





THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

JULY 1836.

No. III.

ART. I.—*Select Notices of the present state of Religion and Religious Literature in some countries of Europe.*

H. Alexander
THE progress of religion on the continent of Europe will naturally maintain a high place in the view of American Christians, until the church shall cover the whole earth. Europe must long continue to be the great centre of moral influence upon the rest of the world, and if evangelical truth were once established in its chief countries, we might look for the speedy return of all mankind to God. But there is a large part of Europe which the Reformation never reached; and even in those kingdoms where Protestantism made its first great conquests, the churches which are nominally evangelical have yielded the truth of their fathers for various forms of Pelagian, Socinian and Deistical unbelief.

This has been remarkably the case in Germany. Not many years ago, heresy had become so prevalent that there was scarcely a professor's chair occupied by an evangelical man, and not a single journal which uttered a word in favour of orthodoxy. At present the case is very different, and the number of godly and zealous professors, preachers and editors is increasing. Among other journals we might mention those of Tholuck, Rheinwald, and Hengstenberg, all which,

but particularly the last, maintain substantially the truth which we hold dear.

Prussia.

There are recesses among the mountains and valleys even of Germany, where the truth has been held in some purity ever since the reformation. Such is the vale of the river Wupper, in which lies Elberfeld; a district of great beauty and manufacturing activity. Here the strongest views of Calvin and the reformed teachers are maintained, perhaps with a tendency to abuse, but still with a heartiness and affection which serves to show that it takes a long time for the settled piety of plain people to give way even before a flood of error. Under the labours of the Krummachers and their associates, this piety, we may hope, will rather increase than vanish. In this connection we are reminded of an interesting occurrence in this part of Rhine-Prussia; namely, the establishment of the first religious circulating library in Germany, by the enterprise and zeal of Hassel, a bookseller of Elberfeld. This library contains nineteen hundred and seventy-seven volumes, and forty-eight periodicals, all tending to promote evangelical piety.

The cause of orthodox Christianity has been greatly advanced in Prussia in consequence of the favour it has received from the king, and still more from the crown-prince. This favour has been felt in the appointment of good men to important professorships, and in the increase of the means of grace by the erection of churches. In the city of Berlin the existing twenty-eight churches have long been found insufficient for the population. The king has therefore determined to erect a number more, probably one in the vicinity of each principal gate. Four of these churches have been built, and furnished with pastors. The beginning of last July was a continued festival in consequence of the dedication of the edifices which then took place. Some idea may be formed of the demand for these places of worship from the fact that one of these, the church of St. Elizabeth, numbers nine thousand parishioners. The architectural display in these buildings is very great. Great crowds attended at the dedication and the installation of the ministers. The king was present, with other members of the royal family, and presented a costly bible to each of the churches. All the solemnities were under the care of bishop Neander. The new ministers preached in their respective churches. The

pastor of St. John's is Mr. Seidig; of the Nazareth church, Mr. Blume, formerly settled in Charlottenburg; of St. Paul's, Mr. Bellermann, late chaplain to the Neapolitan legation; and of St. Elizabeth's, Mr. Otto Von Gerlach, a theological lecturer in the University, a man personally known to more than one American, as possessing every qualification to make him useful in his new and important sphere.

Russia.

Although, as is well known, the Greek church is predominant in Russia, yet the extent of the Catholic influence in the empire must never be neglected in our estimates. One of the most important events in this connexion has been the re-organization by imperial order of the monasteries, which were going rapidly to decay. The inquiries made by direction of the ministry showed that this decline was owing to the unnecessary number of religious houses, disproportionate to the Romish population and to the number of those who were willing to profess. To a population of two millions and a half, there were three hundred convents, or one for every eight thousand of both sexes. In some places this disproportion was so remarkable that convents were found which had not even the minimum required by the church-laws. According to the canons this minimum is eight. It was on this ground, that Benedict XIV. suppressed a large number. The Russian emperor was further resolved to re-pristiniate the pretended discipline of the regulars, and to introduce order into their fiscal administration. He proceeded to suppress the convents which had lost their complement. He caused the scattering fragments to coalesce into new ones at proper places. The Ukase, with reference to these changes, bore date, July 19—31, 1832.

The following statistics, furnished by Rheinwald's Repertorium, are probably true indications of the present condition of things. There are in Russia one hundred and thirteen monasteries of eighteen different orders. The whole number of monks is two thousand two hundred. In the schools of these orders the scholars are three thousand and twelve. There are fifty-two nunneries of ten different orders, containing six hundred and sixty-six nuns. These conduct thirty-three female schools, with one thousand two hundred and fifty pupils. There are fifteen hospitals with three thousand five hundred and fifty-eight patients, and twelve poor-houses, with two hundred and seventy-five paupers.

The sum total of the Romish secular clergy is two thousand and two, and of those who attend confession, two million three hundred and thirty-four thousand nine hundred and forty-one. There are thirteen seminaries, containing fifteen ecclesiastics, and two hundred parochial schools with seven thousand six hundred and thirty-eight scholars.

The number of Protestants in the Russian empire, may be judged from what follows. Under eight Protestant consistories, and two synods, there are eight hundred and sixty-five places of worship. Of these, three hundred and sixty-two are principal churches, one hundred and eighty-six affiliated churches, thirty-three hospital churches, together with two hundred and thirty-nine chapels, all Lutheran; and of the reformed, nineteen principal churches, eighteen affiliated churches, and eight chapels. The whole Lutheran clergy amounts to four hundred and ninety-three.

Of the internal condition of these churches we are not so fully informed as we hope soon to be by the statistical researches of Rheinwald and his associates. It is pleasant however to know that the Lutherans of Russia long resisted neology, and that even now the battle against it is actively carried on. The University of Dorpat is furnished with men sincerely attached to the evangelical doctrines of the reformation, and sharply opposed to rationalism. Professor Sartorius has been a leader in this good cause, and by his instructions, preaching and writings, has done much for the truth. For three or four years Professor Busch has been promoting the same object by his *Evangelische Blaetter*, which are read from the Baltic coast to the shores of the Euxine and the Caspian. We are sorry to learn that these evangelical efforts are actively opposed. In the Baltic provinces rationalism is spreading among both laity and clergy. This however is more from the pulpit than the press, as the ecclesiastical edict of 1832, established a censorship upon the basis of the Lutheran formularies, and forbid, under heavy penalties, all opposition to their strict tenets. This can never be more than a temporary dam over which infidelity will eventually break with the greater force. Sartorius has been opposed chiefly by Pastor Girgensohn, of Oppekahn, in Livland, who professes a moderate rationalism. This party has, for its literary organ, the "Dorpat Annals of Literature, Statistics and Art." One of the leading contributors to this was the late Professor Walter, a zealous Hegelian. This warfare has been waged principally in reviews of Sarto-

rius's writings, and the attempt has been made, not so much to bring in downright rationalism, as to explain away the antiquated standards into a greater conformity with the advancing light of the age; by the same tactics which we see used in our own church for the introduction of semi-pelagianism. Girgensohn is considered in Livland as a very learned theologian. Against his subtle assaults, Sartorius has been ably defended by a pious physician of Charkow, Professor Henry Blumenthal; and the latter was last year in his turn answered by Girgensohn. There is reason to hope that the decline of rationalism in Germany, will prevent its ever taking deep root among the Germans of the Russian empire.

From another statistical statement of Balbi, we have these results. The number of persons belonging to all the Christian sects in the Russian empire is fifty-five million six hundred and thirty-two thousand. Of these the Greek church, forty-five million three hundred and fifty-three thousand; Catholic, seven million three hundred thousand; Lutheran, two million six hundred thousand; Reformed, eighty thousand; Armenian, two hundred and seventy-nine thousand; and other sects twenty thousand. Of the remaining population, Islamism numbers two million seven hundred and thirty-five thousand; Judaism, five hundred and seventy-eight thousand; Boodhism, two hundred and ten thousand; and Fetishism eight hundred and forty-five thousand.

It is very observable that the great majority of inhabitants profess one and the same religion; a fact which promises much for the stability of this immense empire. Hitherto the only sectaries among the Greek Christians are those called *Raskolniks*. They give themselves the name of *Starowerzi*, or orthodox. In Russia proper they are not numerous, but abound in Astrachan, Kasan, along the Wolga, in Chernigow, Archangel and Siberia. Their whole number is reckoned at three hundred thousand, and they are decreasing. The Catholic population is chiefly found in the Polish provinces. In 1828, Poland proper contained three million four hundred and seventy-one thousand two hundred and eighty-two Catholics, and at the same time only forty-one Protestant congregations. The Greek church in Russia is much more friendly to Protestants than to Papists, and the government has afforded special immunities and facilities to evangelical Christians.

Sweden.

Turning now from Russia to Sweden, we find a country where the reformation was once fully established, but where rationalism has made progress to a certain extent, among the educated classes, if not among the mass. It is well known that Gustavus III., who was assassinated by Ankarström in 1792, had become infected with Gallomania. Under the shadow of French literature and luxury thus transplanted to Sweden, there sprang up a rank crop of revolutionary unbelief. Beyond this deepest shade, there was a penumbra of scepticism and neology which embraced many of the first divines. As Gustavus, notwithstanding his severities, was denominated "the best of kings," so the bishops Lehnberg and Lindblow, notwithstanding their departures from the gospel, were hailed as "the best of preachers." The Swedish people also suffered a lamentable depravation of morals by the use of ardent spirits. Under these auspices Swedenborgianism made rapid progress. It had this in common with neology that it taught a positively false doctrine on justification. Wieselgrén, a Swedish author of genius and piety, says that the power of this system is great towards a dissolution of the church. During ten years the Swedenborgians have busied themselves in circulating popular sermons, in which their crafty allegories are mainly directed to subvert those pillars of our faith, the doctrine of the trinity, and that of justification. During the prevalence of the magnetic imposture they made themselves famous as exorcists, by which means they obtained many ignorant females as their instruments. The same writer tells us that they now begin to adopt the phraseology of the St. Simonians.

Such is the dark side of the Swedish picture, but let us be thankful that it is not without its lights also. It has never yet been the case in the church of Sweden, as in Lutheran Germany, that whole provinces have been inundated by a flood of unbelief, and that an open denial of the faith has, as in Weimar, been erected into an ecclesiastical symbol. Neither was it the mere shell of true Christianity which remained. There abode among the body of the people enough of the ancient spirit to make them reject with disgust what their neological teachers offered to them as Christian nutriment. About the beginning of this century, in particular, a strong opposition to dead and heartless orthodoxy was awakened in the mountainous regions of Norrlande, in Lulea, Pitea, Heranosand, and Skelleftea. And, although this great religious

awakening was accompanied by some extravagances, it was evident that the heart of the people was seeking God. Such was the thirst for the word that it was not uncommon for people to travel twenty, thirty, and even fifty miles to hear an evangelical preacher.

Contemporaneously with this, there was a blessed work of grace going on in southern Sweden, under the instrumentality of Henry Schartau, Prebendary of Lund, who in 1825, entered into the joy of his Lord. This good man insisted on the necessity of a conversion wrought by the power of the Holy Ghost, the regular reading and hearing of the word, and a total surrender of all to Christ. By his animating discourses, and still more by his catechising, in which he embraced persons of every rank from the noble and the professor to the peasant, he disseminated the truth far and wide. By this correspondence he was known in every province of Sweden as the spiritual guide and comforter of many souls. After his death a number of his letters were published. As a theologian he addicted himself to the school of Bengel, and communicated the same views to many young divines who were his pupils. And all these efforts were aided by the revival of a new literary feeling, too warm and genial to be allied with rationalism. Examples of this are found in Geijer the historian, and Tegnér the poet.

The first day of December 1830, was celebrated by the Protestants of Sweden, as commemorative of the thousandth anniversary of their national conversion to Christianity. Prebendary Bergquist pronounced a discourse, since published, in which he gave some interesting sketches of Swedish church-history, in a truly evangelical spirit. "It has been observed," says he, "that nations, no less than individuals, have their enthusiastic season of youth. And indeed, if one might not hope for our race at large, that, like the eagle in the fable of the ancients, it would renew its youth, we might be tempted on comparing the enthusiastic strength of the middle ages, with the decrepit, wrinkled, and utilitarian senility of our own day, to wish the return of the middle ages with all their superstitions, youthful freshness, devotion even amidst error, chivalry, and magnanimous enterprise." This we believe to be a mode of thinking very common among good men in all the Teutonic nations.

The polite literature of Sweden has happily been auxiliary to the progress of religion. Wieselgrén, an elegant scholar as well as sound divine, has published a work entitled, "The

Ecclesiastical Literature of Sweden." Under the general name of belles-lettres, he includes liturgical and psalmodic compositions, pulpit eloquence and versions of the bible. He divides the history of this literature into six periods, viz. 1. That of Popery (A.D. 1000—1520). 2. That of the Reformation (1520—1600). 3. That of symbolical Orthodoxy (1600—1700). 4. That of Pietism (1700—1770). 5. That of Neology (1770—1809). 6. That of rational supernaturalism (1809 until the present time). The division is natural and happy, and the last of its periods is one which is full of encouragement to our hopes. When the orator comes to the fifth or neological period, we are pleased to find him saying; "It must be admitted to the honour of Swedish literature, that neology has obtained less footing in no church than in our own. Among the preachers of the people no one in Sweden came out positively for the new doctrine. Those who affected to be instructors of the higher ranks betrayed their change of mind oftener by silence than by words; and in general we must declare with thanks to God that although our light often burned but dimly, our candlestick was never entirely removed out of its place." In the sermons of Lehnberg, who is regarded as the leader of the new party, and who died in 1808, we discern the rationalism more in rhetorical vagueness than bold denial. About the time of the Jubilee in 1793, a great attempt was made to have a new liturgy, a new psalm book, and a new version of the bible, but without success, for as the author happily observes, the age had, together with the ardour of Christianity lost its power of production. Lars Linderot, minister in Goethaborg, distinguished himself during this period as a determined zealous Christian and as a sacred poet.

The day, it seems to be acknowledged, has fairly broken upon Sweden. At the first public meeting of the Swedish Bible Society in 1816, J. O. Wallin, since a bishop, used the following language: "We had made such progress in what our age called *light*, but what a later age will call *darkness*, that the bible was put away as superfluous; for it was held that our economical catechisms, encyclopedias, and novels, afforded means enough for education. God's house was not indeed actually torn down, because this would necessarily have ended in the destruction of sundry other edifices, but no one ventured to carry his religion so far as to hallow the sabbath, to frequent regular worship, or to partake of the sacrament. If any one, for entertainment, entered the

sanctuary, it was where there might be an opportunity of admiring the art of some orator, who like an expert pilot would skim around the breakers and shoals of doctrine, and after rocking his hearers awhile among sentimental billows of fancy, land them safely at last in the port of some ethical common-place." Family worship, and all the observances of vital piety declined, and ministers became mere government agents, overseers of the poor, fiscals, and registers of the marriages, births, and deaths. At length the people became weary of the reign of rationalism, and cried out against a system which was at war alike with warmth of feeling, good taste and faith. The periodicals entitled, "Polyfren," "Phosphoros," and the "Upsala Literary Journal," discovered at least the aridity and heartlessness of Unitarian religion, and stigmatized it. The new liturgy begun in 1793 saw the light in 1811. It was better than one could have expected from the times. In 1816 a translation of the New Testament appeared as a specimen, but was not well received. It was deficient in ordinary exegetical accuracy. The reprint of the old version by the British and Foreign Bible Society was complained of as not giving a pure text. In 1830 there was published a pocket bible, printed with diplomatic accuracy, and furnished with a preface by Schartau, on the devotional reading of the scriptures.

The hymnology of Sweden has always been a striking part of its literature; in the seventeenth century far the most striking part. The following remarks of Wieselgrén will be interesting, if it is only for their originality and earnestness. "The new hymns of the seventeenth century must be distinguished from the more ancient, or those of the Catholic church. The church-song of the middle ages had borrowed its form as well as language from the profane poesy of Rome. Most of the hymns of the sixteenth century, as recent investigations show, were modifications of German Catholic or Roman odes; but in the next age the hymn was thoroughly original, and in a tone varying from all that had hitherto resounded in the church. It is a deep melancholy which here rejoices, it is a triumphant joy which here laments, it is the most artless art within the limits of beauty. Hymns have no appropriate Muse; but if we would represent such a one for the lyrics of Protestants, we must borrow her features from the blessed virgin, at the moment when her innocent heart, alarmed by the angelic salutation, is yet ready to break forth in the thanksgiving of Hannah. During the

Protestant crusade the psalm was not merely the offering of devotion to God, but the war-song of liberty. Gustavus Adolphus and one of his heroes, the duke William of Saxe-Weimar, were Christian Tyrtæuses, who composed hymns in the tumult of arms. The history of the middle ages may be likened to the *Night of Corregio*, where the effect of the light is wonderful because the darkness predominates. The age of Gustavus Adolphus is the *Transfiguration of Raphael*, where the earth is all light under the open heaven."

In 1814 the committee charged with the subject of Psalmody, published a specimen Hymn Book, but it was such a medley, the old matter was so impaired and the new so dilute, that it found no acceptance. Just then Wallin, who has been already cited, and who was a member of this committee, presented to the clergy an effort of his own in this line. In the discourse which he pronounced on the occasion, he said, among other things, "If any one looks for what is sectarian in my performance, I will here declare frankly, that the law and the gospel are my 'fathers of the church.' I am a Christian, it seems, of the old school. I disapprove every alteration in religion by human hands. I regard it as a divine revelation which protects itself, and therefore hold it to be condemnable to add or subtract a single letter." This hymn book of Wallin's succeeded in the rescue of sacred song. Notwithstanding certain blemishes, it has been pronounced by an evangelical German "the best gift which has, during this century, been laid on the altar of the church."*

Holland and Belgium.

In the churches of this once flourishing garden of the reformation, American Christians take a special interest. All the branches of the Presbyterian family look to Holland, as having produced some of the greatest systematic theologians, and some of the happiest specimens of reformed polity, and the highly respectable Dutch church of the United States traces her ecclesiastical lineage directly to this source. But the fine gold has become dim, and is more and more tarnished by the spread of neology. Subscription to the standards is often omitted, and where it takes place, the formulary is received not as being true, *quia*, but so far as *quatenus* it is true.

* *Ev. Kirch. Zeitung.* April 1825.

This distinction has given rise to parties which are designated by these two latin terms. The general synod of 1834 was besought from many quarters to express a definite judgment respecting the formulary of subscription adopted in 1816, that is to say, whether it was to be received *quia* or *quatenus*. By a temporizing policy, it evaded this perplexing inquiry. There were individual members who sustained the ancient opinion, but others, and in particular the Moderator Donker-Curtius, were resolutely against this, and the debate resulted in the following circular letter, addressed to each of the pastors.

“*Gravenhaag, July 16, 1834.*”

“The general synod of the reformed church in the kingdom of the Netherlands, in consideration of the present state of some churches, and in fulfilment of the duty enjoined by the twenty-first article of the general ‘Reglement’ for the government of the reformed church in this kingdom, that they should care for the general concerns of the same, addresses itself to all the preachers and congregations of the national church, as follows:

“We feel ourselves constrained affectionately and fraternally to exhort all, and especially the younger preachers, carefully to avoid in public and private teaching every thing which might render suspicious the purity of their profession or their preaching, or which might even occasion the preached gospel and thereby the whole body of reformed ministers to be misapprehended and contemned by the ignorant or defamed by the malicious.

“At the same time the synod warns all church-officers of every degree, and makes it their duty, to watch with redoubled care, on the one hand, the conduct of ministers; and on the other hand, the machinations of restless and secret agitators, or public accusers, who act without cause; in order that the misapprehension of the latter may by God’s blessing be corrected by careful admonition and earnest and affectionate remonstrance, and that the petulance and censoriousness of the former may be curbed by timely and suitable discipline after fraternal admonition, and if possible may thus be removed out of our midst. And may the Lord of the church establish all ministers and congregations in our most holy faith, and preserve in the reformed church of the Netherlands the spirit of peace and love. May he sanctify us by his truth; his word is truth.”

This unmeaning letter, like all half-measures, satisfied no

one. The terms were such as seemed to reflect on no persons specially, unless it were those who were contending for the faith. Among these there were loud complaints. A venerable clergyman, Engels of Nieuwolda, in the region of Groningen, although he declared his strong opposition to the separatists of his province, was no less opposed to the proceeding of the synod. He expressed his dissatisfaction in a publication, entitled, "Truth and Love." Le Roy, a noted preacher, also published a small treatise to show the fatal consequences which must result from setting aside the confession; an act which he considered as certain to dissolve the church. Still more warmly was the same cause maintained by Scholte, the young pastor of a small church in North Brabant. After reading the circular letter from the pulpit, he made it the object of a most keen invective. He had some time before banished from his church the revised hymn-book, and his congregation went fully with him in all his measures. He was soon involved in various difficulties with his co-presbyters, which increased day by day. About this time Scholte found an opportunity to visit Ulrum and communicate with De Cock, who as may be known by many of our readers, had been deposed from the ministry for his violent opposition to the neologists. Scholte was here debarred from the church, but not feeling himself bound by this prohibition, he ascended the pulpit and not only preached, but administered baptism. He also preached in the open air to some thousands from Hebrews 10: 19—22, inveighing powerfully against the ecclesiastical authorities, and intimating the propriety of separation from so corrupt a church. Upon this a large number of the people of Ulrum, with De Cock at their head, signed an act of secession, which they sent to proper church-authorities. This act was printed with an address to all true members of the reformed body in the Netherlands, calling on such as adhered to the positions of the synod of Dort to come out from the national church. No government permission has as yet been allowed for the formation of a new sect. Le Roy, Engels, and their followers, still continue to preach the truth within the bosom of the church. Great numbers of tracts and pamphlets, exhorting to secession, are circulating, especially in Groningen and Friesland. In the meantime the worst type of German rationalism threatens to prevail in the established church.

The general synod of last summer was expected with great solicitude. Sometime before it convened, a publication was

made by Dr. Capadose, well known among the zealous defenders of the truth. It was entitled, "A word of earnest entreaty to the true ministers of the church in the Netherlands, with reference to the present state of the church, and of the synodical government." The object of the pamphlet was to quicken the efforts of the orthodox in a united opposition to the reigning corruptions; and it is believed to have made a very general impression. Without favouring secession, Capadose coincides with the separatists in all their complaints. One of these concerns the material alteration in the government of the church which has taken place during the present century. Although the genuine Presbyterianism of the Dutch church was held fast during all the convulsions of the French revolution, yet when the kingdom was established in 1815, a very important alteration took place. In place of the ancient democratic government, an oligarchical element was now admitted, resulting in a constantly increasing tendency to centralization, by means of a permanent synodical commission of four members, instituted in 1827. This was established, notwithstanding the remonstrance which was offered in 1815, by the classis of Amsterdam.

The synod of 1835 was addressed by communications from many clergymen, praying for the restitution of the purity and independence of the church. Among these the most distinguished were Engels and Le Roy, the latter of whom insisted upon the restoration of primitive government. A little before the meeting of the synod, Engels had published the first part of a treatise on Justification by Faith, as the basis of Protestant doctrine. He was also joined by about twenty of the neighbouring ministers in the earnest prayer that this principle might be recognised. From the other party there were also numerous memorials, praying that the subscription-formulary might not be interpreted with such a strictness as would tend to divide the church. To both classes of memorialists the synod returned the following answer.

"The general synod of the reformed church of the Netherlands, having considered the contents of an address, recommending to their notice the giving of a determinate explanation to the formula of subscription, &c. &c., reply as follows: that the synod after mature deliberation have resolved not to comply with the request in the above mentioned address, by giving the desired explanation; and this for the reason that they are unable to draft any explanation

which can equally gratify the desire of the different petitioners, or equally meet the views by them expressed; because they hold themselves incompetent to determine on any alteration or exposition of the established formulary; and because from such a determination the worst consequences might be expected, as well to the cause of truth, as to the peace and quiet of the reformed church of the Netherlands.”

Signed in behalf of the general synod, by
 DONKER-CURTIUS, *President.*
 DERMOUT, *Secretary.*

This apparently neutral position really commits the synod on the side of error, and leads us to expect a wider separation than has yet been reported:

In the once pure Universities of Holland, rationalism has made rapid progress. At Leyden, the only adherents to the Heidelberg Catechism, are Clarisse and Van der Palm, the two eldest professors. On the same side are Heringa and Royaards of Utrecht, with their colleagues. In Gröningen, no voice is raised in behalf of orthodoxy.

While many in Holland are complaining of the controversy thus waged, the German writer from whom we glean these facts, observes with the force of truth: “Groundless is the fear of such Protestants as cling to a merely external peace and stillness; groundless the exultation of such Romish foes of our communion as foresee in these commotions and agitations the downfall of the Protestant church, and profess to detect her false foundation. Where *life* is, there is *motion*, and our Lord gives peace, “not as the world giveth.”

We cannot close this notice of Holland, without mentioning a periodical work, now in its second year, entitled, “The Voice of the Netherlands upon Religion, Politics, History, and Literature.”* It is the first journal which has dared to come forth in behalf of vital piety. It is sustained by several able jurists, under the editorial conduct of d’Acosta, a converted Jew, and a man of distinguished genius. At this distance we cannot well judge of the precise views of its conductors. There is however a party of strenuous Calvinists in Holland, who condemn it as not being *zuiver*, or pure. There is likewise a smaller publication, of a pious and edifying character, entitled, “The Spiritual Magazine.”†

* *Nederlandschen Stemmen over Godsdienst, Staat, Geschiedenis en Letterkunde.*

† *Het geestelyk Magazyn.*

Religious Statistics.

In 1828, the population of the Prussian states was divided among the Protestants and Roman Catholics, in the proportion of forty-four to twenty-seven, respectively. Of these, the Catholics live mostly in the country of the Rhine, in West Prussia, Westphalia, and Posen. In the Rhine Provinces they are most numerous, being about seven-ninths. In the grand-duchy of Posen, five-sixteenths are Protestants. The Mennonites and Jews constitute about one-seventy-second of the whole Prussian population, the Mennonites alone being fifteen thousand six hundred and fifty-five, or not more than one in eight hundred and thirteen. They pay a certain fine on account of their refusal to bear arms, and are not allowed to acquire any real estate in addition to what they now possess.

In *Austria*, where the reformation was at its commencement suppressed by violence, it has since made no progress. Lichtenstein gives the following statistics of the Austrian Empire. The Catholics are not less than twenty-one million; Protestants, three million four hundred and fifty thousand; Greeks, two million and a half; in Siebenbürgen, between forty and forty-two thousand Socinians; and about three hundred thousand Jews. From this it appears that the Protestants of Austria are less than one-sixth of the entire population.

Turkey in Europe, contains from three to four millions of Mussulmans, including Albanians and Mohammedan slaves; about six million of Greek and Armenian Christians; about half a million of Catholics, and a considerable number of Jews. It is to be remarked of the Armenian church, that only the smaller portion of it recognises the supremacy of the Roman See. The number of Armenians in all Turkey, is supposed to be about a million and a half. The widely scattered Greeks belong either to the Greek church or the Greek Catholic. The Albanians profess partly Mohammedism, partly Greek or Romish Christianity. In Epirus, Thessaly, Moldavia, Wallachia, Macedonia, Rumelia, and Servia, very few Mohammedans live in the cities, most of the inhabitants belonging to the Greek church. On the other hand, in Bosnia, though so remote from the centre of Mohammedan power, it is calculated that out of from seven to eight hundred thousand inhabitants, as many as four hundred and seventy thousand profess Islamism; that one hundred and

ninety thousand are Christians, and the rest Jews and Gipsies.*

It has been sometimes said that one can judge of a man's character, manners, and morals, by his account-book. With reference to this the fiscal concerns of Rome are not without their interest. From the year 1822, in which Pius VII. died, to 1831, we may observe a difference. At the close of Cardinal Gonsalvi's administration in 1822, there was a surplus revenue of eighty-eight thousand eight hundred and fifty-four piastres. At present there is a deficit of one million two hundred and six thousand piastres. So much for the pontificate of Leo XII. The interest of the public debt in 1822, was nine hundred and twenty thousand piastres; at present, one million and fifty thousand piastres, a difference of about one hundred and thirty thousand piastres. The receipts of 1832 fall below those of 1831, by one million seven hundred and fifty-three thousand two hundred and seven piastres.

Schools in Italy.

According to Valery,† there are in the ecclesiastical states, sixty district schools (*regionaries*), which are conducted by laymen, and which instruct about two thousand children and youth. There are seven schools of church-music which give gratuitous instruction to about five hundred pupils; seven others to as many as two thousand. The school of St. Nicholas in the Strada Giulia is a model-school. At the close of the day's labour about eighty children of labourers are here collected and gratuitously instructed by ecclesiastics. In the singing-schools, the first principles of drawing are communicated, by the *Frères ignorantins*. Some of the rules are worthy of note. Corporal punishment is to be rare and always moderate; and no deformed person is allowed to be an instructor, lest the children should laugh at him; a genuine Italian trait.

In other parts of Italy, less can be said for education. The continental government of the Two Sicilies profess as a principle that every place shall have a public school for the instruction of children in reading, writing, and accounts. If the principle were carried into practice there would be one thousand seven hundred and ninety schools. But there are as many as thirty populous towns entirely destitute. The

* Rheinw. Rep. 9. 165.

† Voyages, historiques et littéraires en Italie.

general education of girls has scarcely been thought of. At Naples, indeed, there are two royal colleges for the daughters of people of rank, in which common accomplishments are taught. In a statistical work respecting Naples, published in 1829, by L. Galanti, it is stated that of two thousand girls who have gone to school, not one-fifth have actually learned to read. From a statistical article upon the Abruzzi, printed in 1833, in the "Echo" of Milan, the following account is taken. It is rare to find a man who can either write or read. Few seem to make any effort to better their condition. Most of the peasantry are involved in debt. Ignorance increases; books are becoming scarce; private libraries can scarcely be said to exist, and public libraries there are none. The whole province depends on two book-hawkers. And yet the people are endowed by nature with an uncommon share of genius.

In 1834, the population of Rome was one hundred and fifty thousand and sixteen. Among these are thirty-nine bishops, one thousand four hundred and twenty-four priests, one thousand eight hundred and fifty-seven monks, one thousand three hundred and fifty-nine nuns, and five hundred and ninety-eight seminarists. Surely here are men and women enough to educate all Italy!

University Lectures.

It is sometimes interesting to American scholars to know the subjects upon which foreign professors have been recently lecturing. We may generally conjecture in this way what important books may be expected from the press, as most of the theological books which are published in Germany, are substantially the same with some course of lectures previously delivered. The following notices refer to the Summer Semester of 1835.

BERLIN. *Bellermann*, on the first fifty Psalms. *Hengstenberg*, the book of Job; Theological Encyclopedia; exposition of Syrian writers. *Marheineke*, Ethics; Theological Encyclopedia; Modern Philosophy as connected with Christianity. *Neander*, History of Doctrines; First part of Church-History; The Gospel of John. *Strauss*, General Practical Theology; Homiletics; Catechetics. *Twisten* (successor of Schleiermacher), Introduction to New Testament; Introduction to Dogmatic Theology; Epistle to the Romans. *Uhlemann*, Hebrew Grammar; Latin Lectures on the Psalms; Introduction to the Syriac Language.

HALLE. *Fritzsche*, Dogmatic Theology; Pedagogics and Catechetics. *Gesenius*, Introduction to the apocryphal books of the Old Testament; Isaiah; Apocalypse; Historical and Critical Introduction to the Old Testament. *Rödiger*, Introduction to the New Testament; Genesis; the Minor Prophets; Arabic Language. *Tholuck*, Interpretation of Sermon on the Mount and Parables; of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. *Ullmann*, First part of Church-History; Theological Encyclopedia; History of Theology. *Wegscheider*, Exposition of Romans; Epistles to Timothy; Hebrews; Titus; Philemon; Christian Ethics.

BONN. At this University there are two faculties, the one Protestant, the other Catholic. 1. PROTESTANT. *Augusti*, Catholic Epistles; Church History. *Bleek*, Critical History of the New Testament; Romans; Chaldee Language. *Nitzsch*, Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology; Systematic Theology; *Rheinwald*, Symbolical Theology; Third part of Church-History. 2. CATHOLIC. *Scholz*, Exposition of Lamentations; Baruch and Psalms; Biblical Archaeology.

ROSTOCK. *Havernick*, The Chaldee portions of the Old Testament; History of Modern Theology; Introduction to the Old Testament; Epistle to the Romans.

FREIBURG. *Hug*, Introduction to the Old Testament.

ERLANGEN. *Olshausen*, Smaller Epistles of Paul; Second part of Systematic Theology; Epistles to the Corinthians.

GOETTINGEN. *Ewald*, Book of Job. *Gieseler*, Theology; Church-History. *Klener*, Pentateuch. *Lucke*, Apologetical and Polemic Theology; Ethics. *Matthaei*, on the Defects of New Testament Exegesis; Romans and Galatians.

DORPAT. *Keil*, John; Psalms; Ecclesiastes. *Busch*, Theological Encyclopedia. *Sartorius*, Ethics; Socinianism; Biblical History; History of Missions in the 18th and 19th century.

The above list is of course only a selection from a catalogue of professors and subjects.

Bibliographical Notices.

The increasing interest taken by Germans in America, is evinced by the fact that both Trollope's and Hamilton's Travels have been published in translations.

England continues to furnish many religious books for continental readers. The Rev. Mr. Bonson of Versailles is translating into French, Scott's Commentary on the Bible. Pearson's Life of Archbishop Leighton has appeared in Ger-

man at Basle; and the Life of Joseph Williams of Kidderminster, in like manner at Stuttgart.

A popular memoir of Zwingle and of the Swiss Reformation, by G. W. Roeder has been published at Coire. The Life of Silvio Pellico, in a German version is attracting great attention in Germany. Professor Marheineke, the noted Hegelian of Berlin, has produced the third and last volume of his History of the German reformation. The history is brought down to the religious peace of Augsburg. The work is very full and interesting. A Memoir of Schleiermacher has been written by Baumgarten-Crusius of Jena. Tholuck's latest publication is a Sermon upon Luke 12: 49, 50, with reference to secession from the church. It appears to be a warning against the spirit of the Silesian seperatists. A history of Pelagianism has issued from Cologne, entitled: *De Pelagianorum doctrinae principiis. Dissertatio historico-critica, quam scripsit J. H. Leutzen, ss. theol. Dr. ejusdemque repetens in seminario archiepiscopali Coloniensi.*

Among the exegetical works we notice a Practical Exposition of the Epistle to the Philippians, by T. Passavant; Basle. The author is regarded as an evangelical man. Expositions of the Apocalypse have appeared from the pens of A. A. Waibel, a Roman Catholic, and Professor Oertel of Ansbach. The second part of Stier's Commentary on the Psalms is expected shortly to appear. Also a Commentary by Thiel upon Genesis, and an Introduction to the Old Testament by Haevernik.

In the department of metaphysics wave follows wave from the German press. Dr. Tafel, librarian of the University of Tubingen, is the author of a work entitled, "History and Examination of Scepticism and Irrationalism, as related to the modern philosophy, with special reference to Hegel." Our readers are probably aware, notwithstanding an intimation to the contrary in the last number of the London Quarterly Review, that Hegel has been several years dead; but his hideous doctrine, subversive of all morality and all Christian faith, still lives. The work of Victor Cousin, upon French and German Philosophy, has been translated by Dr. Beckers of Dillingen. It is prefaced by a long dissertation of the celebrated Schelling, who is now to be mentioned as a privy-counsellor and associé étranger of the French Institute. The work of Cousin is well known in this country. It is not altogether satisfactory to Schelling, who nevertheless bestows great

praise on the author as the only Frenchman who has ever gone down into the abysses of German metaphysics.

There is nothing more interesting in the bibliography of the age than the care which is used in France and Germany to furnish useful editions of the Christian fathers and other rare ancient works. Translations of many early writings are also becoming common. We notice the Apology of Theophilus of Antioch, translated by Thienemann, with a preface by Dr. Augusti. Also the celebrated defence of vicarious atonement by Archbishop Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo?* and likewise a translation of the same. To this may be added Select Works of Ephrem Syrus, from the Greek and Syriac, by Zingerle, a Benedictine monk. And the whole extant works of Berengarius Turonensis, edited by Neander.

The brothers *Gaume*, booksellers of Paris, also propose to publish the entire works of Chrysostom, from the Benedictine edition, with a latin translation and notes. It will occupy thirteen volumes octavo, and be issued in twenty-six livraisons, of five hundred pages, at ten francs each.

It is so seldom that any thing reaches us concerning the theological literature of Holland, that we give place to one or two titles which from any other country might be thought scarcely worthy of record. The first of these is "Ecclesiastical Law of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands; by H. J. Royaards, D.D. and Professor of Theology at Utrecht. Part First."* In this work Professor Royaards furnishes an account not only of the internal polity but the civil relations of the Dutch church. Upon the former of these points he gives some interesting particulars. The early government of the reformed church lasted from 1568 to 1795. The period from 1795 to 1816 is remarkable for the transition to the new government, alluded to above, in our remarks on Holland. After the restoration in Holland in 1814 it became a matter of great moment to regulate the church privileges. The ancient polity had become entirely crippled by state convulsions, and nothing was left but the original classes. It became necessary during this interval for the government to take an irregular administration of church-affairs. In 1816 a commission was appointed by the state, consisting of ministers from the different synods, for the re-organization of the

* *Hedendaagsch Kerkregt by de Hervormden in Nederland door H. J. Royaards, Dr en Hoogleraar in de Godgeleerdheid te Utrecht. Eerste Deel. Utrecht, 1824.*

church. The new arrangements, as we have said above, were opposed by many, and especially by the Classis of Amsterdam, which sent a very bold address to the king; complaining that the new organization had been effected by royal power, and not by ecclesiastical bodies, and remonstrating against the undue authority of the ministry. The government replied that these errors in form had arisen out of the necessity of the times. In July 1816 the new constitution was introduced, securing to the general synod all authority under the king. It appears from Professor Royaard's book, that the church of Holland contains ten provincial judicatories; forty-three classes; one hundred and thirty-four circles; one thousand two hundred and thirty-seven congregations; and one thousand four hundred and sixty ministers.

"Strictures on the new edition of Wetstein's Prolegomena to the New Testament, by J. Heringa."* This reprint is said to be exceedingly inaccurate. Prof. Lotze, it seems, has reprinted all the errors of Semler's marginal notes.

Samuel Tyler

ART. II.—*Balfour's Enquiry.*

OUR attention has been recently directed to "Balfour's Enquiry," a book written in defence of the doctrine of universal salvation. The work makes great pretension to severity of argument and extent of erudition, when in fact there is great poverty of both. It is however well calculated to convince the half-learned reader, by the pedantic prodigality of its second-hand learning, that its doctrines are true. But to any one possessed of even a moderate share of biblical, classical and philosophical knowledge, its premises are erroneous, its reasoning sophistical, and its conclusions false. Of this we shall give our readers a sufficient illustration.

It is contended in this book that the words in the New Testament translated *hell*, refer to a present, and not a future state of punishment. To sustain this proposition, an effort is made (pp. 185—191,) to define the meaning of the Greek words $\piνευμα$ and $\psiυχη$, and then to draw from the definition, certain doctrinal conclusions. It is insisted, that $\piνευμα$ is the only word in the New Testament, used to signify soul; and $\psiυχη$

* Beoordeeling van de nieuwe uitgave der Prolegomena in N. Test. van J. J. Wetstein door J. Heringa. Amsterd. 1832.

never is, but is used to signify natural life only. It is then asserted, that it is ψυχη (life) and not πνευμα (soul), which is always used in the passages generally supposed to refer to future punishment; and as nothing but the soul can be punished in a future state, it is inferred that those passages refer to punishment in this world.

Πνευμα is synonymous with the latin word *spiritus*, and signifies breath, wind, life, spirit; it is derived from the Greek verb πνεω, which is synonymous with the latin verb *spiro*, and signifies to breathe. Originally, πνευμα signified *breath*, *wind* and *air* only: but in the progress of knowledge, like its latin synonyme, *spiritus*, it was used to signify *life* and *spirit* also. In the English Language, we find pneumatics (the science of air) derived from it; and the medical terms pneumonia, pneumatosis, pneumatice, pneumatomphalos, in all which the proper distinctive meaning of πνευμα is retained. The same may be said of the English word *pneumatology* (the doctrine of fluid or spiritual existence) and the latin word *pneumaticus*, (windy, spiritual).

Ψυχη is derived from the Greek verb ψυχω (to breath) and signifies life, wind, soul &c. The English word *psychology* (the science of mind or soul) is derived from it; and so are the latin words *psychomachia* (a conflict between soul and body), and *psychomanteum* (a place where necromancers call up spirits); though they are compounded of ψυχη and λογος, μαχομαι, and μαντεια. The medical term *psychagogica* is derived from ψυχη and αγω and signifies medicines which relieve in syncope or apoplexy.

It is evident from this statement respecting the words πνευμα and ψυχη, that they both mean soul or the immortal part of man; that they have been so used, by both English and Latin Scholars: for what better proof of their opinions can be desired, than that they have derived from both these words, into their respective languages, words which signify the science of the soul? But if either word is more peculiarly expressive of the soul than the other, it is ψυχη and not πνευμα; for in every word into which ψυχη is compounded it signifies soul or mind: which is not the case with πνευμα, as we have shewn above. We have also shewn that even physicians derive from ψυχη, the name of their medicines, which are supposed to have a direct and specific effect upon the mind. In the writings of the best Greek classics, we find that ψυχη and not πνευμα, is always used to express the soul. The fact is, that πνευμα was never used to signify soul, until a

very late period in the history of Greece; not until the decline of its institutions and its literature. It was never used to signify soul by any of the ancient Greek authors: but only by those who flourished at a later period, and we believe not often by them.

As Plato and Aristotle were the two most distinguished Grecian philosophical writers: and as they have written more on the immortality of the soul than any others, let us appeal to their authority. The dialogue of Plato, entitled *Phaedo*, is decidedly the most elaborate treatise on a future state, to be found within the whole range of Grecian philosophy. In this dialogue the following words occur. "Since that which is immortal is also indestructible, what else can we conclude but that the soul ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) being, or happening to be, immortal, must also be imperishable." In the same dialogue is this passage. "But I should rather say, that each of our souls ($\psi\upsilon\chi\omega\nu$) wears out many bodies, though these should live many years; for if the body runs out and is destroyed, the man still living, but the soul ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) always repairs that which is worn out, it would follow of necessity that the soul ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) when it perished, would happen to have its last covering, and to perish only just before that covering." We will make one more extract from the *Phaedo*. "Our soul was somewhere before it existed in the human form as also the soul seems to be immortal afterwards."

The following are extracts from the treatise, *De Legg. X.* of Plato; "The soul ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) is always annexed to a body, sometimes to one and sometimes to another."

"In truth each of us, that is to say, each soul ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\nu$) is immortal, and departs to other Gods (or Gods in another world), to render an account as the laws of the state declare. This to the good is matter of confidence, but to the wicked of terror."

"You say that the substance (or being) to which we all give the name of soul ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\nu$), has for its definition, 'that which moves itself?' I certainly do say so."

In all these passages taken from several distinct treatises of Plato, the word $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ is used to signify *soul*. In Aristotle's treatise *De Gen. Anim.* 11: 4, we read, "The soul ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) is the substance of some kind of body." So also in the treatise *De Anima*. "Those therefore rightly hold who think, that the soul ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$) cannot exist, without the body, and yet that it is not body; it is not body, but somewhat of the body." In Aristotle's *Logic*, Lib. II. chap. 19, is the following pas-

sage, "From perception arises memory. And from memory existing independently, arises experience: for although the objects of memory are many in number, the results thereof (viz. experience), are uniform. And from experience, or this unity independently and invariably existing in the soul (*εν τη ψυχη*), the same in all and to all, come the rudiments of art and knowledge, of art as respects finite; of knowledge, as respects self-existing objects." It is manifest from the above extracts, that both Plato and Aristotle, in several different treatises, use *ψυχη* to signify soul. We do not believe that they ever use *πνευμα* in that sense.

In the last book of Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, Cyrus, just before his death, is represented as addressing his children in this strain. *Ουτοι εγωγε, ω παιδες, ουδε τουτο πωποτε επισθην, ωσ η ψυχη, εως μεν αν εν θνητω σωματι η ζη οταν δε τουτου απαλλαγη τεθνηκεν. 'Ορω γαρ, οτι και τα θνητα σωματα οσον αν εν χρονον η η ψυχη, ζωντα παρεχεται, &c.* In this extract *ψυχη* is used twice to signify soul; and it is used frequently throughout the speech, in the same sense. In Plutarch, in the *Quæst. Platon.* is this passage; "The soul (*ψυχη*) is older than the body, and the cause and origin of its existence; not that the soul exists without the body, or the understanding without the soul; but that the soul is in the body, and the understanding in the soul."

Homer, Sophocles, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and we may say all the ancient Greek writers use *ψυχη* to signify soul. It may be objected that all these writers wrote before the New Testament writers. Dionysius of Halicarnassus wrote about the commencement of the Christian era. It is evident then that *ψυχη*, was used to signify soul down to the commencement of the Christian era. But to destroy the force of this objection, we will cite Lucian's dialogues, which were written at a later period. In his dialogues, which are "dialogues of the dead," *ψυχη*, and not *πνευμα*, is always applied to the souls or ghosts, who are represented as talking together, in the world of spirits. This does not prove that the New Testament writers used *ψυχη*, to signify soul. But does it not raise a strong presumption that they did? a presumption, strong enough, to throw the burden of proof, that they did not, on our adversary? Nevertheless, we will waive our rights, and undertake to show from the New Testament writers themselves, that they used *ψυχη* to signify soul.

There are in the New Testament two classes of texts in which *ψυχη* signifies soul. The one class has reference to

future punishment, and the other has not. We will first consider those texts that have not. In Matt. 11: 29, "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest for your souls." The word translated souls in this verse, is the plural of ψυχη. Make it lives; and what sort of meaning will the verse convey? Matthew 12: 18, "Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased, &c." The word translated soul is ψυχη. Render it life; and it makes nonsense of the verse. So in Mark 14: 34, "And he saith unto them, my soul (ψυχη) is exceeding sorrowful unto death, &c." Substitute life for soul in this text, and it would have no meaning: for we cannot say that the life has emotions of any kind, either of sorrow or of joy. Luke 1: 66, "Mary said, my soul (ψυχη) doth magnify the Lord." Can animal life magnify the Lord? Luke 12: 19, "And I will say unto my soul (ψυχη), soul thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry." John 12: 27, "Now is my soul (ψυχη) troubled, &c." Acts 3: 23, "And it shall come to pass, that every soul (ψυχη) which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people." So Romans 13: 1, "Let every soul (ψυχη) be subject unto the higher powers." The most uncandid must admit that ψυχη, in these passages, does not mean animal life. It may be objected, that it means the same thing as person, and that the pronouns, I, thou, me, &c., might be substituted in all those texts. This objection has no force against the scope of our argument; for it is the inner man that is referred to in all these texts. In this place (though a little out of order) we will notice another objection of Balfour. He says on page one hundred and eighty-eight, that ψυχη is never represented in scripture as separated from the body: but is always spoken of as with the body. Let us see. In Luke 12: 20, we read, "But God said unto him, thou fool, this night, thy soul (ψυχη) shall be required of thee, &c." Here God separated from the body, the very soul to which the rich man said, take thine ease, eat, drink and be merry." But if this construction be objected to, we may quote Revelation 6: 9, "And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar, the souls (ψυχας) of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held." Revelation 20: 4, "And I saw thrones, and they that sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls (ψυχας) of them that were beheaded for

the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands, and they lived and reigned a thousand years with Christ." Now here are ψυχαὶ separated from the body, and in a future state of existence. It is most obvious from these texts that ψυχη (for this is the word translated soul in all of them) is used by the New Testament writers to signify soul; and that the ψυχη is represented as living in a future state, separated from the body. Having seen that ψυχη means soul in that class of texts which do not refer to future punishment, we will now proceed to consider its meaning in those which are generally supposed to refer to future punishment. Matthew 10: 28, "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul (ψυχην); but rather fear him, which is able to destroy both soul (ψυχην) and body in hell." Luke 12: 4, 5, is a parallel text, "And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do: but I forewarn you whom ye shall fear: fear him, which, after he has killed, has power to cast into hell; yea, I say, fear him." These two texts refer to the same discourse of our Lord; and shed mutual light upon each other's meaning. They were addressed to the disciples. Our Lord tells them in these texts, that they should rather fear God than man. This is obviously his meaning; but how do we know that he alludes to God and man in these texts? He does not mention either. We infer it from the relative powers of these persons, whom he tells his disciples to fear and not to fear; for one is a power which man can exercise, and the other is a power which God only can exercise. Suppose then that we substitute "life" for "soul" in these texts, and "the valley of Hinnom near Jerusalem" for "hell," as Balfour contends we ought; can we still say that God and man are the agents alluded to in these texts? If the greater of the two be nothing more than to destroy life and body in the valley of Hinnom, surely man can do it; and we then cannot say that God is alluded to at all in these texts; because it is only from the fact that the exercise of a power, which man cannot exercise, is alluded to, that we infer that God is the agent spoken of. We leave it to the Universalists to reconcile these inconsistencies. Balfour endeavours to get over this difficulty by saying that "man can destroy the life from this present world; but cannot kill the life so as to prevent it ever reanimating the body, so as to

prevent it ever living again." This is almost an admission that ψυχη ought to be translated soul in these texts; for is not killing the body, killing the life? Does scripture any where declare that the life (ψυχη) which dies in this world shall reanimate the body at the resurrection? Let it answer for itself. In Romans 8: 11, "If the spirit (πνευμα) of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his spirit (πνευμα) that dwelleth in you." We see by this text that it is the πνευμα (spirit) of God, and not the ψυχη (life) of man that is to reanimate our mortal bodies at the resurrection. 1 Corinthians 15: 44, "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body." A spiritual body surely will not want natural life to animate it. So we see that Balfour is compelled to resort to gratuitous and anti-scriptural theories to support his interpretation of these texts. But Balfour contends that even if ψυχη does mean soul in these texts, it does not follow that the word translated *hell* means a future state of punishment. For, says he, the texts do not say that God *will* destroy both body and soul in hell, but only that he is able to do it. That is, he is able to destroy both soul and body in the valley of Hinnom. But do we ever find God threatening what he *can* do? Would it have had any effect, upon the minds of the disciples, to tell them of a power of punishment, which God could exercise over them, when they knew that he never would exercise it? Besides, the exercise of this power would be the annihilation of the soul; for to destroy the soul in the same sense as destroying the body, would annihilate it. We see then to what shifts the Universalist is compelled to resort, in order to sustain his interpretation of these texts. Balfour's interpretation of these texts, to sum it up, is, that the word translated *soul* ought to have been translated *life*, and that the word translated *hell* ought to have been translated *the valley of Hinnom*. We affirm that it ought to have been translated exactly as it is. The obvious design of these texts is to magnify the power of God, by bringing it into contrast with that of man, to impress upon the disciples how much more they had to dread from the power of God to punish them, than from the power of man. The interpretation that will make this meaning the strongest must necessarily be the correct one. Now which interpretation makes the contrast between the power to punish possessed by God, and that possessed by man, the more striking? That which merely

states that God is able to destroy the body and the life so as to prevent its ever living again? or that which declares that he is able to punish or destroy the soul in hell? Which interpretation would have produced the greater effect upon the minds of the disciples? Another objection to Balfour's interpretation may be drawn from his own doctrines. His doctrine is, that the *πνεῦμα* (soul) of every person whether wicked or pious, returns to God who gave it, as soon as the person dies, while the *ψυχή* (life) goes to the grave with the body. Now would it have impressed the disciples very deeply, to be told that their *life* should be destroyed and their *body* never rise from the grave, when they knew that their *souls* would be in heaven? The fact is, Balfour's opinions are antagonist to themselves, are destroyed by the very conflict of their own elements. If all his arguments were marshalled in order, and brought into logical conflict, they would refute each other. Does our interpretation of these texts create any oppugnancy between the sentences, or the members of the sentences, or between the words that compose them? Certainly none. A perfect harmony of meaning runs through the whole. If our Lord wished to teach the doctrine of a hell as understood at this day, could he have used language more expressive of it, than is contained in these texts? He certainly could not. Then why attempt to force upon them a strained meaning? Is it because our interpretation of them is not sustained by the general tenor of the scriptures? Let us see.

In Acts 17: 31, we read: "He has appointed a day wherein he will judge the world, in righteousness, by Jesus Christ." Hebrews 9: 27, "It is appointed unto all men once to die, but after this, the judgment." Matthew 12: 36, "Every idle word that men speak, they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment." Revelation 20: 11, 12, "I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heavens fled away, and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God, and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works." 1 Thessalonians 4: 16, "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trumpet of God, &c." Do not these texts, in the most emphatic manner, teach that there will be a final judgment, that it

will be after death, and that there will be a very particular enquiry even into every word spoken by those arraigned at the judgment seat; and that the judge will be Jesus Christ? We see too that the whole proceeding will be attended with the most solemn and awful ceremonies. The Judge will descend from heaven with a shout from the heavenly hosts, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trumpet of God; that when the Judge has ascended the judgment seat, the books will be opened, and the dead, both great and small, will stand arraigned for their conduct in this world. But the doctrine of universal salvation teaches that all this is an idle ceremony; that Christ will descend from heaven, with all this pomp and circumstance, to preside at a mock trial! It is true that these texts do not teach that there will be any punishment inflicted on those who shall be found guilty of the violation of the laws of God; but is not the inference irresistible that there will be? There are texts enough, however, which teach that punishment will be inflicted on those found guilty at this searching trial. Matthew 25:41, 46, "Then shall he say unto them on the left hand, depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels. And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." And in 2 Peter 3: 7, "The heavens and the earth are kept in store, reserved unto fire, against the day of judgment, and perdition of ungodly men." We might stop here, and take defence behind these two texts; but we will add Revelation 20: 10, 14, and 21: 16, "The devil was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever. Death and hell were cast into the lake of fire; this is the second death. And whosoever was not written in the Lamb's book of life was cast into the lake of fire. The fearful and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolators, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death." Can any man pretend that these texts do not teach a future eternal punishment? "These shall go away into everlasting punishment!" Could language be plainer? Remark too, that it is put into contrast with this, "but the righteous into life eternal." The one is the doom of the wicked. The other, the destiny of the righteous. They are intended as a perfect contrast, as the opposite extremes of human condition. One, the

state of eternal woe; the other, of eternal happiness. These two conditions must agree in duration, or they will not form a perfect contrast, as it was evidently intended they should; for it is the circumstance of their duration that constituted their striking characteristic. This is both logically and grammatically true; for it is the only inference from either the sense or the language of these texts. If any one should disregard both the rules of logic and grammar, applicable to these texts, and contend that though the word prefixed to the condition of the righteous ought to be translated *eternal*, the same word prefixed to the condition of the wicked ought not, we need not stop to ask them the reasons for so strange a notion, but merely inquire how we are to dispose of the "lake of fire," and "the second death?" Will they contend that those consigned to this awful doom, will at some time be relieved from it? No such deliverance is spoken of in the scriptures. This doom is spoken of as the second death. Do the scriptures teach any resurrection from the second death? If the scriptures did not teach the doctrine of the resurrection from the first death, would we be at liberty to infer it? Why then infer it here? The reasons against the inference, in this case, are much stronger than in the other. The very fact of the scriptures mentioning one resurrection and not mentioning another, proves that there will not be another, more strongly than if they had not mentioned any; because an enumeration excludes things not enumerated. The scriptures tell us that nothing unclean can enter the new Jerusalem. Then if those who die the second death are to be restored to the joys of the new Jerusalem (as those Universalists who admit a future temporary punishment contend, and this part of the argument is intended more particularly for them), their condition cannot be a state of punishment at all, but one of probation or trial, where they can work out their salvation and be fitted for heaven. Surely the scriptures do not thus represent it. They represent it as a state of punishment. A state of punishment is as entirely different from a state of probation, as it is from a state of reward. According to the logical order of the moral creation, both the state of punishment and the state of reward must come after the state of probation; for they are related to each other as antecedent and consequent, and the idea of the one necessarily implies the idea of the others. The substance of this doctrine of restoration from the second death is, that those who have not prepared themselves for heaven or the new Jerusalem, in

this world, must try it again, must have another chance. But if they did not repent in this world, why take it for granted that they will in the state of the second death? Will any new light dispel their errors, or new moral influences purify their hearts? Certainly the scriptures do not say so. And if it were necessary for Christ to die in order to redeem the wicked in this world, by parity of reasoning, it will be necessary also for him to die again, to redeem those who are in the state of the second death. Let us pause and reflect upon these strange yet legitimate conclusions, which result from the doctrine of the final restoration of the wicked.

We ask again, do the scriptures speak of the restoration of those who die the second death? If this doctrine be true, it is a most extraordinary fact, that it is not once mentioned in the scriptures. The more important the doctrine, the stronger is the silence of scripture against its truth. Can any doctrine be more important than this?

Those who entertain this doctrine, if they have any reasons to support it, must see further into futurity than the scriptures intended man should; for revelation does not extend so far; and we presume that all is revealed which God intended we should know. The believers in this doctrine argue with as much confidence as if the gates of the second death had been opened to them, and they had seen all the solemn realities over which, to the eyes of other mortals, hang shadows, clouds and darkness.

Here another consideration forces itself upon us. If the doctrine of future eternal punishment is not taught in the scriptures, why did not Christ and his apostles preach against it when it was a fundamental article in the religious creeds of both the Jews and the Gentiles? It is as emphatically taught in the *Phaedo* of Plato as language can express it; and *Tartarus* is the place where the torments are suffered. It is taught in the Grecian Mythology, which was the religious system taught, if not believed by the philosophers, and implicitly believed by the people. In fact, the doctrine of future eternal punishment, as is known to every one at all conversant with the history of literature, was universally both the philosophical and popular religious tenet of the ancients, Jews and Gentiles. Balfour answers this objection in this manner: that Christ and his apostles did not contradict expressly every false notion of the Jews and Gentiles, and that if we infer their belief of one false notion from their silence in regard to it, we must infer their belief of all which

they do not expressly contradict. Now we boldly deny this inference. It may be that they did not contradict every idle, silly notion prevalent at that day, because it would have been impracticable. They left them to be swept into the dark gulf of oblivion by the strong tide of moral revolution which Christianity would pour over the world. But can it be supposed that they would pass by the great fundamental doctrine of every religious system of which we know any thing? Christ must have foreseen that it would be a great fundamental doctrine in the religious creeds of those who should call themselves Christians for eighteen hundred years. This fact alone, we should suppose, would have induced him to preach against the doctrine if it were not true. Show us an instance where Christ and his apostles have not expressly contradicted any important religious error of the day in which they lived. A philosopher at this day would not undertake to contradict all the nursery tales believed by children, or the absurd superstitions believed by a great majority of people. But would he intentionally pass over one of the most important errors of the philosophical systems of the day, if he knew that it was an error? It is the rewards and punishments of a religious system that constitute its prominent features. The design of religion is to reveal to us our destiny; to point out the condition of the just and unjust in a future state; and to teach us the means by which we can avoid the doom of the one and achieve the triumphs of the other. Why then did not Christ and his apostles preach against the doctrine of eternal punishments? The only legitimate answer is because it is true.

If the doctrine of universal salvation has nothing to stand upon in the scriptures, it is equally without foundation in the course of nature. It is as unphilosophical as it is unscriptural. The happiness and misery of men even in this life depend upon their conduct. Pleasure and pain are the natural consequences of certain actions; and these consequences seem to be affixed to them with the design of making us perform some actions and desist from others. If we pursue a course of industry, temperance, care and frugality, we can make ourselves at least very comfortable: if we pursue a course of idleness, dissipation, recklessness and prodigality, we can make ourselves as miserable as we please. We have striking examples of both these cases daily before our eyes. So much is our condition dependent upon ourselves, that we cannot even procure food or raiment, or any of the necessa-

ries of life, without exertion. By what continued and laborious effort have the arts and sciences been reared, and brought to minister to the comforts and elegancies of life! By what persevering labour have all the improvements in the world been constructed! But what are all the conquests in science, splendid as they are, and all the works of art, and the comforts and elegancies of life, compared with what they might have been, if no effort of man had ever been misapplied: if genius, true to its holy trust, had never desecrated its lofty prerogatives to the base purposes of selfish ambition, but had led on ordinary minds to subjugate the material world, and bring its laws to minister to man! If, like Newton, all great minds had chosen rather to plant the standard of their conquests upon the remotest star, than to plant it on the battlements of some beleaguered city; or, like Franklin, had preferred disarming the spirit of the storm of his thunders, to disarming a king of his sceptre, the present civilization of the world is savage barbarism in comparison with what it would have been. All the present comforts of man are the rewards of his virtues. If he had misdirected all his efforts, preferred idleness to industry, dissipation to temperance, ignorance to knowledge, he would still be in a state of the most abject misery and barbarism. And his condition would have been the punishment of his vices.

Now all these consequences are the appointments of God; the happiness resulting from virtue is a reward bestowed by him, and the misery resulting from vice is a punishment inflicted by him; and it makes no difference, whether he bestows rewards and inflicts punishments by a special act in every case, or does it by a general providence. We have capacity to distinguish virtue from vice, and to foresee their consequences. The giving us this capacity is the same thing as declaring from heaven the great laws by which we are governed.

That we all believe necessarily, from what we every day experience, that we live under a moral government where virtue is rewarded and vice punished, is evident from our constant practice and habitual language. Every man must admit, from the general manifestations of Providence, that it is designed that the virtuous should be happy, and the wicked not. This is universal experience, and is daily acted upon. For according to the course of nature, it would be just as gross a violation of the laws of the moral economy of the world, for wickedness to produce happiness, as it would

be of the laws of the vegetable economy, for thistles to bear figs. It is true, that the wicked are sometimes prosperous: but their prosperity does not result as a consequence of their wickedness: it is a consequence of their talents, opportunities or something else. To a superficial observer, the instances of the prosperity of the wicked, may appear to conflict with the general tenor of our argument; but upon close examination it will be found perfectly consistent with it. The whole world, in every department, is so constituted as to require human agency to carry its designs into effect. The vegetable kingdom is designed, among other things, for the sustenance of man, but it requires the labour of man to carry this design fully into effect. So with the animal creation; if animals were not domesticated, and attentively and skilfully reared, they would not be sufficient to sustain the human beings now upon the earth. The moral kingdom is also embraced in this general law. We see, that in the course of nature, punishments do not follow immediately upon the commission of crime; for the world is so constituted as to require human agency in every department, and here the agency of human laws, as auxiliary to the laws of nature, is required to punish vice and reward virtue. The dilatory rewards and punishments of nature's laws, are rather intimations to mankind, of what ought to be rewarded and what punished, than any thing else. Now it is very questionable whether all the instances of the prosperity of the wicked do not result from the delinquencies of man, in not performing his part in the moral economy of the world, either through the agency of laws, or of manners, checking the wicked, both by the force of government and of social intercourse.

But if the prosperity of the wicked, in some instances, do result from the laws of Providence, and not from the delinquencies of man, we think it a strong argument in favour of future punishment. Because their prosperity cannot be reconciled with the general course of nature, on any other principle than that this world is part of our great scheme of moral discipline, and that the wicked who prosper here will be punished hereafter. And we observe too, that in the course of nature, men sometimes gain a temporary advantage and prosperity by their wickedness, but that at last this very advantage proves their ruin. Now, why may not the wicked who die in prosperity be punished hereafter, although they lived in prosperity for a time? May it not be, that this apparent exception to the justice of Providence was allowed for

the purpose of inducing us to believe in future punishment? It certainly should have this effect. But are not the righteous sometimes in adversity? If then the prosperity of vice, is any evidence that it will not be punished hereafter, so is the adversity of virtue a proof that it will not be rewarded. All the arguments in favour of future punishments are the correlatives of those in favour of future rewards; and are built upon the same analogies. If the one be true, the other is true also.

In the material world, those things which, in the infancy of science, appear to be exceptions to general laws, have always, upon further investigation, been found to be examples of them, and this too in cases where the most contrariant circumstances marked the apparent exceptions. This is every day's experience in scientific pursuits. Why should it not be so in the moral world? Is it to be supposed that there is not as much harmony in this, the noblest part of the creation, as in the other? If there be, then must future punishments be a part of the scheme of the moral creation; for on no other principle can many apparent exceptions to its general laws be reconciled; and this principle admitted, all is harmony. This, and all the other observations which we have made, are strengthened by the fact that uniformity is a great law of the universe, and that our minds are so constructed as to expect to find it every where in the universe. In philosophical inquiries we always act upon it; for without it we could not get along at all; because without it there could be no such thing as inference or generalization. The whole of knowledge would then be nothing but isolated facts without any relations whatever. This uniformity exists not only in physical but in moral science. Without it we could not know our duties, because we should have to act in every instance before we could know what would be the consequences of our actions. This uniformity is universal in the physical creation. The law of gravity, which pervades this world, runs throughout all worlds. Now why should not this law of uniformity prevail as extensively in the moral as the material world? It is just as striking a characteristic of the moral world, as far as we know it, as it is of the material. Before the days of Newton we had no more reason to believe that the law of uniformity pervaded the material universe, than we had that it pervaded the moral; his discoveries have demonstrated that it pervades the one; and as the two systems are from the same Creator, and perfectly analogous to

each other, as far as we know them, and as the very characteristic in which they are analogous, as far as we know the moral world, is found by the discoveries in astronomy to extend throughout the material universe, we are led irresistibly to conclude that it must extend throughout the moral universe also. The evidence in favour of this uniformity in the whole moral creation, rests upon precisely the same foundation as that which induced Newton to suppose that uniformity extended throughout the whole material creation; and which led him into a course of investigation that resulted in the demonstration of the fact. Then, if there be no future punishments, the apparent exceptions to justice in the administration of Providence cannot be accounted for, but must be real exceptions. The great law of uniformity, upon which all science rests, does not extend through the whole moral creation; and the constitution of the human mind, which compels us to expect it every where, is absurd. Here then discord among the works of God results inevitably from the doctrine that there will be no future punishments.

Bearing in mind this great law of uniformity, let us inquire whether there is not something to support the eternity of punishment. If a man spend his youth in absolute idleness and vice of every kind, it will be impossible for him ever to retrieve his loss. He can never be what he might have been. He must be utterly incompetent to the duties of mature life; and must live and die in misery and disgrace. It is in the course of nature for men to transgress to a certain degree without total ruin, but if they go beyond that they are undone for this life. The relation which youth bears to mature age, is analogous to the relation which this life bears to the future. Both are states of probation. Then the eternity of punishment rests upon the simple and obvious principle, which we see exemplified every day, that a loss of time can never be made up: for no matter how much we improve our condition, it might have been better if we had never misdirected an effort. And also upon another principle which we see exemplified every day, that there are advantages afforded us by opportunities, which, if not embraced, can never be obtained again. We have now, we think, proved that the doctrine of universal salvation is not only anti-scriptural, but also unphilosophical. There is, however, one other point which we propose to notice.

It is urged by Balfour, in the work which we have been considering, as an objection to future punishments, that they

appeal to the fears of men; because all such appeals are productive of demoralizing effects;—that the preaching future punishments, “is as bad state policy, as it is false divinity;” “and shows as much ignorance of human nature, as it displays a want of common humanity.” Now this objection, absurd as we will prove it to be, is urged by Balfour, with as much assurance as though he had drunk the very fountains of omniscience dry. We are well aware that none but the all-seeing eye of God can discern all the secrets which lie hid in the lowest depths of the dark, and awful, and unfathomable abyss of the human heart; but yet we think that we can clearly see that nothing but pride, inordinate pride, a pride that cannot brook to be threatened even by God himself, could have prompted the human mind to urge such an objection against future punishments. Not appeal to the fears of men! Nothing can be more unphilosophical. Take away the restraining force of fear from the discipline of the world. Take it away from domestic discipline, from civil discipline, from religious discipline, and all domestic, civil, and religious subordination would be at an end, and the world, filled with parricide, murder and blasphemy, would retrograde into savage barbarism. In fact man would cease to exist; for he would be destroyed by the dangers, which fear makes him avoid. Every nation that has ever existed, has considered fear a powerful agent in making men virtuous; for they all have used punishment in domestic discipline; have all had penal codes, and all have believed in a religion that taught the doctrine of future punishments. It is not easy to imagine, by what a severe, tedious, protracted and minute discipline, nations have been brought to their present state of civilization. In the early stages of society, all the matters, which are now left to the control of manners, were regulated by law; swearing, lying, drunkenness, and all other acts which are now considered by governments, as mere immoralities against the rules of good manners, were then punished by law as crimes. It is impossible to estimate all the agency which fear has had in the civilization of man; for all criminal laws appeal to the fears, and will any man pretend that all criminal laws, which were ever written, have had a demoralizing effect?

We do not contend that an act done merely from the motive of fear, is virtuous; but we contend that fear has an important agency indirectly in making men virtuous, by restraining them in the indulgence of their propensities. This

we shall now attempt to show, by indicating a few mental processes in which fear has an agency.

If the fears of men ought not to be addressed, for what was the passion of fear designed in the structure of the human mind? Is it a pernicious nuisance amid the splendid glories of the intellectual creation; a monument of the incompetency of the great artificer; the premiss, from which Atheism may commence his blasphemous argument? It must be, if its legitimate effects are demoralizing. No: it is a faculty admirably adapted to useful ends in the mental economy. All the passions are in themselves innocent; it is only their abuse which is criminal. They are all subservient to wise purposes; are a means working to an end in the human constitution. Even anger, which a sickly philosophy that is prevalent in the world teaches ought to be extirpated, has a most important and sacred function to perform. It impels us to protect ourselves, and all that is dear to us. The office of hope is to sustain us in adversity, and of ambition to impel us to exertion. And so of all the others. But none of them have a more important function to perform than fear.

If we look into the phenomena of mind, we discover that there are passive impressions and active habits; and that by a law of our nature, passive impressions by being repeated, grow weaker, while active habits are strengthened by repeated acts. For instance, danger at first produces the passive impression of fear; but at last, by being accustomed to danger, we become courageous. Here then is the active habit of courage acquired by repeated exposure to danger; and the passive impression of fear weakened by it. Fear is a disagreeable act of the mind; and consequently the mind will endeavour to throw it off by acquiring the habit, which will prevent its recurrence; and courage is the only habit that will prevent its recurrence in this instance. In this way fear leads the mind into certain habits; such as caution, circumspection, prudence and respect, where these habits are the proper ones to prevent its recurrence. Let any man analyze his mind, and he will find that all these habits result in a great measure, if not altogether, from fear; for they are in fact modifications of fear. By the law that passive impressions grow weaker, while the active habits which they have led the mind to form grow stronger, the passive impressions cease to be motives at all, but give place to the active habits which become themselves motives of conduct, principles of

action, in which the mind delights. For example, the fear of want leads us into habits of industry, temperance and frugality; but at last these active habits will become the motives of our conduct, and a principle which we love, while the fear of want, which first led us into those habits, is entirely forgotten, and has no agency in the matter whatever. We now remain in those habits from the love of them; because it is a law of our nature for us to love our habits. Now this is the discipline by which all the virtues are produced in the soul; for these habits are virtues in themselves, and the motives which first led us into the course of conduct by which we acquired them, cannot alter their nature. How can we distinguish good from evil but by their consequences? Do we not distinguish poisons from wholesome food by their effects upon the animal economy; and is it not the fear of their deleterious consequences that prevent us from using them? for many of them are so pleasant to the taste, as to cause thousands to use them, until they destroy themselves. It is thus with vice and virtue, we can only distinguish them by their consequences upon the moral character; and it is our fear of the consequences of vice, that makes us abstain from the practice of it; for every vice is agreeable to us. But after practising the habits of self-denial, into which the fear of the consequences of vice has led us, we become fond of the habit. We esteem it a principle of conduct; and by a law of our nature, the more we practise it, the easier it becomes. Up to this point, in the moral discipline of man, fear brings us. It forces us into virtuous habits; yet our action, up to this point, may not perhaps be virtuous; but all our conduct afterwards is virtuous, because then the virtuous habits become the impelling motive. At last, by the mental law of association, we substitute the painful consequences of vice for vice itself, and hate vice, because we hate its consequences; and by the long practice of virtue, we become delighted with it, and substitute its delightful consequences in our minds for virtue itself. This is the last stage in moral discipline.

We see then by this psychological analysis, what an important agency fear exercises in the moral discipline of the world. If fear has an agency in making us moral, why should it not in making us religious? For surely it will not be contended that the moral system is on one plan, and the religious upon another. They are both addressed to the same faculties of man; and of course must be both adapted

to the same faculties. They are one and the same system. The same great law pervades them both. Love is the great fundamental law of Christianity, and the central principle of moral philosophy, embracing all its classifications of human duties. It is the principle of gravity in the moral system of the universe, holding together all its parts in perfect harmony.

Perhaps it may not be inappropriate here to make a short statement of the estimate in which persons who disbelieve in a future state of rewards and punishments are held by the common law of England and America; and the incapacity which such persons labour under in consequence of such disbelief.

The law requires that all testimony given in a court of justice should be free from all suspicion of untruth; and has therefore provided certain tests by which the truth of all testimony shall be tried. The first great test consists in requiring all evidence to be given under the sanction of an oath; and a judicial oath is defined by that eminent law writer, Starkie, on the eightieth page of the first volume of his *Evidence*, "to be a solemn invocation of the vengeance of the Deity upon the witness if he do not declare the whole truth as far as he knows it." "This," says Starkie, "imposes the strongest obligation upon the conscience of the witness to declare the whole truth, that human wisdom can devise; a wilful violation of the truth exposes him at once to temporal and eternal punishment." "Hence it follows, that all persons may be sworn as witnesses, who believe in the existence of God, in a future state of rewards and punishments, and in the obligation of an oath; that is, who believe that divine punishment will be the consequence of perjury; and therefore Jews, Mahometans, Gentoos, or in short, persons of any sect, possessed of such belief, are so far competent witnesses." And in another place (p. 102), he says, "Before a witness takes the oath, he may be asked whether he believes in the existence of a God, in the obligation of an oath, and in a future state of rewards and punishments; and if he does not, he cannot be admitted to give evidence."

These doctrines will show at once, that no man who disbelieves in a future state of rewards and punishments, can be a witness in a court of justice; for the policy of the law is founded upon the supposition, that all such persons are not to be believed upon their oaths; because they are incapable

of taking an oath, which is "a solemn invocation of the vengeance of the Deity upon the witness, if he do not declare the whole truth, as far as he knows it." The law estimates the veracity of Jews, Mohammedans, Gentoos, and all pagans, "who believe that divine punishment will be the consequence of perjury," much higher than it does that of the most enlightened man, who disbelieves in future punishments; and therefore it admits all those to be competent witnesses, while it excludes him.

It was decided in the supreme court of Connecticut, in the case of *Curtis vs. Strong* (*Day's Rep.* fourth volume, page fifty-one), that if a person, who disbelieves in a future state of rewards and punishments, appear as a witness in court, his disbelief shall be proved from his previous declarations out of court; and in such case he cannot be admitted to deny or explain in court, the declarations imputed to him; "for, says the court, it would seem to be incongruous to admit a man to his oath, for the purpose of learning from him, whether he had the necessary qualifications to be sworn." This decision has been fully sustained by the supreme court of the state of New York, in the case of *Jackson vs. Gridley* (18th vol. *Johnson's Rep.* page 102). The able chief justice Spencer said, in delivering the opinion of the court in that case, "I fully concur in the opinion expressed in *Curtis vs. Strong*, that it would be incongruous to admit a man to his oath, to ascertain whether an oath had any binding influence on his conscience." And concludes his learned opinion thus, "The very fact that a man professes such an awful creed, as renders him unworthy of credit, establishes that he should not be heard. Religion is a subject, on which every man has a right to think, according to the dictates of his understanding. It is a solemn concern between his conscience and his God, with which no human tribunal has a right to meddle. But in the developement of facts, and the ascertainment of truth, human tribunals have a right to interfere. They are bound to see that no man's rights are impaired or taken away, but through the medium of testimony, entitled to belief; and no testimony is entitled to credit, unless delivered under the solemnity of an oath, which comes home to the conscience of the witness, and will create a tie, arising from his belief, that false swearing would expose him to punishment in the life to come. On this great principle rest all our institutions, and especially the distribution of justice between man and man."

It appears from these decisions, that no person who disbelieves in a future state of rewards and punishments, can be admitted to give testimony in a court of justice; and if any witness be objected to, on account of such disbelief, he cannot even explain, so little credit does the law give to his testimony; but must call on others who do believe in future rewards and punishments, to explain for him, and rebut if it can be done, the testimony of those who are called to prove his disbelief.

ART. III.—*Modern Miracles and Wonders.*

S. H. J. Gander

WE cannot but admire the adroitness with which the Romish church adapts her arguments to every variety of zone and meridian. What might be good proof in Brazil would be laughed at among us, and therefore we have heretofore heard very little about relics, revelations, and miracles. Among the vulgar even in America, it must be owned however, these means have their ancient credit, and the priesthood make full use of them in a private way. We have ourselves known an instance in which it was attempted to remove an epileptic patient from regular medical treatment, to the care of a priest who was to cure him by prayer. When we read of the horrible impostures which have been used to propagate the Roman superstition, we are continually tempted to think that these were confined to the dark ages. But the truth is, in all countries where Protestantism has not unchained and enlarged the public mind, there is the same predilection for miracle-mongery and lying wonders. Cures are wrought at holy wells and famous shrines; pilgrimages are undertaken; and charlatans like Hohenlohe hoax the miserable populace.

There is a kind of mystical devotion peculiar to the Romish church, the effect of long continued contemplation upon a mind and body distempered by austerities, celibacy, and a mode of life at war with the organic laws of our nature. This devotion may be understood by a glance at the history of Saint Teresa, in Alban Butler's *Lives of the Saints*. It occurs chiefly in convents, and most of all among hysterical women, who have been emaciated by fasting, and reduced to a sickly susceptibility of nerve by the process of 'voluntary

humility.' Such devotion is full of ecstasy, and often grows into a supernatural phrensy, in which the patient is rapt, beholds visions, hears the music of heaven, and in a state of oscillation between madness and idiocy becomes a spectacle of awe to devotees; much after the fashion of an eastern Fakir or Marabout.

Such an occurrence in New York or Boston might create a sensation for a few weeks or months, but would soon become obsolete. Our good friends the Germans, however, are not to be so easily satisfied. They have a special proclivity towards the wonderful, and, to speak in the phrase of the self-styled phrenologists, their heads display a singular development of the organ of Marvellousness. The credulity which they evince, almost without exception, on the subject of Animal Magnetism, is an exemplification of this. While in England and America the whole thing is scouted as beneath serious notice, every one who is acquainted with the current German literature is aware that its periodical publications are fraught with reference to this subject which evince a thorough belief of all its alleged wonders. Thus we could name pious men who have sought the cure of diseases by animal magnetism, and professed Christians who believe that miracles may be wrought by the same power. So also, it is widely believed that the faculty of *clear-vision*, obtained during magnetic sleep, communicates to the somnambulistic patient an elevation above time and space, and an insight into things otherwise out of reach. The obstructions of matter and distance, and the feebleness or limited nature of organs being removed, the soul can look into matters a thousand miles off, or by a singular introversion examine the condition of its own proper body. Thus patients look at their own insides, see what is the matter, and prescribe accordingly. This is not to be laughed at, unless you would laugh at half the wise men in Germany.

Within the last year some interest has been excited by the cures of a certain thaumaturg of Constance, by name Eigler. This man removed some years since from Carlsruhe, and his house is filled with a concourse of patients, principally from Swabia and Switzerland. When they are presented to him he first prays with them, and then gives them a paper on which three prayers are printed. For this they pay one groschen. He puts on a great show of piety. Among his admirers and panegyrists are many educated people. It is

supposed that in January 1835 he was resorted to by no less than five hundred men. Some of these remain from six to eight days. His common method is described to be this: he first takes the patient alone, writes his name and disease in a book which he places on the floor, and causes the patient to kneel upon it, while he prays over him in a low voice. When the numbers increased he took ten or more together. His usual questions were, Whether they firmly believed in his power to save them; Of what religion they were, &c. Then after an exercise of prayer, he cries, with an imposing and imperious tone, "Arise in the name of Jesus, faith hath made thee whole!"

There have been such impostures in every age and nation, and under every form of false religion. But they become alarming when they offer themselves under the garb of Christianity, and especially when they are received by good and learned men as worthy of credit, or as justifying any expense of philosophical investigation. The extreme of credulity in these matters to which we know some excellent German divines to go, fills us with unfeigned apprehension; for it is well adapted to bring a reproach upon evangelical religion. The indiscriminating reception of every legend which may be concocted in a nunnery, even though it is not accompanied by any acknowledgement of popish doctrines, carries with it disastrous consequences. It shakes the pillars of historical evidence, accustoms the mind to familiar dealing with unreasonable fabrications, cultivates a distempered love for the marvellous, and even tends to vitiate the faculty of separating truth from falsehood. And therefore we look upon the connexion of this credulity with evangelical piety as very unfortunate, and as paving the way for an irruption of infidelity. Indeed there is nothing in the character of the modern British mind which we regard as so conducive to the rational investigation and defence of religion, as that cool, critical, reserved and undaunted manner with which it looks at the gorgons, hydras and chimeras dire of the superstitions which affrighted our ancestors. In the meantime Germany is at frequent intervals agitated with some new miracle; and one of the most interesting is that which has recently been published under the following title: "The bitter sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the meditations of the godly Anna Catharina Emmerich, Augustinian nun of the Convent Agnetenburg at Dülmen. With a Memoir

of the deceased.”* As she was, in one respect, a follower of St. Francis, let us premise a word respecting him.

After the veneration of the cross became a part of the Popish superstition, it was a natural wish among devotees to have, or at least to be thought to have, the marks of Christ's death imprinted on their bodies. The first who received these stigmata, so far as we are informed, was the great founder of the Friar Minors, St. Francis of Assisi; and the event occurred about the year 1224. That our account may be wholly impartial, we choose to adopt the language of Alban Butler, one of the most accredited compilers of Catholic legends.† After relating that the saint had been for some time in an ecstasy of devotion, in which he had a vision of our Saviour, the biographer proceeds: “After a secret and intimate conversation, the vision disappearing, his soul remained interiorly inflamed with a seraphic ardour, and his body appeared exteriorly to have received the image of the crucifix, as if his flesh, like soft wax, had received the mark of a seal impressed upon it. For the marks of nails began to appear in his hands and feet, resembling those he had seen in the vision of the man crucified. His hands and feet seemed bored through in the middle with four wounds, and these wounds appeared to be pierced with nails of hard flesh; the heads were round and black, and were seen in the palms of his hands, and in his feet in the upper part of the instep. The points were long, and appeared beyond the skin on the other side, and were turned back as if they had been clenched with a hammer. There was also in his right side a red wound, as if made by the piercing of a lance; and this often threw out blood, which stained the tunic and drawers of the saint.” “St. Francis endeavoured nothing more than to conceal this singular favour of heaven from the eyes of man, and for this purpose he ever after covered his hands with his habit, and wore shoes and the feet of stockings on his feet.”‡ After this preface we are ready for our principal narrative.

Anna Catharina Emmerich, the person to whom we have referred, was born September 8th, 1774, near Koesfeld in Westphalia. In this part of Germany, and especially in the

* Sulzbach 1833, pp. 406, 2d. edition, 1834.

† Lives of the Saints, Vol. X. p. 99. ff. edit. Lond. 1814.

‡ Mr. Butler adds in a note the remarkable circumstances, that Wadding saw, in the convent of the poor Clares at Assisium, a pair of these half-stockings made by St. Clare for St. Francis, with the parts raised above and below for the heads and points of the nails. Blood from his side is kept in the cathedral at Recanati.

region of Munster, there prevails a superstition very similar to the Second Sight of the Scottish Highlands. Persons who have this endowment are privileged with a foresight of deaths, marriages, and other important events. The name given to such a seer is *Gucker*, in low German *Gicker*, literally a Peeper. The parents of Catharina were poor peasants, and her education consisted in little else than a perpetual revolving of Romish offices and legends. The influence of such a regimen upon an ignorant and susceptible mind was what might have been expected. She became the subject of a direful malady which involved first the imagination, and afterwards all the other powers of body and mind. The wildest dreams of Swedenborg are moderate compared with her revelations. In early childhood she was favoured with a sight of her tutelary angel, of the blessed virgin, and of the infant Jesus, with whom she even played. We are told that these things are common in Munster. At this tender age she was possessed of a discernment which enabled her to distinguish the good, pure, and holy, from the evil, corrupt, and profane, both in natural and spiritual matters. Thus she gathered simples which were unknown to others, and rejected such herbs as were noxious or abused to magical purposes.

The self-inflicted penances of this deluded girl were extraordinary. In winter she would go barefoot in the snow for hours together; and these mortifications tended to make inveterate that susceptibility of the nerves and the mind which was the basis of all that followed. The least degree of sin, we are informed, would crush her spirit, so as to produce sickness. In the mean time dreams and visions increased upon her. These, however, she seldom mentioned, thinking, in the simplicity of her heart, that every body had the same. It may be imagined how the constant reading of inflammatory lives of saints would operate upon a crazy constitution such as Catharina's. As a matter of course she sighed for the monastic life, of which she was already anticipating the harshest macerations in her voluntary discipline. It was not her happiness to accomplish this desire until the year 1802, when she was admitted to the Augustinian nunnery at Dülmen, being then in her twenty-eighth year. Long before this, however, she had received a very extraordinary token, the first of that train which made her so famous, and caused the story of her miraculous impressions to be circulated by the good Catholics of Westphalia just as tracts are

circulated by us. As she was, on a time, kneeling at her evening devotions before the altar in the Jesuits church at Koesfeld, the blessed Saviour appeared to her, issuing from what is called by Romanists the Tabernacle. He held in his left hand a wreath of flowers, and in his right a crown of thorns, offering her the choice. She chose the latter and pressed it with transport upon her head. On coming to herself she was sensible of a severe pain about the head, and a swelling around the temples; and after a while blood began to issue from the parts affected. She concealed this for a long time, but her biographer professes to have witnessed this bleeding, most unequivocally, many years afterwards. This choice of the crown of thorns with the consequent bleeding has been experienced by several Romish saints, particularly Catharine of Siena, and Pasithea de Cragis.

In her conventual life, Catharina suffered much from the envy and ill-nature of the sisterhood; but she appears to have borne this and all her other trials with exemplary meekness. After the dissolution of the monastery in 1811, she received, during one of her ecstasies, a double signature of the cross upon her breast, and somewhat later, the lively impression of our Saviour's five wounds; a favour by no means rare in Romish legendary story, and called in Popish phrase *stigmatisation*. We are assured by the author, that the number of persons who have been thus marked is by no means small; since Francis of Assisi, there have been more than fifty. The miracle occurred while Catharina was lying with outstretched arms in a stupor of ecstasy, just as any one may see in the pictures of St. Francis. She was immediately sensible of a change in her whole habit of body, as if the current of blood had rushed violently towards the wounds. After this *vulnus divinum plaga amoris viva* was received, Catharina became bed-ridden. She was now incapable of receiving any strong nutriment, and lived upon weak wine and water, or water alone, or the juice of a cherry or a plum in the smallest quantities. The mysterious wounds bled regularly on Fridays. Towards the end of the year 1819 the bleeding became less frequent, and at length, after having been open for seven years, were entirely closed, leaving bright cicatrices, which reddened upon all high days, and sometimes bled on Good Fridays.

Reader, these things occurred not in Spain, but in Germany, not in the middle ages, but in the nineteenth century. Incredible as they may seem to sceptics of the Anglo-Saxon

race, they appear to be fully credited even by philosophical and pious Protestants in Germany. They were not done in a corner, but are attested by some of the first men in that country. After they became the subject of common rumour, a commission was appointed by the ecclesiastical authorities of Munster, the result of which was a confirmation of the whole story. Dr. Von Druffel, Medical-counsellor-in-chief, acted as the physician in this investigation, of which he gave a detailed account in the Salzburg Medical Journal of 1814, vol. i. p. 145. vol. ii. p. 17. Dean Overberg, a man of note in Germany, annually visited the patient until the end of her life, and substantiates the account. Bishop Wittmann, and Dr. J. M. Sailer, greatly celebrated as a professor, author, and prelate, confirm the statements in full. To these may be added the Princess Galitzin, and Count Leopold von Stolberg. Leading evangelical journals, far from doubting the alleged facts, only differ as to the mode of explaining them. The author of the work from which these details are taken was the most sedulous observer of the wonders, and for several of the last years of her life waited upon her with most religious awe, and wrote from her dictation what he has since made public. Catharina became an object of universal curiosity so that the visits were burdensome. She lay always in an extreme of bodily weakness, and her sacred wounds were always exceedingly painful. She constantly treated them as the punishment of her sins.

While she was thus confined to her bed, she was by the power of a wonderful imagination, or if you please by miracle, engaged in frequent spiritual excursions; visiting distant countries and witnessing events far remote from her corporal whereabouts. And what is most remarkable, she often bore upon her person the bodily marks of fatigue, labour, or accident. Thus, when she had, in vision, worked some days in pulling up thistles out of a field—by which was symbolically represented the purifying of bishoprics—her hands and arms bore the ordinary marks of this employment. This is fully accordant with the most approved records of saintship. St. Paula used thus to visit the holy places. The same happened to Columba of Rieti, and Sidwina of Schiedam, the latter of whom on returning from her putative expeditions was affected in body just as if they had been real; she was weary, wounded in the feet, bruised and scratched with thorns, she even sprained her ankle during one of her excursions and lay longer confined in consequence than if it had

been an ordinary luxation. And we all remember it as a ruled case in the matter of night-mare, that those who have been witch-ridden during sleep, suffer all the exhaustion which would be produced by a similar exercise in their waking hours.

Catharina's nocturnal pilgrimages were usually to those places of which she had read in sacred history or legendary tales. These places her imagination peopled with all the holy ones of the calendar, and she saw these personages face to face, and held with them the moral edifying colloquies which are duly recorded and published for the benefit of Romanists. She was familiar in her travels with the holy land, and not only detailed all the particulars of our Saviour's life and passion, but recounted the whole apostolic history for some weeks after Pentecost, day by day, minutely describing places, persons, manners, discourses and miracles. It was part of her supposed calling to bear, in a vicarious manner, the diseases of many other persons. These she endured with all their distinctive symptoms, and sometimes so severely that she seemed to be at the point of death. However strange this may seem to us, it appears to be agreeable to the rule in such case made and provided, in the routine of saints' miracles. The devotee of Prevorst, of whom Kerner gives account, had the same endowment. This saint had so lively a sympathy with the miseries of others, that when a sick person came near her, even without touching, she immediately was seized with all the same afflictions, and the sufferer of course was relieved.

We almost blush for the honour of Christianity when we find such fables gravely published in enlightened Germany, and such drivellings as those of Sister Emmerich, recorded as revelations, and solemnly received even by Protestant divines. As a physical and psychological phenomenon, we regard the whole affair as interesting, and it is only from this consideration that we lend our pages to a few of Catharina's visions, as reported by her awe-struck amanuensis. It may be pertinent to premise that raptures of this sort are not confined to the Romish religion. The priestesses of the oracles had the same ecstasies. And we learn from the collections of Von Hammer, and the versions which Tholuck and Schlegel have made from the eastern mystics, that the Soofies and other fanatical Mussulmans are affected in a similar way. In Witgenstein-Berleburg, more than a century ago, there appeared a quarto volume of revelations made

to an inspired devotee. We might mention also the notices of a female seer, published at Frankfort, by J. F. Von Meier; the account of another given by Justinus Kerner; "The Mystical City of God, or the Life of the Virgin Mary," revealed by herself to sister Maria de Jesu, abbess of the nunnery of the Immaculate Conception, translated from the Spanish by T. Crozet, and published in three quarto volumes at Brussels, in 1715. But we rather hasten to get through with one or two of the precious morsels gathered from the lips of Anna Catharina.

"The chalice," said she, "which the apostles procured from Veronica, is a wonderful mysterious vessel. For a long time it had lain in the temple among other costly articles, but its use was forgotten, as is likewise the case among us Christians, with many a sacred relic of antiquity, which by the lapse of time has fallen into oblivion. It often happened in the temple, that antiquated unknown vessels were discarded, and sold, or re-wrought; and so in divine providence this most holy vessel, after various fruitless attempts to melt it down, was laid aside, and at length found by the young priests in the treasure-chamber of the temple along with other things, thrown away as a forgotten piece of furniture. The chalice and its appendages procured by Seraphim, had often been used at feasts where Jesus was entertained, and has now become the permanent property of the holy church." If the reader is unable to see the value of this revelation, we must attempt to edify him by a vision of Melchisedek. "Melchisedek did not seem to me to be very old. He was slender, tall, and uncommonly grave and mild. He was clad in a long white dress, like no earthly garment I ever saw. Abraham's white raiment was soiled in comparison with it. It seemed all light. He had a girdle marked with certain letters, and laid down, when he made oblation, a white plaited cap, such as priests afterwards used. His hair was long and fair, like light silk, and he wore a small, pointed, cloven beard. His countenance was shining. Before him every thing was solemn. It was said to me that he was a priestly angel and messenger of God." We cannot record any more of this unfortunate creature's delirium; it is almost a mortification to have said so much. The deranged woman was liberated from her sufferings on the 9th of February 1824.

Wonderful as this account is, we confess that we are no less surprised at the manner in which it has been received

by some of the evangelical and learned Protestants of Germany. It may serve as a wholesome caveat against the vagaries of this imaginative and superstitious people, if we spend a little more time in unfolding the lamentable hallucination which is exhibited in the present case. We find the history of the nun of Dülmen reviewed in two of the leading evangelical journals of the last year; the *Repertorium* of Professor Rheinwald and the *Journal of Hengstenberg*. But how is the narrative received? Instead of questioning the allegations, or rebuking the fraud or credulity of the Papists, both these journals yield implicit credence to the story, and attempt its explanation, upon a hypothesis in which there is a jumble of mysticism, animal magnetism, superstition and magic. The article in the *Repertorium* closes thus: "The writer of this review is not ashamed to avow, that by an affectionate yielding of himself to such relations, he has found his spirit hallowed, his mind elevated and quickened; in a word, he has been edified. We therefore thank the editor for this communication."*

The article in the *Evangelical Journal of Berlin* goes more deeply into the subject. After reprimanding the incredulity of some minds, the writer says: "But when, in opposition to such opinions, we avow our belief in the truth of the alleged facts, and seek their explanation in the depths of the spiritual life in which this pious nun existed, we hope no one will therefore consider us as acknowledging the entire system of the church to which she belonged." And after this disclaimer he proceeds to an investigation which bears the sign-manual of Germanism as fully as any thing we have ever met with. In this aspect, a sketch of the theory may not be out of place or uninteresting. No one who reads what follows, as coming from one of the most orthodox of modern German periodicals, will any longer wonder at the mysteries of transcendental metaphysics. The following theory of ecstatic affections is given with all the faithfulness of which we are capable.

Ecstasy is that extraordinary, self-conscious condition of the soul, in which it is more or less free from the fetters of the body, enters into contact with the world of spirits, and then, in a higher or lower degree, becomes itself active as a demon, either good or evil. Self-consciousness is characteristic of ecstasy, distinguishing it from delirium, mania,

* *Allg. Repertorium f. d. theol. Litteratur. B. X. p. 199.*

and dreaming. This remarkable power of the soul, which elevates it above time and space, is called by our theorizer *psychical magic*, of which animal magnetism and second sight are species. The forms in which ecstasy reveals itself are four:

1. *Ecstasy, in which the soul seems to lose all its influence over the body.* This is exemplified in the trances of those who are apparently dead. It lasts sometimes for weeks and months. The external senses are quickened, but the power of motion is gone; and in religious minds there is a degree of rapture which is indescribable.

2. *Ecstasy, in which the soul by its spiritual nature conquers the materiality of the body, and in a sort spiritualizing matter, exercises over it an extraordinary dominion.* This is the exact converse of the former. Thus we see hysterical patients during their paroxysms, sometimes force themselves into holes and crevices which are narrower than the compass of their bodies! It is evidently by this power that somnambulists mount the most dangerous elevations during sleep. "This magic power, greatly roused at places of pilgrimages, and concentrated at saints' shrines as at a magnetic focus, and then streaming back upon the patient, often produces strong convulsions, and not unfrequently accomplishes cures of nervous diseases, and particularly lameness." This magic power can operate both within and without one's body. It is well known that John Joseph Gassner could by a volition cause convulsions in his patients. Nay, he could stop the pulsation of the arteries and the heart. And it is a very common thing for influence of this kind to extend for miles.

3. *Ecstasy in which, even during the ecstatic condition, the memory is unimpaired.* To this our author refers the visions of all true prophets and seers. Of this sort, we are also told, were the inspirations of Jacob Boehme. This species of ecstasy is by far the most interesting in a psychological aspect.

4. *Ecstasy, of which there is usually no remembrance, after it has passed.* This has become very common in Germany among the magnetic somnambulists, or clairvoyants. It is most common with women of weak nerves. The characteristic is the forgetting of the ecstatic incidents during the interval of sanity. These incidents of the *crisis*, as it is called, are brought to the recollection of their subject, by some second person, or they occur to the mind as

having been dreamed. "But even in this case, people thus affected have not the faintest suspicion that their dreams are mere copies of actual ecstatic occurrences. Thus they will sometimes relate, as a dream, that they have looked inwards at their heart or liver, and that they had prescribed for themselves such and such medicines; without any thought that all this has actually taken place during the ecstasy of clear vision."

The reviewer will not hear of any unfair dealing in the transaction; he seems to honour the sick nun as an unearthly creature, and sets about an explanation of all the marvels, with his convenient apparatus of animal magic. Catharina's ecstasy was of the third kind of those just enumerated. From her earliest years she enjoyed a measure of inspiration. In the country of her birth the so-called *Gicker*, or mysterious *peepers*, are at home. The second sight of these and of certain Scotch personages is attributed to some peculiarity of temperament. The intercourse of Catharina with angels, we are told it would be unreasonable to deny. The Protestant reviewer is less credulous about her familiarity with the virgin Mary. Her power of distinguishing good from noxious plants is admitted as an ecstatic insight into the *signatura rerum*. She had a wonderful discernment of true from false relics. This is a difficult problem for a good Lutheran, but he shows an amazing adroitness in evading the dilemma. These relics had been so often used as talismans and charms, that they may at length—*risum teneatis amici?*—have become magnetized!

After this it is not surprising that the nun's communion with departed spirits presents no difficulties. Even the crown of thorns, periodically bleeding, and the five wounds of Christ impressed on her body, are not questioned; but are accounted for as being the effects of powerful ecstasy. The writer brings as an illustration, the case of those who suffer from *Ephialtes*. These persons, during a half-waking condition, are apt to behold some goblin, ehimera, or fiery horse, gliding slowly by. This visiter seats itself upon the pit of the stomach, and presses the victim until he cannot move a limb and can scarcely breathe. After such attacks of the incubus we often find livid spots, *sugillationes*, which the vulgar take to be the tracks of the Alp or Night-mare. Just of this nature, but from an operation far more intense, does the writer suppose the wound to have been. And he goes into a pathological investigation to show from analogy

that there is nothing inexplicable in the periodical bleeding of the wounds. For our part, we should find it less hard to believe that the whole mystery has much the same origin with the ghost of Cock-Lane; or that the wounds and the bleeding were self-inflictions of fanatic fury, even if they were not sheer fabrications. There is no setting bounds to the phrensy of "silly women" when they are once led astray by a dire superstition. This very writer gives a remarkable instance of female vanity aggravated to mania in the case of a girl who was so struck with the *éclat* of an execution, that she determined to commit a murder herself in order to enjoy the envied lot of the fair sufferer whom she saw to be the object of universal pity.

We have no patience, however, to debate this question, or even to go through the details of the rationale. Enough has been said to show that Romanists gape as much as ever after lying wonders, and that the deceivableness of unrighteousness has not abated; and also to exemplify the diseased thirst for the marvellous which prevails even among the best men in Germany.

If such tales gain credence among the learned, what may we not expect among the vulgar? It is only a few years since we read an account in a German magazine of a singular enthusiast who actually caused herself to be nailed to a cross by her infatuated brothers and sisters. The credulity and fanaticism indicated by fondness for such legends prepares the way for tragedies like that which was enacted at Berne in 1504. Though this well-attested narrative has been often repeated, we cannot forbear a partial rehearsal of it, on account of the light it throws on our principal subject.

It is known that Franciscans contend for the immaculate conception of the virgin Mary. The Dominicans, in order to maintain the contrary, fell upon a horrid scheme, of which the victim was a lay-brother named Jetzer. After a series of pretended apparitions, and a long succession of austerities, in which Jetzer's imagination became prepared for the catastrophe, the prior of the convent assumed the person of the virgin Mary, and among many other communications, all bearing some relation to the doctrine to be denied, told poor Jetzer, that he should receive the five wounds of the Redeemer. Accordingly the pretended virgin took his hand by force, and drove a nail through it, which threw the wretched man into great torment. The next night, the monks gave him an opiate and impressed on his body the

four other wounds of Christ. In this condition he awoke, and being greatly rejoiced at the favour, exhibited himself on the principal altar of the convent to great multitudes. The affair was investigated at Rome, commissioners were sent to examine into the facts, the whole imposture was exposed, and the four friars chiefly concerned were degraded in 1509.*

After the discovery of so many impostures of this kind, one might expect that Papists would have more worldly wisdom than to vaunt their miracles, as any proof of their system. But by that infatuation which often accompanies deceit, they seem driven to repeat their most incredible fictions for the thousandth time. In our ignorance, we had thought that the humbug of St. Januarius's blood had grown stale even at Naples. How were we astonished then, to see, but the other day, in the Catholic Herald of Philadelphia, a detailed account and triumphant vindication of this marvel! But to come nearer home, we are indebted to the Churchman, No. 360, for a notice, which shows that the power of working miracles may be carried to our side of the Atlantic. "The public attention here," says a letter from a gentleman in France to his friend in Boston, "has been, for weeks past, absorbed in the miracles performed, with God's all-potent grace, by Monseigneur Flaget, the venerable Bishop of Bardstown, Kentucky. He has spent some time in this Diocese, replacing our invalid bishops in several pastoral courses, and has been every where admired for his sanctity and humility: people have crowded from all parts to receive his benediction. The miracles are authentic, seen and known by all the world; he has operated the cure of a number of sick and infirm, and the episcopal residence was thronged with the suffering of various classes, as in the times of our divine Saviour, when, by imposition of hands, he cured the lame, the blind, and other infirm, as related in the gospel."

The subject of one of these miracles was a Miss Monti, a young lady of twenty-two years, a model of piety, who, in consequence of a severe malady, had both her legs paralyzed, and was continually confined to her bed, where she could not be moved without great suffering.

"The young lady exposes her unhappy situation to the prelate: he exhorts her to patience and resignation, but above all, to trust in God's mercy. 'If you wish it,' said he

* Maclaine's Moshcim, Vol. IV. 20.

to the sufferer, 'we will make together a little novena to implore of the Almighty a perfect conformity his most holy will: to this intention let us recite daily, the litanies of the Sacred Heart, and other prayers.' After some further conversation, the prelate gave his benediction to the patient, and returned to Nantes. About half an hour after his departure, Miss Monti, finding herself alone, commenced offering the prayers agreed upon, when, hardly had she proceeded with the litanies of the Sacred Heart, than she felt a gentle heat spreading over her body from the lower extremities. She leaps out from her bed, exclaiming, '*I am cured.*' Her father, who was not far off, hastens to her, and they fall into each other's embraces. She prostrates herself to render thanks to God. She wishes to write immediately to the venerable bishop, to inform him of what was passed. Mr. and Mrs. Monti start for Nantes with letter. On their arrival at the episcopal mansion they are, at first, hardly able to utter any thing but '*She is cured.*' They express their warm gratitude to the pious bishop of Bardstown, whose humility is confounded, and who, next morning, left the city for Angers."

In the close of these remarks we may be allowed to say, that the several incidents, ancient and modern, to which we have referred in the preceding pages, affect us with a peculiar distress, as affording a remarkable comment on the apostolical description of that WICKED, "whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the truth, that they might be saved."

Wm. Jones.

ART. IV.—*Perpetuity of the Church.*

IT is a favourite argument of the Romanists against the Protestants, that the church must be visible and conspicuous, and enjoy a perpetual succession of bishops and other ministers. The Protestant churches, they say, are new; they were not known before the time of Luther, and no man during the fifteen centuries preceding Luther, taught in all respects the same doctrine. The following are the outlines of an argument in reply.

I. What is to be understood by the "Church?" Bellarmin defines it thus: *Coetus hominum ejusdem Christianae fidei professione et eorundem sacramentorum communione sub regimine legitimorum pastorum et praecipue unius Christi in terris vicarii Romani pontificis colligatus.* (A company of men bound together by the profession of the same Christian faith, and by communion of the same sacraments under the government of lawful pastors, and especially of the Roman Pontiff, the only vicar of Christ on earth); *De Ecclesia*, lib. 3, c. 2. Gregory of Valentia defines it thus: *Una Christi Ecclesia alia non est nisi ea fidelium congregatio quae paret Romano pontifici pro tempore existenti.* (The true church of Christ is no other than that congregation of the faithful, which obeys the Roman Pontiff, for the time being), Tom. III. Comment. Diss. p. 1, Qu. 1, col. 169. Valerian has it thus, *Dicimus hominis communicantes in fide cum pontifice Romano, constituere illum coetum qui solus est vera Ecclesia Christi.* (We say that the men communicating in faith with the Roman Pontiff constitute that company which alone is the true church of Christ.)

There is no contending, if we allow these definitions. They were made to preclude argument. We shall see by and by whether they are just. The Augustan or Augsburg Confession (Art. VII.) gives this definition: *Congregatio sanctorum in qua Evangelium recte docetur et recte administrantur sacramenta.* (The church is the congregation of saints in which the gospel is *rightly* taught, and the sacraments *rightly* administered.) This definition, though less exclusive than those given above, seems to be sufficiently so. There can be no great danger in joining that congregation in which the gospel is rightly taught, and the sacraments are rightly administered. It admits the Romanist to argue that his church is the only church which answers the description. The word "saints" may be understood in two senses, *viz.* in respect to external vocation, as in Romans 1: 7; Philip. 4: 21, 22, or in respect to internal conviction, spiritual regeneration, as in 1 Cor. 6: 11; 2 Cor. 7: 1.

II. The definitions of Bellarmin, Gregory, and Valerian, are liable to many difficulties. If obedience to the Roman Pontiff is the unfailing mark of the true church, what becomes of the church of the Old Testament? Where was the church during the time of Christ and his apostles before the Roman Pontiff was known? What becomes of the Greek church which never acknowledged the jurisdiction of the

Roman Pontiff? What would become of the church, if there should be no Pontiff at Rome, or if he should fall into heresy? What place in scripture teaches that the true church is united under one visible head and vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. When and where did the bishop of Rome receive this pre-eminence over all other bishops? It is not yet conclusively proved that the bishops of Rome are the successors of the apostle Peter, and if it were proved that they are successors to his seat, they are not his successors in doctrine. When did Peter urge traditions beyond the scripture? Where has he taught the adoration of images? the invocation of saints? the doctrine of salvation by works? of purgatory? of the seven sacraments? Did he deny to the laity the cup in the sacrament of the communion of the Lord's Supper? Did he claim to be the head of the whole church and the vicar of Christ on earth? Was he the only pillar in the church? Gal. 1: 9. Were not James and John also pillars, and were not they also called, not in the sense of pre-eminent authority, conferred by Christ, but on account of the excellency of their spiritual gifts? Peter called himself a fellow presbyter, 1 Peter 5: 1. Christ needs no vicar on earth. He is present with his followers always even unto the end of the world, Matt. 28: 20. He fills and governs all things, Eph. 1: 22, 23. It is beyond the power of man to govern the whole church. The pope cannot understand all languages, and that is a papal reason against translating the Bible. They ought rather to conclude from it that he is unfit to be the head of the whole church. To lead the church of God into the knowledge of the truth is the office of the Holy Spirit, which the apostles and the church were required to wait for at Jerusalem before entering upon their ministry, Acts 5: 4, 5; see also John 14: 26. There is then no necessity that the church should be bound under one Pontiff or Episcopal head, and in the Roman Catholic catechism, Art. 9. Symb. Qu. 2, the definition of Augustin, Ps. 149, is retained, *quod ecclesia sit populus fidelis per universum orbem dispersus*. (That the church is the faithful people dispersed through the whole world.)

III. It is sufficient then to define the church to be an assembly in which the word of God is rightly taught, and the sacraments rightly administered. This assembly is understood in scripture, in different senses—sometimes it is used for the promiscuous assembly of *the called*, as in apostolical salutations—sometimes for the company of the elect. It is sometimes, Isa. 40: 11, called the flock of God; John 10:

12; Luke 12: 32; sometimes the spouse of the Lord, Isa. 62: 5; John 8: 29; Rev. 22: 17; sometimes it is called the body of the Lord, Eph. 4: 15; 5: 23; Colos. 1: 18. It is called a glorious church, not having a spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but holy and blameless, Eph. 5: 29.

IV. In both senses perpetuity belongs to the church. It is God's purpose that there shall always exist among men an external or visible society in which the word may be preached and the sacraments administered, Isa. 55: 10; 69: 21. Some of the ancients thus proved the perpetuity of the church or society of *the called*. God abideth, Ps. 9: 8. His counsel and his will abide, Isa. 46: 10. His word abideth, Isa. 40: 8. Preachers of the word abide, 2 Cor. 5: 18—20. Hearers abide, 1 John 3: 11. Men receiving the word abide, Isa. 55: 11. Therefore the church abides.

V. But perpetuity is especially promised to the invisible church; that is, the church of the elect. To the church, in this sense, especially belong those bright promises in Matt. 16: 18, and 28: 30. Christ is called a pastor, a bridegroom, and the head of his church. As therefore there can be no king without a kingdom, no pastor without a flock, no bridegroom without a bride, no head without a body, so Christ is not without a church, which is His kingdom, John 18: 36; Luke 17: 20—His flock, 1 Peter 5: 3; John 10: 12—His bride, John 3: 29; Hosea 2: 19; 1 Cor. 11: 2; Eph. 5: 25—His body, Eph. 1: 23; 4: 16; 5: 23; Colos. 1: 18; 3: 15. For this invisible company the Son intercedes with the Father that he would preserve it in his name, John 17: 11; even now sitting at the right hand of God the Father, Rom. 8: 34; Heb. 9: 24; 1 John 2: 1; John 11: 42.

VI. Papists err greatly in applying to the Roman church those passages of scripture which are applied to this divine company dispersed throughout the world. No where has God promised perpetuity to any particular church or collection of persons at any particular place. The most flourishing of the ancient churches no longer exist, and did not God himself threaten the church at Ephesus that he would withdraw the light of the gospel unless she repented? The famous passage "Thou art Peter," &c. Matt. 16: 18, is nothing to the purpose. Peter was not created bishop of Rome at that time and place; nor is it there taught that the western church should repose upon his person. Much less was any perpetuity promised thereby to the Roman church in particular. The rock referred to was the confession which Peter

had made, or the truth which he had asserted, and not his person; other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid.

VII. The perpetuity of the church here intended, does not imply perpetual prosperity or external splendour. The church may be oppressed, so that its very existence shall be doubted by the world. What says Elijah in 1 Kings 19: 10? see also Rom. 11: 2—4. The Old Testament church, during the Babylonish captivity, was in a state of great depression. So likewise during the times of the Maccabees, 1 Mac. 1: 43, 67. The apostle likewise describes a condition of great distress in Heb. 11: 37, 38; and to give but one example more—when Christ was apprehended, one of his followers denied him, the rest fled from him, and when he was suspended on the cross, none dared to say aught against the decrees of the Jewish senate. Where was the external splendour of the church of Christ at these periods? The Romanists are wrong then in supposing that the perpetuity of the church is inseparably connected with a condition of external splendour.

VIII. Nor is the true spiritual church always in a state of prosperity. What says Isaiah of the church in his day in ch. 1: 4, &c.? Elijah complains of great defection in the spiritual church, at a time when the external visible church enjoyed great splendour, 1 Kings 19: 10. How few of the Jewish church were found faithful during the life of our Lord on this earth. The doctrine of the Pharisees and Lawyers was corrupt. They knew not the triune existence of God. They knew not that the expected Messiah was the true God. The doctrine of the necessity of regeneration was not known by masters in Israel, John 3: 10. The resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul were denied by some. Even the better and stricter sect was hypocritical and ostentatious in the practices of religion, while others were guilty of flagrant outrages against good morals.

IX. The origin of the New Testament church, dating from the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, was a time of great spiritual prosperity. The word of God increased, and the number of disciples was multiplied, Acts 6: 7, and they continued in the doctrine of the apostles, in fellowship, breaking of bread, and prayer, Acts 2: 42. So great was the prosperity of the church at Rome, that the faith of its members was spoken of throughout the whole world, Rom. 1: 8. The Corinthians were enriched in all utterance

and knowledge, 1 Cor. 1: 5. The Ephesians and Colossians manifested their faith in Christ and love to all saints, Eph. 1: 15; Col. 1: 4. But this state of things was soon changed. The age succeeding that of the apostles and those who had heard them, was marked by combinations of impious error, and by the fraud and delusions of false teachers.* The Arians, Montanists, Donatists, at an early period, desolated the church, and the early Christian writers inveigh strongly against the immoralities committed by members of the church.†

X. The Romanists teach, as one of the marks of the true church, that it is always visible like a city built on a hill, which cannot be hid. With them it has been an argument against the Reformed churches, that they are obscure, confined to narrow limits.‡ In this they err. They ought to remember that Christ has no where promised perpetual splendour to his church. On the contrary, he predicted miseries, calamities, vexations. Blessed are ye when men persecute you, Matt. 5: 12; and this is said in the same chapter where he calls his disciples or his church a city set on a hill. All who will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution, 2 Tim. 3: 12; see also 1 Cor. 4: 13; Isaiah 54: 11, and 62: 4. It is called a little flock, Luke 12: 32; see Isaiah 1: 8. Although therefore the *company of the elect* can never be deceived, but will always remain entire and pure, Matt. 24: 24, yet the *company of the called* may fluctuate not only as to external splendour and prosperity, but as to purity of doctrine and morals.

XI. Christ promised his Spirit to lead his followers into all truth, and that the gates (or counsels) of hell should not prevail against the church. The Romanists rely strongly upon these promises, and apply them to their own communion exclusively. These promises, if of general application in respect of time, cannot be applied to any particular church or society *absolutely*, but only upon the *condition of obedience* to the divine will revealed in the word of God, and *of submission* to the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Nor are they so much applicable to the visible church or the company of the called, as to the invisible church or the company of the elect. In regard to the promise of the gift of the Spirit

* Eusebii Hist. Book 3, ch. 32.

† Tertullian *de cultu feminarum, de velandis virginibus, de pudicitia*. Cyprian, Epistle VI. Eusebius, Book 8.

‡ Bellarmin de Eccles. c. 12, 13.

for guidance, it has especial reference to the apostles who were called to plant the churches; and on the day of Pentecost it was fulfilled in a miraculous and ever-memorable manner. In regard to the other promise—the rock upon which Christ said he would build his church was the doctrine contained in the confession which Peter had made—a doctrine which flesh and blood had not revealed to him, and consequently the promise was that against his church, reared upon the doctrine of Christ crucified in the flesh, the gates of hell should not prevail. The Old Testament church was often idolatrous, Judges 2: 10; Jeremiah 2: 8, 9; Acts 7: 41, &c. And the Old Testament church, as well as the New, received great and precious promises. God calls his covenant with Abraham an everlasting covenant, Gen. 17: 7. Of Zion, he says, this is my rest forever, Ps. 132: 14; see also Jeremiah 31: 35, 38; Ps. 87: 1, 2; Ps. 46: 1, 2, 6. These are great promises; and if it be said they are prophetic of the New Testament church, still they are applicable also to the Old Testament church. If then, notwithstanding these promises, that church did fall into error, why should we conclude that the external visible company called the Christian church cannot err? And even if we yield a momentary assent to the claims of the Romanists that their church is the one and only visible community or company entitled to the name, is it impossible that their condition should have been, at the time of the reformation, like that of the Jewish church in the days of Elijah? 1 Kings 19: 10; Rom. 11: 4; and can they show that such is not their condition now?

XII. The church may be regarded under various aspects. First, as *one and universal*; second, as particular, or in parts; as a visible body and as invisible; as consisting of the externally called or of the elect. Now it is certain that the universal visible church has erred in matters of doctrine fundamental as well as secondary. The church in Paradise erred and fell from the grace in which God placed it. The universal visible church at the subsiding of the deluge comprised only the family of Noah, and from their egress out of the ark to the days of Abraham, we find that the great body of the descendants of Noah had erred in matters of doctrine. The ten tribes of Israel fell into idolatry through the instrumentality of Jeroboam the son of Nebat. In the days of Christ on earth, the great body of the Jews were ignorant of the doctrine of the trinity; they expected for the Messiah a temporal prince who should have an earthly visible kingdom; they ex-

pected salvation by the works of the law; their services were ostentatious and hypocritical; they had contaminated the law of Moses by a profane mixture of human traditions; yet these errors did not extend to all the members of the Jewish, or only true and universal church which then was. There was an *invisible* church within the *visible*, that is, the church of the elect who could not be deceived, Matt. 24: 24. Against this the gates of hell could not prevail. Of this number the names of a few are given, Zacharias, Simeon, Anna.

XIII. Particular churches may fall into error. The church of Corinth was rent by contentions about things not essential. The church of Galatia erred in matters of vital consequence by annexing works of law to the merits of Christ. These errors of particular churches, considered as visible bodies of the called, may be perpetual. We do not read that the ten tribes were ever reclaimed from their idolatry. But the invisible church of the elect will not be left in final error; though cast down for a time it will not be destroyed.

XIV. There is then nothing absurd or unscriptural in saying that the church of Rome had departed from soundness of faith and from the true religion, and was greatly corrupted at and before the time of Luther. For although that church had extended its domination over almost the whole of Europe, still it was, and yet is, only one *particular* church. Besides that church, there has existed equally long the Greek church; and the latter church was not only of equal dignity with the Roman, Latin or Western church, but of equal extent. Nor is there any peculiar privilege by which the Roman church is exempt from error. The texts in Matt. 16: 18; John 14: 16, 17, and 16: 13, are not expressly or specially applied to that church; and the pretence by which she appropriates them to herself in exclusion of other churches, is founded in arrogance, not in truth.

XV. History proves that the Roman church and its Pontiff have often erred.

Truth can never contradict itself. That which is true at one time cannot be false at another. If there be two contradictory decisions of the same question, one of them must be false. If different Popes have given different decisions of the same question, all of them cannot be right. No person even slightly versed in the canon law, can doubt that different Popes have given contradictory decisions of the same question. It would be easy to form a long list of such decisions from their Decretals and Bulls. The following are a

few. Sixtus V. caused to be published with great care an edition of the Bible according to the Vulgate version. He declared, in a bull prefixed to this edition, that it was very correct and restored to its ancient purity. Pope Clement VIII. found many faults in it, and suppressed it by a bull. He got up a new edition of the Vulgate which differs from that of Sixtus V. in a great number of places. Every thing which regards the Bible is a matter of great importance, so that those Popes did not differ in trifles. Either Clement VIII. was wrong in his correction of Sixtus V., or Sixtus V. was wrong in declaring his edition correct and restored to its ancient purity. Which of these Popes was infallible? both, or neither? Take another example. Almiatus (*in tractatu de auctoritate Ecclesiae*) says, that Innocent III. and Celestin, made two contradictory decisions upon the question, whether, if one of two married persons becomes a heretic, the other who remains in the church can marry again. Innocent III. decided it *in the negative* (*De Divortiiis*). Celestin decided the same question *in the affirmative*, as appears by the gloss of the decretal *de conversatione conjugatorum*. Innocent III. remarks in the text that one of his predecessors seemed to have been of a different opinion (*licet quidam praedecessor noster aliter sensisse videatur.*) Almiatus in the same tract mentions an earlier instance. Pope Pelagius, he says, ordained that the sub-deacons of Sicily should observe celibacy though they had married when they were in the inferior orders; otherwise they could not discharge any of the functions of their ministry. Gregory his successor revoked this law, and his decree is found in *distinct.* 31, *ante triennium*.

Innocent IV. (*in cap. Presbyter*) says that there are forms of sacrament which have been invented since the apostles. This decision is contrary to the determination of Eugene IV. and the common opinions of the scholastical theologians. Stephen II. *in Epist. ad Episc. Gall. cap. II.*, says that if a priest has baptized with wine an infant in danger of life, water not being at hand, he ought not to be blamed, and that infants may remain in this baptism. But if there were water at hand, the priest ought to be excommunicated and subjected to penance. This response of Stephen is contrary to the decision of Eugene and the practice of the Roman Catholic church.

The next example of contradictory decision turns upon a

matter which probably will be thought of little importance, but it made a great noise at the time. Innocent IV., Alexander IV., Nicholas III., Martin IV., Nicholas IV., and Clement III., declared by express bulls, that the Minor Friars had no property or right of dominion in the things which they used, not even in those things which were consumed by them in the use. The Protestant reader should be informed that the Franciscan monks were required by the rules of their order to observe great strictness. Poverty was one of their vows. At length dissensions arose among the monks of this order which were finally settled by dividing it into two classes; the one called the Minor Friars (above referred to), the other the Grey Friars. But to resume, Nicholas III., in *Decretali Exiit*, declared expressly that deprivation of property in these things, as well in particular as in common (*abdicatio proprietatis hujusmodi omnium rerum non tam in speciali quam etiam in communi*) is meritorious and holy, and that Jesus Christ, who was a pattern of perfection, taught it by his words and confirmed it by his example; and that the apostles practised accordingly. He excommunicated by the same Decretal those of the contrary opinion, and declared that they should not obtain absolution therefrom, except from the Roman Pontiff. The same was also determined by Nicholas IV. John XXII., annulled all that his predecessors had determined touching the poverty of the Minor Friars. He declared (*Decret. cum inter.*) that it is an error and a heresy to maintain obstinately that Jesus Christ and his apostles had nothing in property either in particular or in common, nor any right to sell or give a thing. He treats this doctrine (*In extravaganti quia quorundam declarat doctrinam de paupertate Christi et Apostolorum*) as a pestiferous, erroneous, and damnable doctrine, and heresy and blasphemy, and orders that all who maintain it shall be considered as heretics and rebels to the Roman church. Here then is a manifest contradiction between Popes upon a point which *they* regarded as essential in their decretals and express constitutions. Bellarmin admits that Nich. IV., taught that the property could be separated from the use, and that John XXII. taught the contrary. He admits also that Nicholas determined that this poverty was holy and that John XXII. treated it as hypocrisy. But upon the third point respecting the poverty of Jesus Christ and his apostles, in which John XXII. charges the opinion of his predecessors with heresy, he thinks that he can reconcile them by dis-

tions of time. But why seek to reconcile the decisions of these popes, since John XXII. avows that his opinion is contrary to that of his predecessors? (*Emericus direct. pag. 2. qu. 17*).—Michel, general of the Minor Friars, objected that the question had been decided by his predecessors, and that questions which regard the faith or morals having once been decided by a sovereign Pontiff, could not be disturbed by his successors. The cardinal who answered for John XXII., and who was afterwards Pope, under the name of Benedict XII., maintained that this proposition was false, and that there are many examples to show that what had been improperly decided by a Pope or by a council touching faith or morals, could be corrected and reformed by another Pope, or another council, who had better knowledge of the truth, and therefore there was no ground for surprise that Pope John, having maturely deliberated upon this article with skilful doctors in theology and law, had revoked what Nicholas had improperly decided touching the poverty of Jesus Christ and his apostles.

XVI. But it will be objected that the argument, if it proves any thing, proves too much, because it goes to show that during several centuries there was no true church, which is contrary to scripture. But the answers are various and obvious. First, the Greek church was coeval with the Roman church; it has continually existed, although it has fallen into many errors, and is more pure in doctrine and morals than the Roman church. The Greek church denies the authority of the Roman Pontiff in matters of controversy; it denies that the efficacy of the ministry depends upon the intention of the priest; it denies that the power of the Roman Pontiff extends to the whole church, &c. It teaches that the Holy Supper should be dispensed under both species; that images are indeed to be retained but not worshipped; that auricular confession, prayers for the dead, and indulgences should be rejected. It allows matrimony to the clergy, &c. This church, which in many important points of doctrine, agrees with Protestant churches, had an external and civil existence at least until the downfall of the Greek empire (in 1453), an event nearly cotemporaneous with the reformation of Luther in 1517.

XVII. Secondly, the church of the Waldenses existed in the west as early at least as the 12th century. Æneas Sylvius, afterwards pope under the name of Pius II. (*in Hist. Bohem. ch. 34*), gives a summary of the doctrines of this

church, which he is pleased to call a pestiferous and long since condemned faction. (*Pestiferae ac jam pridem damnatae factionis*). Among them are the following: That the Roman Pontiff is not superior to other bishops; that there is no distinction between priests; that the soul at death enters immediately upon an eternal state of joy or woe; that there is no purgatory; that prayers for the dead are vain, and an invention of sacerdotal avarice; that confirmation and extreme unction are not sacraments; that auricular confession is of no use; that it is enough to confess sins to God; that baptism should be performed with pure water, without intermixture of sacred oil; that it is of no consequence where the bodies of the dead are buried; that the use of cemeteries, or consecrated burial places, is vain and invented for the sake of gain; that the universe is the temple of God; that those who build church edifices, monasteries, or oratories, as if the divine goodness could be made more propitious in them, have contracted views of his majesty; that sacerdotal vestments, ornaments of the altar, palls, cups, platters and vessels of this sort are of no moment; that it is a vain thing to ask the suffrages of the saints in heaven; that cessation from labour is not a duty except upon the Lord's day; that the festivals of the saints are to be rejected; that fasts instituted by the church have no merit, &c. &c. These doctrines differ not greatly from those which characterize the Protestant churches. This same Æneas Sylvius compares the Waldenses with the followers of John Huss, a sect which arose in the 15th century. It would be easy also to show, that the doctrines of the Waldenses existed among the people residing in the vicinity of Piedmont from the apostolic age.

XVIII. Thirdly, in the deepest darkness of the Papacy there was a true church within the Roman church. And that church *itself* was in one sense a true church, though not a pure church. Such was the Old Testament church in the time of our Saviour. The Jews had Moses and the Prophets whom they could hear and ought to hear, Luke 14: 29. There were persons appointed to read Moses in the Synagogues every Sabbath day, Acts 18: 21. Yet the writings of Moses and the Prophets were corrupted by the false interpretations of the Jewish doctors; and by a multitude of traditions, conscience was burthened with rites and ceremonies. But the rudiments of sound doctrine, of the Messiah, and his divinity, of his atonement and merits were neglected. So the Roman church, or rather the church at

Rome, even after it became greatly corrupted was a true church in contradiction to no church, but not in contradiction to an orthodox church. In it was preserved the word of God and the sacraments, the efficacy of which does not depend on the will of man, or the character of the ministry. Baptism was dispensed, tarnished it is true with many and often with foolish superadded rites. The Bible existed, and the reading of it by the laity was not prohibited before the time of Luther. The word was preached, though sparingly, and with false glosses, fables, and human inventions. The doctrine of God, of Christ, of sin, of the sacraments, was preached, though contaminated by admixture with the doctrine of the adoration of Mary, the mediation of saints, the merit of works, of purgatory, indulgences, the supreme power of the Pope, and many other doctrines false and dangerous to the temporal and eternal interest of men. Yet even in this church, as in the days of Elijah, some were found faithful. Out of it came Wickliffe, Huss, Knox, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, and the other reformers.

In the same sense the Greek church was a true church, and less impure than the Roman church, but still not entirely a pure and orthodox church.

XIX. The church at Rome, which existed in the days of the apostles, to whom Paul wrote and whose defection he predicted, is to be distinguished from the *papacy*, or the hierarchy of that church which acknowledges the bishop of Rome as its head. The church at Rome originally received the gospel in its simplicity, and retained it with no corruptions peculiar to itself for several centuries. But the papacy arose and ingrafted upon the simplicity of the gospel, what was called tradition or the unwritten word. This accretion of human invention to the truth of God, came through the priesthood. Deep ignorance, and the influence of superstition, favoured its general reception, yet, as at other periods and in other churches, there were doubtless some in that church who held the truth in opposition to fatal errors, if not to all error. This view is favoured by a passage in 2 Thess. 2: 4. The Antichrist sitteth *in the temple of God*. The temple of God is worthy of veneration, whoever may occupy it; but Antichrist, and those who pervert the gospel of Christ, or preach another gospel, though they sit in the temple of God, incur the anathema of Paul in Gal. 1: 8. In the temple of God remain the word and the ordinances of God; the seed of the church. Relics of the religion of Christ remained under

the papacy and they are carefully to be distinguished from the errors ingrafted upon them by the son of perdition. This was what Luther attempted while in the communion of that church. If he had prevailed against the hierarchy, and carried with him the laity, the papacy would have been at an end. Had he prevailed with the priesthood to cast off the abominations which they had so long practiced, and return to the simplicity and truth of the gospel, the papacy would have been at an end. But it was not so. The mass of the clergy were given up by the Spirit of God to strong delusion, to believe a lie, and with them a large portion of the laity. Only a portion cleaved to him. The Pope excommunicated Luther from the papacy. Luther had already rejected the Pope's doctrines; Luther in his turn excommunicated the Pope from his communion. Both being within the same visible church at the time of these mutual excommunications, the question arises, which went out of it? The answer is, he to whom the anathema of the apostle in Gal. 1: 8 belonged.

XX. The distinction between the visible and the invisible church has already been noted. Although the Romanists, and some high-church prelatists, ridicule the distinction, it is founded in scripture. It is unnecessary to repeat the grounds of the distinction. The seven thousand who had not bowed the knee to Baal, Rom. 11: 4, though scarcely more than one in a thousand of the visible church, constituted the whole of the invisible and true church in the time of Elias and Joram; the church of the elect, Rom. 11: 5. Elias thought that he alone remained faithful. In this he was mistaken. God alone, who knows the heart, could designate the members of this church, who, though visible as men, were invisible as the *faithful* or elect.

XXI. The objection (mentioned in XVI) is therefore unfounded. Although the Roman Catholic church was in a state of deep apostacy in the days of Luther, and yet is, still there then was and always had been a true church. The true church, at the time of the reformation, was concealed and dispersed within the papacy; it was not *notable* by human judgment; but through the instrumentality of Luther and his coadjutors, this dispersion was gathered; it coalesced and became a visible body, and was restored in a great degree to the purity and simplicity of the church, before it was corrupted by priestly ambition.

XXII. The argument that the Lutheran church did not exist before the time of Luther, nor the Calvinistic churches

before Calvin, and so on, is verbal and puerile. As well might it be argued that the continent of America did not exist before Americus Vesputius. As well might it be argued that the first Christian church was that at Antioch, because the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch, Acts 11: 26. Upon this principle the church at Jerusalem was not a Christian church until after the planting of the church at Rome, and the connexion and subjugation of that church to the Roman Pontiff or Bishop. Even the churches in Asia, which were addressed by St. John, from the isle of Patmos, would be, according to this notion, Christian only in consequence of their connexion with the Holy Roman See, and their subjection to it and its bishop even during the life of the apostle John. But who would affirm these things? No sound argument can be founded upon the *denomination* by which a Christian church is designated. And if so, it would apply with equal force against the *Roman Catholic* church. The *addition* "Roman" proves the inferiority and the particularity of that church in reference to the universal Christian church, as well as the addition *Lutheran, Protestant, Corinthian, Ephesian, Philippian, Colossian, Thessalonian* or *Asiatic*. Among the Corinthians there were parties. One said I am of Paul, I of Apollos, I of Cephas, I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Who is Paul, Apollos, or Cephas, but ministers of Christ? 1 Cor. 1: 12, 13; 3: 5. And what were these apostolic churches but churches of Christ, although they were spoken of and known by particular designations as the church at Rome, the church at Corinth, the church at Ephesus, and so on? Who was Luther, or Melancthon, or Calvin, but ministers by whom the faithful dispersed throughout the papacy were gathered? Did these reformers inculcate the doctrines of grace? Were those principles and practices of the Roman Catholic church, which they denounced as corruption, *really such*? If these questions must be answered in the negative, then they were heretics and schismatics—not reformers. But if the doctrines and practices of the reformers were evangelical, how comes it to pass that those who believed through them were not Christians individually, and, when collected, assemblies of Christians or Christian churches? Names are used for designation; they do not constitute the thing designated, and even when inappropriately given, they serve their purpose. The Protestants may therefore drop their particular designations, or retain them at their pleasure. Even the word "*Catho-*

lic” was first used in the fourth century to designate those Christians who were orthodox according to law. This sufficiently appears from the Code of Justinian, lib. 1, tit. 1. *de Summa trinitate et fide Catholica.*

XXIII. It must not be supposed that those sentiments of Luther which distinguished him from the Romanists, were peculiar to himself. Thousands besides Luther believed in the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ without works of the law. And thousands besides him saw and reprobated the immoral tendency of indulgences. And so of the rest of the doctrines inculcated by him. These persons formed *the church* which our Lord had purchased with his own blood, 2 Tim. 2: 19. Upon any other supposition the success of Luther, and of his coadjutors, were unaccountable. In a very short space a vast number in every part of Europe avowed this new doctrine as it was called; a number so great that all the power of the papacy could not crush them. Now this is to be accounted for mainly upon the supposition of a *separation* into two bodies or classes of those calling themselves Christians, according to their *pre-existing sentiment*; and not upon the supposition of a *conversion* of devout believers in the Roman Catholic religion to the doctrines taught by Luther. And if it were so it would not aid the argument which we oppose, because if it was a conversion in the proper sense it was an event which cannot be accounted for from the ordinary operations of the human mind. It was a miracle far exceeding that of the day of Pentecost. Luther no doubt was a most extraordinary man. And to produce the result which attended his efforts, upon the supposition of a *separation* (as before stated and not conversion), required most extraordinary powers. Every body has heard of the power of Roman Priesthood at that time, and the awful tyranny with which it was exercised. Every body has read of the desolating wars which grew out of the reformation. It required great power to nerve even those pious men who agreed with Luther in opinion, to brave the power and the tyranny of the Romish hierarchy, and the perils which were inevitable upon an attempt to extirpate the abuses of the papacy. A man less gifted by God than Luther was, would have been inadequate to the task. Frederick Schlegel (a Roman Catholic), in his lectures on the History of Literature, Vol. 2, Lecture 15, writes of him as follows: “For myself I am free to acknowledge that I can never regard his writings or his life, except with some portion of that compassion

which is due to a great nature, led astray by over confidence in its own vigours. As to the intellectual power and greatness of Luther, abstracted from all consideration of the uses to which he applied them, I think there are few even of his own disciples who appreciate him highly enough. His coadjutors were mostly mere scholars, indolent and enlightened men of the common order. It was upon him and his soul that the fate of Europe depended. He was the man of his age and his nation." We of course dissent from the opinion of this writer, so far as it assumes that the cause which called forth the effects of Luther was wrong, but coincide with him so far as it respects the estimate of Luther's natural endowments.

XXIV. As to the argument that the reformers agreed not among themselves exactly in all points, it is of no consequence if they agreed in fundamentals, and this they did. But if it still be maintained that perfect unanimity on all points between all the reformers, and those persons before referred to who preceded them, was essential, the argument may be turned against the Roman Catholics themselves and even their last great oecumenical council, the council of Trent. The Romanist themselves allow and teach that the fathers, however distinguished by their erudition and purity of life, have fallen into errors. Bellarmin L. III. de V. D. c. 10. How then can they use the argument that the reformers agreed not in all points with any who preceded them, nor even among themselves, when they can neither show that all their own doctrines were held by those whom they call the fathers, nor that the fathers themselves were of one accord upon all points?

XXV. Protestants then may rest satisfied that the argument against the perpetuity and the Christian character of their churches is unfounded. It is sufficient for them to show, that the doctrines of Christ and his apostles are received and taught by them, and that there always have been some pious persons from the earliest antiquity in the churches of the east and of western Europe, who have in substance believed the doctrines which they profess, although these persons were humble, without ecclesiastical power or place, despised and dispersed throughout an immense mass of nominal Christians willingly subject to a corrupted hierarchy.

XXVI. The sum is this. The Protestants at the reformation did not depart from the Roman church such as it was originally. They rather returned to it. Whereas the modern church of Rome had widely separated from the

primitive church and still persist in the separation. The Protestants acknowledge a universal church, 1 Cor 1: 2. They also acknowledge particular churches, Acts 9: 31; Rom. 16: 16. They acknowledge a visible church and an invisible church, Rom. 2: 28, 29; Ps. 45: 14; Col. 3: 3, 4. The visible church is conspicuous by its objects, means, and works; the invisible is characterized by faith, hope, charity, things not seen, except in the fruits of the Spirit, Heb. 11: 1; James 2: 18; 1 Kings 19: 10; 18: 13; 19: 9; Ps. 45: 14; 73: 4; John 10: 27; Rom. 2: 14; Col. 3: 3; 2 Tim. 2: 14; 1 Pet. 3: 4; Heb. 11: 38. In the visible church there are many who do not belong to the invisible church, Matt. 13: 23, 38; 1 Cor. 5: 10; Josh. 24: 15. Like the second selection made by Gideon (Judges 7: 3—6), out of the army which followed him; the invisible church is taken out of the visible. The Protestants, therefore, with sincerity and truth, may and do say, in the language of the apostles' creed, *we believe in the holy Catholic church*, without meaning thereby the Roman Catholic church. Nor do they believe in *two* churches, but in one church only, which, if considered as a visible body is multiform, but, if considered as invisible, is one in faith, hope, and charity, every member of which is begotten by the sovereign will of God through the same word of truth, James 1: 18, and of course all those who belong to the invisible church, must agree in all things essential to salvation, however they may differ in external forms or in their relations to each other as members of the visible church. It is this invisible church to which Christ refers, Matt. 16: 18. That is the church which is called his body, and which is intended in such passages as the following: Eph. 1: 22, 23, and 4: 15, 16, and 5: 23, 24, 32; Col. 1: 18; Heb. 12: 22. Against the visible church in *Judea, Greece, Asia, Africa, Rome*, the gates of hell have prevailed, Luke 18: 8; Rev. 13: 3, 4, and 20: 8. But against the church which is Christ's body, consisting of those which are given to him by the Father, none has ever prevailed or can prevail; see John ch. 18: also John 10: 27, 29.

The foregoing is the outline of an argument which may easily be expanded into a volume. The reader, if he has leisure and ability, may do the church good service by expanding this outline into a complete argument; but if not, he may find enough in these few hints, and in the sources indicated, to satisfy his own judgment upon this question, and to answer the cavils of those who profess to think Pro-

testantism only another name for schism, or what is worse, a damnable heresy.

Geo. B. Bishop

ART. V.—*Requisite qualifications of a Ministry adapted to the wants of the West.*

THE opinion once prevailed to a considerable extent, that any young man, provided he was pious and devoted to the service of Christ, might make a very useful minister in the west, however moderate his talents and acquirements. Hence, in the older states, when such a young man was found seeking the office of a minister, the remark was often heard respecting him, he will not do to settle amongst us; but in some of the new and less populous parts of the country, where the people are ignorant, and glad to receive any kind of preaching, he may answer very well. Not a few in the west as well as in the east, still entertain and act upon this opinion. Hence, every year we are raising up among ourselves, and receiving from abroad, some scores of men, who give painful evidence that they possess but few, if any of the qualifications of ministers, except the name. The object of this article is to establish, contrary to the opinion mentioned, the proposition, *that the ministers of the west ought to be men of the first order in intellectual and moral attainments.*

By men of the first order in intellectual and moral attainments is meant, men of good natural talents, of sound judgment, of good common sense, and of ardent and consistent piety, with all these well-improved, by a thorough and extensive course of study, close observation of men and manners and constant communion with God. All admit that vital piety, and that in an eminent degree, is an indispensable requisite for a gospel minister. If the nature of the ministerial office is considered, and especially, if reference is made to the Bible, it will be found that to piety must be added, in all cases, no inconsiderable amount of acquired knowledge and mental discipline. "The priest's lips should keep knowledge." Being appointed to teach others, he must be "apt to teach," and "able to teach;" having himself first learned. Able to teach, not merely the ignorant and unlearned, not merely those who manifest a willingness to receive instruc-

tion; but those also, who are learned in all the wisdom of this world. Those who are captious; those who delight in raising objections; those who fortify themselves in delusion; those who are skilled in every artifice and cunning craftiness by which men lie in wait to deceive, and to stop the mouths of the unreasonable and wicked, who will not be convinced. That his profiting may appear to all, he must give continual attendance "to reading, to doctrine," must "meditate on these things;" "give himself wholly to them;" and thus study to show himself, approved unto God, a workman also needeth not to be ashamed. Every temper, and passion, and appetite, must be kept under due restraint, that he may teach by his example as well as by his precepts. "He must be blameless, as the steward of God, not self-willed, not soon angry, vigilant, solemn, of good behaviour, not greedy of filthy lucre, not covetous, one that ruleth well his own house, gentle unto all men, patient in meekness, instructing those that oppose themselves, being an example in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity. Whoever considers attentively the import of these requirements of Holy Writ, will be convinced that every man of piety and of honest intention, is by no means a suitable person to be invested with the ministerial office. However unquestionable and ardent his piety; however much he may desire it, there are other qualifications of a mental and moral character, without which (except in some rare and peculiarly marked cases) no one ought to be set apart to this work. These remarks are general, and are intended to show, that every minister of the gospel should be a man of undoubted talents, of extensive acquirements, of studious habits, with every power of mind and body under strict subjection to the law of Christ. If every minister of the gospel, be his lot cast where it may, should possess this character, much more should those who are called to labour in the valley of the Mississippi. They should be pre-eminently endowed with every natural and acquired qualification. To them should belong, in the highest degree, all that entitles to the epithet, "an able minister of Jesus Christ;" all that gives dignity and influence and efficiency to the gospel ministry.

The state of society, and the work to be performed, demand it. The people of the west, viewed as individuals, resemble the inhabitants of almost every clime; but taken as a whole, they are unlike every people under heaven. They have come hither from the four quarters of the globe, with

manners and habits and genius and temperament, as different as the nations from which they severally sprung. Every thing is new, just coming into existence. Every thing is fluctuating; moving as if on the wings of the mind. And every thing is springing up and growing into maturity with a rapidity unparalleled in the history of the world. This is the state of society in the west. Such are the materials of which it is composed. It is evident that we cannot be a mixed people and prosper. The permanency of our civil and religious institutions, and the happiness of all, demands that this mass of heterogeneous and discordant materials, be formed into one consistent and harmonious whole. Every thing like clanishness, people of the same nation clustering together, and keeping up their national differences, and sectional prejudices, must be studiously avoided. All must be thrown into the same crucible, and the different ingredients must compose one united body of Americans. But further: no nation can exist without religion. No nation can prosper and be happy without the Christian religion. The continuance then of our government, and the happiness of our citizens, demand that this whole community be brought under the influence of religious truth. Not that all become Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, or any other Christian denomination; but that the mass of the people be united, be of one heart and one mind in the belief and practise of the great principles of the Bible. This is the work to be done; to be done not in a moment nor without labour. Men born and educated, or suffered to grow up in ignorance in such different circumstances, though they may settle side by side, and *assume* a common name, cannot on a sudden throw off their old habits and peculiarities, and put on a new and hitherto unknown character. Time and training are alike indispensable. Who now is to take the lead in directing the current of mind, and forming the character of the millions who now inhabit and are destined shortly to inhabit that extensive valley? Undoubtedly the ministers of religion. They alone, by virtue of their office, mingle with all classes of society and have access to every individual. To them, more than to any other class, it is committed under God, to form the manners and habits, to give character and direct the energies of all this people, to qualify them for usefulness in this life and for glory and happiness in another world. And who is sufficient for these things? What kind of ministers are able for such a work? The feeble? The undis-

ciplined? Men of inferior talents, and these but poorly cultivated? Men whose ignorance and imprudence and want of ministerial qualifications unfit them for usefulness in older settlements? Are these the men to pioneer this western world, and govern, and control, and fashion aright the discordant elements of which society is composed? Consider for a moment the work to be done more in detail. It is not to sit down in a corner, surrounded by some fifty or a hundred or two hundred families, and instruct them in the great doctrines of religion, and endeavour to lead them in the paths of virtue and peace. Were this all, it is evident to every reflecting mind, that much knowledge and prudence and active experience united with patience, humility, zeal and perseverance, would be indispensable. But this is not the half, nor a quarter part of what might be required of every minister, and is required of a great body of them. They have to preach the gospel not only to one or two congregations, but frequently to some half-a-dozen, scattered over large districts, and watch over the spiritual interests of whole townships and counties, and even several counties. The previous week is seldom, if ever given them to prepare for the Sabbath, sometimes not even a day of it. A large portion of it they are compelled to be on horseback, or at a distance from home in strange families, who claim their constant company, and where study is out of the question. They are constrained to be in season and out of season, ready at all times, to preach, or visit, or talk, with any one and every one, who may please to call. Not a few are so shamefully, not to say sinfully, provided for by the people, that they are obliged to labour from Monday morning to Saturday night, with their own hands, to provide for themselves and families the necessaries of life, and still obey every demand on their time and services the community or any individual may see fit to make. They may refuse, but they do it at the peril of their usefulness. Their time and services are regarded as common property. They must literally be the servants of all men and of themselves too. Nor do they always find a people willing to receive their instructions and be benefitted by their kind services. It often happens that every truth they deliver is controverted, and every inch of ground contested. Almost every shade of error and delusion that ever was known amongst men, exists in that interesting portion of our country, and finds a most congenial soil, and like the timbers of the forests grows in rich profusion. And not

only so, but new gods which our fathers knew not, have sprung up, and have their worshippers. Numbers show themselves willing to put up with any thing and every thing as a substitute for vital godliness, no matter how absurd or ridiculous, if it will only quiet the conscience and promise happiness hereafter. The land swarms with those who are bitterly opposed to the spirit and power of the gospel; men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth. Many come out boldly and show in their foreheads the image of the beast whom they worship. Without a blush at their impiety they laugh at every thing sacred, sit down in the seat of the scornful, become the champions of infidelity, the shameless advocates of atheism. Numbers more, not less enemies at heart to all that is good, have assumed the mark of friendship. They bear the Christian name, and not a few claim to be the only true Christians. But, if the Bible be true, they are led astray by damnable heresy, and instead of being churches of Christ, are in reality synagogues of Satan. Nor are the errorists and infidels with whom the land abounds, fools; men of weak understanding and limited knowledge; too contemptible to be noticed; whose objections can be answered, whose mouths stopped, by every contender for the true faith. In their ranks are to be found men of the first order for talents, and learned in all the wisdom of this world. If let alone, their influence will extend far and wide, and prove, wherever felt, most destructive in its consequences. All these giants in intellect, in cunning and wickedness, are to be met and resisted and put to silence by the ministers of religion. Nor is this all; the great subject of education in all its length and breadth must receive the fostering care of the ministry. Primary schools, academies, colleges and seminaries; religious papers, periodicals and books adapted to the wants of the Christian community, all look to the ministry for existence, patronage, counsel and instructors. If deserted by our ministers, all our fountains of knowledge would be dried up. That institution of useful knowledge is not in existence in our land, especially in the west, which the clergy have not been foremost and principal in founding, in rearing and in making it what it is. We ask again, then, who is sufficient for these things? To preach the gospel among such a people and in such circumstances; to instruct the ignorant, to warn the unruly, to bind up the broken-hearted, to comfort all that mourn, to council inquirers, to remove their doubts and difficulties, to answer objections, to stop the mouths of gain-

sayers, to expose the errors and delusions which abound, and to commend the truth to every man's conscience? Who is sufficient to stand as sentinels of the press, to conduct our religious journals, to contribute to their columns, to promote a sound and healthful literature, to give wise counsel on all subjects, to calm the passions and control the outbreaks of populous fury; especially in these days of agitation and of fierce conflict of mind with mind? Who is sufficient to superintend the schools of colleges and seminaries, and impart instruction to the millions of youth rising up in the west, to curb their juvenile passions, to restrain their follies, to correct their morals, to form their manners and habits, to qualify them for usefulness here and glory hereafter? Verily, this is a work which an angel might shrink from undertaking. And shall feeble man, and the feebler among the sons of men, rush rashly into this service? Would we could say, it has never been so. Would we could say, it will never be so again. If ever talents and learning, humility, prudence, patience, zeal and perseverance, the wisdom of the serpent and the harmlessness of the dove, united with ardent and consistent piety, acquaintance with the human heart, the cunning craftiness of men, and the wiles of satan were required in any man or class of men, they are required in the ministers of Christ in the valley of the Mississippi.

How is such a ministry to be obtained?

1. The best talent in the land under the influence of divine grace must be consecrated to this work. God has indeed in days past chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and weak things to confound the mighty, and base things of the world and things which are despised hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught, things that are. But he had a special design in view in those dispensations of his power. That design being accomplished, he has ever since, for the most part, chosen means more adapted in their nature to bring about the end in view. Other things being equal, he has always given more abundant success to men of superior minds, and of extensive mental and moral training; to men of the best natural and acquired talents. It is humbly conceived that not a few good men and great men too, have erred in urging young men into the ministry merely because they gave evidence of piety. It is to be feared also that our Education Societies, in consequence of the facilities afforded to every young man of receiving an education, provided he will consent to be a minister, are instrumental in

introducing many into this service whom the head of the church has never called. As a general rule, no one ought to be urged or persuaded to study for the ministry. It is the duty of every one to serve God to the utmost of his ability. And he should be exhorted to do it. But it ought to be left to every man's own conscience to decide in what particular way he can do most to glorify his Master. The Spirit of God, it is firmly believed, will direct every honest inquirer into the path of duty; and no one whom he moves to seek the sacred office, will ever be kept back, though men may speak against and discountenance his every effort. If left in the hands of this divine agent, where it ought to be, we may rest assured, that the fittest instruments would be chosen and duly qualified for the work. But when committed to the fond partialities of friends and the pride of relations, as it often is, no wonder the ministry is filled with weak and inefficient men.

2. Seminaries must be established and fully endowed, that young men seeking the ministry may have every facility for preparation. Many objections have been made to theological schools, the answer to which does not fall within the province of this article. One thing is certain: students who attend a regular course of instruction in a theological seminary, have advantages and facilities for improvement and mental discipline, which are unknown to those who study in private. To afford these advantages they must be fully organized. That is, a sufficient number of competent professors must be secured, to give due attention to the different branches of study and to do justice to their several departments. Libraries also are indispensable. These ought to be extensive and well selected, containing works on all the parts of Theology in its widest sense, composed both in ancient and modern times, together with the most popular and approved foreign and domestic periodicals of the present day, relating not merely to Theology, but also to law, medicine, politics, the arts and sciences, and general literature. Nor must the number of seminaries be so multiplied as to render the number of students at each necessarily small. This would be, to defeat one great end of such institution, which is, to bring in close contact many men of different minds, that by mutual friction, the excrescencies of some may be worn off, and the rough places polished, and the latent energies of all roused into action; that by early acquaintance and intercourse, the future ministers of our church, may know each others minds and feel-

ings, conform to each others habits, and be cast into the same mould, that when they enter upon the broad arena of life, they may be prepared for acting in concert and with unanimity, than which few things are more adapted to promote the peace and prosperity of the church at home and abroad. Nor can a professor take the same interest or feel the same responsibility in lecturing to a class of two or three or six, as to one consisting of as many dozen. Consequently the same good results cannot be expected. Besides, if every presbytery, synod, or even state, must have one or more seminaries of its own, where shall suitable instructors be found? It would be a useless, and by consequence a sinful expenditure of funds, even if competent men could be spared from other fields of ministerial labour. To erect requisite buildings for the accommodation of the students and the professors' families, procure libraries, support the professors, and meet all contingencies, requires an immense sum, which the church has no right to give, even if able, unless necessity requires it. Nor has she a right to call some twenty or thirty of her ablest ministers from the immediate work of preaching the gospel, to superintend her numerous schools, when five or six located in some central point might answer the same purpose equally well, if not better.

3. Candidates for the ministry must take a regular and thorough course of study. The course of study in theological schools under the Old Testament dispensation, was long, liesurely and mature. No priest could enter on the full and active duties of his office until he was thirty years of age; having devoted fifteen, and especially ten of the preceding years, to diligent study and preparation for his official work. At the commencement of the new dispensation, like careful study and preparation were enjoined by divine authority. (See the epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus.) Down to the fourth century, preparatory study was considered as a very serious thing, not to be hurried over. Some of the early councils decided that no man ought to be ordained to the work of the ministry under thirty years of age, chiefly because in their opinion, none could be qualified at an earlier period.* It was almost impossible to get the consent of some of the most learned and devoted men of that age, to receive ordination: so deeply were they impressed with a sense of their own unfitnes and of the importance of the work. In mod-

* Introductory Lecture by Dr. Miller, 1825.

ern times both in Europe and this country, three years have been considered little enough time to be devoted to the especial study of divinity. The plans of study adopted in our seminaries, without an exception worthy of being named, embrace this number of years. And they are all formed on the supposition, that previous to entering a seminary, the candidates have first completed a regular collegial course. No intelligent individual can examine the plan of studies in any of these seminaries, without being convinced, that to acquire even a superficial knowledge, much less become masters of the subjects embraced, will require, at the least calculation, three years of diligent and laborious application. Hence, not a few, who have thought much on the subject, and whose opinions are entitled to the highest respect, believe, that the time at present allotted, is not sufficient for mature and adequate preparation, and that one, two or more years ought to be added. These facts are mentioned to show what amount of study, and what degree of preparation, the wisdom of the church in ancient and modern times has enjoined on candidates for the ministry. Happy would it have been for the church, happy for the world, if her wise counsels had always been listened to and obeyed. But in every age, there have been some, (and in modern times not a few) who, in their own opinion at least, were wiser than all who lived before them, who were destined to enlighten and reform the world, and that without any preparation on their part. It is amazing, as well as humiliating, to see how many step from the work-shop or the plough into the pulpit, with scarcely an idea in their heads, save that they have been called to preach the gospel. And when they attempt to preach, it is manifest to all that they understand neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm. Frequently they may be heard, boasting of their ignorance and even daring to thank God, they never set foot in a college or seminary. They claim to be divinely inspired; but almost every sentence they utter is painful evidence against them, and proof positive that God no more called them to the work of the ministry, than he did the work-bench or the yoke of oxen which they left behind. Many take a different course. They do not affect to despise human learning; yet they do not see the necessity of spending so much time in preparation. Especially are they opposed to paying any attention to those subjects which have no direct connexion with theology, such as the dead languages and mathematics. They wish to take a shorter course. They are intent on engaging forthwith in

the work of preaching the gospel and saving souls. Instead of opening the gate and walking decently along the prescribed path as other men (faster if they please or are able), Samson-like, they lay hold of both gate and posts and are for carrying all off together. They enter our seminaries. The studies intended to occupy them three whole years, they think they can master in one or two at most and accordingly make the attempt. This is the nineteenth century, it is said; an age of improvement; mind has waked up. No doubt, this is an *age*, and verily mind has waked up, if the repeated assertions to this effect are proof. The proof, however, would be more convincing, if it partook less of vain and confident boasting, which is merely a cloak to hide ignorance and laziness, and more of sober thought, profound research, solid attainments and unfeigned humility. Till this is done, those will be pardoned, it is hoped, who believe that even in this age of wonders, children are not born wiser than their fathers, nor do they acquire every thing by intuition: and consequently that young men had better study a while and learn something before they set up to be teachers of others. They may think that God has need of them sooner, but in all probability, they are mistaken.

4. Presbyteries must be more careful in licensing and ordaining candidates. We wonder at the eagerness and impatience of some young men to be clothed with ministerial functions. It is still more wonderful, that the fathers and brethren in the ministry should so readily give them the right hand of fellowship. True, the wants of the world and the call for labourers are strong inducements to multiply ministers, even when candidates are allowed to be deficient in requisite qualifications. But it is evident, that regard should be had, not so much to numerical force, as to individual power and efficiency. As a general rule, an ignorant, half-educated, imprudent minister does more harm than good. For one soul he is instrumental in converting, he is in danger of hardening ten in their sins. Other things being equal, one minister fully trained to the work, will do more good than a dozen half-fledged novices. One soldier, well armed and skilled in the use of his arms, will render more effectual service in the day of battle, than scores of militia having neither sword nor fire-arms. Every presbyter is under solemn obligation to "lay hands suddenly on no man;" to take time and be well assured, in his own mind, that he commits the office which he has received "to faithful men, who

shall be able to teach others also." Such men presbyteries are bound to license and ordain, and no others. The guilt of having incompetent men in the ministry, does not rest so much on the individuals themselves, as on the ecclesiastical bodies ordaining them. To the presbyteries it belongs to examine, license and ordain candidates for the holy ministry, and according as they prove faithful or unfaithful to their trust, the church will be blessed or cursed in her ministers.

J. A. Alexander

ART. VI.—*Thoughts on the Religious State of the Country; with Reasons for preferring Episcopacy.* By Rev. Calvin Colton. New York: Harper and Brothers. 12mo. 1836.

MR. CALVIN COLTON, with whom most of our readers are probably acquainted, as the writer of a popular and lively book on England, has become a convert to Episcopalianism; and with a due sense of the magnitude of that event, as forming a new chapter in the history of the church, he has made it the subject of a duodecimo. In the simplicity of our hearts, we should have thought that Mr. Calvin Colton might become even a Papist or a Pagan, without throwing the religious public into much commotion. But alas for our home-bred ignorance! we have never been to London. It is plain, from the work before us, that our presumptions were entirely delusive. The "change of religious connexions" (p. 21) is a thing so common, especially with persons of a certain class, that we have learned to regard it as a very slight affair, except when invested with an accidental importance by something extraordinary in the person changing. Shall we confess it, or will it be believed, that, till we saw this book, we had no idea of any thing in or about Mr. Calvin Colton, that should make him an exception to the general rule? We had ignorantly looked upon him as a well-meaning man, not destitute of talent, though rather scant of knowledge, somewhat ambitious of making a figure in print by means of a brisk and pointed style, not at all addicted to the vice of self-contempt, on good terms with all men, and especially himself; in short a literary *petit-maitre*, always harmless, though not always inoffensive, but even in his faults so free from malice, that the surliest critics could not find it in their hearts to touch a

hair of his head. Such being our impressions, what must we have felt when, on opening the volume now before us, we discovered our mistake; when we found that the author's "change of religious connexions" was a matter of public interest, and requiring explanation in a closely printed book. All this of course implied that we had erred in our estimate of Mr. Calvin Colton, and we awoke as from a dream. But we awoke too late. It is as true of great men, as of other personal and public blessings, that we never know their value till we lose them. The only reparation that we can now make, is by doing a sort of posthumous justice to the character of one, who might still have been ours had we praised him enough, but whose name and influence are lost to us forever, or at least till his "reasons for preferring Episcopacy" have been nullified by reasons for preferring something else. Our Presbyterian readers, most of whom no doubt have been as guilty as ourselves of injustice and mistake, will be glad to do penance for their error, by patiently following us through this book. And we need not beg that, whatever may have been their previous opinions, they would *pro hac vice* be content to look through Mr. Calvin Colton's microscope, and believe, if they can, that the transplantation of this hopeful scion into our neighbour's garden is as signal an occurrence as the conversion of Constantine or the apostacy of Julian. We hope that Dr. Hawks will not be allowed to overlook it.

The design of the book may be described as threefold:

1. By explanation, to vindicate the author from the charge of inconsistency.
2. By argument, to make proselytes.
3. By condescension and caresses, to mitigate the violence of the shock which Independency and Presbytery have been made to feel.

This specification is of course derived from our own examination of the work, and not from any avowal on the author's part. He makes no secret of the first and second items, but he is too polite not to disguise the third as neatly as he can. Even when his heart is breaking with sympathy for those whom he has ruined, his tact, address, and knowledge of etiquette, will not suffer him to soothe their grief except by indirection. He feels no doubt like a delicate woman who has just turned off a suitor, and, while she remains fixed in her determination, is longing in some way to assuage her lover's feelings. We appreciate

Mr. Calvin Colton's tenderness and skill, and shall do what we can, not only to strengthen the effect of his consolatory arts upon our readers, but to pay him in kind, by showing that his sympathy is really excessive, and that the Presbyterian church may even yet survive her irreparable loss. This will no doubt remove a burden from his heart. We now return to our threefold division of the topics of the book, and shall advert to each in order.

First comes Consistency, the personal consistency of Mr. Calvin Colton. We remember to have read of David Garrick somewhere, that in order to alleviate his morbid dread of ridicule, he frequently lampooned himself, when his conduct had by any chance afforded food for sarcasm; thereby forestalling his enemies, and making his own follies a source of fresh applause. This was an ingenious application of a medical expedient to a literary case; he chose to inoculate himself with ridicule rather than take it in a natural way. Its chief effect however was to show how sensitive he was to satire. We are afraid that an inference somewhat similar must be drawn from Mr. Calvin Colton's self-accusations on the score of inconsistency. He seems to have imagined that mankind were ready, like a pack of hounds, to open at once on this offensive scent, and so determined was he to defeat their malice, that he could not wait a page, no, not a paragraph, but in the very first sentence of his introduction, arraigns himself as a prisoner at the bar, with all the solemnity, and somewhat in the style, of a regular indictment. "Inasmuch as it has been supposed by some that the author of these pages has made certain demonstrations," &c. &c. From the solemn grandeur of the "inasmuch," a reader might suppose that the whole was to be wound up with a strong denial. Not at all. The plea is "guilty," and the culprit declares this book to be, as it were, his confession under the gallows. "Admitting that he has manifested such an inclination, it can only be said that he has changed his opinion, which is in part the design of this book to set forth, with the reasons thereof," (p. 11). We should feel for our friend, if he had not thought fit to convict and hang himself. His method of descending from this self-erected gibbet is by advancing such original and startling views as these, that "while he remained a Presbyterian he was an honest one;" "he may now be an equally honest Episcopalian, and charity would not require him to assert it." How uncharitable then is Mr. C. C. to himself! But not content with these general propositions, he proceeds

to startle the reader by informing him that Episcopalianism is the established sect in England and not in America, and that therefore the same person may consistently abuse the Church of England and admire her unestablished daughter. Having sufficiently elucidated this dark point, he drags out another of his own sins to light, and commences a wanton attack upon himself for having been at one time a furious *new-measure-man*, and at another time an enemy of what he elegantly calls "special effort." Hereupon he actually ventures to aver that a man may change his mind upon the subject of revivals! This paradox we tremblingly admit, though it seems to involve the startling proposition that writers of a certain sort are apt to advance opinions without examining their grounds; to maintain them with rash petulance and contempt of others; and then, when their eyes are partly opened, to rush into the opposite extreme, and make a virtue of exchanging the blindest reliance upon self for the blindest submission to authority. But where are we wandering? What has all this to do with Mr. Colton? Some strange association of ideas has misled us. What we meant to say next was, that the whole of the author's exculpatory paragraphs about his own consistency, amount to this, and nothing more, that he has changed his mind, and that he had a right to do it. Now even Mr. Calvin Colton never could believe that these two propositions wanted proof; his demonstration therefore only shows that his mind is not at ease, or, to use a coarser phrase, that he is sore. He has been scared by some phantom of the imagination, which palmed itself upon him as his own consistency, and complained of being murdered, though it never had any life to lose. We can lay the ghost; and Mr. Calvin Colton is so kind to other people,* that we perform with pleasure the work of an exorcist. This we shall do by showing that his agony of mind arises from three errors as to fact—three false assumptions.

The first assumption is, that consistency of sentiment or conduct is expected and required of all men. We undertake to say, in the name of our fellow men, that this is a mistake. It is only some peculiar characters that we expect to be consistent; such as refuse to draw conclusions without premises,

* "Having cleared the ground in the light of Constitutional organization, there remains yet a phantom—a ghost of an objection to the same point; and with many minds, I suppose, it has operated, and still operates, to frighten, not unlike a ghost. But as I have reconnoitered the apparition, and found it such, perhaps I may assist in quieting the fears of others." P. 84.

or to act without good reasons. The rest are allowed to change as often as they please. No body cares what they are in the second place, because no body knows what they were in the first. Nay, there are some persons and things whose utility depends upon their exemption from the law of consistency. What would be the use of a consistent weather-cock, or of those who serve as social weather-cocks to show which way the winds of popularity and fashion blow, if they were not allowed to shift with the changes of that which is the breath of their nostrils?

The second assumption is, that Mr. Calvin Colton's former notions of church-government and revivals, and the stand which he took in their defence, are regarded by his former friends as things of vast importance, intimately connected with the welfare of the church, and not to be abandoned without serious injury to the cause of true religion. With such ideas it is not surprising that our friend should be distressed. But we hasten to relieve him by the cheering assurance; that his embassy to London* was by no means a subject of excessive complacency and superstitious confidence to his friends at home. To ease his mind, we frankly confess that we were heartily ashamed of his connexion with our church, when he undertook to be the American *par excellence* in England. No imaginable change in his opinions here at home could give us half the pain that we experienced in consequence of his hasty, shallow, and conceited labours in the cause of truth. Now that it is all over, why may we not confess that we were even angry at what we were disposed to call the vanity and imprudence of our representative, and nothing would have pleased our selfish feelings better than to have heard that he had emigrated to another church, trundled his spades and pruning-hooks into some other vineyard. In all this we know that we were not alone. All judicious Presbyterians, who knew any thing about the *American in London*, wished him safely home again, while some of the best men in the church enjoyed a blissful ignorance that such a man existed. May we not hope that this plain statement will occasion some relief?

In the last place our author plagues himself without necessity, by taking it for granted that his recent metamorphosis

* "At the very moment when these events were in the incipient stage of their career, or before their proper character had been developed, I was removed to a distant position—to London," (p. 22). A reader ignorant of the author's history might be pardoned for supposing that he was at least a *Chargé d'Affaires*.

has, in the eyes of Presbyterians, subtracted something from the weight of argument in favour of their doctrines. How shall we go about to disabuse him of this error? We know what to say full well; but how shall we express it? Mr. Calvin Colton is so gentle and considerate where others are concerned, that we can hardly bring ourselves to tell him the plain truth. The error of imagining one's self to be an oracle, or of fearing that others will be crushed by one's own superior weight, is so harmlessly amusing and so often accompanied by amiable qualities, that it would be cruel to do more than repeat the poet's wish:

O that some power the gift would gie us,
To see ourselves as others see us!

Having set the question of consistency at rest, and thereby administered an opiate to our patient, we proceed to investigate his other symptoms. The second object of his work, we apprehend, is to make converts to Episcopalianism. The arguments employed with this laudable design, are both offensive and defensive. The objections urged against Presbyterianism may be reduced to these five heads:

1. The business of church-courts is unedifying, uncomfortable—and none more so than that of the General Assembly, p. 29.

2. Nothing can be a greater abuse of creeds, and of Christian associations under their forms than the guarding of the creed to all the nicety of its minute, grammatical, and verbal distinctions, p. 30.

3. An excess of law—a uniform, received, and established code, formed into a book of statutes—enforced *verbatim et literatim* by a supervision from which there is no escape—and on principles not unlike the administration of civil courts,* p. 31.

4. The pastoral office is robbed of its primitive, legitimate, essential, reasonable influence, p. 33.

5. The excessive amount of labour that is demanded of the clergy is undermining their health, and sending scores to their graves every year long before they ought to go there, p. 39.

6. The mode of admission to full communion is objectionable, p. 45.

As there is nothing very new in these objections, or in

* The author speaks with special horror of the "Assembly's Digest."

Mr. Calvin Colton's presentation of them, we shall not be expected to follow him through his details. The following remarks have occurred to us in reading them.

1. With respect to many of the things which he alleges, "there are," to use his own words, "hundreds, not to say thousands, of the Presbyterian and Congregational clergy, who will sympathize with him fully," (p. 37.) Some of the things complained of have no natural connexion with any particular organization, and are so entirely at variance with our's, that the regular operation of our system is at this moment counteracting and suppressing them. For example, it is admitted by this writer, that fanatical excess is not congenial with the spirit of genuine Presbyterianism; and yet we, as a church, are to be lectured on the evil effects of "special effort," "protracted meetings," "novelties," "rash experiment," "sallies of fanaticism," "over-heated excitements," "spurious excitements," "religious mania"—and by whom? Who is the sage reprover? Is it some one of acknowledged and established reputation, who, having long waged war against spurious religion, has a right to speak with authority? Or is it one who could play the zealot when fanatical excitement was the order of the day, who could try to import new measures and new nonsense into England, while they were in vogue at home; but now when the tide has changed, can change his course, and cease to be fanatical as soon as he discovers that fanaticism is *mauvais ton*?* We are more opposed to fanatical imposture than Mr. Calvin Colton ever was, or probably ever will be, because we are opposed to it on settled principle; but we disclaim his alliance as a party in the contest. Let him go to Mr. Finney with his recantations, and receive for answer, *Et tu Brute?* not in Latin but in Saxon.

2. Mr. Calvin Colton shows his candour by mixing Presbyterianism and Congregationalism together, urging against both what is true (or false) of either, and drawing conclusions from this mongrel monster of his own creation, in favour of Episcopalianism. We mention this only to show the fairness of his logic, not because his misdeeds of this kind can have any bad effect; for as he takes great pains to contradict himself, his cogent arguments neutralize each other. While we sympathise sincerely with our sister churches, we feel bound only to defend our own, and we are perfectly contented

* We may possibly do Mr. Colton injustice in calling him a zealot at that period. We really do not know precisely what it was that he advocated when he was in England; but he repents of having been an ardent friend of "special effort," and that we suppose must mean what we call "new measures."

with the following concessions of Mr. Calvin Colton, who, be it remembered, was brought up a Congregationalist and not a Presbyterian.

"In church organization, or polity, it is known that these denominations differ *materially* not to say **RADICALLY**," p. 31.

"It is true, no doubt, that Presbyterianism has been vitiated by the transfer and incorporation of the elements and leaven of Congregationalism into its body; and that fanaticism commenced its most frightful career in those parts of the Presbyterian church, where the spirit of Congregationalism most prevailed," p. 59.

These admissions are qualified no doubt by him who makes them; but Mr. Colton may comment and qualify forever, if he leaves us in peaceable possession of these facts.

3. As a sample of the author's intellectual operations we extract this paragraph, in which he states what he calls his "grand objection," the fourth in our arrangement.

"The grand objection, which I have to make to these systems, so nearly alike, as ordinarily found in practice, is, that the pastoral office is robbed of its primitive, legitimate, essential, reasonable influence. If any should refuse to concede to me what is implied in the word *primitive*, I will not here insist upon it, although I think so. Or if *legitimate* is objected to, let that go, rather than raise a discussion, for which I have no space; only I would not be understood as conceding to an opponent the argument that might be based upon these terms. I dispense with them simply on the ground that it is an historical argument, which, for my present purpose, would cost more than it is worth. I purposely avoid all learned research, and design to rely upon obvious, generally admitted, practical principles; principles tested by the common operations and developements of society. Say, then, that these systems rob the pastoral office of its *essential* and *reasonable* influence," p. 33.

What acumen! what address! "I will not ask you to admit that the power which I claim for the clergy was *primatively* theirs, or is *legitimately* theirs, if you will only say it is *essential* to the office!"

4. Mr. Calvin Colton's notions of the Presbyterian church have been picked up on the frontiers of New England. We do not doubt that like most of his brethren in the east, he has travelled through the country, as an agent or as something else; but still his impressions of Presbyteri-

anism are of eastern growth, that is to say, derived from "those parts of the Presbyterian church where the spirit of Congregationalism most prevails." Why else should he complain of public confessions and admissions to the church, as *Presbyterian* ceremonies? Why should he charge upon the Presbyterian church the evils resulting from particular church covenants and private creeds; and then exclaim, "How different this from the practice of a church, which has the same creed throughout the land, in every man's, in every woman's, and in every child's hand!" Have not we one creed, and is not that one universally accessible? As Mr. Colton thinks that so much mischief has resulted from diversity of creeds, we are under the necessity of charging upon him a part, we know not how much, of the evil he deploras. His glowing descriptions of the bad effects of Presbyterianism must of course have been derived in a great measure from the scene of his pastoral labours, "the western parts of New York." Now we have to state that some ten or fifteen churches in that region are supplied with creeds, each varying from the other, and of course from the Confession. And by whom were they prepared? By Mr. Calvin Colton. Hear himself. "I have myself organized from ten to fifteen churches, giving them creeds drawn up by my own hand, which varied from each other, according as by more thinking on the subject I supposed I could improve their forms." (p. 65.) We cease to wonder at the loose, incoherent, heterogeneous mass of notions which makes up the theology of that ill-fated region, when we know that its systems of belief have been thus botched up by itinerant tinkers in theology. No wonder that "special effort" has degenerated into "spurious excitements," and that these have gone from strength to strength, till they have ended sometimes in "religious mania." Do men gather grapes from thorns or figs from thistles? The quality of Mr. Colton's first attempts at creed-making may be shrewdly guessed from that of the work before us. If this is the product of "more thinking on the subject," for the last six or seven years, what, oh what, must his *coup d'essai* have been!

5. The "grand objection," after all, to Presbyterianism is, that the clergy have not power enough, and are too closely watched, and too much under the control of their parishioners. Complaints of this kind are always symptomatic of a certain something in the intellectual constitution of the sufferer. We need not seriously state that no imaginable church or-

ganization can protect from interference and control men who are born to be interfered with and controlled. Nor can any system, on the other hand, whatever be its forms, impose entire and permanent restraint upon a minister capable of influencing others. Let any man go through our churches and inquire who they are that most frequently complain of being thwarted by their elders or hampered by their people: They are just the men whose inefficiency tempts others to impose upon them. Show us a strong man, in the best sense of the term,* who habitually whimpers about being watched and managed; or show us, on the other hand, a clerical coxcomb who, in any situation, can escape the influence of superior minds; and we will then begin to sympathise with Mr. Calvin Colton in all that he has suffered at the hands of elders, deacons, and "tattling women." If we may judge from the frequency and point of allusions, it is the female class of meddlers that has vexed him most; and we very much suspect that "thereby hangs a tale." Who knows but that officious female hands have laid the deep foundations of that great event which forms the subject of the work before us? *A priori* we should rather have concluded that the peculiar qualities of Mr. Calvin Colton's mind and manner, his intellectual feminality, not to say anility, would have shielded him from peril and alarm in that direction; but the fact is otherwise. We are very far from meaning to dissent from his opinions in relation to the mischief done by meddling women in religious matters; we agree with him *in toto*. As little do we mean to quarrel with his prudent method of escaping from this grievance. All men are not able to resist the strife of tongues; there must be weaker brethren in the church and in the pulpit, and when these are fairly overcome either by male or female strength, they cannot do better than betake themselves to flight.

As we cannot make large extracts from this precious volume, we shall gratify our readers, and perhaps alarm them, by a highly charged paragraph, which seems to be intended to exhibit the essence of the author's argument in deadly concentration.

"My own reasoning on this spectacle has come to this: that the Presbyterian church, from the nature of man, is an impracticable machinery;—that from a spiritual community,

* 'A wise man is strong; yea, a man of understanding increaseth strength.'
'If thou faint in the day of adversity, thy strength is small.' Prov. 24: 5, 10.

professing to be governed by moral influences, it has degenerated into a species of civil polity; first, by burdening itself with too much law; next, by attempting to enforce the statutes under a literal and rigid construction in all possible forms of application, contrary to the design of Christianity, which is peculiarly a religion of *principles*, availing itself of the civil regulations of society to reform mankind by moral suasion;—and, that the equality claimed for all its ministers is the immediate occasion of its perpetual dissensions,” p. 61.

Along with this specimen of reasoning let the reader take a specimen of Mr. Calvin Colton's knack at telling a good story. Those who are familiar with his writings, are aware that, excepting wit, he has all the gifts of an accomplished jester.

“I have heard of one reception of these lay apostles, which may not be unworthy of record. One pair of them—for they went forth ‘two and two,’ and thus far were conformed to scripture—both of them mechanics, and one a shoemaker, having abandoned their calling to engage in this enterprise, came upon a subject, who was not disposed to recognise their commission. They began to talk with him: ‘We have come to stir you up.’ ‘How is the shoe business in your city?’ said the clergyman to the shoemaker, who was the speaker. For it was a city from which they came. The shoemaker looked vacant, and stared at the question, as if he thought it not very pertinent to his errand, and after a little pause, proceeded in the discharge of his office: ‘We have come to give your church a shaking.’ ‘Is the market for shoes good?’ said the clergyman. Abashed at this apparent obliquity, the shoemaker paused again; and again went on in a like manner. To which the clergyman:—‘Your business is at a stand, sir, I presume; I suppose you have nothing to do.’ And so the dialogue went on: the shoemaker confining himself to his duty, and the clergyman talking only of shoes, in varied and constantly shifting colloquy, till the perverse and wicked pertinacity of the latter discouraged the former; and the shoemaker and his brother took up their hats, to ‘shake off the dust of their feet,’ and turn away to a more hopeful subject. The clergyman bowed them very civilly out of doors, expressing his wish, as they departed, that the shoe business might soon revive. Of course, these lay apostles in this instance were horror-struck; and it cannot be supposed they were much inclined to leave their blessing behind them,” p. 36, 37.

We like this tale, and wish to make a 'practical improvement' of it. Mr. Colton considers it a capital joke that a cobbler should presume to stir a parson up. And so it is; but is it not a better joke that Mr. Calvin Colton, of all men in the world, should undertake to settle, in half a dozen flimsy chapters, what never could be settled to mutual satisfaction by a Cartwright or a Hooker, an Usher or a Baxter? The tone and import of his volume, as addressed to Presbyterians, is this: "I have come to stir you up." And a better answer could not be returned than by copying the humour of the anti-lay-apostle. "How does the Thames Tunnel come on, Mr. Colton?" "I have come to give your (pretended) church a shaking." "What sort of breeches did the king wear at his levee?" or "How many guineas did the coronation-stalls cost?" And so the dialogue might well go on, to the finishing stroke, "Your business, Mr. Colton, we presume is at a stand. We suppose you have nothing to do." And this, no doubt, is the simple truth. When in the receipt of his penny a line from Mr. Morse, he was industriously working at a somewhat decent trade, and we wish for his own sake, that when he first thought of leaving his lapstone and his last, to "stir us up" and "give our church a shaking," his guardian angel had whispered, in intelligible English, *NE SUTOR ULTRA CREPIDAM.*

Mr. Calvin Colton's *defensive argument* is a curiosity. With an air of self-complacency peculiarly his own, he begins and ends with a *petitio principii*, and then talks of having reasoned on the subject! As a sample of his manner in ratiocination, we need only state that he assumes the necessity of perpetual succession in the ministry as an "axiom;" not merely as something which has been fully proved, but as an "axiom!" He evidently does not know the meaning of the word; and we are sorry to say that in this part of his performance, he is chargeable with something worse than nonsense. "I must beg leave to insist, that the necessity of such a perpetuity is an axiom in this argument. *It would be impossible for me* to repose that confidence in the head of the church, which *I wish to feel* and do feel, as having made all necessary and indispensable provisions for the perpetual maintenance of his visible kingdom and as having sustained those provisions by his providence, if I did not take this ground." (p. 149.) Impossible for ME (i. e. Calvin Colton) to feel that confidence which I (i. e. Calvin Colton) wish to feel in the Head of the Church! We do not believe that the

man who wrote this sentence designed to be irreverent; but we quote it to show that the gangrene of his vanity has eaten its way to his religious feelings, so that he can write such revolting trash as that just quoted, without meaning any harm by it.

As a sample of his logical acumen we may quote his frequently repeated statement that "Episcopacy is the only ministry that has been uninterrupted." Does he mean by *Episcopacy* the order of bishops, or the Episcopal organization to which three orders are essential? If the former, his own system has at some time been imperfect since the days of the apostles. If the latter, then on his own hypothesis the succession of presbyters has been uninterrupted.

As a sample of his learning, or rather of the sense which he attaches to that term, we may state that, after recommending the new Episcopalian *vade-mecum* (containing the tracts by Mr. Barnes and Dr. Onderdonk) as the best thing on the subject "for common and popular reading," he oracularly says: "For the scholar and the more learned who may wish and who have leisure to extend these investigations further, I may mention"—what does the reader think? A complete set of the fathers, Greek and Latin?—"Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity, Potter on Church Government, Slater's Original Draft, Skinner on Episcopacy, Works on Episcopacy, the last being a collection of tracts in two volumes," (p. 147.) And this is a prescription for "the scholar and more learned!" but as we cannot help suspecting that the names were given to Mr. Calvin Colton on a slip of paper, perhaps by his diocesan before his ordination, we shall not hold him responsible, at least until we learn that he has drained the Original Draft and mastered the collection of tracts in two whole volumes.

Another proof of Mr. Colton's learning and of his condescension to the ignorant, is afforded by the following fine specimen of felicitous translation. "The above reasoning from Papal and English Episcopacy is what is called in the forum, a *non sequitur*. For those not learned the version is, *It does not follow*," (p. 81.) Ergo, they are learned who can construe two words of Latin and read Works on Episcopacy.

One feature of this argument, which must not be neglected, is its thorough-going character. Mr. Calvin Colton "argues" not merely for Episcopacy, but for Episcopalianism; not merely for a theory of church-government, but for all its

actual adjuncts. It is pleasing to observe what clear conviction he has attained already, upon points both great and small. While he sees something shocking in every lineament of Presbyterianism, he is wholly unable to discern a single blemish in the other *ism* which he now adores. We have known some men to change their "religious connexions," as Mr. Colton calls it, from a conviction that the one system, as a whole, was preferable, while at the same time, they deeply felt that there were doubtful points on either side. Not so Mr. Calvin Colton. His conversion seems to have been effected by a flash of light so vivid, that it brought out every dark point into full relief, and left him nothing to do in the way of solving doubts or slowly overcoming scruples. Thrice happy Mr. Colton! While many weaker brethren have to grope their way in twilight, he basks in sunshine; while even Bishops have been known to question the divine right of surplices, the absolute necessity of praying in white linen and preaching in black silk, our author, from the rare construction of his mind, attains *per saltum* to a comfortable certainty, and looks upon Episcopalianism no doubt as an "axiom." This process of intuitive conviction is so perfect, that the very same things which are eye-sores to him elsewhere, are beauty-spots, nay beauties, in his present "pale and section of the church," to use his own pure English. Popular influence, as we have seen, is something very shocking in the Presbyterian system; and yet there is no one thing which Mr. Colton urges with more earnestness in favour of his own sect than this same bugbear. He even goes so far as to say that "of the two, the Episcopal church is more favorable to a predominant influence of the laity!" and again that "in the Episcopal church, the clergy of the three orders combined have actually less power in relation to the laity, than the Presbyterian. So much for these comparisons." (p. 83.) And so much for the man that makes them. What a mercy that all men are not bound to be consistent! Another instance of this graceful versatility, equally clear though not so glaring, may be found in his invectives against Presbyterian strictness, in the interpreting of creeds. Nothing, he thinks, can be more unreasonable and improper than tying men down to all the niceties of a uniform and complex creed. He sees no harm, however, in tying them down to all the niceties of a uniform and complex ritual. To his perspicacious mind, no doubt, it is apparent that Christian doctrine is a very small affair, respecting which men should "agree to differ;"

whereas the postures and responses and manoeuvres of the service-book are everlasting truths, in which no two men can differ and be safe. It is unchristian to enforce uniformity in doctrine; but woe to the young deacon who mistakes a lesson or violates a rubric, whose surplice is ruffled or his band awry!

With such convictions of his having at last got right, it is by no means surprising, that our author should be vastly charmed with all he sees around him. The raptures of his new ecclesiastical *liaison* are sometimes quite amusing. For example, near the end of the book, he describes his agreeable surprise on finding that some bishop or other, whom he happened to fall in with, allowed his subalterns to differ from him upon points of doctrine. Our amiable neophyte "was as much surprised as delighted at the freedom allowed, and at the perfect good nature and kindness with which such differences are discussed; the bishop himself assuming no more the airs of authority, than if he had none," (p. 199.) People seldom "assume the air" of that which they really possess. But did the good man expect to see the bishop cudgelling the priests and deacons? His ideas of the office must have been like that of the Scotch minister in the days of Charles I., who fainted away at the sight of one of "thae beasts." We are really ashamed of Mr. Calvin Colton's ignorance, and beg that when the Episcopalians laugh at the simplicity of their new convert, they will not extend their ridicule to other Presbyterians.

In the same connexion, there occurs a pleasing instance of the awful reverence and implicit confidence, with which Mr. Colton receives the dicta of his new relations. "I am satisfactorily certified, that the Episcopal church is almost perfectly harmonious and increasingly so," (p. 198.) We should be glad to see that same certificate.

At the close of Mr. Calvin Colton's unique *argument*, he modestly remarks: "My object, in this chapter, as declared in the outset, has been rather to *suggest* the argument for Episcopacy in a comprehensive statement, than to arrange it in detail; and to expose briefly the method of my own reasoning on the subject," (p. 156.) Mr. Calvin Colton is, at least in English Grammar, an Independent still, and we dare not determine, from the structure of this sentence, whether he did or did not intend "to expose briefly the method and course of his own reasoning." But if exposure was his object, he has perfectly succeeded. His attempts at concatenated thought are so abortive that they only serve to exem-

plify the proverb, "whoso boasteth himself of a false gift, is like clouds and wind without rain."

As a sense of justice has compelled us to speak with some severity of Mr. Colton's arguments (so called), we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of stating that this very portion of his book contains one admirable passage, which, at the imminent risk of overrunning our allotted limits, we must quote at length.

"I shall now proceed to compare American Episcopacy-in-form with American Episcopacy that is not in form, or that is not in the usual form. And I do it for the purpose of setting Episcopacy proper in a still more clear and more advantageous light.

"The Episcopal principle under its own proper form is one thing; but it should be remembered, that the principle may be adopted and applied without the form. This is constantly done, as we have just seen, by self-appointed bishops; it is assumed and acted upon to a great extent by theological seminaries; it is the vital principle of our voluntary religious and benevolent associations, national and subordinate.

"Take, for example, the American Home Missionary Society. This is an appropriate Episcopal institution on a stupendous scale and of great energy, wanting only the form and name. Its diocese is the United States of America; nay, it would seem by one of the resolutions brought forward at its annual meeting in 1835, that it proposes to extend its jurisdiction over the world. But we will consider it first, as limited to the United States.

"This society was organized under this name in 1826, having taken the place, and assumed the work and responsibilities of the United Domestic Missionary Society, which was merged in this. It then had one hundred and nineteen congregations connected with it, and one hundred and one ministers in its employ. From year to year this society has been extending its connexions, its operations, and its influence, and multiplying its agencies, to an extent unexampled, till in 1836 it reported "seven hundred and nineteen missionaries and agents" (all ministers, I suppose) in its employ; four hundred and eighty-four of whom were settled pastors; and one thousand and fifty congregations and missionary districts. The income of this society, as reported for the first year, was twenty thousand and thirty-one dollars; as reported in 1835, it was eighty-eight thousand eight hundred

and sixty-three—having gradually increased annually for nine years from the first mentioned sum to the last.

“The instructions, or canons, of this society, as contained in the form of their commission for the guidance and government of the ministers in their employ, are minute, specific, and imperative. ‘You are required,’ &c., on *six* several and specific points, together with a reference to *six* other specifications in ‘General Instructions.’ In addition to these is another ‘Notice,’ embracing *ten* specifications—the whole comprehending the entire code of canons for the regulation of individuals in commission of the society.

“The effect of this commission is to bring all its agents and beneficiaries into an intimate connexion with the society, and under its supervision and control. The connexion is much more intimate, and the control much more absolute and energetic, than that which results between the relation of a bishop on the one hand and the clergy and congregations of his diocese on the other, because, in the former case, it is a connexion of *dependance*; and the canons of instruction are no less minute and specific.

“The secretary of the American Home Missionary Society, then—who stands in relation to these numerous clergy, and to these still more numerous congregations, as a Bishop, exercising Episcopal supervision and control in a far more absolute and energetic sense, than any Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal church of the United States—had under his care in 1835, of clergy, seven hundred and nineteen, and of congregations, one thousand and fifty; while all the seventeen Bishops of the Episcopal church together, for the same ground, have only seven hundred and seventy-two clergy, and eight hundred to nine hundred congregations—averaging, if we take eight hundred for each class, forty-seven for each Bishop.

“It is not my business to certify to the worthiness or usefulness of this Episcopal Missionary Institution—for it is obviously of an Episcopal character. It does not require such certificate from me; if it did, I would most cheerfully give it. ‘Its praise is in all the churches.’ It has done and is doing a great and good work. May the head of the church still prosper and smile upon it. My only object is to show, that for extent of influence, for power in actual possession, and energy in the execution of the Episcopal office—an energy resulting from the peculiar character of the relation—the whole college of Bishops presiding over the Episcopal

church of the United States, in their united sway, fall far behind the secretary of the American Home Missionary Society," (p. 88—90.)

Our inference from all this is of course far different from that which Mr. Colton draws; but we admit his premises. If we had doubted them before, the recent events at Pittsburg would have established sufficiently the episcopal character of Dr. Absalom Peters. Nor is he by any means so lax in the discipline of his enormous diocese as the nominal bishops whom Mr. C. admires. A word, a nod, from this Right Reverend Father seems to have been sufficient, on a late occasion, to reverse the judgments, belie the professions, and annul the pledges of himself and all his followers. We cry aloud with Mr. Colton, "If such power is dangerous," which he denies and we affirm, "then is it high time to look to this society."

Having paid our respects to Mr. C. C. as a reasoner, we have now to view him in the light of a comforter, healing by his blandishments the wounds which his defection has inflicted on our church. That he really believes himself to have been guilty of this outrage, is apparent from the whole strain of the book, and may be proved by some particular expressions. "To pass from one Christian sect to another,* is an indirect censure on that which is left behind" [left in the lurch, he means,] "and a compliment to that which is adopted; the latter is gratified, the former feels injured. One has gained what the other has lost." (p. 21.) That equation will not answer; loss and gain in this case are not always equal. The Episcopalians have certainly gained Mr. Colton; but we should like to know what we have lost. Again: "When ministers change their relation, their conspicuous standing before the public makes an impression. The public is in some measure and for a moment startled," (p. 22.) The startling, in the present case, must have been measured and momentary indeed; it was probably accomplished like the twinkling of the eye, unobserved and unremembered. These extracts will, however, serve to show that Mr. C. is sensible of what he has inflicted; now for the salve and plaster. "Of one thing the author feels a good degree of confidence: that none of his former friends will accuse him of a bad spirit, nor generally, if at all, of want of fairness," (p. 16.) Far be it

* Mr. Colton has not perfectly acquired the shibboleth of that which Dr. Parr called *Churchianity*. If he dares to say that THE CHURCH is a *sect*, even by implication, he may find his superiors not so free and easy as they are on points of doctrine.

from us to disturb this confidence. If "a bad spirit" means an angry or malignant one, then can we truly say that the spirit of this book is excellent. The author evidently thinks that Presbyterians can be saved; nay, he is warm in his professions of regard to the deluded ministers of our "connexion," with all of whom he would seem, from his language, to have been on intimate terms, though in many instances we fear the acquaintance was what the Germans call *one-sided*. He is friendly to the American Board of Commissioners, and even patronising in his kindness to the American Home Missionary and Education Societies, one or both of which he has served, we believe, as a travelling agent. But besides these positive expressions of good will, we are glad to be able to state negatively also, that there is nothing acrimonious in the temper of the book. There is not a spice of bitterness or a drop of acid in the whole performance. It has all the sweetness of skim-milk and all its strength; the very jests are as bland as water-gruel. In short, our poor brethren's hearts will leap within them when they find how they are spared. This gentleness, though rare, is not surprising. It is the prerogative of great minds placed in lofty stations, to be condescending. As the Archbishop of Canterbury can afford to be familiar with a country curate, so the Ex-Correspondent of the New York Observer hazards nothing by exhibiting a merciful spirit towards the Presbyterian parsons of America, not a score of whom, perhaps, ever saw the Thames Tunnel, and not one of whom ever held an official station near the Court of St. James. We seriously say, that if the author of this book had been confessedly the greatest man in these United States, he could not have assumed a more patronising air of lofty condescension. His self-esteem is so intense that it excludes all wrath and bitterness.

Such is the spirit in which our author undertakes to comfort us, and we are happy to inform him that his object is attained, though not perhaps in the way that he expected. His expressions of compassion and regard would only have deepened and inflamed our wounds; but happily for us, his books are full of comfort. No one can read them and continue grieved at the defection of the author. Among the consolatory thoughts which they suggest, the following may be specified. 1. The author never was a real Presbyterian, though he may have been an "honest" one; what he lacked was not sincerity, but knowledge. 2. While he wore the name, he did us no great honour, especially abroad. 3. He

was born to be an Episcopalian. We mean no offence; but it is a fact, that some Presbyterians have a sort of second-sight by which they can determine who will turn Episcopalian. Some, it is even said, have made out lists of future converts, and we dare not say that Mr. Calvin Colton's name was never thus distinguished. Be that as it may, he is clearly in his element. No one who has read his correspondence can doubt that he has a very pretty taste in dress and decorations; and no one, we are sure, would wear lawn sleeves with more delight. May we live to see him in them!

Our only fear is that these remarks may be misunderstood by Mr. Calvin Colton. Before he went abroad, he was "a little mortified" on hearing a ministerial brother, of "a narrow and weak mind," say in relation to ministers visiting England—"It sometimes spoils them." Our author was very much afraid of being "spoiled," which, if a possible event, would certainly have been a very dismal one; and so much was he affected by the thought of it, that on his return he actually fancied it had happened: "Either going abroad had spoiled me, or else my country was spoiled," (p. 25.) Oh modest alternative! Oh sad dilemma! "Me" or "my country!" The United States or Mr. Calvin Colton! Now we cannot suffer Mr. Colton to infer from what we have been saying, that we are glad to get rid of him because he has been "spoiled." He has not been spoiled. He is decidedly improved. He evidently knows much more than when he went abroad, though he falls into the error of supposing that because his own vacuum was partly filled in England, it could not possibly have been filled at home, and therefore that every one who has not been in England has a narrow mind, is prejudiced, &c. Hence his implied apology for Presbyterians, that they continue such because they have not been abroad. Dr. Johnson said that Goldsmith, if he went to Constantinople, would bring home a wheelbarrow as a curiosity. So Mr. Calvin Colton has imported, as the result of foreign travel and extensive observation, facts and opinions which have always been familiar to our plainest men of sense. And then he talks of narrow minds, want of information, prejudice, and what not? But all this is easily endured when we consider that he is not "spoiled;" that he is not quite as ignorant as he was when he made the fifteen creeds. Another improvement, which naturally follows from the one just mentioned, is a change of tone and manner. He is not by any means so pert and flippant as he was when he

began his epistolary labours, and exposed himself in London. Profound ignorance and profound knowledge are generally modest. 'A little knowledge is a dangerous thing' in its effect upon the manners. We are happy to bear witness that, compared with his former self, Mr. Colton is decidedly a well bred writer, quite the gentleman on paper. A third improvement gained by foreign travel is apparent in his English. Mr. Colton is scarcely even yet a faultless model for the young Episcopalian clergy. He still belongs to that class of writers who elaborate advertisements for our female schools, over one of which, for aught we know, he has of old presided. A specimen of this style may be found in his remarks upon philosophy, p. 201.* His very first page presents at least two specimens of rather knotty syntax;† his Americanisms are still numerous; and his affected vulgarisms not a few. But just compare him with "Our London Correspondent," and he is—we had almost said—"Hyperion to a Satyr." Now these are great improvements, truly great, when we consider what was to be overcome, what blanks were to be filled, what perversions to be rectified. Surely, then, there cannot be a moment's hesitation with respect to the alternative already mentioned—surely it is not Mr. Calvin Colton, but the country that is spoiled.

* "If I may presume to say it, the Christian world wants more philosophy—philosophy of mind and philosophy of observation. It has been cantingly said—We have too much philosophy—that it is philosophy which has done religion so much injury. This is a mistake. We want the philosophy of common sense—inductive—founded upon facts—growing out of observation. So long as religion is propounded as a mystery—a thing not to be understood—not to be philosophized upon—so long it will be at war with common sense; and so long, it may be expected, that attempts will be made to enforce its dogmas without allowing the privilege of thinking." And this writer talks of cant!

† "Admitting that he has manifested such an inclination, it can only be said, that he has changed his opinion, which is in part, the design of this book to set forth, with the reasons thereof. If he has written against, and in the conflict, or in any train of consequences, has been convinced, that his former position was wrong, the least atonement he can make is to honour what he now regards as truth, with a profession as public and a defence as earnest, as any other doings of his on the other side."

Mr. Colton's style is apparently formed upon two models most unlike, the magazines of Old England, and the sermons of New England. From the former are copied his affected piquancy and point; from the latter such favourite forms of speech, as "in the light of this or that," "in view of this or that," and many others. We need not particularly notice his original constructions, such as having a preference to Episcopalianism, (p. 31.) nor his hard usage of some words, e. g. *pale* and *section*. We shall merely give as a closing example these two lines: "There may be incidental betrayals of opinion; but it was not an object to declare opinion as to the expediency of the practice, which has been scandalized. It was virtually the proof of a negative; that's all," (p. 16.) And that's enough.

Mr. Colton gives us some historical account of his conversion to Episcopacy and Episcopalianism. He thinks he never would have changed if he had staid at home. But going abroad enlarged his views and overcame his prejudices. He saw that amidst the corruptions of the Church of England, arising from her unnatural relation to the State, there was something apostolical and excellent, &c.; and that this important something was possessed in common by the mother church and by her daughter here. He came home, found the country spoiled, i. e. the non-episcopal division of it, and the rest soon followed.

This is not quite correct. Mr. Colton will allow us to dispute his facts a little, as we do not mean to question his sincere belief of them. We would tell the story hypothetically thus. He went to England filled with a false sense of his own importance and of what he was to do, and by precipitate exposure of his weakness there, soon made himself ridiculous. When this became obvious even to himself, he no doubt honestly endeavoured to retrace his steps. As he had done injustice to the Church of England, he laboured to repair it. He began to regard her with amicable interest, and to smile at the excess of his foreign prepossessions. All this was well enough. The Church of England was entitled to the reverence of greater men than he. But when his feelings were released from the constraint of early prejudice, his natural bias soon began to operate. We do Mr. Colton no injustice when we say, that all his writings mark him as a person fond of show. This taste was gratified in England, and the gratification soon became a necessary element of comfort. Then his taste operated on his understanding, and he thought he was convinced of the divine right of Episcopacy. When he came home, he felt an aching void. The stimulus afforded by the tasteful splendour of the English church was wanting. The Presbyterian worship was, as Crabbe said, "bald and bad." Episcopalianism was not quite the same thing here as in the old world; but still it was the best thing to be had. Now he remembered the "old, stiff, dry, cold elders," as Mr. Finney calls them, and the pragmatical deacons, and the tattling women, who had vexed his soul in "the western parts of New York." The "special efforts" in which he once delighted, rushed upon his mind, rendered doubly hateful by the thoughts of the *faux pas* into which they had betrayed him. The "Assembly's Digest" and his own fifteen creeds hung like so many millstones round the

neck of Presbyterianism, and it sank like lead in the mighty waters. But how could he, "the observed of all observers," change his "connexions" without public notice? How could mankind fail to mark the obscuration of that "bright particular star" in the Presbyterian firmament? It could not be. The world would expect an explanation; it was written; the Harpers published it; and here it is;—"that's all," as Mr. Colton says.

All this might have happened, and we admit did happen, to a conscientious man; but it never would have happened to a man who went to England with a sound judgment, and a well-stored mind. Our version of the story is of course hypothetical, but not on that account less worthy of attention. We appeal, in confirmation of it, to the correspondence of the *New York Observer*, the *Four Years in England*, and the work before us.

One advantage of the principles professed by Mr. Colton is that they admit of his progressive improvement, and leave room for future changes. No one can suppose that Mr. Colton will not some day visit England again; and who will have a right to wonder if he should return to us a strenuous advocate of the church of England, "as by law established," with her archbishops, bishops, deans and chapters, archdeacons and chancellors, her church-rates, tythes, and lay-impropriations. What if he should then "expose the method and course of his own reasoning" thus: "That an industrious caterer should be able to make an array of things that have dropped from the author's pen somewhat at variance with his present views, as brought out in this volume, is very possible. One principal object of these pages is to give reasons for a change of opinion," (p. 16). "The author's main design has been to address himself to the *present time* and to the *present state* of the religious public," (p. 17). "I frankly confess that had not my pastoral relation been providentially broken up, it is very likely I should not have been shaken or disturbed on this question," (p. 22). "With regard to myself, I confess, that going abroad had spoiled me or else my country was spoiled. Not that my country was spoiled in every thing, nor wholly spoiled in that particular to which I allude." (p. 25). And then he might go on to say, that the church to which he was attached, was lying under desolation for want of connexion with the state; that when he went abroad he was in favour of Episcopacy unestablished, but when he returned, the state of things brought his mind

to a pause and suggested a re-examination of the subject. (See most of these phrases on p. 27.) And what if he should then proceed to copy all the objections to the voluntary system, which have ever been urged by the British Critic or the Quarterly Review; such as an inadequate supply of religious teachers, dependence of the clergy, &c. &c., placing each particular in strong relief; and then go on to defend the English plan, justifying every thing, as he now does in relation to Episcopacy, not even expressing doubt as to any point whatever, but merely admitting that sophistical objections have been urged against some features of the system, by the enemies of all establishments, and winding the whole up by saying, "I have attained to the full conviction, that a church establishment, in contradistinction from the voluntary system, is altogether best." Supposing all this to happen, who would wonder? We should not, and if any one should breathe the word "consistency," Mr. C. would have a right to repeat his manifesto, "Inasmuch as some persons have supposed," &c., to the end of the chapter.

We do not at all suspect Mr. Colton of any such opinions at the present moment. We believe him to be perfectly sincere in disavowing them. But we also believe that such a change of sentiment would be quite as natural as the one already past, and that if the existence of fanatical excesses, the impertinence of ruling elders, and the tongues of female gossips, have enabled Mr. Colton to believe in the *jus divinum* of prelatical episcopacy, the evils which confessedly accompany the voluntary system ought to make him believe in the *jus divinum* of national establishments. We congratulate him therefore on possessing a "method and course of reasoning," which will serve him more than once, and with little change enable him to die a "good Catholic," if that religion should in our age and country become a genteel thing, without which we are afraid that Mr. Colton's head is proof against all argument. Some of our readers may be shocked at our suggesting what implies a change of sentiment as to fundamental doctrines. But doctrines, great or small, do not seem to be regarded by our author as a barrier to the "change of religious connexions." He expressly says, when speaking of the doctrinal diversities in the P. E. Church, "Is not this a lesson? Is it not instructive? Does it not prove that an exact agreement, even in the MINOR POINTS of a common creed; and I may add, in some of THE CARDINAL DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIANITY, is not

essential to harmony of feeling, to Christian fellowship, to general union, to concert of action, to edification, and to efficiency of combined enterprise?" (p. 200.) Could Laud say more? Does not this give Mr. Colton access without scruple to Holy Mother Church? Popery, however, is turning out to be a shocking vulgar thing, quite too low for Mr. Colton. Besides, he has been twice wrong already, which is twice too often. *Semel desipuisse nimium est theologo.* Now that he is right, let him do his best to stay right, and try to be contented with his triple transformation—a Congregational larva—a Presbyterian chrysalis—an Episcopalian butterfly. With this advice we bid him an affectionate farewell.

We have just a word to say to our Episcopalian friends. They are always much elated when they gain a Presbyterian; but of late they seem to have discovered that their lottery, if it gives no prizes, gives abundance of neat blanks. We earnestly entreat them not to lose their equanimity, although we must acknowledge that their bad luck is provoking. They are now in the condition of our southern friends when they first begin to see through the tricks of yankee pedlars. Once or twice they may be cheated and attribute it to chance, but they must lose their patience when they find that the general rule has no exceptions, that all the nutmegs are of wood and all the flints of horn. Nor do we wonder at our neighbours losing patience. A bad bargain of the kind in question is far more injurious to them than it would be to us. Their numbers are so small, and they proclaim their conquests so laboriously, that when they are over-reached, all the world enjoys the joke; while the very same addition to our superior numbers could not possibly occasion either pride or disappointment. If, for example, Mr. Calvin Colton, like a still more zealous advocate of "special effort" in our own vicinity, should take it into his head to turn another summerset and tumble back again, he would be absorbed at once, as a mere chance drop, in our big whirlpool, and become as obscure as he was five years ago. This is a mere hypothesis and may it long continue so; but let our neighbours see to it, that their One, Indivisible, and Apostolic Church does not become a drain—an emptying sewer—for the kirk and the conventicle.

Charles Hooper
ART. VII.—*The General Assembly of 1836.*

The General Assembly of 1836 convened in the city of Pittsburgh on the third Thursday of May. The opening sermon was preached by Dr. Phillips, the moderator of the last Assembly, from Rom. 1: 17. After the sermon the permanent clerk reported the roll of members, and in the afternoon the Assembly proceeded to the choice of a moderator. The Rev. John Witherspoon of N. Carolina, and the Rev. Dr. Peters having been nominated, the votes were taken, when it appeared there were 110 for the former and 102 for the latter. Mr. Witherspoon accordingly took the chair.

New stated Clerk.

Dr. Ely having resigned his office as stated clerk, Dr. John M'Dowell, Rev. G. Duffield, Rev. Samuel G. Winchester and others were put in nomination. Subsequently, however, the other candidates being withdrawn, Dr. M'Dowell was elected by common consent.

Intercourse with the Congregational Union of England and Wales.

The Rev. Dr. Spring, the delegate of the General Assembly to the Congregational Union of England and Wales, reported that he had attended the meeting of that body, had been kindly and courteously received, and made the bearer of the following resolution, viz.

“Resolved, That highly appreciating the many benefits that have resulted from the interchange of delegates between our churches and those of the United States, this body will attempt to secure the renewal of the advantages and pleasures which have been enjoyed in both countries, through the interchange of deputations this year, by a reciprocal visitation to the churches of England and America at least once in *six years*.”

This report was submitted to Drs. Peters and Skinner to draft a suitable minute to be placed upon the record and transmitted to the British Union. This committee subsequently presented the following report which was amended and adopted.

“1. Resolved, That in view of the reciprocal advantages of the intercourse which has been opened between the General Assembly and the above Union, the Assembly will be happy to continue the intercourse, and to receive delegates from the Union as often as our brethren in England and Wales shall judge it for mutual edification to be thus represented in our body.

“2. Resolved, That it will not be expedient for the General Assembly to re-

peat its appointment of delegates to the above Union oftener than once in three years.

"3. Resolved, That in no case will the assembly send more than two delegates in the same year; and that they bear their own expenses."

On motion of Dr. Neill, the latter part of the third resolution requiring the delegates to pay their own expenses, was, after some debate, stricken out.

The next General Assembly.

The Assembly voted to take up the question of the place for the next meeting. Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, and some other places were nominated. After some discussion, the roll was called, and the votes were for Philadelphia 167, for Pittsburgh 86, for Baltimore 3.

Foreign Missionary Board of the General Assembly.

The last General Assembly appointed Dr. Cuyler, Dr. Hoge, Dr. Cummins, Mr. Witherspoon, and Dr. Edgar, a committee, to confer with the Synod of Pittsburgh on the subject of the transfer of the supervision of the Western Missionary Society now under the care of that Synod, to ascertain the terms on which that transfer can be made, and digest a plan of conducting Foreign Missions under the care of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church, and report the whole to the next General Assembly. This committee were subsequently 'authorized if they shall approve of the said transfer, to ratify and confirm the same.' They accordingly reported, that in pursuance of their appointment they had conferred with the Synod of Pittsburgh, and agreed upon the transfer on the following terms, viz. 1. That the General Assembly will assume the supervision of the Western Foreign Missionary Society, and carry on its missions, it being expressly understood that the said Assembly will never hereafter alienate or transfer to any other judicatory or board whatever, the direct supervision of the said Missions, or those which may hereafter be established by the Board of the General Assembly. 2. Provides for the appointment of a Board of Missions by the General Assembly. 3. Defines the duties of the Board. 4. Prescribes the duties of the Executive committee. 5. Provides for the holding of funds and other property by the Trustees of the General Assembly. 6. Relates to the seat of the operations of the Board. This report was committed to Drs. Phillips and Skinner, and Messrs. Scovil, Dunlap, and Ewing, who subsequently submitted a report concluding with the following resolutions, viz :

"1. Resolved, That the report of the committee appointed by the last Assembly to confer with the Synod of Pittsburgh, on the subject of a transfer of the Western Foreign Missionary Society to the General Assembly, be adopted, and that said transfer be accepted on the terms of agreement therein contained.

"2. Resolved, That the Assembly will proceed to appoint a Foreign Mission Board, the seat of whose operations shall be in the city of New York.

"(Signed) W. W. PHILLIPS, *Chairman.*

"Agreed to by the committee, except Dr. Skinner."

Dr. Skinner, as the minority of the committee, presented a counter report, which is as follows:

"Whereas the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions has been connected with the Presbyterian church from the year of its incorporation, by the very elements of its existence; and whereas at the present time the majority of the whole of the Board are Presbyterians; and whereas it is undesirable, in conducting the work of foreign missions, that there should be any collision at home or abroad; therefore,

"Resolved, That it is inexpedient that the Assembly should organize a separate Foreign Missionary institution."

The question being on the adoption of the report of the majority, Dr. Peters moved its postponement with a view to take up the counter report of Dr. Skinner. A long debate ensued which embraced the merits of the whole question. The principal speakers in favour of the motion to postpone, and consequently against the organization of a Foreign Missionary Board by the General Assembly, were Mr. Jessup, Dr. Peters, Dr. Skinner, Dr. Palmer, Messrs. Wisner, Brainard, Stevens, Ford, &c. &c. Their leading arguments were the following:

1. This Assembly is under no obligation to receive the Foreign Missionary Society, or carry out the compact made with the synod of Pittsburgh, first, because one Assembly cannot bind its successors, and secondly, because a committee sitting after the dissolution of the Assembly had no power to conclude such a compact. A distinction is to be made between the judicial and legislative powers of the Assembly. In judicial matters this is the court of last resort and its decisions are final; in matters which it recommends to the churches it is not a court. Its whole power is either judicial or recommendatory. The present case not being judicial in its nature, was simply a recommendation. The last Assembly recommended the appointment of a Board of Foreign Missions; this Assembly has a right to recall such recommendation, and to proceed further in the business. All power originates with the presbyteries, and as they have not conferred the authority to make such an arrangement it is

not obligatory. You have no right to tack on to the constitution, contracts or other irresistible arrangements till you first go down to the presbyteries and get their authority. As to the right of one Assembly to bind another, there is a distinction to be observed in parliamentary law. The United States Senate never dies, as only one third of the Senators go out of office every two years; and consequently in a new Congress the Senate take up the unfinished business, and proceed with it the same as from one session to another. But in the House of Representatives it is otherwise. Each Congress opens with a new house, and all the unfinished business has to be taken up *de novo*. And no House of Representatives would think of passing a resolution binding their successors. So with the British Parliament. Its committees sit and act during the recess, or adjournment, but when the Parliament is dissolved, as this body is dissolved at the end of its session, the committees are at an end, and the members go home as private citizens. The house may appoint a committee to investigate a subject and report information as the last Assembly appointed a committee to report on slavery. But they cannot clothe that committee with any authority, for no body can communicate that which it has not. Suppose the members of the last Assembly had all come together themselves after the dissolution; would they have had any authority to make such a compact? Plainly not. How then could they do that by a committee which they could not do by themselves?

2. But further, the Assembly has no power to conduct missionary operations at all. It cannot appoint a Board of Missions, because the necessary power has never been delegated by the Presbyteries to this body.* Nobody doubts that it

* This extraordinary argument was first we believe advanced by Mr. Jessup of Montrose. After saying that the powers of the Assembly are derived from the presbyteries, he asks, 'How is it with the subject of Missions? Have the presbyteries clothed us with power to establish Boards for the management of Missions? I find no such power.' *New York Evangelist*, June 4th. According to the *New York Observer*, of June 11th, Dr. Peters said, 'I do not think the Assembly has power to make such an arrangement. I accord with the legal views of the subject given by brother Jessup.' The *Observer* does not enable us to determine what was the point as to which Dr. Peters accorded with Mr. Jessup, but it makes Dr. Phillips say in reply, evidently referring to Dr. Peters, 'It has been said by another member that the Assembly had no power to engage in the business of missions, and on this subject the Act and Testimony has been quoted.' It was Dr. Peters who quoted the Act and Testimony in support of the position that all power was vested in the presbyteries.

We are very glad that the motion to exclude the Editor of the *Evangelist* from

is the duty of the Catholic visible church to spread the gospel through the earth. But that is nothing to the point to prove that this body has power to appoint a Board of Missions. The Catholic visible church it is truly said is not an organized body. It is composed of the individuals that compose it; and they are to promote missions, and extend the gospel in the best way they can. How does this go to prove that the General Assembly has authority to conduct and regulate the missionary efforts that are made by the members of the Presbyterian church? This question of authority is to be proved, not assumed. If it exists in the General Assembly, it has been given by the churches. The whole authority remains in the sessions and presbyteries, unless it has been expressly given to the Assembly. Hence if any new authority is proposed to be exercised by this body, it is necessary to send down the question to the presbyteries for their consent. If it is said we subvert the authority of the Board of Domestic missions. Suppose we do. A precedent is nothing in the face of the constitution. It is a bad argument from one breach of the constitution to plead in favour of another.

3. It is unnecessary to organize another Board of missions inasmuch as the American Board of Commissioners possess and deserve the confidence of the churches. This being the case, it is very unwise to go to the expense of separate action involving a new set of permanent and salaried officers, of travelling agents, &c. &c.

4. The General Assembly is ill-constructed for the work of missions, on account of its fluctuating character and party divisions. Its members are changed every year, whereas in a voluntary association they remain permanently at their post and may thus constantly profit by experience. Besides, the Assembly has too much other and discordant business to transact.

5. If another Board is organized, it will certainly produce

the floor of the Assembly, for a supposed disrespect to the Moderator, did not prevail, for to him the public are indebted for the most satisfactory reports of the proceedings of the house. It is not from the Observer that we or any one else could learn that Mr. Jessup had taken the ground that the Assembly had no right to have a Board of Missions, much less that this extreme position was assumed by the Secretary of the Home Missionary Society. Yet as it appears from the reports given by the Evangelist, this was made one of the chief points in the debate. And it certainly has done as much, to say the least, to destroy confidence, and disturb the harmony of the churches as any thing either said or done during the whole sessions of the Assembly. The argument in support of this novel and alarming position given above, is from the speech of Judge Stevens of Geneva Presbytery, as found in the Evangelist for June 25.

collision and strife through the whole church. The history of the two Boards of Domestic Missions teaches an affecting lesson on this subject. At first it was predicted and promised that there should be no interference, and the Assembly recommended both Boards to the patronage of the churches. But soon there appeared symptoms of reluctance, until at length it was disputed whether it was proper to name the Home Missionary Society, in the annual report of the state of religion. Last year the Assembly very gravely resolved that though they regretted the separate action of the two associations, yet, on the whole, they were persuaded that it was not expedient to attempt to *prohibit*, within our bounds, the operations of the Home Missionary Society.

6. The organization of a Board of Foreign Missions by the Assembly is unfair, inasmuch as such Board would act in the name of the whole church, while it was really preferred by only a part, whether great or small. Unless there is universal preference in the Assembly for an ecclesiastical organization it ought not to be adopted, because those who preferred a voluntary association,* being united by the constitution to the others, were made to lend their sanction to a plan which they do not approve. We are like men in a ship. Where that goes we are obliged to go, however unwillingly. This is unfair, and gives the friends of ecclesiastical organizations an undue advantage. They are enabled to say, 'this Board belongs to the church, if you do not sustain it, you are not a good member of the church to which you belong and profess to be attached.'

7. It was said that there were stipulations between the Assembly and the American Board which stand in the way.†

* It is singular that those who are so strenuous for voluntary associations, should advocate the American Board of Commissioners, which is a close corporation, self elected, and perpetuating itself. Whether it is the better or worse on this account, is not the question, but it is certainly far less a voluntary association than any Board appointed by the General Assembly. The members of that body are elected by the Presbyteries, and comes every year fresh from the churches, and therefore they and their Boards are under the control of the whole church. Whereas the American Board was organized with the express view to prevent that control. Its original members were so much influenced by the fate of Harvard College, which had been made Socinian by the Boston churches, that they were afraid of a voluntary association, and therefore formed themselves into a close corporation, and obtained a charter as such. It is consequently the least voluntary, though it may be the best conducted, body in the country.

† This argument was urged by the same men, who maintained that one Assembly cannot bind another. The N. Y. Observer represents Dr. Peters as

The Assembly of 1826 having sanctioned the union of the United Foreign Missionary Society with the American Board, and recommended that Board, it is virtually bound not to organize a separate Board of its own.

8. We take higher ground. It is with us a matter of conscience. The proper way to propagate religion is by anti-sectarian plans of action. Religion is anti-sectarian. It is not faith in Presbyterianism that we wish to spread, but faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Saviour of sinners. It is not the faith in those peculiarities by which Christians are divided, but the common faith in which Christians are united. The plan proposed is sectarian. Its object is to spread Presbyterianism. The religion which it wishes to spread is Presbyterian religion, when the object should be to spread the common faith of all the saved.

The principal speakers against the motion to postpone and in favour of Dr. Phillips' report, were Mr. Nesbit, Dr. Hoge, Dr. Miller, Dr. Phillips, Dr. M'Elroy, Dr. Neill, Mr. W. Breckinridge, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Boyd, &c. &c. Their most important arguments were the following.

* 1. In virtue of the action of the last Assembly, this body is bound in good faith to appoint a Board of Foreign Missions, agreeably to the contract formed with the synod of Pittsburgh. Though one Assembly cannot by an act of ordinary legislation bind its successors, yet in all cases in which contracts have been formed under the authority of one Assembly, succeeding Assemblies are bound in honour and honesty to execute them. It has been contended on the other side of the house, that this Assembly is bound by even the implied stipulations involved in the transfer, by the Assembly of 1826, of the United Foreign Missionary Society to the American Board, and the recommendation of the latter body to the patronage of the churches, although the Assembly had formally refused to give any pledge against the adoption of another method of conducting foreign missions, should it subsequently be deemed expedient. Yet these same persons deny that this Assembly is bound by a formal agreement entered into by the express authority of its pre-

asserting this principle, and saying, 'You cannot tack on to the constitution contracts and other irresistible arrangements, until you first go down to the Presbyteries and get their authority. I am firm in this conviction,' in the very same column makes him argue that the arrangements of the Assembly of 1826, were binding on this Assembly.

* It is not intended to convey the idea that the arguments which follow were all presented on the floor of the Assembly precisely as they are here exhibited.

decessor, and duly ratified with another party. It is not now the question, whether, this agreement is wise or unwise, expedient or inexpedient, but simply whether it has been actually formed, and formed according to the constitution of the church. As to the first point, there can be no doubt, for here are the documents; first a resolution of the Assembly appointing a committee to confer with the synod of Pittsburgh, in reference to the transfer of the Western Missionary Society; secondly, a subsequent resolution authorizing that committee to conclude the arrangement and "to ratify and confirm the same with the said synod;" thirdly, the report of this committee, that they had; in the name and by the authority of the Assembly, concluded a compact which had been accepted and ratified by the synod of Pittsburgh. Here is surely a formal agreement binding in honour, in morals and in law, which can be vitiated only by proving that the Assembly of 1835, had no authority to make such an agreement, or if they possessed the power that they had no right to delegate it to a committee. Both of these positions were assumed. That however the Assembly had itself the right, is plain from the constitution of the church, and from the nature of this body, as the supreme judicatory. It has the right to agree to do, whatever by the constitution, it has a right to do. It has the right to acquire and to alienate property, to conduct domestic and foreign missionary operations, to found and superintend theological seminaries, and having the right to do these things, it has the right to enter into contracts with second parties in relation to them, which contracts must be binding, in law and conscience, on all future Assemblies. Suppose the last Assembly had solemnly agreed for the purchase of a house or tract of land, for a stipulated price, could the present Assembly with any show of honesty refuse to issue its warrant for the payment of the money, on the plea that their predecessors had made a bad bargain? Could the Assembly of 1836, recall or annul the agreement made some years ago, with the executors of the Hon. Elias Boudinott, on the ground that one assembly is not bound by the acts of another? This is the very doctrine sometimes, though happily for the world, not very often, heard from political men, that one legislature cannot bind its successors, and consequently that the public debts contracted by one generation, are not binding on the following. This doctrine would subvert all our institutions civil and religious. This is a point so perfectly plain that it is impossible to

escape the conclusion that this Assembly is bound by the contract of the preceding one, excepted by assuming the position that conducting missionary operations is beyond the constitutional power of the Assembly, and consequently that this body had no right to agree to conduct them, or to enter into any contract in relation to them. This seems to have been the occasion of the far reaching declaration from the other side of the house that this body 'has no power to engage in missions.' If this is true, then indeed is the contract null and void. This body has no right to organize political parties, to declare war or make peace with foreign nations, and any contract so to do would be of no binding force. And if in like manner it has no right to conduct missionary operations, then it had no right to make this contract with the synod of Pittsburgh. This is evidently a desperate resource. The constitution of the church says, 'the General Assembly may, of its own knowledge, send missions to any part to found churches or to supply vacancies.' Here is the power in express terms and in all its amplitude. It is a power which has been exercised from the very organization of the church, and which has been universally recognized. It is, therefore, sustained by the very letter of the constitution, by long continued and undisputed precedent, by innumerable acts of legislation, and by the uninterrupted assent of the churches. If it is now to be denied and overturned to serve a purpose, then there is nothing in our constitution which may not, by the will of a majority of this house, be voted out of the book, or trampled under foot. If the Assembly had no right to organize a Board of Missions, it has no right to establish theological seminaries, and if the Assembly has no such right, the several synods cannot have it, and the Auburn, Princeton, Pittsburgh, Union, Columbia Seminaries, are unconstitutional excrescences, and must be put down, in order to place them under voluntary associations or close corporations. It is, therefore, in vain to deny that the Assembly has the power to conduct missions, and if it has this power, it has the right to enter into engagements, which from the nature of all compacts are binding, until properly dissolved.

As to the second position, that the Assembly could not enter into such a compact by a committee, it was much more feebly supported. It was maintained principally on the ground that the power not residing in the Assembly itself, could not be delegated; and secondly, that the Assembly not continu-

ing as a permanent body, the doings of a committee, acting after its dissolution, can be of no authority. The former of these grounds has been already considered; and as to the latter, it is inconsistent with all precedent and all analogy. The Assembly has always been in habit of appointing delegates or committees, invested with more or less power, to act after its final adjournment. All its Boards of missions, education, and directors, are committees of this nature. According to this doctrine we can have no stated, and no permanent clerk; the moment the Assembly adjourns, they, and all the directors of our theological seminaries, are out of office, and may 'go home as private citizens.' The compact, therefore, entered into by the committee acting under the authority of the last Assembly, with the Synod of Pittsburgh, relating to a subject within the legitimate powers of this body, and formed in a way consistent with the constitution, cannot in good faith be violated by this body. If this Assembly thinks it altogether inexpedient to enter upon the work of foreign missions, and to adhere to the compact already formed, let them appoint a committee to wait on the Synod of Pittsburgh, and solicit that body to annul it, and to consent to receive again under its care the Western Missionary Society; but do not let them act in the face of their own solemn engagements.

2. The resolution of the last Assembly to conduct Foreign Missions was not only constitutionally formed, but it is reasonable and expedient. It is notorious and acknowledged, that one portion of our churches prefer voluntary associations, and another ecclesiastical organizations, for conducting benevolent enterprises. The former have an organ suited to their wishes in the American Board; it is therefore but reasonable that the others should have one adapted to their wishes, organized by the General Assembly. It has been said indeed, that they might operate through the Western Missionary Society, which is under ecclesiastical control. This would be a satisfactory answer, were they all connected with the Synod of Pittsburgh. But the fact is, they are scattered over the whole country, connected with every Synod, and perhaps every Presbytery, in the church. They need a common bond of union, and this bond can be found only in the General Assembly. This body is their mutual representative, where they can all meet, and through which alone they can combine. They have a natural right to avail themselves of their own system, to give harmony and union to their action. It was therefore ungenerous and unjust for those who do not

wish such an organization for themselves, to say that those who need it, shall not have it. What avails it to say,—we think the American Board is good enough, that it is efficient, that it is wisely conducted, that it has many Presbyterians in its ranks, that we dislike ecclesiastical associations? These may be good reasons for determining the action of those who prefer that Board, but they have no manner of force to show that the opposite class should be forced to agree with them, or why they should be denied the privilege of following out their own plan in the way they think the most efficient. It is said indeed by those on the opposite side of the house, we do not hinder you from having your own plan, we only refuse to renounce our own preferences and co-operate with you in the furtherance of yours. The assembly is one, the church is one. We are all in one ship. If we agree to this Board we virtually say that we prefer it, and are bound to support it. But do these brethren reason thus with regard to the Boards of Education and Domestic Missions? Do they consider themselves as giving a preference to these ecclesiastical organizations, every time they vote for Directors, or order the printing of their reports, or as long as they abstain from putting an end to their existence? Do they not resolutely assert their entire freedom in these matters, and deny that because the Assembly has a Board of Education, they are under obligation to support or sanction it, or to renounce their preference for the American Education Society? When some extreme men urge the fact that the Boards in question are under the Assembly, imposes an obligation on all good Presbyterians to sustain them, do they not spurn at the assumption and deny its truth? With what consistency then do they now maintain that if they allow the organization of a Foreign Board, they are made parties to it; that they sanction it, and are brought under obligations to sustain it? The fact is not so: they themselves are loud and constant in proclaiming the contrary. They never cease asserting that they are not bound to sustain the Assembly's Boards of Education and Missions, but are perfectly free to patronise what societies they please. And they are right. They have this liberty, and the Assembly has no right to interfere with it. But if this is so, then according to their own principles they are not now refusing to sanction the principle of ecclesiastical organization, or to bring themselves under an obligation to sustain a mode of operation which they do not approve of, but they are deliberately refusing to allow their brethren to

have an organization such as they prefer, which they believe to be essential to the right discharge of their duty as a church, and necessary to bring all its resources to bear efficiently on the missionary work. They assume therefore a fearful and gratuitous responsibility, without necessity and without excuse. They are not called upon to compromise their own principles, but simply to allow freedom to others in the exercise of theirs.

3. The Assembly ought to organize a Board of Foreign Missions, because a large portion of our churches desire it. It is no matter whether this desire in itself is reasonable or not, it is sufficient that it exists, to render it obligatory on the Assembly to gratify it. The fact that a very large part of the Presbyterian church does entertain this wish, is evident from the action of the last Assembly, and from the number of members in this house who stand forth as the advocates of the measure. Unless it can be shown that the Assembly has no right to comply with the request, the consideration that a portion of its members prefer a different mode of action, is no sufficient reason for rejecting it. These brethren come forward and say, We feel bound in conscience to appear and to unite as a church in sending the gospel to all nations; we believe that the command of Christ requires this at our hands; we have no desire to interfere with others; we wish merely to do our own duty in our own way; we are so scattered over the country, that no one Synod or Presbytery can unite or direct our efforts; the General Assembly is our only point of union; we wish it to give us a Board, not for the purpose of withdrawing patronage from other societies, or of forcing others to act with us, but simply to enable us to act in the most efficient manner to attain a common object. As we have no right to say to others, you must prefer the Ecclesiastical Board, and send out missionaries through its agency alone; so they have no right to say to us, you must be content with the American Board, or with an imperfect synodical organization which does not embrace the tenth part of our members. The simple question is, how can the spirit of missions be most widely diffused through the church, the zeal of its members excited, its resources called forth, and its efforts combined and directed? Can this be done by an organization situated at one extremity of the country, which a large part of the church, whether properly or improperly, look upon as a foreign body, and which after the trial of twenty years has failed to reach and excite some of the

most dense and important portions of the church? Is it not obvious, that more can be done by allowing free scope to the preference of both classes, by leaving both without excuse for backwardness in this great work, and by adopting two systems, when there are notoriously two sets of opinions or prejudices to be conciliated? What harm can possibly result from this course? To say it is too expensive, is nothing to the purpose. It may show indeed that the desire for a separate organization is unwise, but it furnishes no ground for saying that those who are willing to sustain this expense, shall not be allowed to do it. It is urged as an objection, that collision must necessarily arise from this separate action. But separate action does exist and cannot be prevented; and unpleasant collisions are much more likely to be prevented by mutual concessions, than by an arbitrary determination to resist all compromise, and to refuse to one whole moiety of the church, what they consider an absolute right and a most important privilege. If it was determined to embroil the church, and to alienate its members, a more effectual method could not be adopted, than by refusing to grant a measure which one half of the church has so much at heart. If the spirit which has hitherto guided the operations of the American Board of Commissioners be continued, no unpleasant strife or rivalry need be anticipated. Not the slightest opposition of this kind has yet arisen between that Board and the Western Society, though they operate, in a measure, upon the same ground. No fair inference can be drawn as to this point, from the experience of the two Boards of Domestic Missions. The result was not then arrived at, that there were to be two separate Boards. Constant attempts were made to effect a union, first on one plan and then on another, to which one party was very averse. Separate action was regarded as so great an evil, that it was thought right to prevent it at any cost. While this conflict continued, there was of necessity difficulty. But since the matter has been settled, we hear little of collision. And if it does occur, the blame must lie in a great measure on the personal character and conduct of the agents. There is therefore no valid objection to the proposed plan, and even if the Assembly were not committed and bound by the action of the last Assembly, it would be right and expedient for the accomplishment of the greatest good, that a Board of Foreign Missions should be organized by this body.

4. We feel it to be the duty and privilege of the Presby-

terian church to engage as a church in the great work of evangelizing the world. We find all other denominations thus engaged. The Episcopalians, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Moravians have each their Missionary Societies; why should Presbyterians alone be deprived of a separate organization? What is the object of a church organization? Is it the mere administration of discipline, as has been strangely asserted? Or is it to maintain and promote the truth, to extend and to sustain the preaching of the gospel and administration of ordinances wherever there are human beings to be saved? This unquestionably is the great design of the church; and the attainment of this object demands not only the mission of preachers to the various portions of our own land, but to all countries to which we have access. If this is our high vocation as a church, we must have the necessary organizations for the accomplishment of our work. This is the more necessary because the moral influence of such action upon the church itself and upon the world is eminently salutary. Every organized body has a moral character to sustain and cherish as well as every individual. And that character is its great means of influence. To attain a character which shall enable it to do good, it must appear before the world pure, faithful, intelligent, and active. It must not only be such, but it must be seen as such. It must let its light shine. What is the reason that the Moravians are looked up to with such respect and affection by the whole Christian world? It is because they have, as a denomination, and not merely as individual Christians, stood forth as an humble, faithful, devoted band of missionary men. The world would have lost all the influence of their example had they contented themselves with operating through the established organs of the Lutheran or Reformed churches on the continent, or aided to swell the resources of the London Missionary Society. They have done right in acting by themselves, in perfect peace and love with all other denominations, but still as a separate and independent portion of the universal church. The high moral character attained by a denomination exerts the most happy influence upon all its members. The spirit of the whole diffuses itself through the several parts; every member feels not only the motives which press upon him as an individual, but as a constituent portion of a great benevolent society. He feels himself called upon to act as becomes a Moravian, for example, as well as in a manner becoming a Christian. There is no more effective means of diffusing

life through the several parts, than to maintain an elevated spirit in the organization as a whole. If the Presbyterian church had from its origin been engaged as visibly and as actively in the prosecution of the missionary work, as the Moravians, or if even what its individual members have done through other channels, had been done through its own organs, its praise would now be in all the earth; its moral character would be far higher than it now is; the spirit of its members would be more pure and elevated; and its influence over the world would be unspeakably more salutary.

It has been objected that on these principles we should have a Presbyterian Bible Society, a Presbyterian Tract Society and a Presbyterian Sabbath School Society. This is not a fair inference. There is an obvious principle which should decide the cases in which the union and co-operation of the different Christian denominations are at once feasible and desirable, and those in which they are undesirable and impracticable. Wherever the field of operation is common to all, and the means of operation the same, then all should unite, but not otherwise. With regard to the distribution of the Bible, both these conditions necessary for harmonious union obviously concur. The field of operation is the whole population without the least regard to their being Baptists, Episcopalians, or Methodists, and the means of operation is common to all sects, viz. the authorized English version of the Scriptures. Had the different denominations different versions of the Bible, it would be a very serious obstacle to their united action in the work of its distribution. We have seen the trouble which the different modes of translating one single word has occasioned. The same remarks apply to the Tract Society. The publications of this Society are intended for promiscuous distribution. No tract distributor as he goes from house to house can inquire to what particular denomination its inhabitants belong; he must give to all he meets. It is therefore, essential that there should be a society in which all have confidence and in which all unite. With regard however to the education of the clergy and the formation of churches the case is very different. Here, from the nature of the object to be effected, the points of difference between the different denominations must be taken into the account. Protestants cannot commit the education of their candidates for the ministry to Catholics, or Catholics to Protestants; nor can Episcopalians give this matter up to Presbyterians or Presbyterians to Episcopalians. The idea is preposterous.

As long as men conscientiously differ to such an extent as to give rise to distinct ecclesiastical organizations, they do but stultify themselves by saying that the points of difference are of no account, and are to be utterly disregarded. When all sects are abolished, and Christians are united on some platform broad enough to sustain them all, then, when there is no difference, there will be no need for separate action.

Again, it has been strongly objected to the proposed that it is sectarian. The ground has been assumed that 'the world can never be converted by sectarian movements for propagating, along with the essentials of Christianity, the peculiarities of the various sects. Religion is anti-sectarian. But the plan proposed is sectarian. Its object is to propagate Presbyterianism. The religion which it wishes to spread is Presbyterian religion, when the object should be to spread the common faith of all the saved.' This is an amiable chimaera. The mere illusion of an ardent mind. No such thing exists on the face of the earth as Christianity in the abstract; and no such thing ever has been or ever can be propagated. You might as well talk of colonizing a country with man as a *genus*, while you obstinately refuse to send out any of the varieties of the race. Where is this religion in the general to be found, unless in the person of the amiable enthusiast, who has so eloquently urged this objection? Look around you: every man you see is either an Episcopalian or a Methodist, a Presbyterian or an Independent, an Arminian or a Calvinist, no one is a Christian in the general. Each may possess the common faith of all the saved, but to send out that common faith, you must also send what each has mixed up with it in his head or heart. You cannot get the ethereal essence uncombined, and are therefore reduced to the necessity of either sending nothing at all, or of sending Christianity in some of the forms in which it actually exists. Under these circumstances, it would seem to be wise to send it in that form which you conscientiously believe to be the best. Besides, we would ask the brother, what he proposes to do, when he gets among the heathen? Does he mean to have an organized ministry and external ordinances? Then he will have a sectarian church, with which the pious Quaker can have no fellowship. Does he mean to have the ministers ordain their successors? Then he will be in conflict with the Independent. Does he mean to baptise the children of his converts, after the manner of the apostles? Then he will have a sectarian anti-baptist church. Does he mean to

allow of Presbyterian ordination and extempore prayer? Then he will raise a wall of separation between himself and the Episcopalians. Alas! he will stand alone in his universalism, and be a sect by himself. The primary principle which has led the brother so much astray, is correct and beautiful. He quotes from our standards the maxim, "truth is in order to goodness." But we would have him remember that that is *our* confession; the very one which we are accused of loving even to bigotry. It is because truth is in order to goodness, we are so zealous for it, and that we so much marvel that others make so light of it. But he says, there are some who forget this maxim, and making truth its own end, insist that Christian union, must be an union in doctrinal opinions; while 'others who dwell much on church order consider union to consist in unity of ecclesiastical organization. Those who regard holiness of heart and life as the main thing, consider Christian union to consist in the exercise of love and fellowship towards all who possess this one thing needful. It is perfectly plain that the expectation of union on either the first or second ground is perfectly chimerical. The other is plainly practicable.' With all this we perfectly agree. The brother's error consists in the self-contradictory assumption, that sectarian organizations are unavoidable, yet inconsistent with the Christian union, which he pronounces to be plainly practicable. That is, he would have us believe there is an insurmountable obstacle in the way of an easily attainable end. Now, we avoid this absurdity, by maintaining that diversity of doctrinal belief, and separate ecclesiastical organization are not inconsistent with Christian union. We regard Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists and Moravians, as our brethren, and as constituting with us one body in Christ Jesus. We welcome them to the table of our common Lord. We love them. We rejoice when they rejoice, and weep when they weep. Though they should not acknowledge us, still we acknowledge them, and regard them as belonging to the one fold of the one great Shepherd. How then is this true, vital and only valuable union of Christians to be promoted? Is it by saying to Episcopalians you shall not send out Episcopal missionaries to propagate Episcopalian religion; you must send out Christianity in the general? Is it by laying the same injunction on the Baptist, Moravian, Methodist and Presbyterian? Then nothing will ever be done. You can write a book which may contain nothing to which an Episcopalian or Baptist

would object, but you will not readily find a man who holds to nothing but the common faith of all the saved. Take the brother himself, we doubt not he has that faith, but he has with it such a multitude of positive opinions as to make him more universally antagonistic than any man in the church. He is not a Congregationalist and he is not a Presbyterian. He is not an Episcopalian and he is not a Methodist. He is simply an anti-sectarian. He stands therefore alone, in violent opposition to the whole Christian world. This comes of being over liberal. Such liberality always ends in being denunciatory and exclusive. It is, therefore, a mere chimera to think of sending a Christianity without form or organization through the world. The brother himself pronounces the expectation of the union of Christians in opinion and ecclesiastical organization chimerical. Different denominations must then, according to his own principles, exist. And if they must exist, the best way is to let them alone. The surest way in the world to exasperate their feelings, and widen the breach between them, is for one to interfere with the other, and to undertake to forbid or denounce the propagation of Christianity in the form which they severally believe to be the purest and the best. It is for this reason that we think it so unwise and so unkind in our Congregational brethren, and in those Congregationally inclined, to come here and denounce us as sectarians and bigots because we do, what alone we can do, endeavour to promote what we believe to be truth. We are forbidden to teach Presbyterian religion. <What is Presbyterian religion according to our belief and solemn profession, but the truth of God, truth in order to goodness?> We should be of all men the most besotted, if, with this belief, we did not desire to promote it to the ends of the earth. If then, we are to have Christian union, we must have separate organization and separate action. This anti-sectarian spirit is a mere *monomania*, which may serve well enough to inspire an essay or a sermon, but should have no influence on the deliberations of a grave ecclesiastical assembly.

Dr. Peters has said this measure originated in the celebrated Pittsburgh Convention. This is a mistake. It has been in consideration for years, and has been the subject of long and anxious consultation. It is in vain to attempt to cast odium on the plan. It must be judged by its own merits. So far from originating in the convention of last year, it is almost universally known that the late Dr. Rice prepared, on his death bed, an overture on this subject to be presented to the

General Assembly, embracing every essential feature of the proposed measure. It has not originated in any narrow sectarian policy, nor is it advocated on sectarian grounds. There is no man in this Assembly, who could find it in his heart to stand on the grave of JOHN HOLT RICE, and pronounce the words, sectarian bigot. The overture as prepared by that good man, breathes the very spirit of the gospel, and that overture contains every thing which the most strenuous advocate for ecclesiastical organization desires.*

* As this overture is short, we give it here entire, as the best possible refutation of the charge in question.

“*Project of an Overture to be submitted to the next General Assembly.*—The Presbyterian church in the United States of North America, in organizing their form of government, and in repeated declarations made through their Representatives in after times, have solemnly recognized the importance of the missionary cause, and their obligation as Christians, to promote it by all the means in their power. But these various acknowledgments have not gone to the full extent of the obligation imposed by the Head of the church, nor have they produced exertions at all corresponding thereto. Indeed, in the judgment of this General Assembly, one primary and principal object of the institution of the church by Jesus Christ was, not so much the salvation of individual Christians—for, ‘he that believeth in the Lord Jesus Christ shall be saved’—but the communicating of the blessing of the gospel to the destitute with the efficiency of united effort. The entire history of the Christian Societies organized by the apostles affords abundant evidence that they so understood the design of their Master. They received from Him a command to ‘preach the gospel to every creature’—and from the churches planted by them, the word of the Lord was ‘sounded out,’ through all parts of the civilized world. Nor did the missionary spirit of the primitive churches expire, until they had become secularized and corrupted by another spirit. And it is the decided belief of this General Assembly that a true revival of religion in any denomination of Christians, will generally, if not universally, be marked by an increased sense of obligation to execute the commission which Christ gave to the apostles.

“The General Assembly would therefore, in the most public and solemn manner, express their shame and sorrow that the church represented by them has done, comparatively, so little to make known the saving health of the gospel to all nations. At the same time, they would express their grateful sense of the goodness of the Lord, in employing the instrumentality of others to send salvation to the heathen. Particularly would they rejoice at the Divine favour manifested to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, whose perseverance, whose prudence, whose skill, in conducting this most important interest, merit the praise, and excite the joy of all the churches.

“With an earnest desire therefore, to co-operate with this noble Institution; to fulfil, in some part at least, their own obligations; and to answer the just expectations of the friends of Christ in other denominations, and in other countries; in obedience also to what is believed to be the command of Christ; be it therefore *Resolved*,

“1. That the Presbyterian church in the United States is a Missionary Society; the object of which is to aid in the conversion of the world; and that every member of the church is a member for life of said Society, and bound in maintenance of his Christian character, to do all in his power for the accomplishment of this object.

5. We are anxious for the adoption of this measure, because we believe it to be necessary for the accomplishment of the greatest amount of good. This argument has been in a great measure anticipated. It is beyond comparison the most important. Did we not believe that the resources of the church could not be effectually elicited in any other way, we should be less anxious about the result. "It is impossible to bring the Presbyterian church as it is, into general action on any other principle than the one proposed. There are a multitude in this church who will not contribute to the American Board. You can neither persuade nor compel them to do it. The principle that the church ought to act in this behalf is written on their hearts, right or wrong. They are the bone and sinew of the Presbyterian church, and they have taken up this conviction totally unconnected with all questions of temporary excitement or party strife, as a prin-

"2. That the ministers of the gospel in connection with the Presbyterian church, are hereby most solemnly required to present this subject to the members of their respective congregations, using every effort to make them feel their obligations, and to induce them to contribute according to their ability.

"3. That a committee of — be appointed from year to year by the General Assembly, to be designated, 'The committee of the Presbyterian church of the United States for Foreign Missions,' to whose management this whole concern shall be confided, with directions to report all their transactions to the churches.

"4. The committee shall have power to appoint a Chairman, Corresponding Secretary, Treasurer, and other necessary officers.

"5. The Committee shall, as far as the nature of the case will admit, be co-ordinate with the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and shall correspond and co-operate with that association, in every possible way, for the accomplishment of the great objects which it has in view.

"6. Inasmuch as numbers belonging to the Presbyterian church have already, to some extent, acknowledged their obligations, and have been accustomed, from year to year, to contribute to the funds of the American Board, and others may hereafter prefer to give that destination to their contributions; and inasmuch as the General Assembly, so far from wishing to limit or impede the operations of that Board, is earnestly desirous that they may be enlarged to the greatest possible extent; it is therefore to be distinctly understood, that all individuals, Congregations or Missionary Associations, are at liberty to send their contributions either to the American Board, or to the committee for Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian church, as to the contributors may appear most likely to advance the great object of the conversion of the world.

"7. That every church session be authorized to receive contributions; and be directed to state in their annual reports, to the Presbytery, distinctly, the amount contributed by their respective churches for Foreign Missions: and that it be earnestly recommended to all church sessions, in hereafter admitting new members to the churches, distinctly to state to candidates for admission, that if they join the church, they join a community, the object of which is the conversion of the heathen world, and to impress on their minds a deep sense of their obligation as redeemed sinners, to co-operate in the accomplishment of the great object of Christ's mission to the world."

ciple of moral propriety and duty. And as to numbers, we are willing to pledge our character for judgment, that at least two-thirds of the whole Presbyterian church, could they be consulted, would give their voice in favour of ecclesiastical action, on a proper system, by the church, through her constituted authorities, for the evangelization of the world."* We regard this measure, therefore, not merely as a means of doing good to others, but as a measure of immense importance for diffusing new life and vigour through our own body. We wish to awaken a missionary spirit, and with it a spirit of universal and active benevolence. Why should this means of grace be denied us? Our brethren are loud in proclaiming its importance. They rejoice in possessing it in a form adapted to the views and wishes of their portion of the church; why should they deny this inestimable blessing to us?

On the conclusion of the debate the vote was taken by *yeas* and *nays*, when it appeared there were 133 for the postponement of Dr. Phillips's report, and 134 against it, being a majority of one in favour of an ecclesiastical organization. The further consideration of the subject was then postponed. When it was resumed at a late period in the session of the Assembly, the plan proposed by Dr. Phillips was finally rejected by a vote of 111 to 106. Against this decision a solemn protest was entered on the minutes, signed by Dr. Miller and eighty-one other members of the Assembly, containing a summary of the reasons previously urged in favour of the formation of a Foreign Missionary Board. This protest was answered by Dr. Peters, as chairman of the committee appointed for that purpose.

Thus ended this important discussion. We fear the result has inflicted a deeper wound on the prosperity of our church, than she has suffered for a long time. It has weakened materially the bands which have hitherto held us together; not so much on account of the nature of the measure rejected, however important and desirable, as on account of the reasons assigned by the majority for that rejection. These reasons have taken the church by surprise, and excited general anxiety and alarm. There are several important points on which our new-school brethren have taken new ground, and renounced their former principles. They have hitherto earnestly contended, that the adop-

* This passage marked as a quotation, is taken from the speech of Dr. Hoge as reported in the New York Evangelist, June 25.

tion of any particular mode of benevolent action by the General Assembly, imposed no obligation on the churches to adopt that mode, contrary to their own preference; and that their allowing free scope to such mode of operation, implied no sanction of its propriety, or at least of its superiority to others. On this principle, they have not only contended for their perfect right to co-operate with the Home Missionary and American Education Societies, in preference to the Assembly's Boards, but they have called upon the Assembly to recommend those societies. It was never supposed, that those who voted for such recommendation committed themselves as to their private preferences or purposes of co-operation. It has been regarded as a settled point, that those who preferred an ecclesiastical organization, and those who preferred voluntary associations, might meet together in the same Assembly, the former recommend the societies of the latter, and the latter uncommitted vote in reference to the ordinary business of the boards of the former. But these brethren have now discovered that all this is a mistake. They have taken the ground that the whole church is committed by the action of the Assembly. They refused to allow the organization of a Board of Foreign Missions, because they would thereby sanction the principle, renounce their own preferences, and stand committed to sustain an ecclesiastical Board. The standing objection was, that it would be unfair to give the sanction and authority of the whole of the church to a part; whereas, according to their old doctrine, the sanction and authority of the whole, it was not in the power of the Assembly to convey or bestow.

The most important and startling principle, however, advanced by our new school brethren was, that the Assembly has no power to appoint such a Board, or to conduct missionary operations at all. This seems to have been in many minds the turning point of the whole matter. Mr. Jessup, Dr. Peters, Judge Stevens, and other leading speakers on that side gave it a prominence which appears to have surprised and alarmed even those who have never been considered men of extreme opinions. Dr. Hoge says expressly, "As the subject has been proposed in other forms, I have always objected. But the question is now brought before us in a new form, and is to be decided on the naked ground of the power and rights of the Assembly to conduct missions. And on this ground, I cannot abandon it while I love the faith and order of the Presbyterian Church." There are several things

in the assumption of this position adapted to create both alarm and sorrow. The first is, its novelty and its inconsistency with the previous professions of its advocates. To the best of our knowledge this is the first time that this principle has ever been advanced in any of our judicatories, and it is now advanced by men who for a long series of years, and in many different forms, have professed a different opinion. When the friends of the Home Missionary Society on the floor of the Assembly, in their public addresses, and official publications have taken the catholic ground that all they wished was that both Boards should be allowed free scope, and both recommended to the churches, they did there by in the strongest manner, acknowledge the Assembly's Board as a lawful institution. Every profession of friendship was an admission of this fact. Every action on their part in the Assembly in attending to the routine of the business of the Board of Missions, involved more or less distinctly the same acknowledgement. The secretary of the Home Missionary Society, has from his station been the most frequent organ in giving utterance to the professions to which we have alluded. He was the active agent also in proposing different plans of compromise and co-operation all involving the admission of the right of the Assembly to conduct missionary operations. Yet he was the leader of the party which now assumes the opposite ground. The men who have hitherto professed most liberality and friendship, are now foremost in avowing a principle of deadly hostility; a principle which demands not merely reform, a change of men, or of measures, but absolute destruction. It is this that has produced alarm. The churches know not what to depend upon, or what to trust to. Mutual confidence is destroyed, when such repeated professions and avowals are forgotten in a moment. The case is the more aggravated because of the weakness of the arguments by which the position in question was defended. Were it matter for which some show of reason could be presented, about which there had been previous diversity of opinion, or with regard to which some new light had sprung up, we might be less concerned. This, however, is not the fact. The power of the Assembly to conduct missions, is asserted to the letter in our constitution, it has always been exercised, it has always been admitted and recognised, and that too by the very men who now deny its existence, without even professing a change of opinion. Under these circum-

stances, the churches feel astounded. They know not when they are safe, not what is to be considered sacred.

It is not, however, so much the novelty of this principle, nor its inconsistency with the former professions of its advocates, nor its untenableness, as its own intrinsic character which makes it alarming to every true Presbyterian. It effects a radical revolution in the whole church. It not only cuts off the Boards of Education and Missions, but all similar Boards, all ecclesiastical seminaries, and gives up the control of all the affairs of the church, beyond mere matters of discipline, to voluntary associations. And by whom are these voluntary associations controlled? By moneyed men. Whatever may be the theory of their operation, this we believe to be practically the fact. These men of wealth, as far as we know are good men, but it is not their goodness, but their wealth which gives them their controlling influence. It is too late in the day now to question the fact, that the men who control the benevolent operations of the church are the men of supreme authority. It is not necessary to suppose either that this influence is a direct object of pursuit, or that it exerts its power through the force of mercenary motives. It results from the nature of the system. The men who have the direction of the education of the candidates for the ministry,* and the location and support of these candidates when ordained, have ten thousand sources of influence in the feelings and associations, as well as interests of those concerned, which render them the arbiters of the destiny of the church. This influence is the more serious because it is invisible, unofficial, and consequently irresponsible. It is acquired in one sphere, and is made to bear on all others. It is created without, yet enters all our church judicatories, decides points of discipline and doctrine, and determines the whole course of ecclesiastical affairs. Whether, abstractly considered, it is better that this influence should be vested in the conductors of voluntary societies, than in the regular officers and judicatories of the church or not, certain it is, it is not Presbyterian. According to the theory and former practice of our system, the education of ministers, the formation of churches, the decisions of matters of doctrine and

* We have no special reference here to the peculiar system of the American Education Society, and its Presbyterian auxiliary, which in our judgment is one of complete and odious vassalage, degrading to the beneficiaries, whom it holds in legal bonds, as well as dangerous to the church. Against this system we have protested from the beginning.—See *BIBLICAL REPERTORY* for 1829,

discipline, rest with the judicatories, composed of the clergy and the representatives of the people. These matters are now virtually, and to a degree, even in form, taken out of their hands, and are effectually controlled by the agents, officers, and leading patrons of a few societies. We are willing to admit that this system is in accordance with the genius of Congregationalism, which, with the forms of popular government, has always had the tendency to place the controlling power in the hands of a few individuals. The Congregational pastor, when in favour with his people, has far more power than the Presbyterian minister surrounded by his session, though when that favour is lost he is more completely at their mercy. It is in ecclesiastical as in political affairs, the freest governments in form are often the most despotic in fact. Now, so long as this influence, of which we have been speaking, had its counterpoise in Boards of the General Assembly; so long as it was admitted that that body had a right to provide for the education of ministers and the formation of churches, and so long as all intention or design of interfering with the institutions of those who preferred Presbyterian modes of action were disclaimed, the great majority of the churches felt contented and secure. But when we see the very men who possess this controlling influence in the church, and who of all others are the most sensible of its extent, rising in the Assembly, and declaring that they must be alone; that the other Boards are unconstitutional; that the principle of ecclesiastical organization is not only unwise, but illegal and of course must be put down, we are brought to a stand. We feel as though a mine, cautiously and secretly constructed, had been suddenly sprung under the very foundations of the citadel. We believe, however, that our new school brethren on this, as on some other occasions, have made a mistake. They have gone too far. They have avowed their ultimate objects too soon. We do not believe that a majority of the churches are prepared to see Presbyterianism abolished, and all judicatories made, as Dr. Peters would have them,* mere courts of discipline. When such men as Dr. Hoge are driven to declare they feel themselves contending for "the

* "We discriminate," he says, "between an organization of the Presbyterian church for church discipline and ecclesiastical order, and for the work of carrying on missions. Her internal organization is for discipline alone." *New York Observer*, June 11th. We had always supposed a church was organized for a much loftier end, the conversion and sanctification of men; or, as our confession expresses it, "for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, unto the end of the world."

faith and order of the Presbyterian church," against the ground assumed by these brethren, we cannot think the latter can carry the consciences, the approbation, or support of any large portion of our churches with them. Certain it is, they have lost the confidence of many of their former friends, and greatly consolidated the ranks of the opposite party.

Report on Slavery.

The last General Assembly having appointed Dr. Miller, Dr. Hoge, Mr. Dickey, Mr. Witherspoon, and Dr. Beman, a committee to prepare a report on the subject of slavery, Dr. Miller at an early period presented the following report :

"The committee to whom were referred, by the last General Assembly, sundry memorials and other papers touching the subject of slavery, with directions to report thereon to the General Assembly of 1836, beg leave to report :

"That after the most mature deliberation which they have been able to bestow on the interesting and important subject referred to them, they would most respectfully recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the following preamble and resolutions, viz :

"Whereas, the subject of slavery is inseparably connected with the laws of many of the states in this Union, with which it is by no means proper for an ecclesiastical judicatory to interfere, and involves many considerations in regard to which great diversity of opinion, and intensity of feeling, are known to exist in the churches represented in this Assembly :—And whereas there is every reason to believe that any action on the part of the Assembly in reference to this subject, would tend to distract and divide our churches, and would, probably, in no wise promote the benefit of those whose welfare is immediately contemplated in the memorials in question :—therefore,

"1. Resolved, That it is not expedient for the Assembly to take any further order in relation to this subject.

"2. Resolved, That, as the *notes*, which have been expunged from our public formularies, and which some of the memorials referred to, request to have restored, were introduced irregularly—never had the sanction of the church—and therefore never possessed any authority—the General Assembly has no power, nor would they think it expedient, to assign them a place in the authorized standards of the church."

In this report it was stated that Dr. Miller, Dr. Hoge, and Mr. Witherspoon agreed; Mr. Dickey presented a counter report, which concluded with the following resolutions, viz :

"1. Resolved, That the buying, selling, or holding of a human being as property, is in the sight of God a heinous sin, and ought to subject the doer of it to the censures of the church.

"2. Resolved, That it is the duty of every one, and especially of every Christian, who may be involved in this sin, to free himself from its entanglements without delay.

"3. Resolved, That it is the duty of every one, and especially of every Christian, in the meekness and firmness of the gospel, to plead the cause of the poor and needy, by testifying against the principle and practice of slaveholding; and to use his best endeavours to deliver the church of God from the evil; and to

bring about the emancipation of the slaves in these United States and throughout the world."

Mr. M'Ilhenny, of Virginia, proposed the following substitute, viz :

"The committee to whom were referred by the General Assembly sundry memorials and other papers touching the subject of slavery, with directions to report thereon to the General Assembly, beg leave to report :

"That after the most mature deliberation which they have been able to bestow on the interesting and important subject referred to them, they would most respectfully recommend to the General Assembly the adoption of the following preamble and resolution, viz :

"Whereas the subject of slavery is inseparably connected with the laws of many of the states of this Union, in which it exists under the sanction of said laws, and of the constitution of the United States :

"And whereas slavery is recognized in both the Old and New Testaments as an existing relation, and is not condemned by the authority of God ; therefore

"Resolved, That the General Assembly have no authority to assume or exercise a jurisdiction in regard to the existence of slavery."

Dr. Hoge presented the following preamble and resolution, viz :

"Inasmuch as the constitution of the Presbyterian church, in its preliminary and fundamental principles, declares that no judicatory ought to pretend to make laws to bind the conscience in virtue of their own authority ; and as the urgency of the business of the Assembly, and the shortness of the time during which they can continue in session, render it important to deliberate and decide judiciously on the subject of slavery in its relations to the church ; therefore,

"Resolved, That this whole subject be indefinitely postponed."

After some remarks from Mr. M'Ilhenny in favour of his substitute, and from several other members on the merits of the whole question, Dr. Hoge proposed that the vote should first be taken on his resolution for indefinite postponement, and then upon its preamble. This course was finally agreed to, when the resolution was carried, *y eas* 154, *nays* 90. Many of the southern members and many of the abolitionists united in voting in the negative. The question^d was then taken on the preamble and decided in the affirmative, *y eas* 150, *nays* 84. Against this decision several protests were entered by the abolitionists, to which an answer was given by Mr. Pratt of Georgia, as chairman of the committee appointed for the purpose.

Funds of the General Assembly.

The Trustees of the General Assembly having presented an extended report exhibiting the state of the funds, it was

referred to a committee, who presented the following report, viz :

“ The committee to whom was referred the report of the Trustees of the General Assembly in relation to the funds of the church, report—

“ That they have endeavoured to give the important subject committed to them, the consideration which it demanded. That in the discharge of their duties they have examined the books of the treasurer, and find them in perfect order, *exhibiting all the different funds of the church in a clear and perspicuous manner* : That difficulties and perplexities which had arisen from the fact, that for many years the treasurer's books had not been posted up, *are removed*, and the books and accounts now show the transactions of the Board in the management of the funds of the church, in their proper light.

“ During the past year, important changes have been made by the trustees in some of the funds. Under the suggestions made by a previous General Assembly, the Board have made new and much more productive investments, and by means thereof, have not only been able to meet the annual appropriations for the professors' salaries, but have also paid off \$2671 09 of the moneys previously borrowed from the permanent funds, to meet the orders of the Assembly.

“ Of this sum, \$700 has been repaid to the E. D. scholarship. The Directors of the Princeton Seminary, whose report was also referred to your committee, have called the attention of the Assembly to that scholarship; and in relation thereto the committee have only to observe, that in their opinion the loan which was made from that fund ought to be repaid by the trustees, as soon as the state of the funds will admit; and that in future no loans ought to be made from the permanent funds, and in case loans should be necessary under any resolution of the Assembly, they ought to be drawn from other sources.

“ The subject of investments in stocks is much better understood by the Board of Trustees than by your committee, and the committee believe the Assembly may place entire confidence as well in the judgment and skill, as in the prudence of the trustees in relation to this whole subject. They therefore only suggest to them, that while it is of importance to secure the increase of revenue, which the new investments in bank stocks have yielded, and promise to yield in future, yet a due regard is to be had to the safety and permanency of those investments; and taking into consideration the highly important interests dependent upon such security, that greater risk ought not to be run, than would be incurred by a prudent man, whose family, with himself, might be dependent upon the investments.

“ The committee therefore recommend the following resolutions, to wit :

“ Resolved, That the General Assembly approve the proceedings of the Board of Trustees, as detailed in their report of the 10th of May last, and direct the stated clerk to transmit a copy of this report and these resolutions to that Board, as containing the opinion of the Assembly upon the subjects herein mentioned.

“ Resolved, That the trustees be directed, (if it be not inconsistent with the terms and objects of the bequest,) to dispose of the stock held by them in the United Passaic and Hackensack Bridge Co.

“ Resolved, That the report of the trustees be published in the appendix to the minutes.

“ WM. JESSUP, Chairman.”

The Editor of the New York Evangelist having published a series of articles insinuating, if not directly presenting the charge against the Trustees not only of malservation, but of the embezzlement of the funds, he published the above report

with the following remark : ‘ This report seemed quite satisfactory in regard to the funds of the Assembly in the hands of the Trustees, as at present managed ; and as we have published extensively strictures on the former management, we felt it due to justice to publish the report at full length.’

Desecration of the Sabbath.

On Wednesday, June 8th, Mr. Cleaveland, from the committee to whom had been referred an overture on the desecration of the Lord’s day, made a report which concluded with the following resolutions, viz :

“ Resolved, That the observance of the Sabbath is indispensable to the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty ; and furnishes the only security for eminent and abiding prosperity, either to the church or the nation.

“ That the growing desecration of the Sabbath in our country must be speedily arrested, and the habits of the community essentially reformed, or the blessings of the Sabbath, civil, social, and religious, will soon be irrecoverably lost.

“ That in as much as the work of a general reformation belongs, under God, to the Christian church, it is the duty of the church to apply the convictions of a firm and efficient discipline, to all known violations of the Sabbath, on the part of her members.

“ That in as much as ministers of the gospel act a conspicuous part in every successful effort to do away this sin, it is their solemn duty to maintain, by faithful preaching and consistent practice, the rule of entire abstinence from all profanations of the Lord’s day, uniformly avoiding even the appearance of evil.

“ That this Assembly deem it an immorality to journey, or transact any secular business, or give and receive social visits on the Sabbath ; [or to own stock in such establishments as stages, steam boats, rail roads and the like, which are employed in violation of that holy day.] (The part included in brackets above was stricken out, and the amendment proposed by Dr. Miller in the two following paragraphs was adopted :)

“ That in the judgment of this General Assembly, the owners of stock in the steam boats, canals, rail roads, &c. who are in the habit of violating the Sabbath, are lending their property and their influence to one of the most wide-spread, alarming, and deplorable systems of Sabbath desecration, which now grieve the hearts of the pious, and disgrace the church of God.

“ That it be respectfully recommended to the friends of the Lord’s day, as soon as possible, to establish such means of public conveyance as shall relieve the friends of the Sabbath from the necessity under which they now labour, of travelling at any time in vehicles which habitually violate that holy day ; and thus prevent them from being partakers in other men’s sins, in this respect.

“ That the power of the pulpit and the press must be immediately put in requisition on behalf of a dishonoured Sabbath ; that the magnitude and remedy of the evils, which its violation involves, may be fully understood by the whole community.

“ That this Assembly solemnly enjoin it upon the churches under their care to adopt, without delay, all proper measures for accomplishing a general and permanent reformation from the sin of Sabbath-breaking, and all its attendant evils.

“ That a committee of one from each Synod under the care of this Assembly be appointed, to hold correspondence with ministers and churches, for the pur-

pose of carrying out and applying the leading principles of the foregoing report and resolutions.

“That the foregoing report and resolutions be published in those newspapers, secular and religious, which are friendly to the observance of the Sabbath.”

This report gave rise to a protracted discussion which had reference principally to the clause pronouncing the owning stock in steam boats, rail ways, &c., which were employed on the Sabbath, to be an immorality. This clause was subsequently stricken out, and the paragraphs proposed by Dr. Miller, as stated above, inserted in its place.

The Western Theological Seminary.

MR. WINCHESTER, from the committee to whom had been referred the report of the Directors of the Western Theological Seminary, made in substance the following report, viz :

“1. Resolved, That the transfer of Professor Halsey to the chair of Ecclesiastical History, and of Professor Elliott to that of Didactic Theology, in said seminary be, and the same is, hereby sanctioned by this General Assembly.

“2. Resolved, That the entire interests of said seminary be and they are hereby transferred to the supervision and direction of the Synod of Pittsburgh, and that the Board of Directors are hereby authorized to accede to such a transfer, whenever the Synod of Pittsburgh shall signify its acceptance of the same.

“3. Resolved, That the sum of four thousand five hundred dollars be appropriated to the use of said seminary.”

It having been stated, that Professor Halsey consented to the proposed arrangement, the report was adopted. It soon appeared, however, that there had been some misapprehension on the subject, and that Professor Halsey was willing to accede to the proposition to transfer him to the chair of Ecclesiastical History, but not to the transfer of himself and the seminary to the supervision and control of the synod of Pittsburgh. The discovery of this fact gave rise to much confusion. A motion was made for reconsideration; Professor Halsey tendered his resignation, and various methods were proposed to get out of the difficulty, when a member fortunately remembered, that according to the plan of the seminary, no alteration could be made in its constitution, without its being proposed at one Assembly and acted upon at the Assembly following, unless by a unanimous vote. This embarrassed the subject at once. It was, therefore, proposed to append a clause to the minutes, declaring that ‘the vote not being unanimous, the whole subject is referred to the next General Assembly.’ This was agreed to by acclamation: and the subject was, with much apparent satisfaction, dismissed.

*Report on the Biennial Meeting of the Assembly.
Amendment of the Constitution.*

DR. SKINNER, from the committee to whom were referred overtures Nos. 8 and 9, proposing that the Assembly hereafter meet once in two years, and that no appeals, except in cases of charges for heresy or unsoundness in doctrine, be taken from the judgments of synods, made the following report, which was adopted, viz :

“That it is inexpedient that the Assembly should meet less frequently than once a year, and that the following overture be sent down to the Presbyteries, for their adoption or rejection, viz :

“Resolved, That so much of the constitution of the church as empowers the General Assembly to issue appeals, complaints and references brought before them from the lower judicatories, except in cases of charges against a minister of the gospel for error or heresy, and of process commencing in the synods, be and the same is hereby amended, that hereafter the synods, except in the cases above mentioned, be the judicatories of last resort.”

Appeal and Complaint of the Assembly's Second Presbytery of Philadelphia.

The Assembly took up the appeal and complaint of the second presbytery of Philadelphia, relating the decisions of the synod of Philadelphia, refusing to grant their petition for geographical limits, dissolving their presbytery, requiring its members to apply for admission into other presbyteries, and declaring that if they refused to do so before a given day, they should be *ipso facto* excluded from the Presbyterian church. The sentence appealed from, the reasons assigned for the appeal and complaint, and the whole record of the proceedings of the synod in the case were read. The parties having been fully heard, the roll was called for the judgment of the members, when the vote was taken first on the appeal, which was sustained by a vote of 116 to 95 ; and on the complaint, which was sustained nearly unanimously, one vote only being heard in the negative. Mr. Jessup then offered a series of resolutions, expressing the judgment of the Assembly on the merits of the case, which gave rise to some discussion. A committee was subsequently appointed to draft a minute which should contain the decision of the Assembly. This committee reported the following minute, which was adopted, viz :

“Resolved, 1st. That the petition of the Appellants be granted.

“2d. That all the ministers and churches now connected with the said presbytery remain in their present relation, until they shall signify their desire to said presbytery to withdraw from it.

"3d. The boundaries of the said presbytery to be as follows: viz. East, a line running from the Delaware along Tenth street, as far as Coates' street, and thence to the township-line road where it intersects Broad street, and along said road to the southern boundary of Montgomery county, including all between said lines and the river Schuylkill; and also the whole of the counties of Berks and Schuylkill, and as much of Chester and Philadelphia counties as lies north of the Conestoga Turnpike road from Morgantown to the Lancaster Turnpike road, and along this latter road to the Schuylkill Permanent Bridge. Provided, that the above shall not be construed to embrace the Ninth church and the Pastor thereof; but the same shall remain a part of the Second Presbytery (Synodical); and provided also, that the Tenth church and the Pastor thereof, be authorized to unite with the First Presbytery, if they desire it.

"*Resolved*, That the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, defined and bounded as above, be hereafter known by the name of the Third Presbytery of Philadelphia."

*Trial of Mr. Barnes.**

The Assembly at an early period of its sessions took up the appeal of the Rev. Albert Barnes, from the decision of the synod of Philadelphia, suspending him from the ministry. The Rev. Dr. Junkin had presented a series of charges against Mr. Barnes, for error in doctrine, founded on his Notes on the Epistle to the Romans, which were tried before the second presbytery of Philadelphia. The presbytery having acquitted Mr. Barnes, Dr. Junkin appealed from their decision to the synod of Philadelphia. When the appeal came on for trial, the presbytery pled to the jurisdiction of the synod and refused to produce their records in the case. The synod overruled this plea and censured the presbytery for contumacy, and resolved to proceed with the trial. Mr.

* We have deferred this case to the last moment in hopes of receiving some more extended report of the proceedings of the Assembly in relation to it. But we have been disappointed. The Presbyterian, as usual, gives little more than the minutes. The New York Observer and the Evangelist give only the preliminary debates on points of order, and the decision of the House, together with the several protests and counter-protests to which that decision gave rise. We have no outline of Dr. Junkin's argument in support of his charges, nor of Mr. Barnes' defence, nor of the opinions of the members. The case has excited so much interest, that it is to be regretted that the public are not informed of the grounds on which it was decided. The Observer had already gone to so much expense in giving a report of the trial before the synod, and in publishing the previous defence of Mr. Barnes, that its Editors probably feel that they have done enough to satisfy the majority of their readers. And perhaps they have. Still, as the trial before the Assembly was in many respects a very different affair from that before the synod, the report of the one is not a satisfactory substitute for that of the other. We wish to know what ground Mr. Barnes finally took as to his doctrines, and what reasons were assigned by the members for their votes. We hope the editor of the Evangelist will yet publish his notes. We like this imperturbable reporter, who concentrates his feelings, now and then, within brackets, and thus prevents their imparting their own tinge to what he puts into the mouths of others.

Barnes, however, although declaring himself ready for trial, refused to plead on the ground that the cause could not be regularly tried without the records of the lower judicatory. The synod having voted that the refusal of Mr. Barnes to appear in his defence, was no bar to the appeal being heard, proceeded to issue the case by sustaining the appeal of Dr. Junkin, and suspending Mr. Barnes from the ministry. From this decision Mr. Barnes appealed to the General Assembly. When the appeal came on for trial, the records in the case were read, first the appeal itself, and then the records of the synod of Philadelphia. The reading of the records of the presbytery were then called for. At this stage a voluminous document was introduced purporting to be an appendix to the book of records of the second presbytery of Philadelphia, and certified to contain the trial, testimony and final decision of the presbytery in the case of Mr. Barnes. The reading of this document was at first resisted, on the ground that it was not properly a part of the records of the presbytery, and had never been before the synod from whose decision the present appeal was taken. It was however read by the consent of the parties. Mr. Barnes then proceeded with his defence, which occupied part of two days. Dr. Junkin followed in support of his charges, and occupied part of the two succeeding days. The Assembly's second presbytery declined to exercise their right to speak by their committee. Mr. Winchester was then heard in defence of the synod. The parties having been fully heard, the roll was called for the opinions of the court. This occupied the Assembly during the whole of Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and Monday morning. When this calling of the roll was completed, Dr. Peters moved, 1. That the appeal of Mr. Barnes be sustained. 2. That the sentence of the synod suspending him from the ministry be reversed. To this Dr. Hoge objected on the ground that 'to vote to sustain in this naked form is equivalent to the approval of every doctrine in that (Mr. B's.) book, which he hoped there was not a majority in the Assembly yet prepared to do. If they should, it would lay the foundation for a protest, of a most solemn and searching character, that would reach and shake the remotest bounds of the church. He preferred the immediate appointment of a committee that should represent all sides on this question, to prepare and bring in a minute that should, as far as possible, harmonize that body.' He therefore moved 'That the appeal of the Rev. Albert Barnes be sus-

tained in part, and that a committee of five be appointed to bring in resolutions expressive of the sense of the House.' Dr. Skinner objected; he said there were some, of whom he was one, who would not vote to inflict, even by implication, a censure on the book of Mr. Barnes, as containing doctrinal errors. Mr. Nesbit offered the following substitute for the resolutions of Dr. Peters: 'Resolved, That the appeal of the Rev. Albert Barnes be sustained so far as relates to that part of the definitive sentence suspending him from all the functions of the gospel ministry.' Dr. Hoge's amendment having been withdrawn, it was moved to postpone the consideration of Dr. Peters' resolution with a view to take up the resolution offered by Mr. Nesbit. This motion was lost; whereupon Dr. Hoge renewed his amendment. After an exciting discussion of two hours and a half, these motions were all withdrawn, on the suggestion of Dr. Phillips that the question should be taken in the naked form prescribed in the book of discipline, *sustain or not sustain*. This suggestion was acceded to and the roll was called, when it appeared the votes were as follows, viz: to sustain the appeal 134, not to sustain 96, non liquet 6.

DR. MILLER then moved the following resolution, viz:

"Resolved, That while this General Assembly has thought proper to remove the sentence of suspension under which the Rev. Mr. Barnes was placed by the synod of Philadelphia, yet the judgment of the Assembly is, that Mr. Barnes, in his Notes on the Epistle to the Romans, has published opinions materially at variance with the confession of faith of the Presbyterian church, and with the word of God—especially with regard to original sin, the relation of man to Adam, and justification by faith in the atoning sacrifice and righteousness of the Redeemer.—The Assembly consider the manner in which Mr. Barnes has controverted the language and doctrines of our standards as highly reprehensible, and as adapted to pervert the minds of the rising generation from the simplicity and purity of the gospel plan. And although some of the most objectionable statements and expressions which appeared in the earlier editions of the work in question, have been either removed, or so far modified or explained as to render them more in accordance with our public formularies, still the Assembly considers the work, even in its present amended form, as containing representations which cannot be reconciled with the letter or spirit of our public standards, and would solemnly admonish Mr. Barnes again to review this work, to modify still further the statements which have grieved his brethren, and to be more careful in time to come to study the purity and peace of the church."

DR. PETERS moved the postponement of Dr. Miller's resolution to take up the following:

"Resolved, That the decision of the synod of Philadelphia, suspending the Rev. Albert Barnes from all the functions proper to the gospel ministry, be, and it hereby is, reversed."

This course being assented to, the vote was taken on the motion of Dr. Peters, which was carried, *yeas* 145, *nays* 78, *non liquet* 11.

Dr. Miller's resolution was then introduced, when Mr. Labaree of Tennessee proposed that it be amended by striking out all after the word 'Resolved,' and inserting as follows:

"That in the opinion of this Assembly there are terms and modes of expression in the first edition of Mr. Barnes' Notes on the Romans, which are liable to misconception, and which have been misunderstood, but we are happy to find that these exceptionable expressions have generally been modified or omitted in the late editions of this book. This Assembly would, therefore, affectionately recommend to Mr. Barnes, in his future publications, to avoid the use of phraseology which is liable to misconstruction."

On this amendment an animated debate ensued. Dr. Hoge, Messrs. Boyd, Weaver, Nesbit, S. G. Davis, complained of introducing the substitute when those who were in favour of Dr. Miller's resolution wished the opportunity of voting directly on the question, and of recording their names. The substitute itself was characterized as good for nothing, as determining nothing, and as virtually an approval of the whole book. Dr. Hoge said he would rather take his departure from the house never to return to it, than vote for such a resolution. He hoped members would pause before they took this step, and see what is before them on the next. They will plunge us into confusion. It is in fact giving up the ship. Mr. Labaree said he had not intended to interfere with the rights of others, but had proposed the amendment in order to express exactly his own views. As it was unsatisfactory to his brethren, he withdrew it.

DR. SKINNER said, in opposition to Dr. Miller's resolution, it goes to condemn and stigmatize the sentiments of those who are called new-school, as heresy, or at least, as materially contrary to our confession of faith. If this resolution passes, New England divinity is branded by this General Assembly. So it will be regarded throughout the church, and by the world. He believed that New England divinity and that Mr. Barnes' book are in all substantial points, in accordance with the confession of faith, and he could never consent to stigmatize that book. It would be easy to pervert even the most qualified censure.

DR. MILLER said, that as to censuring New England divinity he had occasion to know, that if we pass this resolution, we shall rejoice the hearts of hundreds of our New England brethren. I speak not unadvisedly. After much

discussion, the question was taken on Dr. Miller's resolution and the result was as follows: *yeas* 109, *nays* 122, *non liquet* 3. So the resolution was rejected.*

Against this decision a protest was subsequently introduced by Dr. Phillips signed by himself and one hundred† other members of the General Assembly, and which is as follows, viz:

“WHEREAS the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church did by their vote on the 7th instant reject a resolution disapproving some of the doctrinal statements contained in Barnes' Notes on Romans;—which resolution, especially under the peculiar circumstances of the case, the undersigned considered of high importance to the church with which we are connected, to the cause of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and to the just exhibition of his grace and truth;

“We, whose names are subscribed, feel constrained, in the name of the great Head of the church, solemnly to protest against said decision, for the following reasons, viz:

“1st. Because we believe the constitutional standards of the church, in their plain and obvious meaning, and in the sense in which they have always been received, are the rule of judgment by which all doctrinal controversies are to be decided: That it is the duty of the church to maintain inviolate her doctrine and order, agreeably to those standards, to bear her decided testimony against all deviations from them, and not to countenance them, even by implication; yet in the above decision, there was, as we believe, a departure from our constitutional rule, a refusal to bear testimony against errors, with an implied approbation of them; and a constructive denial that ministers of the gospel in the Presbyterian church are under solemn obligations to conform in their doctrinal sentiments to our confession of faith and catechisms.

“2dly. Because the errors contemplated in the aforesaid resolution do not consist merely, nor chiefly, in inaccurate and ambiguous expressions, and mistaken illustrations, but in sentiments and opinions respecting the great and important doctrines of the gospel which are utterly inconsistent with the statement of those doctrines made in the confession of faith, and revealed in the word of God. We sincerely and firmly believed that Mr. Barnes has denied (and that in a sneering manner) that Adam was the covenant head of the human race—that all mankind sinned in him, as such, and were thus brought under the penalty of transgression—that Christ suffered the penalty of the law when he died for sin—and that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to believers for justification. These and similar doctrinal views, we regard as *material* variations from our standards, as dangerous in themselves, and as contravening some of the leading principles of our system, such as man's dependence and the perfect harmony of justice and grace in the salvation of sinners.

“3dly. Because this expression of approbation of his opinions was passed after, as we believe, it had been clearly and sufficiently proved to the Assembly that Mr. Barnes had denied these important truths, and had expressed opinions respecting original sin, the nature of faith, and the nature of justification, which cannot be reconciled with our doctrinal standards; and after—instead of retracting any of his doctrinal opinions—he had declared expressly, before the

* Of the interesting debate on this resolution we have seen no further report than the meagre account given above, which is taken almost word for word from the Evangelist.

† This statement is taken from the New York Evangelist, June 25.

Assembly, and published in the preface to his Notes on the Romans, that he had not changed, but held them still, and was determined to preach them until he died.

“For these reasons, and for the glory of God—that we may preserve a conscience void of offence—we request that this our solemn protest may be entered on the records of the General Assembly.”

Dr. Hoge in behalf of himself and fifteen other members (some of whom join in the preceding protest), presented the following protest, viz:

“The undersigned members of the General Assembly, who were of opinion that the appeal of the Rev. Albert Barnes should be sustained only in part, and that a modified decision should be made, beg leave to present to the Assembly this brief explanation of their views, and desire that it may be entered on the minutes, as their protest against the course which has been pursued in the case.

“1. They explicitly declare that in their opinion the refusal of the presbytery to bring their records before the synod, and of Mr. Barnes to appear and plead in defence when their objections had been overruled, was irregular and censurable; and that although the synod acted in a manner that was questionable, and perhaps injudicious, in trying the appeal of Dr. Junkin, without the records of the presbytery, and in the absence of Mr. Barnes, who had declined making any defence, yet this irregularity was not of such a nature as to annul their proceedings.

“2. They were of the opinion that the charges brought against Mr. Barnes, by Dr. Junkin, were at least partly substantiated, and that on very important topics of the system of doctrine contained in the confession of faith and the word of God; and that therefore the appeal could be sustained only in a modified manner, if at all on this ground, without an implied approbation of his doctrinal views.

“3. Further, they were of opinion, that inasmuch as some of the charges were not fully if at all sustained; and it may be doubted whether the synod ought, as the circumstances of the case appeared to be, to have inflicted the censure of suspension; and Mr. Barnes, during the progress of this trial, exhibited some important alterations of his book, and made such explanations and disavowals of the sentiments ascribed to him as were satisfactory in a considerable degree; the removal of his suspension might be deemed proper and safe: they were therefore willing on this account to concur in this measure, but did not desire to sustain the appeal in an unqualified sense.

“The undersigned therefore desire to place themselves aright, in the discharge of their official duty, before this Assembly, and the church with which they are connected, and the whole Christian church, so far as these transactions may be known; and cannot consent to be understood as giving countenance to irregular proceedings in the judicatories of the church, or those who are amenable to them: or as overlooking erroneous doctrinal sentiments; or as desiring to exercise undue severity towards the Appellant. And they cannot withhold the expression of their regret, that all their efforts to procure a justly modified decision were defeated by the positions occupied by different and opposite portions of the Assembly, in regard to this case; nor will they conceal that they have painful apprehensions that these things will lead to extended and increased dissension, and endanger the disruption of the holy bonds which hold us together as one church.

“*Pittsburgh, June 7, 1836.*”

These protests were committed to Drs. Skinner and Allan and Mr. Brainard, who subsequently reported the following answer, viz:

"In reply to the two protests of the minority from the decision of the Assembly in refusing to censure the first edition of Barnes' Notes on the Romans, the Assembly remark:

"1. That by their decision they do not intend to, and do not in fact, make themselves responsible for all the phraseology of Mr. Barnes; some of which is not sufficiently guarded, and is liable to be misunderstood, and which we doubt not Mr. Barnes, with reference to his usefulness and the peace of the church, will modify, so as to prevent, as far as may be, the possibility of misconception.

"2. Much less do the Assembly adopt as doctrines consistent with our standards, and to be tolerated in our church, the errors alleged by the prosecutor as contained in the book on the Romans. It was a question of fact, whether the errors alleged are contained in the book; and by the laws of exposition, in the conscientious exercise of their own rights and duties, the Assembly have come to the conclusion that the book does not teach the errors charged. This judgment of the Assembly is based on that maxim of equity and charity adopted by the Assembly of 1824 in the case of Craighead, which is as follows, viz: 'A man cannot be fairly convicted of heresy for using expressions which may be interpreted so as to involve heretical doctrines, if they also admit of a more favourable construction. It is not right to charge any man with an opinion which he disavows.' The import of this is, that when language claimed to be heretical admits without violence of an orthodox interpretation, and the accused disclaims the alleged error, and claims as his meaning the orthodox interpretation, he is entitled to it, and it is to be regarded as the true intent and import of his words. But in the case of the first edition of the Notes on the Romans, the language is without violence reconcilable with an interpretation conformable to our standards; and therefore all the changes of phraseology which he has subsequently made, and all his disclaimers before the Assembly, and all his definite and unequivocal declarations of the true intent and meaning of his words in the first edition, are to be taken as ascertaining his true meaning; and forbid the Assembly to condemn the book as teaching great and dangerous errors.

"3. When the Assembly sustained the appeal of Mr. Barnes by a majority of 38; and by a majority of 67 removed the sentence of his suspension and restored him in good standing to the ministry, it is not competent for the same judicature, by the condemnation of the book, to inflict on Mr. Barnes, indirectly but really, a sentence of condemnation as direct in its effects, and as prostrating to his character and usefulness, as if it had been done directly, by refusing to sustain his appeal and by confirming the sentence of the synod of Philadelphia. And what this Assembly has declared that it cannot in equity do directly, it cannot in equity or consistency attempt to do indirectly.

"4. The proposed condemnation of Mr. Barnes' work, as containing errors materially at variance with the doctrines of our standards, after sustaining his appeal and restoring him to good standing in the ministry, would be a direct avowal that great and dangerous errors may be published and maintained with impunity in the church. For if the book does in fact inculcate such errors, it were wrong to attempt to destroy the book and spare the man. If the charges are real, they are not accidental. Therefore should the Assembly decide the alleged errors of the work to be real, it would by its past decisions declare that a man suspended for great and pernicious errors, may be released^o from censure, and restored to an unembarrassed standing in the ministry; a decision to which this Assembly can never give its sanction.

"5. The attempt to condemn Mr. Barnes by a condemnation of his book, after he had been acquitted on a hearing on charges wholly founded on the book is a violation of the fundamental maxim of law, that no man shall be twice put in jeopardy for the same offence. And if it were otherwise, and the

man might be tried in his person and tried on his book, the same process of specification and defence is due to personal and public justice.

"6. So far is the Assembly from countenancing the errors alleged in the charges of Dr. Junkin, that they do cordially and *ex-animo* adopt the confession of our church on the points of doctrine in question, according to the obvious and most prevalent interpretation, and do regard it, as a whole, as the best epitome of the doctrines of the bible ever formed. And this Assembly disavows and would deprecate any attempt to change the phraseology of our standards, and would disapprove of any language of light estimation applied to them; believing that no denomination can prosper, whose members permit themselves to speak slightly of its formularies of doctrine; and are ready to unite with their brethren in contending earnestly for the faith of our standards.

"7. The correctness of the preceding positions is confirmed in the opinion of the Assembly, by a careful analysis of the real meaning of Mr. Barnes, under each charge, as ascertained by the language of his book and the revisions, disclaimers, explanations, and declarations which he has made.

"In respect to the 1st charge, that Mr. Barnes teaches, that all sin is voluntary, the context and his own declarations show that he refers to all *actual* sin merely; in which he affirms the sinner acts under no compulsion.

"The 2d charge implies neither heresy nor error, but relates to the expression of an opinion on a matter, concerning which no definite instruction is contained either in the bible or the confession of faith.

"In respect to the 3d charge, Mr. Barnes has not taught that unregenerate men are able, in the sense alleged, to keep the commandments, and convert themselves to God. It is an inference of the prosecutor from the doctrine of Natural Ability, as taught by Edwards, and of the natural liberty of the will, as taught in the confession of faith, chap. 9, sect. 1. On the contrary, he does teach, in accordance with our standards, that man by the fall hath wholly lost all *ability of will* to any spiritual good accompanying salvation.

"In respect to the 4th charge, that faith is an act of the mind, Mr. Barnes does teach it, in accordance with the confession of faith and the bible: but he does not deny that faith is the fruit of the special influence of the Spirit, and a permanent holy habit of mind, in opposition to a created physical essence.—That faith 'is counted for righteousness,' is the language of the bible, and as used by Mr. Barnes, means not that faith is the *meritorious* ground of justification but only the instrument by which the benefit of Christ's righteousness is appropriated.

"In respect to the 5th charge, Mr. Barnes nowhere denies, much less 'sneers' at the idea, that Adam was the covenant and federal head of his posterity. On the contrary, though he employs not these terms, he does, in other language, teach the same truths which are taught by that phraseology.

"In respect to the 6th and 7th charges, that the sin of Adam is not imputed to his posterity, and that mankind are not guilty, or liable to punishment on account of the first sin of Adam, it is to be observed, that it is not taught in the confession of faith that the sin of Adam is imputed to his posterity. The imputation of the *guilt* of Adam's sin, Mr. Barnes affirms, though not as including personal identity, and the transfer of moral qualities, both of which are disclaimed by our standard writers, and by the General Assembly.

"In respect to the 8th charge, that Christ did not suffer the penalty of the law as the vicarious substitute of his people, Mr. Barnes only denies the literal infliction of the whole curse, as including remorse of conscience and eternal death; but admits and teaches that the sufferings of Christ, owing to the union of the Divine and human natures in the person of the Mediator, was a full equivalent.

"In respect to the 9th charge, that the righteousness of Christ is not imputed to his people, Mr. Barnes teaches the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, but not as importing a transfer of Christ's personal righteousness to believers,

which is not the doctrine of our church. And where he says that there is no sense in which the righteousness of Christ becomes ours, the context and his own declarations show that he simply means to deny a literal transfer of his obedience: which, on the contrary, he teaches is so imputed or set to our account, as to become the only meritorious cause or ground of our justification.

“In respect to the 10th charge, Mr. Barnes has not taught that justification consists in pardon only, but has taught clearly that it includes the reception of believers into favour, and their treatment as if they had not sinned.”

In the absence of any satisfactory account of the trial, we must content ourselves with a few remarks upon the points of the case as actually presented in the reports. We think every one must be struck by the uncompromising spirit manifested by the new school men in every part of the proceedings. It is almost always the case that when a trial of much interest and difficulty is concluded, a committee is appointed to draft a minute expressing the judgment of the house. This custom is founded on obvious propriety. There are few cases in which a simple answer to the question sustain or not sustain? is sufficient to express the judgment of those who are called upon to answer it. It may well happen when numerous charges are presented, embracing various specifications, that some of these may be proved and others not. Must a man necessarily either be guilty of all charges which are brought against him, or entirely innocent? Is such a case ever so one-sided that a categorical yes or no satisfies the demands of justice, or of a good conscience? Besides, there is almost always a diversity of opinion as to the import or operation of the answer to the question sustain or not sustain? This being the fact, it is absolutely impossible that an answer to that question can express fairly the opinions of the Assembly in the decision of the case. To urge it, therefore, in this form is to present a false issue, and impose upon the church a false result. Thus we find in this trial of Mr. Barnes, Dr Hoge voting one way and Dr. Miller the other on the question of sustaining the appeal. Yet these gentlemen agreed exactly in their views of the 'merits of the case, and of the manner in which it ought to be issued. How is it then that their votes are diametrically opposed to each other? Simply because they differed in their opinion of the import of the question put to them. Dr. Hoge said a vote to sustain was virtually a declaration that the Assembly approved of every thing in Mr. Barnes' book. Dr. Miller, on the contrary, thought that it simply declared that Mr. Barnes had just reason to complain of the action of the synod of Philadelphia, that it decided nothing as to the nature of those reasons. It left it entirely undetermined whether they related to the

mere mode of procedure, or to the substantial merits of the decision. Dr. Miller doubtless considered that every man who said *not sustain*, declared that Mr. B. had no reason for his appeal, either constitutional or otherwise; that the synod did right in proceeding to trial without the records of the presbytery and in the absence of the accused. He was not prepared to sanction these principles. It was impossible for him, taking this view of the import of the question *sustain or not sustain?* to answer it in the negative, without thereby declaring that he thought a trial in a court of review might be constitutionally conducted without the records of the lower judicatory in the case, and without the defence of the accused. This is a declaration which he could not make. He was constrained, therefore, to vote for sustaining the appeal. Had he taken the view of the import of the vote entertained by Dr. Hoge, he would have voted in the negative. Now was it just to present the question in a form which prevented those, who agreed as to the merits of the case, from voting together? What possible objection could there be to following the course sanctioned by usage, and sustained by such obvious considerations of propriety? Would it have been a difficult thing for a committee to prepare such a minute? Might they not have recommended that in view of the irregular mode of the trial before the synod the appeal of Mr. Barnes be sustained? And secondly, that although the Assembly considered the book of Mr. Barnes to contain propositions in conflict with the truth and the standards of the church, yet in view of his explanations, and corrections, the sentence of suspension be reversed, and he be enjoined to make his book harmonize with his defence? Did our new school brethren fear that any compromise would rob them of their disastrous victory, that their only chance of success was to force the question in a form which would secure the votes of foes as well as friends? It is evident that had the vote to sustain been regarded as involving a decision on the whole case, it would have been carried by a much smaller majority. The result, however, has shown that it was a mistake to allow that, and the subsequent resolution reversing the sentence of the synod to pass, in hopes of subsequently censuring the book. The resolution to censure was immediately opposed on the ground of its inconsistency with the previous votes. The fact is, that as far as we know, the sentiments expressed in many passages of Mr. Barnes' book, are considered by all the old-school (and professedly by a large portion of the new-school also), as subversive of the gospel, inconsistent with

the system of doctrines taught in the confession of faith, and entirely incompatible with the honest adoption of our standards. On this point, there is no diversity of opinion among us. The only question is, does Mr Barnes really hold these sentiments? This is the question which it was the object of the trial to determine, and it is certainly one of no easy decision. The fact that his book contains these errors does not settle the point; because it also contradicts every one of them. It is to be remembered that Dr. Junkin's charges were presented not against the Notes on the Romans, but against their author. When, therefore, certain propositions were produced from the book denying the doctrine of original sin, of the federal headness of Adam, of justification on the ground of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to the believer, &c., it was perfectly fair for the accused to bring forward other passages in which he affirms all these doctrines. And when he accompanied these counter passages with a solemn disclaimer of the errors charged, a declaration that he never meant to teach them, and a profession of the opposite truths we see not how it was possible for any one who believed in his sincerity, to find him guilty of still holding them. Under these circumstances, the obvious course of propriety and justice was, for the Assembly to condemn the erroneous propositions, and to acquit the man on the ground of his explanations and corrections. This was the course pursued in the case of Dr. Beecher. His writings certainly contain the doctrines charged against him by Dr. Wilson (except that of perfectionism), with greater precision and consistency than Mr. Barnes' Notes contain the errors imputed to him. Yet when Dr. Beecher came out and renounced these doctrines, declared that he never meant to teach them, and published over his own name a statement of his views in direct opposition to these errors, almost every individual was satisfied. Dr. Wilson withdrew his charges, and the case was dismissed. Dr. Junkin professed his readiness to acquiesce in a similar course with regard to Mr. Barnes. After the conclusion of that gentleman's defence, which was regarded on all sides as a recantation of his errors, and as a full profession of orthodoxy, the prosecutor virtually declared himself satisfied. He said, 'If the concessions which we heard yesterday can be put in a form that is satisfactory, I shall be willing to take a course that will save the time of this Assembly.' This was understood to mean that if Mr. Barnes would do what Dr. Beecher had done, publish with his name what he had said before the Assembly; and if the Assembly

would do as the synod of Cincinnati had done, express disapprobation of the book, all parties would be satisfied. Perhaps some few individuals on either side might have regretted such a result, but that the great body of the Assembly and of the church would have readily acquiesced in it, there can be no doubt. It is publicly stated that some of the most earnest friends of orthodoxy, urged the prosecutor to withdraw the charges at once, on the ground of the orthodoxy of Mr. Barnes' defence. Had there been a sincere desire to bring the case to a harmonious and satisfactory issue, had there not, on the contrary, been a fixed determination to press matters to an extreme, would not the fair and conciliatory course, suggested by the prosecutor, been adopted? Mr. Barnes did all he could to prevent such an adjustment, by publicly calling the Assembly to witness that he retracted nothing, and by declaring that he never would retract. This, however, was regarded as a mere manifestation of an unfortunate state of mind. It mattered very little to the Assembly what particular idea Mr. Barnes chose to attach to the word *retract*. To save his feelings they might well dispense with the word, provided they had the thing. If a man publishes in a book that there is no sin where is no voluntary transgression of known law, no moral character before there is moral conduct, because character is the result of conduct, and then comes forward and declares that he adopts the definition of Calvin and Edwards of original sin, that it is an *innate*, and *sinful*, hereditary depravity of heart; if he publishes that the righteousness of Christ is *not* set over to the believer, and then declares, that it *is* set over to him; if he says, the word *impute* means to reckon, to set to one's account, and then says, the righteousness of Christ is not *imputed*, but that it is *reckoned to* the believer, he may say as often as he pleases that he does not, and that he will not retract, others will understand the matter just as well. Though this declaration, therefore, of Mr. B. no doubt gave offence, and diminished the confidence of those who heard his explanations, yet we do not believe it would have prevented the satisfactory issue of the trial, had the leaders of the majority of the Assembly wished to produce such a result. They however would yield nothing. They would make no distinction between Mr. Barnes and his book. They would not allow the question to be put in a form in which it was possible for the friends of truth to unite. They insisted on a course which gave the implied sanction of the Assembly to doctrines which Mr. Barnes disclaimed, and which they

themselves have, as a body, hitherto professed to abhor. The simple vote to sustain the appeal and reverse the sentence, did in the exulting language of the Evangelist dismiss Mr. Barnes and his book without reproach; it accomplished to the letter the wish of Dr. Skinner, that "the slightest censure" might be avoided.

2. Besides this uncompromising spirit there is another aspect of this case which must produce general disapprobation and concern. It is universally known and admitted that there are three theological parties in the Presbyterian church, the old-school, the Edwardean (or Hopkinsian as it is popularly but incorrectly called), and the New Haven. The last being very inconsiderable as to numbers. It is no less generally known that the members of the second class, constituting the great body of the new-school party, have been, if possible, more violent in their opposition, and more severe in their denunciations of New Haven men and New Haven doctrines than any other men in the church. Certain it is that the most serious professions of abhorrence and apprehension that have ever come under our notice of the 'new divinity' have proceeded from men of this class, and some of them members of the late General Assembly. Now the complaint is that these men, by insisting on the simple vote to sustain the appeal and reverse the sentence without any expression of disapprobation of Mr. B's book, have, contrary to their own professions, endorsed these very doctrines, and given them the sanction of the General Assembly. The justice of this complaint rests on the fact that the Notes on the Romans have almost universally been regarded as teaching the New Haven theology. All that was desired on the one side was that these doctrines should be condemned. The acquittal of Mr. Barnes was a matter of no moment, any farther than it involved a sanction of these opinions. When he came forward and renounced them, no one wished for his condemnation, provided the opinions which he was supposed to teach in his book were condemned. This the new-school men refused to do, and by this refusal lent all their weight to their support. That Mr. Barnes' book has been generally understood to teach the New Haven doctrines cannot be denied. It is notorious that the New Haven men openly and constantly claim him as belonging to their side. Several articles in the *Christian Spectator*, universally attributed to Mr. Barnes, distinctly advocates some of their peculiar opinions. The Philadelphia brethren have, from the beginning, declared that their opposition to Mr. Barnes arose 'not from

the comparatively trivial errors of Hopkinsianism, but the more serious ones of Drs. Murdock, Taylor and Fitch.' The Unitarian Examiner understands him as denying "a strictly and fully vicarious atonement," as spurning "the idea of hereditary depravity," as treating the imputation of Adam's sin "as a scholastic absurdity;" and as saying, "of the figment of Adam's federal headship, and the condemnation of men for partnership in his sin, 'there is not one word of it in the bible.'" The Christian Intelligencer of the Dutch Reformed church, speaking of the Commentary by Prof. Stuart, and the Notes by Mr. Barnes on the Romans, says, 'Both are equally devoted to the new-school theology in its extreme, of the New Haven school.' The Watchman, published at Hartford Connecticut, and edited by the Rev. Mr. Harvey, which is the organ of the class of theologians to which Dr. Tyler, Mr. Nettleton, Dr. Hewett &c. belong, after speaking of Dr. Miller's remark in reply to Dr. Skinner's assertion that to condemn Mr. Barnes' book would be to stigmatize New England divinity, viz. 'if we pass this resolution, we shall certainly rejoice the hearts of hundreds of our New England brethren,' uses the following decisive language: 'the remark of Dr. Miller is doubtless correct. We deny that the sentiments contained in the book of Mr. Barnes is New England divinity. Dr. Miller's resolution expressed precisely the views of many in New England. Mr. Barnes has stigmatized his own book by introducing into it *sentiments subversive of the gospel*, and it is a stigma from which no apology of Dr. Skinner nor vote of the General Assembly will wash it clean.* Was it, then, an unreasonable request that the Assembly, when acquitting Mr. Barnes on the ground of his concessions and explanations, should express their disapprobation of such a book? Was it too much to expect that those who were so zealous in private in condemning New Havenism, should abstain from endorsing a work which was thus universally regarded as teaching that very system? What must we think of the men who objected to 'the slightest censure,' who complained of Mr. Barnes as 'too orthodox,' and especially what impression must such language as the following, from the lips of Dr. Peters, make, 'When I heard the sentence, I regarded it as a blow struck at one half of the Presbyterian church. The doctrines held by brother Barnes, he has proved to be substantially in accordance to the Confession of Faith. I shall

* WATCHMAN, June 27, 1836.

not vote to restore him on the ground of *toleration*, he has a right to be a minister in our connexion. If any one is to be *tolerated* it is the prosecutor, who says, that man has in no sense ability to love God. Yes, sir, the time has come, when the question is, whether such men are to be tolerated in the Presbyterian church. . . . No, sir, I do not even condemn his indiscretions! It is time to have the question settled, whether in this nineteenth century we may not exercise the liberty of using language adapted to the age. I do not only approve of the doctrines, but of the *language employed*, while I may not agree with every word spoken or written by any man.* To hear such language uttered of a book which Unitarians hail as rejecting the doctrines of original sin, the federal headship of Adam, &c.; which a standard paper in New England denounces as containing 'sentiments subversive of the gospel,' is sufficiently startling; and to have it virtually sustained by the General Assembly is still worse. Had these brethren contented themselves with declaring their conviction that Mr. Barnes did not hold the doctrines ascribed to him, there could be no ground of complaint, because his book furnishes no sufficient data to decide what his real opinions are. It is a complicated web of contradictions. And on the principle that every man has a right

* The above account of Dr. Peters' remarks is taken from the Presbyterian of July 2, and are given by a member of the Assembly from notes taken on the spot. As this gentleman writes over the initials of his own name, and in his communication identifies himself distinctly, his report is certainly worthy of as much confidence, to say the least, as those of the other reporters. The few sketches which he has given shows the importance of having the opinions of the members, as given on the calling of the roll. We must, therefore, again beg the editor of the Evangelist, who says he has full notes, to give us light. Let the churches see what they have to depend upon.

As to Dr. Peters' objection to the sentiment expressed by Dr. Junkin, it is to be presumed that the word *ability* is used as it is by President Edwards in its natural and proper sense, for *sufficient power*. And if Dr. Junkin is to be turned out of the church for denying that men have ability to love God, what is to become of President Edwards? He asserts that, to say that mankind have "a sufficient power and ability to do all their duty, and to avoid all sin," makes the redemption of Christ needless. He ascribes this opinion to Dr. John Taylor, of whom he says, "he insists upon it, that 'when men have not sufficient power to do their duty they have no duty to do.'" After quoting a few more such passages, he adds, "These things fully imply that men have in their own natural ability sufficient means to avoid sin, and to be perfectly free from it; and so form all the bad consequences of it. And if the means are *sufficient*, then there is no need of more; and therefore there is no need of Christ dying in order to it." *Original sin*, Part III. ch. 1, § 4. The time is come, it seems, when the question is to be settled, whether such sentiments are to be *tolerated* in the Presbyterian church!

to explain himself, and state what he does and does not believe, there can be no objection to allowing Mr. Barnes to pass for perfectly orthodox, if he chooses to endorse only the orthodox portion of his work. But when we are told the book itself does not contain censurable propositions, that even its language is not to be found fault with—language which has led so large a portion of its readers to the conclusion that its author teaches the very doctrines he disclaims—we cannot wonder at the feeling of surprise and indignation which has been excited.

3. What is to be said of the Answer to the protests which we have given above? Is it not wonderful to hear it moved by Dr. Skinner, seconded by Mr. Duffield, and voted, as it would seem without dissent, by the whole majority, 1. THAT THE ERRORS ALLEGED IN THE CHARGES OF DR. JUNKIN ARE NOT TO BE TOLERATED IN THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. 2. THAT UNREGENERATE MEN ARE NOT ABLE TO CONVERT THEMSELVES TO GOD. 3. THAT FAITH IS ONLY THE INSTRUMENT BY WHICH THE BENEFIT OF CHRIST'S RIGHTEOUSNESS IS APPROPRIATED. 4. THAT ADAM IS THE COVENANT AND FEDERAL HEAD OF HIS POSTERITY. 5. THAT THE GUILT OF ADAM'S SIN IS IMPUTED TO ALL MEN. 6. THAT THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF CHRIST IS IMPUTED TO HIS PEOPLE—THAT HIS OBEDIENCE IS SO IMPUTED OR SET TO THEIR ACCOUNT AS TO BECOME THE ONLY MERITORIOUS GROUND OF THEIR SALVATION. Now it cannot be that these brethren are disingenuous in all this; that they mean to 'palter with us in a double sense; and keep the word of promise to our ear, and break it to our hope.' It cannot be. That men acting in their highest character, as members of the supreme court of the church to which they belong, in a solemn official document placed on permanent record, are guilty of such duplicity is too monstrous to be believed. All the bands of society would be loosened, if sincerity on such occasions were not to be taken for granted. Strange, therefore, as this document appears; strongly as it seems in conflict with the previous declarations of its authors, we cannot allow ourselves to doubt that it expresses their real sentiments. If this is not the case, the Presbyterian church should be clothed in sackcloth, and hide itself in the dust from the face of men for ever. We cannot express our sense of the enormity of trifling with the truth of God, in the solemn and official acts of a judicial body. It is the duty, therefore, of every man to dismiss all suspicions of this kind from his mind, and to reconcile as he best can, the statements of this document with the known facts of

the case, and the avowed opinions of its authors. There is one thing to be remarked in the illucidation of this point, which seems to us of importance. The majority state in this answer, "It was a question of fact whether the errors alleged are contained in the book (Notes on Romans); and by the laws of exposition, in the conscientious exercise of their own rights and duties the Assembly have come to the conclusion that the book does not teach the errors charged." This is a fair statement and a fair issue. But how did the Assembly reach the conclusion at which they arrived? They answer, "By a careful analysis of the real meaning of Mr. Barnes under each charge as ascertained by the language of his book, AND THE REVISIONS, DISCLAIMERS, EXPLANATIONS AND DECLARATIONS which he has made." Here is the origin of the difficulty. To ascertain whether the book contains the errors charged, and whether Mr. Barnes holds or avows them are two very different points, which the Assembly have unfortunately confounded. To determine the former, the only proper way is to take the language of the book, and explain it by the laws of exposition. Here Mr. B's *disclaimers, explanations* and *declarations* have nothing to do. The question is not what he believes, but what the book teaches. When, however, the other point is under consideration, his explanations and disclaimers are all important. Had the majority of the Assembly merely arrived at the conclusion that Mr. B. disclaimed these errors, no one would have been surprised. This was the conclusion to which every one seems to have been led. The Presbyterian informed the public, "It is said his defence was a virtual recantation of all his errors, and that he seemed anxious to prove that he was orthodox almost to ultraism." It is no wonder, therefore, that the Assembly were led to the conclusion, that he disclaimed the errors charged. It should, however, be remembered that the point they undertook to prove was, that his book does not contain them. They seem to have forgotten that they were not called upon to state why they did not condemn HIM; but why they did not condemn his BOOK.

It is easy to see the effect of the confusion of these two points, or the whole of the extraordinary document under consideration. It asserts that Mr. Barnes' book does not contain the doctrine that "all sin consists in voluntary action;" yet it contains such passages as the following: "In all this and in all other sin man is voluntary," p. 249. "The passage (*sin is not imputed where there is no law*) states a great and important principle, that men will not be held

guilty unless there is a law that binds them, of which they are apprized, and which they voluntarily transgress," p. 118. Again, "This (Rom. 9: 11) is a very important passage in regard to original sin. It proves, 1. That as yet they (Jacob and Esau) had no moral character. They had *done* nothing good or bad, and where that is the case, there can be no character, for character is the result of conduct." This according to the common "laws of exposition" seems to mean, that until there is actual sin, something bad *done*, there is no moral character; and the passage is said to be important in relation to *original sin*. Yet the Assembly say, "the context, and his own declarations show that he refers to all *actual* sin merely, in which he affirms that the sinner acts under no compulsion." We know no match to this, but Dr. Beecher's declaration that when he said, "A holy or depraved nature is impossible," he meant, "in respect to *actual* depravity."*

* Beecher's Trial, p. 57.

How much better it would be for Dr. Beecher and Mr. Barnes both, instead of asserting that when they said black they meant white, to come out manfully and say they were mistaken. Every one sees that they were mistaken, and that their present explanations and declarations are irreconcilable with their previous statements, and they may as well admit it at once. The fact is, New England men have been so long accustomed to regard the six eastern States as the whole world, and to consider the works of Edwards, West, Bellamy, and a few others, as the only theological writings extant, that when they come to extend their views they find there are many more things in theology than they in their philosophy had dreamt of. Dr. Beecher very ingenuously confesses his surprise at finding the fact that man is a free agent was known in the church, with any distinctness, before the time of Edwards. (Trial, p. 46.) We have ourselves been exceedingly shocked on hearing him from the pulpit attribute the opposite doctrine to old Calvinists, and pronounce it the means of causing the broad stream of souls to set into hell for ages. We certainly did consider him as uttering slander on a very large scale. He now admits that he was mistaken, that the Reformers, Turretin, and old Calvinists taught no such thing, but held the truth. It would cost very little more to acknowledge that he was equally in the dark as to several other matters in the opinions of the same class of men, as, for example, original sin, imputation, &c. When he and others, under erroneous impressions of the old doctrines, put forth round denials of them, and then come to discover that these doctrines are very different things from what they imagined, they should at once say so, and not attempt to make a denial an affirmation. If a man supposed that the Reformers taught the doctrine of physical depravity, that the substance of the soul is corrupt, and that sin is a created essence, and, with a view to disprove this doctrine, should maintain that there can be no depravity "without understanding, conscience and choice;" no sin without voluntary transgression of known law; no moral character before moral conduct, it is a great deal better to retract these sweeping declarations, than to say they relate to *actual* sin and free agency. Whatever they were intended to deny, they do in fact deny the very doctrine of original sin which those who uttered them profess to hold.

These trials have had one good effect. They have set men to studying a

It asserts that the book does not deny that Adam was the covenant and federal head of his posterity. Yet it contains such passages as the following: "Various attempts have been made to explain this. The most common has been that Adam was the representative of the race; that he was a covenant head, and that his sin was imputed to his posterity, and that they were held liable to punishment for it as if they had committed it themselves. But to this there are great and insuperable objections. 1. There is not one word of it in the Bible. Neither the terms, representative, covenant, or impute are ever applied to the transaction in the sacred scriptures. 2. It is a mere philosophical theory; an introduction of a speculation into theology, with an attempt to explain what the Bible has left unexplained," p. 128. Again, "A comparison is also instituted between Adam and Christ in 1 Cor. 15: 22—25. The reason is, not that Adam was the representative or federal head of his race, about which the apostle says nothing, and which is not even implied, but that he was the first of his race; he was the fountain, the head, the father; and the consequences of that first act introducing sin into the world, could be seen every where. The words *representative* and *federal head* are never applied to Adam in the Bible. The reason is, that the word *representative* implies an idea which could not have existed in the case—the consent of those who are represented. Besides, the Bible does not teach that they acted in him, or by him; or that he acted *for* them. No passage has ever yet been found that stated this doctrine," p. 120, 121. Yet this document affirms that Mr. Barnes no where denies "that Adam was the covenant and federal head of his posterity"!

With respect to the imputation of Adam's sin, it is admitted that the book does deny the doctrine, but "the imputation of the guilt of Adam's sin" it is said, "Mr. Barnes affirms." The question then is, does the book teach or deny the imputation of Adam's sin? What is the meaning of the question? What does Mr. B. understand by the word *guilt*? On page 82 of his Notes he says, "It (*guilty*) is never used to denote simply an obligation to punishment, but with reference to the fact that the punishment is personally deserved." According to this definition of the word *guilt*, we are at

little. We see evident traces of progress even in Professor Stuart (though very little, we confess, he moves in a circle), more in Mr. Barnes, and still more in Dr. Beecher. We think there is truth as well as humour in the remark attributed to good old Dr. Wilson of Cincinnati, that 'if we have a few more prosecutions, the new-school men will become more orthodox than the strictest of us.'

a loss to know what the phrase imputation of the guilt of Adam's sin means. Does it mean the imputation of Adam's personal obligation to punishment, his personal criminality? In his defence, however p. 196, Mr. B. says, "To impute *sin itself* to a man is one thing; to impute the *obligation to punishment* is another thing. The latter is the doctrine of the standards; the former is not." Again, "The confession is explicit. It does not say that the first SIN of Adam is changed on his posterity, but that the GUILT of that sin is so charged on them," p. 217. Well, then, does Mr. Barnes' book teach that the guilt of Adam's sin, i. e. *an obligation to punishment* on account of it, is charged on all men? On p. 10. the book denies, "that men are held responsible, [i. e. bound to suffer punishment] for a deed committed thousands of years before they were born;" on p. 128, it is denied that men are "held liable to punishment for it;" on p. 123, it is affirmed there is no reason to believe that men "are held to be guilty of his sin, without participation of their own, or without personal sin." It frequently asserts that the word *impute* is "never used in the sense of transferring, or of *charging that on* one which does not properly belong to him," or "which ought not to be charged on him as a matter of *personal right*."

Finally, this document affirms that Mr. Barnes teaches "the imputation of the righteousness of Christ," "his obedience," he teaches, "is so imputed or set to our account as to be the only meritorious ground of our justification." Yet the book contains such passages as the following: "When therefore, it is said that the righteousness of Christ is accounted or imputed to us; when it is said that his merits are transferred and reckoned as ours, whatever may be the truth of the doctrine, it cannot be defended by *this* passage of scripture," p. 95. This is an intimation at least. What follows is more distinct. "I have examined all the passages (in which the word for *impute* occurs), and as the result of my examination, have come to the conclusion that there is not one in which the word is used in the sense of reckoning or imputing to a man that which does not strictly belong to him; or of charging on him that which *ought* not to be charged on him as a matter of personal right. The word is never used to denote imputing in the sense of transferring, or of charging that on one which does not properly belong to him. The same is the case in the New Testament. The word occurs about forty times, and in a similar signification. No doctrine, of transferring, or of *setting over to* a man what does not properly belong to him, be it sin or

holiness, can be derived, therefore, from this word," p. 95. "But if the doctrine of the scriptures, was that the entire righteousness of Christ was *set over* to them, was transferred to them *in any sense*, with what propriety could the apostle say that God justified the *ungodly*?" p. 96. The declaration repeatedly occurs that the word *impute* never means to set to a man's account what does not properly or personally belong to him; and as the righteousness of Christ is of course not personally or properly the believer's own righteousness, the book denies the imputation of that righteousness. Indeed in the last quotation given above, it is expressly denied that *it is set over* to the believer.

It is certainly a very unhappy thing that the solemn official declarations of the General Assembly should seem to be in such direct contradiction to obvious and notorious facts. The explanation which we have suggested, we have no doubt is the correct one. The Assembly have in fact told us what Mr. B. according to his *explanations, disclaimers and declarations* before them, professed to teach, and this they have inadvertently confounded with what his book teaches. We do not doubt that Mr. Barnes professed his faith in all these doctrines, and did retract his errors, but every impartial man must admit that his book does contain plain, pointed, and argumentative denials of the several points which we have specified. Now if these errors are in the opinion of this General Assembly not to be *tolerated* in our church, if the book contains such assertions respecting them, if it is notorious, that in all parts of the country, and by all classes of theologians, it has been understood distinctly to avow these errors, was it too great a concession for the Assembly, to condemn at least these assertions? Ought not those men who professed their willingness to stay in Pittsburgh all summer, and fast and pray, to prevent a division of the church, to have paused before they dismissed this book "without reproach?" Should they have disregarded the earnest appeal and remonstrance of Dr. Hoge, warning them that such a course would convulse the church to its very centre?

Good, however, often comes out of evil. The protests against the course adopted by the majority, called forth this Answer which goes much farther than Dr. Miller's resolution; farther than the famous Act and Testimony; farther than the much decried resolutions of the Assembly of last year. It goes farther in support of orthodoxy, and in condemning new school theology in every form, than any act of any Assembly, with which we are acquainted. Let the churches,

for their consolation, listen to this. "So far is the Assembly from countenancing the errors alleged in the charges of Dr. Junkin, that they do **CORDIALLY** and **EX-ANIMO** adopt the Confession of Faith of our church, on **THE POINTS OF DOCTRINE IN QUESTION** according to its **OBVIOUS AND MOST PREVALENT INTERPRETATION.**" Some of these points of doctrine are original sin, ability, imputation and justification. Let us hear the language of the confession, "By this sin (eating the forbidden fruit) they (our first parents) fell from their original righteousness, and communion with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of soul and body. They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity, descending from them by ordinary generation. From this original corruption, whereby we are utterly *indisposed, disabled,* and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions," ch. 6. Again, "Man by his fall into a state of sin, hath wholly lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation; so as a natural man being altogether averse from that which is good, and dead in sin, is not able, by his own strength, to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereto. When God converts a sinner, and translates him into a state of grace, he freeth him from his natural bondage under sin, and by his grace alone, enables him freely to will and to do that which is spiritually good; yet so as that, by reason of his remaining corruption, he doth not perfectly, nor only, will that which is good, but doth also will that which is evil." "This effectual call is of God's free and special grace alone, not from any thing at all foreseen in man; who is *altogether passive therein* until, being quickened and renewed by the Holy Spirit, he is thereby enabled to answer this call, and to embrace the grace offered and conveyed in it," chs. 9, 10.

Again, "Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth; not by infusing righteousness into them, but by pardoning their sins, and by accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; not for any thing wrought in them, or done by them, but for Christ's sake alone; not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them, as their righteousness; but by *imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ* unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith; which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift

of God." "Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are justified, and did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to his Father's justice in their behalf. Yet, inasmuch as he was given by the Father for them, and his obedience and satisfaction accepted in their stead, and both freely, not for any thing in them, their justification is only of free grace; that both the exact justice, and rich grace of God, might be glorified in the justification of sinners," ch. 11.

All this beautiful and precious truth the Assembly solemnly declare they "do cordially and ex-amino adopt," according to its "OBVIOUS AND MOST PREVALENT INTERPRETATION," and farther, that the errors contrary thereto are not to be *tolerated* in the Presbyterian church. We hold them to their bond. They have thus digged the grave of new school theology, and declared it to be unfit to remain on the face of the earth. What an unexpected termination to this long struggle!* We do not see how the new-school men are to survive this affair. If they are sincere in their declaration, then they have struck their flag and become orthodox; if they are not sincere, they must forfeit the confidence of every honest man in the community.

The length of the preceding discussion precludes the possibility of our entering very fully into any reflections on the present aspect of the affairs of our church. They have been brought to a crisis by the action of the late Assembly. There is great need, therefore, of mutual instruction and conference, and especially of much prayer for divine direction. The question forces itself on every mind, and is repeated from every quarter, what ought to be done? Without attempting to answer this question either definitely or in detail, there are some obvious principles which it may not be useless briefly to state.

1. In the first place, nothing, in so momentous a concern, should be done under the sudden impulse of even good feeling. A zeal for truth, a sense of wrong, a conviction of danger to the best interests of the church may be so excited by

* "They digg'd a pit, they digg'd it deep,
They digg'd it for their brother,
And for their sin, they did fall in
The pit, they digg'd for t'other."

Sternhold and Hopkins.

It is currently reported that it was Dr. BEECHER, who thus converted the whole Assembly, led them back into the strong holds of orthodoxy, and then turned the key upon them—that he was the main author of the wonderful document presented by Dr. Skinner, and adopted by the majority. If this is so, we owe him many thanks. It is certainly the greatest exploit of his life.

recent events, as to urge even wise men to measures, which in cooler moments neither their judgments nor conscience would approve.

2. Nothing should be done on vague or indefinite grounds. Men are very apt to satisfy themselves of the propriety of taking almost any course, not obviously immoral, if they feel that they are actuated by good motives. It is not enough, however, in such matters, that we should desire to promote the purity of the church, or the general interests of religion; we must have some definite principles, which will commend themselves to the understanding and conscience, and which will bear the scrutiny of posterity and ——— of the bar of God. We must be able to give a reason for our conduct which shall satisfy the impartial and competent, that it is right and wise; that it necessarily results from our principles. We consider this a matter of great importance. Every day affords melancholy examples of the confusion and inconsistency which arise from acting on the mere general ground of doing what seems to make for truth and righteousness. Measures involving precisely the same principles are opposed or advocated by the same individuals, as they happen to make for or against the cause or the party which seems to them to be the best. We see constantly in our public judicatories, the power of the courts extended or contracted, the rules of procedure enforced to the letter or construed away to nothing, as the occasion requires. This is not always, nor, we trust generally, the result of dishonesty. It is the result of the want of fixed principles. Hence this inconsistency; this justifying to-day, what was condemned yesterday; this applauding in one man what is censured in another. If so much evil results from this source, in matters of ordinary routine, what must be the consequences of random action, on occasions which threaten organic changes, whose effects are to last for ages?

3. Nothing should be done by a part, which affects the interests of the whole. The church is not a voluntary society, which one may enter or withdraw from at pleasure. It is an army, of which the several portions are bound to each other and to their common head, by very strong bonds, not to be lightly severed. It is obvious that the reasons must be very strong indeed to justify one division of an army engaged in a perilous campaign, in withdrawing from its associates and seeking its own ease or safety. It is not enough to authorize such a step, that it is dissatisfied with the conduct of the commander, or that it supposes it can provide more effec-

tually for its own interests by itself. * The consequence of such defection, however, may be to bring ruin on the whole, and can never be justified except in those extreme cases, which are a law unto themselves. We doubt not that our southern brethren feel that they would be in many respects more secure if separated from the north; that they would be more unembarrassed in their efforts for the good of the coloured population; freed from the necessity of vindicating themselves from the charge of a fellow feeling with some of their ecclesiastical associates, they would have more leisure and more power for their own appropriate work. Admitting, however, what we are very far from believing, that their peculiar interests would be more effectually promoted by a separate organization, the duty or propriety of such separation is not thereby established. Would the good of the whole be promoted by it? Would the best interests of the church and the country be thereby advanced, not for the present merely, but for the long uncertain future? Alas, who can tell how pregnant with future woes, such an event might prove. Again, there are portions of the church which are so compact in their geographical limits, so homogeneous in their population, so harmonious in their theological opinions, as to be tempted to believe they would have much greater peace, security and prosperity, by being entirely disconnected from all the rest. Suppose all this is true, would they be justified in withdrawing? What then would become of the rest? Is it wise to take the balance wheel out of a rapidly revolving machine, and let the whole go to ruin, for the sake of the supposed and doubtful benefit of that one wheel? It surely cannot be denied that the constituent parts of such a body as a great ecclesiastical society, organized as one church, with common standards and a common constitution are under very strong moral obligations to each other and to the whole; that no one part has a right to dictate to the rest, nor to consult exclusively its own interests, nor make its own opinions the rule even of its own action. It can have no right to bring irreparable evils on others for its own sake, nor to jeopard the interests of the whole by acting on its own views, as though it were a whole by itself. Whatever therefore is to be done should be done with the concurrence and co-operation of all those interested in the result. Such concurrence cannot be secured unless there be mutual forbearance, concessions, and confidence. There must be a determination on the part of all, to yield their private opinions or judgment to the majority of those concerned, whatever that may

prove eventually to be. Unless God gives us grace to be humble, it is very plain we are ruined.

4. There can be no doubt that the separation of a church is an extreme measure, to be justified before our Supreme Judge, our own conscience, and before the world, by absolute necessity alone. We are obviously bound by our mutual engagements to submit to the regular operation of our own system, and abide by the decisions of our own judicatories, except in those cases which justify revolution. This being the fact, it is incumbent on those who assume that such a case has arisen, to make it out; to present and establish the principle on which the separation of a church becomes a duty; for when not a duty, it is a crime. A preliminary point, therefore, absolutely necessary to satisfy the judgment and conscience of the church, in this momentous concern, is to ascertain and establish this principle. What is it? We acknowledge ourselves ignorant of the views of the brethren on this subject. It can hardly be that the opinion sometimes presented, is very prevalent, that any portion of the church has a right to separate from the rest, when its own peculiar interests may thereby be better promoted. We have already remarked that this opinion is founded on an entire forgetfulness of the relation of the several parts of the church to each other, and the duty of each to consult not its own good merely, but the greatest good of the whole. Others may take the ground that whenever a church consists of such discordant materials that there is frequent collisions between them, it is best for them to separate. But this is obviously much too indefinite. It is a mere matter of opinion which every one must decide for himself, whether the evils of collision are in any given case, greater than the evils of separation. Men accordant in their theological views, in all their personal feelings and plans of operation, may well come to opposite conclusions as to such a question as this. It affords no principle of division. It may separate the most congenial. It binds no man's conscience. Besides, where is it to end? Is collision from whatever source it arises, to be perpetually a ground of separation? If so, we shall have to divide and subdivide until we are reduced to our original elements. We had better renounce our principles, and become congregationalists at once. And then if any man should start up and apply to the congregation, the rule that had been applied to the church as a whole, we know not what is to become of us. Were the same principle to be applied to civil communities, society could not hold together at all.

Others may be disposed to take the more plausible ground that when the majority of a church has become unsound, it is the duty of the minority to separate; either by secession, or by assuming to be the true church and disowning the other portion. There are two things to be here determined, before this can be practically applied to our case. First, the soundness of the principle itself, and secondly, the proof of the fact that the majority of the Presbyterian church is unsound. Both of these points must be made out before the churches can be expected to act in the case. It would require far more time and space than we can command, to do any thing like justice to either of these points. We shall, therefore, say only a few words on each, inverting their order. First, then, is the majority of the Presbyterian church unsound? It might be difficult to decide on what is to be considered the test of soundness. If the *cordial* and *ex-animo* adoption of the confession of faith, according to its obvious and most prevalent interpretation, is to be the test, since the late Assembly we are all sound. We are saved much trouble, however, on this point by the frequent admissions from the most zealous men amongst us, that the majority of the church is substantially sound, that all that is needed is to rouse it to a sense of the necessity for action. These declarations were made previously to the Assembly of 1835. The character of that body greatly increased the confidence of all concerned in their correctness. If the contrary is to be now assumed, it must be on the evidence afforded by acts of the Assembly which has just closed its sessions. The question then is, do those acts furnish such evidence of this fact as to satisfy the churches and make them feel the necessity for a separation? Assuming, what is surely as much as can be asked for, that all who voted against the formation of a Foreign Missionary Board, against the resolution to censure Mr. Barnes' book, or displacing the old members of the Board of Missions, are to be considered unsound, what is the result? The first vote on the Foreign Missionary Society was 134 in favour of it, to 133 against it. A majority of *one* on the right side. It is evident, that such a question is no fair test. When the second vote was taken it was decided in the negative, by a vote of 110 to 106; that is, 110 men finally rejected a measure for which 134 had previously voted. This is a greater evidence of a dereliction of a duty on the part of the orthodox in not remaining to the close of the sessions, than of the unsoundness of the majority of the house. On Dr. Miller's resolution, the vote stood 122 to 109. This was in the absence of the synod of Philadel-

phia; and at most it exhibits only 122 votes out of 270, the whole number of the Assembly, of whom from 134 to 140 had voted with the opposite party. On the election of the Board of Missions the vote stood about 140 for the old Board to 125 for the new. It appears, therefore, taking the worst possible view of the case, that every question which has seriously agitated the church was decided by a comparatively small minority of the whole Assembly. Is this to be considered decisive evidence that the majority of the Presbyterian church is unsound? Besides, the character of the majority of any particular Assembly, is obviously a most fallacious test of the state of the whole church. The character of the Assembly depends upon a multitude of circumstances, which it must be next to impossible to estimate. The Assembly of 1835 was strongly old school: that of 1836, for a part of the time at least, was the reverse. Has the state of the church, however, materially changed, during the last twelve months? This cannot be pretended. Those, therefore, who now contrary to their belief a year ago, would assume that the majority of the case is unsound, must produce some better evidence than the relative strength of parties in the late Assembly, before the churches will yield to the melancholy conviction. The character of the answer to the protests presented by Drs. Phillips and Hoge, furnishes a far better index to the state of the church than any vote of the General Assembly. That answer yields every thing, and professes every thing for which the most orthodox have ever contended. Those who believe its authors perfectly sincere, must of course admit that the battle is won; and those who can find it in their hearts to question their sincerity, must at least see that those authors themselves felt that the public sentiment of the church is orthodox, and demands the profession of the most thorough orthodoxy from its representatives. Take it, therefore, either way, it goes to prove the soundness of the church. Our faith in the orthodoxy of the great body of the Presbyterian denomination, much as we disapprove of the acts of the majority of the late Assembly, remains unshaken; and we feel satisfied that it requires nothing but wisdom, union, and efficiency, on the part of the orthodox, to make the fact abundantly evident.

As to the second point, the correctness of the principle itself, that when the majority of a church is unsound, it is the duty of the minority to separate, we are not prepared to say that there may not be some extreme cases in which it may be correct. There may be instances in which the majority

is so great, their conduct so oppressive, and the defection from the truth so serious as to render separation a duty. But these cases are exceptions, and are not, properly speaking, included in the simple principle under consideration. The principle itself, as a general rule, we think incorrect, for the following reasons: 1. The minority do not in fact profess, and are not regarded by other churches, or by the world, as professing or in any way sanctioning the opinions of the majority. They profess the doctrines contained in the standards of the church to which they belong. The Episcopalian professes his faith in the Thirty-nine Articles, and is not in conscience bound to leave his church, because he may think a majority of its members are Arminians or Pelagians. The Presbyterian professes to believe the Westminster Confession, and not the varied and contradictory opinions of those who may be associated with him in the same denomination. When the defection of the majority is from the very essentials of the gospel, so that they cease to be a Christian church, and where our association with them is such as to involve an admission of their Christian character, the case is altered. But this, as before remarked, comes under a different principle. A minority, therefore, is not bound in conscience, and if not bound, is not authorized, to separate from the church to which it belongs, on the ground that it is responsible for the opinions of the majority. 2. The name, the character, the influence, the institutions, the various resources of a church are a sacred deposit held in trust, for the secure keeping and safe transmission of which all its members are jointly and severally responsible. Any mode of separation that would throw this deposit entirely into hands which, in the judgment of the minority, would use it for purposes foreign to its original design, must be regarded as virtually a breach of trust. They are responsible for the right use of these various sources of influence, and consequently are bound to do all in their power to secure their proper management. Is it to be supposed that the founders of our seminaries would have entrusted their money to men, who they imagined would on the first defeat in the Assembly, abandon the trust into hands which were never intended to receive it? This is a very serious view of the subject, as it relates to a question of moral obligation. The evil is scarcely less, if any course should be taken which would make the property of the church a subject of protracted and doubtful litigation. 3. The evils attending such separations are incalculably great. The division runs through every judicatory, through individual congregations, and even

through families, producing discord, alienation and rivalry in its course. It almost always greatly promotes the power and permanence of error. In our own case, it is doubtful whether human ingenuity could devise a scheme more certain to render Pelagianism prevalent in the Presbyterian church, perhaps for generations, than the defection of the orthodox party. We do not mean to say that any considerable portion of the new-school party is now Pelagian. But this is the tendency of the age; and the leaning of the leaders of that party. When once separated from the stricter portion of the church, in what a condition would they be placed! Discordant among themselves, with no principle of union, except the negative one of general license of opinion and measures,* is it not to be feared their career would be most disastrous for the church and the country? Shall the name, the character, the resources of the Presbyterian church be surrendered to promote such results? Shall every thing be given up to advance the very cause we are so anxious to oppose? Besides, if division once begin, where is it to end? Is there not danger that when the name, the associations, the bond of sympathy, are given up, we shall break into numerous and inefficient bodies, and become the wonder and pity, instead of the admiration and blessing of the country. 4. All experience is against the course we have been considering. This might easily be shown from the history of the church, but it is too wide a field for us now to enter upon. The conduct and triumph of Witherspoon and his associates in the kirk of Scotland, are at once a guide and encouragement for those, in our own church, who profess to admire his principles. 5. It would be now more unwise than ever, because the prospect of the triumph of correct principles is better now than it has been for years. The action of the late Assembly has consolidated and thereby strengthened the ranks of the friends of truth and order. The new-school men have placed themselves in a false position. They at first refused to condemn a work which the public sentiment of the church unquestionably disapproves of; and then went to the opposite extreme of adopting the very language of the *ultra orthodox*, as they have been accustomed to call them. To give up now would be to turn back when we have the goal in sight. All that we need is Presbyterianism—let our own system have its way—

* We infer from the frequency with which the sentiment is quoted, that any man who does not deny the ESSENTIALS OF CHRISTIANITY, they would admit even under the present constitution of the Presbyterian church.

it is able to stand worse times than these. If faithful to their principles, if prayerful and active, the friends of the Presbyterian church have no reason to fear the result.

We cannot see, therefore, how any set of men can with a good conscience, desire to effect the division of the church until they are called upon to profess what they do not believe, or required to do what they cannot approve. This, as far as we can see, is the only principle which can bear the test; which will acquit us in the sight of God and man, for tearing asunder that portion of the church of Christ committed to our care.* We know not how good can result. Instead of producing peace; it will probably increase discord. Instead of promoting truth; it will probably render error triumphant. Instead of advancing the interests of Presbyterianism; it will probably destroy its influence. In taking a step involving the interests of so large a portion of Zion, and affecting generations yet unborn, how much wisdom, humility and prayer are needed! May He in whom are all our hopes, guide his people in the right path.

We conclude these remarks as we began, by saying, that whatever is done should be done with the concurrence as far as possible of all concerned. The few should yield to the many. If the church is to be divided, though we disapprove of the principle and deprecate the consequences, the responsibility will rest with those who effect it. Let it, if possible, be done harmoniously. Let some fair principle of separation be established, and when the deed is done, every man will have his choice where to pitch his tent.

* That it may not be supposed that this is the opinion of men who have often been considered too moderate, we quote the following passage from an article in vindication of the Act and Testimony, published in the Presbyterian for Dec. 4, 1834, and signed R. J. B. "As long as our standards remain such as we can from our hearts approve them—at the same time that we have liberty to preach and live by them, and testify against those who do neither—we have no sufficient ground to secede, nor any thought of doing so. Secession is indeed an easier work than reformation; but the latter is our present duty."

CONTENTS OF NO. III.

ART. I.—Select Notices of the present state of Religion and Religious Literature in some countries of Europe. - - - -	307
II.—Balfour's Enquiry. - - - - - - -	327
III.—Modern Miracles and Wonders. - - - - -	348
IV.—Perpetuity of the Church. - - - - - -	362
V.—Requisite qualifications of a Ministry adapted to the wants of the West. - - - - - - - -	380
VI.—Thoughts on the Religious State of the Country ; with Reasons for preferring Episcopacy. By Rev. Calvin Colton.	390
VII.—The General Assembly of 1836. - - - -	415

