries. It is true that, for a time at least, the augmented apparatus of the Protestant Episcopal Church may provoke a sarcasm or a smile from those who are sufficiently ill-natured to compare it with the importance and extent of the denomination. But to this our exclusives are accustomed, and their airs could scarcely be more ludicrously lofty than they are at present. Besides, what is lost at home will be gained abroad. American 'dissenters' may continue, in their malice, to compare the 'church' with Esop's swelling frog; but English high-churchmen will no longer have occasion to accuse her—as the British Critic once profanely did—of exactly resembling Esop's fox without a tail.

Having adverted to the temper and spirit which are likely to be propagated by a zealous advocacy of these opinions, we may add a few words in relation to the right reverend authors at the bar. Of Bishop Griswold's 'Discourse' we have only to say, that there is nothing in it to impair the feelings of personal respect for his character which we believe to be generally entertained. Our opinion of his argument is known already; but we feel ourselves bound, as well in justice as in christian courtesy, to say, that in maintaining his opinion, he is simple, modest, earnest, and, we doubt not, most sincere. We should not have introduced his name at all into this article, but for the fact, that his sermon, although lately printed, was preached two years ago, and he may therefore be regarded as the parent of the doctrine which we have discussed. We are not at all anxious, with respect to its paternity, but it certainly cannot have a pedigree more honourable than the one assigned to it by this conjecture.

With Bishop Onderdonk we desire to deal most tenderly. We fully appreciate his parental fondness for his darling Tract, and can bear with the amiable weakness which disposes him to tremble for it, if it be but touched. The operation which it was our duty to perform upon this precious offspring of his intellect and fancy, was indeed a painful

one, and we were not at all displeased to see the tender father much distressed and even angry. The first gush of feeling, about six months ago,* while it indicated sensitiveness of the highest order, no doubt gave relief by giving vent to deep emotions. *Hinc illae lacrymae!* The wound inflicted on the Tract was not yet healed; but we are now rejoiced to learn that it is convalescent. "That *such* a review has done our Tract no injury, may we hope be affirmed by us, without incurring the charge of egotism."† That is not by any means the charge that we should think of bringing; but the best is yet to come. "We even indulge ourselves in the belief, that that little production has come out of the ordeal prepared for it, stronger than it was before." So much for wholesome discipline. That the Tract survives at all, seems to surprise its author, though it does not surprise us; for we never meant to kill it. But we are truly gratified to learn that we have made it 'stronger,' an effect so miraculous, considering the utter want of stamina in the subject, that we should not have the vanity to ascribe it to our practice, on any other authority than the very best. If this indeed be so, we must keep our tonic medicines in readiness, to strengthen any other 'little productions' of the Bishop, which may threaten to die of constitutional debility. We only fear that a few such recoveries may destroy the patient.

This happy issue of a desperate case has restored the Bishop, not to the calm pomposity of manner which he had before he fell, but to a very passable degree of equanimity and cheerfulness. Nay, the powerful reaction of his feelings has developed a gift which we should never have suspected. We were not aware that humour was the stream in which, while lambs may wade, even elephants may swim. To those who are familiar with the ordinary movements of the mind which inspired the Tract, the following specimen of playful *badinage*, with its dashing punctuation copied closely from the latest fashions in the magazines, will be peculiarly refreshing.

"Some people are prompt, and some tardy—the same with periodicals—and the Biblical Repertory is of the latter class—perhaps with good reason."—*Protestant Episcopalian*, page 241.

Where the wit has an edge at once so keen and smooth, the intellect cannot be permanently dull.

* See the *Protestant Episcopalian* for May.

† *Answer*, p. 269.

Another point in which we sympathize sincerely with our friend the Bishop, is his vast amazement at our venturing to put one of his strongest arguments almost unaltered into our review, without "a syllable of reasoning" against it—"not one."* At this he is not merely surprised, but perfectly astonished: "Perfectly astonished we were," quoth the Bishop, with an elegant inversion. And more than perfectly astonished will he be, when we tell him that, if he could concentrate into a single page all the arguments in favour of diocesan episcopacy, that have yet been brewed, without impairing in the least any force that they might have in a more extended form, we should not be afraid to introduce it, neck and heels, "without a syllable of reasoning against it—not one." Nay, so far as apprehension for the issue is concerned, we should be very willing to insert the "little production," or any other equally diminutive affair, into our "thick and handsome quarterly,"† and submit it without note or comment to the "less informed."

We have learned a useful lesson from the article before us, with respect to inverted commas. Another of the Bishop's neat inventions it will not be in our power to adopt; we mean his ingenious method of varying the type, according to the nature of the argument employed. The public are indeed so slow of heart to believe that episcopalians will abide by the test of scripture, that it is very prudent to afford a kind of ocular demonstration of the surprising fact. This typographical contrivance we exhort him to retain and perfect, with a slight improvement which we venture to suggest. It is that the type should be proportioned, not to the weight of the premises from which he argues, but to the value of the argument itself. On this improved principle, the aspect of the article before us would be just reversed, for the patristic argument in favour of episcopacy is beyond comparison the strongest in the world. We exhort Bishop Onderdonk, however, not to cramp himself by using only two of these varieties of type. Let him rather go as far as Mr. Harding's font will suffer, and we faithfully promise to assist him in selecting the appropriate character for all his future tracts or articles on this absorbing subject.

* *Answer*, p. 260.

† "Only the 'less informed,' be it noticed—the *Biblical Repertory*, a thick and handsome quarterly, is the vehicle of communication with the 'less informed of the Presbyterians!'"—*Answer*, p. 242.

We shall then have a graduated scale, by which to measure *a priori*, with the eye, what we are going to imbibe, and in course of time this typographical discovery may rival that of the triple ordination; and it may become as usual a thing to talk about the *brevier argument*, the *long-primer*, *bourgeois*, *pica*, *minion* argument, as about "our disquisition" and "our tract." In the mean time we propose that when this "Answer" is reprinted in the famous volume which at present threatens to eclipse the Prayer Book, the letter called *nonpareil* may be selected as an appropriate type of the high church doctrine in its present phase, reserving *pearl* and *diamond* for the phases yet to come.

We are glad, before we close, to inform our readers that the "puppet" with which they have been entertained is by no means an essential of episcopacy, nor even of high-churchism in its common form. Hundreds of sincere and even strict episcopalians will feel themselves untouched by any praise or censure of this real or adopted child of Bishop H. U. Onderdonk. It would indeed be hard to make them answer for the idiosyncracies of their "chief ministers." Of Bishop Onderdonk himself we have no wish to speak in any other terms than those of personal respect. We are not aware that he is arrogant either in temper or private manners;* but if he chooses, as a theorist, to put on airs which, as a christian gentleman, he would be ashamed to wear, we can only say that we are sorry for him. At the same time it is just to add, that in our strictures on the pride and arrogance of high-church prelacy, we have not had Bishop Onderdonk especially in view. His *hauteur* may be abstract; that of others is concrete; and we only won-

* In forming this favourable judgment we have had no reference to a unique production ascribed by *fama clamosa* to the Bishop; we mean the Review of Dr. Miller's Tract on Presbyterianism, originally published in the *Protestant Episcopalian*, and reprinted as a pamphlet. As Dr. Miller, we are sure, will never think it worth an "Answer," and as we shall most assuredly never think it worthy of a re-reviewing, we subjoin a few choice samples of its style and spirit.

"These ninety-six tract pages are stuffed to extreme tension with presbyterian and puritan topics, the greater portion of them being such, merely, as invectives against episcopacy and the episcopal church."

"They are so charged also with bitterness, and not unfrequently with sanctimony, that we should sicken at the task of draining them to the dregs."

"From Dr. Miller, of course, nothing better, towards episcopalians, was to be expected; he has shown very thoroughly what he is, both in

der that he did not leave the paltry work of crowing over his ideal conquests to one of his brother bishops who has better gifts. Nevertheless, as Bishop Onderdonk has thought it right, in answering us collectively, to thrust at an individual, and even to aim blows, across our article, at Hammond, who is one of his own party; so we have deemed it not unjust to strike, through Bishop Onderdonk himself, at some who, though notorious in private for their arrogant assumptions, and for aspersing Presbyterians in the dark and at a distance, are very careful not to make themselves the subject of a public exhibition. When the modesty of such shall have allowed them to appear, we shall be very prompt in paying our respects to them directly, and showing up, for the amusement of our readers, the thrasonical swagger of a *soi-disant* apostle.

From such we turn with pleasure to the venerable image of that patriarchal prelate, whose public life has been a living demonstration that a man may be a zealous and consistent churchman, and that too in the most conspicuous station of his church, without swerving for a moment from the humility of a christian or the courtesy of a gentleman. Such an example is the severest satire on the new school of high-churchmen. And of this we, as non-episcopalians, have a special right to judge, because the ultra-high-church-prelatists are growing every day in their demands on public admiration and respect. And though their drafts are likely to be all protested, the formalities of protest should be properly attended to; in other words, they should be told what people think of them. We therefore undertake to tell them now, in the name, not of Presbyterians only, but of very many others, that if we ever do submit to the encroach-

the green tree and in the dry; he has fed on his prejudices till he has become all prejudice; he has been exposed for *quotations* till almost every one but himself has stood aghast at the developements; of course he is Dr. Miller still. For this we were prepared. But we were *not* prepared for such a *farrago* issued under the authority of the tract Society of the Synod of Philadelphia."

"Such, reader, is the tone of this tract—it is one of the most supercilious and pharisaical productions (but not scurrilous) we have ever seen." "Were there a possibility of supposing it to have an obscure origin, it would be laughed at, as the mere spleen of imbecility."

If Dr. Miller's tract is the 'spleen of imbecility,' what sort of spleen is this? We have not held Bp. O. responsible for this effusion, first, because it is anonymous, and next, because, whether penned by bishop, priest, or deacon, it is a thing of which the most effeminate 'candidate for orders' might blush to be the author.

ments of high-churchmen, they must come from men who have a title to respect. The success of their pretensions is, at present, very doubtful; for although the junior bishops are, with scarcely an exception, not unworthy of their relative position to their church, they have underlings whose arrogance is in exact proportion to their want of knowledge, sense, and manners. To the zealots of this party, whether high or low, the modest dignity and kindly spirit of their senior bishop gives perpetual reproof. It is indeed a strange thing to see that ancient minister of Christ maintaining, in a green old age, his catholic charity towards all the branches of the christian church, while a set of *novi homines* are springing up beneath him, to insult him indirectly by their insolence towards those whom he acknowledges as brethren. But a day is coming which will undeceive them, by contrasting the false glitter of their trumpety pretensions with the pure and mellow lustre of the well beloved White.

We had actually finished, but in turning over the number of the *Protestant Episcopalian* which has occasioned the present article, we observe an extract from another paper, in relation to a controversy said to be now raging on the subject of episcopacy. A single sentence of this extract has arrested our attention by its pertinence and truth.

“Episcopalians are entirely and unanimously satisfied with the manner in which Bishop Onderdonk has conducted the argument. Presbyterians, too, are satisfied, inasmuch as scripture has been made the basis of the controversy.”—*Churchman*, as quoted by the *Protestant Episcopalian*, p. 272.

We heartily respond to both these statements. While we thank the *Churchman*, and his orthodox endorser, for the compliment to Presbyterians in the second sentence, we claim a share in the professions of the first. We too are satisfied, entirely satisfied, with Bishop Onderdonk's proceedings in this matter; and if he will consent to carry on the contest as he has begun it, there is likely to be one point, at least, on which the two denominations may unite, satisfaction with the consequences of the Bishop's efforts. But with still more cordiality we say Amen to the other statement. Presbyterians are indeed sincerely satisfied that “scripture has” at length “been made the basis of this controversy,” so long conducted upon wrong and unfair grounds.

And deny it who will, we boldly say, that from the moment when this principle was recognized upon the adverse side, the war was at an end. Acts of hostility may be repeated, and the parties may continue to dispute the field; but the war, not as a war of words or passions, but as a war of principles, is absolutely over. Presbytery triumphed when the fathers and grandsires of the church were taught to keep their proper place behind the oracles of God. Such an advantage would never have been yielded by the more wary papist. Untempered zeal has betrayed our adversaries (for they are not foes) into a decisive, nay, a ruinous concession. Presbyterians have only to maintain what they have won. Let no sophistical evasion tempt them, therefore, to forsake the fountain of living waters, to fish for truth in muddy streams, or rake for it in ditches. Let those who will, instead of walking in the plain path of scriptural precedent, climb the tottering ladder of patristical tradition, till they reach the point from which they ought to have set out; and then, like the Irish juggler, let them pull the ladder after them, and foist into the scriptures all the pitiful inventions of the middle ages. Let them prove, if they will, that when Peter 'girt his fisher's coat unto him,' (John xxi. 7) he was 'vested with his rochet' as a bishop; or that the young man who followed Jesus (Mark xiv. 51) 'having a linen cloth cast about his naked body,' was 'decently habited in a surplice.' Let them prove, that without three orders in the ministry, or ten, or twenty thousand, there can be no salvation. Let them consign us, if they please, to 'uncovenanted mercy;' and let us consign them to the 'sure mercies' of Him who openeth the eyes of the blind, and whose word maketh wise the simple.

Charles Hooper

ART. V.—*A Narrative of the Visit to the American Churches by the Deputation from the Congregational Union of England and Wales.* By ANDREW REED, D. D. and JAMES MATHESON, D. D. In two volumes. New York: published by Harper & Brothers. 1835.

“THE Englishman,” says Bulwer, “is vain of his country for an excellent reason—IT PRODUCED HIM. In his own

mind, he is the pivot of all things—the centre of the solar system. Like virtue herself, he

‘Stands as the sun,
And all that rolls around him
Drinks light, and life and glory from his aspect.’”

It is probably owing to this trait of character, that the English are generally the most prejudiced and disagreeable of travellers. Their standard of judgment is commonly false, and they seem to have a personal interest in derogating from all other excellence than their own. It is, therefore, a rare thing to see an English traveller rising above his national prejudices, and viewing in a truly philosophic spirit the manners and institutions of foreigners. Though no country has suffered more from their injustice than our own, the complaints against them are nearly universal. We have had travellers of all sorts, the fastidious patrician, the vulgar radical, the vitiated nursling of the green-room, yet all English. Each appeared among us as the personation of England, and each, in his own way, has had it for his object to show how far he and his country are superior to all other people. Most of these travellers, apart from the national feeling common to them all, have had each his own special motive for misrepresentation. To the high-churchman and tory it was the first of all objects to show that religion, refinement, order, and justice, all wither under a democracy. To the radical, the desire of making a piquant book of travels, which should replenish his purse, was a stronger motive than even his long cherished antipathy to aristocratical institutions. The result has been that the most injurious representations of America have been constantly presented to the British public. The same national egotism which produces the calumnies, secures for them a ready reception and full credence. There seems, indeed, to be no limit to the easy faith of our English friends, wherever any thing to the disparagement of America is concerned. The Quarterly Review gravely appeals to Major Downing's Letters as a finished specimen of the colloquial dialect of the United States, and betrays no misgivings lest its readers should question the conclusiveness of the evidence.

We owe Drs. Reed and Matheson some apology for connecting these remarks with a notice of their work. Contrast, however, is as strong a principle of association as

likeness. It is precisely because they are so unlike their predecessors that we were led to advert to the subject. We have at length an account of America written with something like justice. The advantages of these gentlemen for the successful execution of the task which they undertook, were in every respect considerable; and they have accomplished it in a manner to confer a lasting benefit on their readers on both sides of the Atlantic. While we think thus favourably of the general character of the work, we admit that it has many defects, though fewer perhaps than we had any right to anticipate. In the portion written by Dr. Reed, there are not a few indications of English egotism, a sense of personal superiority, and an air of condescension in administering praise. All this, however, disappears in the second volume, when he comes to the discussion of the important questions connected with religion and education. In the narrative portion of the work, there is much fine description of natural scenery, though rather laboured and ambitious, with much insignificant detail and trifling remark. He frequently betrays either a want of judgment or a want of consideration in drawing general conclusions from very narrow premises, or in stating facts as "illustrative of manners" which are perfectly isolated or accidental. An example of this kind occurs at the very commencement of the book. As he arrived in New York in the early part of the day, having missed his breakfast on board ship, he requested some refreshment at the bar of a very respectable hotel. The attendant, not being apprised of the peculiarity of his circumstances, very naturally supposed he merely wished something to stay his appetite before dinner, and acted accordingly. Our traveller still did not explain, but ate his bread and cheese in silent wonder at the manners of the Americans. "The breakfast hour," he says, "was past, and the dinner hour was not come; and an American inn, while it provides bountifully for periodical hunger, has no compassion for a disorderly appetite." This occurrence is made the foundation of a general reflection on the American character in contrast with the English. Now the truth is, as every one knows, that if he had ordered breakfast he could have had it, in his own room at his own time, and at his own table, as easily and comfortably as in London or Liverpool. But Mr. Bunker's attendant, not having the gift of divination, could not discover that he wished what he did not ask for, and Dr. Reed was

not slow in drawing the general conclusion that no breakfasts are to be had in America except at a given hour, and that *therefore* the Americans are far less independent in their *habits*, whatever they may be in their *opinions*, than the English. This is a very good specimen of the art of manufacturing both premises and conclusion, so common among travellers. There is a good deal of this disposition to make every little occurrence however casual, or however peculiar to the individual concerned, an illustration of character. This perhaps is very natural. When a man comes to a foreign country with the definite purpose of ascertaining its peculiarities, his eyes are always open, and his mind is ever on the spring for conclusions. This, however, is the very reason why he should be on his guard, and be certain in the first place as to his facts, and in the second as to the correctness of his deductions. After all, it is with Dr. Reed, as with his predecessors, only when an isolated incident goes to the support of a foregone conclusion, that it is so readily generalized. The interesting meeting of slaves which he attended in Lexington, Virginia, was not assumed as proof of the religious advantages and culture of all the slaves in the United States, with the same readiness with which his inability to get a breakfast at Mr. Bunker's, without asking for it, was made the ground of his conclusion as to the character of all American inns, and the general habits of the people. In Ohio he met with a very respectable lady in the public stage, who, having in vain requested her daughter to sing for the amusement of the passengers, herself delighted them with the song "Home, sweet home!" This also is given as a characteristic incident; yet nothing could be less so. According to the statement of Dr. Reed and of all other, even the most vituperative, travellers, the decorum of American ladies is peculiarly remarkable. In the judgment of Mrs. Trollope, for example, it is carried to a ridiculous extreme. We have travelled many thousand miles in the United States, but we never had the fortune to hear one indecorous word from female lips, or to witness one act of boldness analogous to the case mentioned by Dr. Reed. We cannot avoid the surmise that the lady in question was a foreigner. At any rate, an occurrence more completely un-American could scarcely be mentioned.

Dr. Reed has not been able to place himself in the right position in travelling through this country. Accustomed

to little England, with her twelve or fourteen millions of inhabitants, and her centuries of gradual improvement, he marvels at not finding her roads, her inns, and public conveyances, even in Ohio, where, forty years ago, there was scarcely a white inhabitant. The wonder really is that he should have found any comfortable tavern at the extremity of that state, any public roads, or regular conveyances. We think, therefore, his complaints are rather unreasonable. "For many miles out of Columbia," he tells us, "the roads are *shamefully* bad. - - - About noon we paused at a town called Jefferson. We were to wait half an hour: there would be no other chance of dinner; but there appeared no signs of dinner here. However, I had been on very short supplies for the last twenty-four hours, and considered it my duty to eat if I could. I applied to the good woman of the inn, and, in a very short time, she placed venison, fruit, tarts, and tea before me; all very clean, and the venison excellent. It was a refreshing repast, and the demand on my purse was only twenty-five cents. 'How long have you been here?' I said to my hostess, who stood by me fanning the dishes to keep off the flies. 'Only came last fall.' 'How old is this town?' 'Twenty-three months, sir; then the first house was built.' There are now about 500 persons settled here; and there are three good hotels." We should think this would satisfy even an Englishman. It is an undoubted fact, that, even in our newest states, a man can travel more securely, expeditiously and comfortably, and find better accommodations on the road, than he can in many parts of some of the oldest parts of Europe. It is not the mere mention of the incidents of a journey, pleasant or unpleasant, the statement of the fact that the country is thinly inhabited, the roads rough or miry, the taverns indifferent, the people rude, where such is actually the case, but it is the tone of complaint and disparagement with which these things are stated that we object to in this narrative. Where such wonderful progress has actually been made, it is rather ungracious to find fault with us for not achieving impossibilities. We confess that the whole of the narrative portion of this book is not exactly to our taste. The tone of gentleman-like superciliousness which pervades Dr. Reed's portion of it, is not adapted to conciliate his readers, who, we suspect, will regret that he has crowded Dr. Matheson so much in a corner.

We turn with pleasure, therefore, to the second volume. The discussions of the various topics introduced into this portion of the work constitute its chief value. Dr. Reed has here raised himself to a level with his subject, he has felt its dignity and importance, and, on almost all the topics introduced, he has presented with great ability an array of facts and arguments which must produce a strong impression in favour of the cause which he espouses. As might naturally be expected the first subject presented is REVIVALS. Dr. Reed correctly remarks, that this term has become conventional, "and that it describes the fact, that within a limited and comparatively short period, a church is greatly renovated in pious feeling, and a considerable accession is made to it from the classes of the formal and the ungodly." If this be a correct definition of the term, it is very obvious that the fact which it describes is of common occurrence in every part of christendom, and in every period of the church. Revivals are not a phenomenon peculiar to the American churches, and should not be so spoken of or regarded. We apprehend that great evil has resulted from the manner in which this subject has often been represented, both in this country and in Europe. As Christianity is everywhere the same, there is reason to suspect all accounts of results purporting to be peculiar to any one age or country. We do not wonder, therefore, that English Christians have been led to stand in doubt as to the genuineness and value of religious revivals, so long as they were represented as something peculiarly American. Dr. Reed's account will contribute, we hope, to dispel this erroneous and injurious impression. So far from revivals being peculiar to America, it may almost be doubted whether they are of more frequent occurrence here than in Great Britain. If they are, it is only because religion, at this particular period, happens to be more flourishing here than there. It can hardly be questioned that in every church there are seasons when "it is greatly renovated in pious feeling, and considerable accessions made to it from the classes of the formal and the ungodly." What evangelical minister in England or Scotland, Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Independent, has failed to witness and rejoice in such seasons once and again? Yet these are revivals. We fear that the only difference is that we make more noise about them; that we number the people more frequently, and publish the result more ostentatiously. Dr.

Reed says he detailed a case to the brethren of Connecticut, which (although "the half was not told,") satisfied them that it was exactly what they called a revival. Yet this was not so called in England, nor was it published in all the papers as a remarkable event. Such occurrences are familiar wherever the gospel is preached; yet even when remarkable and extensive, they seldom, in Europe, excite general attention.

Although Dr. Reed presents a correct view of the nature of a revival, and seems fully aware that they are not peculiar to this country, yet he at times yields to the idea that they are, if not peculiar to America, at least in a high degree characteristic of the state of religion here. He accordingly gives what he considers satisfactory reasons why religion should advance in this form amongst us rather than in any other. The first is, that *we expect it*; and the second is, that *we labour for it*, in this form. There is perhaps some truth in the assumption, and some correctness in the reasons assigned why such is the fact. But we apprehend that there is less than is generally supposed. We have already seen that it is a vague and incorrect idea of the nature of a revival, and our custom of giving general publicity to every such occurrence, which have produced this impression. If every case in which a church in Great Britain, Germany, or Switzerland, experienced a decided renovation of pious feeling, and received considerable accessions from the world, were regularly published in the newspapers, we are persuaded that revivals would cease to be regarded as an American peculiarity. It is only so far as religion is more prosperous here than elsewhere, that revivals are more common. If religion advances at all, it advances everywhere, more or less distinctly, in this form. As in every individual Christian there are seasons of more or less devotional feeling, fidelity, and activity, so it is in every church. These successive periods of decline and revival are incident to our state as sinful men, and evidence of our imperfection. When an individual or church has thus declined there is obviously a call for special efforts for improvement; and if by saying the Americans expect and labour for revivals, is meant that they expect and labour for deliverance from coldness and formality in the church, and for the conversion of sinners unto God, it is saying nothing more, we trust, than can be said of the churches abroad. But if it is intended that we lay it to our

account that religion should advance only by fits and starts; that we make great efforts for a short time, and then relapse into indolence and indifference, there may be some truth in the statement, but it is assuredly a great defect in our religious character. A revival is, of all blessings, the most precious to a church or community in a state of spiritual declension; and those who have witnessed such seasons of the manifestation of the divine power can no more doubt their reality or their divine origin, than they can doubt the truth of evangelical religion. And yet it may be true, as Dr. Reed intimates, that we wish to have our religion all together; to have a great feast and then a long lent. If American religion is assuming this form, it should be generally known, and the evil assiduously counteracted. It may be that the efforts for the promotion of religion are sometimes pressed beyond the point at which they can be sustained. Where this is done, a relapse occurs as a matter of course; and comes to be looked for as a season of repose from unnatural excitement. This is an evidence of an unhealthy state of feeling; it may be a vital action, but still irregular and injurious. It would not be conducive to the health of the body, to take such exercise one day as to produce exhaustion and debility for the six following days. Nor can it be desirable in spiritual matters, to adopt such measures, and to produce such a state of feeling, as to render intermission and declension a matter of necessity. To judge from accounts in the religious papers, it would appear that some churches send for a "revival minister," get up a round of special meetings and exciting measures, with the deliberate purpose of inducing a state of religious feeling which is to continue only while the revival lasts; and to consider the departure of the preacher a signal for a cessation of labour and a collapse of feeling. It can hardly be doubted that such a course must be ultimately injurious. It is here as with extra efforts in behalf of benevolent societies. They do good indeed, but much more harm. So long, then, as individuals and churches are subject to declensions, so long will revivals continue to be essential to the prosperity and progress of religion, but they should not be regarded as affording an excuse or even an occasion for relapsing into comparative indifference and sloth; nor should they lead us to consider the advance of religion by means of seasons of periodical excitement, as the only or the best mode of its progress. It is indeed, as already remarked, everywhere its common

mode; but it is so from the facility with which individuals and churches decline from the elevated state to which a revival leads them.

In adverting to the circumstances which favour the occurrence of revivals more frequently in this country than in Europe, Dr. Reed refers to the fact that they are matters which every one expects. We are not disposed to deny that there is some force in this remark, but still there is no small amount of fallacy connected with it. While it is true that the expectation and desire of a divine blessing not only prepares the mind for its reception, but is a common precursor of its enjoyment, yet an expectation excited and founded upon the supposed efficacy of particular measures, or the skill of particular preachers is generally a source either of disappointment or of a spurious excitement. Dr. Reed says, that frequently the mere notice that a revival preacher is about to visit a town is the means of producing a revival. We question this very much. It is much more likely to produce the directly opposite effect. We have often admired the wisdom of those men whose ministrations have been so pre-eminently blessed, in purposely avoiding to excite any such expectation. It was almost an invariable rule for them not to go where they had been specially invited and great expectations aroused of the results of their visit. They appeared among the people without any flourish of trumpets, or note of preparation, and without allowing the word revival to be mentioned, laboured to awaken the church and to bring the careless under the power of the truth. This we know is very different from the plans of the new race of revival preachers, and the results are no less different. An expectation founded on earnest desire and humble faith in God, cannot be too strong, and is seldom disappointed; but when founded on any human devices, or human agency, is uniformly productive of evil.

Dr. Reed asserts strongly and frequently that revivals are always the result of special means. "The means may be proximate or remote, more or less apparent, but always they do exist;" "I am prepared to say, I know of no case in which means have not been employed. There were, indeed, some cases reported to me before I visited the country, and some, also, while there, that were spoken of as unconnected with all means to the end. But I am now satisfied that the parties making such statements had too limited conceptions of the order of means; and, led away

by the natural love of the marvellous, reported things to have happened without instrumentality, when, in truth, it was only an instrumentality which they were too short-sighted to discern!" If this means any thing at all, it means that revivals are always the result of some special effort; of efforts in some measure proportionate to the result, and which tend to account for its occurrence. Dr. Reed could hardly suppose his informants meant to say that the ordinary means of grace were suspended, and that revivals occurred in the entire absence of all the usual dispensation of the word and ordinances. Their statements doubtless went no farther than this, that revivals often occur without any peculiar expectation, or special application of means for bringing them about. And these statements are unquestionably correct. In a large proportion, if not a majority of cases, the work commences silently in the hearts of a few praying people; the sacred fire gradually spreads through the church; the word is preached with more point and fervour; prayer is offered with greater importunity and faith; the Spirit descends with power upon the people, and they are in the midst of revival before the word has been pronounced. The array of means which Dr. Reed mentions, are the usual methods in which an incipient revival manifests itself, and by which its power is spread; but it would be like the ineffectual beating of cold iron to get up all this array before the revival had actually commenced. This is often attempted, and the result is commonly an increased degree of deadness, or a factitious excitement.

Dr. Reed seems to estimate much more highly than we do the value of the publicity given to revivals in this country. It has indeed its advantages, but we fear these are more than counterbalanced by its evils. All the desirable ends of publicity might be attained by the regular annual reports of ecclesiastical bodies, without the evils attending on the loose and exaggerated accounts with which the newspapers abound. As our author correctly remarks, "Revivals have often been used as advertisements. A feeble, or a vain man, doubtful of his standing, or thirsting for illegitimate distinction, has looked to a revival, as he would call it, as his instrument." The temptation, to those desirous of notoriety, which the eclat connected with a great revival presents, is so great, that it is not to be wondered at that the most improper means should at times be adopted to produce an excitement, which may afford an excuse for a

newspaper paragraph. The result is, that the public confidence in all such accounts is greatly impaired, and, when they appear in connexion with the new measures, it is, in many portions of the church, entirely destroyed. Who imposes the least reliance on the statement that at the close of a meeting "fifty persons professed submission to God"? Or what confidence is placed in the annunciation of conversions which are known or suspected to be assumed on no better evidence than merely walking from one room to another?*

The mournful truth is, that spurious and fanatical excitements have so commonly been dignified by the name of revivals, that that term, so dear to the American churches, has in a measure lost its sacred import, and no longer stands as the certain symbol of the manifestation of the divine power. This result is, we fear, to be attributed, if not directly at least indirectly, in a great measure, to the notoriety given to every case of religious excitement.

We think Dr. Reed in most respects does justice to this all-important subject. He fully recognises the genuineness and value of those revivals which have so long been the joy of our churches. He admits their fruits, as proved by experience, to be quite as good, and frequently better, than those produced under ordinary circumstances. There is, however, one point on which his statements need explanation, and his judgment some correction. In answer to the question, Are there any evils attendant on the approved revivals? he says, Yes, there are. They are liable to run into wild fanaticism. This answer seems rather strange, when viewed in connexion with his definition of the term, as describing the fact, "that within a limited and comparatively short period, a church is greatly renovated in pious feeling, and a considerable accession is made to it from the classes of the formal and ungodly." A revival, then, is but the increase of pure religion. Can this be productive of evil? It is indeed very true that this, as all other things good in themselves, is liable to be perverted and abused; but this affords no sufficient reason for regarding them as sources of evil. Dr. Reed would probably not have proposed, or if proposed, not have answered affirmatively the question, Are there any evils attendant on Christianity? and yet an affirmative answer would be quite as appropriate in this case as in the other. As the worst of crimes have found

* See Vol. II. page 34.

shelter under the sacred name of religion, so many extravagances have been connected with revivals; but there is not, and obviously cannot be, any greater connexion between revivals and the evils complained of, than between religion and the sins and follies which incidentally become associated with it. We seldom or never heard of the evils of revivals in this part of the country, until the rise of the new measures, and the new divinity. It is the unanimous testimony of the pastors and churches that these seasons of the special manifestation of the grace and power of God, came attended only with good. The church was elevated and strengthened; its graces as well as its numbers increased; and the permanent results in all respects desirable. We do not mean to say, that sinful human nature is not prone to make every good the occasion of evil; or that the excitement, which from the nature of the case attends the rapid progress of religion, is not liable to be abused in various ways; nor yet that in fact many extravagances have not been connected, in some cases, with genuine revivals. All we wish to say is, that the form in which this matter is presented is not sufficiently guarded; that a revival in itself is good, and only good; and that whatever evil is connected with it, is to be attributed to its perversion and abuse precisely as when the gospel itself is made the occasion of evil.

An interesting and able letter is devoted by Dr. Reed to the "New measures." As this subject is discussed at length in a succeeding article in this number of our Review, we shall do little more than state the results to which the English delegates were led, in reference to it. It must be acknowledged that they had the best opportunity of looking at the new measures in their most favourable aspects. They were associated, on their arrival, with their most decided advocates, and heard from friendly lips the history of their rise and progress. The unfavourable judgment, therefore, which these gentlemen express, cannot be attributed to partial or prejudiced accounts. The two measures to which Dr. Reed particularly refers, are protracted meetings and anxious seats. With regard to the former, he correctly remarks, that it "existed before, and the principle of them enters into the very nature of a revival; but they existed under other names, and had a different character." "With the friends of the new measures, the protracted meeting does not arise out of the urgency of the case; it is a component part of the system. It is, agreeably to its

name, rather a lengthened meeting, than a number of meetings admitting of intervals for worldly and social duties. It is seldom less than four days in duration, and is often run to seven or more."

"The evils of making it an essential part of a system appear to be, that an undue importance may be given to it at the expense of ordinary and stated means; that the means supplied may be so far in advance of the spirit to use them, as may abate, rather than improve desire, and end in weariness; that many excellent ministers, in meeting the claims of such a period, will break down under them, as indeed they have done, and be unfitted for their fair share of labour. Besides, where the length of the meeting becomes amongst the people the popular test of its excellence, there will be no bounds to this easy mode of competition. Already a seven-days' meeting has a sound of reputation about it, which is denied to one of three or four days. Of course, empirical teachers have taken advantage of this impression, and have outdone all outdoing. They have held, some of them, fourteen days; some twenty-one; and recently an attempt has been made to hold a forty days' meeting. This party then, if length be excellence, has excelled all; and has, moreover, the benefit of a number which is frequent in scripture, and is associated with sacred recollections. As you might expect, long before the forty days were expired, all patience and all feeling were exhausted. The pastor whom he professed to assist, I was told on the best authority, sought to meet his congregation on the usual evening, for the usual service on the following week, and he could not get enough people together to compose a prayer meeting."

"The other measure which has been lately adopted, and which is, I believe, altogether new, has received the somewhat barbarous and canting denomination of 'Anxious seats.' The practice is so styled from the circumstance, that after a sermon which is supposed to have impressed the people, a seat, or seats, before the pulpit, and in the face of the congregation, is cleared, and persons willing to profess anxiety for their salvation or conversion to God, are challenged to come forward, and use them for that purpose. They are then made mostly the subject of particular address and supplication." Dr. Reed is mistaken in supposing that this measure is "altogether new." It is in fact, as is the case with almost every feature of the system, old, and is simply by courtesy called new, in the same way that the antiquated heresies of former days are now called the New Divinity. These doctrines and measures are not new in themselves, they are only new among the churches professing Calvinism in the north and east. We are the more surprised at this mistake, as the "anxious seat" is a measure as rife among the "Ranters" of England as it has ever been in America. The course running by the new measure

men of the present day, has been disastrously run before, and the evils which it produced stand as a warning to the churches, and as a condemnation to the misguided men who are labouring to bring upon us the desolations of former generations. Dr. Reed's remarks on this particular are so excellent, and so well-timed, that we give them in his own language.

“1. In the first place, I am disposed to submit, that we have no right to establish such measures. It is certainly not an apostolic method. It is not within the limits of our commission. It is our duty to urge the authority of Christ on the conscience, and to insist on an entire submission to it; but, as I conceive, we have no right to make this particular movement the visible test of that submission. It is an undue encroachment on the rights of a congregation assembling on the authority of Christ, and professedly for his worship; and there is no reason why they should obey such a call to show their discipleship.

“2. It is a bad auxiliary to the success of the ministry. That some good may arise from it, is not denied; this may be predicated of the worst things. Its general tendency is not to support the effect of the preached word, if it is wisely administered. Where it is introduced as a novelty, there is, indeed, excitement enough; but it is of the wrong complexion. I have seen a whole congregation moved by it; but their attention has been withdrawn from themselves to others; or from what was spiritual in themselves to an overt action of no importance any way to their welfare. The question has then been amongst the people, ‘Will *any* go? Will *they* go? Shall *I* go?’ Questions which many are glad to entertain, as a diversion to the conscience, from more serious and inward inquiry.

“3. Then, as an evidence of character, it is certainly among the worst that can well be employed. It is a measure highly inviting to the ignorant, the vain, and the self-conceited; and it is equally repulsive and difficult to the timid, the modest, and reflective. I can hardly conceive of a delicate and well-educated young female, being able to meet such a demand in the face of a large congregation, unless she regards it as a duty to Christ, and a term of her salvation; and then, in obeying, she does violence to those feelings, which are the safeguard and the beauty of her character. I have seen such persons shrink and shudder at the call, through modesty, and then comply through fear; and, when complying, writhing from distress under hysterical tortures. But who has a right to exact all this amount of suffering? And is it not the worse, if it is not only unnecessary, but prejudicial, to the end proposed, by diverting the attention to a bodily service, from what alone is of acknowledged importance?

“4. Let me again observe, that where it is used as an evidence of state, it is likely to lead to hazardous and precipitate conclusions. I know that many ministers are very guarded on this subject; but with this caution it is difficult to prevent the anxious inquirer from regarding it, and similar signs, as evidences of condition. And in many instances, especially among the Methodist denomination, the anxious seat, or the altar, and the acts of rising or kneeling, are in reality, if not with formal design, made terms of state. They are used, too, not only to express the reality of awakened concern; but as tests of having ‘submitted to Christ,’ ‘found hope,’ and of being ‘true converts.’ Such notices as the following are common in the several religious papers:—

“‘Last Sabbath day I attended a camp meeting; it was orderly and solemn; and thirty-one professed to *indulge hope.*’

“‘On Saturday, an awful solemnity was on the assembly. On Sabbath morning three persons *gave themselves away* to Christ, and *were admitted to the church.*’

“‘A protracted meeting began on Monday. On the following Saturday the session examined twenty-one; *all of whom were next day admitted to the church.*’

“‘On the second day of the meeting, the *anxious* and the *converts* were called on to separate themselves from the rest of the congregation.’

“‘On the last day,’ at another meeting, ‘about four hundred, if I mistake not, assembled in the anxious room. The converts being called on to separate themselves from the anxious, about one-third *declared themselves converts.*’

“A revival preacher, after delivering a sermon, called on the anxious to meet him in the lecture-room. About two hundred obeyed. He called on them to kneel in prayer; and he offered an alarming and terrific prayer. They arose. ‘As many of you,’ he said, ‘as have given yourselves to God, in that prayer, go into the New-Convert-room.’ Upwards of twenty went. ‘Now,’ he said to the remainder, ‘let us pray.’ He prayed again in like manner. He then challenged those who had given themselves to God in that prayer, to go into the New-Convert-room. Another set followed. This was repeated four times. The next morning he left the town, having previously sent a notice to the newspaper, stating, that Mr. ——— had preached there last night, and that sixty-one converts professed religion.

“Need I multiply cases? or need I remark on those I have adduced? Apart from the last, which is too blameworthy to be common, has not the *spirit* of these measures a strong tendency to beget, on the part of ministers and people, an impatience of results; not of actual determination of mind, which we cannot ask, nor the sinner yield, too soon; but of outward and visible evidence, when, in truth, the case does not really admit of such evidence? Regeneration is, indeed, the work of an instant; but the evidence of it is the work of time. The mere assurance on the mind that I am converted, is not evidence to me; and the mere assertion of it, can be no evidence to others. The proper fruits of conversion are the only safe evidence in either case; and there has not been time to produce or ascertain them.

“The effect of such a course is, undoubtedly, to create a fearful amount of premature and unscriptural hope, and, therefore, of dangerous and destructive delusion. The effect again, on the church, is to fill it with unconverted, ignorant, and presumptuous persons, and to produce defection on the one hand, and corruption on the other. And this, in fact, has been the result. Of revivals, *so managed*, it is considered that not one-fifth, sometimes not one-tenth, have stood; and many of those who have remained in the church, have given painful evidence of the want of renewed character and conversation. If one-half of those sixty-one, who were so hastily reported by the minister to whom I have referred, to be converted on one evening, should retain a false hope through life, and die with it in their right hand, where would the responsibility lie? or who would dare to incur such responsibility?

“5. Besides the objections to the new measures thus taken, it must be stated, that they seem to have the faculty of generating a spirit worse than themselves, and which is chiefly to be apprehended. Rash measures attract rash men. Those who would have felt it difficult enough to manage an argument, or discriminate between a right or wrong affection,

are struck by what is so tangible and so visible, and so capable of impressing the grosser and animal sensations. Without the power, and perhaps the piety of their teachers, they quickly usurp their places. As they have attained their stations by deviating from the usual way, they reckon that it is only to be retained by the same course; and their onward and devious path is tracked by the most unsanctified violence and reckless extravagance.

“In fact, a number of young and raw men, previously unknown to the ministry, and without pastoral experience, instead of giving themselves ‘to reading, meditation, and prayer,’ have chosen this shorter method to ministerial efficiency; and the effect, wherever it has reached, has been exceedingly calamitous. They have announced themselves as the revival preachers; and have chosen to itinerate over the church; unsettling every thing, and settling nothing. They have denounced pastors, with whom they could not compare, men of tried and approved piety, as hypocrites, formalists, ‘dumb dogs,’ and as ‘leading their people to hell.’ They have denounced the Christians who listened to them; and have made submission to their mechanism the test of their conversion. They have addressed the sinner, under the name of fidelity, in harsh, severe, and bitter terms; and have been covetous either of submission or opposition. The endearments and ties of relative life have been sacrificed to the bitter zeal which has taught the child to disrespect the parent, and the parent to cast off the child. They have made, as many have recently in our own land, great, if not full pretensions, to inspiration; and have taught people to rely on impulse and impression in offering what has been called the prayer of faith. They have encouraged females to lead in prayer in promiscuous and public assemblies; and, in fact, have revived all the irregularities of the Corinthian church, as though they had been placed on record, to be copied, and not avoided.

“The consequence has been most disastrous. Churches have become the sport of division, distraction, and disorder. Pastors have been made unhappy in their dearest connexions; they have stayed to mourn over diminished influence and affection; or they have been driven away to find in calmer regions a field of renewed labour. So extensive has been this evil, that in one presbytery of nineteen churches, there were only three that had settled pastors; and in one synod, in 1832, of a hundred and three churches, only fifty-two had pastors; the rest had stated supplies. The general effect has been to discourage revivals in their best form; to cast down the weak, to confound the sober-minded, and to confirm the formalist; and to dispose the censorious world to ‘speak evil of the good way.’”

Dr. Reed closes this interesting letter with extracts from Dr. Beecher’s famous letter against the new measures. Widely as this publication has been circulated, we should be tempted to borrow largely from its pages, did our limits permit. We know not where a more able, solemn and faithful warning to the churches on this momentous subject is to be found, than in this master-piece of Dr. Beecher’s pen. It will stand a lasting monument to his glory, and a beacon to coming generations, when the apparent defection of its distinguished author from his own standard is forgotten, and the disastrous consequences of that defection forgiven,

in gratitude for the benefits of this powerful exposition of the evils of fanaticism and spurious revivals.

Although Dr. Reed nominally confines his remarks to protracted meetings and anxious seats, it will be perceived from his own exposition of the subject, that they are but subordinate features of the complicated system, of which "New Measures" is merely the technical name; that there is a style of preaching and praying, a mode of dealing with professed inquirers, a regular machinery for excitement and effect, peculiar to the system, and that the whole is instinct with a corresponding and characteristic spirit. That the new measures and the new divinity should have formed an intimate alliance, can surprise no one aware of their natural affinity. We know, indeed, that they may be disjoined, and that they have in fact existed separately; but their close relationship cannot be denied. The new theory of plenary ability seems essential to the new mode of effecting conversions; and making religion to consist in a change of purpose, analogous to the change of a profession, is necessary to justify the assumption and annunciation, that a man is a Christian who rises in his place and says he has submitted to God. No better method therefore could be devised to secure the adoption of the new doctrines, than the introduction of the new measures. The attempt has accordingly been made. The cold, Pelagian system of the new divinity has been attached to the engine of fanaticism. Whether this union will not prove disastrous to both, time must show. If we may judge from the report, the locomotive has exploded, and left the heavy train attached to it, hopelessly at a stand. Dr. Reed also, it seems, received strongly the impression, that the new measures had lost most of the little share of public confidence they once enjoyed. On page 37 he says, "Those ministers of most talent and character, who were partially carried away by the heat and interest of the period, are now reviewing their course. The madness of others will make them perfectly sober. The leading ministers of the country, and among them the best friends of revivals, have entered their testimony against them." On page 57, he says, "The new divinity and the new measures have greatly coalesced; and they have given for a time, currency to each other. Many pious and ardent persons and preachers, from the causes to which I have adverted, were disposed to think that the new opinions had all the advantage in a

revival, and this gave them all the preference in their judgment. Where they, in connexion with the new measures, have been vigorously applied, there has, indeed, been no want of excitement. The preacher who firmly believes that the conversion of men rests on the force of 'moral suasion,' is not unlikely to be persuasive. And the hearer who is told, 'he can convert himself;' that it is 'as easy for him to do so as to walk;' that he has only 'to resolve to do it, and it is done,' is not unlikely to be moved to self-complacent exertion. But it may be asked, do either the preacher or hearer possess those sentiments, which are likely to lead to a true conversion, and to bring forth fruit meet for repentance? By their fruits shall ye know them. There has certainly been good done where there has been much evil; for with this evil, there has still been a large portion of divine truth. But I fear not to say, that where there has been the largest infusion of the new divinity into the new measures, there has been the greatest amount of unwarrantable extravagance. There has been great excitement—much animal emotion and sympathy—high resolves, and multiplied conversions; but time has tested them, and they have failed. Many see this; the candid are weighing it; and the effect will be, as I have already intimated, that the truth will be separated from the error," &c. &c. Again, on page 59, "Before I left this country, (England,) some attempts were made to supply us with the *rationale* of Calvinism, by the adoption of some of the more objectionable opinions of the new divinity; and since my return, a clergyman, who has seceded from the Episcopal church, has been strangely allowed to enact the objectionable parts of the new measures in the Methodist pulpits of the metropolis. I am fully desirous that we should import what good we can from America; but it would be sad indeed if we should covet the evil and despise the good; and it would be ridiculous as well as pitiable, to be adopting, as interesting novelties here, what have already become obsolete nullities in the estimation of the wise and the good there. For my own part, all that I have seen of the new methods, both of thought and action, incline me to think that our true wisdom will consist in 'asking for the old ways.'"

The opinions which the English delegates formed of the new divinity are sufficiently obvious from the preceding extracts. The meaning of the term new divinity, in this connexion, can hardly be mistaken. It should constantly be

borne in mind that there are three leading classes of theological opinion prevalent in the Presbyterian and Congregational churches in this country. The first is the old Calvinistic; the second, the somewhat modified Calvinism of New England; and the third, the new divinity of New Haven. The rise of this latter form of doctrine has had the happy effect of bringing the advocates of the two former much nearer together. It has led to such discussions and explanations, that prejudice and want of confidence have been in a great measure removed; and as they share in the deep and conscientious conviction that the new divinity is hostile to the truth and detrimental to religion, they are disposed to make common cause against a common enemy. We believe the number is very small indeed among the old-school Calvinists, who feel the least disposition to cast out as evil the names of any who adopt the system of which the late Dr. Porter, Dr. Woods, Mr. Nettleton, and others of the same class, may be considered as representatives; and we believe the number is still smaller, in either of these classes, who are disposed to regard the errors of the new divinity as either trivial in themselves or consistent with the honest adoption of the Westminster Confession or the Saybrook Platform. It would, indeed, be deplorable should these classes spend their strength, and divide their ranks, by contending among themselves, while their cordial and peaceful union would secure the triumph of all that either deems essential. A great part of the distraction and difficulty experienced in the Presbyterian church has arisen from these two sections not understanding each other. The fact, however, that they have now a common ground of anxiety, and a common enemy to contend with, will, it is to be hoped, lead them to avoid all minor points of difference, and present an undivided front to all opposers of the truth and order of the church.

The course which Dr. Reed has adopted in the exhibition of this subject, although the most convenient for himself, is not the best adapted to lead to correct results. He first gives a summary of the peculiarities of the new divinity, which, "though from a warm friend of orthodoxy, is," he thinks, "drawn by a careful hand, and with much concern to make an impartial statement;" he then offers a condensed view of these doctrines as presented by their leading advocates, in their formal protest against the charge of heresy. These statements he considers may in a measure neutralize

each other, though he admits the differences of opinion still to be considerable. It is very evident that in order to get a correct view of any theological system, we should go neither to the expositions of avowed opponents, nor to those statements of its friends which are made with the express purpose of showing that they are not heretical, and which must of course be softened down to the extreme point which the conscience of the writers will allow. The only proper way is to go to the writings of its advocates in which they unfold their doctrines, and in which they oppose the opinions of others and defend their own. The adoption of this course would have imposed on Dr. Reed a little more reading, but it would have led him to more correct views. There are some things in the statement of the "friend of orthodoxy," which it would be difficult to sustain against the new divinity as a system; while, on the other hand, it would be impossible to form the slightest conception of that system from the view Dr. Reed has presented of the New Haven protest. Who that is not in the secret could divine what the expression "entire depravity by nature" means in the language of New Haven? Who would suspect any thing amiss in the clause "justification, by faith, through the atonement of Jesus Christ"? And yet, what a melancholy substitute for the old doctrine of atonement do the pages of the *Christian Spectator* present us? Dr. Reed makes this protest deny that the advocates of the new divinity maintain that God cannot prevent sin in a moral system; and yet a very moderate acquaintance with their writings would have led him to see that they first stated this proposition hypothetically; they then positively affirmed it; that they argue to prove that it must be assumed, that the contrary is absurd, and inconsistent with the divine character; that they make it the ground of other arguments, and of expostulations and exhortations; and, in short, that they affirm it, directly and indirectly, in every way in which a doctrine can be asserted to be true. This opinion, though not the radical, is yet the most characteristic point in the whole system; and is essential to its correct diagnosis. It is like the fatal boil in the plague. No great knowledge of the history of theology is necessary to discover that this doctrine has ever been the dividing line between Augustinian and Pelagian systems; between those which exalt God, and those which exalt man. As soon as it assumed that such is the nature of free agency, that God cannot certainly

control its operations; that "God has limited his own efficiency by the creation of free agents;" whatever may be thought of the truth of the assumption, it can hardly be questioned, that the vital spirit of all such doctrines as efficacious grace, personal election, and perseverance of the saints, at once departs.

Imperfect as Dr. Reed's idea of the new divinity obviously is, he learned enough to get some insight into its nature. He correctly regards a fondness for "speculative opinion" as one source of the discrepancies in question. "Many," he says, in no very flattering vein, "delight in metaphysical inquiry, though very few can master it. It is astonishing how much has been written in this discussion, and most of it with acumen and power; though little of it with that command of the subject which reduces the complex to the simple, and sheds light where darkness was before." He says the speculators have had "an ardent passion to relieve Calvinism of the burden by which they thought it to be oppressed. At present, unwilling to think they have laboured so long in vain, they flatter themselves they have succeeded. When they shall have had time to look more soberly on the subject, they will find the burden still remains." "The very reference to discoveries in this connexion is somewhat ominous, as it implies a forgetfulness of historical testimony which is improper to the occasion. I say not, that no farther light shall be thrown by devoted study on the relations and harmony of revealed truth; but I do say, that this discussion has little of such honour or distinction. This new divinity is, in fact, many centuries old, and for as many centuries it has been exploded."! He bids us be "careful of a philosophy which is 'heady and high-minded,' and which is 'falsely so called;' it will assuredly lead from Calvinism to Pelagianism; from Pelagianism to Socinianism; and from Socinianism to Theism. All heresy, the most subtle, the most mischievous, from the time of Origen to the present, has wormed its way into the churches under these refined pretences; and we have nothing to learn on this subject, beyond what the schools and the schoolmen have taught us."

A little better acquaintance with his subject would have preserved Dr. Reed from the mistake of representing the new divinity as a recoil from "old orthodoxy." It is impossible to understand any one period of the history of theology, without a knowledge of those which preceded it.

New-Havenism, therefore, is not to be understood by looking at it apart from its connexions. It had nothing to do with "old orthodoxy;" it sprung up in New England, where little or nothing of what Dr. Reed means by *old* orthodoxy has existed for two generations; it is the pressing out of one corner of the system of President Edwards, to results from which that good and great man would have revolted; it is but one of the many phases of doctrine assumed by the planetary orbs which revolve in changeful and dubious light around that central body.—The advice which Dr. Reed gives to the old orthodox, though very kindly meant, and very good in itself, being founded on his limited knowledge of the state of the case, cannot be deemed of any special weight.

It is impossible for us to notice particularly the contents of the following letters. Dr. Reed presents an interesting account of the several christian denominations and of the religious and temporal economy of the churches. Under this latter head he exhibits with great force the ability of religion to sustain itself without any alliance with the state, and shows that with all the amazing disadvantage of our rapidly increasing population, the supply of the means of religious instruction is greater in proportion to the number of the people than in Scotland itself. Thus in New York the case stands—

Population	1,913,508
Ministers	1,750
Churches	600 (1600 ?)
Communicants	184,583

In Pennsylvania—

Population	1,347,672
Ministers	1,133
Churches	1,829
Communicants	180,683

While Scotland stands thus—

Population	2,365,807
Ministers	1,765
Churches	1,804
Communicants	(uncertain.)

Even the ten Western States last admitted to the Union exhibit the following results:

Population	3,641,000
Ministers	2,690
Churches	3,701
Communicants	286,560

A similar result is afforded by a comparison of the principal cities of Great Britain and America. For example, Liverpool has—

Population	210,000
Ministers 57
Churches 57
Communicants	18,000

New York has—

Population	220,000
Ministers	142
Churches	132
Communicants	31,337

Edinburgh has—

Population	180,000
Ministers 70
Churches 65
Communicants	(uncertain.)

Philadelphia has—

Population	200,000
Ministers	137
Churches	83
Communicants	(uncertain.)

Dr. Reed continues his comparison much farther, and uniformly with similar results. "After the statements already made," he adds, "there can be no difficulty in concluding, that the general supply of the whole country is, in comparison with any other country, astonishingly great. The figures would stand thus:

Population	13,000,000
Ministers	11,450
Churches	12,580
Communicants	1,550,890."

It must be acknowledged that these statements are exceedingly auspicious for the "voluntary principle," and must tell powerfully in those countries where the people have been long groaning under the burden of establishments.

We cannot follow Dr. Reed in his notice of the various religious societies of which he speaks in terms of high commendation. His praise of the Temperance Society is peculiarly earnest and well deserved. Instead of copying his statement of the progress of this great work as it appeared in the year 1834, we give the following account from the Annual Report of the American Temperance Society for

1835. "It is supposed that 2,000,000 of persons in this country have ceased to use distilled liquor. More than 8,000 Temperance Societies have been formed, embracing, it is thought, more than 1,500,000 members. Twenty-three of these are state societies; and there is now one in every state, with one exception, throughout the Union. More than 4,000 distilleries have been stopped, and more than 8,000 merchants have ceased to sell ardent spirits; and many of them have ceased to sell any kind of intoxicating liquor. More than 1,200 vessels sail from our ports in which it is not used; and more than 12,000 persons who were drunkards, and, it is supposed, more than 200,000 other persons, have ceased to use any intoxicating liquor." These are indeed splendid results; sufficient to call forth the gratitude and admiration of all friends to human happiness. Dr. Reed candidly acknowledges that he considered this noble cause as labouring under a temporary reaction when he was in this country. This reaction he attributes to the intemperance with which it has at times been urged, and to the attempt to extend the pledge to wines and other things, by which its simplicity and power have been destroyed. "No people," he says, "know better than the Americans how to bear with manly and united energy on any portentous evil of the day; they have only one fault—they know not when to stop." Whatever may be thought of the correctness of the assumption as to the existence of a reaction in this case, or of the reasons assigned to account for it; we are constrained to say that the cause of temperance has long suffered, and is now suffering more than ever, from the weak, and in some cases the revolting arguments by which it is advocated. The case has always appeared to us a very plain one. Here is an evil of undeniable extent and magnitude; the question is, how may it be abated? Experience answers, by inducing men to abstain from the liquor by which intemperance is produced. How are men to be induced to take this step? Experience again answers, by forming societies whose members agree to practise this entire abstinence. Since no one doubts that ardent spirits produce ninety-nine hundredths of all the drunkenness of the land, the friends of temperance therefore are ready to abandon their use entirely. Now, if any one will prove that entire abstinence from beer, wine, tea, coffee, bread, meat, or any thing else, is necessary to prevent intemperance, and to stay this desolating plague, we admit that the

obligation to abstinence is fairly made out. But to urge this duty on the ground that these things, or any of them, are not necessary; that they are not the creatures of God; that the Bible forbids their use; is something far more injurious than mere trifling with a sacred subject. We regard the attempt now making to prove from the word of God the use of wine to be a sin, as one of the most ominous of the indications of fanaticism which our country has ever witnessed. The advocates of this doctrine evidently feel themselves, and are clearly seen by others, to be in direct conflict with the *obvious* meaning of the Bible. That obvious meaning must be got rid of to make way for an opinion formed on other grounds than scriptural authority. This is itself a dreadful evil and a great sin. Whenever men have such confidence in their own conclusions as to feel that they know better than the Bible; that the obvious sense of the scriptures must be wrong, and are therefore disposed to look far and near for means to set it aside, they sever the bond which connects them with truth, morality, and religion, and are loose upon the broad sea of human passions and speculations, and no mortal can tell on what dark shore they may be cast. They have assumed another and a higher standard of truth and duty than the word of God, and virtually proclaim themselves wiser than their Maker, and better than their Saviour. What can be more revolting to a mind, unblinded by the spirit of fanaticism, than to hear men denounce as the "cup of devils" the cup, which even these men allow it is presumable the Saviour blessed, and which almost all other christians who have ever lived, regard as certainly that of which Christ himself partook! There is scarcely a step farther to be taken. Men have got to the extreme limit, when they can deliberately pronounce that to be sinful which they themselves, until within a few days, ever believed that Christ repeatedly performed.

These remarks are not intended as an argument on the wine question,—for this is not the place for such an argument,—but as the expression of the indignant feelings with which every christian must regard what he considers an aspersion on the Redeemer's character.

We must pass over the interesting letters relating to education, and would be glad here to conclude our notice of the work before us. The letters, however, on slavery, we consider so unworthy of the character of these English brethren, and so unjust in themselves, that we cannot consent

to let them pass without remark. We can, of course, have no objection that Dr. Reed should have and express his own opinions on this subject, and of the conduct of Americans in relation to it; but we do object to his making statements at once incorrect and injurious, especially as they are made without any adequate opportunity or effort to gain accurate information. As to Dr. Reed's personal knowledge of the state of slavery in this country, it is as near nothing as possible; and Dr. Matheson's absolutely nothing. Yet these gentlemen, especially the former (for he is the real author of the book,) appear as reporters or witnesses, and bear testimony to facts which they have ascertained by their visit to this country. The case is the more objectionable, because the little that Dr. Reed did see (as appears in his narrative) is in direct contradiction to his general statements in these letters. Any one who will compare the letters on slavery with those on revivals, on the state of religion, and on education, will be convinced of the carelessness with which this momentous subject is presented. There is no discussion of the principles which it involves; no statistical details by which the moral, physical, and intellectual condition of the slaves can be ascertained; no citations of authentic documents containing such information. Dr. Reed ought not to have touched this subject; he ought to have gone home and reported that his personal inspection having been almost exclusively confined to the non-slave-holding states, he was not prepared to speak as a witness in the case. All that he saw of slavery was in a very hasty journey through part of Kentucky and part of Virginia; too little surely to justify him in making the statements found in these letters. He gives the general features of slavery as enacted by law, which amount to little more than that it is slavery; a state of hereditary and compulsory bondage, in which the individual is regarded as the property of the master. This is saying what all England and America of course knew before. But when he says, "the actual condition of the coloured population is worse than the law contemplates; and severe and despotic as it is, it knows no relaxation, except what may spring from individual charity; and where slavery is found charity does not often dwell;" we cannot but regard the statement as not only unjust, but as inconsistent with his own accounts and admissions. The law forbids the slaves to be taught to read, yet "many, very many" masters, he tells us, instruct

them and assist them to worship God. The law makes no provision as to the labour which may be exacted of them; as to the food and clothing which must be allotted them; and yet, as a general rule, they perform less labour than the freemen at the north (southern men say not more than one-third as much,) and are well fed, clothed and lodged. The most unworthy feature of Dr. Reed's account is, that he selects from various quarters individual cases of hardship and cruelty, and presents them as specimens of the general treatment of the slaves. This is entirely beneath such men as the authors of this book; it is the flimsiest and easiest of all methods of producing a popular impression. Any one who seriously felt the responsibility and importance of the task of representing to the christian public of Great Britain the state of slavery in America, would have taken care to be accurately informed on the whole subject. He would have ascertained their external condition and circumstances; their moral and intellectual state, and their opportunities of religious instruction; and he would have presented this information in a shape to command confidence in its accuracy. Dr. Reed has not done this, but contented himself with common-place declamation, or loose and exaggerated statements. Had he taken the course just suggested, we have little doubt, from our knowledge of the case, that he would have found that the slaves are far less severely tasked,—that they are far better fed, clothed and lodged, and all their physical wants better provided for, than the operatives in the English manufactories. We very much question whether their moral condition is not also much superior. Dr. Reed's representations would lead his readers to a conclusion directly the reverse of the truth on all these points. How is it that men who can shut their eyes, their ears and their hearts to the appalling oppression, cruelty, and vice connected with the establishments of their own country, should dwell so much on the condition of the American slave, so much less pitiable, as far as all the comforts of life are concerned? As it regards the religious advantages of the slaves, Dr. Reed's accounts are still more incorrect and injurious. "Education," he says, "has been felt to be incompatible with slavery; and it has been refused. To the honour of religion, it has been open to the same objection; and the slaves must not meet to rest their griefs on their Maker, unless a white man will condescend to be present and watch their conduct." This is evidently meant to

be understood as being equivalent to a denial that the means of grace are permitted to the slave. This is the obvious meaning of the passage, because in the conclusion of the paragraph he represents the American planter as deliberately determining to sustain slavery at the expense of christianity, on the ground of his conviction that religion and slavery are incompatible. There never was a more unfounded charge brought against any community, and Mr. Reed's own observations, as far as they went, contradict his assertions. He attended a meeting of slaves in Lexington, Virginia, and was delighted with the evidence of religion which they afforded; nay, he heard no discourse in America, whose peroration was superior to that of the black preacher on this occasion. At the protracted meeting, of which he gives such a graphic and touching account, the slaves are found sharing all the religious advantages of the whites. The fact is, that wherever the gospel is preached in the south to the whites, it is preached regularly to the blacks; they are considered as an important part of every minister's charge; Sunday-schools are extensively established among them; many devoted and able men consecrate all their time to their religious instruction; and a very considerable portion of the communicants in every church are slaves. In the state of South Carolina it is estimated that there are thirty thousand communicants belonging to the slave population. "Our elergy," says the Rev. Rufus Bailey, in the *Portland Mirror*, September 1835, "generally pay a particular attention to their black congregations. Many of them give the entire afternoon of the Sabbath to them. Sunday schools among them are almost universally organized." It is also well known that in religious families the instruction of the slaves is an object of general solicitude. It is by no means unusual for individual planters, or two or more in connexion, to support a chaplain for the exclusive benefit of their coloured people. It is not that we love slavery that we write thus, but it is that we love truth, and are convinced that no good end can be accomplished by false and exaggerated statements. If the evils of slavery are to be mitigated, or slavery itself abolished, it will not be by means of misrepresentations or abuse.

Dr. Reed concludes his work in a spirit of kindness and conciliation. His general impressions of the state and prospects of our country are decidedly favourable. We are happy in being able to follow his example. While there

are many things in these volumes from which we have felt constrained to dissent, there is a great preponderance of what is true, kind, and important; and we are persuaded that our English brethren have performed a service of great and permanent value by the publication of their Report.

ART. VI.—*Lectures on Revivals of Religion.* By CHARLES G. FINNEY. New York: Leavitt, Lord, & Co. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1835.

WE proceed to redeem the pledge we gave in our last number, to exhibit to our readers, the *measures* recommended, and the *spirit* displayed, in Mr. Finney's Lectures on Revivals. We do this at the known hazard of being denounced as enemies to revivals, and friends of Satan. But it is a very small thing with us that we should be judged of Mr. Finney's judgment. We, in common with all the friends of pure and undefiled religion, have a sacred duty to discharge in relation to this subject, from which no considerations of fear or favour should deter us. Mr. Finney, and his followers, have shown a resolute determination to persevere in their course. It is surely, then, the duty of those who believe that course to be detrimental to the best interests of religion, to proclaim their dissent. We believe, therefore will we speak.

Our first remark is upon the disingenuousness of which Mr. Finney is guilty, in stating the question of New Measures. These measures, he says, are opposed "on the ground that *they are innovations.*" Now he knows perfectly well, and all the world knows, that this is not the ground on which they are opposed. Of the many testimonies against them, which have been published, we defy him to point to a single one in which their novelty is made the cause of their condemnation. And yet he seeks continually to make upon his reader the impression, that naught has been, or can be said against them, save that they are *new*. Who, but himself, ever supposed that they were *new*? Who does not know that he has picked up his measures, as well as his theology, among the cast-away rubbish of past times? The only novelty in the matter is, that these measures should be em-

ployed in the Presbyterian church, in combination with a false theology and a fanatical spirit. Why then, when Mr. Finney is professedly defending his course from the objections which have been urged against it, does he confine himself so exclusively to the single ground of opposition, that his measures are new? Why, if he felt himself equal to the task, did he not fairly and honestly meet the real objections which have been urged against him? Such disingenuous evasions always injure the cause, in defence of which they are employed.

A similar artifice may be detected in his enumeration of New Measures. "They are Anxious Meetings, Protracted Meetings, and the Anxious Seat." He must have known, while uttering this sentence, that the public estimation has never ranked these three things together; and we very much doubt whether he has ever heard the term, New Measures, applied to the Inquiry Meeting, or the Protracted Meeting. Meetings, of the kind thus designated, have been held in all parts of our church, and, when wisely instituted and controlled, have never, within our knowledge, met with any opposition.* Why, then, should he place the Anxious Seat in the same category with these institutions, unless it were furtively to borrow for it a portion of their admitted respectability? Doubtless he intended that his triumphant vindication of things which no one has opposed, should leave a general impression on the reader's mind, of which the Anxious Seat might receive the benefit. But does he not know, that while there are some who will be imposed upon by such chicanery, there are others who will penetrate the flimsy

* We are aware that the Editor of the New York Evangelist has said that "before Mr. Finney arose, Mr. Nettleton was much blamed for his irregularities and imprudence." This piece of information, it seems, came to Mr. Leavitt, all the way round by St. Louis. Such statements are intended to cast over Mr. Finney the broad mantle of Mr. Nettleton's reputation; or, possibly, the design may be to make Mr. N. jointly responsible for the evils which are now seen to be pouring in upon the church, through the flood-gates which the modern reformers have hoisted. Whatever may be the object, it is exceedingly unfair and dishonourable to attempt to associate the name of Mr. Nettleton with a class of men, of whom we know, and they too, he has ever said, "Oh, my soul, come not *thou* into their secret!" Would it not be well for the Rev. Editor, before putting forth statements, which reach him by such a circuitous route, to make some inquiry as to their truth nearer home? Mr. Nettleton's life has been spent chiefly in New England, and we challenge Mr. Leavitt to produce as authority for his statement, the opinion of any settled minister in New England, of the denomination to which Mr. N. belongs, who was not an avowed enemy to all revivals.

deception, and turn with disgust from a cause thus advocated? Or does he take it for granted, that among his "fit audience," would that we could add, "though few," there will be no discrimination of mind?

In his formal defence of his peculiar measures, Mr. Finney undertakes to establish the position, "that our present forms of public worship, and every thing, so far as measures are concerned, have been arrived at by degrees, and by a succession of New Measures." His remarks under this head are so curious, that we are sure they would amaze our readers. We wish we could quote them all. He descends with most admirable perspicacity and force, upon cocked-hats, fur caps, bands, silk gowns, stocks, cravats, wigs, and small-clothes. He then passes on to the discussion of Psalm Books, lining the hymns, choirs, pitch-pipes, whistles, and fiddles. In the course of his profound and edifying remarks upon these topics, he relates several stories, of which the following may be taken as a specimen. "I have been told that some years ago, in New England, a certain elderly clergyman was so opposed to the new measure of a minister's wearing pantaloons that he would, on no account, allow them in his pulpit. A young man was going to preach for him who had no small-clothes, and the old minister would not let him officiate in pantaloons. 'Why,' said he, 'my people would think I had brought a fop into the pulpit, to see a man there with pantaloons on, and it would produce an excitement among them.' And so, finally, the young man was obliged to borrow a pair of the old gentleman's small-clothes, and they were too short for him, and made a ridiculous figure enough. But any thing was better than such a terrible innovation as preaching in pantaloons." Again, he says, "I remember one minister, who, though quite a young man, used to wear an enormous white wig. And the people talked as if there was a divine right about it, and it was as hard to give it up, almost, as to give up the Bible itself." We dare not reproach him for these instructive little stories, in which he abounds, since he is a strenuous advocate for the propriety, nay, the necessity, of telling such stories from the pulpit. "Truths, not thus illustrated," he says, "are generally just as well calculated to convert sinners as a mathematical demonstration." But as, besides himself, "there are very few ministers who dare to use these stories," he calls upon them to "do it, and let *fools* reproach them as story-telling ministers." Speaking, too, of

such as contend for the dignity of the pulpit, he cries out, "Dignity, indeed! Just the language of the *devil*." We do not pretend to be as well acquainted, as Mr. Finney seems to be, with the language of the devil; but knowing who it is that has said, "whosoever shall say, 'Thou *fool*, shall be in danger of hell-fire," we would rather abide the consequences of the malediction against those who censure "story-telling ministers," than stand in the predicament of him who uttered it. "Fool" and "devil," are, in truth, very hard names, but we will not be angry with Mr. Finney for employing them; we can bear them *from him*, and it would be cruel to deny him the use of his most effective weapons. We trust that we may be excused, however, from attempting to reply to such arguments. Nor can it be reasonably expected that we should answer his stories about cocked-hats, wigs, whistles, &c.; or controvert the important truths they were intended to illustrate. Indeed, so far are we from wishing to controvert them, that we will furnish him with an additional truth of like kind, and one of such vital moment, that we can only wonder how it escaped his penetrating survey. It is unquestionably true, that the ministers in New England, within the last half century, were very generally in the habit of wearing long *queues*, and riding on switch-tailed horses; and, if he will apply to us, we can furnish him with some instructive stories to illustrate this truth. We shall leave to him, however, the duty of explaining how the "new measure" of cutting off the *queues*, carried through, like that of wearing pantaloons, black stocks, and round hats, in the face of persecution and danger, was made instrumental in promoting the purity and power of revivals of religion. We should be glad if he would inform us, too, whether the men, who, in the spirit of martyrs, introduced these innovations, regarded conformity to them as the only credible evidence of true piety. Did any of these worthies ever say of "wearing pantaloons instead of small-clothes," as he has said of the "Anxious Seat," that it occupied the precise place that *baptism* did with the apostles? Or has the signal honour been reserved for him, of discovering and introducing a measure co-equal in importance with a divine institution?

The object of Mr. Finney, in this miserable farrago, is to produce the impression, that the objections which have been brought against his measures, are as trivial and ridiculous as those which were urged against the innovations of which

he here speaks. Whether he has succeeded, however, in making any other impression than that of pity for the man who can thus ineptly trifle with a serious subject, we leave our readers to judge.

It has often been objected against the modern reformers, that, granting the beneficial tendency of their measures, they unduly magnify their importance. This charge they have denied, and have maintained that they considered them important, but yet unessential circumstances attending and favouring the exhibition of truth. We rejoice that evasion of this kind is no longer possible. Mr. Finney, throughout his Lectures, insinuates, and often directly asserts the paramount importance, nay, the indispensable necessity of the new measures. "The object of the ministry," he says, using that "Saxon colloquialism" which his reporter so much admires,—“is to get all the people to feel that the devil has no right to rule this world, but that they ought all to give themselves to God, and vote in the Lord Jesus Christ as the governor of the universe. Now what shall be done? What measures shall we take? Says one, ‘Be sure and have nothing that is new.’ Strange! The object of our measures is to gain attention, and you *must have something new*. As sure as the effect of a measure becomes stereotyped, it ceases to gain attention, and you *must try something new*.” In the exercise of a wise economy “of our new things,” he thinks, public attention “may be kept awake to the great subject of religion, for a long series of years, until our *present* measures will by and by have sufficient novelty in them again, to attract and fix the public attention. And so we shall never want for something *new*.” All this would be abundantly unintelligible, if interpreted by the light of Mr. F.’s own definitions. On the page preceding that from which it is taken, he says, “building houses for worship, and visiting from house to house, &c. are all ‘*measures*’ the object of which is to get the attention of the people to the gospel.” And in another Lecture from which we have made some extracts, he dignifies with the name of “*measures*” the several articles of the clergyman’s dress, the chorister’s pitch-pipe, and various other like things. As “building houses for worship” is a “*measure*,” it must, according to his theory, soon cease to produce its effect; and the gospel cannot gain attention then, unless we “try something new,” such for instance as preaching in tents instead of our present church edifices. In the revol-

ing cycle of these "measures," too, the time will come when the cocked hat, small clothes, and wig must be restored to their former honours, or the truth cannot make any impression upon the minds of men. Will Mr. Finney calculate the length of this cycle, that the public may know when they will be favoured with the opportunity for observing the impulse which will be given to the spread of the truth by the return of these ancient observances? Admitting the truth of Mr. Finney's favourite maxim that "obligation and ability are commensurate," he cannot perhaps be considered bound to write with any thing like logical precision, or consistency. But we have a right to expect honesty. We are entitled to demand that he shall not use terms in one sense, when seeking to relieve his system from odium, and then artfully change the meaning to subserve his purpose. This he has evidently done, in the passage above quoted. Let us assign however to the term "measures," in this extract, the signification which it was intended here to bear, and yet how revolting is the doctrine taught! According to this theory, the gospel, which its divine author left complete in all its parts and proportions, and most admirably adapted to secure its destined ends, must utterly fail of its effect unless there be added to it a set of machinery of man's invention. A great, if not the chief, part of ministerial wisdom is made to consist "in devising and carrying forward measures" for exciting public attention. The very perfection of Christian wisdom, the height of religious prosperity, are to be sought in that state of things in which "we shall never want for something that is *new*." How is the temple of God dishonoured by this alleged necessity for a continual shifting of its services, like the scenes of some rarec-show, to attract the vulgar gaze! How is the Gospel degraded by being thus made dependent for its effect upon a kind of jugglery which shall be studiously adapted to surprise and startle beholders, and thus "attract their attention"! It is the very nature of truth to be severely simple; and in this simplicity she delights to go forth to win her victories. She leaves to error the use of stratagem and guile.

The quotation we have made is not a solitary passage in which the writer, in an unguarded moment, has claimed for his new measures a degree of importance, which, in his more sober moods, he would rather disavow. Deliberately and often, does he assert the unqualified *necessity* of these new measures, to the success of the Gospel. "Without new

measures, he says, it is impossible that the church should succeed in gaining the attention of the world to the subject of religion." And again, "But new measures, we *must have*." It will be seen, in the sequel, that this is only one illustration of Mr. Finney's disposition to claim infallibility and supreme importance for all his own opinions, even when the smallest matters are in question. His argument, in the paragraph from which the sentences last quoted are taken, may certainly claim the merit of originality. "There are so many exciting subjects constantly brought before the public mind, such a running to and fro, so many that cry 'Lo here,' and 'Lo there,' that the church cannot maintain her ground, cannot command attention, without very exciting preaching, and sufficient novelty in measures to get the public ear." He then proceeds to explain what these "exciting subjects" are, which call upon the church to institute specific measures for producing a counteracting excitement. They are such as, "the measures of politicians, of infidels and heretics, the scrambling after wealth, the increase of luxury," &c. It would seem then that the church must vary the method of celebrating divine worship, and modify all the arrangements for presenting religious truth to the minds of men, according to the dainties of their tables and the elegance of their furniture and equipage, the degree of commercial enterprise among them, or the extent of infidel machinations, the number of rail-roads and canals in progress, and of Presidential candidates in the field. The measures we must use are some determinate function of all these variable quantities; and its form should be, in each case, most carefully calculated. Every change in the state of speculation, trade, or politics, must call for such a change of measures, as will be "calculated to get the attention of men to the gospel of Christ," under these new circumstances. Religion must descend from her vantage ground, and on the level with all this world's concerns and by kindred arts, must she bustle, contrive, and intrigue "to get the public ear." To make use of one of Mr. Finney's own illustrations, because "the politicians get up meetings, circulate handbills and pamphlets, blaze away in the newspapers, send their ships about the streets on wheels with flags and sailors, send coaches all over town with handbills to bring people up to the polls, all to gain attention to their cause and elect their candidate," the church is bound to imitate their wisdom, and institute a similar system of manoeuvres. Where

then is the contrast which Paul so often draws between the weapons of our warfare, and those with which the world contends? How widely do these *ad captandum* measures differ from the direct, single-hearted course of the apostles! They evidently relied upon the truth, as the only instrument they could lawfully employ in the accomplishment of their errand. Their miracles were not intended, like the glaring show-bill of some exhibition, to attract the attention of the public; their object was to convince, not to amaze the people. They felt that they were the heralds of God, commissioned to bear a weighty message to the children of men; and while to their miracles they appealed for the proof of their commission, upon the intrinsic overwhelming importance of their message they founded their claim to the public attention. If we may credit their own statements, they "renounced the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully, but, *by manifestation of the truth*, commending themselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God." They seem to have had no idea that they must set in operation some preliminary mechanism to awaken the attention of conscience to the truth. If this complicated, and ever-shifting system of "exciting measures" is necessary to the success of the Gospel, why do we find no trace of it in their practice, and not a syllable of it in their writings? If, as Mr. F. says, "new measures are *necessary* from time to time to awaken attention, and bring the Gospel to bear upon the public mind," why has it been left for him to reveal to us these necessary means for the propagation of the Gospel?

Mr. Finney refers distinctly to the character of the present age as furnishing a special argument for the use of new measures in religion, and as determining the kind of measures to be employed. The substance of his argument is, that this is an age of great excitement, and therefore the same kind of preaching and of measures, which did very well in the days of our fathers, will not answer now; we must have something more exciting, or religion cannot obtain a hearing. From the same premises, we should arrive at a very different conclusion. This is, indeed, an age of extraordinary excitement. The great improvements in the mechanic arts, and the wide diffusion of knowledge have given a strong impulse to the popular mind; and every where the social mass is seen to be in such a state of agitation, that the lightest breath may make it heave and foam.

This being the case, should religion fall in with this excitement, and institute measures for fostering it up to a certain point, that she may gain a favourable moment for presenting her claims? We had thought that one great object of religion was to allay this undue excitement of the human mind; to check its feverish outgoings towards earthly objects, and to teach it without hurry or distraction, in self-collectedness, to put forth its energies in a proper direction, and to their best advantage. This self-possession being included in the final result at which religion aims, can it be wise to commence the attempt to produce it, by exasperating the contrary state of mind? Paul was once placed among a people who were proverbial for their excitability. Their feelings would kindle and flame with the lightest spark, and, like all persons of this mercurial temperament, they delighted in excitement, and were continually seeking its procuring causes. "For all the Athenians and strangers which were there, spent their time in nothing else, but either to tell or to hear some *new* thing." Here, then, according to Mr. Finney's theory, was the very people upon whom it would be necessary to play off some preparatory measures to excite them, and gain their attention to the truth. But the apostle appears to have felt that nothing was necessary beyond the simple declaration of the truth. He looked upon the truth, declared by his lips, and prospered in its course by the energy of the Holy Spirit, as amply sufficient to secure the needful attention, and accomplish the purpose whereunto it was sent. Nay, so desirous was he to prevent the surprise of *novelty*, that he represents himself as aiming, by the truth which he exhibits, merely to supply a chasm in their knowledge which they had themselves discovered. He presents Jehovah to them as the God of an altar already existing, and declared to them Him, whom they had ignorantly worshipped. Nor did this apostle ever vary his course to suit the latitude of the place he was in, or the temperament of the people around him. Among the pains-taking and thrifty Jews; the learned and witty Athenians; the dissolute Corinthians; the more phlegmatic and martial Romans, he employed but one measure, the declaration of the truth. Will it be said that, in his day, the Gospel was so novel, its truths so surprising, that the necessity for other measures was superseded, but that now, when men have become familiar with the revelations of the Gospel, something else than the "thrice-told tale" must be employed to awaken public attention?

And is it conceivable, then, that the Great Head of the Church, foreseeing that the time would come when the preaching of the Gospel would lose its effect, and other means become necessary for its propagation, should leave human reason to grope in the dark for these additional measures? Such imperfection does, indeed, often mark the ways and proceedings of man, but may not be attributed unto Him, "whose thoughts are not as our thoughts, nor his ways as our ways."

We have assumed, thus far, that the new measures cannot be defended under the pretext that they are only a particular mode of preaching the Gospel, or of exhibiting the truth, and are therefore virtually comprised in the appointed means for the promotion of religion. The measures for which Mr. Finney pleads are something distinct from the truth, aside from it, and intended to exert a separate influence. He plainly presents them as the precursors of the Gospel, to prepare the way for its coming. It is surely incumbent on him, therefore, to explain why the Scriptures make no allusion to these indispensable appendages, or rather prefixes, of the Gospel.

Pressed with this difficulty, and unable to work a miracle in confirmation of his right to supply the deficiencies of the revelation already made, will he yield the position that these new measures are necessary, and content himself with maintaining, that as they tend to favour the impression of the truth, and it is our duty to preach the truth in its most efficient form, it is both expedient and right to make use of them? Upon this ground some of Mr. Finney's fellow labourers have rested their cause, and have constructed for it a much better defence than he has made. The principle is here assumed, that it is the right and the duty of every man to make use of any measures for promoting religion that seem to him well adapted to co-operate with the truth and aid in its work; and this principle is, within certain limits, both just and safe, but when pressed beyond them it is false and dangerous. If there be no restraint upon the application of this principle, then are the means for the diffusion of Christianity left, as before, at the mercy of human discretion. Each minister should, in this case, be keen as a Metternich in foreseeing the final effect of the machinery he puts in operation; and the most eagle-eyed would often find themselves mistaken. Hence experiment after experiment must be made to try the efficacy of differ-

ent measures; and the house of God becomes transformed into a kind of religious laboratory. Upon this same principle the Roman Catholic church has introduced the worship of images and pictures, and overlaid the simplicity of the Gospel with the tinsel and glare of her pompous ritual. She has cast upon religion such a profusion of ornaments wherewith to deck herself, that she has expired beneath the burden. The measures of the Catholic church, though adopted with the honest design of favouring the operation of the truth, are readily condemned by all Protestants. We might imagine, too, many other measures which would temporarily assist the impression of the truth, and which would yet meet with universal condemnation. It was Domitian, we believe, who invited some of his senators, on a certain occasion, to sup with him, and when they arrived at his palace, they were ushered into a room hung with black, and against the walls of which were placed coffins, each one, by the dim, blue light of a sulphur lamp placed within it, showing the name of one of the horror-stricken guests. At a signal from the emperor, executioners rushed into the room, each with a drawn sword in his hand. There can be no doubt, that a homily on death, delivered just then, would have produced a wonderful effect upon the audience. But would any one recommend such measures for giving effect to the truth of man's mortality? Or would any one, save the preacher and the trumpeter who are said to have actually tried the trick, approve of stationing a man in the belfry of the church to give emphasis, by a blast from his horn, to the preacher's account of the blowing of the archangel's trump? Phosphoric paintings might be drawn upon the walls of the church, which being rendered suddenly visible by the extinguishment of the lights, at the proper point in the preacher's discourse, would most powerfully aid the impression of the truth he was delivering. A thousand devices equally effective, and equally objectionable, might be invented by the exercise of a little ingenuity. Where then shall we draw the line between what is right and what is wrong? If compelled to run this boundary line, we should make it divide between those measures which might be considered vehicles of the truth, or intended simply to provide for the exhibition of the truth; and those which are designed of themselves to produce an effect. There are various methods in which the truth may be presented, such as from the pulpit, in Bible classes, or Sunday-schools, and in private conversation. Of

all such measures, if measures they must be called, those are best, which are best adapted to make the truth effective. Means must also be provided for the proper exhibition of truth, such as building convenient houses for public worship, collecting children in Sunday-schools, visiting from house to house, forming Bible, and other benevolent societies. To this class may be referred also Protracted Meetings and Inquiry Meetings. The design of these meetings is simply to collect the people together that they may hear such truths as are deemed suitable to their state of mind. It was never intended that the mere institution of such a meeting, or the act of going to attend upon it, should produce any religious effect. Such arrangements as these may undoubtedly be made, if they are fitted to favour the operation of the truth. And this limitation will be found to include the condition that the measures themselves, the bare mechanism of the arrangements for the presentation of the truth, instead of being constructed with the design and the tendency to surprise and captivate the attention, should be so ordered as to attract no notice. The perfection of pulpit eloquence is when the manner of the preacher attracts no attention, and the truth is left to work its unimpeded effect upon the hearer; and so those are the best measures which themselves pass unregarded, and suffer the mind to be entirely occupied with the truth. The measures which are peculiar to Mr. Finney and his followers are of a very different class. The *Anxious Seat*, for instance, is intended to produce an effect of its own. Its object is not simply to collect in one place those who are in a particular state of mind that they may be suitably instructed and advised. No, there is supposed to be some wonder-working power in the person's rising before the congregation and taking the assigned place. This measure then, and all that resemble it in its tendency to occupy and excite the mind, we should condemn, on scriptural grounds, as inexpedient and unauthorized.

The distinction we have here made we think is just and important; and we could urge many reasons why it should be taken as the dividing line between right and wrong measures for promoting religion. But this position might be contested by some, and we are anxious here to reason from premises universally conceded. There are many cases where right and wrong run into each other, and the bounding line between them, like that between neighbouring states,

is involved in dispute and doubt. We will grant, therefore, to save all cavil, the universal truth of the principle, that it is right to make use of any measures, in our efforts to promote religion, that are adapted to aid the truth in its operation upon the minds of men. Here then we are called upon to examine the tendency of the particular measures proposed and insisted upon by Mr. Finney; and when he shall have worn out these, and, in accordance with his Athenian notion that we must continually find something new, introduced others, we shall be under the necessity of testing them in like manner.

For reasons already given we shall throw out of consideration Inquiry Meetings, and Protracted Meetings. We shall first consider what Mr. F. calls the *Anxious Seat*. His formal definition of this measure is, "the appointment of some particular seat in the place of meeting, where the anxious may come, and be addressed particularly, and be made subjects of prayer, and sometimes conversed with individually." Let this definition be well marked. It points out, with sufficient distinctness, the nature and design of this measure. What then will be the surprise of the reader to learn, that on the same page he implicitly admits that the real *design* is totally different from the avowed one. In defending this measure from objection, he says, "the *design* of the anxious seat is undoubtedly philosophical, and according to the laws of mind:—it has two bearings." These two bearings are, that "it gets the individual, (who is seriously troubled in mind,) willing to have the fact known to others;"—and secondly, "it uncovers the delusion of the human heart, and prevents a great many spurious conversions, by showing those who might otherwise imagine themselves willing to do any thing for Christ, that in fact they are willing to do nothing." In defending this measure, who would not have supposed that his arguments would have been drawn from the importance of having those who were troubled in mind, collected together that they might "be addressed particularly," &c.? But there is not one word of his defence that has the remotest connexion with the avowed object of this measure. He was evidently thrown off his guard; and the plainness with which he thus incautiously reveals the true, in distinction from the professed design, is only a new instance to illustrate the difficulty of maintaining a consistent system of deception. We have understood from the beginning the guileful character of this measure,

and it has constituted in our minds a strong objection against it; but we had not expected to find so distinct an acknowledgment of it in Mr. Finney's defence. Can any measures, thus marked by insidiousness, be lawfully employed in the promotion of religion? How careful is the Apostle Paul to inform us that he did "not walk in *craftiness*;" and when some of his enemies at Corinth charged him with having "caught them with *guile*," how promptly did he repel the odious accusation! We are told too that in the Saviour's lips, "there was found no *guile*;" but that his enemies used *crafty* measures to ensnare him. Christian wisdom becomes wordily cunning the moment that it ceases to be united with the artlessness and simplicity of the dove. But we need not multiply arguments to prove that deception can never be lawfully employed in the support and furtherance of the truth. The only difficulty heretofore has been to substantiate the charge of guile against the new measures, and Mr. Finney has saved us all farther trouble on this score.

Deception may seem, for a time, to aid the progress of truth, but its ultimate effects must always be injurious. In the case now under examination, it is easy to foresee the evil. Many will doubtless go to the anxious seat, and finding that no counsels or prayers are offered on their behalf, which might not have been delivered with as much propriety and effect, while they occupied their former seats, will perceive that the apparent and professed design of this measure was intended merely as a lure to draw them within the sphere of its real operation. They will feel that they have been deceived, and there is nothing which the mind more instinctively and quickly resents than the least approach to fraud or imposition upon itself—nothing which more surely awakens its unfriendly and hostile feelings. A still larger class will see at once the deception of this measure, and will turn away in disgust from a cause which calls in the aid of such fantastic trickery,—a disgust which we should not hesitate to pronounce reasonable, if the conduct which excites it were lawful and right. The best cause imaginable, on trial before a jury, would be prejudiced and probably lost, by any appearance of fraud in the matter or management of it. What impression then must be made respecting religion, when her friends employ such measures, and represent them as essential to the success of the Gospel! What multitudes will conclude, and conclude justly, if the sayings and doings of these reformers are true and right, that the

cause itself thus supported, must be a bad one! The character of religion is known to the world chiefly from the conduct of its professed friends; and they cannot be too careful, therefore, to pursue such an open and honest course, as will plainly show, that, in the strong consciousness of the merits of their cause, they reject with disdain the tortuous policy and intriguing arts of worldly men.

The substance of Mr. Finney's first argument in defence of the anxious seat, is comprised in the following extract. "When a person is seriously troubled in mind, every body knows that there is a powerful tendency to try to keep it private that he is so, and it is a great thing to get the individual willing to have the fact known to others. And as soon as you can get him willing to make known his feelings you have accomplished a great deal." The anxious seat he supposes will produce this willingness, will "get him to break away from the chains of pride," and thus "gain an important point towards his conversion." It is true that there is often found the tendency, here spoken of, to conceal the state of the feelings from public observation. But this is not always the effect of pride. However strange and inconceivable it may be to Mr. Finney, there can be no doubt that there is such a thing as a diffidence, which has its origin in modesty rather than pride. There are those, and they form perhaps a much larger class than he supposes, whose minds shrink from every thing like a parade, or public display of feeling. Every refined mind possesses more or less of this retiring delicacy. Its tenderest, most cherished feelings are those which are least exposed save to the objects of them; it feels indeed, that its affections would be profaned by being laid open to the stare of vulgar curiosity. It is easy to see how such a mind will be affected by the anxious seat. In proportion ordinarily to the intenseness of the feelings awakened within a man of this mood, will be his aversion to make the public exhibition of them, which is demanded. He knows that there is, in every community, a circle of religious gossips, who are always found among the earliest and warmest patrons of the anxious seat, and who attend continually upon it, to satisfy their prurient curiosity and gather materials for conversation from the disclosures there made of the feelings of their neighbours. And he cannot bear the thought that his most private and sacred emotions should be thus idly bruited about. After a severe struggle of mind, he will decide not to go to the anxious

seat, and, as he has been taught to consider this step necessary to his conversion, there is much reason to fear that his decision not to take it will put an end to his seriousness. The spark, which, properly fostered, might have been kindled into a bright and ever-during flame, is thus quenched by a kind of rude and harsh dealing for which the word of God affords no warrant. There are others, in whom the unwillingness to make known their religious concern, proceeds from the dread of ridicule. This dread has a place in most minds, and with some men it constitutes one of the strongest feelings of their nature. There are many young men who could better brave almost any danger than endure the laugh or face the sneer of their thoughtless companions. The religious anxiety of such must become deep and strong, before it will drive them to break through the restraints which this fear imposes upon them. Can it be deemed wise or safe then to expose them unnecessarily to so severe a trial as the anxious seat? This trial may in some cases effect, so far as this is concerned, the desired result, but there is a dreadful risk incurred of repelling some, upon whom the truth had taken hold, to their former state of thoughtless unconcern. And what is the counterbalancing advantage to warrant this risk? Why, the anxious seat, argues Mr. Finney, "gets the individual, who is seriously troubled in mind, willing to have the fact known to others; and as soon as you can get him willing to make known his feelings, you have accomplished a great deal." The true state of the question is here very artfully concealed from view. The real operation of the anxious seat is not to make the individual upon whom it takes effect, willing to have his feelings known to "*others*;"—it is to make him willing to display them before the *whole congregation*. And this is so far from being "an important point gained towards his conversion," that it should be deprecated as fraught with almost certain evil. It is important that some one or more should be made acquainted with his state of mind, that he may receive instructions adapted to his case; but it is highly undesirable that the whole community should know it, lest the thought that he is the object of general observation and remark should turn away his mind from the contemplation of the truth, and call up an antagonist influence, which shall prevail over that which had begun to work within him. The risk then which is involved in the use of this measure, is

incurred for the attainment of an end, which is of itself a positive and serious disadvantage.

In this connexion, too, we would remark, that the tendency of the anxious seat, and of the whole system of public pledging, voting, &c., or, as Mr. Finney calls it in his Saxon English, "of speaking right out in the meeting," is *to obstruct the operation of the truth*. They distract the mind and divert it from the truth, by producing a distinct and separate excitement. Suppose an individual, listening to the message of God, feels the truth manifested to his conscience. As the preacher proceeds, the truth takes deeper hold upon him, the penitential tear starts from his eye, and he resolves that he will begin to seek the Lord. When the sermon is closed, his heart still meditates upon the truth he has heard, and his feeling of anxious concern becomes each moment more intense. But now comes the call to the anxious seat. He hears himself exhorted, in the most impassioned manner, to exchange the seat he now occupies for another designated one; and the vehemence with which this measure is urged upon him, and the motives and illustrations employed to enforce it, seem to imply that the salvation of his soul depends upon his taking this step. Here is a new subject presented to his mind, and one of a very agitating nature. The divine truth, which was but now occupying his mind, is forced away, while he revolves the questions, shall I go or not? Who else will go? What will they say of me? The excitement thus produced, obliterates the impressions which the truth had made, and, but for the consideration we are now about to present, it would then be a matter of small moment whether he went to the anxious seat or not.

The consideration just alluded to, is the tendency of the anxious seat *to form and cherish delusive hopes*. Mr. Finney has, indeed, assigned as his second argument, and the only additional one to that already examined, in favour of this measure, that its bearing is "to detect deception and delusion, and thus prevent false hopes." This argument would have astonished us beyond measure, had we not ceased to be startled by any thing which Mr. Finney can say or do. He has worn out all our susceptibilities of this kind, and no measures from him, in argument or action, however new, could now surprise us. This case is but one out of several similar ones, in which Mr. F. resorts to the forlorn hope of reversing what he knows and feels to be the most formidable objections against him, and changing them into argu-

ments in his favour. As might have been anticipated in every attempt of this kind, he has utterly failed. He supposes that the anxious seat operates as a test of character. "Preach," he says, "to him (the awakened sinner) and at the moment he thinks he is willing to do any thing,—but bring him to the test, call on him to do one thing, to take one step, that shall identify him with the people of God, or cross his pride—his pride comes up, and he refuses; his delusion is brought out, and he finds himself a lost sinner still; whereas, if you had not done it he might have gone away flattering himself that he was a Christian." This argument involves the capital error that no sinner who is truly awakened can refrain from obeying the call to the anxious seat. It assumes that to go to the anxious seat is "to do something for Christ," and that it is impossible for him who refuses to go, to be a Christian. It supposes that these things are true, and that every awakened sinner is ignorant or undiscerning enough to believe them true. Some test of this kind, he says, the church has always found it necessary to have. "In the days of the Apostles, baptism answered this purpose. It held the precise place that the *anxious seat* does now, as a public manifestation of their (the people's) determination to be Christians." So it appears that baptism, like all other measures, wears itself out, and must be replaced by something new. Will Mr. Finney, inform the church how long we must wait before this measure will be again fitted to accomplish the purpose for which the Saviour intended it? Though he supposes that the anxious seat occupies "the precise place" that baptism did, we can by no means consent to receive it as an equivalent. Baptism was, indeed, a test of character, since obedience or disobedience was exercised in view of a divine command; but the anxious seat cannot operate thus, except by arrogating to itself a similar authority. We trust that this may be deemed a sufficient answer to Mr. F's. argument for the anxious seat as a test of character.

The tendency of this measure to foster delusion and create false hopes is very evident. There are some persons who are fond of notoriety, and ever ready to thrust themselves forward, on any occasion, or in any manner which will attract to them the notice of others. To such, the anxious seat holds out a powerful temptation. This measure, if used at all, must be used without discrimination. It applies the same treatment to all, and does not permit us,

according to the apostolic direction, to make a difference, "having compassion on some," "and pulling others out of the fire." While it unduly discourages, and in many cases overwhelms with despair, the timid and diffident, it invites forward the noisy and bustling, who need to be repressed. Others again will go to the anxious seat, who are not properly awakened, upon whom, indeed, the truth has produced no effect; but they go because they have been persuaded that to do so is "to do something for Christ," and that it will be "an important point gained towards their conversion." Mr. Finney agrees with us in supposing that such public manifestations will often be made by persons who have not the feelings indicated; for however irrational a man's theories may be, he cannot refrain, sometimes out of connexion with them, from talking common sense. On one occasion, when he is out of his controversial attitude, he says to his congregation, "perhaps if I should put it to you now, you would all rise up and *vote* that you were agreed in desiring a revival, and agreed to have it now;" and he then goes on to prove to them, that nevertheless they are not agreed. Doubtless it would be so, and in like manner will many go to the anxious seat, who are not "anxious." And the great majority of all who go will go under the influence of erroneous impressions and wrong excitement. Whatever may be the theory of the anxious seat, in practice it is not used for the purpose of making visible and thus rendering permanent, the impressions made by the truth, nor is such its effect. This is most fully disclosed by Mr. Finney. Those who have been affected by the truth, and who obey the summons to the anxious seat, will not go with the view of making known their state of mind to their spiritual adviser. They will ordinarily make this 'pilgrimage to Mecca,' because they have been deceived into the belief that it is a necessary step towards their salvation; and that they are rendering to Christ an acceptable service by thus attending upon an institution which is as good as baptism, or, perhaps, a little better. The excitement which draws persons, of these different classes, to the anxious seats, not being produced by the truth, and yet partaking of a religious character, must tend to conduct the mind to error and delusion. Some, no doubt, who, in the heat of the moment, have taken this step before so many witnesses, will feel that they are committed, and rather than be talked of as apostates through the whole congregation, they will be induced to counterfeit a change

which they have not experienced. We have not been surprised, therefore, to learn what is an unquestionable fact, that where this measure has been most used, many hypocrites have been introduced into the church—men professing godliness, but living in the practice of secret wickedness. And a still greater number, through the operation of the same influence, have been led to cherish false hopes. In the mind of an individual who has gone to the anxious seat, an important place will be filled by the desire to come out well in the estimation of the multitude who have looked upon this declaration of his seriousness; and, already too much disposed to judge favourably of himself, he will be thus still more inclined to rest satisfied with insufficient evidences of a gracious change. Every extraneous influence of this kind, which is brought to bear upon a mind engaged in the delicate business of forming an estimate of itself, must tend to mislead and delude it.

The anxious seat, no matter how judiciously managed, is liable to the objection here advanced. It excites the mind and thus urges it forward, at the same time that it thrusts aside the truth, the attractive power of which is alone sufficient to draw it into its proper orbit. But the intrinsic tendency of this measure to lead the mind astray, is very greatly enhanced by the manner in which it is conducted by Mr. Finney and his imitators. The ordinary course of proceeding with those who come forward to occupy the anxious seat is on this wise. They are exhorted to submit to God during the course of the prayer which the preacher is about to offer. They are told that this is a work which they can perform of themselves. They have only to summon up all their energies, and put forth one Herculean determination of will, and the work is done. A strong pull, as in the case of a dislocated limb, will jerk the heart straight, and all will be well. At the conclusion of the prayer, they are called upon to testify whether they have submitted. All who make this profession, without any farther examination, are at once numbered and announced as converts. Sometimes a room, or some separate place is provided to which they are directed to repair. Those who remain are upbraided for their rebellion, and again urged to energize the submitting volition during another prayer. And this process is continued as long as there is a prospect of its yielding any fruit. Does it need any argument or illustration to show, that the anxious seat, thus managed, must be

a very hot-bed of delusion? The duty here urged upon the sinner is not, as we have shown in our former article, the duty which the Bible urges. We are at no loss to understand why Mr. Finney presents the sinner's duty in this form. Submission seems to be more comprised than some other duties within a single mental act, and more capable of instant performance. Were the sinner directed to repent, it might seem to imply that he should take some little time to think of his sins, and of the Being whom he has offended; or if told to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, he might be led to suppose that he could not exercise this faith until he had called up before his mind the considerations proper to show him his lost condition, and the suitableness of the offered Saviour. Repentance and faith, therefore, will not so well answer his purpose. But with submission, he can move the sinner to the instant performance of the duty involved, or, as he says, in his Saxon way, can "break him down,"—"break him down on the spot,"—"melt him right down, clear to the ground, so that he can neither stand or go." In the mental darkness, consequent upon this unscriptural exhibition of his duty, and while flurried and bewildered by the excitement of the scene, the sinner is to perform the double duty of submitting, and of deciding that he has submitted. Who can doubt that, under these circumstances, multitudes have been led to put forth a mental act, and say to themselves, "there, it is done," and then hold up the hand to tell the preacher they have submitted, while their hearts remain as before, except, indeed, that now the mists of religious delusion are gathering over them? Had this system been designed to lead the sinner, in some plausible way, to self-deception, in what important respect could it have been better adapted, than it now is, to this purpose?

The test-question propounded to the occupant of the anxious seat, is not always made as definite as we have represented. Sometimes it is proposed in as loose and vague a form as this: "Would you not be willing to vote that God should be the Supreme Ruler?" and an affirmative answer to this question has been deemed and proclaimed adequate evidence of submission, and the assenting individual filed off among the "new converts." So unbecoming and foreign from the true nature of religion have been the attempts often made by these preachers to produce an excitement; so indecent the anxiety manifested to force upon the anxious sinner some expression or sign which might authorize them

to make use of his name to swell their list of converts, that we can liken it only to the manner in which the recruiting serjeant by the display of drum and fife and banner, and, if this will not answer, by the intoxication of his dupe, persuades him to accept a piece of the king's money, and thus binds him to the service and increases his own reward. The chief difference is, that the enlisted soldier soon perceives that he has been caught with guile, and bitterly deplores the consequences of his delusion, but the deceived sinner will, in many instances, remain deceived until he learns his mistake at the bar of his Judge.

Lest the proclamation, upon the most slight and insufficient grounds, that the anxious sinner is a convert, should not act with sufficient power upon his sense of character to make him counterfeit a Christian deportment, or deceive himself into the belief that he is a true disciple of Christ, there is provided an additional new measure, *the immediate admission to the Lord's Supper of all who profess themselves converts*. It will be at once seen how this measure plays into the rest of the system and assists the operation of the whole. Mr. Finney, to perfect his system, has but to take one farther step, and maintain that no church has the right to discipline any of its members who have been thrown in by the operation of the new measures. This is evidently wanting to complete his plan, which ought to provide some method for retaining his converts in the church, as well as for their easy introduction into it. And why should he hesitate to make this small addition? It is surely more defensible than many other parts of his system. We should not be surprised to find a denial that the "set of old, stiff, dry, cold elders," that have crept into our churches, have any authority to discipline his converts, figuring at large in the neat pattern-card, which he issues, of the newest fashion in measures. Mr. Finney endeavours to show that it is the duty of the young convert to apply immediately for admission to the church, and the duty of the church to yield to this application. In Chatham-street Chapel, it seems their practice is to propound applicants for a whole month, but the reason of this long delay is that in a city many strangers will apply, and it is necessary for the session to have opportunity to inquire respecting them. In the country, however, the church will "sin and grieve the Holy Spirit," by debarring from the communion any who apply, "if they are sufficiently instructed on the subject of religion, to know

what they are doing, and if their general character is such that they can be trusted as to their sincerity and honesty in making a profession."—"Great evil," he says, "has been done by this practice of keeping persons out of the church a long time to see if they were Christians." No doubt great evil has been done to the credit of his system, wherever the converts made by it have been thus tried, but this is the only evil that we have ever known to result from the practice. Under the ordinary ministrations of the Gospel there is much that springs up, having the semblance of piety, but without root, so that it soon withers away. And it cannot be doubted that much more than the usual number of these fair-looking but rootless plants will start up in Mr. Finney's forcing-bed. Surely then the voice of wisdom and of duty calls upon the church to wait until the blossom, if not the fruit, shall have appeared. When the seeming but deceived convert has been once admitted within the pale of the church, the motives and means of continued self-deception are so greatly multiplied, as to leave but little ground for hope that he will ever be awakened from his false security until the dawning light of another world breaks in upon him. The church also owes a duty to herself in this matter. The addition of unworthy members to her communion, by rendering frequent acts of discipline necessary, will expose her to distraction within, and to scandal without. But these weighty considerations, plainly involving the eternal welfare of individuals and the true prosperity of the church, must all give way to provide for the effectual working of Mr. Finney's system. Better that the church should be filled with the hypocritical and the deluded, than that the new measures should lose their credit.

Many of Mr. F's opinions tend to this same point, to provide for smuggling his converts into the church, before they themselves, or the session to whom they apply, can have had full opportunity to judge whether they have undergone a change of heart. "There is no need," he says, "of young converts *having* or *expressing* doubts as to their conversion. There is no more need of a person's doubting whether he is now in favour of God's government, than there is for a man to doubt whether he is in favour of our government or another. It is, in fact, on the face of it, *absurd* for a person to talk of doubting on such a point, if he is intelligent and understands what he is talking about." Though it might perplex a man of plain understanding to conceive how such

instruction as this could be reconciled with the scriptural account of the deceitfulness of man's heart; yet its meaning and drift are perfectly intelligible. Its tendency, and, it would hardly be uncharitable to say, its design, is to form a bold, swaggering, Peter-like confidence, which may preserve the fresh convert from misgivings of mind during the brief interval of a few hours, or, at most, days, which must elapse between his professed submission and his reception into the church. The next thing is to impress him with the belief that it is his duty to apply at once for admission to the Lord's Supper, and this is most fully done. He is told that if he waits "he will probably go halting and stumbling along through life." No, there must be no waiting,—drive on, or the tempestuous breeze will die away. Then the church must be taught to throw open her doors, and this she is told to do under the pains and penalties of "grieving the Holy Spirit" if she refuse. Some examination, however, must be held, and the result of this might be to show that many of the applicants had been insufficiently or erroneously instructed in the plan of salvation. And see how beautifully Mr. Finney provides for this difficulty. "In examining young converts for admission to the church, their consciences should not be ensnared by examining them too extensively or minutely *on doctrinal points*." The meaning of the phrase, "too extensively or minutely," may be readily understood from the exposition we have given of Mr. Finney's theological system. The church session who should ask of one of these converts, what is the ground of your hope of salvation? might receive for an answer, "My submission to God:—the world is divided into two great political parties, the one with Satan, the other with God at its head; and I have energized a mighty volition, and resolved to join the latter and vote in the Lord Jesus Christ, as governor of the universe." Suppose the examination to proceed a little farther,—Have you been led to see the depravity of your heart? "I know nothing of a depraved heart. All I know on this subject is, that ever since Adam sinned, every person begins to sin when he becomes a moral agent."—But does not David say, I was shapen in sin? "Yes, but the substance of a conceived foetus cannot be sin, and David only meant that he sinned, when he sinned." Have you any reason to believe that your soul has been washed in the fountain set open for the remission of sin? "I know nothing of any such operation. I have been

taught that it is a great error, introduced into the church by the accursed traditions of the elders, to speak as though in religion there occurred any thing like the washing off of some defilement."—Upon whom do you rely for strength in the conflict which is before you? "Upon the might of my own arm."—Do you not pray to God to strengthen you and enable you to discharge your duties? "No, it would be an insult to God to pray thus, as though he had commanded me to do what I am not able to perform."—Do you believe that God is all-powerful? "Yes; that is, I believe he can do some things, and others too, if his creatures will not oppose him."—Can he preserve and promote the prosperity of the church? "Yes, by taking advantage of excitements." The session, somewhat dissatisfied, we may suppose, with this examination, resolve to question the candidate more closely on some of these points. But,—Hold, hold, cries Mr. Finney, take care how you ensnare the conscience of this young convert by examining him too extensively or minutely on doctrinal points.

The way is thus laid perfectly open for the entrance of his converts into the church. But how shall they be kept there? There are two new measures proposed by him that might seem to aim at this end, but both of them inadequate. The first is, that they shall be kept in ignorance of the standards of the church they have entered. Young converts, he says, ought to be indoctrinated, but he avowedly excludes from the means of indoctrination, "teaching the catechism." This would answer if he could only keep in the first ones until he had introduced a majority into every church who should know nothing of the catechism or confession of faith. The other measure proposed is, that his converts should not be made "to file in behind the old, stiff, dry, cold members and elders." No doubt, if they could be permitted to take the lead and manage all things in their own way, there would be no difficulty. But there is reason to apprehend, that age, combined with Christian experience and clothed with official pre-eminence, will still insist upon its right to direct the young and inexperienced.

Nothing can be more evident than that these new measures are remarkably adapted to form and propagate a false religion. Indeed, we have little doubt that the whole system has originated in a total misconception of the true nature of religion. This charge was, in substance, alleged against Mr. Finney several years since, and substantiated

from the only production which he had then given to the public.* It was fully made out, to the conviction we imagine, of every candid mind that examined the evidences, but its only effect upon Mr. Finney, so far as we can perceive, has been to induce him to throw in an unintelligible paragraph upon the difference between emotion and principle. "One of the first things," he says, "young converts should be taught, is to distinguish between emotion and principle in religion. - - - By emotion I mean, that state of mind of which we are conscious, and which we call *feeling*, an involuntary state of mind that arises of course when we are in certain circumstances, or under certain influences. But these emotions should be carefully distinguished from religious principle. By principle, I do not mean any substance or root or seed or sprout implanted in the soul. But I mean the voluntary decision of the mind, the firm determination to act our duty and to obey the will of God, by which a Christian should always be governed." Does he intend here by maintaining that our emotions are *involuntary*, to deny them any moral character? Does he mean to tell us, that the emotion of complacency towards holiness is not an adequate or proper motive for the cultivation of holiness in ourselves? Are all those actions which are prompted by our emotions, divested of morality, or, if moral, are they sinful? And, then, what a definition of a *principle*, as distinguished from an emotion! A voluntary decision of mind! A man decides to do some act because he thinks it right. His decision is a principle. He has stumbled into this arrant nonsense, over his dislike to mental dispositions. But we will not puzzle ourselves or our readers in the attempt farther to analyze this mysterious paragraph. Whatever may be its meaning or design, it will not turn aside the charge that the general tendency of

* See a pamphlet, published in 1828, entitled "Letters of the Rev. Dr. Beecher and Rev. Mr. Nettleton on the New Measures in promoting Revivals of Religion." This pamphlet contains a masterly discussion of the subject. And though written before the new measures had as fully disclosed themselves as now, all its allegations have been more than sustained, and all its prophecies of evil time has already converted into history. We fear that the continued press of new publications has crowded this pamphlet out of sight. It deserves more than an ephemeral existence, and we shall be glad if this notice has, in any degree, the effect of calling attention to it. It has never been answered. Mr. Finney, we are told, makes it his rule never to reply to any attacks upon him,—it should have been added, save by bitter vituperations from the pulpit. A very convenient principle this.

Mr. Finney's representations is to give an undue predominance to the imaginative emotions in religion. We are susceptible of two very different classes of emotion,—the one connected with the imagination, the other with the moral sense;—the one awakened by objects that are grand, terrible, &c. the other called into exercise by the perception of moral qualities. These two kinds of emotion produce widely different effects upon the animal frame. Let a predominant emotion of terror fill the mind and it will fever the blood, quicken the pulse, blanch the cheek, and agitate the whole frame. Each moment that the emotion becomes more intense, the bodily excitement increases, and it may be heightened until life is destroyed by it. But let the mind be occupied with disapprobation of moral evil, and in the intensest degree of this emotion, how feeble in comparison is its effect upon the powers and functions of animal life! This close sympathy of the imaginative emotions with the bodily frame gives them a dangerous pre-eminence. The same object often calls into simultaneous action emotions belonging to both these classes. The contemplation of his sinful life may call up at once in the mind of a man abhorrence of sin and dread of its evil consequences, and there is reason to fear that, without great care, the latter feeling will absorb the former. Now, it is just here that we think Mr. Finney has erred, and gone over into the regions of enthusiastic excitement. He is evidently possessed of an ardent temperament, and the calm and gentle excitement attending the exercise of the moral emotions, disconnected with the imaginative, has not sufficient relish for him. It is comparatively tame and tasteless. For the same reason, he discards as "animal excitement," all the gentler feelings; such as, like the "soft and plaintive music of an Eolian harp," spread themselves through the soul and dissolve it in tender sadness or pity. He turns from these to the stronger and more boisterous emotions, which, stirring both soul and body like the sound of the trumpet, can yield the luxurious play and revel of intense sensation. When a feeling of this character is awakened by religious objects, though it should swallow up the accompanying emotion inspired by conscience, yet the imaginative mind entertains no doubt of the religious character of the passion which fills and moves it. It is in this region where prevails the awakening din of the storm and tempest of pious passion, that Mr. Finney, as it appears to us, has constructed the

chief dwelling-place of religion. For the proof of this, we appeal to the general tone of swelling extravagance which marks all his sentiments, and to the habitual tenor of his illustrations and instructions. He teaches in various places and ways, that the progress of religion in the heart cannot properly be set forth under the symbol of the growth of "any root or sprout or seed, implanted in the mind." Now it so happens that one of these figures, the growth of a seed, was employed for this very purpose, on more than one occasion, by our Lord himself, and by his apostles. And it must be acknowledged that this is a very fit and instructive emblem, if the progress of religion be dependent on the growth of *principle*, that is, of that which is the *beginning*, or which lays the ground for a series of actions and determines them to be what they are; but inappropriate and deceptive, as he represents it to be, if religion has its origin in a "deep-seated" act of the mind, and for its increase depends on the fitful gusts of passionate fervour. To the same effect are the many representations which he puts forth of the repugnance which the Christian will feel when brought into contact with a fellow Christian who is more spiritual than himself. This electric repulsion will only take place when their minds are under the dominion of the imaginative emotions. The Christian, whose religion is the offspring of principle and has its range among the emotions of the moral sense, will love Christian excellence, and be attracted by it in proportion to its purity and brightness. The effect of greater holiness than his own, whether seen in men, in angels, or in God, will be to increase his admiration and draw him onward in the divine life. This repellent effect of the exhibition of greater piety, Mr. Finney supposes, will only take place in those who are considerably below it. If those around are anywhere "near the mark," it will "kindle and burn" among them, until it has warmed them all up to its own temperature. Hence, in a prayer meeting, if a spiritual man leads, who is "far ahead" of the rest, "his prayer will repel them;" but it "will awaken them if they are not *so far* behind as to revolt at it and resist it." And again he says, "in the midst of the warm expressions that are flowing forth, let an individual come in who is cold, and pour his cold breath out, like the damp of death, and it will make every Christian that has any feeling, want to get out of the meeting." A precise account this of the operation of a kind of religion which has cut loose from

principle and conscience, and surrendered itself to the emotions of the imagination. And in accommodation to this species of religion must all the arrangements of the prayer meeting be ordered. "There should be," he says, "but one definite object before the meeting." Forgetful,—perhaps we ought to say, reckless,—of the model our Saviour has given us, in which there are as many objects brought before the mind, as it contains sentences, he censures and ridicules every prayer which is not confined to a single point. Unless some short passage of scripture can be found which bears upon this specific point, he says, no portion of the Bible should be read at the meeting. "Do not drag in the word of God to make up a part of the meeting as a mere matter of form,—this is an insult to God." There must be no "joyful singing." "When singing is introduced in a prayer meeting, the hymns should be short, and so selected as to bring out something solemn, some *striking* words." There must be no adoration of the Deity. Yes, incredible as it may appear, Mr. Finney proscribes and burlesques that sublimest, holiest exercise of the human mind, in which it rises to the contemplation of Infinite excellence and prostrates itself before it, rehearsing the perfections which it feels it cannot worthily celebrate. "Some men," he says, "will spin out a long prayer in telling God who and what he is"!! The tendency of all this is easily perceived.—We have mentioned the correspondence which always takes place between the movements of imaginative emotions, and of the animal frame. Mr. Finney contends that the spirit of prayer, is, in its very nature and essence, a spirit of agony; and he mentions with commendation a state of mind in which "there is but one way to keep from *groaning*, and that is by resisting the Holy Ghost." Nay, he brings forward, with very special praise, the case of a man "who prayed *until he bled at the nose*"!! Another pattern is afforded by a woman, "who got into such a state of mind that she could not live without prayer. She could not rest, day nor night, unless there was somebody praying. Then she would be at ease; but if they ceased, she *would shriek with agony*." Of himself he says, "Brethren, in my present *state of health*, I find it impossible to pray as much as I have been in the habit of doing, and continue to preach. - - - Now will not you, who are *in health* throw yourselves into this work, and bear this *burden*, and *lay yourselves out* in prayer." Again, it is well known that persons who are un-

der the dominion of imagination, soon become a prey to delusion. All their inward impressions are projected into the form of external realities. Their forebodings of mind are to them the shadows of coming events, and they assume the character and authority of prophets. This peculiarity is fully endorsed by Mr. Finney, under the name of "spiritual discernment." There was a woman, in a certain place,—almost all his stories of this kind are about women,—who "became anxious about sinners, and went to praying for them,—and she finally came to her minister and talked with him, and asked him to appoint an anxious meeting, for she *felt* that one was needed. The minister put her off, for he *felt* nothing of it. The next week she came again, and besought him to appoint an anxious meeting; she *knew* there would be somebody to come, for she *felt* as if God was going to pour out his Spirit. He put her off again. And finally she said to him, 'If you don't appoint an anxious meeting *I shall die*, for there is *certainly* going to be a revival.' The next Sabbath he appointed a meeting." The result of course was, as in all other *published* predictions of this kind, that the oracle was fulfilled. He has several other stories to the same effect; and the expectation of these women, founded on no evidence save that of individual feeling, he calls "spiritual discernment;" and gives warrant to those who possess it to arraign their minister and elders, and fellow members of the church, as "blind" and "sleepy." "Devoted, praying Christians," he says, "often see these things so clearly, and look so far ahead, as greatly to stumble others. They sometimes almost seem to prophesy." They do indeed not only almost, but altogether, seem to prophesy, and so has many an enthusiast before them. This disposition to put faith in spectral illusions, is indeed a very common mark of enthusiasm, and the reason of it is well understood by all who are acquainted with the philosophy of the human feelings.

In like contradiction to the true nature of religion, but in perfect keeping with the false notion of it which we suppose Mr. Finney to have adopted, are his opinions respecting the absolute necessity of excitements to the general prosperity of religion in the world, and to its growth in the Christian's heart. "The state of the world is still such, and probably will be till the millennium is fully come, that religion must be mainly promoted by these excitements." His professed theory on this subject is that there must be an alternation

of excitement and decline,—that after a great religious stir among the people, they will decline and keep on declining “till God can have time so to speak, to shape the course of events so as to produce another excitement,”—then comes another decline, and so on. He represents this same spasmodic action as taking place in each Christian's experience. It is impossible, he thinks, to keep a Christian in such a state as not to do injury to a revival, unless he pass through the process of “breaking down” every few days. “I have never laboured,” he says, “in revivals in company with any one who could keep in the work and be fit to manage a revival continually, who did not pass through this process of *breaking down* as often as once in two or three weeks.” He adds, “I was surprised to find a few years since, that the phrase ‘*breaking down*’ was a stumbling block to certain ministers and professors of religion—they laid themselves open to the rebuke administered to Nicodemus, ‘Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things?’” We are surprised that any one should have been ignorant of the meaning of this “breaking down.” It is very intelligible. In consequence of the law to which we have several times referred, when the imaginative emotions are strongly excited, the bodily frame sympathizes powerfully with the excitement,—and all the chords of the system are so tensely strung, that they cannot long bear it. Hence follows reaction, exhaustion, “breaking down.” If religion be founded in principle, if its peculiar and cherished emotions be those of the conscience, then can there be no call for this breaking down, and jumping up,—this cicadic movement. But we have dwelt at sufficient length upon this point. We were anxious to present as complete evidence of the truth of our position as our limits would permit; for we do believe that Mr. Finney's mistaken views of the nature of religion lie at the bottom of his measures, and have given to them their character and form; and that these measures therefore wherever used will tend to propagate a false form of religion.

These measures might have had their origin in the “New Divinity,” for they are in entire keeping with the theology as well as the religion of the system. Historical facts however have guided us in assigning their origin to erroneous views of religion. The new measures, we believe, were in full action before the theology of New Haven shed its light upon the world. We recollect that it was matter of sur-

prise to many when the conjunction took place between the coarse, bustling fanaticism of the New Measures and the refined, intellectual abstractions of the New Divinity.—It was a union between Mars and Minerva,—unnatural, and boding no good to the church. But our readers will have observed that there is a close and logical connexion between Mr. Finney's theology and his measures. The demand created for the one by the other, and the mutual assistance which they render, are so evident, that we will spend no time in the explanation of them.

There is one argument of Mr. Finney in favour of the new measures which we have not noticed, and to which we should not now allude, but for a purpose which will soon disclose itself. This argument is, in true importance, on a perfect level with that drawn from the small clothes, wigs and fur caps. It consists in producing the names of a great number of wise and eminent men who have been prominent in introducing innovations. All this has nothing to do with the question,—it is perfectly puerile indeed to introduce it,—unless these men introduced such innovations as he contends for. Among these new-measure men he introduces the name of President Edwards. And on several occasions he makes such a use of the name of this great man, as is calculated to leave upon the reader's mind the impression, that Edwards had sanctioned his proceedings. He has no right thus to slander the dead, or impose upon the living. It is well known that Davenport, against whose extravagant fanaticism Edwards wrote at length, is *redivivus* in Mr. Finney, and that the same scenes over which he grieved and wept have been re-acted in our day under Mr. Finney's auspices. For one of his measures, lay exhortation, he does distinctly claim the authority of Edwards. "So much opposition, he says, was made to this practice nearly a hundred years ago that President Edwards actually had to take up the subject, and write a laboured defence of the rights and duties of laymen." We were not surprised by Mr. Finney's ignorance in confounding Mary, Queen of Scots, with "bloody Queen Mary" of England, we do not demand from him historical accuracy; we do not look indeed for any thing like a thorough knowledge of any one subject, for should he obtain it, it would surely pine away and die for want of company. But we were not quite prepared for such ignorance of Edwards's opinions and writings. Can it be ignorance? Charity would dispose us to think so,

but we cannot. In the same work from which Mr. Finney has taken long extracts, and to which he often refers, as if familiar with its contents, Edwards makes known, with all plainness his opposition to lay exhortation. He expressly condemns all lay teaching which is not "in the way of conversation." He censures the layman "when in a set speech, of design, he directs himself to a multitude, as looking that they should compose themselves to attend to what he has to say----and more still, when meetings are appointed on purpose to hear lay persons exhort, and they take it as their business to be speakers." In a published letter of his to a friend, who had erred in this matter, he tells him, "you have lately gone out of the way of your duty, and done that which did not belong to you, in exhorting a public congregation;-----you ought to do what good you can by private, brotherly, humble admonitions and counsels; but 'tis too much for you to exhort public congregations, or solemnly to set yourself by a set speech, to counsel a room full of people, unless it be children or those that are much your inferiors." These are the sentiments of Edwards, and it is hardly possible, that Mr. Finney should have been unacquainted with them. Whence then this bold misrepresentation? This is one illustration of that unscrupulousness in the use of means for the attainment of his ends, which he too often manifests. With perfect nonchalance, he will make figures, facts, scripture, every thing, bend to the purpose he has in hand. We have often been reminded, while reading his pages, of the calculator, who, being applied to, to make some computations, asked his employer, with perfect gravity, "on which side, sir, do you wish the balance to come out?" Another illustration of Mr. F.'s peculiar facility in this way, is at hand, and we will give it. In one of his Lectures, when endeavouring to persuade the people not to contradict the truth preached, by their lives, and, as usual, inflating every sentiment to the utmost degree for the accomplishment of his purpose, he says, "If Jesus Christ were to come and preach, and the church contradict it, it would *fail—it has been tried once.*" But in another Lecture, where he is labouring might and main, to prove that every minister will be successful in exact proportion to the amount of wisdom he employs in his ministrations, he is met with the objection that Jesus Christ was not successful in his ministry. But, reader, you do not know the man if you imagine that this difficulty staggers him at all. Not in the

least. In disposing of it he begins by showing that "his ministry was *vastly more successful* than is generally supposed," and ends by proving that "in fact, he was *eminently successful*." And no doubt if his argument required it, he could prove that Christ was neither successful nor unsuccessful. This unscrupulous use of any means that seem to offer present help, whether for the attainment of their objects within the camp or without, was early noted as a peculiar mark of the new-measure men. Dr. Beecher says, in a letter written eight years since, "I do know, as incident to these new measures, there is a spirit of the most marvellous duplicity and double-dealing and lying, surpassing any thing which has come up in my day."* And the heaviness of this accusation will not be much lightened by any one who has been an attentive observer of their movements since.

There only remains to be noticed, the argument for the new measures which Mr. Finney draws from their *success*. We shall not stop to dispute with him the position which he assumes, that the success of any measure demonstrates its wisdom and excellence. No man can maintain the ground which he takes upon this subject, without denying that it

* This letter was addressed to the Editor of the Christian Spectator. It seems that there had been some symptoms of a disposition, on the part of this Editor, to compromise with the new measures, from a desire to promote the circulation of his work in those regions where these measures were then burning in all their fury. Dr. B. immediately writes this letter of strong remonstrance, in which in the most rousing strain, he exhorts to firm, open and decided resistance. "The more thoroughly we do the work," he says, "of entire demolition of these new measures, the sooner and safer we can conciliate." His opinion of Mr. Finney, at that time may be gathered from the following extract. "Now, that such a man as he (Mr. Nettleton) should be traduced, and exposed to all manner of evil falsely, in order to save from *deserved reprehension* such a man as Finney, (who, whatever talents or piety he may possess, is as far removed from the talent, wisdom, and judgment, and experience of Nettleton, as any corporal in the French army was removed from the talent and generalship of Bonaparte,) is what neither my reason, nor my conscience, nor my heart will endure." These were Dr. Beecher's sentiments in 1827. Since that time he is understood to have patronised the Corporal, when he visited Boston; and but lately he delivered a high eulogy upon him at the West, in the course of which he says, "I have felt the beatings of his great, warm heart before God," and professes to have heard more *truth* from him than from any other man in the same space of time. Dr. B's opinions, expressed in the letter from which we have quoted, profess to have been formed from the most full and accurate acquaintance with facts. Dr. Beecher has an undoubted right to change any of his opinions, but he cannot expect the public to give him their confidence if he makes such changes as this, without rendering a more satisfactory account of them than he has yet given of this one.

forms any part of the plan of God in the government of the world, to bring good out of evil. But there is no need of discussing this matter now. We will grant him the benefit of the criterion. It is too late in the day for the effect of this appeal to success. The time was when an argument of this nature might have been plausibly maintained. Appearances were somewhat in favour of the new measures. At least wherever they were carried, converts were multiplied, and though the churches were distracted, ministers unsettled, and various evils wrought, yet it might have been contended that, on the whole, the balance was in their favour. But it is too late, now, for Mr. Finney to appeal, in defence of his measures, to the number of converts made by them, to the flourishing state of religion in the western part of New York, where they have been most used, and to the few trivial evils which have been incident to them. Indeed, he seems to have a suspicion that the public possess more information on this subject than they did a few years since, and he pours out his wrathful effusions on the informers. He is animated with a most special dislike to letter-writing. "Some men," he says, "in high standing in the church, have circulated letters which never were printed. Others have had their letters printed and circulated. There seems to have been a system of letter-writing about the country." "If Christians in the United States expect revivals to spread, they must give up *writing letters*," &c. "If the Church will do all her duty, the millennium may come in this country in three years; but if this *writing of letters* is to be kept up, &c. the curse of God will be on this nation, and that before long." "Go forward. Who would leave such a work and go to writing letters?" "If others choose to publish their *slang and stuff*, let the Lord's servants keep to their work." Who will not feel thankful that Jack Cade's day is gone, and a man cannot now be hung "with pen and ink-horn around his neck," for being able to write his name? But thanks to these much abused letter-writers, we have received their testimony, and neither Mr. Finney's assertions, nor his ravings, will shake the public confidence in it. It is now generally understood that the numerous converts of the new measures have been, in most cases, like the morning cloud and the early dew. In some places, not a half, a fifth, or even a tenth part of them remain. They have early "broken down," and have not gotten up again. And of those that yet remain, how many are found revelling in the

excesses of enthusiastic excitement, ready to start after every new vagary that offers, and mistaking the looming appearances, the "fata morgana" of the falsely refracting atmosphere in which they dwell, for splendid realities! How many more, the chief part of whose religion consists in censuring the established order of things around them, in seeking to innovate upon the decent and orderly solemnities of divine worship, and in condemning as unconverted, or cold and dead, the ministers, elders, and church-members, who refuse to join them! From the very nature of these measures, they must encounter the conscientious and decided opposition of many devout Christians, and, hence, wherever they have been introduced, the churches have been distracted by internal dissensions, and in many cases rent asunder. Ministers who have opposed them have been forced to abandon their charges; and those who have yielded to them have been unsettled by their inability to stimulate sufficiently the seared surface of the public mind; so that it is now a difficult matter, among the western churches of New York, to find a pastor who has been with his present flock more than two or three years. Change and confusion are the order of the day. New ministers and new measures must be tried, to heighten an excitement already too great to admit of increase, or to produce one where the sensibility has been previously worn out by overaction. Rash and reckless men have every where rushed in and pushed matters to extremes, which the originators of these measures did not at first contemplate. Trickery of the most disgusting and revolting character has been employed in the conduct of religious assemblies; and the blasphemous boasts of the revival preachers have been rife throughout the land. Mothers have whipped their children with rods to make them submit to God; and, in this, have done right, if there be truth in the theology, and fitness in the measures of Mr. Finney. Men of taste and refinement have been driven into scepticism by these frantic absurdities of what claims to be the purest form of religion, or they have sought refuge in other denominations from these disorderly scenes in ours. Doctrinal errors and fanatical delusions of the wildest kind have started into rank existence. The imposture of Matthias, and the perfectionism of New Haven, are monster-growths, in different directions, of this same monster-trunk.* And no

* See the history of "Matthias and his Impostures," by Col. William L. Stone. Col. Stone has rendered an important service to the public

one can tell what new and yet more monstrous growths it will cast out. No form of enthusiasm develops at once, or soon, all its latent tendencies. Though its present course may be comparatively regular and near the truth, no mind can predict in what erratic wanderings it may be subsequently involved. The path of the comet within the limits of the solar system can scarcely be distinguished, by the nicest observations, from the regular orbit of the planet; but it ultimately rushes off into unknown fields of space. And the course of enthusiasm, while in sight, like that of the comet, will not suffice to furnish us with the elements of its orbit; to what blackness of darkness it may finally rush, we know not. We might fill a volume with describing evils already wrought by the new divinity and new measure system, and then fill many more by collating this system with history, and showing what evils are yet within the limits of its capabilities.

We would not be understood to mean that no good has been produced under the preaching of the new divinity, and the operation of the new measures. They have, doubtless, in some cases, been over-ruled for good, and been made instrumental in producing true conversions. But we do maintain, for we fully believe it to be true, that the tendency of this system, of all that is peculiar to it as a system of doctrine and of action, is unredeemably bad. We have brought forward every argument which we could find in Mr. Finney's pages, in favour of his reforms, and in canvassing them, have presented our own objections. And our readers must now judge between us.

We have one more objection still to present, and it would alone be sufficient to outweigh all the considerations which Mr. Finney has presented in favour of his measures. We mean the *spirit* which accompanies them. We shall be under the necessity of giving a much briefer developement,

by the publication of this work. It furnishes a train of facts which will astonish those who have looked upon this noted imposture as a sudden and isolated freak of the human mind. It was our purpose to have made copious extracts from this work to illustrate the opinion of its author, that the delusion of Matthias and of his victims, "originated in the same spirit of fanaticism which has transformed so many Christian communities in the northern and western parts of New York, and states contiguous, into places of moral waste and spiritual desolation." But we must content ourselves with this reference. We hope the work will circulate widely. It furnishes a salutary lesson of warning to all who would be "wise above what is written."

and fewer illustrations of this spirit than we had intended, but we shall succeed, we think, in showing that it is the essential spirit of fanaticism.

The first feature of it, to which we invite attention, is its *coarseness* and *severity*. Mr. Finney's language is habitually low and vulgar. He revels in such Saxonisms as these. "Let hell boil over if it will, and spew out as many devils as there are stones in the pavement." "Look at that sensitive young lady. Is she an impenitent sinner; then she only needs to die to be as very a devil as there is in hell." "Devil" and "hell" are, indeed, familiar to him, "as household words." The young men in some of our theological seminaries, he says, "are taught to look upon new measures as if they were the very inventions of the devil. So, when they come out, they look about, and watch, and start, as if the devil was there." We imagine that all the young men in our seminaries know that there are *men* who are equal to these things, without any help from the devil.—In condemning those who pray, "Lord, these sinners are seeking thee, sorrowing," he says, "it is a *LIE*." The men who had promised to pay, each, a yearly sum to the Oneida Institute, but who afterwards refused, on the ground, as one of them assured us, that the pledge under which they subscribed, that a thorough course of instruction should be established in the institution, had been violated, are rated after this manner. "Is this honest? Will such honesty as this get them admitted to heaven? What? Break your promise, and go up and carry a *lie* in your right hand before God? If you refuse or neglect to fulfil your promise, you are a *liar*, and if you persist in this you shall have your part in the lake that burns with fire and brimstone." He subsequently adds, "you cannot pray until you pay that money." In dealing with impenitent sinners, he will allow no symptoms of compassion or pity. The church, in all her conduct, must show that she "blames them." We must at all times make it plain, by our deportment, that we "take God's part against the sinner." He thinks it a dreadful error even for us to make use of our Saviour's language in praying for sinners, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do." Every sentence and every term must be charged with fierce accusation against them. To this harsh severity all the tender amenities of social intercourse, and the still more tender charities of the domestic affections must be sacrificed. He maintains that parents can never pray for their children

“in such a way as to have their prayers answered, until they feel that their children are *rebels*.” And he narrates a story to show that no mother can expect her son to be converted, “until she is made to take *strong ground against him as a rebel*.” Had we space for comment here, we might easily show that no spirit can claim fellowship with the gospel of Jesus Christ, which thus runs rough-shod over all the tender sympathies and affections of the human heart. But it is thoroughly consistent with the fierceness of fanatical zeal, which has its play among the stronger passions of our nature, and looks with contempt upon whatever is kind, tender, gentle, or compassionate.

The next feature of Mr. Finney's spirit to which we turn, is its *extravagance*. It is a peculiar mark of the fanatic that every dogma, every little peculiarity to which he is attached, is made to be infallibly certain, and infinitely important. Should he admit any thing less than this he would feel the ground sliding from under him. To hold natural sentiments, and express them plainly, and with proper limitations, would be to sink all his advantage and bring himself down to a level with others. His own mind too is often in an uneasy and self-doubting state which needs confirmation. Hence for the double purpose of making a strong impression on others, and of strengthening himself, every opinion and sentiment are inflated entirely beyond their natural limits. To quote all the illustrations of this disposition to extravagance which Mr. Finney's Lectures afford, would be to cite no inconsiderable portion of the whole volume which contains them. The minutest things are made matters of indispensable necessity. Every rag which he touches is henceforth endowed with the power of working miracles. He is himself addicted to telling stories and parables from the pulpit to illustrate the truth, and we have no objection to this provided it is done,—as Mr. F. says the devil wishes it done,—so as to comport with the proper dignity of the pulpit. We have known many preachers who excelled in this style of preaching. But Mr. F. is not content with maintaining that this is a good, and, for some men, the best way of presenting and enforcing the truth. No, nothing less will satisfy him than that “truths not thus illustrated are generally just as well calculated to convert sinners as a mathematical demonstration.” Many excellent men, who have no taste or turn for this illustrative method of preaching, will be astonished and grieved to learn that to deliver a

plain, unvarnished statement of scriptural truth to their congregations, is as hopeless a means of doing good, as to prove to them that two sides of a triangle are greater than the third side.—Again, Mr. Finney is given to extemporaneous preaching, and of course this is not merely the best, it is the *only* way of preaching. He can find no resting place for the sole of his foot but on the broad ground that “we never can have the *full meaning* of the gospel till we throw away our notes.” We do not like forms of prayer, not thinking them adapted to promote the spirit of prayer; and we shall always oppose them, unless they should be found necessary to protect us from such prayers as Mr. Finney is in the habit of offering. But we can, by no means, agree with him in saying that “forms of prayer are not only absurd in themselves, but they are the very device of the devil.”—We have seen many a pious old lady, when she had finished reading a portion of her Bible, placing a piece of paper or a string, or perchance her spectacles between the leaves, that she might readily open to the place again, and it certainly never occurred to us that this custom was any evidence of want of piety. But Mr. Finney says to all such, “the fact that you fold a leaf or put in a string demonstrates that you read rather as a *task*, than from love or reverence for the word of God.” Of the prayers of pious females, who have assembled by themselves, without inviting impenitent sinners to be present, he says “such prayers will do no good,—*they insult God.*” To those who are in the habit of praying with submission to the divine will, he says “you have no right to put in an *if*, and say, Lord, *if it be thy will*, give us thy Holy Spirit; *this is to insult God.*” Mr. Finney, like all other fanatics, makes additions of his own to the scriptural code of morals. Matthias forbade his disciples the use of pork. Mr. Finney condemns tea, coffee and tobacco, evening parties, ribbons, and many other things. He is just as confident in supporting his false standard, as extravagant too in denouncing those who transgress it, and in launching against them the thunderbolts of divine vengeance, as if it had been communicated to him by express revelation. He says, “If you are not doing these things”—among which he has enumerated *the disuse of tea, coffee and tobacco*—“and if your soul is not agonized for the poor, benighted heathen, why are you such a *hypocrite* as to pretend to be a Christian? Why, your profession is an *insult* to Jesus Christ.” Again, he says, “Perhaps he is looking upon

it—the use of tobacco)—as a small sin,” and he then proceeds to prove that the sin is as gross as a merchant’s clerk would commit in robbing the money drawer. He lifts up his hands in astonishment at an agent who is in the city soliciting funds for some charitable purpose, and actually uses all three of these abominations; and he enters his protest against the Home Missionary Society for aiding churches in which the members use tea, coffee, or tobacco. Again speaking of the *ministry*, as refusing to give up the use of coffee, he cries out, “Is this *Christianity*? What business have you to use Christ’s money for such a purpose?” Matthias surely could not have raved in better style over a delinquent, caught in the horrible act of eating a piece of pork.—Of evening parties, even when none but “Christian friends are invited, so as to have it a religious party,” he says, “this is the *grand device* of the devil.” These social assemblies are often concluded with prayer:—“now this,” he says, “I regard as one of the worst features about them.” When there is to be a circle of such parties in a congregation he advises them “to dismiss their minister and let him go and preach where the people would be ready to receive the word and profit by it, and not have him stay and be distressed and grieved, and *killed*, by attempting to promote religion among them while they are engaged *heart and hand in the service of the devil*.”—To the young lady who wears “a gaudy ribbon, and ornaments upon her dress,” he cries “Take care. You might just as well write on your clothes, *No truth in religion*.” And over this fondness for dress, tight-lacing, &c. he says, “Heaven puts on the robes of mourning and hell may hold a jubilee.”—The man who stands aloof from the Temperance cause has “his hands all over *red with blood*,”—he who drinks cider, beer, or any thing else, until “you can smell his breath,” is a *drunkard*,—and no slave holder “can be a fit subject for Christian communion and fellowship.” We had marked some twenty other passages, many of them worse than any we have given, but we suppose enough has been furnished to satisfy our readers, of Mr. Finney’s extravagance.

We turn then to his *spiritual pride* and *arrogance*. We have not been able to find one sentence in his book which wears the semblance of humility. But there is arrogance and assumption beyond any thing which it has ever been our fortune previously to encounter. Such a swelling, strutting consciousness of self-importance looks forth from al-

most every page, that we have been compelled again and again to turn from it, not in anger but in pity. Any one who should read his book and believe it, would be led to suppose that until he came forth in the plenitude of his wisdom and goodness to instruct mankind, all had been darkness. The Bible had been misunderstood, and its doctrines perverted,—ministers had been preaching “an endless train of fooleries,”—the pulpit had never “grappled with mind,”—“very little common sense had been exercised about prayer meetings,”—every thing had been managed in the most ignorant and bungling way. But he comes and all things are set right, or at least would be, if his measures were not opposed. All the wise and good, however, fully agree with him. We encounter this arrogant and exclusive spirit at the very outset. In his preface he says, “But whatever may be the result of saying the truth as it respects some, I have reason to believe that the great body of *praying* people will receive and be benefited by what I have said.” Speaking, in one of his Lectures, of “ministers, who by their lives and preaching give evidence to the church, that their object is to do good and win souls to Christ,” he says, “*this class* of ministers will recognize the truth of *all* that I have said or wish to say.” In the full magnitude of a self-constituted bishop of all the churches, fully entitled by his superior wisdom to rebuke with authority all other ministers, he exclaims, in another place, “I will never spare ministers from the naked truth.”—“If the whole church,” he says, “as a body had gone to work ten years ago, and continued it, as a *few individuals, whom I could name*, have done, there would not now be an impenitent sinner in the land.” The greatest appearance of modest humility which we have seen in him, is his refusing, on this occasion, to name himself at the head of the “*few individuals*.”—He claims, in no guarded terms, the exclusive approbation of God for his doctrines and measures. “They” (the church) “see that the *blessing of God* is with those that are thus accused of new measures and innovation.” Desirous as he is to monopolize the favour of Heaven, we do not wonder at finding him, in another place, declaring, with great *nai-veté*, “I have been pained to see that some men, in giving accounts of revivals, have evidently felt themselves obliged to be particular in detailing the measures used, to avoid the inference that *new measures* were introduced.” And if the accounts of all the revivals that have occurred without any

help from the new measures, were as much noised abroad as those aided by them have been, he would be still more "pained," by the more abundant evidence that the symbol of the divine presence does not shine exclusively upon his camp.—In presenting to his hearers, "the consequences of *not being filled with the Spirit*," he says to them, "you will be much troubled with fears about fanaticism—you will be much disturbed by the *measures* that are used in revivals—if any measures are adopted, that are *decided* and *direct*, you will think they are all new, and will be *stumbled* at them just in proportion to your *want of spirituality*—you will stand and cavil at them, because you are so *blind* as not to see their adaptedness, while *all heaven* is rejoicing in them." Again, of those that are opposed to "new measures," to "this new-light preaching," and to "these evangelists who go about the country preaching," he says, "*such men* will sleep on till they are awakened by the judgment trumpet, without any revival, unless they are willing that God should come *in his own way*." This fanatical claim to the exclusive favour of God, this arrogant indentification of all his opinions and measures with the Divine will, is very frequently put forth. After having proved that his system has been greatly prospered, that it has been successful beyond any thing the world had yet seen, he says, "if a measure is *continually and usually blessed*, let the man who thinks he is wiser than God call it in question—take care, how you *find fault with God*." Of the Cedar Street Church in New York, who had taken a decided stand against the new divinity and new measures, or, as Mr. Finney states it, had pursued a course "calculated to excite an unreasonable and groundless suspicion against many ministers who are labouring successfully to promote revivals," he says, "they may pretend to be mighty pious, and jealous for the honour of God, but *God will not believe* they are sincere." Of this same church he afterwards says, in allusion to their requiring an assent to the Confession of Faith from all applicants for admission to the Lord's supper, a step which would exclude his converts, unless their consciences should be as elastic as their teacher's, "No doubt *Jesus Christ is angry* with such a church, and he will show his displeasure in a way that admits of no mistake, if they do not repent."—In the prospect of a rupture with France, he tells his people, "No doubt"—it will be observed that he never has any *doubt* about the divine feelings, when his measures

are in question—"No doubt God is holding the rod of war over this nation;—the nation is under *His displeasure*, because the church has conducted in such a manner with respect to revivals."—The "dear fathers" who have the training of our young men for the ministry, he thinks unfit for their office, and in this opinion he is perfectly confident that he has "the mind of the Lord." "Those dear fathers," he says, "will not, I suppose, see this; and will perhaps think hard of me for saying it; *but it is the cause of Christ.*" But we have given specimens enough of this offensive self-glorification.

In close connexion with this trait, stands his *ensoriousness*. The passages we have already adduced, for other purposes, so far illustrate this disposition, that it will not be necessary to produce many in addition. Of those who have circulated what he calls "slanderous reports of revival men and measures," he says, "It is impossible, from the very laws of their mind, that they should engage in this work of death, this mischief of hell, if they truly loved the cause of Christ." "Hell" is with him nothing more nor less than the state prison of his system, to which all are condemned who dissent or doubt. Again he says, "No doubt the devil laughs, if they can laugh in hell, to hear a man pretend to be very much engaged in religion, and a great lover of revivals, and yet all the while on the look-out for fear some *new measures* should be introduced." And of prayers which ask "that sinners may have more conviction," or "that sinners may go home, solemn and tender, and take the subject into consideration," he says, "All such prayers are just such prayers as *the devil wants.*" This is but a common and very vulgar method of cursing. It contains no argument. It would be very easy for his opponents to reply, that the devil is thus exclusively busy among the adversaries to the new opinions and measures, because he is aware that among their friends his work is well enough done without him. And the argument would be as good in the one case as in the other.—Mr. Finney has some mystical notions respecting the "prayer of faith,"—notions in which none, we believe, out of his own *coterie* agree with him.* But here as

* It was our purpose, had our limits permitted, to notice at length his wild opinions on this subject. We the less regret the necessary exclusion of our intended remarks on this topic, as we are able to refer the reader to a very excellent discussion of it, in two Lectures, lately published, from the pen of Dr. Richards, of the Auburn Seminary. Since

elsewhere, he condemns without mercy all dissentients. Having spoken of a public examination at a theological seminary, in the course of which his peculiar opinions on this subject were controverted, he says, "Now, to teach such sentiments as these, is to trifle with the word of God." And he declares, that all persons who have not known by experience the truth of his enthusiastic views of this matter, "have great reason to doubt their piety," and adds, "this is by no means uncharitable."—Every thing which has, at any time, or in any quarter of the land, been said or done that seems calculated to operate to the prejudice of his measures, is dragged into the pulpit, and made the occasion of denunciation against the transgressors. "Some young men in Princeton, came out a few years ago with an essay on the evils of revivals." We cannot see what necessity there was for Mr. Finney to tell the people of Chatham-street Chapel, that the young men in Princeton, some years before, had published their opposition to the new measures. But he does tell them, and adds, "I should like to know how *many* of those young men have enjoyed revivals among their people, since they have been in the ministry; and if *any* have, I should like to know whether they have not *repented* of that piece about the evils of revivals?" We can inform Mr. Finney, that that "piece" affords "no place for repentance," though it should be sought "carefully with tears."—He tells his people again, that "one of the professors in a Presbyterian theological seminary felt it his duty to write a series of letters to Presbyterians, which were extensively circulated;" and in these letters the new measures were condemned. This incident is made the occasion of a tirade, in the course of which he breaks out with the exclamation, "It is a *shame* and a *sin* that theological professors, who preach but seldom, who are withdrawn from the active duties of the ministry, should sit in their studies, and write their letters, advisory or dictatorial, to ministers and churches who are in the field, and who are in circumstances to judge what needs to be done." And he says it is "*dangerous* and *ridiculous* for our theological professors, who are withdrawn from the field of combat, to be allowed to dictate in regard to the measures and movements of the

the publication of these Lectures, Mr. Finney no doubt has another argument for proving that this venerable servant of Christ, is not 'such a man as is needed for training our young ministers, in these days of excitement and action.'

church." We shall see whether his theological professorship will put a bridle on his tongue.—It will be seen that no venerableness of years or wisdom or Christian excellence can turn aside the fulminations of his displeasure. To disapprove of his measures, no matter with what otherwise excellent qualities this disapproval may be associated, is to give decisive evidence of wickedness, and not only to offend him, but to insult God. Nor is he ever startled by the number of his victims. All, whether a few individuals, or a whole church, who will not fall down and worship the golden image which he has set up, are doomed to the fiery furnace. The General Assembly, a few years since, issued a Pastoral Letter, in which the new measures were condemned. But neither Mr. Finney's modesty nor his tenderness is at all troubled by the array of the whole church against him. When he saw their pastoral letter, he says, "My soul was sick, an unutterable feeling of distress came over my mind, and *I felt that God would visit the Presbyterian church for conduct like this.*" How to the very life is the fanaticism of this sentence,—this turning from general opposition to solace and strengthen himself in the singular prerogative which he enjoys of a back-door entrance into the Court of Heaven, and of unquestioned access to its magazines of wrath. In a like spirit he says of the "Act and Testimony warfare," that "the blood of millions who will go to hell before the church will get over the shock, will be found *in the skirts of the men* who have got up and carried on this dreadful contention." And, of the General Assembly, that "no doubt there is a jubilee in hell every year about the time of meeting of the General Assembly."—Of all ministers, be they few or many, "who will not turn out of their tracks *to do any thing new,*" he says, "they will grieve the Holy Spirit away, and God will visit them with his curse." At the close of these extracts, for we must put a period to them from other causes than lack of materials to furnish more like them, we would ask, was there ever a fanatic who was more intelligible in his claim to a close relationship of his own with the Most High, or more indiscriminate and wholesale in his condemnation of those who refused submission to his peculiar dogmas? Was there ever a Dominic who was more exclusive or more fierce?

There remains one more feature of Mr. Finney's spirit to be noticed, his *irreverence* and *profaneness*. This is a topic which we would gladly have avoided. It is painful

to us to contemplate this trait of character, and we would not willingly shock the minds of others, as we have been shocked by some of the passages which we must quote under this head. But it is necessary to a correct understanding of the spirit of the new measures, that this feature should be exhibited. It has been seen all along that Mr. Finney's theology is not a barren vine, and we trust it has at the same time been seen, that its fruit is the grapes of Sodom and the clusters of Gomorrah. We will now show what are the practical results of his theory of the divine government; though, for reasons just hinted, we shall give no more illustrations under this allegation than are necessary distinctly to sustain it. In urging the necessity of new measures to the production of revivals, he says, "Perhaps, it is not too much to say, that it is *impossible for God himself* to bring about reformations but by new measures." Here we might pause, for the man who is capable of uttering such a sentence as this, is capable of almost any degree of profaneness. But lest it might be urged that this may be a solitary instance of unpremeditated rashness, we must furnish a few more. He says of a certain class of people, that "they seem determined to leave it to God alone to convert the world, and say, If he wants the world converted let him do it.—They ought to know," he continues, "that *this is impossible*:—so far as we know, *neither God nor man can* convert the world without the co-operation of the church." Again, when speaking of the duties of church members "in regard to politics," he says, "*God cannot sustain* this free and blessed country, which we love and pray for, unless the church will take right ground."—In rebuking those who do not "exhibit their light," he tells them, "*God will not take the trouble* to keep a light burning that is hid." To cast ridicule upon a certain kind of prayers, he says, that they who offer them pray in such a manner, that "every body wishes them to stop, and *God wishes so too*, undoubtedly."—And in reference to the subscribers to the New York Evangelist, who have neglected to pay in their dues, he says, "Why, it *would be disgraceful to God* to dwell and have communion with such persons."—We will close these extracts with two passages of a still more extraordinary character. Speaking of the Saviour, he says, "*He was afraid* he should die in the garden, before he came to the cross." And yet again, and more astounding still, he says, "Jesus Christ, when he was praying in the garden, was in

such an agony that he sweat as it were great drops of blood, falling down to the ground;—I have never known a person sweat blood, but *I have known a person pray till the blood started from the nose*!! Who that has ever dwelt in holy contemplation over the sacred mysteries of his Saviour's sufferings, can but feel indignant at this unhallowed, vulgar profanation of them? And what extremes can appal the mind that could perpetrate this without shrinking?

Let it be noted that the spirit which we have here pictured, is not the spirit of Mr. Finney alone. Had it belonged to the man, we would not have troubled ourselves to exhibit it. But it is the spirit of the system, and therefore deserves our careful notice. And it is seen to be, as Dr. Beecher called it eight years ago, "a spirit of fanaticism, of spiritual pride, censoriousness, and insubordination to the order of the Gospel."* It is prurient, bustling and revolutionary,—harsh, intolerant and vindictive. Can the tree which produces such fruit be good? The system from which it springs is bad in all its parts, root, trunk, branches, and fruit. The speculative error of its theology and religion is concrete in its measures and spirit. Let it prevail through the church, and the very name revival will be a by-word and a hissing. Already has it produced, we fear, to some extent this deplorable result. Such have already been its effects, that there can be no doubt, if it should affect still larger masses, and be relieved from the opposing influences which have somewhat restrained its outbreakings, it will spread desolation and ruin, and ages yet to come will deplore the waste of God's heritage. To the firm opposition of the friends of truth, in reliance upon the Great Head of the church, and prayer for His blessing, we look for protection from such disaster.

We have spoken our minds plainly on this subject. We intended from the beginning not to be misunderstood. It is high time that all the friends of pure doctrine and of decent order in the house of God, should speak plainly. Mr. Finney was kindly and tenderly expostulated with at the commencement of his career. Mr. Nettleton, than whom no one living was better qualified or entitled to give counsel on this subject, discharged fully his duty towards him. Others did the same. But their advice was spurned, their counsels disre-

* See Dr. Beecher's Letter in the pamphlet on New Measures, before referred to.

garded. To their envy, or blindness, did he impute their doubts of the propriety of his course. He had a light of his own, and by it "he saw a hand they could not see." All the known means of kindness and expostulation have been tried to induce him to abandon his peculiarities, but without success. It is the clear duty of the Church now to meet him and his co-reformers with open and firm opposition. Let us not be deluded with the idea that opposition will exasperate and do harm. Under cover of the silence and inaction which this fear has already produced, this fanaticism has spread, until now twelve thousand copies of such a work as these Lectures on Revivals are called for by its cravings. And there is danger that this spirit will spread still more extensively. The elements of fanaticism exist in the breast of every community, and may be easily called into action by causes which we might be disposed to overlook as contemptible.

We conclude this article, as we did our former, by pointing out to Mr. Finney his duty to leave our church. It is an instructive illustration of the fact that fanaticism debilitates the conscience, that this man can doubt the piety of any one who uses coffee, and call him a *cheat*, who sends a letter to another on his own business, without paying the postage, while he remains, apparently without remorse, with the sin of broken vows upon him. In this position we leave him before the public. Nor will we withdraw our charges against him, until he goes out from among us, for he is not of us.

John S. Hart,

ART. VII.—*On the extent of the Atonement, in its relation to God and the Universe.* By THOMAS W. JENKYN. *With an Introduction,* by the REV. DANIEL L. CARROLL, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N. Y. Boston, pp. 334. 1835.

THIS book is, in itself, a very trifling affair, and would not have been noticed at all, but for its "Introduction by the Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church at Brooklyn," and, what has pained us still more, the publication of some of his most extravagant terms of praise, on the cover of the Mis-

sionary Herald. The most striking peculiarity of the book is its almost total disregard to Scriptural authority. Scriptural language is sometimes introduced, but it is only to improve the sound, or turn a period. Strange as it may seem, here is a professed and extended treatise on the Atonement, in which there is not the slightest allusion to any of those words by which the sacred writers have described it, nor even an attempt at a critical exegesis of any term or phrase whatever, in the Bible. Without any embarrassing diffidence or hesitation, the author launches out into the subject, as if gifted with a plenary inspiration to inform the church what is and what is not the atonement, untrammelled by the authority of Scripture, or the formalities of logic. And yet, like all writers of his class, he is forever harping upon "human systems," "departure from apostolical simplicity," and "the progress of the new *Scriptural* theology."

Another feature of the book is, its constant and wanton misrepresentations of the opinions of others. We had intended to give specimens, but cannot, for want of room. To quote every instance would be to republish a large part of the volume; and as to reference, we need only say, one cannot look amiss. In connexion with his misrepresentations, should be mentioned, his perpetual cant of a "commercial atonement." He rings his changes upon these terms, till the reader sickens with the pointless repetition.

The definiteness and precision of his ideas may be estimated from his observations on the nature of moral government.

"We keep our oxen to the plough by *physical force*, but we keep the ploughman at his work by *moral government*; that is, by giving him sufficient motives and inducements." p. 127.

"Physical force can never become an element of a moral government. In proportion as force enters it, it ceases to be a moral government. *The more freedom there is in a government, the more purely moral it is.*" p. 127.

Ergo, whatever acts without physical constraint, whether man or dog, is under a moral government!

The following will serve the purpose of showing what Dr. Carroll calls "clear, cogent *argument*, absolutely irrefutable." We quote it precisely as it stands, italics, capitals, dashes, and all.

"Evil is not the product of mind. Sin is not the result of design and

arrangement. Suppose I were to say that the annihilation of the world would be an act of Omnipotence; I should be speaking what is absurd; for I should make almighty power to act——for what? to *do nothing*. It is highly inconsistent to suppose Omnipotence, in effort or at work, to produce——*nothing*. And it is as inconsistent, though we may not perceive the incongruity so distinctly, to suppose evil to be the product of mind, and purpose, and decree in God. God does nothing but *good*. To purpose *not* to do good is to purpose to do NO-thing, and a purpose *to do* NO-thing is surely NO purpose, NO decree; that is, the absence, or the reverse of good, is not the product of design, evil is not the result of arrangement." p. 89.

"Gainsay it who can."

"As it is a general impression, that an event to be certain must be decreed, I crave the indulgence of a few lines, even at the charge of metaphysical prolixity, to show that *an event may be certain without being decreed*. The whole is greater than its part:" (this an *event!*) "two straight lines cannot enclose a space: one and two will not make four: if two mountains are created, there must be a valley between them. No decree can make these things otherwise." p. 98.

As a specimen of the Calvinism recommended by a Presbyterian minister to the Presbyterian church, we subjoin the following extracts.

"It should not be evaded nor blinked, that the divine plans are susceptible of failures. It is a morbid squeamishness that makes us afraid to avow what are daily matters of fact. This failure has taken place in creation. It takes place in Providence.——It takes place in the atonement, &c. p. 105. This assertion may sound startling, but try to evade it as you may, you cannot avoid the conclusion, that the moral government of free agents, in a state of trial, *must* be susceptible of failures. It is a FACT that such failures have taken place; and to attempt to wrest or alter this fact, is to try to change the universe." p. 92.

"The various dispensations of probation are various experiments in moral government, in which God submits his own plans and ways to the acceptance, and for the use of free agents. These dispensations, or experiments, are capable of failure. The Eden experiment failed—and the Sinai experiment failed. Such susceptibility of failure has been shown to be incidental to a moral government and a state of trial." p. 97.

The author's style is worthy of his logic and theology.

"Sin would have become the pilot of wrecks, without a shore to stand on—the Polyphemus of a valley of dry bones—the real Upas of the universe." p. 27.

"Nature, Providence, and Grace, are three immense wheels in our machinery, the cogs and revolutions of each catching and influencing those of the others, *and all put in motion by the blood of the great atonement*." p. 135.

The blood of Christ has been often trampled on by reckless rhetoricians, but never more grossly than in this revolting metaphor. That Dr. Carroll should admire and imitate the style of such a writer, is not at all surprising; but it is

surprising that he should have exposed himself to the charge of ignorance, by bringing such exploded errors forward as original, and extravagantly lauding, as unheard of and unanswerable, what has been repeatedly advanced and answered within fifteen years. One might suppose, from the Doctor's language, that the church had but just discovered that the atoning death of Christ was an important doctrine, and that, for this discovery, we are indebted to the author of the present treatise. We have no right to prescribe what Dr. Carroll shall be startled and surprised at—*omne ignotum pro magnifico*—but we cannot sympathize with him, either in his lamentations over the ignorance of past ages, or his exultation at the discoveries of the present, respecting “the great wonders of the crucifixion.”

“It is matter of deep regret, that the time and thought, the patience and labour, the intellectual acumen and strength, which, in ages past, have been employed on trifles, or worse than wasted, had not been concentrated on those wonders of the crucifixion which ‘angels desire to look into.’” p. ix.

“But this illusion will not continue long.” God is “training his church to those views of truth befitting her era of coming glory.” p. x.

“The whole intellect of the church must gather round Calvary and tax its gigantic energies in grasping the magnitude, and tracing the relations of that one offering for sin which the Son of God made of himself there.” p. xi.

“The intellect of the church shall be yet trained to see the atonement in a new and celestial light, and in new and mightier relations to earth and to the universe.” p. xi.

“There are yet reserved, glories of infinite mercy, which some mind, favoured of God, shall discover and disclose to the world.” p. xi.

The “gigantic intellect” which has opened the way to these brilliant discoveries, is that of T. W. Jenkyn, whose book is thus described.

“It is a book which may emphatically be said to contain the ‘seeds of things’—the elements of mightier and nobler combinations of thought, respecting the sacrifice of Christ, than any modern production.” p. xiii.

“Characterized by highly original and dense trains of thought, which make the reader feel he is holding communion with a mind that can ‘mingle with the universe.’” p. xiii.

“This volume will prove a star in the east to guide the ‘wise men’ again to the incarnate suffering Redeemer.” p. xv.

“The author has opened a vast and rich mine of thought connected with the atonement, where the *improved mental machinery of the age* may ply its powers with prodigious effect.” p. xv.

“The propositions of the author,” he says, “are confirmed by a train of clear, cogent argument, absolutely irrefuta-

ble." He boldly challenges any body "to show the fallacy of the author's reasoning." "After a careful perusal, let any gainsay it who can." "It will set the long and fiercely agitated question respecting the extent of the atonement, completely at rest"—a book, in short, "for which posterity will thank the author to the latest ages."

These extracts need no comment. The samples which we have given, both of the book and Introduction, will illustrate one another. Nor do we think it necessary, in a case so plain, even to mention the discordance of the sentiments advanced in the one, and recommended in the other, with the standards of our church. Even he that runs may read it. We shall conclude by stating, that Mr. T. W. Jenkyn, in a note, refers to "four Sermons of Dr. Beman on the Atonement," as a wonderful performance, containing what Lord Bacon calls the "seeds of things." And well might he say so; for they contain the "seeds" of every thing in his own treatise. What Dr. Beman put into four ordinary sermons, and Dr. Murdock into one, Mr. Jenkyn has contrived to dilute with words, till it has swelled to a volume of three hundred and thirty-four pages. This may explain what his American patron and admirer means by "highly original and dense trains of thought, which make the reader feel he is holding communion with a mind that can mingle with the universe."







