

Vol XIV

1842







THE

BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

PRINCETON REVIEW

FOR THE YEAR

1842.

VOL. XIV.

PHILADELPHIA:

M. B. HOPE—EDUCATION ROOMS, 29 SANSOM STREET.

J. T. ROBINSON, PRINTER, PRINCETON.



## CONTENTS OF VOL. XIV.

### NO. I.

*John Woodbridge*  
ART. I.—Revivals : or the Appropriate Means of Promoting True Religion. A Sermon preached in the South Congregational Church in Bridgeport, Conn., on the Lord's day morning, June 20, 1841. By John Woodbridge, D. D. . . . . 1

ART. II.—The Kingdom of Christ Delineated, in two Essays on our Lord's own Account of his Person and of the Nature of his Kingdom, and on the Constitution, Powers and Ministry of a Christian Church, as appointed by Himself. By Richard, Lord Archbishop of Dublin. *J. N. Leonardus* . . . . . 45

ART. III.—1. The Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes, containing Evidence of their Identity, an Account of their Manners, Customs and Ceremonies, with Sketches of Travel in ancient Assyria, Armenia, Media and Mesopotamia, and Illustrations of Scriptural Prophecy. By Ashbel Grant, M. D.

2. The Remnant Found, or the Place of Israel's Hiding Discovered. By the Rev. Jacob Samuel, Senior Missionary to the Jews, for India, Persia, and Arabia; Author of a Hebrew Sermon on the "Evidences of Christianity," and a Journal of Five Months' Residence in Cochin. *Archibald*<sup>59</sup> *Alexander*

*William Keenan*  
ART. IV.—1. Reports of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland for the years 1834 to 1839 inclusive.

2. Reports of the Committee to the Annual Meeting of the Society for promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland, held in Kildare Place, Dublin, 1839 and 1840.

3. Speech of the Lord Bishop of Norwich in the British House of Lords, May 21, 1838, on the National System of Education in Ireland, with an appendix of Letters on the causes of the opposition made to the system in Ireland, &c., signed "T."

4. Irish Education. Speech of Thomas Wyse, Esq., M. P., in the House of Commons, May 19, 1835, on moving for leave to bring in a bill for the establishment of a Board of Education in Ireland, &c. To which is added the bill, documents, &c.

5. Thoughts on the mixed character of government institutions in Ireland, with particular reference to the System of

National Education. By Rev. James Carlisle, one of the Commissioners, &c.	
6. Defence of the National System of Education in Ireland, in reply to the letters of J. C. Colquhoun, Esq. M. P. By the same.	
7. State Education; considered with reference to prevalent misconceptions on religious grounds. By Rev. Baden Powell, Professor, &c. in the University of Oxford.	87
ART. V.—History of the Great Reformation of the sixteenth century, in Germany, Switzerland, &c. By J. H. Merle d'Aubigné, President of the Theological School of Geneva, and Member of the "Société Evangelique." Volumes First and Second. First American, from the Fifth London Edition.	
	119
<i>James W. Alexander</i>	
ART. VI.—The Prelatical Doctrine of Apostolical Succession Examined. And the Protestant Ministry Defended against the Assumptions of Popery and High-Churchism, in a Series of Lectures. By Thomas Smyth, Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Charleston, S. C.	129
<i>J. W. Alexander</i>	
ART. VII.—Sermons on Important Subjects. By the Reverend Samuel Davies, A. M., President of the College of New Jersey. With an Essay on the Life and Times of the Author. By Albert Barnes. Stereotype Edition, containing all the Sermons of the Author ever published.	142
<i>Chas. Hodge</i>	
Quarterly List of New Books and Pamphlets.	170

## NO. II.

ART. I.—The Life and Times of Red-Jacket, or Sa-Go-Ye-Wat-Ha; being the sequel to the History of the Six Nations. By William L. Stone.	183
<i>Samuel Miller</i>	
ART. II.—1. Joannis Calvinii in Librum Geneseos Commentarius. Ad editionem Amstelodamensem accuratissime exscribi curavit E. Hengstenberg.	
2. Kommentar über die Genesis von Dr. Friedrich Tueh, Privatdocent an der Universität zu Halle.	
3. A Companion to the Book of Genesis. By Samuel H. Turner, D. D. Prof. Bib. Lit. and Interp. of Serip. in the Theol. Sem. of the Prot. Epis. Church, and of the Hebrew Lang. and Lit. in Columbia College, New York.	
4. A Family Exposition of the Pentateuch. By the Rev. Henry Blunt, M. A., Rector of Streatham, Surrey, Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Richmond, and formerly Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge.—Genesis.	199
ART. III.—Address delivered in Easton, Pennsylvania, August 18th, 1841, on the occasion of the Author's Inauguration as President of Lafayette College. By John W. Yeomans.	215
<i>John W. Yeomans</i>	



*Chas. Hodge*  
**ART. IV.**—The History of Christianity, from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire. By the Rev. H. H. Milman, Prebendary of St. Peter's, and Minister of St. Margaret's, Westminster. With a Preface and Notes by James Murdock, D. D. . . . . 236

**ART. V.**—Mission to England in behalf of the American Colonization Society. By Rev. R. R. Gurley. *Archibald Alexander*<sup>286</sup>

**ART. VI.**—1. Address delivered in South Hadley, Massachusetts, July 30, 1840, at the third anniversary of the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary. By Mark Hopkins, D. D.  
 2. An Address delivered at the Dedication of the Williston Seminary, at East Hampton, Massachusetts, Dec. 1, 1841. By Rev. Mark Hopkins, D. D., President of William's College. *J. W. Alden* . . . . . 280

**ART. VII.**—1. Report relating to Capital Punishment, presented to the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Feb. 22d, 1836. *J. S. Lovi*  
 2. Report on Capital Punishment, presented to the Assembly of the State of New York, April 14, 1841. . . . . 307

Quarterly List of New Books and Pamphlets. . . . . 347

NO. III.

*Stephen Colwell*  
**ART. I.**—1. The Last Will and Testament of James Smithson, London.  
 2. The Letters of John Q. Adams, F. Wayland, Thomas Cooper, Richard Rush, S. Chapin, to John Forsyth, Secretary of State, on the subject of the trust assumed by the United States, under the will of James Smithson.  
 3. The Congressional Proceedings and Documents on the same subject. . . . . 359

*Edwin Hall*  
**ART. II.**—1. Primitive Christian Worship: or, the evidence of Holy Scriptures and the Church concerning the invocation of Saints and Angels, and the blessed Virgin Mary. By J. Endell Tyler, B. D. Rector of St. Giles-in-the-fields, and late fellow of Oriel College. Oxford.  
 2. The Virgin Mary. A candid comparison with the Holy Scriptures of the doctrine of the Church of Rome, respecting the mother of our Lord. By John Hall, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Trenton, N. J. . . . . 407

**ART. III.**—The Scriptural Doctrine of Sanctification stated and defended against the error of Perfectionism. By W. D. Snodgrass, D. D. *John Woodbridge* . . . . . 426

**ART. IV.**—The General Assembly of 1842. *Charles Hodge* 473

Quarterly List of New Books and Pamphlets. . . . . 524

## NO. IV.

- ART. I.—The works of Nathanael Emmons, D. D., late Pastor of the Church in Franklin, Mass., with a Memoir of his life. Edited by Jacob Ide, D. D. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1842. Six volumes, 8vo. *Archibald Alex and Co. 529 J. D. A. C.*
- ART. II.—The works of Thomas Chalmers, D. D., and L. L. D., Professor of Theology in the University of Edinburgh, and Corresponding Member of the Royal Institute of France. Glasgow: William Collins. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1835—1842. Twenty-two volumes, 12mo. *James W. Allen and Co. 562*
- ART. III.—The Kingdom of Christ delineated, in two Essays on our Lord's own account of his person and of the nature of his Kingdom, and on the Constitution, Powers and Ministry of a Christian Church, as appointed by himself. By Richard Whately, D. D. Archbishop of Dublin. New York: Wiley & Putnam, 161 Broadway. 1842. *J. S. Alexander. 584*
- ART. IV.—*W. Barber, Knapp* 1. The Divine Rule of Faith and Practice; or a Defence of the Catholic Doctrine that Holy Scripture has been since the times of the Apostles the Sole Divine Rule of Faith and Practice, against the dangerous errors of the authors of the Tracts for the Times, and the Romanists, as, particularly that the Rule of Faith is "made up of Scripture and Tradition together;" &c., in which also the doctrines of Apostolical Succession, the Eucharistic Sacrifice, &c. are fully discussed. By William Goode, M. A., of Trinity College, Cambridge; Rector of St. Antholin, London. Philadelphia: Herman Hooker. 1842. Two volumes, 8vo.
2. A Treatise concerning the Right use of the Fathers in the Decision of Controversies in Religion. By John Daille, Minister of the Gospel in the Reformed Church at Paris. Presbyterian Board of Publication. Philadelphia. 1842.
3. Not Tradition, but Scripture. By Philip N. Shuttleworth, D. D., Warden of New College, Oxford, (late Bishop of Chichester). First American from the third London edition. Philadelphia: Hooker & Agnew. 1841.
4. The Authority of Tradition in Matters of Religion. By George Holden, M. A. Philadelphia: Hooker & Agnew. 1841.
5. Tradition Unveiled. By Baden Powell, of Oriel College, Oxford. Hooker & Agnew. 1841. . . . . 598
- Short Notices. . . . . 631

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

JANUARY 1842.

---

No. I.

---

---

ART. I.—*Revivals: or the Appropriate Means of Promoting True Religion. A Sermon preached in the South Congregational Church in Bridgeport, Conn., on the Lord's day morning, June 20, 1841. By John Woodbridge, D.D. Published by request.*

WHATEVER diversity of sentiment may prevail in regard to the subject handled in this discourse, there can be but one opinion respecting its vast importance. All who believe in the reality of true religion must be agreed, that it is of the highest moment to understand what are the true and legitimate means of reviving its power and furthering its progress. The views advanced by Dr. Woodbridge in this discourse are judicious, scriptural and timely. Although it was not prepared for the press, the fact that a congregation not his own, on hearing it, requested its publication, because they thought it adapted to subserve the cause of Christ, is an encouraging symptom of a good state of opinion in Christian communities.

Dr. Woodbridge shows first what are not, and secondly what are "the appropriate means of promoting true religion." Among the first class he places "a bitter and censorious spirit in opposing wickedness; a neglect or superficial notice of the distinguishing doctrines of the gospel; en-

couraging innovations in the form of sound words, or the introduction of doctrines unknown to men of former generations ; the introduction of a new philosophy into religion, or connecting an old erroneous theory of the divine government and human liberty with Christian doctrines ; joining with those who would merge all denominational differences in the general name of Christian ; giving special countenance to those who are accounted peculiarly revival preachers, whose business it is not to labour as missionaries in waste places, or among the heathen ; nor to take the pastoral oversight of churches at home, but to aid settled ministers in preaching, visiting and other means of awakening and saving their people ; the introduction of new measures not inculcated in the scriptures ; encouraging young converts to great forwardness in religious meetings, and in public efforts to alarm the careless ; projects of reform calculated to divide rather than unite those who sincerely love the truth as it is in Jesus, and which imply no change in the principles and morals of those with whom we are immediately associated."

These points are enforced by our author by cogent arguments. Whenever it is requisite he interposes sufficient guards and qualifications, to avoid those rash and indiscriminate assertions which would expose him to the assaults of antagonists. Among the appropriate means of promoting religion he mentions "the faithful and frequent preaching of the gospel ; the faithful instruction and government of families ; the maintenance of kindred faithful discipline in the church ; a knowledge of the truth, and unflinching zeal in its defence and propagation ; corresponding spiritual affections, as ardent love to God, penitence, humility, faith in the Redeemer, and disinterested, active benevolence towards men ; earnest attention to the duties of the closet ; a suitable religious demeanor and conversation in the family ; a strict attendance on the public ordinances of religion, and frequent meetings for exhortation and prayer ; abstinence from every known sin, and the performance of every known duty ; a consistent example ; *lastly*, direct personal efforts by the devotement of time and property, by counsel, warning, and entreaty, to promote the conversion and salvation of men."

We presume that these views will meet the concurrence of the great mass of intelligent and spiritual Christians. And the more numerous the experiments made in the way

of attempting to promote religion by the unsound and unscriptural methods reprobated in this discourse, the more unsatisfactory are the results in the judgment of the pious and discerning.

Having presented this brief outline of the sermon under consideration, without further canvassing its merits, we shall avail ourselves of the opportunity afforded by it, to exhibit our own views on some of the topics of which it treats. We propose to inquire particularly into the fitness and validity of those means which have been most largely plied to produce a considerable proportion of the religious excitements in this country, for the last fifteen years, till in many quarters they have become identified with the very idea of a revival, and whoever discards them is judged destitute of a proper zeal for the salvation of souls.

The only common and distinctive attribute by which all classes have agreed to characterize these means, is novelty. They have been known over the land, assailed by foes and vindicated by friends, under the name of *New School, New Divinity, New Measures*. It is well known that under the vigorous appliance of these means, sometimes the new doctrines, sometimes the new measures, but more commonly both in conjunction, inasmuch as the latter are the legitimate offspring of the former, numerous extensive religious excitements have occurred, which have resulted in large accessions of members to the visible church. They have been set out and emblazoned in high-sounding reports, often streaked with some tints of the marvellous, and thus arrayed, have been trumpeted abroad on the wings of the wind.

It should be understood, however, that these means are not new in the most absolute sense. Those who introduced them among us, are not entitled to the credit of originating them. As to the substance of them, they had long been in use among other sects, and were the habitual and familiar weapons of their warfare. In the use of them they gloried, and on them they founded their claims to popular favour, as against Calvinistic churches, whose doctrines and usages they delighted to hold up in horrid caricature, and in awful contrast to their own more liberal and encouraging views. The novelty in the case is their introduction to Calvinistic communions, by men professedly attached to Calvinistic doctrine and that type of religious experience which results from it. But although whatever is peculiar to the authors and abettors of new divinity and new mea-



tures is evidently borrowed from heresiarchs of former days, or surrounding Arminian sects, still no small ingenuity was required to solve the problem, how men could adopt the usages and principles of the adversaries of Calvinism, even making free use of their odious caricatures of it, and every other mode of blackening it in the eyes of mankind, and still remain sound and hearty Calvinists. The effort to solve this problem has wonderfully sharpened the wits of a considerable number of moral philosophers, and given rise to some curious and original processes in the art of casuistry. If any thing in these matters is strictly entitled to the praise of novelty, it is the new light thus shed upon the science of ethics and Christian morality. It is likewise notorious that the religious excitements which have been chiefly promoted by the use of the means under consideration, have been regarded with more or less distrust by a large proportion of the most orthodox, intelligent, and pious Christians and ministers in Calvinistic communions, who have long been known as most devoted friends of true revivals and experimental piety. This distrust is usually in the ratio of their attachment to orthodox doctrines, to the very doctrines which Edwards and Whitefield and Dickinson and Witherspoon constantly pressed upon their hearers, as the chief and indispensable means of nourishing a genuine revival of religion. What class of men, we ask, have been most conspicuous as rallying points of unflinching opposition to all the peculiarities in question? Are they crude and aspiring novices in the church, young and inexperienced fault-finders, dealing out wholesale slanders from sheer ignorance or malice, speaking evil of the things they understand not? Or are they men of dubious reputation for discernment, orthodoxy, zeal and piety? If we inquire who have most distinguished themselves by strenuously resisting, and rallying others to resist this order of things, do they not form a constellation of stars of the first magnitude in our American Zion? And is not the number exceedingly small of those who a few years since were leaders of the sacramental hosts, that have been pleased with the irruption of that order of things, known by the all-comprehensive appellation of new school? Have not such men in one form or another, as they have had opportunity, been sounding the notes of alarm and warning to the churches, as if they were exposed to the secret inroads of error and delusion? Are the fears of such men, and of the sound, intel-

ligent Christians who sympathize with them, at all abated by the information that great religious excitements are generated by these inventions and expedients? Or do they not rather apprehend that this poison eats like a canker into these excitements themselves, thus bringing this erroneous system to a most dreadful consummation? The more they see of this sort of excitements, is not their distrust of them increased? Have not many felt impelled, like Dr. Woodbridge, to mark the difference between such agitations and a genuine outpouring of the Holy Ghost, the means respectively adapted to promote the one and the other, and to urge upon the people not to believe every spirit, but to try the spirits whether they be of God.

Now it is hardly credible that these men should all have concurred simultaneously in detecting an insidious poison in that which was only the salubrious medicine of the great Physician, the milk and meat of divine truth. It would seem that there must be something wrong, some element essentially unsound and anti-evangelical at the bottom of these movements. What that is, deserves careful inquiry. It is due to the cause of truth, as well as to all parties concerned, to subject the means used to promote the excitements in question to a strict examination. This we shall now aim to do, dealing only with points of divinity so far as they form a material part of the machinery commonly relied on to produce such scenes.

But inasmuch as the measures which men employ for the promotion of religion will be chiefly determined by their conceptions of its nature, particularly of the natural state of man, and the state into which he must pass in order to become a child of God, and of that power and agency by which alone this change can be effected; it will facilitate our progress, to obtain a clear conception of those views of the nature of holiness, moral obligation, human depravity, regeneration, and repentance, which have formed the ground-work of these excitements. This new and facile method of making christians, was first promulgated in form, and defended in a series of elaborate articles on "The means of regeneration," first published in the *Christian Spectator*, for 1829, and then re-published in a separate pamphlet, of which Dr. Taylor was the undisputed author.

The following passage embodies the cardinal principles, in accordance with which he constructs a new theory of

regeneration, and recommends a new model of preaching that shall multiply converts with unexampled rapidity.

“This self-love or desire of happiness is the primary cause or reason of all acts of preference or choice which fix supremely on any object. In every moral being who forms a moral character, there must be a first moral act of preference or choice. This must respect some one object, God or mammon, as the chief good, or as an object of supreme affection. Now whence comes such a choice or preference? Not from a previous choice or preference of the same object, for we speak of the first choice or preference. The answer which human consciousness gives, is, that the being constituted with a capacity for happiness desires to be happy; and knowing that he is capable of deriving happiness from different objects, considers from which the greatest happiness may be derived; and as in this respect he judges or estimates their relative value, so he chooses or prefers one or the other as his chief good. While this must be the process by which a moral being forms his first moral preference, substantially the same process is indispensable to a change of this preference.” *Chris. Spec.* 1829, p. 21.

In this passage several things are either directly stated or implied.

1. That the only inward affection which prompts the choices or preferences of moral beings, God, angels, saints, sinners and devils, is the love of self, otherwise called the desire of happiness.

2. That the ultimate end of all choice, or reason why any object is chosen by rational beings, is the happiness which it is expected to impart to the person choosing. Or, as it is elsewhere affirmed: “Of all specific voluntary action the happiness of the agent in some form is the ultimate end.”

3. As the choices of the wicked and the righteous are not distinguished from each other, either in the principle from which they flow, or the end they seek, they are distinguished solely by the difference in the objects they respectively select as means of gratifying the same ruling desire, and attaining the same ultimate end.

4. Any thing like a sinful nature, or innate sinful affection is of course discarded. Because previous to, and aside from this choice of mammon in preference to God, which occurs after “judging or estimating their relative value,” there is no principle or affection which does no



exist in the breast of the glorified saint. No wonder then that in the same volume, p. 367, the following interrogatory is put with an air of triumph: "Why then is it so necessary to suppose some distinct evil propensity—some fountain of iniquity in the breast of the child previous to moral action?"

5. A saving change involves nothing more than a choice of new means to gratify the same reigning principle or affection which prompted a life of sin. God is chosen and the world renounced, simply because the man "judges or estimates" this course most conducive to happiness. Hence it involves no renovation of the heart, or implantation of holy principles and affections, or change of nature by the Holy Ghost, as prior to and causative of holy exercises. Thus regeneration, as the scriptures teach and divines have ever understood it, is done away. If man has no sinful nature by the first birth, there is no occasion for a new birth to produce a holy nature.

6. The only conceivable room which this scheme leaves for the work of the Spirit, is in producing a change of judgment as to the "relative value" of God and the world as sources of happiness. For the law of moral action laid down is, that, "as in this respect he judges or estimates their relative value, so he chooses one or the other as his chief good." If therefore a correct understanding or conviction on this point, be effected, the great work is accomplished. But such a result is not beyond the reach of human argument and persuasion. No new affection or principle needs to be implanted. But principles already existing, are to be excited to a new choice, by gaining a knowledge of the true means of gratifying them, of which they were previously ignorant. If the Spirit's work in regeneration then, be any thing more than that of the preacher—the merest moral suasion—it is, at the utmost, nothing beyond the lowest degree of those operations which are common alike to sinners and saints, and consist in solely quickening old principles, not in imparting new ones. For who does not know that the first and faintest glimmerings of seriousness in the impenitent, from which few entirely escape, arise from the conviction, that they are forfeiting their true welfare and happiness? What is this but self-love somewhat quickened and enlightened? Thus the lowest degree of common grace is all that is requisite to regeneration, and special grace, as to its essence, is filtrated away, as a part of the dregs of an obsolete system. Strongly as

the charge has been resented, it is no caricature of this system, to say, that, "according to it, sin is a mistake, and regeneration is a correction of that mistake."

7. By this scheme regeneration being made the act of the sinner, is of course confounded, or made identical with conversion, which is appropriately the exercise of a soul renewed by the power of God.

8. Religious experience consists in forsaking the world and choosing God as a source of happiness.

These points all seem to us, either to be fully enunciated, or clearly implied in the passage we have cited. When the religion of the Bible is dwarfed and enervated to such a standard, few can wonder at the increased facility of making converts to it. That we have done no injustice, by unfair inferences, or by imputing to the author of a theory extreme practical conclusions, from which he would shrink, will be sufficiently shown by a few passages from other parts of this essay, in which he carries out the principles of the quotation already made, to their legitimate practical results. And for the better understanding of some of them, it should be remembered that the principles in question are held in company with that radical element of Pelagian theology and metaphysics—the power of contrary choice, or as the *Christian Spectator* styles it, "the power to act in despite of all opposing power."

Regeneration is made the sinner's own act, in the following passage :

"When we speak of the means of regeneration we shall use the word *regeneration*, in a more limited import, than its ordinary popular import; and shall confine it chiefly, for the sake of convenient phraseology, to the act of the will or heart, in distinction from other mental acts connected with it: or to that act of the will or heart which consists in a preference of God to every other object; or to that disposition of the heart, or governing affection or purpose of the man, which consecrates him to the service and glory of God."—pp. 18, 19.

That this act of the sinner is prompted by the same inward desires which first lead men to sin, is taught in the following terms :

"Divine truth does not become a means to this end, until the selfish principle so long cherished in the soul is superseded; and the mind is left to the control of that constitutional desire of happiness which is an original principle of

our nature. Then it is, we apprehend, that God and the world are contemplated by the mind as objects of choice, substantially as they would be by a being who had first entered on existence, and who was called on for the first time to select one or the other as his supreme good." p. 210.

That these views of regeneration are no mere theory which its authors shrink from carrying into consistent practice, is manifest from the following passage:

"We have already said that the sinner is the subject of that constitutional desire of happiness, called self-love, to which no moral quality pertains. Let the sinner then, as a being who loves happiness and desires the highest degree of it, under the influence of such a desire, take into solemn consideration the question whether the highest happiness is to be found in God or the world; let him pursue this inquiry, if need be, till it results in the conviction that such happiness is to be found in God only; and let him follow up this conviction with that intent and engrossing contemplation of the realities which truth discloses, and with that stirring up of his sensibilities in view of them, which invest the world when considered as his only portion with an aspect of insignificance, of gloom, and even of terror, and which shall chill and suspend his present active love of it; and let the contemplation be persevered in, till it shall discover a reality and excellence in the objects of holy affection, which shall put him upon direct and desperate efforts to fix his heart upon them; and let this process of thought, of effort and of action be entered upon as one that is never to be abandoned, until the end proposed by it is accomplished—until the only living and true God is loved and chosen as his God forever; and we say that in this way the work of regeneration through grace *may be accomplished.*" pp. 32, 33.

"Nor do we intend that a *direct* tendency to a change of heart pertains to the first act of the process, but that when self-love prompts the first act of sober consideration, there is in this act a tendency to augmented feeling, and that this feeling tends to fix contemplation, and this again to deepen feeling; and that thus, by the mutual action and re-action of thought and feeling, the process, were there no effectual counteracting influence, would go on until it terminated in a change of heart." p. 222.

We think few intelligent Christians can dissent from the following judgment pronounced upon it by Prof. Stuart, in

a letter written to Dr. Porter, immediately after the publication of Dr. Tyler's strictures upon it. "Dr. Tyler has published his pamphlet, and a noble one too, which has made an end of the matter as to brother Taylor's regeneration by self-love, a full end; there is no redemption. All the fog is blown away, and we have at last a clear and sheer regeneration of the natural man by himself, stimulated by self-love, made out to be the scheme of brother Taylor; there is no getting aside of it." *Memoirs of Dr. Porter*, p. 222.

We believe that Prof. Stuart has not prided himself on being a *heresy hunter*. And we think that the abettors of this scheme must be somewhat in straits for a defence, if they can find no other cause of the extensive and unyielding opposition to views which such a man so unequivocally condemned, than ignorance, prejudice or malice.

The following paragraphs from the *Christian Spectator* would seem to import that the heart of the sinner is hindered by no inability, whether natural or moral, from a compliance with the commands of the gospel.

"What is that heart with which God in his law requires sinners to love him? Surely not a heart which is holy before they love him. Still less with a sinful heart; and yet he requires them to love him with some heart, even *their* heart. Is this no heart at all? We think, on the contrary, it is a *real* heart, a heart with which sinners can love God, even without the grace of the Spirit, and, certainly, with it." *Christian Spectator*, 1830, pp. 149, 150.

Surely one whose heart is not "sinful," and who can love God "even without the grace of the Spirit," is free from all inability, whether natural or moral.

The lowest form of moral inability is certainly repudiated in the following passage, or it is utterly unmeaning.

"Common sense decides that if it is a known or revealed truth, that the sinner under a present call to duty, will not act, unless God do more than he is now doing, then let the sinner wait till God does more." *Christian Spectator*, 1829, p. 704.

View, in connexion with this, the following passages, which are unmeaning, if they do not import that it is improbable, nay impossible, that God should renew the heart until the sinner first yields submission.

"And what is this but assuming that God *may*, and *desiring* that he would, so depart from the immutable principle of his government, as to interpose to save him, while in heart a rebel and still resolved to be so." *Ch. Spec.* p. 30.



“The case, therefore, now stated, shows that the only supposable acts of the sinner with which his regeneration can be connected, involve the suspended influence of the selfish principle; and how impossible it is that without such a suspension the heart should be changed.” *Ib.* p. 38.

“Were there no other access to the inner man, except through this principle of the heart; were there nothing to which the motives of the gospel could be addressed, but the hardihood of this fell spirit—no way to overcome this ‘strong man,’ except by direct assault, then for aught we can see, the moral transformation of the soul were hopeless even to Omnipotence.” *Ib.* p. 39.

We see not what language could more strongly deny that the work of the Spirit in renewing the soul is direct, sovereign, and irresistible. Let it be viewed in connexion with the following extracts from Dr. Fitch’s review of Dr. Fisk on election and fore-ordination.

“We earnestly object to that antinomian scheme which makes grace terminate solely on dispensing with free-agency, by an act of mere omnipotence creating a new heart; thus leaving none of the elements which constitute the moral certainty of a conversion in the agent himself.” *Ib.* 1831, p. 633.

“Whatever is the degree of influence which he uses with them, it is not in its nature irresistible; but men as free agents still keep to their guilty choice in resistance to it, or through its operation, freely give up their idols, and place their hearts on God.” *Ib.* p. 632.

Here we see the doctrine that God creates the new heart by his almighty power, stigmatized as antinomian; a denial that his grace is irresistible; in company with the assertion that it is for those on whom it operates, to determine whether or not it shall be efficacious, and of course that they have within themselves some of the “elements which constitute the moral certainty of conversion.” What Arminianism ever went greater lengths in exalting human power, and invalidating divine grace in regeneration?

In this connexion let the following passage be considered.

“We know of no other hold which this divine agent can have on the sinner whom he would turn from the error of his ways, but that which consists in so bringing the truths of the Bible in contact with his understanding and moral sensibilities, that he shall voluntarily shun the threatened evil and choose the proffered good.” *Ib.* 1833, p. 356.

Again, p. 357, "There is no more difficulty in accounting for the fact that the yielding sinner supremely loves God from the impulse of a regard to his own happiness, than there is in explaining the opposite fact of his having formerly, under the influence of the same principle, when perverted, loved his idols."

This surely narrows down the work of the Spirit to the mere presentation of truth to the mind and heart of the sinner, so that his self-love will be excited to shun eternal woe and choose everlasting happiness; in other words, to mere moral suasion. The carnal mind could scarcely demand any further concessions. After such an explanation of the nature of religion, it was scarcely necessary to add that "under the call to present duty, the sinner is authorized to believe in the practicability of present duty." Religion is made easy only by debasing its quality. While human nature is what it is, there can be no way of exalting human power in the affair of conversion to God, except by degrading religion itself into conformity to the tastes of the unrenewed heart.

The sound and scriptural doctrine on this subject is altogether plain and indisputable. It teaches that the moral nature of man is totally depraved, alienated from God, averse to holiness, to the law and gospel of God, and all that is peculiar to the Christian life. It teaches that there is no affection, susceptibility or capacity in the unrenewed heart, which can be so affected or wrought upon by the truths of the gospel, as to yield obedience, love and conformity to them. The carnal mind is enmity against God, is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. It teaches that no act of spiritual and acceptable obedience to the gospel, will be rendered by any heart which is not created anew in Christ Jesus unto good works; that the word of God is powerless on all who are not made willing to obey it in the day of his power; and that the most skillful and earnest preachers, can make converts no faster than God makes their hearers willing and obedient, drawing them by his Spirit. If Paul plants, and Apollos waters, still it is God that gives the increase.

Now the attempt to multiply conversions, by getting over or around this barrier of man's total depravity and absolute dependence on divine grace for a new heart and a right spirit, and substituting in lieu of it some principle of the natu-

ral man which will respond to the truths and motives of the gospel if brought into proper contact with it, has resulted in an elaborate effort, to resolve all religious affections and exercises into the mere workings and products of self-love, as their common root; religious experience into a mere governing purpose to serve the Lord as a more fertile source of happiness than the world; a denial of the sinfulness of human nature; of sovereign and efficacious grace; of the creation of a new heart by divine omnipotence; of any election not conditioned on a foresight of obedience; in short, of every distinctive feature of Calvinistic doctrine and experience.

It has been constantly held up as a shield of those doctrinal innovations that have so deeply agitated the church in recent years, that they respect solely the more minute and attenuated philosophical explanations of Christian doctrine, while they do not touch in the slightest degree the doctrines themselves, and much less Christian experience and practice, as taking its character from the doctrines which nourish them. But whether the scheme above unfolded does not strike at the roots of both doctrine and practice, and radically revolutionize them; whether it does not at least sink them as low as the loosest Arminianism; whether it does not lay the foundation for substituting in place of the transforming work of the Holy Ghost on the soul those fictitious excitements of merely human passions which characterize some Arminian sects, and have crept from them into Calvinistic communions, we leave to our readers to judge.

We ask, what provision does the class of exercises prescribed to, or at least supposed in the case of, a sinner passing into the kingdom, by the foregoing scheme, make for his being slain by the law, and made alive by Christ? How does it provide for the work and office of the Mediator as the great and fundamental requisite in our reconciliation to God? How does it make it the conspicuous and characteristic feature of his experience that he feels himself wicked, guilty, blind and helpless under the power, and doomed to the curse of sin, and flees for refuge to his almighty Saviour, as his wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption? Might he not go through with all the exercises prescribed for "accomplishing the work of regeneration" without once thinking of Christ? And is this Christian experience?

Moreover, does not the whole scope of this scheme go to

fritter down the agency of the Spirit in regeneration and sanctification? Is not this carried so far as to convey the distinct intimation that it is dangerous for the sinner to know that "God must do more for him than he is now doing," in order to his conversion? Does not the idea of regeneration by the influence of self-love tend to the same result? But it is needless to add to our previous remarks in confirmation of this point.

It is withal worthy of remark, that with the decay of a sense of dependance, all the Christian graces must proportionably languish. This is a direct and obvious result as regards prayer, humility, reverence, gratitude, submission, faith, confidence and love towards God, pity, compassion and forbearance towards men. It is moreover a sound principle, that it cannot be consistently maintained that man of himself, without the renewing work of the Spirit, is sufficient for producing within himself spiritual religion, without contracting that religion to the measure of his natural sufficiency. It is idle therefore to say that this is a mere doctrine having no relation to practice. The very doctrine itself respects practice, and goes to its vitals.

It deserves consideration how far such a scheme is likely to beget in those converted in accordance with it a sense of the wickedness of their own hearts; a humbling and mournful sense of their own corruptions; and the earnest conflict between nature and grace which distinguishes the Christian life. What room is left for the continuance of a principle of sin in antagonism to a reigning principle of holiness, when nothing is admitted to be sinful or holy in man but acts, when the same principle of self-love prompts the acts of the regenerate as well as of the unregenerate, and when man is as able by means of self-love perfectly to keep the law as to break it? Is it wonderful, under the prevalence of such views, that such multitudes are strangers to the Christian conflict, or that Perfectionism grows apace?

We would inquire whether, on this scheme, the longings and aspirations of the Christian will not be in the line of becoming happy, or obtaining a hope of salvation, rather than of being conformed and assimilated to God and his law? If all moral goodness consists merely in seeking the greatest amount of happiness, then the prime object must be to obtain that which will minister the largest gratification to our desires whatever they may be, instead of so purifying our desires that they can be gratified with pure and holy objects.



For by this scheme, holiness is made a mere subordinate to, and instrument of, happiness, instead of subordinating happiness to itself as the "ultimate end" and supreme regulator? We see not, if it be true, what exception can be taken to the holiness of the Mohammedan, who is pursuing with might and main the sensualities of his fancied heaven.

This suggests the great and comprehensive objection to the practical bearings of this scheme, which is fundamental and fatal. It makes Christian holiness consist in a love of divine things not on account of their intrinsic moral excellence, beauty and loveliness, but solely on account of some conceived relation, or instrumentality which they hold in the furtherance of our own happiness. Now no principle is more self-evident than that no affection towards another deserves the name of love, which does not delight in his intrinsic qualities for their own sake, aside from all consideration of his becoming a source of profit or happiness to us. We may value a person whose qualities we hate, as an instrument of profit or happiness to us, but we do not love him. The most profligate man on earth, loves his neighbour Christian who ministers to his advantage or comfort, considered as thus profitable to him, just as much as he loves his own interest. Does he therefore exercise that love of the brethren which the gospel requires, and makes an infallible sign of saving grace? Obviously, this Christian love consists in a complacency of heart in the spiritual graces of the Christian, the love of which evinces a love of that God of whose moral attributes they are the image. Suppose then an individual conceives himself to love God, because he expects that he shall obtain eternal salvation from him, while he has no delight in his holiness, justice, faithfulness, and veracity: is this such a love as is pleasing to God, or accompanies salvation? Christian charity "seeketh not her own." "If ye love them that love you what thanks have ye? For sinners love those that love them." In accordance with these views, all standard writers on religious experience have made this their grand criterion of genuine and gracious religious affections, in distinction from those which are common and spurious: that "their object is the excellence of divine things," and not any conceived relation which they bear to self-interest: while the hypocrite's affections arise from no higher source than self-love. President Edwards, in his *Treatise on Religious Affections*, occupies two chapters at the very threshold with establishing this principle, as his great guid-

ing light in discriminating genuine from spurious religious experience. He says,\* "There is a kind of love or affection towards persons or things, which does properly arise from self-love. A preconceived relation to himself, or some respect already manifested by another to him, or some benefit already received or depended on is truly the first foundation of his love: what precedes any relish of, or delight in, the nature and qualities inherent in the being beloved, as beautiful and amiable. That kind of affection to God or Jesus Christ, which thus properly arises from self-love, cannot be a truly gracious and spiritual love, as appears from what has been said already. For self-love is a principle entirely natural, and as much in the hearts of devils as angels; and therefore surely nothing that is the mere result of it, can be supernatural and divine in the manner before described."† We might go on quoting passages equally explicit and decisive, but if besides showing his doctrine, we were to exhibit his proofs and application of it, we should be obliged to reprint the whole two chapters to which we have alluded. Our next authority shall be John Owen. In his *Treatise on the Holy Spirit*,‡ speaking of the preparatory work of the Spirit, which is common to the regenerate and unregenerate, as distinguished from that which is special and saving, he says, "The effects of this work on the mind, proceed not so far as to give delight and satisfaction in the lively spiritual nature and excellency of the things revealed to it. True saving illumination gives the mind such a direct intuitive insight into spiritual things, as that in their own nature they suit, please, and satisfy it: so that it is cast into the mould of them, and rests in them, Rom. vi. 17; xii. 2; 1 Cor. ii. 13, 14; 2 Cor. iii. 18; iv. 6. But the work we have spoken of reaches not so far; the light it communicates may cause a man to like the gospel for its beneficial effects, as a way of mercy and salvation; but it will not give him such a spiritual insight into the mystery of God's grace by Christ Jesus, as that the soul in its first direct view of it should, for what it is in itself, admire it, delight in it, approve it, and find spiritual solace and refreshment in it."

In accordance with this is the general testimony of ortho-

\* Works, vol. v. p. 130. New-York edition.

† "There is a natural love to Christ as to one that doeth thee good, and for thine own ends: and spiritual, for himself, whereby the Lord only is exalted."—*Shepard's Par. of the Ten Virgins*, P. I, p. 25.

‡ Page 142. Edition of the Presbyterian Board of Publication.

dox divines, as we might readily show if we had the space. Unless, then, such divines as Owen, Shepard, and Edwards, were utterly mistaken as to the fundamental distinction between true religion and hypocrisy, there can be no doubt where to rank that sort of piety which accords with the principles we have been examining.

We pass now to the consideration of certain measures which have been much employed for the purpose of promoting religious excitements, and are in perfect correspondence with the views of Christian doctrine and experience which have been under review. Although some of them have been occasionally adopted by men of sound views, yet they always seem unnatural and awkward in their hands. Sound doctrine is uncongenial to them, and encumbers them with so many fetters, that they cannot be plied with much tact, vigour, or celerity. Indeed the two are so essentially contrary and repellant to each other, that they seldom keep company long before one overmasters and extirpates the other. An orthodox man using these measures, seems like one who has thrown aside his spiritual weapons of celestial edge and temper, to try the clumsy and untempered armour of man's fashioning; and if he is thus tempted to go down to Egypt for help in any crisis, he usually repents it bitterly enough, to prevent a repetition of the experiment. These measures have usually flourished in connexion with those erroneous doctrines of which they are the offspring.

It ought however to be borne in mind, that many who have been foremost in plying these means for the production of revivals, have never gone into those refined and astute metaphysical processes, which are interwoven with the scheme of divinity we have been considering. Many of them are too crude and uncultured to master any subtleties in logic or metaphysics. Many of them have never penetrated into the subject so far as to see that self-regeneration by the natural man is impossible, except on the supposition that all the exercises of piety are prompted by self-love. But without minding the chasms which intervene, they leap headlong to the great conclusion, which is the basis of all these operations; viz. that unrenewed men are endowed with every quality requisite for complying with the gospel, even without a transforming work of the Holy Ghost in the soul. Without always waiting to inquire whether it be self-love or something else, they hold that there is some taste or pre-disposition in the natural man, which, if brought into

proper contact with the truths of the gospel, will be won and charmed to love and obey them. They repudiate and abjure in the most fierce and intemperate strain, as fatal to their operations, every mode of belief which does not imply in man a perfect capacity and aptitude to be savingly affected with the truths of the gospel, whether regenerated by the Spirit or not; if he will only resolve to be a Christian. On this point, we suppose that no man is a more standard authority with all this class, or a more correct representative of their opinions, than was Mr. Finney before he got mired in the abyss of Perfectionism, on the verge of which, judging from the following and many other passages, he must have been for a long time treading with fearful presumption and temerity. We quote from his Lectures on Revivals, which must of course be taken as a formal and authentic exposition of his sentiments on this subject. He says, p. 351, "And I am persuaded there never would have been such multitudes of tedious convictions, and often ending in nothing after all, if it had not been for those theological perversions that have filled the world with *cannot-ism*. In Bible days, they told sinners to repent, and they did it then. *Cannot-ism* had not been broached in that day. It is this speculation about the inability of sinners to obey God, that lays the foundation for all the protracted anguish and distress, and perhaps ruin, through which so many are led." It is enough to say of this wild raving, that it can reach none for whom it was intended, without first dashing against Paul and Christ as their shield. Says Paul, Rom. viii. 7, 8, "Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, NEITHER indeed CAN be. So then they that are in the flesh CANNOT please God." Says Christ, John vi. 44, "No MAN CAN come unto me except the Father, who hath sent me, draw him." Now we submit whether the above extract be any thing better than a railing accusation against the word of the Lord. We beg our readers also to observe how the preparatory law-work of conviction of sin is scouted as not only needless but pernicious, and likewise how evident it is that Mr. Finney gets rid of this by dint of his doctrine that there is nothing in spiritual religion which man cannot at once bring to pass by the might of his own will. Again he says, p. 352, "Afraid of sudden conversions! Some of the best Christians of my acquaintance were convicted and converted in the space of a few minutes. In one quarter of the time that



I have been speaking, many of them were awakened, and came right out on the Lord's side, and have been shining lights in the church ever since, and have generally manifested the same decision of character in religion, that they did when they first came out and took a stand on the Lord's side."

While all things are possible with God, and the suddenness of a conversion is not *per se* proof that it is spurious, yet it may safely be declared to be God's ordinary method of dispensing grace, to occupy a longer or shorter time with the preparatory work of the law in the soul, to the end that the sinner slain thereby, may come to Christ and have life. And it may be added that most true penitents spend a considerable season in considering their ways, before they have comfortable evidence that they have turned their feet to God's testimonies. But what deserves special notice in the preceding passage is, that conversion is spoken of, not as a coming to Christ, or to God by Christ, not as a loathing and renunciation of sin, and walking in the divine commandments; but it is held up solely in the attitude of "taking a stand, or coming right out on the Lord's side"—an aspect most favourable to the idea of sinking it into a mere resolution to serve the Lord, such as the natural man can put forth, in the utter neglect of those spiritual affections and graces, that inward renovation of the heart, which lie at the root of all evangelical piety. This, it is well known, is a grand point with all modern revivalists to explain away religious experience into a mere purpose, resolution, or determination to live and act religiously. The idea of continuing any time in a state of conviction, or of supposing that in order to the acceptable performance of religious duties, there must be a prior change of the heart or affections or feelings wrought by the Holy Ghost, is thrust at by these men on the right hand and the left, as a fatal stumbling block to all their operations.\* Indeed as it is fundamental to the success of these movements, that every conception of religion, or of the power and manner of producing it, should be dissipated, except that which makes it the sinner's own act or resolve, like any civil or moral act, Mr. Finney utterly abjures the very phrase "religious experience" as fitted to do mischief. He says, p. 355, "I do not like this term, 'experienced religion,' and I use it only because it is a phrase in

\* Finney's Lectures *passim*.

common use. It is an absurdity in itself. What is religion? Obedience to God. Suppose you should hear a good citizen say he had experienced obedience to the government and country. You see it is nonsense."

Now with these views of regeneration and conversion, let us suppose a minister, or, what is more common, one of those expert and practiced itinerant tacticians, who claim to be revival-preachers *eminenter*, to undertake the kindling of a religious excitement in a congregation or community—what course will he naturally pursue? All experience shows that the following become integral and inseparable parts of the "moral machinery" put in requisition to achieve the desired result.

First, a peculiar strain and style of preaching. One main object of the preaching will be to foster in the minds of the hearers a practical unbelief of all those doctrines of grace which imply that true religion cannot exist in the soul, unless produced by a direct operation of the Holy Ghost. This, as we have already seen, accords with Mr. Finney's prescription for promoting revivals. For this purpose the doctrines of election, inability, regeneration, are sometimes kept utterly out of view; sometimes explained away; sometimes obscured and mystified; sometimes coarsely misrepresented, caricatured and maligned; sometimes openly and directly denied. Having cleared away all obstacles to "immediate action," by making religion a mere act or resolution of the creature, a second great object is so to operate upon "self-love," that it shall prompt to an immediate and decisive resolution. To this end the everlasting woes of the wicked, and joys of the righteous, are vividly and abundantly portrayed, and this is a part of the counsel of God which revival-preachers can no way be accused of shunning faithfully to declare. In connexion with this, invention is tortured for arguments, and memory for anecdotes, to inspire the belief, that if any do not escape hell during the present excitement, or perhaps the present day or hour, they never will. For the purpose of compassing these objects more effectually, every effort is made to spice the preaching with anecdotes and illustrations, often of the most strange, crude, motley description. We recollect once to have heard a sermon by a "revival-preacher," which consisted wholly of three anecdotes. By this means they present a powerful inducement to all that class of persons who are seeking pastime and recreation to come to their meetings, since there are few who are not

fascinated with a good story well told; and hence it is said, that this sort of preaching competes with the theatre in its attractions for a numerous class. Besides, there is something peculiarly grateful and bewitching to the more coarse and profligate sort of wicked men, in seeing the pulpit, which in their minds has ever been associated with a purity, sanctity and solemnity that they cannot endure, degraded into a stage for reciting droll and vulgar stories and grotesque images and comparisons. And especially if these are plied for the abuse, ridicule, or disparagement of those ministers and Christians who do not bow the knee to the revivalist, or of the ordinary teachers and professors of religion, whom these persons have ever hated, they enjoy a still richer "feast of reason and flow of soul." This is not the only advantage. Such anecdotes and illustrations serve the double purpose of giving plausibility to any notion, however absurd, which the preacher may wish to inculcate, and of lowering all that is spiritual and supernatural in religion to the standard of things purely natural, civil or moral, i. e. to the capacity and tastes of the carnal and worldly mind, which is void of the renewing and illumination of the Holy Ghost. Thus Mr. Finney, in a paragraph already quoted, explains away religious experience, by likening obedience to God to obedience to civil government. We have heard the wonderful skill of a noted revivalist illustrated by one of his admirers thus: He was vindicating the necessity of protracted meetings, and for this purpose employed the following illustration: "If we kindle a single fire under a kettle it will warm the water somewhat, but will not raise it to a boiling heat. And if we wait till the water becomes cold before we again put fire under it, we may repeat the experiment endlessly without making it boil. The fire must therefore be kept a-going without interruption till the result sought is attained. So with preaching. If it occur only on the Sabbath, the effect dies away during the week. It must be therefore repeated without cessation, in order to accomplish any thing." This supposes that religion is a mere working up of the natural susceptibilities by the efficacy of persuasion, instead of a product of the divine power attending the preaching of the word. Otherwise it is unmeaning. Yet it is plausible with unreflecting minds. These are fair specimens of the anecdotes and illustrations used by this class of preachers. And although there is a legitimate use of anecdotes and illustrations, when conscientiously and judi-

ciously employed by experimental and spiritually enlightened preachers, yet we insist that the free use of such as are commonly employed by the class of preachers under review, is obnoxious to all the charges we have laid against them.

An itinerant revivalist makes his first *entree* into a place, with the advantage of a certain sort of celebrity, as a preacher of prodigious power and unparalleled interest, and a worker of wonders in the way of producing revivals. He is often sent for, under the idea that his advent will certainly bring with it a revival, and his fame is trumpeted before him on the wings of the wind. By means of this, and the free application of the style of preaching we have described, day after day, and night after night, a crowd is soon gathered to witness this strange thing, and see whereunto it will come. Unless these means have already become stale, and bereft of the charm of novelty and freshness by frequent repetition, unless they have thus exhausted the excitability and curiosity of the people, or unless their true nature and tendency have come to be generally understood, or there are other unpropitious circumstances, they will rally all sorts of people to witness the spectacle, whether they approve or disapprove it. And now the preacher is pretty sure to announce that a "shaking" is about to occur under his labours, such as passes all former example, and points to the sensation already made, the crowds of people rushing to hear him, as premonitory symptoms of what will be witnessed by those who shall be on the ground a few weeks hence. Moreover he teaches the praying people, that if they will offer the "prayer of faith," they can procure whatever conversions, and as much of a revival, as they ask. Thus the indications of a revival are made at once to appear. And now the great labour is to accumulate all excitements from heaven, earth, and hell, that urge an immediate taking of the great resolve, which is deemed equivalent to passing from death unto life, and here is tested whatever virtue there is in efforts descriptive and histrionic, to make the auditory see themselves in the grasp of death, or standing before the judgment seat of Christ, or hear the sentence of the judge, or inhale the sulphureous fumes of the pit, or the balmy fragrance of the paradise above, to hear the frantic shrieks of the damned, or catch the transporting melodies of heaven, and thus to make the present seem the last moment in which the lake of fire can be exchanged for



immortal bliss, and in this way to impel to that resolution to serve the Lord, which is made one with spiritual regeneration. That the truths thus brought to view are most necessary to be enforced powerfully and felt vividly, especially in a religious revival, we know full well. But then they must be unfolded in their proper places and proportions, according to the analogy of faith. And unless properly accompanied with other evangelical truths, they become incentives to spurious conversions and false hopes, instead of that faith which works by love and purifies the heart. But this process alone is found ordinarily not to be sufficiently stimulating; hence, in order to hasten and develop the work still more palpably, certain *measures*, as they have been styled, are usually introduced at a favourable crisis. They have reference to that well understood principle of human nature which is ashamed to renounce any course to which it is publicly committed, and on this they chiefly depend for the efficacy.

One measure commonly resorted to at an early stage of these proceedings is, a call upon all persons in the assembly who are determined or disposed to come out on the Lord's side, or to flee from destruction, or seek heaven, to indicate it by rising, and all who are of a contrary mind, to indicate it by keeping their seats. In this case, if those who are really determined to serve the Lord respond to the call, it is quite certain that most of those who are not will join them. When men of the world are unexpectedly surprised into a dilemma, one horn of which is to go along with a bewildered and excited concourse of people, and the other to be set down in the black list, as sinners of extraordinary hardness and desperation, very few have nerve and courage enough to choose the latter. We consider this procedure no better than a trap to ensnare men into insincere, or, in the best view, inconsiderate professions. We know it has been resorted to for the promotion of many worthy objects, in a manner, however, which involves less of the nature and sanctity of a vow to the Lord than in this case, with the design of extorting professions and pledges in their behalf, from persons who never expected to make them. But in the end this trick, like all other tricks, cannot fail to re-act disastrously upon any good cause which adopts it. In the case of thus publicly calling on men to disclose their religious character, their pride is appealed to virtually, first to induce them to profess themselves religious, and then to

induce them to preserve at least an outward and seeming conformity to the professions to which they have thus been ensnared to commit themselves. Indeed we have heard an enthusiastic defender of a celebrated revivalist who is now in the full tide of successful experiment, allege the influence of pride in holding men to professions already made, as the great reason and justification of all his manifold artifices to get men publicly committed to become pious. Moreover, in most cases, the preacher will largely expatiate upon the importance and necessity of taking a stand before men, by means of this and certain other measures which we shall presently notice, as being the grand and decisive step on which their conversion depends. When this is done, no matter how many salvos the preacher throws in to clear himself from the charge of teaching the obvious delusion that such a step is scriptural regeneration, the anxious hearer, ready to catch at a straw, infallibly understands that this step is either identical with, or evidential of, or certainly antecedent to, true conversion; and that if taken with a desire of getting religion, it is one of the things which accompany salvation. And when a large concourse have thus publicly committed themselves to be religious, the news spreads far and wide, that a great religious awakening or revival is in progress in —— under the labours of the Rev. Mr. ——.

In order to perfect this public commitment, recourse is usually had to another series of expedients. Certain seats, rooms or other localities, are allotted to persons in various conditions of mind. Some have a miscalled altar to which all persons who wish conversion must come to be prayed for. Others set off a certain number of seats, usually those nearest the pulpit, which they style “anxious seats,” which answer the purpose of the altar already mentioned. To these are often added “decision seats,” “hoping seats,” &c. &c. Instead of seats, sometimes a particular room is used, styled the “anxious” or “inquiry” room; and another styled the “young converts” room. Or some other expedient is adopted answering the same purpose. And now all the influences already adverted to, and every other device which can reach the human sensibilities, are put in motion to induce sinners to come to the anxious seat, room or altar. They are made practically to believe that their salvation is staked upon it. Of course, if there is any excitement, great numbers rush to this hallowed point of en-

trance into the kingdom of God. Here they soon learn that the new birth is an act of their own sovereign power of willing, in which they choose God instead of the world, or determine to serve him, or come out on his side, or give themselves to him—an act to which they are at this moment, as at all times every way competent. This is usually followed by what is sometimes called the “dedicatory” prayer—a prayer in which the speaker calls on his hearers to unite with him in giving themselves to God, and uses expressions in accordance with his previous instructions. And in the emphatic phrase of Mr. Finney, large numbers “in the space of a few minutes come right out on the Lord’s side ;” ripe for the decision seats, or hoping seats, or young converts’ room, or any other place to which they may be allotted. It is very common, in order to rally greater numbers around the anxious seats, for leaders in the work, sometimes the preacher himself, to go around the house and address individuals singly, urging them to the anxious seat or altar, and in order more effectually to awe and startle them, they often pray for them aloud by name. This is done in many cases, while others are publicly praying or exhorting. In order still further to perfect the commitment, it is usually insisted on as a capital point, that young converts should rise and state their feelings and purposes, and otherwise exhort and pray in the meetings. This heightens the startling effect of the rest of the proceedings, and ministers fresh food to restless curiosity and love of excitement in the assembling and gazing crowds. When the proceedings reach this pass, whatever of decorum, sobriety and rationality may have attended the beginning of the excitement, are usually supplanted by phrenzied and tumultuous excitement, and “confusion worse confounded” takes the place of the solemn order and decency that befit the house of God.

That by this course of procedure, going to the anxious seat or altar becomes the great matter in conversion, in the view of those who go to it, admits, we think, of no dispute. We know that these preachers try to evade the responsibility of inculcating a sentiment so self-evidently absurd and pernicious, by taking care to say that this step has no intrinsic virtue or efficacy in it; and that, in itself considered, praying and preaching may be as salutary to an individual in one part of a church as another: but then they are ever careful to add, that there is a something in some way con-

nected with or consequent upon taking the anxious seat, which makes it almost if not altogether the turning point of their salvation or perdition. And what matters it, as to the real importance and efficacy of the anxious seat, whether it cause conversion *per se*, or by means of its necessary adjuncts and consequences? They often say that "the seat is indeed nothing in itself, but going to it serves to break down pride, and is taking the cross, without which men cannot be saved." But are not bearing the cross, and breaking down pride, things which accompany salvation, and is not that which produces these things the cause of conversion? How then do these evasions help the case? Does not the anxious seat stand in the sinner's mind after all as the great point of transition into the kingdom of God? Can it be otherwise, if a few stories are told as they always are, showing how persons who have refused to come up to the altar or anxious seat have been kept out of the hope and peace of the gospel, until they yielded the point, and on repairing to it, immediately had joy and peace in believing?

We say moreover that it is self-evident that this measure is fitted, in all its bearings, to dwarf Christian experience into a mere barren resolution to serve God for the sake of escaping misery and gaining happiness. Of course, taking the anxious seat will be deemed the highest exercise, pledge and manifestation of such a resolve.

Besides, it is a fixed principle, that wherever uncommanded outward rites and observances are conceived to have an important agency in procuring the divine favour, there they overshadow, or rather supplant, in the practical estimation of men, the real righteousness which God requires. We believe this to be an unvarying fact. The same is true of rites having a scriptural warrant, if they are invested with an importance and efficacy which the Bible does not attach to them. Those who made so much of tithing mint, anise and cumin, neglected the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith. This is the essence of formalism and hypocrisy, and has been the vice of the sacramental party in the church in all ages. No doctrine is so sweet and exhilarating to the unregenerate heart as the idea that some external ceremony propitiates the favour of God. It is eagerly grasped as a substitute for the spiritual conformity of the heart to the divine law, and for the prostration of all personal pride and self-complacency, in order to be justified exclusively by the merits of Christ.



Hence, in some form, it has been the characteristic ingredient of every form of heathen superstition and spurious Christianity. Where uncommanded rites especially are exalted, so as to be deemed influential in procuring the divine favour, they at once usurp the place which belongs to the true objects of spiritual worship, and are regarded with downright superstition. The invocation of saints, the worship of the Virgin, the bodily penances and asceticism, and all the rites of the Romish church confirm and illustrate this remark. Who does not know that the anxious seat, room or altar, is extensively regarded with a similar superstition by those who subject themselves to their exorcisms? As to the *caveats*, which warn the people not to regard them as having an inherent, but only an attendant or consequential efficacy, who does not know that every Romish rite is enveloped by its advocates in a mist of sophistry far more subtle and attenuated than this? But what do such minute distinctions avail with the bewildered mass on whom these rites are imposed?

But by Mr. Finney's own showing he invests the anxious seat with all the importance which we have contended is attached to it by those who take it. P. 153, after relating an anecdote of a man who was awakened, and "determined that he would not go into a certain grove to pray," and who "went on for weeks in this way, with no relief," but "at length he concluded he would go into the grove and pray, and as soon as he got there he was converted, and went and poured out his full heart to God," he proceeds to say, "So individuals are sometimes entrenched in a determination that they will not go to a particular meeting, perhaps the inquiry meeting, or some prayer meeting, or they will not have a certain person pray with them, or they will not take a particular seat, such as the anxious seat. They say that they can be converted just as well without yielding this point, for religion don't consist in this, going to a particular meeting, or taking a particular attitude in prayer, or a particular seat. This is true, but by taking this ground they *make* it the material point, and so long as they are entrenched there, and determined to bring God to their terms, they never can be converted." In this connexion, read the following, p. 344, "Whatever point is taken hold of between God and the sinner, when the sinner **YIELDS** that, he is converted."

To say nothing of the improvement in dialectics as well

as theology here exhibited, how could it be possible to teach more directly that taking the anxious seat is the turning of salvation or perdition to all such as, doubting its scriptural warrant, respectively consent or refuse to take it?

The ingenuity of this reasoning deserves notice. According to Mr. Finney, although "they can be converted just as well without the taking the anxious seat as with it," yet by insisting that this is the fact, and acting accordingly, "they *make* it the material point," and until they yield it, that is, go to the said seat, "they can never be converted!" This seems very like making the truth a lie, by insisting that it is the truth! Suppose then that a Romish priest should direct Mr. Finney to wear a hair shirt, in order to break down pride and lead him to bear the cross, and thus promote his conversion, and he should reply that he would not do it, for he could be converted as well without it as with it. Suppose now the Jesuit should retort, "This is true, but by taking this ground you *make* it the material point, and while you are entrenched there, determined to bring God to your terms, you never can be converted;" how, on his mode of ratiocination, could he get rid of the obligation and necessity of the austerities of the Romish church, or whatever else any one might choose to impose upon him, as essential to salvation? After all this we cease to be surprised as we read, p. 249, "Perhaps it is not too much to say that it is impossible for God himself to bring about reformations but by new measures!" "Which things indeed have a show of wisdom in will-worship and humility, and neglecting of the body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh." Col. ii. 23.

That under this lashing process immense numbers should be spurred to form and publicly indicate their determination to serve the Lord, and that the number of such converts may be equal to that blazoned in the printed accounts of these excitements, is by no means improbable. As to resolutions to be holy, made by men with unregenerate hearts, we have a memorable instance recorded in Deut. v. 27—29, "Go thou near, and hear all that the Lord our God shall say; and speak thou unto us all that the Lord our God shall speak unto thee; and WE WILL HEAR IT AND DO IT. And the Lord heard the voice of your words, when ye spake unto me; and the Lord said unto me, I have heard the voice of the words of this people, which they have spoken unto thee: they have well said all that they have spoken.

O THAT THERE WERE SUCH A HEART IN THEM, that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them and their children forever." The great vice of the resolutions of the unregenerate is, that being made by the "will of the flesh," while the affections of the heart are still impure, there is not such a HEART in those who make them that they will keep God's commandments always. Nothing is more common than for graceless men, under mere legal conviction, and terrors wrought by the common operations of the Spirit, or in seasons of affliction, to make resolutions to live righteously, and adopt a corresponding reformation of life, which in different persons is of various extent and duration. Nay, the whole form of religion may be assumed without its power. The spirit of bondage may goad the subject of it to the earnest purpose to obey the will of God, and to put forth all the appearances of piety. But the living and abiding root of grace in the soul is wanting; so that there is no living faith, no life-giving union to Christ the only source of supplies of strength and growth, no inward transformation by the renewing of the mind, no true spirit of adoption, no love of holiness for its own sake. In this sense many are partakers of the heavenly gift, and taste the powers of the world to come, who sooner or later fall away. Many anon hear the word with joy, who, when tribulation ariseth because of the word, are straightway offended. Many, under the impulse of selfish hope or fear, or from a pride of consistency, keep up an outward and barren form of godliness through life, who nevertheless have no living principle of thrift and growth, and manifest none of the precious fruits of the Spirit. Says Dr. Owen, in the work already quoted, p. 290, "Few are so stubbornly profligate as not, at one time or other, to project and promise an amendment of life; they will abstain from their old sins for a time, and perform some duties from which they expect relief to their consciences, especially when the afflicting hand of God is upon them; and this produces that kind of goodness which is "like the morning cloud and the early dew;" things which make a fair appearance, but quickly vanish. And though this is most remote from evangelical obedience, yet hereby multitudes deceive themselves to their eternal ruin." Again, pp. 143-4, speaking of the preparatory work of the Spirit in the soul, he says, "This work is frequently carried on so far in reformation of life, that it will express the whole form of godliness. But

here also it is deficient. For it will consist with reigning sins of ignorance. It leads not to the abhorrence of all sin, as sin; nor to a desire of universal conformity to Christ; but often leaves great sins unregarded. So it left persecution in Paul, before his conversion; and so it leaves hatred and a desire of persecution in many at this day. Besides, its reformation of the life is seldom universal as to all known sin; unless it be for a season while the soul is in a flagrant pursuit of self-righteousness. When the efficacy of the first impressions abates, lust will reserve some peculiar way of venting itself. Further, the conversation of such persons is assuredly fading and decaying. Coldness, sloth, love of the world, carnal wisdom and security, get ground upon them every day. Hence, though by abstinence from open sensualities, they may not be given up to them, yet they become walking and talking skeletons in religion; dry, sapless, and useless worldlings. But where the soul is inlaid with real grace, it is in a state of thriving continually. Such an one will go from strength to strength, from grace to grace, from glory to glory, and will be fat and flourishing in old age. By these things we may learn to distinguish in ourselves, between the preparatory work mentioned, and that of real saving conversion to God." And is not this, we ask, likewise the exact contrast between the great mass of new-measure converts, and humble, experimental Christians? It is, in short, the distinction between legal and evangelical righteousness, with which new-measure preachers do not meddle. But we think it indisputable, from what has already been made to appear, that the whole genius of their principles, teaching and measures, is to lead men to a legal righteousness and nothing more; and as indisputable, that this sort of repentance falls short of that faith which works by love, unites to Christ, and without which it is impossible to please God. Although the subjects of it have a zeal for God, it is not according to knowledge; or being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, they do not submit themselves to the righteousness of God. Rom. x. 2, 3.

Quite a common direction given to anxious inquirers by a celebrated revival-preacher is, that if they would obtain peace and comfort, they must get up and speak in meetings, or go and address some impenitent person on the subject of religion, or make a public confession of the more flagrant iniquities of their past life, instead of directing them to



Christ to obtain rest for their weary and labouring souls. And this suggests, what we might have more properly adverted to earlier, that one fundamental measure which these men much insist on, is, a public confession, on the part of old professors and new converts, of all their mal-practices. Many things are thus, in some cases, publicly blazoned in a revival of religion, of which it is a shame even to speak. A motley succession of crimes and peccadillos is displayed to gratify the foul and malign passions of the listening spectators. Contrary as all this is to the solemnity of a revival, to that shrinking humility, and ingenuous shame, and unfeigned abhorrence of all pollution which every Christian ought to cherish. Who does not see that it presents new attractions to draw people to the scene of action, and fans afresh the flame of wild and tumultuous excitement?

It is usually a part of these operations to adopt a style of praying marked by the total want of all humility, solemnity and reverence. A coarse, familiar, colloquial style of address to the Most High is practised and inculcated by these men, as being the only sort of prayer that can be acceptable and prevalent with God. God is addressed as if he were a fellow worm. The names, characteristics and circumstances of individuals, are often recited in public prayer, under the pretext of making it more definite and interesting, in the style of ordinary parlance between man and man. It thus becomes a convenient vehicle of traducing the characters of any, especially ministers and church-officers, who have become obnoxious, by refusing to succumb to the revivalist. Many prayers that we have heard of this description, which were claimed to indicate a peculiarly wrestling and prevailing spirit, seemed to us little better than a profanation of divine worship. This sinking process pervades all the exercises. They are all tinged with the same irreverence, not unmingled with personal vituperation, which are the direct contrary of that solemn order, decency and reverence that God requires in his house. But this conspires with the influences already depicted, to kindle still further the excitement, such as it is; both by means of the shock it gives to the sensibilities of the pious, and the pleasure it affords to those who hate all that is comely, sacred and awe-inspiring in religion.

The last of these measures to which we shall now advert, is the immediate admission to the visible church of those, who become converts, in the manner and under the influ-

ences already described. This is notoriously a fundamental part of these operations. Almost without exception, the class of revival preachers under review, insist upon a public profession of religion, at the first opportunity after the supposed conversion. During the brief space, in which these startling proceedings are going on, opportunities are usually made, so that those who "come right out on the Lord's side" during the week, are admitted to church fellowship on the succeeding Sabbath. And generally the whole multitude of those who have resolved to be Christians, are hurried into the church with the utmost precipitancy. We consider this almost universal characteristic of these operators, as decisive proof that they have a lurking distrust of the soundness and stability of the conversions resulting from their appliances: that they know full well, that if most of their converts do not join the church under the impulse of the excitement, they will soon lose all inclination to a profession of religion, and renounce the form as well as the power of godliness. This measure consummates, it puts in the most permanent and remediless form, all the indescribable evils, which naturally, (and, unless divine grace prevent,) inevitably spring from such a course of experiments upon the community. It confirms all the false hopes which have been engendered: it loads the church with a mass of wood, hay, and stubble, sufficient to impede all its motions, and smother all its spirituality. It is opening the doors of Christ's house to things common and unclean, without applying any adequate test to distinguish those who are visibly, and in the judgment of charity holy, from those who are not. The proper and scriptural evidence of true gospel righteousness in men, is the fruits of righteousness. By their fruits shall ye know them. What doth it profit though a man say he hath faith, and have not works, can faith save him? By this we know that we know Christ, if we keep his commandments. Consequently, in order that we may have the means of judging whether the faith of a supposed convert, be living or dead, real or imaginary, some reasonable time must elapse, in which it may have a trial, and show whether it is sound, enduring, working by love, purifying the heart, overcoming the world, and producing all holy obedience, in short, a vital principle of grace implanted in the soul: or whether it is a transient ephemeral, resolution, shooting up on the shallow soil of a forced excitement of the natural susceptibilities. "They

on the rock are they, which when they hear, anon hear the word with joy : and then have no root, which for a while believe, but in time of temptation fall away." Now if there is ever a danger of making multitudes of this sort of converts, must not that danger be pre-eminently great, under such devices as have been set forth? If there is such a thing as healing slightly the hurt of sinners, will not such empiricism do it? After the most faithful vigilance and caution, many tares will be mixed with the wheat in the visible church. Many will find their way to the Lord's table, whose goodness is as the morning cloud and the early dew, dissipated by the first sharp onsets of temptation. What less than can result from the immediate union to the church of persons converted after the method in question, but a complete inundation of it, with such as are strangers to vital godliness? When the people after having been miraculously fed by Christ, were ardent to assume the attitude of being his followers, he repelled them, saying, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled," John vi. 26. And surely it can hardly be supposed, that these devices, would lead to conversions animated by any purer principle than self-love. Indeed if there is any thing deeply and awfully criminal, of which a minister of Christ can be guilty, we think it is the using of devices to bring unholy persons into the church of Christ. It is pestiferous and absolutely fatal in all its bearings.

We by no means intend to intimate that none, or even few of those who profess religion under such circumstances, prove in the end to be real Christians, and to walk as becometh the gospel of Christ. We rejoice in the belief that there are many such. But, as concerns the instrumental causes of this, we ascribe them chiefly to other agencies, which are wholly unnoticed in the blazing accounts of these excitements that are paraded in the public prints. We ascribe them to previous religious instruction, to the Sabbath school, to pastoral preaching, prayer and other labours; to the teachings, prayers and tears of godly parents. Will God utterly forget his covenant or disown his own ordinances, because of such vandal irruptions on his heritage, or the temporary blindness and waywardness, which happen in part unto Israel? Moreover, so much poisonous error would not be welcomed in any community having a semblance of Christian knowledge, unless it were mixed

with some truth to disguise and render it palatable. And in some cases, almighty grace may open the heart to attend to the truth and fortify it against the influx of error. Withal, some who by these devices are decoyed into a profession of religion, afterwards learn their delusion, and being favoured with sound evangelical preaching, or by means of private inquiry, are led to him who is the way, the truth, and the life. This, however, results not from the legitimate tendency of the means we have been discussing, but from a gracious counteraction of that tendency.

That we have not exaggerated the true character and results of these manœuvres, is attested by the concurrent voice of all competent witnesses in any degree acquainted with them. To present any considerable part of this description of evidence, which has been accumulating the last ten years would itself fill the usual space allotted to an article. We shall barely exhibit as a specimen the last that has come in our way. It is from a *concio ad clerum*, preached by Rev. A. Newton, at the late commencement of the Western Reserve College. It is, therefore, from a source not liable to the imputation of being warped by "Old School prejudices." We take the following extract from the *New England Puritan*, of Sept. 23, 1841. *Ex uno disce omnes.*

"I do not know that any of our modern evangelists would consent to labour in a place at all unless they could be allowed to hold a meeting of five or six weeks in continuance. During these meetings it is expected that Christians will suspend much of the ordinary business of life—that they will attend meetings from three to five times a day—that they will confess their sins in public—that they will converse with the impenitent—and generally, do what they have perhaps never done, and what they are not expected to continue to do for a great length of time. Furthermore, there is generally incorporated with this system the practice of dividing off those who seem to be affected with religious truth into classes, and assigning to them different seats, which take their names from the supposed spiritual condition of their occupants—as anxious seats—decision seats—hoping seats, &c. It is not an uncommon thing to call persons by name in prayer. There is also very generally encouraged a style and inanner of praying so grossly familiar, as to shock most minds unaccustomed to it; and a manner of preaching is practised which is calculated rather to affect



the imagination and the passions, than enlighten the understanding and impress the conscience and the heart.”

He further lays to the account of this system, the producing of many spurious conversions. And after showing *how* it produces the result, he says :

“ But what do facts teach us on this subject ? If any reliance can be placed on the testimony of some of the most discriminating and judicious pastors whose churches have been the theatre of these operations, we must believe that the system does produce a large proportion of unsound conversions. I am not permitted to name persons or places, but I may say that in one church where an evangelist was employed, more than half that united with the church, proved, within two or three years, in the estimation of the pastor, to be destitute of piety ; that in another where upwards of one hundred conversions were proclaimed, not fifteen, in the opinion of the pastor, ever gave evidence of a saving change ; and the children who had been thought converts, were pronounced by their school teachers to be seven-fold worse than before ; and that in another church where an evangelist had laboured with great apparent success, the pastor in less than a year afterwards declared that of the two hundred who united with his church in the season of excitement, not more than fifty gave satisfactory evidence of piety. These three examples are adduced as fair illustrations of the effects of the system. The revivals occurred in different places, and were all conducted by different evangelists. And from an inquiry somewhat extensive on this subject, I have good reason to believe that not a much greater proportion of sound conversions has been the result of such efforts generally for the last six or eight years.”

Our limits will now only permit a cursory glance at some of the more flagrant evils resulting from this whole system, which have not been distinctly noted in the foregoing analysis.

These are only so many developments of that law which governs the use of preternatural stimulants, throughout every department of animated existence. They are neither foodful nor nutritious. Though they may goad for the moment into a spasmodic energy and excitement, they do it by taxing those latent, residuary powers, which constitute a reserve force for future emergencies, and consequently, in a brief period, induce a greater debility than they found.



Now all these expedients for producing a religious excitement are but so many stimulants of man's inventing, applied to the natural susceptibilities, to produce a transient stir and commotion on the subject of religion. They are a substitute for the regenerating work of the Holy Ghost in the soul, implanting new principles of hearty love and obedience to the truth as it is in Jesus. They are therefore perfectly analogous to those stimulants of the physical system, which excite a transient, unnatural, and almost a demoniac power, but instead of imparting real, abiding strength, only consume and exhaust it. As under the application of these stimulants there is a degree of overwrought, morbid excitement, which the human system cannot long endure, so, immediately on their cessation, there is a terrible relapse. An awful torpor usually ensues, and that, in most cases, immediately.

The ordinary means of grace, the unadulterated milk and meat of divine truth, cease to invigorate and quicken those who have been subjected to these exorcisms, just as nutritious food will not give the requisite tone to the system which has been chiefly kept up by narcotic or alcoholic stimulants. Hence preaching, and all other means of grace, are beyond precedent, stript of all power and interest among a people thus hardened and stupified. All the plain and solemn services of the sanctuary, as conducted by a stated ministry, become ineffably tame and dull to those who have so long been regaling themselves on droll stories, startling paradoxes, and degrading or delusive illustrations. Worshipping assemblies speedily become thin and inattentive. Decay and langour rapidly mark every thing pertaining to the cause of religion. Things wax worse and worse. And the withering re-action is equal to the overheated action. As a necessary result a species of infatuation ordinarily possesses at least the leaders in these transactions. Those who are quickened by morbid stimulants, instead of attributing their subsequent lassitude and other distempers to the true cause, will usually charge them upon something else : perhaps upon influences most salutary in their nature. So in this case. They usually charge their decay and exhaustion upon those Christians and ministers who will not fall in with and endorse such proceedings, styling them "Achans," "stumbling-blocks," &c. &c. Or they charge it upon the want of the "revival spirit, or revival preaching," in the pastor, who may be endeavouring, by a judicious

course of instruction, to restore the chaotic mass to a state of order and thrift.

Hence the remedy for this prostration and debility, which is always resorted to, unless God graciously dispel their blindness, is a more liberal use of the same sort of means which produced them. A mere repetition of the same precise measures is usually stale, and has little power to rouse the people. As novelty and strangeness formed a chief ingredient in the exciting power of their first measures, so these qualities vanish at each repetition, unless produced by some new devices still more strange and startling in their nature and disastrous in their results. And this process usually goes on from bad to worse, in places not cured of the love of such things, till the folly of these operators becomes manifest, and they can go no further, having tried experiment after experiment, till the most desperate expedients cease to affect the people. Thus Mr. Finney, who, in his discourse on measures, insists that there must always be something *NEW*, has tried every expedient, doctrinal and practical, till he has at last taken up Perfectionism as the magic instrument which is to rouse the church to a higher standard of action, and revive those slumbering professors, whom he so emphatically denounced as a *DISGRACE TO RELIGION*. And his folly has become manifest to multitudes who never could see it before. For it is an unalterable law that "evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse."

And when such means come to be regarded as "the great power of God," the grand appliances by which religion receives its chief impulse and advancement, then a proportionate disparagement of the divinely instituted means of grace ensues. Having become insipid, unprofitable and powerless, they likewise become contemptible in the eyes of the people. That, in the train of these measures, the Sabbath, sanctuary, ministry, and family religion, sink in the practical judgment and affections of the people, is not so much matter of speculation as of history. All these latter means contemplate a gentle, solid, and steady growth, a progress which, if slow, is sure. Of course they are at war with the whole genius of new measures. What opinion would he have of the efficacy of family worship, or of a plain gospel-sermon on the Sabbath, who conceived that it was the province, not of God, but of some famous, story-telling, paradoxical preacher to give the increase? We be-

lieve it to be a well-established fact, that family religion does not flourish in churches, which depend chiefly on these unnatural stimulants for the promotion of religion. If the form is retained, the power of it vanishes. And what more fatal shock can the permanent interests of religion receive, than the dissemination of a general contempt of these great ordinances of God for its promotion? Of course these measures sweep away the pastoral relation in their dreadful wake.

People who have been regaling themselves on the rare entertainments afforded by this sort of preachers, with its varied condiment of vulgar humour, sarcasm, anecdote, illustration and histrionism, and who think this the great means of promoting religion, will not long endure plain gospel sermons, or those who preach them; "for the time shall come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but will after their own lusts heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears." Pastors therefore are early victims to this course of things. All this has for a long time been matter of history. Through whole presbyteries, and tracts of country where these men have figured, there is only here and there a settled pastor, and what few there are, have in most cases been settled, and are destined to continue settled, but a few months. Now if there is any sure method in which the curse of God is inflicted upon churches, it is in their privation of faithful and competent pastors.

This system is the fruitful mother of doctrinal errors and heresies of every form and hue. It works this result in various ways. It is based upon and presupposes a fundamental error respecting that power by which the heart of man is conformed and made obedient to the truths of the gospel. It substitutes human expedients which operate on the natural susceptibilities, for God's sovereign, omnipotent, transforming grace. It of course denies or explains away special grace, and all affiliated doctrines. This, as we have already seen, strikes, by inevitable consequence, at the very vitals of religious experience, and dwindles it down to a mere resolution put forth under the impulses of self-love. But after these errors, so exhilarating to the carnal mind, lose their freshness, they lose their power to arouse men; and they generally prefer to postpone attention to a religion which it is so easy to obtain at any moment, till they have a more convenient season for attending to it. Then the new conception of the "prayer of faith" is brought in to

surmount this obstacle. But when this demonstrates its own fallacy in unquestionable results, improved dietetics or Perfectionism is brought forward as the last desperate remedy for a desperate case. It is learned that external ordinances are an incubus on the free aspirations of the spirit within. The obligation of the moral law also is found to fetter inward liberty. It is discovered to be a dreadful bondage to be under any law but our own passions and lusts. Thus the most unbridled licentiousness has stalked abroad, with great swelling words of vanity, saying to humble piety, *STAND BY FOR I AM HOLIER THAN THOU*. Meanwhile, many who have been pronounced converts, and perhaps made foremost in promoting the revival, finding that their conversion is all a delusion, begin to consider all religious experience as a dream of enthusiasm, and all evangelical religion an imposture. In a genuine revival of religion, we have seen those who were fortified against it; because, as they said, "they had been all through with this conversion before, and it was all a farce." Spectators who observe these scenes and their results often imbibe the same sort of scepticism. Many of the more substantial sort of people disgusted with such a course of things, flee for relief to some of those sects, where an orderly formalism takes the place of evangelical piety. Thus infidelity, universalism and formality grow apace. The result is, in many cases, incurable divisions and feuds in churches; in others, their utter disruption and disorganization; in others, their complete apostacy and extinction, or, at best, evanescence into Perfectionism, Unionism, *et id genus omne*.

Suppose however that these more fearful rocks and quicksands are avoided. Let us consider, for a moment, the case of such as, in the judgment of charity, are real Christians in churches which have been filled with members by these measures. Although their tendency may have been so far counteracted as to prevent fatal delusion in many cases, yet it does not follow that they are harmless even in that event. On the contrary, they do exceedingly mar, distort and debilitate the piety of real Christians. They serve to make them weak in the faith; to give them confused views of that truth by which they are sanctified; to impede their growth in grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; to impoverish all that part of religious experience which consists in communion with God, self-searching, mortification of lust, the inward conflict be-



tween nature and grace, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, and all the fruits of the Spirit. They greatly impair the beautiful proportion and symmetry of religious character; inspiring a disproportionate zeal for some things, and a comparative neglect of others equally important. There is often, for example, a most vehement zeal for the conversion of sinners, and the reformation of public morals, while there is little zeal against sin within the zealot himself, little habitual spirituality and heavenliness of mind. This degenerate, lean, starveling sort of religious experience has become exceedingly prevalent of late years, and is matter of universal complaint. There are immense multitudes who do not appear so much no Christians, as weak Christians; babes in knowledge and grace, who retain all the weakness and imbecility of helpless infancy. They are incapable of withstanding the seductions of error and temptation. They are "children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive." Eph. iv. 14. They have not their "senses exercised to discern both good and evil," and "when for the time, they ought to be teachers, they have need that one teach them again, which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat." Heb. v. 12—14. And what else could be expected? Can a bad tree bring forth good fruits?

In short, what has been styled New Divinity and New Measures, is essentially Arminianism: it produces an Arminian religion: wherever it has prevailed in Calvinistic communions, it has reduced them to, if not below, the level of the surrounding Arminian sects. All that pre-eminence for scriptural knowledge, spiritual discernment, stable, sober and principled piety, which has been the glory of Calvinistic churches; which has made them pioneers in religious enterprise and useful reformations, and bulwarks of truth, liberty, order, purity, intelligence and learning, against the v. adal irruptions of rationalistic and prelatie arrogance, fanatic and ignorant zeal, instantly vanishes when this leaven prevails; and THE GLORY IS DEPARTED.

Indeed we believe these innovators took the first hint from the Methodists. Mr. Finney says, p. 253, "We must have exciting, powerful preaching, or the devil will have the people, except what the Methodists can save. It is impossible



that our ministers should continue to do good, unless we have innovations in the style of preaching. Many ministers are finding it out already, that a Methodist preacher, without the advantages of a liberal education, will draw a congregation around him which a Presbyterian minister, with perhaps ten times as much learning, cannot equal, because he has not the earnest manner of the other, and does not pour out fire upon his hearers when he preaches." But it should be borne in mind, that the Methodists rarely go the length of many of the extravagances we have noted. Moreover they are honest and avowed Arminians in their belief. All their ecclesiastical polity is adapted to this system, whereas Presbyterian and Congregational churches, in their whole structure and arrangements, presuppose the truth of Calvinism. Thus, in the reception of church members, they provide for "falling from grace," and can ease themselves of apostates without any protracted and tedious difficulties. So they make provision for a frequent change of ministers; and much more of a like nature. But we believe that no true Christian will ever become an apostate; and we know of no method of getting rid of those who prove to be so, but by toilsome discipline; and therefore the adoption of measures, which are adapted to flood the church with apostates, works clumsily according to our polity. The same is true of an unstable ministry, and of all other peculiarities of this system.

At this point it may not be amiss to make a suggestion in regard to the union of different sects in revival meetings, which has a close connexion with this whole subject. These unions are usually brought about in this wise. Some one of the sects that are accustomed to employ stimulating expedients to work up religious excitements, will commence operations in a community with copious discourses on the beauty, loveliness and excellence of union among different denominations, and especially its necessity in order to the most effective promotion of revivals. And such phrases as brotherly love, harmony, and co-operation among different denominations, are highly captivating to ingenuous Christian minds that have had no experience in such things. On this account the Congregational or Presbyterian minister is often prevailed upon to accede to the proposal, and, in many cases, against his own judgment and choice, through fear that if he refuses, his motives will be misunderstood, and he shall offend against the generation of the upright. The

consequence is, that he thereby seals his lips against uttering any truths which are denied by those with whom he unites, at a crisis when his people are pre-eminently tender and susceptible to instruction. In most cases he cannot rise above Arminianism. Moreover he is obliged practically to endorse the teaching and measures of his confederates, as comprising whatever is essential to the welfare of men's souls. Soon he finds that they are employing crafty devices to proselyte his people to their ranks, and that his own position, so far from enabling him to parry off their attacks, exposes his people to their utmost force. The invariable result, so far as we are informed, is that some of his own people are decoyed away; the breach between sects has been widened rather than healed; he has given erroneous views a very undesirable sanction and currency among his people; and he finds that this result was originally designed by the proposers of the pseudo-union. Repellant bodies increase their repellantcy in proportion to the closeness of their contiguity. We knew an exhorter who commenced operations in a place by circulating tracts on the union of sects; as soon as by this pretext he could get some dozen people together, he established a separate worship, according to the principles of his own sect on the Sabbath. This case we think is a fair illustration of the true nature and design, of the very affectionate proposals for union meetings often made by sectarians.

It deserves to be stated that there is a numerous class in the country who espouse and teach the doctrinal principles which we have discussed, who would repudiate with disgust the foregoing measures, so far as they offend against good taste and the decency and order proper to the house of God. There are some evangelists of this description, of exquisitely fine taste, who attract crowds and kindle an excitement wherever they go. While, in such cases, there is a freedom from whatever is revolting to the natural taste and sensibilities; yet so far as regeneration is explained away into a mere resolution or other act of the creature; so far as conviction of sin by the law is treated as needless; so far as human ability is exalted; so far as, in any way, the anxious are led to suppose that taking a particular position or attitude goes to make them Christians, or are induced to make any public manifestation of themselves, except for the purpose of receiving appropriate instruction; so far as an evangelist is looked upon as endued with the

power of producing a revival where he goes, so that with his aid, it is anticipated as probable, and without it despaired of as impossible; so far as by anecdotes, histrionism, &c., no matter how elegant and polished, he creates a low esteem of pastoral labour and preaching; in due proportion all the fore-mentioned disastrous fruits inevitably ensue, on the principle of cause and effect. To whatever extent it is taught, and the belief is engendered, that man is competent to make himself a child of God, without renovating grace, to the same extent mischievous delusion is propagated, and will produce its appropriate results; however its influence may be narrowed and impeded, and its disastrous effects softened and palliated by the absence of the grosser devices which have been depicted.

A few words as to the manner in which such principles and proceedings are commonly vindicated by their authors and abettors.

Although great evil confessedly attends them, yet it is deemed enough to silence all objections, that they accomplish great good, and are the occasion of many genuine conversions. But this plea renounces the only standard by which all controversies are to be tried, and appeals to results. We say "to the law and the testimony." Moreover, appealing to results, they are non-suited, as the foregoing pages abundantly show. As to those who are truly converted at such times, could not and would not the grace of God bring them into his kingdom, in the due use of his appointed means, and in a manner far more promotive of the prosperity of their souls? Are not great numbers fatally deluded and otherwise injured, and are not all the interests of religion smitten with a withering blight? Is it said that the church can be purged by discipline? Under the purest administration, and the utmost vigilance, some false professors will find their way into the church, and there will be need of an occasional excommunication. But is it not unutterably cruel to beguile men into the church by a system of devices, which can only be defended on the ground that the mischiefs flowing from them, can be counteracted by inflicting on their victims the pains of ecclesiastical decapitation? And is it not ruinous to their souls to use measures expressly designed to produce religious excitement in them, which shall stop short of true conversion? For do not scripture and experience prove that, in such cases, "the last state is worse than the first?" It is one

thing to be visited with such evils occasionally in spite of the best efforts to avoid them, and quite another to adopt a system directly adapted to engender them.

They are in the habit of replying to all objections with great assurance, by saying that in this age the world moves by steam, and unless we adopt some more improved, rapid method of converting it, it will run away from us. This idea is put forth in every variety of form, *ad captandum*, to catch the unreflecting crowd. Our readers, we fear, will think we are dealing with trifles, in giving it this distinct and formal notice. But we are impelled to do it, in view of the serious use which is made of this fancy. When those who profess to surpass all others as teachers and promoters of religion, offer it as a serious answer to the objections of the "Old School" against their fierce and impetuous movements, and loose doctrines, that "if any choose to travel in ox-carts or scows they can, but we prefer a steam-boat or locomotive," when things of this nature are seriously thrown out in "revival" sermons, as they have been freely by those who have figured most prominently in these things of late; then we say it ought to be put in print; so that it may become the object of calm contemplation; and that those who presume to argue thus about God's truth, and the order of his house, may retain whatever credit they can as teachers of "the religion of the Bible," which is the same "yesterday, to-day, and forever."

In conclusion, we think that ample cause has been shown why the orthodox Christians of this land look with greater or less distrust upon all religious excitements, which are produced under the influence either of the doctrines or measures which have been examined, or of both conjoined; and still more why they cannot look upon such excitements as evidential of the truth of the principles, the rectitude of the measures, of the men, that are instrumental in their production; and why they cannot confide in the authors and abettors of these doctrines and devices, no matter what wonders they may work, until they explicitly repudiate them.

And we think that in these things the course of duty is the course of safety; that the more entirely all ministers and churches avoid all participation in, all sanction or countenance of these extravagances, the more will they be in the way of receiving the divine blessing, and becoming ultimately sound and prosperous. Mark those which cause



divisions and offences among you and avoid them. Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them, is the course, not less of wise policy, than of gospel righteousness. And it behooves all concerned to see to it, that they so faithfully and prayerfully use the means of divine appointment for promoting the cause of religion, that they shall give no occasion to those who seek occasion, and wish a plausible pretext for thrusting upon them the contrary sort of proceedings, and thus kindling UNHALLOWED FIRE UPON THE ALTAR OF THE LORD.

*J. W. Newman*

ART. II.—*The Kingdom of Christ Delineated, in two Essays on our Lord's own Account of his Person and of the Nature of his Kingdom, and on the Constitution, Powers and Ministry of a Christian Church, as appointed by Himself.* By Richard, Lord Archbishop of Dublin. London: Fellowes. 1841. Svo.

THIS new work of Archbishop Whately would afford abundant matter of discussion on the general subject of the Constitution of the Christian Church. But we avail ourselves, at present, of his name, to introduce a few reflections of our own, upon one of the topics mentioned in his title-page, the Ministry of the Church, "as appointed by our Lord himself." We have wished, for some time, to suggest the inquiry, whether the members of our church do habitually join its unimposing and familiar institutions with proper views of the supreme authority of Christ. Perhaps our people, not the irreligious alone, but too frequently the professedly religious, are inclined to depose certain of the offices of the Christian church from their station of divine authority; and among these, the pastoral office, which is liable to be accounted only a human and voluntary modification of the Christian ministry. It seems to be presumed by some, that the pastoral functions do not belong of divine right to any portion of the Christian ministry; and that the claims of Christ in regard to the official administration of the gospel are met by sustaining only the more general forms of ministerial service. It cannot therefore be amiss to pass, in brief review, a portion of the argument for the divine authority of the office of the Christian pastor.

There is an evident distinction between the office of the



pastor and that of every other gospel functionary. There were diversities of gifts. The distribution of appointments by the Head of the Church was accommodated to the various circumstances in which, under the Christian dispensation, the people would be found. At first, the universal prepossession of Judaism and Heathenism would erect the opposition, both of conscience and of corruption, against the introduction of Christianity. To meet such an exigency, and also to establish an authority of last appeal, for all the coming ages of the church, there was appointed the office of apostle. The persons designated for this office were selected by the Saviour himself in person; with the exception of one whose appointment was determined by a solemn appeal to the Saviour in the lot. Paul, though not of the original twelve, was nevertheless elected by the above general rule. No human agency intervened between Christ and him, either in his nomination or his election. These apostles received spiritual endowments entirely peculiar to their office. They were clothed, as ecclesiastical officers, with full authority, and as religious teachers, with the attribute of infallibility. Although sufficient in number for all the purposes of their appointment, they were few. It hence became convenient to distribute more extensively the inferior powers of these offices, that the Christian assemblies might have edifying exercises, although an apostle might not be present. To provide for this was the design of the office of prophet. The prophets had special gifts, fitted equally with those of the apostles, to arrest attention and present the sensible and miraculous proofs of the divine authority of their doctrine, and thus to produce a first impression in favour of Christianity. When these apostles and prophets should thus win the public ear for the gospel preacher, their extraordinary gifts might be spared. Other men without miraculous endowments could preach the doctrines of the gospel to persons willing to hear and prepared to receive them, collect and instruct the converts, organize churches, and establish the regular administration of divine service. Here was the field of the evangelist. Then the system of stated and regular religious instruction, and the ceaseless and peculiar demand for ministerial service was the occasion for the office of pastor. And so he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers.

The apostleship was first in authority and first in time.

The apostles received truth directly from Christ for the people. They were next to Christ as original teachers of the Christian doctrine, and stood in this office between God and all other teachers. In authority no others were superior or equal to them. It belonged to them to determine what doctrines should be taught by all other teachers, and what forms of worship, government and discipline should prevail in the church.

Next the apostles stood the prophets, endowed with miraculous gifts of understanding and of speech. They, too, received certain revelations directly from God, yet were not, in their official exercises, equal in authority with the apostles. The knowledge of the mystery of Christ was revealed unto the holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit. The prophets are so joined with the apostles in the Christian offices of authority and teaching as to form with them the foundation on which the church was built, and of which Jesus Christ was the chief corner-stone. In certain direct communications of spiritual knowledge, the prophets evidently shared with the apostles, while in the authority of their teaching and other ministrations, they were as evidently subordinate, and received directions from the apostles in the exercise of their office. This prophetic office, like the apostolic, was temporary, demanded for the introduction of a new and strange religion, supplying the requisite credentials for the ordinary and permanent teachers, intended to serve the infancy of the church, and furnishing intelligent teaching and exhortation for the people, until men could, by the ordinary methods of instruction, be prepared to take their places.

Next came the evangelist. His labours were desultory. He seems to have been a sort of irregular itinerant, holding himself ready like the apostles and prophets, to go from place to place at the call of circumstances, but differing from them in the nature and extent of his personal endowments and the rank of his authority. Since the evangelist might find, in every age of the world, as proper fields of labour as those presented in the early state of the Christian church, his office seems destined to be permanent. The authority of this officer does not appear to have been like that of the apostles, intended for a temporary purpose. Nor were any of his personal endowments conferred with special and exclusive reference to any state of the world peculiar to those days. How the authority of the evangelist differed from

that of the pastor, or whether it differed at all, except in those matters which were strictly and exclusively pastoral, it may not be easy, nor are we greatly concerned, to decide. He was competent to preach the gospel, to administer the ordinances, to direct the converts in matters preliminary to the organization of churches, and to serve the churches as occasion might require.

The office of the pastor was connected with a local and limited charge. The elders of the church of Ephesus were pastors, by the Holy Ghost made overseers, ἐπίσκοποι, bishops; and the pastoral nature of their office appears in their being commanded to feed the flock of God, or, to use words derived from the very terms of the original, to exercise over them the office of pastor. The bishops Timothy and Titus were charged with the duty of teaching, by preaching in public and exhorting in private. To them it belonged to regulate the internal affairs of the church, and to administer its government and discipline. They watched over the faith and practice of the members, to prevent error and offence. They ordained approved men to the work of the gospel ministry. They were charged with giving reproof and rebuke, as occasion might require, to old and young, masters and servants, husbands and wives, parents and children, and to all inferior officers of the church. By the terms of ordination, the pastor or bishop was confined to a local and limited charge. Within that charge he held responsibilities not extending to other portions of the church, and had official rights and authority, with which other officers of the church might not interfere.

Such, so far as can be clearly learned from the scriptures, were the chief points of distinction between the authority, duties, and claims of the pastor, and those of the other officers of the church; yet among the officers who were especially charged with "feeding the flock of God," we hear of none. No ecclesiastical distinction can be drawn between Timothy and Titus, or between them and the ἐπίσκοποι of Ephesus. The tenor of the instructions which they all received from the apostle, indicates, in the most unequivocal manner, an official equality among the bishops or pastors of the churches. And we are now to observe with what decided forms of supreme authority the pastoral office was ordained; and what proofs appear in the nature, the design, and the effects of the pastoral institution in favour of its divine and perpetual authority in the church.

The office was instituted at the beginning of the Christian church. It originated with the origin of the church itself. The apostle speaks of it with others, as a part of the system of organization provided, in the original counsels of God, for the administration of his kingdom on earth. It did not grow out of any pre-existent exigency of the church. And yet when it actually arose and assumed its functions, it seemed to have a field exactly suited to its operation, and appeared to come to supply a demand. The office of pastor was ordained at the same time with the offices of the apostle and the prophet. No difference can be discerned between the apostle's solemn recognition of the pastorship, as one of the authoritative appointments of the Head of the Church, and his recognition of the office of the apostleship itself. It was from his station of authority that he gave the word creating the office. In his previous humiliation he did not announce it; but deferring its promulgation till his ascension to glory, he published it in union with those offices of acknowledged authority appointed for the edification of the church. The manner of creating this office places it among those appointments of unquestionable and perpetual authority which bear the acknowledged sanction of the mediatorial king.

The circumstances of its appointment were suited to secure for it what we consider its due place among the constituted authorities of the Christian church. The office was ordained before the exigency it was intended to meet had arisen. The appointment of the office, and the adaptation of the church to receive its ministrations, appear to have been fixed by a simultaneous decree; and so far as human eyes could see, the church was as really formed for the pastor as the pastor for the church. In other words, he who had determined that the pastoral office should have place in the church, determined also that the church should have need of the pastor. The office of deacon, on the contrary, although equally the offspring of divine counsels, seemed to rise out of an existing necessity in what appeared the natural course of things. The members of the church complained of inadequate ministrations. The apostles wanted helpers; and the want suggested the supply. The occasion itself seemed to have prompted the first conception of an office to meet the case. Hence, although the deacon be a legitimate and perpetual officer of the church, his office differed widely from that of the pastor in the cir-



cumstances of its origin. It seems to have arisen more from the people's judgment of their own wants, and upon that judgment it may seem to depend, in a larger measure, for the vindication of its claims. But as to employing the pastor, the people have no choice. The manner of appointing this office makes it the manifest duty of the people to place themselves, if possible, in a condition in which they may require and enjoy the labours of the pastor, and then to select the person and secure his services. From the apostle's studied and emphatic statement of the manner and circumstances of the pastoral institution, we must presume that no people can consider themselves in the state most favourable to their growth in knowledge, purity and comfort, except when they are best prepared to receive the benefit of the pastoral authority and care.

The design of the institution comprehended the most sacred and important interests of the church. The pastor was not a secular officer. He was not charged imperiously with the temporal concerns of the people. Whatever incidental and personal influence he might hold in temporal affairs, that was not embraced in the original design of his office. That original design was spiritual. The apostle, the prophet, the evangelist, the pastor, were all ordained for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. Here assuredly is a design worthy of the wisdom of God. Here are interests which justly claim to be consulted. What could be more important in the view of him who wills the sanctification of his people? To what office, if not to one ordained for such an end, would he attach the open and formal sanction of his authority? Feed the flock of God, says one of the precepts of the pastoral law. Preach the word, says another; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine; speak the things that become sound doctrine; that they which have believed may be careful to maintain good works. It is for these purposes that believers are called. The object of their vocation is their edification in knowledge, purity and comfort. And the office of the pastor is the chief of the permanent means on which this edification of the people of God must depend. The apostles were to have no official successors; but, with the men who first held it, the office was to die.



The prophets were to exist in only a brief succession, if indeed in any at all. The evangelists were pioneers of the pastor, watching for promiscuous and temporary opportunities of introducing the gospel, where bishops could not, from lack of qualified men, or the circumstances of the people, be conveniently established. While these forerunners fulfilled their course, they sometimes gathered churches, sometimes instructed families in transient visits, sometimes employed themselves, under providential and not unfrequently special divine direction, in teaching individual strangers the way of salvation. The results of these labours would often be, in course, a demand for the stated and continuous labours of the pastor. A flock, now gathered, wants a shepherd to feed them. An assembly of Christian worshippers, now established, require a teacher of their own to guide them. A church, now organized, calls for a pastor as the head of its organization, who shall superintend the dispensation of its authority, administer its ordinances, and, instead of going from place to place, reside among the people, watch over them, and go in and out before them as their own. This teacher becomes the minister of a particular congregation, and that congregation becomes, in a delicate and important sense, his. Henceforward the work of the ministry there is his work. His relation to the people is solemnized in a form significant of his dignity and responsibility, and of the corresponding duty of the flock over which the Holy Ghost makes him bishop. His duties are enjoined by solemn charge. It becomes the official duty of the minister, as he hopes for the favour of him who shall judge the quick and dead, to supply his people with all needful instruction, warning and exhortation. If he do not teach them, they will not be taught. He stands between them and all other teachers, and becomes responsible for their supply of gospel ministrations. A relation is formed which is not lightly to be sundered, and the responsibilities of which are to be recognized with peculiar solemnity at the last day. And many an award will be assigned at the judgment bar, with reference to the mutual faithfulness of shepherd and flock.

Our first argument for the divine authority of the pastoral office, and that a most conclusive one, is drawn from the time, the manner, the circumstances, and the express design of it. Our second is, that there are reasons in the nature of man for supposing such an institution to have come from him who formed our intellectual and moral constitution.

Religious knowledge is to be acquired by the human understanding in the same way that other knowledge is acquired, by study; by personal, diligent, and intelligent instruction; and by pressing the considerations best fitted to command attention and render knowledge interesting and attractive to the people. So far as religious knowledge is the mere result of experience, it may be gained by direct impressions from the Spirit on the heart. But the treasures of the understanding are, both in the material and spiritual fields, to be acquired by the same methods. The true and profound knowledge of the holy scriptures must be acquired by study not less diligent and severe, and by teaching not less skilful and constant than the study and the teaching which secures the command of other sciences.

Since religious instruction is a matter of so vital concern with the people, it invests with peculiar solemnity and attractiveness, the character of those who give it. It is by an impulse of his religious nature, that the serious hearer of the gospel exclaims, How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth glad tidings, that publisheth peace. In the degree in which the spiritual affections of the people are moved towards the privileges and the duties of religion, and their understandings engaged in searching for the treasures of divine knowledge, will their natural affection be enlisted in favour of the persons through whom their knowledge and comfort are received. Such is the natural course of things. Unless some disturbing influence be interposed by the defective character of the minister or the gross prevalence of irreligion among the people, the ardent attachment of pastor and people is the spontaneous growth of the peculiar relation. There is the intimate, friendly, personal acquaintance of the parties with each other. There is the reciprocation of respectful and useful service. There is the delicate and constant force of a peculiar mutual obligation, restraining the common antagonists of the kind affections, and giving to the exercise of mutual respect a freer and purer occasion than is afforded by any secular relations. There is the genial connexion of pastoral service with some of the liveliest joys and deepest sorrows of the human heart. There is often the pleasing excitement of pure affection towards God and man by the pastor's personal and official influence in public and private labour. There is the natural and often useful predisposition of the people to extend the honours of the agent to the instrument, and to indulge

an amiable fondness for the visible messenger of an invisible benefactor. There is the mutual endearment which all deem becoming to the relation, and which all good people account it a duty and a comfort to maintain. Where, in the round of human relations, can be found a fitter opportunity and fairer scope for mutual confidence, respect, and love? From the nature of the office, from the kind of service it provides, from the character and value of the interests with which it is properly concerned, and from the purity and strength of the kind affections it begets and nourishes, might there not be expected to grow up in the nature of man such attachments as would hold no where else without the ties of blood? It is the offspring of the laws of our nature, under the direction and impulse of heavenly grace; and who can doubt that, without this affection, the duties and responsibilities of the office would be grievous to the minister, less acceptable to the people, and less conducive to the ends of the gospel? The nature of religion and the nature of man produce this result; and the more perfectly the gospel does its work, the stronger becomes the principle of which we speak, and the more useful. What plainer indication could there be that the affections growing out of the pastoral relation have been provided with a view to gracious purposes; and that the office, for the useful and agreeable exercise of which we have such provision in our nature, is of divine appointment?

This is our second argument. Our third is, that the history of the pastoral office affords solid ground of belief that the origin of the institution is divine. It was under the faithful ministrations of the pastors that the early churches received, in their prosperity, the blessing of God, or in their decline, the warnings and reproofs of their Head. The seven churches of Asia were addressed through their pastors. It was to the angels, the messengers, the ministers of those churches, that Christ committed those admonitions which were intended for all the members. And when Paul, on his last voyage to Rome, proposed to leave his parting counsel with the churches of Ephesus, he sent for the men whom the Holy Ghost had made overseers of those churches, and commanded them to feed the flock of God, that is, to be its faithful pastors. These were among the beginnings of the pastoral history of the church. And we hence learn how great was the influence and dignity of the office among the people. It was taken for granted, it was ordained, that the pastor should be a guide of the flock; that his influence

and responsibility, in the matters pertaining to his office, would be powerful. Suppose, for a moment, that Christ had communicated with the churches otherwise than through their official organs, that the apostles had sent by other messengers or addressed the people themselves; how different would have been their testimony concerning the rank and authority of the pastor. The instructions, the rebukes, the warnings, intended for the people were committed to the pastors, as organs which would be not only convenient, but effectual for such a service. The early fathers were peculiarly jealous for the honour and usefulness of the pastor; and they laid no greater stress on any duty, after that of repentance and faith, than upon the mutual duties of the spiritual shepherd and his flock. In the declension of the church in the following ages, this office was universally maintained, and with great uniformity, in its duties and its results. While the memory and personal influence of the apostles lingered among the following generations, this institution was cherished as one of the conspicuous features of the first ecclesiastical organization.

As a part of its history, its effects are worthy of special note. It is a fact that in the time of the Apocalypse, all the churches which are mentioned at all as having been addressed by their Head, for the purpose of instruction, commendation, or correction, were addressed through their pastors. And this fact gives us a hint by no means obscure, that all the churches, to which the cause of truth and righteousness could then look for support, had their bishops; that any which had existed without pastors were now scattered and extinct, and that those only remained which had the benefit of pastoral care. In the time of the apostles, the pastorship was deemed so important as to demand special care to qualify the man for the office. In the apostolic instructions on ministerial duty, the most emphatic and solemn of all are those which charge the bishops with peculiar responsibility in relation to the doctrine and practice of the people. As might then have been supposed, the strength of the churches in truth and order was commonly in proportion to their supply of episcopal fidelity. When the churches prospered, it was by pastoral faithfulness; and when they declined, their declension was produced or hastened by pastoral defection. The doctrines held by the congregation have, in every age, been, to an almost proverbial extent, susceptible of modification from those affections which be-



long to the pastoral relation. While the peculiar opinions of a transient preacher make little impression on those who feel only the influence of his public address, those of a pastor who holds the people in the bonds of a tender endearment, all know how delicate and difficult it is to call in question. We may state it as a general rule, that the doctrines of the pastor are the doctrines of the people; and that not always because the one sought out and found the other by elective affinity, but because the faithful and skilful pastor forms, as it were, by a law of nature, the religious opinions of the people. In the earlier periods of Christianity, when the people had rarely a copy of the holy scriptures, and few means of information, and, in religion, no other means of instruction, than the pastor and his helpers, these teachers might be strictly said to hold the keys of knowledge. And what class of teachers could be supposed to keep the portals under so close a guard, as those who had the special and exclusive charge of particular churches? But these remarks are not to be confined to times of ignorance. In modern days, in ages and countries of light, when the living teacher is only one among a thousand instruments of popular instruction, the pastor, above all other teachers, controls the religious opinions of the people. Among the common events in the history of the church is to be reckoned the people's adoption of whatever peculiar views in theology their pastor may have entertained; and instances of sudden and almost unanimous conformity of the views of the people with those of a popular pastor are not of rare occurrence. It is common, in the progress of error, for a skilful pastor to take the majority or the whole of a congregation with him, in spite of the strongest and most prudent influence of all other watchfulness and counsel. On the other hand, who else, like the intelligent, diligent and affectionate pastor, can build up a people in truth and order? Who like him is wont to cultivate and bring out in fair developement, the fruits of the Spirit in a congregation? Who else so fills the house of worship with devout and habitual hearers of the gospel, and commends the pure word of God with effect to their belief and practice? If the people who have a pastor do not grow in the knowledge of the holy scriptures, and acquire a keen discernment of truth and a hearty relish for it; if the children are not brought up in the house of the Lord, and the youth taught to respect the doctrines, the institutions, and the people of Christ; if the people are not



prompt in supporting the gospel at home, and aiding in its propagation abroad, we may almost take for granted it is the pastor's fault. It is impossible to survey, without admiration, the workings of this institution on the opinions and the character of our people. What other office, civil or ecclesiastical, has at this very day such power? What other influence touches and controls so many of the springs of human action, and modifies so widely the social habits and institutions of our population? In proportion to the energy and skilfulness of pastoral labour is almost invariably the moral and religious prosperity of the people; and, the world over, when a people enjoy moral and religious prosperity, all other things are added unto them.

If these remarks seem to any to savour of exaggeration, it can be only to persons who do not consider the actual state of the Christian church, and the principles on which her prosperity depends. The pastoral office is of God; and here is a part of the proof of its divine original, that the most faithful exercise of this office, and the most prompt support and reception of its influence is always attended by the most rapid advancement of the church in pure faith, in spiritual peace and joy, and in all good works.

Such proofs of the divine authority of this institution remind us forcibly of the pastor's peculiar responsibilities. If a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth not only a good work, but a great and solemn one. The minister of the gospel who has the charge of a congregation is responsible for a peculiar class of ministerial duties. He is required, indeed, as all preachers and as all Christians are, to take heed unto himself, that his feelings agree always with his work. But in this matter his responsibilities exceed those of other Christians and of other ministers, since there is no other form of Christian duty, in which success and enjoyment depend so much on the labourer's feelings, as in this. He is responsible also to his people for a supply of instruction in the gospel; and to this responsibility there are no limits except the limits of his own abilities. He does not fulfil his obligations to his congregation by giving them a course of lectures on the doctrines or the duties of religion. He can never lead any portion of his people to the end of their course, where he has no more to teach, and where they have no more to learn. He must continue giving line upon line, precept upon precept; adapting his instruction to all the varieties of understanding and character

among his people, reproving, rebuking, exhorting, with all long-suffering and doctrine. He must give lessons, at the same time, in the rudiments of Christian learning and in the highest branches, bringing forth out of his treasure things new and old, instant in season and out of season, and instead of ever being able to say that his work is done, finding it so to increase on his hands that the more he does the more he finds to do. What diligence must the conscientious and affectionate pastor maintain, to meet the amiable demands of the poor, who enjoy his acquaintance and his kind and generous attentions; of the ignorant, who hunger for his instructions; of the intelligent and refined, who claim his respectful regards; of parents, who prize his aid in training their children; of the youth, who need and often seek his prudent oversight and counsel; of the afflicted, who depend on his sympathizing and soothing ministrations. Such ceaseless and exhausting draughts upon his resources seem often inconsiderate and excessive and are doubtless urged, in many cases, with too little regard for the limits of his ability; yet are they in strict accordance with the law of the pastoral office; and the bishop who conforms his spirit to the intent of his commission, instead of resisting the largest demands as oppressive or unjust, divides his resources among them, rejoices to spend and to be spent in meeting them, and feels a real though an indescribable pleasure in their very excess. He cannot but choose rather that his official services should be in great demand than otherwise. He yet feels, all the more, the overwhelming disproportion between the work to be done and his power to do. The private feelings of a conscientious and devoted pastor are a delicate subject for public discussion. Little can ever be gained by obtruding them upon the attention of the world. But no reflecting and enlightened person can fail to understand that, in the habitual and ceaseless effort to perform duties of such nature, magnitude, and variety, the pastor must often experience what no other class of labours would require or produce. Every Christian sentiment of responsibility, of insufficiency and of dependence, has, in his mind, peculiar intensity. Feelings which, in the hearts of private Christians, are only gentle affections, rise, in him, to strong emotions. What in others would be lively emotion, kindles in him to an agonizing fervour. So indeed it ought to be. Such labours require such feelings both to prompt and to sustain them; and the feelings themselves are at once an

effect of the official responsibilities, and a chief qualification for discharging them.

A servant of Christ, whose office is so evident and solemn an appointment of God, has complete assurance of all desirable success. The greatest benefit, both to himself and his people, may be expected from the most faithful and wise exercise of his ministry. The diligent and prudent pastor may trust, without presumption, in the promise of the Lord. The almighty Redeemer will accomplish his promised redemption; and among the instruments of forwarding his work, the pastoral office has ever been his favourite. By this means, more than by all others, he provides for the work of the ministry, for the perfecting of the saints, for the edifying of his body. It is indeed an earthen vessel in which the treasure of the gospel ministry is placed; while the work to be done requires the excellency of power. But the application of that power is pledged. God worketh together with his faithful servants, and his work shall never be in vain. The pastor is one of the most important servants of the Lord. He is, under God, the abiding dependance of the church. The apostleship has done its work, and was long since withdrawn. The prophets, where are they? The evangelist is little else than the voice of one crying in the wilderness to prepare the way of the pastor. By the pastor, Zion has risen and shall rise. Until God forsake his glorious work, he will not forsake those servants who have such a share in that work. Until he erase the image of his church from his hand where he hath graven it, he will not abandon the office on which so much of her beauty and glory depends. Till he break down the bulwarks he has built around his Zion, and quench the glory in the midst of her, and give her up to desolation and reproach, he will uphold and honour those to whom he has so largely entrusted her fame. While her walls stand, these, her watchmen and defenders, shall stand upon them, seeing eye to eye, augmenting and enjoying her glory, the achievers of her victories, and the sentinels of her security.

A just view of the divine authority of the pastoral office will prepare the people of God to hold that office in due esteem. The chief dangers are, that in one case the infirmities of the man will lessen the people's reverence for the office; and in another, a blind and fanciful favouritism will idolize the man for some peculiar personal accomplishments, and minor qualifications for the Christian ministry. If, in

the view of the people, the pastor becomes only an instrument for maintaining the order of Christian worship, or providing a stated entertainment for the understanding and taste, or promoting general intelligence, refinement, and morality, he loses the divine glory of his character, and the right arm of his influence. Such objects are not the pastor's chief end. His aim is to instruct the people in the gospel, to convert them to the faith, and to confirm them in Christian holiness and comfort. To employ him for other purposes is a perversion of the gracious provisions of God for our benefit, and renders a most precious institution of divine mercy a savour of death unto death.

But with due regards for the divine authority and the merciful design of the pastoral office, a people may account it the greatest of all the blessings of their earthly life. If they make it their first concern to obtain salvation, and consider what are the means which the Lord distinguishes by the excellency of his power in saving sinners, they will never fail to regard the faithful pastor as an invaluable treasure to them and their children. They will esteem it but a small part of their privilege to have the word and the sacraments of the gospel dispensed to them with due regularity and by proper authority. The office and the ministrations of the preacher must be joined with those lovely and pure affections, which are at once an evidence of divine grace in the heart, a source of true religious comfort, and a part of the means of religious influence. They want the pastor, through whose genial and plastic instrumentality they are taught to hope for the spiritual heritage of the people of God in this world, and for glory, honour and immortality, in the life to come.

---

ART. III.—1. *The Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes, containing Evidence of their Identity, an Account of their Manners, Customs and Ceremonies, with Sketches of Travel in ancient Assyria, Armenia, Media and Mesopotamia, and Illustrations of Scriptural Prophecy.* By Ashbel Grant, M.D. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1841.

2. *The Remnant Found, or the Place of Israel's Hiding Discovered.* By the Rev. Jacob Samuel, Senior Missionary to the Jews, for India, Persia, and Arabia; Author



of a Hebrew Sermon on the "Evidences of Christianity," and a Journal of five Months' Residence in Cochin. London. 1841. *Archibald Alex ander*

THE work of Dr. Grant is an uncommonly interesting volume ; at least it has proved such to us ; and we cannot but recommend it to the careful perusal of all who pursue biblical studies, or take a lively interest in missionary operations. In the year 1831, the American Board of Foreign Missions sent out Messrs. Smith and Dwight to explore the state of the Oriental church ; especially as it is found among the Armenians and Nestorians. From the report of these missionaries, the Prudential Committee were induced to resolve on establishing a mission, if practicable, among the Nestorians, who inhabit the country on the lake Ooroomiah ; a remarkable body of extremely salt water on the borders of Persia, and at this time under the jurisdiction of the king of Persia. The person selected to occupy this new and important station was the Rev. Justin Perkins, who with Mrs. Perkins, proceeded according to the direction of the exploring missionaries who had preceded them, and arrived at Tabreez, a commercial town on the north-west of Persia, in the year 1834 ; and in October 1835, were joined by Dr. Grant and Mrs. Grant, who, from purely evangelical motives, had made a sacrifice of all their earthly prospects of affluence and social comfort, and offered their services to engage in the arduous duties of this untried field of labour. Dr. Grant was in full and increasing practice as a physician in Utica, when the American Board met there in 1834 ; and upon finding that all their efforts to procure a suitable physician for the station had proved ineffectual, he was led, we doubt not, by the Spirit of God, to devote himself for life to this self-denying work. The wisdom of sending out a skilful and experienced physician was soon manifest ; for no sooner had he arrived at Tabreez, than the sick, the lame, and the blind, surrounded him by hundreds, and his fame was spread abroad through all the surrounding country. The missionaries, instead of being looked upon as unwelcome intruders, were considered in the light of public benefactors. The Nestorians, in particular, welcomed them with great kindness and cordiality, and their bishops and priests affectionately invited them to aid them in the instruction of their people. This people appear, indeed, to have been remarkably fitted and prepared to receive instruction with doc-



lity. They cherish a great reverence for the holy scriptures, and are very desirous to have them diffused among the people. Their feelings towards other denominations are liberal; and in their religious rites and worship, they are much more simple than the other Orientals. They abhor image-worship, auricular confession, and the doctrine of purgatory; so that they have, not unappropriately, been called "the Protestants of Asia." But notwithstanding, as a people they are sunk into the darkness of ignorance and superstition: none but the clergy, when the missionaries arrived, could either read or write; the education of their females has been entirely neglected; and they are accustomed to lay greater stress on feasts and fasts, and other external ceremonies, than upon purity of heart and life. Still there were found among them persons whose exemplary lives furnish ground of hope that vital piety is not entirely extinct. The most surprising circumstance is, that they should be so entirely willing that strangers coming from a country of which they had scarcely heard, should be permitted without a breath of opposition from their ecclesiastics, to open schools among them, and to preach the gospel in its purity; and to make use of every means of instruction which they could wish, not only without obstruction, but with the most cordial approbation of their bishops and priests. Even their highest ecclesiastics have been willing, and indeed esteemed it an honour, to be assistants to the missionaries in their evangelical labours.

The accounts received from this mission were so encouraging, that in 1837, the Board sent out a reinforcement, consisting of the Rev. A. L. Holladay and Mr. William R. Stocking, and their wives, who arrived at the station in June, 1837. And in 1839, the Rev. Willard Jones and wife, and in 1840, Mr. Edward Breath, a printer, were sent out to join this mission: and also Rev. A. H. Wright, M. D. With this company, a printing press was sent to the mission, so contrived, that it could be taken to pieces, and be carried on the back of beasts of burden.

Dr. Grant had the misfortune to lose his wife early in the year 1839; soon after which event he received instructions from the Board of Missions to proceed into Mesopotamia, and form a station among the Nestorians dwelling, as was supposed, on the west of the central mountains of Koordistan. The object was to gain access to the main body of this interesting people, who were understood to have their habitations in the mountains which are situated in the centre of

ancient Assyria. These tribes were difficult of access, on account of the sanguinary Koords by whom they are surrounded, and who had recently treacherously murdered the traveller Schultz, the only person who had attempted to visit the country of the independent Nestorians.

Dr. Grant, however, had been assured by a brother of the Nestorian patriarch, who had visited the missionaries in Ooroomiah, and by a Koordish chief, that his profession, as a physician, would be a safeguard to him through all that region. His own plan was, to proceed directly from Persia, through the Koordish mountains; but by the opinion of others, and by his instructions from the Board, he was induced to attempt the journey through Mesopotamia. And after encountering many difficulties, and being exposed to many dangers, in a visit to Constantinople, he directed his course to Mesopotamia, where he found the country in a miserable state of dissension and disturbance, until he arrived at M<sup>o</sup>sul, on the 20th September, 1839. Here, he found the country in a more quiet state, under the vigorous rule of their pasha. This city contains about 30,000 inhabitants. On the 7th of October, he left M<sup>o</sup>sul, and crossed the Tigris, where he stood upon the ruins of Nineveh, and was reminded of the prophecy of Nahum, "Nineveh is laid waste! who will bemoan her? She is empty, and void, and waste: her nobles dwell in the dust, her people are scattered on the mountains, and no man gathereth them."

The author fell in now with some villages of a strange people, called Yezidees, who are reputed to be worshippers of the devil. He was received into the house of one of their chief men, who finding that he was a Christian and not a Mohammedan, as he at first supposed, was disposed to treat him with much kindness; for the Yezidees cherish an inveterate hatred against Mohammedans. The truth is, the religion of these people is misapprehended by those around them. They actually believe in one supreme God, and have a great respect for Christ. They seem, however, to retain something of the religion of the ancient fire-worshippers; for they adore the rising sun, and kiss his first rays when they strike on any object accessible to them. They have, also, something common with the Jews, in their religion, for they use circumcision, and attend on a feast which resembles the passover. They also practice the rite of baptism, and make the sign of the cross, and speak of wine as the emblem of the blood of Christ. From a resem-

blance to the ancient sect of the Manichees, our author thinks, that they are probably the remains of some branch of this heresy ; and the opinion derives probability from the fact that the region in which they reside, was the country where Manes first laboured, and disseminated the seeds of his extravagant opinions. As to their being worshippers of the devil, Dr. Grant is of opinion, that there is no foundation for the charge, except in a very qualified sense. They refuse to speak disrespectfully of the "prince of darkness ;" probably from fear of his displeasure ; and some of them believe that he is a fallen angel, who has incurred the displeasure of God, but will, at some future day, be restored to favour. Indeed, their notions of the evil being, seem to be derived, in some degree, from the opinions of the ancient Magians. Their precise number it is difficult to estimate, as so little is known of them ; but it is sufficient to make them an object for some missionary society : they might be included in the field of a mission among the Nestorians, who consider them as a heretical branch of themselves.

Dr. Grant pursued his journey among the mountains, until after having spent the greater part of the month of October, in his travels, he reached the residence of the patriarch of the Nestorians, about the close of the month. By this prelate he was received in the most cordial manner, and was invited to make his house his home while he continued in the country. The patriarch said, that he had long been looking for a visit from some member of the mission, and was now convinced that it had only been prevented by the difficulty and danger of the journey. He is described as about thirty-eight years of age, above the middle stature, well proportioned, with a pleasant, expressive, and rather intelligent countenance ; while his flowing robes, his Koor-dish turban, and his long grey beard, give him a venerable aspect, which is heightened by a uniform, dignified demeanour. "I would have taken him," says the doctor, "to be nearer fifty than thirty-eight. But his friends assured me that the hoariness of his beard and locks was that of care and not of age. His situation is certainly a difficult and responsible one, since he is in an important sense, the temporal as well as the spiritual head of his people. To preserve harmony, and settle differences between the various tribes of his spirited mountaineers, and with the Koords, by whom they are surrounded, is a labour that would tax the wisdom and patience of the greatest states-

man; and I could hardly wonder that the hoar-frost of care was prematurely settling on his locks. It was quite evident, that the patriarch's anxiety extended not less to the temporal than the spiritual wants of his flock."

During the five weeks which Dr. Grant spent under the hospitable roof of the patriarch, he had the opportunity of seeing Nestorians of the greatest intelligence and influence from all parts of their mountain abodes, and to elicit from them much information which he could not have obtained in any other way.

"Their form of church government," says Dr. Grant, "is essentially episcopal, but with a single exception in the Jelu tribe, there is not a bishop among the Independent Nestorians, where their religious forms have been preserved the most exempt from foreign influence. It is a singular fact, to which my attention was first called by the testimony of Dr. Buchanan, that there is not a word in the Syriac language, expressive of the office of a bishop. The Nestorians, in common with the other Syrians, have borrowed the Greek term *episkopos*. This is the more remarkable, considering the fact, that the Syriac language was extensively used in Palestine, in the days of our Saviour, and was spoken by our Lord himself; and considering also, the very early date of the Syriac version, of the scriptures; as early as the beginning of the second century. In every case where the term bishop occurs, in our version, in theirs it is rendered *presbyter*, or *priest*. I make these statements with the single remark, that, while this form of church government may be the best for the Nestorians, in their present circumstances, there is enough in the facts I have mentioned, to caution us about too hasty an inference concerning the apostolic origin of episcopacy, on the ground that it exists in a church which was founded by the apostles."

The author has fallen into a small mistake respecting the language spoken by our Saviour. It was not the pure Syriac, but the Syro-Chaldaic; and though the old Syriac translation was made very early, there is no proof of its existence as early as the beginning of the second century.

Dr. Grant having finished his visit to the patriarch, made ready to leave the country; but instead of retracing his steps, and returning along the route which he pursued in going thither, he determined to pursue a direct course to Ooroomiah, the seat of the Nestorian mission. This resolution rendered it necessary for him to visit the Koordish chief, who had put to death the unfortunate traveller Schultz. His object in this visit was, not only to secure a safe passage through the territory of this ferocious man, but he considered that if he could conciliate his favour and confidence, it might be very important to the operations of the mission among the Nestorians, and might perhaps open a communication free from danger, between Ooroomiah and the Independent Nestorians. In anticipation of such a visit,



he had procured letters from the Turkish and Persian authorities. The patriarch also kindly offered to send one of his brothers, to introduce him in person to the Koordish chief. And he took special care to avoid every thing which would have a tendency to arouse the cupidity and jealousy of these semi-barbarous people, to which Schultz owed his death.

The parting of Dr. Grant with the patriarch, was in the truly oriental style. The patriarch presented him with a pair of scarlet *shalwars*, the wide trousers of the country, trimmed with silk; and also, one of the ancient manuscripts of his library. It was the New Testament written on parchment, seven hundred and forty years ago, in the old Estrangelo character. His favourite sister Helena furnished the traveller with a store of provisions, sufficient for a week, and a pair of warm mittens made by her own hands, from the soft goat's hair of the country. And finally, a thousand blessings were invoked upon his head, and ardent wishes were expressed that he might return with associates, and commence among the mountains, a similar work to that in which the missionaries were engaged upon the plain. Having received the last embrace and benediction of the friendly patriarch, Dr. Grant set off towards the residence of Nooroolah Bey, the famous chief of the independent Hakary Koords. This chief has lately removed his residence from his castle, at Jûlamerk, to Bash-Kalleh, nearly two days' journey from the residence of the patriarch. Upon his arrival, he found the chief on a sick-bed, and the doctor was desired to do something for him immediately. He had taken a violent cold, a few days before. Dr. Grant bled him and gave him some medicine; but he was impatient and wanted something more done; and at midnight a messenger came again to the doctor, saying that the chief was still very ill and wished to see him. The summons was promptly obeyed, and Dr. Grant entered the castle by a winding path. The sentinels were sounding the watch-cry in the rough tones of their native Koordish. The outer court was entered through wide, iron-cased folding doors. A second iron door opened into a long dark alley, which conducted to the room where the chief was lying. It required some courage for a solitary stranger to put himself so entirely in the power of such a tyrant, and the fate of the unfortunate Schultz, said to have been put to death by his order, could not but occur to the thoughts of our traveller.



He found the chief very impatient, and earnest that something should be done for his immediate relief. The doctor told him that the medicine taken was producing a good effect; yet he needed more powerful means, which for a time would make him feel worse, instead of better; that he could administer palliatives, but in the end they would be injurious. At length he permitted the doctor to take his own course, and he administered an emetic; this operated well, and next morning he was much better.

The advantage which a man skilled in medicine possesses over others is striking, in almost every part of the east. Dr. Grant, on account of his medical profession and skill, was every where safe, and not only so, but held in admiration and reverence by the people. The following anecdote is related by our traveller:—"The chief had just heard of the case of a Koordish woman, from whose eyes I had removed a cataract, while I was at the patriarch's residence. With a spice of the characteristic passion of her sex, she was curious to know what had been the effect of the operation, and long before the prescribed time, she removed the bandage from her eyes. But so strange was the prospect that opened before her, that she was frightened, and immediately bound up her eyes, resolved thereafter to abide by my instructions. The story was so amusing to the chief, that he continued to divert himself by rehearsing it to his courtiers, with encomiums on my professional skill, too oriental to repeat. He is a man of a noble bearing, fine, open countenance, and appeared to be about thirty years of age. He was very affable, and on my departure made me a present of a horse, as an expression of gratitude for the restoration of his health."

Our traveller now took his leave of the chief, and joining a small caravan, proceeded to Salmas, and thence to Ooroomiah, where he arrived on the 7th of December; having been absent more than eight months. His joy at meeting with his beloved friends of the mission may better be conceived than described. The very sound of his native tongue was delightful; and the habits of civilized society were rendered agreeable by his long acquaintance with the manners of a semi-barbarous people; and to find a place of calm repose, after a pilgrimage so long and wearisome, could not but be peculiarly delightful. And his pleasure was greatly enhanced by the bright prospect of usefulness which now arose before him. His gratitude for preservation, through so many dangers, was heightened by the kindred sentiments of his

Christian friends at the station. "In all the perils," says he, "through which I had passed, the angel of the Lord had encamped round about me, for my deliverance, and it was sweet to unite in ascriptions of praise for the abounding mercies of our covenant-keeping God."

During the winter, two of the brothers of the patriarch, one of them his designated successor, paid a visit to Ooroomiah, and urged the missionaries to extend their labours through all parts of their country; and the patriarch himself wrote a cordial letter, renewing his invitation to Dr. Grant to repeat his visit in the spring. The following extract from his letter furnishes a pleasant example of the Oriental style, and of the earnest desire of the writer for the extension of the labours of the missionaries to his country. "With prayer and blessing!—My heart went with you, O doctor, in the day you went from me; but after I heard that you had arrived in safety, I greatly rejoiced. If you inquire of my affairs, and what I have to say, it is that word which we spoke. What I said to you before, is what I say now: you and I are one; and there is no change touching the things you heard from me. And again, may you be a blessing, and blessed with the blessings of God and the words of salvation. And may He give you joyful seasons and length of years, and remove and keep from you troubles and disquietudes."

Dr. Grant, to improve the favourable disposition of the patriarch, and to acquire further information of this interesting region, determined again to pass through the country of the Koords, on his return to his native land. Therefore, leaving Ooroomiah on the 7th of May, 1840, accompanied by his little son, Henry Martyn, then about four years of age; also, with the two bishops, Mar Yohannan and Mar Yousuph, coadjutors of the mission, he set off on his journey. At Salmas, they were joined by the two brothers of the patriarch already mentioned, and a number of Nestorians who were returning to their homes in the mountains, after spending the winter on the plains. Although the season was so far advanced, yet their way was rendered very difficult on account of the snow, which to a great depth lay in the valleys, and sometimes so obstructed the path as to render it impassable. The Koordish chief he did not see, as he was absent from his residence, but he was kindly received and entertained by the governor of the castle. Upon his arrival, Dr. G. found the bridge which led to the dwelling of the

patriarch, swept away ; so that access to it was cut off ; but he was so happy as to find the patriarch at the residence of Suleimah Bey, the then presiding Hakary chief, of Jûlamerk, with whom he was a guest. He received the doctor most cordially, and during a residence of ten days in the castle with the patriarch, all his former impressions of the importance of a mission to that country were renewed and strengthened. Indeed, the confidence and interest of the patriarch, instead of being diminished since his last visit, were manifestly increased : and he was joined in his entreaties that I would either remain, or speedily return, by the chief with whom he was now residing. On this journey, Dr. Grant had laid aside the flowing oriental robes, which he had before worn, and had resumed his usual dress, which made him an object of great curiosity among the people. In the eyes of those who had seen him on his former visit, his appearance was much deteriorated ; for he seemed now, in his American dress, to be a much smaller man. This appeared manifest to himself, when the chief asked permission to put on his dress, in which he exhibited himself in his harem, for the amusement of his ladies. After a time of agreeable intercourse with the patriarch and his people, Dr. Grant took his leave, and proceeded by the most direct rout through Erzeroom to Constantinople. Although it was now the month of June, he found the roads on the mountains impeded with large banks of snow. He passed by the town of Van or Wan, overlooked by an immense "rock of defence," which supports an ancient castle, and is embosomed in extensive, fruitful gardens. The most of the inhabitants are Armenians, who are said to number 40,000, in the district. The town is situated on an extensive lake of the same name, the water of which is so alkaline, that the people use it for making soap ; while the lake Ooroomiah is so salt, and leaves so much of this article as a sediment on the shore, that it is used for culinary purposes without purification. "Both Van and Ooroomiah," says Dr. G., are several thousand feet above the level of tide water." Here our traveler remained ten days, and met the Koordish chief, whom he had attended in his sickness at his castle of Bash-Kalleh. He still cherished the friendly feelings towards the doctor which he had at first entertained, and in which all his people appeared to participate. His condition, however, was considerably changed ; for he was now placed under the Turkish jurisdiction. The fierce chief had been induced to barter

his independence for an office under the pasha of Erzeroom; and he was now returning from that place to resume the government of his spirited clans, whom he had found too restless to be governed by his single arm. And foreseeing the probability of the extension of European influence over the East, he feared that at no distant period, his independence and his country might be wrested from him; he therefore deemed it wise to make such voluntary overtures as would enable him to retain his station as the immediate head of the Hakary tribes.

The value of foreign protection was experienced by Dr. G. on his journey from Van to Erzeroom; for while he was sleeping under the tent of a petty Koordish chief, one of the horses of the party was stolen in the night. He told the chief that he must see that it was restored, or he would make complaint to the English consul. The stolen horse, upon this, was soon brought back. On his arrival at Erzeroom, he had the pleasure of finding himself surrounded by a circle of Christian friends, among whom were two of his own countrymen; "but," he observes, "in this distant land, after having experienced so much kindness from Englishmen, he found it difficult to recognize any national distinction." The welcome now received from his English friends was most cordial and gratifying. From one of whom he received letters of introduction to Lord Ponsonby, the British ambassador, at Constantinople; and when he arrived there, and delivered his letters, he received from his lordship the warmest assurances of a disposition to afford all necessary countenance and protection to the mission contemplated among the mountain Nestorians, in whose condition and prospects he manifested a lively interest.

From Constantinople Dr. Grant proceeded in a steamer to the city of Smyrna, where he embarked in a small merchantman, and after a passage of seventy days, arrived safely at Boston on the 8th day of October, 1840.

The second, or larger part of Dr. Grant's book, is occupied with an attempt to prove, that the Nestorians of the mountains, are the descendants of the tribes of Israel carried into captivity by the Assyrian kings. The two tribes and a half, residing east of Jordan, were first carried away, as is recorded in 1 Chron. v. 26. "And the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul, king of Assyria, and the spirit of Tilgath-pilneser, king of Assyria, and he carried them away, even the Reubenites and the Gadites, and the half



tribe of Manasseh, and brought them unto Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and to the river Gozan, to this day." By comparing this record with what we read in 2 Kings, xv. 19, 29, it would seem, that Pul, though his spirit was stirred to come against the land of Israel, was induced by the consideration of a large sum of money, which Menahem the king exacted from the people, to return without executing his purpose; but Tilgath-pilneser, his son, who succeeded him, had his spirit also stirred within him to come against the people of Israel. This second invasion took place in the days of Pekah, king of Israel, when the afore-mentioned king of Assyria took, not only the inhabitants of Gilead and of the other cities east of the Jordan, captives, but all those of Galilee, and all the land of Naphtali. Between the first invasion by Pul, and the second by Tilgath-pilneser, about thirty years are supposed to have elapsed; and the first invasion to have occurred about 770 years before the birth of Christ, and the transportation of the people about 740 years before the advent. The second recorded transportation of the people of Israel occurred in the reign of Hoshea, king of Israel. At first, Hoshea made his peace with Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, by giving presents; but breaking his engagements with this monarch, to whom he had become tributary, he came into the land and besieged Samaria, the capital, three years; and in the ninth year of Hoshea, the city was taken, and Shalmaneser carried away the people captive, and placed them "in Halah, and in Habor, by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."

This second transportation of Israel occurred within less than twenty years after the first by Tilgath-pilneser. And it is remarkable, that they were located in the very same country to which their brethren had been carried; that is "in Halah and Habor, and the river Gozan." The only difference is, that in the former captivity "Hara" is mentioned, and in the latter "the cities of the Medes." Bishop Patrick is of opinion, that Hara signifies the mountainous district of Media. But Professor Robinson conjectures, that the word "Hara" has probably crept into the text by the carelessness of transcribers, as it is not in the LXX. or Syriac.

Dr. Grant very properly commences his investigation, by endeavouring to ascertain the situation of that part of Assyria in which these captives were planted. He seems to show, with considerable probability, that Halah was a city



not more than a day's journey from Nineveh, which has been the seat of a Nestorian archbishop. Habor, he makes to be the name of a river, which rises in the mountains of Assyria, and which retains its name unchanged, to this very day. Gozan, according to his interpretation of the text, was the province through which this river flowed. In this very region, the Nestorians are now situated; who still retain, as our author thinks, so many of the peculiarities of the Israelitish nation, as to render it more than probable that they are their descendants. And if it has been made out that this is the country to which the ten tribes were carried, there is the strongest probability that the present inhabitants of that region, or at least a part of them are the descendants of those who anciently inhabited that country. For, in general, the bulk of a nation, not leading a migratory life, continue on the same ground, amidst all the revolutions and conquests which may sweep over them. There is, therefore, in the absence of all testimony to the contrary, an intrinsic probability that the descendants of those tribes are now resident in the country to which their forefathers were carried. In confirmation of his opinion, that the country afterwards called Adiabene, in Assyria, was the country of these captives, our author refers to a speech of king Agrippa, to the whole nation of the Jews, assembled in council at Jerusalem, in which the fact is alluded to, as well known to all, that the ten tribes were then in this very region. And this speech was delivered more than seven centuries after their captivity. Now, the country formerly known by the name of Adiabene is precisely the region now inhabited by the Nestorians; and while there are more than a hundred thousand Nestorians, the number of Jews is inconsiderable. And in the neighbouring country of Media, there are twenty thousand Nestorians, and not a tenth part as many Jews. The number of Nestorians on the north-west of the river Habor has not been ascertained, but they are said to be numerous. The whole Nestorian population in Assyria and Media, is probably not less than two hundred thousand; while the Jewish population, in the same region, does not exceed twenty thousand. Now can it be supposed, that these are the only remaining descendants of the ten tribes in the country, when they were in such multitudes carried thither? The result of the whole to which our author comes, and which to us has much appearance of probability, is, that the Nestorians are to be considered the pos-

terity of these ancient Israelites; who retained their national characteristics until they were converted to Christianity; and do still retain many of the peculiarities of their nation, as our author takes much pains to show, in the sequel of the work.

If the ground work has been solidly laid, then one of two things must be supposed, either that the present inhabitants of this region are the lineal descendants of the ten tribes, or that those having been removed, the Nestorians succeeded them as inhabitants of this region. Our author, then, in prosecution of his object, goes on to show that the Israelites were never removed from this region. In confirmation of this, he takes the following positions: 1. That we have no evidence of their having been removed. 2. That they did not return with the captivity from Babylon. 3. That the ten tribes were in the land of their captivity in the first century of the Christian era; for proof of which Josephus is cited, who says, that only two tribes are subject to the Romans, while ten are beyond the Euphrates. 4. That they were in the land of their captivity, as late as the fifth century; which is expressly and repeatedly asserted by Jerome. 5. That the ten tribes are to this day in the land of their captivity. Here he refers to Dr. Buchanan, and introduces a long quotation from this learned author. But finally and chiefly, Dr. Grant depends on the Bible to sustain his positions, and cites a prophecy, bearing on this subject, from Isaiah ch. xi. "It shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left from Assyria," &c. And again, "With his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over the river, and there shall be a highway for the remnant of his people, which shall be left from Assyria."

The next source of evidence which Dr. G. relies upon, in support of his favourite opinion that the Nestorians are the descendants of the ten tribes of Israel, is the testimony of the Jews residing in that country; and the language which they speak. He considers it as ordered by Providence, that a few of the posterity of these tribes should still continue in the religion of their ancestors, as they, on account of the opposition subsisting between them and the Nestorians, are qualified to give an unexceptionable testimony to the common origin of both parties. And such testimony, he informs us, they unequivocally bear. And this, it cannot be denied,

ought to have no small weight in deciding this question; for what motive could these Jews have, for asserting, that the Nestorians, whom they hate, were originally of the same stock with themselves, if it were not indeed a fact?

But a stronger argument still, may be derived from the identity of their language. Not that either party speaks the Hebrew language, but both, a dialect of the Syriac. The Nestorians declare this to be the fact, and our traveller, from opportunities of extensive observation, has no doubt of it. He says, "I have heard Nestorians of Ooroomiah converse with Jews of Amâdîeh, without knowing from their language, that they were Jews; and I can now converse with the Jews of Ooroomiah, with the same ease, in their language, that I can with the Nestorians of the mountains, in theirs."

The testimony of the Rev. Mr. Holladay, who has composed a grammar of the modern Syriac, is to the point. "The language of the Nestorians of Ooroomiah," he remarks, "differs so little from that of the Jews in the same city, that I can consider it only as a dialect of the same. This language, and the dialects which I have heard spoken by individuals belonging to several of the mountain tribes of Nestorians, had evidently a common origin." Mr. Stocking, another missionary, who has become familiar with the vulgar Syriac, spoken by the Nestorians, and has aided in reducing it to system, likewise testifies to its common origin with that of the Jews of this province. "I have repeatedly conversed with the Jews of Ooroomiah," says he, "in the language of the Nestorians, which is so similar to their own, that they both naturally use their respective languages as the common medium of communication with each other. It is evident that they are only different dialects of the same language." And Dr. G. remarks, that they could not have learned it from each other, for the Nestorians and Jews have scarcely any communication with each other, except in the casual transaction of business. "How came the Nestorians and Jews of this region by this common Syriac language? Neither of them could have acquired it here, as it was never vernacular, east of the Euphrates." The only link in the chain to render this argument almost irresistible is, to show that the Syriac was the language of the ten tribes when carried captive. And therefore, to establish this point, our author takes no small pains. The arguments which he uses are partly historical, and partly derived from the long

and frequent intercourse and alliance of the ten tribes with the Syrians; and by whom they were also often subjected, so as to become tributary, as we learn from the sacred history. And it cannot be disputed, that when our Saviour was on earth, and long before, a dialect of the Syriac was the vernacular tongue of the Jews in Palestine. When these tribes were separated from the other two tribes, by the worship of the calves set up by Jeroboam, it would be natural and easy to widen that separation, by inducing them, by degrees, to adopt the language of their idolatrous neighbours, with whom they had most intercourse. Now, as both the Jews and Nestorians, on the east of the Euphrates, speak the language used by the ten tribes before their captivity, it certainly furnishes a strong argument in favour of their descent from these tribes. Had this been the country in which the Syriac tongue was vernacular, the evidence would not be so conclusive; as it might in that case be supposed, that the captive Israelites had adopted the language of the people among whom they lived. And if it be true, that these tribes spake the Syriac language, and that they were removed from the country where they were at first located, how incredible would it have been that another people coming in their place, should speak the same language, which was not vernacular, in all that region?

The next argument which Dr. Grant adduces to prove that the Nestorians are the descendants of the ten tribes, is derived from the names which have been given to them; and which can be accounted for upon no other supposition. *BENI ISRAEL* is commonly used to designate the Nestorians. Ask any intelligent man among them respecting their origin, and he will at once reply, that "we are sons of Israel." This name is also distinctly mentioned by writers who give an account of the Christians of Persia, as an evidence of their relation to the Jewish nation. The term *NAZARENES* has also been used by themselves and others in application to the Nestorians; and it is known to all, that this was the name of that branch of the early Christian church who were converts from the Jews. Indeed, the name is older than that of "Christian;" and though at first applied to all the followers of Jesus of Nazareth, yet as the first disciples were originally Jews, and as some difference of religious usage took place between the converts from Judaism and those from the gentiles, the name was at a very early period appropriated to those Christians who were of Jewish origin,



and who continued to observe some of the Jewish customs. The argument from this name is, however, weakened by the consideration that in the East this name is very commonly applied to any and all Christians, by the Mohammedans.

The name "NESTORIANS," by which they are usually spoken of by others, is one which they dislike, and seldom use in application to themselves. The reason is, because they do not wish to be confounded with the ancient sect of heretics, so denominated. They deny that they derived, either their doctrines or their rites from Nestorius; for, while they approve of the opposition made by him to the worship of images, and to the use of the unscriptural phrase "the mother of God," in application to the virgin Mary; yet they maintain none of the errors which have been ascribed to him; and our author does not pretend that all who are denominated Nestorians, were Israelites by descent. Neither is it asserted that all the existing descendants of the ten tribes, are now to be found in this region. Many of them, it is probable, have migrated to different countries.

Another argument, of no small weight, is derived from the practice of certain rites and ceremonies, by the Nestorians, which evidently are of Jewish origin. Indeed, the use of certain sacrifices of the Levitical law, is still retained among them; for although they believe, that by the one offering of Christ, the Lamb of God, for the sins of his people, all the sacrifices which prefigured the atonement are abolished; yet, they are of opinion, that votive and free-will offerings, commonly called "*peace offerings*," may still, with propriety be made. Thus when they would express their gratitude for a recovery from sickness, they bring the animal and slay it at the door of the church, and sprinkle some of the blood, on the lintel and the posts. The right shoulder of the slain animal belongs to the officiating priest, as does also the skin. Who can avoid recognizing the Levitical law, in these usages? But the conformity to the Jewish ritual does not stop here. The animal is eaten by the offerer and by his friends; and sometimes, a portion is sent to every house in the village, and especially to the poor; and it is a custom to eat the whole of the flesh on the day on which it is offered.

The Nestorians themselves, consider these sacrifices as a remnant of their ancient Israelitish customs, retained since their conversion from Judaism. There are other customs, among the Nestorians, which appear to have existed among



the Jews only. Such is the vow sometimes made in the event that a child is bestowed upon them, in answer to their prayers, that it shall be devoted to the service of the Lord, all the days of his life; and if a son, they educate him for the church; but if a daughter, that her marriage dowry shall be given to the Lord; and in some rare cases, she is devoted to a life of celibacy; in which case, her marriage dowry may be given for her redemption, if she should not consent to the original terms of the vow. Who that has read the history of Hannah can doubt, that this custom was derived from the Jews? "The most intelligent priest in the employ of this mission," says Dr. G., "was devoted to the service of God by his mother, who like Hannah, asked him of the Lord under a solemn vow." The vow of the Nazarite is also retained among the Nestorians; and other vows are very common among them; and although this custom is found among Mohammedans, its origin is undoubtedly Jewish. "First fruits are to this day presented to the Lord by the Independent Nestorians, as they were among the Jews, of old. The first ripe fruits of their fields, gardens, and vineyards, are presented to God, before the harvest is gathered; and as their flocks comprise their chief wealth, they also set apart the first fruits of the dairy, as an offering to the Lord." In some parts of the Nestorian country, however, first fruits have ceased, on account of the poverty of the people; and for the same reason, tithes have been discontinued. The Sabbath is regarded with a sacredness no where else observed among the Christians of the east. Formerly, a man would have been put to death for travelling or labouring on the Sabbath; but the custom has been discontinued, since their acquaintance with the practice of other Christians. Even now, some of their tribes will not on any account kindle a fire on the Sabbath. They have also, as the Jews, a preparation for the Sabbath, commencing about three hours before sunset, on the Saturday, at which time all labour ceases, except what is necessary to prepare for the Sabbath. They have also, in their churches, a sanctuary, which can be entered by none but the priests, and by these only when fasting; and when by any accident this holy place is desecrated, it cannot be used until it is consecrated anew to the service of God. They have even imitated the "holy of holies," in their churches; for a small recess, in the wall, is called by that name. Other parts of their churches, bear the names

of parts of the temple of the Jews; and the Nestorians feel much the same reverence for their churches, as did the Jews for their temple. As by the Mosaic law, the touch of a dead body produced contamination the same is the case among the Nestorians; except that, they consider Christians as purified by their baptism; so that no uncleanness is contracted by touching their bodies; nevertheless, they always purify themselves after attending a funeral. A woman, after child-birth, cannot enter the church for forty days, when the child is a male; and she is debarred for a still longer time, when she has given birth to a female. Seven days, she is regarded as unclean, and can touch no food or utensils, but what is appropriated to her own use. On the eighth day, the child may be baptized; as the Nestorians are of opinion, that baptism comes in the place of circumcision. After which, she may attend to her usual domestic occupations, but must touch no hallowed thing, nor enter any hallowed place, until her forty days are accomplished; or, in case the child is a female, her separation extends to sixty days. The requisition of the Jewish law has been shortened, as a privilege enjoyed under the gospel dispensation. Swine's flesh, and other things forbidden in the Levitical law, are held in nearly as great abhorrence, as with the Jews; yet intercourse with other Christians has produced a considerable change in the sentiments of many of the people. This change, however, is far less among the Nestorians of the mountains, than amongst those of the plains. Formerly, they would not so much as touch, much less eat the flesh of swine. Their fasts and festivals, also, bear a close analogy to those of the ancient Jews. Like the Pharisees, they fast twice in the week, and they attach great importance to these observances. The passover, they observe as their principal festival, and call it by the original name, *pascha*, but instead of a slaughtered lamb, they eat the Lord's Supper, as having come in the place of the ancient sacrifice. As they consider circumcision as being succeeded by baptism, they do not practise this rite, but they never baptize their children until the eighth day, when this ordinance is commonly administered by immersion, but not uniformly. If all the above sentiments and usages do not prove a Jewish origin, we do not know what would be deemed sufficient. To us, they furnish conclusive evidence, that these people have derived their origin from some branch of the Abrahamic nation; and as they certainly occupy a

region either the same, or near to the residence of the ten tribes, we see no good reasons to lead us to dissent from the conclusion, drawn by our pious and enterprising missionary. The similarity of most of the Jews in physiognomy, as far as we have seen them, is striking; so that, in most cases, a descendant of Abraham can be known by this mark. No doubt, however, this characteristic varies in different parts of the world; but as there are Jews dwelling in that land, whose forefathers have resided there from time immemorial, it will furnish some evidence of the identity of race, if a similarity between the physiognomy of these and the Nestorians is observable and is strongly marked. And to this point, the testimony of Dr. Grant is very strong. "Even," says he, "the nations who are accustomed to discriminate by the features between the various classes of people, are often unable to distinguish a Nestorian from a Jew: and I have taxed my own powers with no better success. While Nestorians and Jews have been seated together before me, I have in vain endeavoured to find some distinguishing mark between them, in the features or general contour of the face." Something may also be learned from the Israelitish origin of their names. Sometimes in a circle of a dozen Nestorians, there will not be found one who has not a Jewish name. The doctor informs us, that out of forty-five scholars in the mission seminary, thirty-two had Jewish names, found in the Bible, a list of which he gives.

Although the Nestorians are still divided into tribes, corresponding in number very nearly with the ancient Israelites, yet very few of them are able to trace their genealogy to the particular tribe from which they are descended, as is the case with the Jews; but a few of them profess to have preserved among them an undoubted and unbroken tradition, not only that they are the descendants of the ten tribes—which they all believe—but also of the particular tribe to which they belong. The most remarkable instance of this kind is found in the family of the patriarch, the most intelligent in the nation. They declare with confidence that they belong to the tribe of Naphtali; "a claim," observes our author, "that certainly savours little of vanity. If the assertion be not founded in truth, why do they not claim affinity with the sacerdotal or royal tribes? What possible motive can they have for courting an alliance with the humble son of a handmaid? The highest family in the nation setting up an unfounded claim

to a connexion with the most humble—with one of the least distinguished of all the ancient tribes !” They admit, however, that they are not in possession of any ancient records, or tables, by which to verify their tradition : these, they say, were lost about sixty years ago, with a large number of manuscripts, in conveying them across the river Zab. It is also worthy of notice, that the civil head of each tribe is distinguished by the official name, *Melek*. In the government of the Nestorians, there is also a remarkable similarity to the theocracy of the ancient Hebrews. Among them the patriarch exercises a power over the tribes, corresponding very exactly with that of the High Priest over the tribes of Israel. It is a fact, also, that they retain the ancient custom of committing the punishment of murder to the nearest relatives of the deceased ; and the kinsman on whom this duty devolves, if he neglects to avenge the blood of his brother, or near relative, is rendered infamous in his tribe and nation. And as the Jews had cities of refuge, to which the manslayer might flee, and where he might remain safe from danger, unless upon impartial inquiry it was found that he had maliciously perpetrated the act ; so among the Nestorians, their churches are all places of refuge to which the manslayer may flee for security ; and where he may remain in safety until the elders have decided on his case.

It might at first view seem probable, that by this time the descendants of the ten tribes would be much mingled with other nations, among whom they dwelt, and by whom they were surrounded, but their geographical position, and other circumstances have been such as to preserve them from being mingled with the gentiles. They have been, and are still, a peculiar people. “ Although surrounded by Persians, Turks, Koords, Arabs, Armenians, Jews, and Yezidees, they have very little intercourse with any of them, and admit none into their country, except on particular business ; and then only such as are well known, or who come with the sanction of their chief men. Their secluded retreat is so walled around with adamantine barriers, and is so easily defended, that their enemies have never been able to scale their mountain ramparts ; so that they have remained, for ages, almost shut out from the world around them. Their civil condition, and religious customs also, greatly assist in preserving them distinct from other nations. With the Moslems they cannot intermarry if they would. The Armenians are the only people with whom they could mingle, but the



worship of images among these, is sufficient to keep the Nestorians separated from them, as they detest this worship.

Dr. Grant has brought forward a number of particulars, in which the domestic and civil customs of the Nestorians bear a remarkable similarity to those of the ancient Hebrews. We have not room to introduce any of these details, but the curious reader will find them in the ninth chapter of the second part of this volume.

Upon a review of the whole subject, we are led to make the following remarks :

We do not know whence the opinion has arisen, that there was something mysterious and extraordinary in the history of the ten tribes. If they have been lost sight of, and have been long unknown, nothing has occurred in regard to them, but what has happened to nearly all the nations of antiquity. By continual wars, revolutions, captivities, and voluntary emigrations, the descendants of all ancient nations have become so mingled and amalgamated, that no one can now ascertain the descendants of any people, however great and powerful, who formerly inhabited any particular country. To this general fact, the Jews furnish, the solitary exception. And their case is so singular in comparison with other ancient nations, that their remaining for so many centuries distinct from the nations among whom they have been dispersed, has appeared to many a kind of standing miracle; at any rate, all have acknowledged that their case is singular and remarkable. If, then, the ten tribes have been lost by being mingled with the nations among whom they lived, nothing extraordinary has occurred; but that has happened to them, which has to almost all ancient nations. Their descendants may be so mingled with other nations that they can no longer be distinguished, or their relation to the ancient Israelites identified. And we know of no important reason why it should be assumed as true, that these tribes must still exist in a distinct national state. Because this has been the fact in regard to the descendants of the Jews inhabiting Palestine, it furnishes no proof that the same thing must have happened to the ten tribes. Our author does indeed attempt to prove from prophecy, that they were to remain a distinct people until re-united to the other two tribes, but the evidence appears to us feeble, and the reasoning in support of the position obscure. If Dr. Grant has found these lost tribes, and can identify them, we shall be well pleased with the discovery; but we do not see its importance.



On the return of the Israelites after the seventy years captivity in Babylon, under the decree of Cyrus and his successors, it is probable that many of the ten tribes returned also, for the liberty given was not confined to the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, but extended to all who might choose to return. The language of the decree was, "Who is there among you of all his people? His God be with him," &c. "And whosoever remaineth in any place where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help him with silver and with gold, and with goods, and with beasts," &c. No doubt the major part who returned were of Judah and Benjamin, who had been more recently carried away from their country. And in accordance with this, we read, "Then rose up the chief of the fathers of Judah and Benjamin, and the priests and the Levites;" but it is added, "*with all them whose spirit God had raised, to go up and build the house of the Lord, which is in Jerusalem.*" Many of the places mentioned, to which certain families belonged, seem to have been cities appertaining to Ephraim or some other of the ten tribes. And the fact, that of the company who returned, there were many who were unable to understand the Hebrew language, but needed to have it translated into Chaldee, affords evidence that such were of the tribes first carried away captive. It would seem, from all the accounts we have recorded, that a very small portion even of Judah and Benjamin did at first actually return; but the probability is, that there would be large accessions to their number, every year, especially after the temple was re-edified.

When a nation are known to have inhabited a certain region, the presumption always is that their descendants will be found inhabiting the same, unless we have positive testimony that they have been removed, or driven out of the land, or exterminated. If, therefore, Dr. Grant has been successful in ascertaining that the country now inhabited by the independent Nestorians, is the very country to which the ten tribes were carried, this itself is a strong presumption in favour of the opinion, that the present inhabitants of that country are the descendants of the former inhabitants; especially as the country is one not easily invaded or conquered by a foreign foe. At any rate, this circumstance prepares the way for our lending a favourable ear to other evidences of the fact, such as are accumulated by Dr. Grant in this volume. If he is correct in fixing the location of the ten tribes, then it appears to us that he has made out his case.

As to the other theories of the ten tribes which have been advocated by one and another, they have always appeared to us destitute of all plausibility. But if the statements and facts of Dr. Grant are accurately given, we confess that it appears exceedingly probable, that these Nestorians are indeed the seed of Abraham, and the real descendants of the captive Israelites and that they were converted to Christianity at a very early period after its first propagation. It would be very natural for some of the apostles to visit their brethren of the dispersion in this country. We know that Paul, though especially the apostle of the gentiles, yet in every city whither he came, made the first offer of the gospel to the Jews; and as the residue of the ten tribes appear to have been well known in those days, it seems highly probable that there is foundation for the ancient tradition, that several of the apostles visited these children of Israel, and preached the gospel to them. The name "Nestorians" seems to mislead, as we know that this sect did not arise until the sixth century. But they disclaim the name; and the probability is, that this sect having spread very much in the surrounding countries, the name was given at last to all Christians who inhabited these regions.

While we cannot but admit that Dr. Grant has made out a strong case, and has probably discovered a part, at least, of the descendants of these tribes, we are not prepared to yield assent to all the proofs which he has adduced. His application of the prophecies has not served to increase our conviction, derived from his other testimonies. And although we do not attach any high degree of importance to the discovery, yet we think it must interest every believer in the Bible to find among the professors of the Christian religion so many of the seed of Abraham, "the father of the faithful," and "the friend of God."

But Dr. Grant is not the only one who professes to have recently discovered the remnants of the ten tribes. The Rev. JACOB SAMUEL, *Senior Missionary to the Jews*, for India, Persia, and Arabia, has published a work in London very recently, entitled, "THE REMNANT FOUND, OR, THE PLACE OF ISRAEL'S HIDING DISCOVERED, *being a summary of proofs, showing that the Jews of Daghistan, on the Caspian Sea, are the remnant of the Ten Tribes--the result of personal investigation during a missionary tour of eight months in Georgia.*" Mr. Samuel, himself born a Jew, has been employed as a missionary to the Jews, by a Society in

India, and thinks that he has found a remnant of the ten tribes in a mountainous and almost inaccessible country, on the west of the Caspian Sea. These people observe the pass-over with many ceremonies, which he describes. They also observe the Feast of Weeks, and the day of Atonement with great solemnity. Likewise, the Feast of Tabernacles,—the Feast of Dedication, or Inauguration. They also observe the Jewish Sabbath. They are entirely ignorant of the oral law, and the traditions followed by the Jews, elsewhere. They practise circumcision, and consider it a rite of the highest importance, and nothing will induce them to defer it even for a single day, though the child be ever so sick. They differ from the other Jews, who are regulated by the Talmud in their ceremonies, in many particulars. They are in possession of a few manuscript copies of the law of Moses, which are divided, like ours, into five books. They are written in the original Hebrew character, without any division of chapters, sentences, or points; which manuscripts they hold to be very ancient, and which they will not part with on any account. Their copies are said to agree with ours, except in a few small particulars. The last chapter of Deuteronomy (probably added by Ezra) is wanting in their copies. They have no copies of the other books of the Old Testament, except a fragment of Esther. It is remarkable, that they have among them neither priests nor Levites; of which thing their explanation is, that when Jeroboam set up the calves, the priests and Levites forsook them. They differ from the other Jews principally in this, that they know nothing of the rules contained in the Talmud, which most other Jews consider as binding as the written law. They, like the other Jews, do not acknowledge the Apocrypha. Indeed, they are totally ignorant of the books so called. Before the Russians took possession of Georgia, they had no printed books, and knew nothing of printed copies of the scriptures. "This," says our author, "is another proof that the Massorah, and the divers critical remarks upon the punctuation, have not originally accompanied the text from Mount Sinai, nor can they have been invented in the time of Ezra, for the Jews in Kurdistan, who have been in communication with their brethren in Babylon and Syria, ever since the return from the captivity, are in a great measure ignorant of the points. This fact is sufficient to show that they were not invented by Ezra, nor by the men of the great synagogue. And from the fact, that all the traditions and

compositions that are found in the possession of the Jews throughout the world are without points, we may safely conclude that the Masoretic notes were introduced by the doctors of the school of Tiberias, and were perfected between the ninth and eleventh centuries of the Christian era."

Their sacred places are called "houses of prayer." These buildings are not consecrated to divine worship, like our churches, but are used as school houses for children, places of conversation, or for assemblies of any kind. On festival days, they resort to these places to receive instruction from the elders. These, the author asserts, were identical with the "schools of the prophets and seers," where the people assembled for religious worship and instruction. These buildings consist of a stone wall enclosing a quadrangle, and entered by a gate. They are divided into several apartments, in one of which is an earthen vessel, in which are deposited their manuscripts; and one is reserved for strangers. In these, any stranger is permitted to lodge, and to join in their worship if he chooses to do so. After prayer, they are accustomed to embrace each other as friends.

There is another place where the Jews of the mountains assemble, called "The Tabernacle of Nab." This is a small building, surrounded by trees, and built on a hill, where the people assemble for music and dancing.

A third place of assembling is on the Koisoo river, which rises in the Caucasian mountains, and flows into the Attala, which enters the Caspian Sea. This place is called "The Tabernacle of Shiloh." To this the Jews of Daghistan resort, on the three great festivals. This is the only place from which females are prohibited; probably, because by the law only males were required to attend on the three annual festivals. Here prayers are offered up, the cornet is blown, and allegories are recited; and at the close, the benediction found in Numbers vi. 25, 26, 27, is pronounced.

The Jews in Daghistan are very hospitable. When any one of their brethren, whom they call *neighbours*, comes to them, he is immediately received with cordiality and feasted sumptuously, and may remain as long as he will. The words used in salutation on meeting a stranger are, "Blessed be thou of Jehovah!" The answer is, "The blessing of Jehovah be on thee!" All differences among them are decided by the "Father of the house;" or if his decision be unsatisfactory, there is an appeal to the "Chiefs of the community," who decide every thing in the congregation. This seems to



be in exact accordance with the mode of administering justice instituted by Moses, and practised always in the Hebrew republic.

They are fully persuaded that they will be restored to the land of their forefathers, where they expect another temple to be built, and sacrifices to be offered, according to the law of Moses.

Our author gives an account of another set of Jews, whom he found scattered all over the country, in a state of abject slavery. Their lives, their property, and their persons, are at the absolute disposal of their masters, whom they serve as long as they live. Since the Russians took possession of the country, the condition of these degraded people has been somewhat improved. The power of capital punishment is taken from their masters, and, at present, they are placed on the same footing as the serfs, in other parts of Russia. Of course they are very ignorant, and have no means of educating their children. Commonly they are permitted to abstain from work on the seventh day. Their tradition is, that they were brought from the land of Judea in ships. It is highly probable, therefore, that they are the descendants of the Jews sold into slavery by the Romans, after the destruction of Jerusalem. The country in which these Jews reside is called *Imiriti*, and Mr. Samuel computes the number of families at fifteen or sixteen thousand. He mentions also two other districts, in which Jews much resembling these reside, in the same condition of abject slavery.

This account of the "Remnant of the Ten Tribes" found in <sup>the</sup> Daghistan and the neighbouring districts, is, in no degree, inconsistent with the theory of Dr. Grant; for it is probable from the Bible history, that the captives were pretty widely dispersed.

The sentiments of the Rev. Mr. Samuel respecting this discovery may be learned from the following quotation: "This discovery of the ten tribes at the present important crisis must appear a wonderful event. The preservation of them through so many ages, in the very heart of their enemies, must be acknowledged as a most signal act of divine Providence; and we need no stronger or more convincing proof of the time of their restoration being at hand, when they shall be taken from the place of their interment for nearly two thousand five hundred years, and be restored to their own land, to share with their brethren of the house of Judah the splendour of the Messiah's kingdom. No people

on earth have been scattered like rain in an immense body of waters amongst the nations, like them; and yet they still live distinct; and though the distinction of tribes and families is in a great measure lost among them, yet they have preserved their national character as the Israel of God.

“Whatever difficulty and perplexity there may exist in chronological records of their tribes, they have been preserved for the great day, which is now fast approaching; when the Lord shall stretch forth his hand to redeem his people a second time, ‘And say unto them, thus saith the Lord God, behold I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt, and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children’s children for ever, and my servant David shall be their prince for ever.’ Ezek. xxxvii. 21, 25. ‘Then shall they know that I am the Lord their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen; but I have gathered them into their own land, and have left none of them any more there. Neither will I hide my face any more from them; for I have poured out my spirit upon the house of Israel, saith the Lord God.’ Ezek. xxxix. 28, 29.” “I trust,” says the author, “that all conjectures regarding the ten tribes are at an end, for we have found their hiding place, and shall give their history at large, if the Lord permits.”

It will gratify curiosity to hear this author’s opinion respecting other Jews found in the East—

“The BENI ISRAEL in Bombay,” says he, “I believe to be the original descendants of Fatur, the son of Ishmael, who were admitted into the Jewish church by the rite of circumcision only, during the reign of Aristobulus.

“The Jews of Cochin emigrated after the destruction of the second temple, between the second and third century of the Christian era.

“The black Jews are none other than the proselytes made from the slaves of the former.

“The Jews of China are the same as those of Cochin.

“The Jews of Yemen are the descendants of the numerous robbers dispersed in the days of Herod the Great.

“The Jews of Abyssinia are the descendants of the numerous slaves who were proselytes at the court of Solomon.

“The Jews of Hadjirah are the descendants of the Rechabites.

“The Jews in Persia are a mixture of all tribes.

“The Jews of Georgia are the remnant of the half tribe of Manasseh.

“The Jews near the Caspian Sea are the descendants of the tribes of Gad and Dan.

“The Jews of Bokhara and Turkistan are the remnant of the mixed multitude that came with queen Helena and her son from Jerusalem.

“The rest of the Jews in Asia, including Syria and Mesopotamia; and in Europe, viz. Italy, Spain, &c., are all descendants of the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin.

“I shall trace the time of their arrival in each country, with their present position, their customs and manners, &c., in ‘THE COMPLETE HISTORY OF THE JEWS.’”

In the Appendix to Mr. Samuel’s published volume, there are some curious documents, which our space does not permit us further to notice. We shall wait, with some expectation, to receive the “Complete History of the Jews,” which this author, himself a native Jew, has promised. He has undoubtedly enjoyed uncommon advantages for becoming acquainted with the scattered remnants of Israel.

*J. A. Packard*

ART IV.—1. *Reports of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland for the years 1834 to 1839 inclusive.*

2. *Reports of the Committee to the Annual Meeting of the Society for promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland, held in Kildare Place, Dublin 1839 and 1840.*
3. *Speech of the Lord Bishop of Norwich in the British House of Lords, May 21, 1838, on the National System of Education in Ireland, with an appendix of Letters on the causes of the opposition made to the system in Ireland, &c., signed “T.”* Parker, London. 1838.
4. *Irish Education. Speech of Thomas Wyse, Esq., M. P., in the House of Commons, May 19, 1835, on moving for leave to bring in a bill for the establishment of a Board of Education in Ireland, &c. To which is added the bill, documents, &c.*
5. *Thoughts on the mixed character of government institutions in Ireland, with particular reference to the Sys-*

- tem of National Education.* By Rev. James Carlisle, one of the Commissioners &c.
6. *Defence of the National System of Education in Ireland, in reply to the letters of J. C. Colquhoun, Esq. M. P.* By the same.
7. *State Education; considered with reference to prevalent misconceptions on religious grounds.* By Rev. Baden Powell, Professor, &c. in the University of Oxford. London: Parker. 1840.

SOME of the most perplexing questions that have ever puzzled political educators, have arisen under the school systems of IRELAND, and they have grown, to some extent, out of the peculiar position of parties. There is the anomaly of a Roman Catholic nation under a Protestant government. The Roman Catholics outnumber the Protestants in the proportion of nearly five to one; and in 1837, out of 106,000 children at the public schools, 90,500 were Roman Catholics, leaving only 15,500 Protestants.

Under the auspices of a society incorporated in 1733, there existed for nearly a century a very singular order of schools called *Protestant charter schools*, to which, from 1800 to 1829 an average grant of \$120,000 was made by government. They established day-schools for the education of such children as could be supported at home; and boarding schools, where they were not only instructed, but fed, clothed, lodged and apprenticed.

It is not surprising that such a process, controlled by Protestant influence should wean those who were educated under it, from the Catholic faith in which most of them were born. Would that Protestant parents in our day were awake to the power of such an influence when brought to bear on their own children in Roman Catholic schools. From 1775 to 1803, a bye-law existed, restricting the advantages of the charter schools to the children of Roman Catholics. For ninety years this society instructed, on an average, one hundred and forty children annually. A parliamentary inquiry instituted in 1825, brought to light so many abuses in their schools that the government grants were withheld. Our last accounts state that they have still ten schools under their care, in which upwards of five hundred children are trained.

In the year 1786 a school was established in School-street, an obscure part of the suburbs of Dublin, so regulated



(it was said,) that children, of all classes and persuasions, might be admitted and instructed without offence to religious peculiarities. The Bible was used without note or comment. This school, in process of time, became one of the largest and most popular schools in the country. The exclusion of *special religious* instruction, (which its principles seemed to make necessary,) was, however, regarded as an objectionable feature: and in 1800 (the year of the Union of Ireland with England) an educational society was formed, called "*The Association for discountenancing vice,*" the principle of which was that all catechisms should be excluded from their schools save that of the Church of England; and that the scriptures should be read only in the authorized or Protestant version.

This association began to establish schools in 1806, and received aid from the government till 1831; sometimes to the amount of \$50,000 per annum. Four or five years since they had in their schools 10,000 Protestant and 4000 Roman Catholic children.

In 1811, (Dec. 2,) a society was formed "for promoting the Education of the Poor in Ireland," designed to introduce a more general and acceptable plan than "the Association for discountenancing vice" offered. They held their meetings in School-street, whither they were attracted by the famous school just now mentioned, and which they adopted as a model school for the illustration of their principles. These principles were, substantially, that the society should be managed by persons of different denominations; that any person might become a member by paying a guinea annually; that no religious distinction should be made in the admission of pupils, the course of instruction, or the appointment of teachers; that the Bible or New Testament should be read by ALL the scholars who were sufficiently advanced to read it, but should not be used as a school-book, from which to teach spelling or reading, and that all catechisms and books of religious controversy should be excluded. The use of either the Protestant or Roman Catholic version of the scriptures was considered optional with the directors or teachers of the schools.

In 1812, the attention of the government was drawn to the low state of education in Ireland, and it was ascertained that the whole number of children at school was but about 200,000, and moreover that most of the schools were miserably inefficient, and often decidedly mischievous in their

influence. It was thereupon determined, that a Board of Commissioners should be established to receive and dispose of parliamentary grants, and have the general control of the educational interests of Ireland. It was admitted to be highly important that among the books to be used, there should be an ample volume of "Extracts from the Scriptures," an early acquaintance with which (the scriptures) was declared to be of the utmost importance, and indeed indispensable in forming the mind to just notions of duty and sound principles of conduct; and the study of such extracts was designed to prepare the pupils for more particular religious instruction from another source and at other times and places.

To carry out this scheme seemed to be quite a difficult matter; and hence it was thought best that Parliament should avail itself of an organization already existing, closely resembling that which was proposed in the form of a Board of Commissioners. Accordingly, in the session of 1814-'15, they made a grant of nearly \$40,000 to aid the society in School-street to extend their plans. Becoming thus the object of government confidence, the society sought a more respectable location, which they found in Kildare-place—whence the name of the "Kildare-place" (or street) "School Society."

For two or three years they applied the grants they received to the establishment of two model schools,—one for males and the other for females,—with apartments for teachers who should repair thither for instruction; and also a ware-house, sale-rooms, &c., for their books, stationary, and school requisites. They took possession of these premises in 1817, and date their efficient operations from that period.

It is not our purpose to trace these operations through succeeding years, except so far as they directly involve the question of *religious or scriptural instruction*. And, on this point, we may observe, that though they supplied *gratuitously*, to schools connected with them, (and to *all* purchasers at *cost prices*,) the school books and requisites, *they did not supply the only book that was required to be used under all circumstances in all the schools, viz. Bibles or Testaments*. This remarkable fact is a key to many mysteries in the succeeding operations of the society.

As the reading of the scriptures without note or comment was the only source of religious instruction, it was naturally

enough a topic of discussion, to what extent it answered the purpose. One gentleman connected with the society declared his conviction, that any degree of acquaintance with the scriptures was of inestimable value to the peasantry. "I do not suppose," he says, "that we can expect any very decidedly religious effect to be produced upon children, while they are prevented from having any explanation given them; but I am satisfied that great advantage will arise from making them know that the book in which they read is the word of God; that when in future life they are suffering under illness, or affliction, or any other chastening dispensation of the Almighty, they may be enabled to take up that book in which they will be sure to find consolation. I think it is also of great importance that they should know that the book, on which they are so often called to take their oath, is the word of God. I am perfectly satisfied that they are not acquainted with that fact. I know of many instances in which the lower classes have mistaken other books; and a friend of mine, who was lately at Loughrea, told me that a poor man in that neighbourhood supposed the Bible was written by Luther for the use of Protestants."\*

Mr. Donelan, a Roman Catholic inspector of the Kildare-street Society's schools, was asked whether, in his opinion, the peasantry could, in most instances, distinguish between a testament and any other book of the same size, upon a religious subject, which might be put into their hands? "Upon my word," he replied, "I think they could scarcely do it, except where the exertions of the Bible Society have succeeded; but in many parts of Connaught *the peasant does not know what a Bible or Testament is.*"

To the question whether they generally understood that the Bible contains the word of God, the history of the creation, the life of our Saviour, and the plan of redemption, he replied, "I think we may say in general that they do not."

The prevalent ignorance of the scriptures being thus established, it became important to know to what extent the Kildare-street Society was likely to remove it. And on this point we agree substantially with the Archbishop of Dublin, "that a child may, by reading a certain portion of the scriptures, be rendered tolerably familiar with the words and sub-

\* We know that the impression is very general among the lower class of Roman Catholics in this country, that the Protestants were without any religion till Martiu Luther helped them to one!

jects, so far as respects a matter of history, or exceedingly plain instruction. At the same time there will be, of course, a kind of undefinedness in the minds of young persons, even as to the meaning of simple sentences, that will mislead them if left entirely to themselves." It might be apprehended, moreover, that if Bibles and Testaments were left to be procured or not, at the option of the teacher or pupils; and if, when used at all, they were merely read off, once a day, with an air of stiff reserve and superstitious awe, the religious influence of the exercise would be as unhappy as the exercise itself would be unintelligible. This, however, was the basis of the compromise.

As to the result, there is very instructive, though conflicting testimony. The commissioners of Irish education reported concerning it, that "while from necessity there had been a strict observance of the exclusive principle, the terms of the compromise have never been perfectly realized; and even if realized, would not have been completely satisfactory." Lord Stanley, in a letter to the Duke of Leinster, (Oct. 1831,) says, "His Majesty's present government are of opinion that no private society, deriving a part (however small) of their annual income from private sources, and *only made the channel of the munificence of the legislature*, without being subject to any direct responsibility, could adequately and satisfactorily accomplish the end proposed; and while they (the commissioners) do full justice to the liberal views with which that (Kildare-street) society was originally instituted, as well as to the fairness with which they have, in most instances, endeavoured to carry their views into effect, they cannot but be sensible that one of the leading principles of that society was calculated to defeat its avowed objects, as experience has subsequently proved. The determination to enforce in all their schools the reading of the holy scriptures without note or comment, was undoubtedly taken with the purest motives; with the wish at once to connect religious with moral and literary education, and at the same time not run the risk of wounding the peculiar feelings of any sect by catechetical instruction or comments that might tend to subjects of polemical controversy. But it seems to have been overlooked, that the principle of the Roman Catholic church (to which, in any system intended for general diffusion throughout Ireland, the bulk of the pupils must necessarily belong) were totally at variance with this principle; and that the reading of the holy scriptures



without note or comment by children, must be peculiarly obnoxious to a church which denies, even to adults, the right of unaided private interpretation of the sacred volume in articles of religious belief."

The officers and friends of the society at the same time contended that it was never in higher favour than in 1825, when the commissioners of inquiry reported thus adversely to their success ; and that if parliament would not interfere, nor withhold its grants, the society would outlive all opposition. They attributed the want of confidence among the Catholics very much to the circumstance, that many of the schools connected with the Kildare-street Society were at the same time receiving aid from other societies, which were professedly Protestant and proselyting.

Mr. Donlan (to whom we have before referred as one of the Roman Catholic inspectors of the Kildare-st. Society's schools) expressed to the commissioners his conviction that the object of the Roman Catholic clergy was to overturn their system, and to prove to the commissioners that it was totally inefficient for the circumstances of Ireland. And he testified that in many instances, six or seven of which were well authenticated, so evident was their opposition, that "the clergy (to compel parents to withdraw their children) had refused to give them absolution, or to church the women after childbirth, or to administer the consolations of religion to them at the hour of death." The refusal extended to both parents ; and if the children still remained at the schools they had recourse to the only remaining method of deterring them, viz. CURSING, which the people suppose will bring down the vengeance of heaven in every respect, or as the vulgar expression is that they will have neither "luck nor grace." What they object to, is "*the use of the Testament* ;" and it was his opinion that the opposition would prevail ; that the peasantry would never be induced to break the bond which unites them to their clergy. He said he "had seen all the influence of the landlord come into open collision with the parish priest, and that his experience had been that the power of the latter was generally paramount."

Another inspector, Mr. Griffith, stated to the commissioners that he had heard from the people, in many cases, that the priests had announced their determination not to administer the sacraments to them, nor to visit them when dying, unless they would withdraw their children from the schools,

and he adds, "I have known instances where it has been put to the proof, and they have actually refused the sacrament."

Dr. Doyle, a Roman Catholic bishop, stated to the commissioners the case of a school under the patronage of a noble lady, where the New Testament was used, and which was attended by the children of her ladyship's gate-keeper. He was warned by the priest to withdraw his children; but rather than incur her ladyship's displeasure, and lose his place, he suffered one of his children to attend, in consequence of which he and his wife were refused the sacraments.

A third inspector, Mr. Daly, thought the authority of the clergy was adequate to keep the children out of the schools, but that their objection was not so much to their reading the Testament, as *to their reading it without note or comment.*"

Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, declared to the commissioners that "the objection of their clergy was to the reading of the Testament without note or comment, *let the school be under whatever society it might.*" He thought "the Kildare-street Society's plan less dangerous where the patron is a Catholic, and the school is under the superintendence of a Catholic clergyman who will deem it his duty to select the passages to be read, &c.; but he most decidedly opposed the principle that the scriptures should be read by children, in order that they may become acquainted with the principles of the Christian religion; in other words, that each child, on inspecting the sacred volume, should select such principles of religious faith and practice as he may think he can there discover; and that by private judgment, with an almost total absence of culture of mind, and before his reason has arrived at maturity. That this child is, in this state, to make out his religious belief and practice from the sacred volume, is a principle which we conceive to be erroneous; and as long as that principle is affirmed by the Kildare-street Society, so long we must endeavour to oppose its influence."

The conclusion from these premises is sufficiently obvious. The principles of religious faith and duty are not to be drawn from the Bible without assistance; and that assistance is exclusively in the hands of the Roman Catholic church, and is to be obtained only through the legitimate authorities of that church. This is the doctrine; the Roman Catholics have a right to hold it, and to suffer martyrdom

for it. As Protestants, however, we deny and utterly renounce it, and the difference between us is radical and unsusceptible of compromise.

“But,” said the commissioners to his grace the archbishop, “you do not object to the Testament being read by persons of mature years and education?”

“Of course not,” replied his lordship; “all the bishops of Ireland have publicly recommended to the *faithful* to read the scriptures, but to read them in those dispositions of prayer and of *obedience to the authority of the church* which we think necessary, that they may be read with profit.”

In other words, the Roman Catholic bishops do not object to Roman Catholics of mature years and education reading the Testament issued under Roman Catholic authority, and with Roman Catholic notes and comments. “Our principles,” said the archbishop, “are those of St. Paul. We wish to give to children milk and not strong meat. We give them, therefore, in the form of the (Roman Catholic) catechism, the first principles of the religion of Christ,\* and

\* There is no way of illustrating the force of these terms so satisfactorily as by transferring to our pages a spoonful of this milk, or a few passages from a catechism now before us, of which the following is the title: “A catechism; or a short abridgement of Christian doctrine; revised by the Right Rev. Dr. Kendrick, and approved for the use of the diocese of Philadelphia. Published by E. Cummiskey, 130 South Sixth-street, 1839.” This is clearly an orthodox imprint.

“In the morning.—When you are dressed, kneel down and say the following prayers: . . . . O holy virgin, I put myself under thy protection, and beg the help of thy prayers. O my good angel, be thou also my protector, and pray to God for me, that I may do his will in all things.” p. 2.

*The angelical salutation.*

“Hail Mary! full of grace, &c. Holy Mary, mother of God, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of our death.” p. 2.

*The confiteor.*

“I confess to Almighty God, to blessed Mary, ever virgin, to blessed Michael, the archangel, to blessed St. John the Baptist, to the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and to all the saints, that I have sinned, &c. Therefore I beseech thee, blessed Mary, ever virgin, &c., to pray to the Lord our God for me.” p. 7.

*At night.*

“Kneel down and say the following prayer: . . . . I believe, and hold for certain, all thou hast revealed to thy holy church,” &c. p. 9.

Q. How shall we know with certainty what God has taught?

A. From the Catholic church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth. p. 14.

Q. Whither did the soul of our Saviour go after his death?

A. His soul went down into that part of hell called Limbo.

Q. What do you mean by Limbo?

A. I mean a place of rest where the souls of the saints were. p. 19.

as they grow up in (Roman Catholic) faith, we give them the strong meat of the gospel to digest.”

Q. What is the Catholic church ?

A. All the faithful under one head.

Q. Who is the head ?

A. Christ Jesus our Lord.

Q. Has the church any visible head on earth ?

A. Yes, the bishop of Rome, who is the successor of St. Peter, and commonly called the Pope. pp. 21, 22.

Q. Can the church err in what she teaches ?

A. No, she cannot err in matters of faith.

Q. Why so ?

A. Because Christ has promised that the gates of hell shall not prevail against his church, and that the Holy Ghost shall teach her all truth, and he himself will abide with her forever. p. 23.

Q. Are the souls in purgatory helped by our prayers ?

A. Yes, they are.

Q. In what cases do souls go to purgatory ?

A. When they die in less sins, which we call venial, or when they have not satisfied the justice of God for former transgressions.

Q. To whom has Christ given power to forgive sins ?

A. To the apostles and their successors, the bishops and priests of the church. p. 24.

Q. Are we bound to obey the commandments of the church ?

A. Yes ; because Christ has said to the pastors of his church he that hears you hears me, and he that despises you despises me.

Q. Why does the church command us to fast ?

A. That by fasting we may satisfy God for our sins. p. 37.

Q. What is confession ?

A. It is to accuse ourselves of all our sins to a priest. p. 42.

Q. What is an indulgence ?

A. It is a releasing of temporal punishment, which often remains due to sin, after the guilt has been remitted by the sacrament of penance.

Q. What is extreme unction ?

A. It is a sacrament which gives grace to die well. p. 43.

Q. Is it not bread and wine which is first put upon the altar for the celebration of the mass ?

A. Yes, it is always bread and wine till the priest pronounces the words of consecration during the mass.

Q. What happens by these words ?

A. The bread is changed into the body of Jesus Christ, and the wine into his blood.

Q. Do you believe this firmly ?

A. Yes, and as firmly as if I saw it with my eyes ; because Jesus Christ has said it.

Q. Does any thing remain of the bread and wine after consecration ?

A. Nothing remains of them but the forms or appearances.

Q. When the host is divided, under which part is Jesus Christ ?

A. He is whole under each part.

Q. Does he who receives but one part of the host, or but one form, receive Jesus Christ whole and entire ?

A. Yes ; because Jesus Christ is whole under each form and each part of the form.



Dr. Doyle also informed the commissioners, that if a parent should continue to send his children to a school, from which he had been warned by the priest to withdraw them, it would be a sin that he must abandon, or be denied absolution; nor could he receive any sacrament, "except that of matrimony, which, being a civil contract as well as a religious rite, is sometimes solemnized when we are not certain that the party is not in a state of sin," and that in these views the Roman Catholic clergy, *as a body*, fully concurred.

We have extended these extracts considerably, that our readers might understand the importance that is attached by the Roman Catholic church to the mere reading of the scriptures, unless under specific restrictions. The evidence satisfied the commissioners that such reading could not be insisted upon without a violation of the discipline and principles of the Roman Catholic church. And they were satisfied, moreover, that the use of the scriptures in the Kildare-street Society's schools, was frequently a matter of mere form; that notwithstanding their professed neutrality, catechisms were taught as freely, in many of their schools, as in any others, merely by the fiction of treating the appointed hours as if they were not school-hours, (the restriction upon catechetical instruction being confined by the rules to "school-hours;") and that in the selection of masters and mistresses, though nominally uninfluenced by religious considerations, they uniformly appointed Roman Catholic teachers to schools, of which the Roman Catholic clergy were patrons, and Protestant teachers to those of which the Protestant clergy were patrons. And as to the supplementary education, which was supposed to be furnished out of school-hours and under appropriate ecclesiastical sanction, (and which all admitted to be indispensable,) it was very insufficiently provided.

When it was found that some change in the system was inevitable, the Roman Catholic bishops, in the first place, required, as a *sine qua non* of their concurrence in any national scheme, "that the master of each school in which the majority of the pupils profess the Roman Catholic faith

Q. Is there any thing under the form of bread but the body of Jesus Christ?

A. There is also there his blood, his soul, his divinity; in short, the whole person of Jesus Christ.

Q. And under the form of wine?

A. Jesus Christ is also wholly there. pp. 48—50.

shall be a Roman Catholic; and that in schools of which the Roman Catholic children form only a minority" (no matter how small,) "a Roman Catholic assistant shall be employed; and that each master and assistant shall be appointed upon the recommendation or with the express approval of the Roman Catholic bishop of the diocese in which the school is situated."

And in the second place, they objected to any compilation from the scriptures taken exclusively from the Protestant version; nor would they even consent to the use of such a compilation in the national schools, whatever modification it might assume. And finally, to cut the matter short, the Roman Catholic archbishop of Dublin recommended, that as the whole difficulty seemed to lie in the use of the scriptures in some form, it would be best to *dispense with their use entirely*, and leave it in the hands of the pastors of the respective parties; and to this opinion the commissioners themselves evidently leaned!

Notwithstanding this utter alienation of the Roman Catholics as a body, the Kildare-street Society continued to receive parliamentary aid at the rate of \$100,000 per annum, and when these supplies were withheld (1832), they had 1500 schools, and about 130,000 pupils in their connexion. Now (1841) their schools are reduced about one-third in number and size. The latest report we have seen gives them 1097 schools and 81,178 scholars. Their model school in Dublin contained 465 boys and 436 girls; and had under training, last year, 18 school masters and 63 school mistresses. The annual contributions amounted to \$125,000 including \$90,000 paid by pupils in sums varying from twenty-seven cents to one dollar. Probably the number of scholars above stated is the number at one time. Of course the number in attendance during some portion of the year would be very much larger. The society still retains the fullest confidence in the correctness of its principles. They contend that entire harmony among different religious persuasions, is quite compatible with a full exposition of scriptural knowledge and truth, and their report of 1839 expresses a fixed determination to have the Bible read in their schools without limitation or control. "There can be no parley on this subject," say they. "It is based on a principle too firm to be shaken. The desirable end of uniting children of different religious persuasions in the same school can only be obtained by the fullest and most unfettered

acknowledgment of this principle. By it a fusion of discordant sects can be, and in multiplied instances is, effected—without, no such fusion can take place.”

However sound this opinion may be, it is certainly anti-Roman Catholic; and it was vain to expect that the followers of that faith would yield one of their strongest ecclesiastical positions, when their numerical strength in the country was, to that of Protestants, as five to one. And indeed it was preposterous to ask it of them. The mass of their children remained uneducated; and in 1832, a board of national education for Ireland was established by Parliament; and of course, in organizing and administering its affairs, special reference was had to pre-existing difficulties.

1. As union schools were desirable where they would prosper, the most favoured applications were those in which both parties united; and when an application for aid came, from either Protestants or Roman Catholics exclusively, an inquiry was instituted into the causes of the anomaly.

2. A report of all applications, and the disposition made of them, with reasons, &c., were to be reported to Parliament.

3. An entire separation of the literary branches of instruction from the religious, was required; the latter to be conducted exclusively by the pastors or teachers of the denominations to which the parents of the children belong. For this purpose, one day of each week was reserved.

We have said that the separation of letters from religion was to be entire, and this is literally true; but there was a curious scheme devised to preserve the semblance of scriptural instruction. A small manual was prepared, containing passages inoffensive alike to Roman Catholics and Protestants, and extracted from their respective versions of the scriptures. The use of these extracts was not required, but simply recommended. The extracts are represented by the commissioners, “to comprise such passages as appear to be most level to the understanding of children and youth at school, and also best fitted to be read under the direction of teachers, *not necessarily qualified, and certainly not recognized as teachers of religion.*” They add the very singular declaration, that “no passage has been introduced or omitted under the influence of any particular view of Christianity, doctrinal or practical!”

In a short time this scheme was marvellously liberalized. The scriptures at large, or *other works of a religious character*, were permitted to be read any and every day at a stated

hour, provided only that those children whose parents desired it, might withdraw during that hour; and in order that the withdrawing party might not be incommoded, it was required that either the first or last hour of the school session should be appropriated to this exercise. But as this hour was as much a school-hour as any other, except to the voluntary absentees, it was boldly said, by the friends of the system, that the Bible was not excluded during school-hours! Hence, in the investigation of the subject by a committee of parliament in 1837, a witness (Rev. Robert Bell) was asked a series of curious questions, all turning on the point whether that could be properly called a *school-hour*, during which a portion of the school is excluded by the offensive character of the exercises?

The result of the inquiries and decisions on the subject amounted to this, that there were certain hours devoted to the instruction of the children in a body, during which all were expected and required to attend; and from this portion of the day biblical and all other religious instruction was excluded. But if the local patrons of any school should specify a day or days, hour or hours, for the reading of the scriptures, or for other religious instruction, such reading and instruction would be perfectly admissible, inasmuch as the designation of the time would allow the objecting parents an opportunity to withdraw their children. These religious hours were regarded as properly school-hours, however, though distinguished from the hours of general attendance. This was called the *combining*, in distinction from the *blending* process!\*

\* James Simpson, Esq., of Edinburgh, in a series of letters to the Marquis of Lansdowne, proposes a method of carrying out this distinction. He tells us that there are two revelations, one of nature and the other of scripture. No one, he thinks, will claim that doctrinal Christianity should be, or can be blended with lessons on material objects, as botany, chemistry, physiology, &c. "The Bible must be closed when we are busy with the retort and crucible!" Is this an epitome of the modern philosophy of education?

In *combination*, secular and religious instruction may be given to each pupil by two teachers; the religious by a teacher of his own sect. When *blended*, there can be but one teacher, and he must be of a sect whose lessons offend the consciences of all the sects in the school, but his own. If it is said that this plan tends to exclude religion from education, by depriving the secular teacher of the use of Christian precepts and motives, (a very weighty argument by the way,) Mr. Simpson replies, that as the pupil has two teachers, what one lacks the other must supply!

He thinks the religious teacher will find a great advantage in the circumstance that the holy scriptures will be his especial book, which the child has never seen



As might have been anticipated, the organization and proceedings of the board proved unsatisfactory to both parties, and the causes of the failure afford our country very instructive lessons.

The leading facts upon which Protestants relied to sustain their objections to the National Board of 1832, were—

1. That many of the schools aided by the government were under the eaves of Roman Catholic churches, and some of them under the superintendence of monks and nuns; all which was regarded as inconsistent with the professed neutrality of the system.

2. That the scriptural "Extracts" were partial to the Roman Catholic version. And—

3. That the use of the "Extracts" displaced the holy scriptures, which should, in their entire, unutilated form, occupy an essential place in all systems of popular education.

We will very briefly examine the grounds of these objections in their order.

(1.) One of the most formidable attacks on the principles and proceedings of the Irish Board, was made in the House of Lords, as early as March 1836, by the bishop of Exeter, in moving for a select committee "to inquire into the operation of the commission for national education in Ireland."

His first allegation was, that in a plan they had published for the establishment of one or more normal schools to instruct five thousand teachers, no provision was made for their religious culture—a point which he thought should receive the most careful attention, as he concurred in the opinion of an eminent French statesman,\* "that if the reality and the freedom of the religious instruction of the children ought to be secured in all schools and for all creeds, with still stronger reason ought the same care to be taken for the religious instruction of the teachers themselves, who are to

deseccrated and degraded to the profane uses of a common-school reading book.

Rev. *Baden Powell*, in discussing this point, seems anxious to guard against a possible (may we not say highly probable) neglect of the religious, when thus separated from the secular department of instruction. "In any system of State education," he says, "full, systematic and precise religious instruction for the children of each denomination at the hands of the ministers or other authorized instructors of such denomination, should be expressly recognized and ENFORCED, as an essential part of the system; thus securing its perfect incorporation *into the body and scheme of education as one united whole*, the sole distinction being a separation of time and place, where such a separation is unavoidable." *State Education*, p. 53.

\* M. Guizot.

be placed at the head of these schools." "This position," the bishop affirmed, "disclosed a grand essential defect; and not a defect only, but a positive evil, inasmuch as without religion all other knowledge can only lead, as it always has led the corrupt nature of man to a more frightful excess of wickedness."

The board attempted to defend themselves upon this point by reference to sundry passages\* in their published documents, where the *moral* character of the teachers is insisted upon with much positiveness; but when we consider how easily that term may be and is moulded to suit the purpose in hand, we must regard the answer of the board as insufficient, if not evasive.\*

A second ground taken by the bishop, and sustained by Protestants, embraced the practice of giving aid to schools connected with nunneries, monasteries, &c. The fact was admitted by the board and justified. In regard to a specific case, in which it was alleged that for more than two years the service of mass was performed *during school hours*, in one of the national schools, attended by Protestants as well as Catholics, the commissioners admit that there was an altar in the recess of the school room, *screened by a curtain from public view*, at which mass was performed for such children as attended *before school hours*; and then the question turned wholly on the *time* of the celebration—which might be a very doubtful point to settle, especially where children were witnesses for or against their teacher! In farther support of the same objection, the bishop stated that a grant to a national school under the care of a monastic establishment, had been applied to aid in building a nunnery; and that in another case \$500, granted for a school, had been applied to building a Roman Catholic chapel.

These statements were denied by the national board; but it was clearly in evidence before the committee of inquiry, that there were gross departures from the neutral principle allowed in some of the schools. In one school, for example, where *Wednesday* was the day set apart, and published as

\* The very lax principle that prevailed on this subject is incidentally shown in the examination of the *Rev. Mr. Carlisle*, before the select committee of the House of Commons, Aug. 4, 1834. He stated that a candidate for employment as a teacher, would probably be rejected by the board, if he was known to be a professed Deist, (understanding by this phrase one who denies revelation,) but a Unitarian, (understanding by this phrase, that he believes in some revealed religion,) would be admitted.

the day for religious teaching, a visitor on *Friday* saw in use and examined several Roman Catholic catechisms, and a Roman Catholic prayer book. While he was present, too, the clock struck twelve, and the scholars made the sign of the cross, and moved their lips as if repeating a prayer.

It was also clearly proved, that several of the national schools were within the precincts of nunneries; and the reason assigned was, that the rules of their establishment forbade the nuns from leaving their abode, and therefore the schools must be brought to them!

In one of these "national" nunnery schools, a visitor found that there was no school-mistress or principal in the school; that the nuns, who were dressed in their peculiar religious garb, were the teachers; the school opened and closed with prayer; there were two opportunities given for saying the Roman Catholic catechism during school hours, and a *spiritual* lecture was delivered towards the close of the school exercises. There was also a confessional in the room, or a place where the priests heard the confessions of the children, and gave them tickets, by virtue of which they were admitted to the communion. In another part of the room, there was an altar where mass was celebrated, and where the children brought their tickets and received the communion.

It was alleged, in behalf of the board, that these abuses never came to their knowledge, and hence that they should be exonerated from all responsibility for them. It cannot be denied, however, that the government revenue and influence were given (whether through design or defect is not material to our present point) to advance objects which they were pledged to discountenance; and it would be difficult to conceive that men of ordinary shrewdness could have expected to prevent gross abuses, by a system of inspection so uncertain and superficial as that which the commissioners employed. We are not surprised to learn that the schools in which these practices were tolerated, were chiefly, if not entirely, Catholic. For surely, if a Protestant child attended, it must be from ignorance, or from a desire to be weaned from all Protestant habits and attachments.

We ought to add that there was nothing in the regulations established by the commissioners to prevent their aiding a purely Roman Catholic school, or a school, the patrons of which should provide religious instruction for children of a particular communion; leaving it to parents or guardians to provide for all others. It is perfectly obvious, however, that

in such cases, the aid is given to a sectarian school, and not a national school, for *practically* all children are excluded who are not of the prevailing faith.

There was another class of schools enjoying the national patronage, though not conducted on principles approved by Protestants. They were taught by an order of men called *Christian Brothers*, who take a vow of poverty, chastity, and obedience to their superior, from which they cannot be released but by the pope's or bishop's dispensation. The teachers of these schools appeared in the dress and order of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics, which would of itself (as it was said) be, to many Protestant parents, a sufficient objection to the school; such slight causes often producing very permanent and baneful impressions. The patronage of such schools was defended on the ground that better masters than these could no where be found; and the occupation of school rooms in, or connected with, Roman Catholic chapels, was also justified on the ground that no suitable site was to be had for a separate building. One of the nice distinctions made by the board in deciding on applications for aid was, that where there was an internal communication between the school room and the chapel, the application was rejected; but if the apartments were separated by brick and mortar, the school might be patronized.

(2.) The second objection which was urged against the combining system respected the "Scripture Extracts," which, it was maintained, embraced several Roman Catholic features which were highly offensive to Protestants. We have only space for a few leading examples.

In the first chapter of Luke the salutation of the angel is given by the two versions as follows:

*Protestant.*

And the angel came in unto her and said, "Hail, *thou that art* \*highly favoured. The Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women," &c.

*Roman Catholic.*

And the angel being come in said to her, "Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women," &c.

The "Extracts" insert neither of the above passages, but paraphrase them in small type and in brackets thus:

[And the angel saluted her as one peculiarly blessed of God, &c.]

The commissioners, in replying to the Protestant objec-

\* Marg.—Graciously accepted or much graced.



tion on this point, say, "That an examination of the original verses would at once explain to any person, accustomed to prepare scriptural instruction for youth, why we thought it best to give a summary of them in a work intended for school lessons."

We have examined with some care the book of "Extracts," and both versions of the original scriptures, and we confess it puzzles us to discern the advantage of the "Extracts" over either of the versions, except as a matter of favour to Roman Catholic views; and not a little light is thrown upon the subject by a remarkable circumstance which occurred in 1818. A gentleman, not connected with the Kildare-street Society, conceived that Mrs. Trimmer's "Selections from the New Testament" would be a suitable book for the lower classes of Ireland; and, with a view to its republication, submitted it to the revision of a Roman Catholic clergyman. Among the extracts was the verse just now quoted, and the words "*thou art highly favoured*" were stricken out with a pen, and the words "*full of grace*" written above. These latter words were then struck out, in a subsequent revision, by another person, and the original words restored, and the book was so printed.

In a correspondence which ensued on this subject with a Roman Catholic clergyman, the ground of his complaint was that the Protestant, rather than the Douay version, was followed, "*respecting the veneration of the blessed virgin, the mother of God,*" &c. Now it is obvious, we think, that the summary was adopted chiefly, if not exclusively, to leave room for the Roman Catholic doctrine on this subject, and indeed this was virtually admitted, by the compiler, on his examination before parliament.

Objections of a kindred nature were made to the "Extracts," from Exodus xx. where "*graven thing*" is put for "*graven image,*" and "*thou shalt not worship them nor serve them*" is put for "*thou shalt not bow down to them,*" &c., both which changes are regarded as favourable to some alleged practices of the Roman Catholics.

So also the passage Genesis xiv. 18.

*Protestant version.*

"And Melchisedeck, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was a priest of the most high God, and he blessed him and said,"

*Roman Catholic version.*

"But Melchisedeck, the king of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine, for he was a priest of the most high God, blessed him and said"—

The "Extracts" have it, "And Melchisedeck, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine, being a priest of the most high God," &c. "By this rendering of the passage," said the dean of Ardagh, "it is made to appear that Melchisedeck's priesthood consisted in bringing forth bread and wine, and this is one of the arguments invariably used by Roman Catholic divines, to prove the truth of the sacrifice of the mass;" and, to sustain his assertion, he then quotes sundry passages from a Roman Catholic work by Dr. Chalonner, entitled "The Catholic Christian Instructed."

It was admitted that the authorized version was more correct than the version of the Roman Catholics, or than the "Extracts;" but it was contended that the Roman Catholic inference, supposed to be favoured by the language of the "Extracts," was not sufficiently obvious to children to make it, on that account, objectionable. This answer would hardly satisfy Roman Catholic scruples, if the objection came from their side. One of the most violent spasmodic affections we ever knew in a denominational body, was occasioned by a picture in a child's book of Naaman in the river Jordan. The stream was represented as quite shallow, with a view, as it was argued by the objector, to furnish an argument to be used afterwards against immersion in the ordinance of baptism, on the ground that there was not sufficient depth of water in that river for thus baptizing our Saviour! If a point like this may be warmly contested between two Protestant sects, who will say that the "Extracts," in the above translation, as they bear on Roman Catholic tenets, are harmless or immaterial?

But again, Luke xxii. 20, (a verse which has been the subject of continual controversy between Protestants and Roman Catholics for centuries,) is thus given in the "Extracts." "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is *about to be* shed for you," evidently favouring the Roman Catholic use of it to support the doctrine of transubstantiation.

We will cite but one more example.

*Authorized version.*

"Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." Luke xv. 10.

*Roman Catholic version.*

"So I say to you, there shall be joy before the angels of God\* upon one sinner doing penance.

\* "Before the angels. By this it is plain that the spirits of heaven have a

The "Extracts" give us the following: "So I say to you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God\* over one repenting sinner."

The objection of the Protestants to the original note is, that it favours the alleged Roman Catholic practice of worshipping saints and angels; and certainly whatever objection lies to the note in the Roman Catholic version, lies equally to the note in the "Extracts." The compiler of the "Extracts," (Mr. Carlisle,) in his examination before the committee, stated that it was his own opinion "that angels must know people who repent, or else they could not rejoice in it; and it did not appear to him a legitimate mode of opposing error to withhold the truth!" &c.

(3.) But the Protestants objected farther to the use of any extracts or selections whatever, if they were introduced as a substitute for the scriptures, or because the scriptures could not be used. It was considered an improper concession to the Roman Catholics. "It strikes me," said the Rev. Mr. Boyton, of Dublin, in his examination before the committee of parliament, "that supposing, for the sake of argument, the whole period during which the children are to be under instruction is six hours in the day; then, according to the regulation of the board, the person who wishes to have religious instruction in reading the scriptures given to his child, may have it done in one out of the six hours, so that the reading of the scriptures is permitted for one and prohibited for five hours. Now it strikes me, I say, as a very clear thing, and I think the clergy generally agree with me, that the Roman Catholic principle is carried out clearly and fully during the five hours, and that, even in reference to the sixth hour, it is the same principle in another shape; because, even then, the scriptures are read *only by permission*, or dispensation. Consequently, in every way, as far as the practical action of any executive body can avow a principle, the Roman Catholic principle is avowed and acted upon by the board, and the Protestant principle negatived; and I consider every body, connecting his schools with the board, as subscribing to this principle."

Though the commissioners relaxed this regulation by suf-

concern for us below, and a joy at our repentance, and consequently a knowledge of it."

\* "Before the angels. By this it is plain that the spirits of heaven are interested in our welfare. They rejoice at our repentance, and therefore they know when we repent."

fering the scriptures to be read at all hours, (only stipulating that it should be done in a *place* set apart for the purpose,) the gain to the Protestant side of the question was of no consideration, for the practical results of the arrangement were easily foreseen. Conducted apart, like a speculative science, the religious exercise would soon become odious. To conduct it on the principle of self-defence would be to make it dogmatic and exclusive. Proceeding on the false supposition that clergymen would or could attend, the children would be left to chance if not to neglect; and under these and other concomitant influences, sectarian feeling would necessarily be promoted and aggravated.

At this juncture the clergy of the united dioceses of Raphoe and Derry submitted certain propositions to the government, which, if accepted, might obviate some of the Protestant difficulties we have mentioned; and principally the objection that the denial of the use of the scriptures, except at stated seasons, was tantamount to the exclusion of them; and was as much an infringement of Protestant principles, and a violation of the rights of Protestant consciences, as the Roman Catholics were supposed to suffer by an opposite course. The Protestant motto was "NO COERCION AND NO EXCLUSION." "If," say they, "certain portions of time are assigned to Bible reading and instruction for some children, while others are dismissed, or not required to attend, the practical effect is to make the exercise an irksome task. It is agreed that no force should be put upon the consciences of any body of religionists—that from those children whose parents object to the reading of the Bible in school, the reading shall not be required; and that from those whose parents require such reading, it shall not be withheld. But they could not be parties to any arrangement recognizing the power or right of withholding the reading of the Bible, because it is the Bible, from any children during any portion of time. The conscience which says '*give*' should be as much respected as the conscience which says '*withhold*.' The conscience which says '*open*' should be dealt with as tenderly as that which says '*shut*'—and if it be permitted to other persuasions to shut the Bible from their children, it should be permitted to us to open it for ours." And, in the same conviction, the synod of Ulster, in their address to the people, Jan. 14, 1835, only asked "a plan of education under which the Bible could be freely used in all the schools during all the school hours, as the



light of heaven which is open to every eye that is not shut against it. Should any choose to forsake their own mercies, we will use neither coercion nor compulsion; but leave them, as God does, to future responsibility. To this course they declared themselves constrained by the injunction of Jehovah, Deut. vi. 6, &c., and they would regard objectors and withdrawers, as that law regarded strangers and sojourners in the land, not constraining them to learn or teach, though they themselves felt bound both to teach and learn."

These arguments, however plausible, were considered partial and irrelevant. As the Protestants and the Catholics had but one school-house and one teacher between them, they were both asked to agree upon a time when their children should assemble for the common purpose of learning to read and write. And they agreed upon the four hours between 10 A.M. and 2 P.M. But both parties were desirous that their children should also receive instruction in religion. Their principles however were different; their teachers, text-books and forms of religious instruction were different, and hence they could not receive this portion of instruction in common. They therefore adopted the only alternative of separation; and to effect this without interference, the seasons of religious instruction were designated beforehand, and upon the parents was thrown the responsibility of their children's attendance, in accordance with their wishes. And hence it was said, by the friends of this arrangement, that the charge of giving to one and withdrawing from another, or shutting up from one and opening to another, was unjust and groundless.

But we were about to introduce the reverend clergy of Raphoe and Derry, who urged the board to agree to the two following propositions:

1. That in all the national schools there should be a scripture class, to be composed of those children whose parents or guardians wish them to read the Bible.

2. That it should be part of the *daily exercises* in the schools, that such class shall read the Bible, at suitable times *during school hours*.

A substantial compliance with these propositions would be embraced, they thought, in the following rule: "The ordinary school business, upon which all the children of whatever denomination they may be, are required to attend, and which is expected to occupy a sufficient number of hours

of each day, shall consist of instruction in those branches which belong to a literary and moral education, embracing the reading of the holy scriptures by those children whose parents or guardians consent to it."

"This," said the bishop of Exeter, "coupled with a regulation requiring the scriptures to be used by all the children, at the time of separate religious instruction (*but not requiring any particular version*), would have contented me; provided it was sustained by a system of inspection, that would insure an actual and efficient use of the holy scriptures, in some version, in all the national schools, by children of all denominations."

This seems all very fair and reasonable, but one of the Roman Catholic members of the board (Mr. Blake) thought that no new legislation was required; for he considered it "perfectly consistent with the already established regulations that there should be a scripture class in every school, composed of those whose parents desire them to belong to it." And Lord Stanley says (Sept. 1832) that "his Majesty's government fully recognizes the right, of all who choose it, to read the sacred scriptures, but the exercise of this right in the case of infants" (all under twenty-one years of age?) "must be subject to the control of their parents and natural guardians; and, in point of time, it must be limited by the appropriation of certain hours to certain other branches of study."

This was an ingenious device to shift the odiousness of exclusion upon the secular branches of instruction. The Bible may be used at all times except when the pursuit of other branches pushes it aside!

"In the hours thus appropriated to secular studies," says Mr. Blake, "be they more or fewer, neither the Bible, nor any other book, could be used in the school, to which any of the parents objected on the score of religious scruples. To introduce the reading or learning of any such book, during these hours, would be a palpable violation of liberty of conscience." And we find, by the latest construction of this rule, (1839,) that it excludes the reading even of the "Scripture Extracts" during the time of secular or literary instruction, in any school attended by children whose parents or guardians object to it.

The clergy of Derry and Raphoe were probably puzzled to discern the "consistency," (so clear to Mr. Blake,) between their proposition and the existing regulations, as interpreted

by himself and Lord Stanley ; nor does it appear that even their construction was uniformly given ; for in a national school in Belfast the rule was, that “so much time should be allowed for the reading of the scriptures as should be consistent with the greatest average convenience of all the scholars, and the allowance of sufficient time for the other studies of the school ; and that every extension or change of time should be notified in the public regulations of the school ”

But Mr. Blake would object to the establishment of a scriptural class, as proposed by the clergy of Raphoe and Derry, (even were the parents all of one mind,) “if it would interfere with, or be regarded as a substitute for special religious instruction at set times. *“It might do,”* he said, *“for dissenters, but not for denominations that have a creed or articles of faith. It would be too general and indefinite to answer the purpose.”*

The reply to the clerical propositions by the board was somewhat singular. The clergy asked that the holy scriptures should be read *daily, as a part of the ordinary school exercises*, by those children whose parents and guardians consent to it ; and the commissioners consider it a virtual compliance with their wishes to allow such an exercise to be introduced, *except in cases where parents or guardians disapprove of such use of the Bible.* “In one of our schools,” (we may suppose the clergy of Derry and Raphoe to say,) “there are twelve boys and girls whose parents wish them to constitute a scriptural class, and that they may be allowed to read the scriptures as a part of the ordinary daily school exercises.” “Certainly,” say the commissioners, “provided there are no other children in school, whose parents or guardians object to it !”

In the course of the evidence drawn out on this whole subject, two points were established with considerable clearness :—

1. That the objection to the reading of the scriptures was not felt by the Roman Catholic laity, but by the priesthood. It was stated by a witness before the parliamentary committee, (on whom, as a recent convert from the church of Rome, the opposers of the national board greatly relied, but whose testimony, for that very reason, should be the more cautiously received,) “that he could not say the Roman Catholics were actually desirous to read the Bible, because it is a thing which, in many instances, they are not at all aware of. *It*

*is out of their sphere.* They have no information of it, but that derived from the priests, that it is a bad book, *but they have no objection to the book when they know it.*" The Catholic priesthood object to any such use of the scriptures as might carry with it the notion, that the reading of them affords sufficient religious instruction, or is indeed safe, without the aid of the authorized interpreters of its meaning. And a similar objection was urged by the English hierarchy to the Lancasterian schools, viz. that the use of the scriptures, without note or comment, implied an improper undervaluing of creeds, catechisms and priests.

2. The second point supposed to be settled was, that the reading of "Extracts," selected with good judgment, and so arranged as to present the various subjects contained in the scriptures in proper order and connexion, gave children a much better notion of Bible history and truth, than the stated reading of the sacred volume without any comment or exposition. In other words, that if the scriptures could not be freely used at the discretion of the teacher, as a text book of moral and religious instruction, it was best not to use them at all, but to substitute something as nearly like them as might be. This result of experience would be readily anticipated, and hence we regard the use of the Bible under such restrictions as we have been considering, as tantamount to its literal exclusion.

There was another ground, besides the three above stated, on which Protestants rejected the compromising system. They conceived that by sanctioning that scheme, they indirectly recognized the Roman Catholic clergy as religious teachers. They would of course instruct their flocks in their own places of worship, but there was an objection to the priests being in the schools at all. "The Board of National Education," said the objectors, "put it forward in the very front of their proceedings, that they encourage and invite the Roman Catholic clergy to give peculiar religious instruction to children in the school, though out of school hours. Every person, therefore, connecting himself with that board, virtually subscribes to the principles of the board, and must therefore be considered as a party to a plan for encouraging the Roman Catholic clergy to teach their religious opinions to Roman Catholic children." So strongly was this objection taken by many, that it was affirmed that Protestants would sooner be excluded themselves, than have the priests admitted.



The national board of Ireland certainly failed to supply, to any considerable extent, the defects which were attributed to pre-existing institutions. They might have some apparent claims to the confidence of the Roman Catholics, which the Kildare-street Society did not possess in form; but after all, they evaded the grand difficulty. They did not, by any means, provide for the certain, efficient religious education of the children. That their designs and principles were misrepresented, and that all sorts of weapons were employed to weaken their strength and subvert their system, may be true; but whatever the cause, we see no evidence that they accomplished what they designed. And indeed, if their means and facilities are considered, they certainly accomplished far less than the preceding voluntary associations, and especially the Kildare-street Society.

The position which the national board took is clearly stated, though lamely defended, by Dean Burgh, in a letter to the archbishop of Tuam. "I am not restrained by the board," he says, "from instructing my flock in my principles, nor am I accountable for the course the Roman Catholic clergyman adopts towards his flock, nor he for mine, be it right or wrong. The board could, under the circumstances, adopt no better plan. *If religion had not been considered, the plan would be unsuited to a christian country.* If the public money had been given to any church exclusively, it would have been sectarian. Then no Bible, no Testament, proved acceptable to all, and therefore were the recognized ministers of every persuasion permitted and encouraged to exercise their pastoral office, not in school hours, but at other times, to their own flocks." The dean, however, would not probably be received as an approved champion of the board, nor would his vindication be regarded as complete. The board would show what their system is capable of being made, or rather what it allows, than what restrictions and disabilities it imposes. They would also much prefer one of their own number to set forth and defend their measures, and they could find none more ingenious, faithful, and eloquent, than the Rev. Jas. Carlisle, whose work lies before us. He regards the system "as formed upon the principle of introducing as much of religion as all (religious) parties concerned can agree upon." "Children under this system, in the present condition of the kingdom at least, cannot be educated atheists or deists; they cannot be left in ignorance of the being and attributes of God, his

power, his justice, his holiness, his mercy, or of the law of God, or of their own guilt, or of their moral responsibility, or of the future state and the coming day of retribution, or of the advent of the Son of God to save sinners by his life, his death, and his resurrection from the dead; or of the punishment of the wicked and the salvation of the righteous, or of the necessity of faith in Jesus Christ, of repentance and new obedience." "Doubtless it would be desirable if the children could be explicitly informed in what the whole word of God consists, and could be thoroughly instructed in it as a complete code of revelation; but that is impracticable under the auspices of a government which, emanating from a people divided upon that point, are themselves also divided. Even the Kildare-place Society were under the necessity of admitting the New Testament in place of the whole scriptures, and dispensing with religious instruction from the whole Bible. Although it was rendered necessary that at least the whole New Testament should be in the schools, they could not announce to the children that the New Testament, nor even the Bible, as received by Protestants, contained the whole revealed will of God."\*

The theory of the Irish system may contemplate all the agreeable results above set forth by Mr. Carlisle, but when we look through the volumes of testimony drawn from the parties concerned, and examine the principles and regulations of the board, as they show themselves in the actual contact of the teacher with the learner, we find little to satisfy us that these results were often realized.

As an evidence of the liberality of the system, and of the "perfect provision it makes for the religious instruction of children," we are triumphantly informed, that "if the scriptures in the authorized version are not read in every school within the influence of a Protestant minister, and in which there are children willing to read them, the fault lies with him, (the Protestant minister,) and not with the government or board." And pray might not the same thing be said if there were no school system at all? No one pretends that the government plan disables or interferes with the liberty of Protestant or Roman Catholic ministers. So that the argument might be employed with equal force, that no system of public education is at all necessary, because if every pa-

\* Thoughts on the mixed character of government institutions in Ireland, pp. 28—30.

rent, master, and guardian, would do their duty, their children, apprentices, and wards, would be suitably instructed, and ignorant people would soon become as rare as lepers. But will clergymen assume the duties which this argument assigns to them? Are they in a situation to do it? Let them answer. However it may be with the Roman Catholic priests, we know that the life of a Protestant clergyman is crowded with its appropriate avocations; and the idea of assigning to him, as a distinct branch of professional duty, the religious instruction of a school, or perhaps half a dozen schools daily, or even once a week, is utterly preposterous. It may do very well to append such a provision, in order to cover up a defective or suspicious place in the system; but whoever will read the official documents respecting the state of education under the British government, cannot fail to see that, with few exceptions, arising from peculiar circumstances, whatever direct religious instruction there is comes and must come from the teachers, and not from parents or pastors.

And it is not irrelevant to advert, in passing, to a singular feature of these same official documents. In the examination of witnesses, and in the reports and arguments on either side of the contested points or principles, the compromise system always comes up with a double face. If it is alleged that opportunities and topics of religious instruction are so restricted and cramped, that the teacher may as well be altogether silent as to attempt to introduce the subject, it is answered, that "this is an error; that the whole field is open;" the only prohibited ground being the inch or two occupied by some ceremony or form of words. "Certainly there is not a single essential doctrine of Christianity of which he may not discourse to his school at all times, and with the utmost freedom." But if the objection comes from the other side, and it is alleged that children's minds are liable to be "worked upon by sectarian influence," or misled by the "unauthorized teachers of religion;" unless the whole subject is shut out from the circle of school occupations, the system is at once screwed up to this point; and we find that "the teacher is required to occupy ground common to all parties, and not to meddle with the sacred topics of religion but in a form acceptable to all."—"Religious instruction, as such, belongs to a class of men appointed for this purpose; school masters, if not unqualified, are not recognized as religious teachers."

The question returns, Is efficient and appropriate religious education secured in one form or another? If it must be given by the teacher, or the parent, or the pastor, and if the teacher is forbidden to give it, the parent incompetent to give it, and the pastor too busy to give it, it is a logical conclusion that the children must go without it. It may have a conspicuous place in the printed scheme, but it loses its honours in the visible working. It gives a grace and finish to the diagram, or model, that goes to the patent office, but is laid aside when the machine is put in motion.

We could fill a whole number of our review with examples of this "fast and loose" method of managing the controversy. One must suffice:—The bishop of Norwich, in reply to the bishop of Exeter, (House of Lords, May 21, 1838,) remarked that the scripture "Extracts" used in the national schools contained every doctrine which a Protestant values and believes, and every doctrine which the Roman Catholic conceives to be essential to his salvation. They clearly, unequivocally, and candidly state the divinity of our Saviour, the atonement, the sanctification of the spirit, and every other doctrine of the Protestant religion which they valued, and would inculcate in their own church." Now if these doctrines were indeed honestly and intelligibly set forth in the "Extracts," as the bishop of Norwich plainly intimates, so that the objection of the bishop of Exeter on this score became entirely groundless, then it must be admitted that religious instruction of a very direct and pointed character is given. But how will this consist with the remark of another friend of the national schools, who is considered as the bishop's coadjutor?

"The only question is, Does the system afford the means of giving a really efficient *moral* (not *religious*) education? If so, those who wish to *superadd* religious instruction, are at perfect liberty to do so. But the board, or rather the State which it represents, *must be limited within the ordinary sphere of civil functions.*"\*

The only way of reconciling these apparent inconsistencies, is to suppose that the phrase, "religious instruction," is used by some to denote the inculcation of those religious truths and doctrines, a belief of which is generally regarded as essential to salvation; while others apply it to the training of a pupil in the peculiar formularies of faith and wor-

\* Speech of the Lord Bishop of Norwich, and the letters of "T.," p. 39.



ship which distinguish various communities of Christians, one from the other. It is not, however, till we attempt to reduce to some definite and discernible shape, the actual results of the religious departments of this scheme, that we find how very shallow, defective, uncertain and slovenly its operations are. From a very close and careful examination of the controversy, and the voluminous documents connected with it, we are led to doubt whether there is not actually less systematic instruction in the schools of Ireland at this hour, than there would have been in the absence of all legislation on the subject.

We have entered so largely into the supposed grievances of Protestants under the national system, that we can allow but a very small space for hearing the other party.

From 1709 to 1782, the government of Ireland tolerated only Protestant education ; and during all that time it was a transportable offence, (and if the party returned, high treason,) for a Roman Catholic to act as a schoolmaster, or as a schoolmaster's assistant, or even as a tutor in a private family. When we call to mind these gigantic disabilities, it seems scarcely credible that Protestants and Roman Catholics are now on the same level of privileges.

The objections of Roman Catholics to the national system were, 1. That they had not a representation at the board, nor a voice in the selection of teachers, to which their number and interests entitled them.

2. That the supervision of public education, the appointment of teachers, and the appropriation of the funds, &c., belonged *of right* to the clergy, and were improperly entrusted to *any* secular board.

3. That the "Scripture Extracts" were unfair as to points at issue between Roman Catholics and Protestants, and that the reading of the scriptures at large in the school, even though the attendance of their children is not required at that time, is to expose them, indirectly, to the danger which their church apprehends from an improper use of the sacred volume.

But perhaps the strongest objection they urged against the reading of the scriptures, was founded on the *compulsory* aspect of the rule. "The compulsory reading of the scriptures is just as tyrannical as their prohibition. The Protestant principle, asserting the right of the laity to study them, includes the right of leaving it alone, if they please." 'I wish I were free! I wish I were free!' exclaimed an Ul-

ster politician. 'Free!' replied his friend; 'you are free to do as you please,' 'Aye,' exclaimed the other, 'but I am not free to make *you* do as *I* please.\*'

"There is no doubt," said one of the witnesses before the parliamentary committee, "that the Roman Catholics have a general indefinite suspicion of the scriptures, or rather of our version." But still it was abundantly proved, in the progress of the government inquiries, that the schools using the scriptures without restriction were frequented by more Catholics than Protestants. The London Hibernian Society required the whole Protestant Bible to be taught in their schools, and also sought to disseminate a "knowledge of those scriptures through the country, by the agency of select readers; and yet the proportion of attendants on their schools was as two Roman Catholics to one Protestant! Hence it is the opinion of many intelligent Protestants of Ireland that it is to the *compulsory* feature of the regulation to which much of the Roman Catholic opposition lies, and that it would abate very sensibly, if it were a matter of discretion with the teacher whether to read the scriptures or not. We doubt it.

By a recent plan of the national board, the country is divided into twenty-five districts, with a model school and a model farm of forty acres near the centre of each district. A strict system of local inspection is contemplated. The superintendent of each district is expected to reside at the model school, whence he can go to the remotest part of his field and return the same day. His salary to be \$500 a year, and a horse at the commencement of his labour, with which he is to keep himself supplied at his own expense. He is provided with lodgings at the model school; and is entitled to \$1 25 for each day that he shall be obliged to travel more than twenty miles from home. The master of the model school receives his board and \$250 per annum, and the assistant master his board and \$100. Each child attending the model school is required to pay 37½c. a quarter, to be divided between the master, assistant master, and head monitors, in certain proportions. The common schools are divided into primary and secondary; the masters of the former to receive 12½c. a quarter from each scholar, and a "reasonable salary from the public;" and the masters of the latter to have apartments at the school, to receive 37½c. per quarter from each pupil, and \$150 a year from the public. By the

\* Letters of "T." before cited.

report of the year 1839, it would seem that only 205,000 children were connected with the schools under the national board.\* The cost of annual instruction in them is \$2 50 per head for such as learn to read; \$4 33 for reading and writing, and \$7 50 for reading, writing, and arithmetic. The board express as full confidence in the success of their scheme, as the Kildare-street Society have in theirs; and the latest report mentions but one adverse circumstance, and that is the withdrawing of a body of thirteen Roman Catholic clergymen from the support of the board, "under the conviction that the system as now constituted, could never enjoy the confidence of the Irish people." This is assumed to be a local and temporary alienation merely, and occasioned by the influence of a single prelate. We shall see.

---

ART. V.—*History of the Great Reformation of the sixteenth century, in Germany, Switzerland, &c.* By J. H. Merle d'Aubigné, President of the Theological School of Geneva, and Member of the "Société Evangelique." Volumes First and Second. First American, from the Fifth London Edition. New-York: Robert Carter, 1841. pp. 390, 400. *James W. Alexander*

It is one of the most pleasing indications of our time, that we receive from Geneva, the cradle of reformed theology, a work written in the very spirit of that great revolution, and by a learned man, loved and honoured for his labours and his self-denial in the cause. That delightful spot, once hallowed by the work of Farel, Calvin, Viret, Beza, the Turretines and the Pictets, has long lain waste, and been trodden down by the foot of infidelity. But we look for better days, and our hopes are quickened by every new piece of intelligence from the little seminary and the evangelical society. At our last advices, the number of students was eight, and twenty-five were pursuing their studies in the prepara-

\* In 1812, a board of commissioners for inquiring into the state of education in Ireland reported, that upwards of 200,000 of the children of the poorer classes were provided with the means of education in the schools then established. Considering the increase of population, and the advantages of long experience, the gain in numbers, from 1812 to 1839, of the educated portion of the children, does not seem to be very flattering.

tory school, making a total of thirty-three. They are under the tuition of four professors. It is believed by pious men abroad, that the establishment of this seminary has had a happy tendency towards the encouragement of scattered believers, and towards the recent acquisition of influence for the truth at Montauban. Geneva was once a source of divine instruction to a large part of Europe: we hope to see it such again. Its site fits it in a remarkable manner to be the inlet of the scriptures and scriptural teaching, to the French, the Germans, and the Italians. From this point the books of Calvin penetrated into northern Italy, and we may expect the same thing to take place in our day, if Christians lend their aid to the efforts which are making.

If we may judge from the notices of public journals, from the sale of these volumes, and from the fact that three rival translations have appeared in England, the work of Dr. Merle is destined to play an important part in the blessed changes which we hope for. It is a production—we speak of the portion translated—of great labour, and at the same time of great vivacity. No history of the Reformation has appeared, in the English language, with so many marks of having been formed by having recourse to the original authorities. The author owns, on every page, his obligations to works in Latin, German, French, Italian, and English, and these for the most part contemporary with the events which he relates. For this he has been eminently fitted by long residence in Germany, Switzerland, and the Low Countries.

It is now more than eleven years since we called the attention of our readers to the voluminous collection of Luther's letters, then recently set forth by De Wette.\* Ever since that day we have been diligent students of these volumes, and the consequence has been a continually increasing conviction that the key to the history of the early Reformation is to be sought in the private history of Martin Luther, and that this key is found in his own writings, and chiefly in his letters, prefaces, and autobiographical memoranda. Many of these were unpublished at the time when the earlier histories were written, and later works were in a great degree made out of the old materials. Our own age has witnessed an indefatigable research into the documentary monuments of the sixteenth century, and the result has been a body of

\* *Biblical Repertory* for 1830, p. 504.



facts, which affords more complete material for a correct narrative than has ever before been extant. We observe with pleasure that the author has availed himself of these aids. His history, as contained in these two volumes, is in great measure the history of Luther ; it could not well be any thing else. It is, moreover, the history of Luther's mind, heart, and inward development. For this he has gone back to the earliest notices of his boyhood and youth ; and every where the reformer is made to speak for himself. Any reader will be surprised, who looks through these pages for the purpose of inquiring how many of them are filled with the *ipsissima verba* of Luther.

A striking advantage of this method is, that it gives an air of reality, a naturalness, and a fascinating liveliness to the history. Such is the rapidity of the action, and such the marked individuality of the characters, and the genuineness of the dialogue, that it becomes dramatic, and we pause and wonder whether these can possibly be the same events which we once read in the heartless annals of Mosheim. Whatever fault may be found with the present work, this is an excellency which it possesses in no common degree : it is interesting as a narrative. This was greatly needed, and the author has constantly and successfully made it a special object of pursuit. Whether the production has not, in consequence of this attempt, lost something as a history, properly so called, is another question ; but that it has the charm of reality, and that it whets and satisfies the curiosity of the reader, it needs but the perusal of a few pages to show.

In pursuance of this end, the great personages of the period are presented in a series of portraits, and we are possessed, by a few bold but masterly touches, of the individual traits of each. It is a gallery through which we walk, without weariness and with distinct and lasting impression. In like manner, the cardinal events, on which all the rest of the action turns, are brought out in a prominent manner ; and here we have a series of historical paintings. No history is richer in such subjects than that of the Reformation. The dry and tedious details which connect these are omitted, or passed over in a very rapid manner. We are not sure that this is not sometimes carried a little too far, and whether the completeness of the annals is not sacrificed to the interest of the story : and as an instance of what we mean, let us refer the reader to the manner in which Erasmus is introduced, vol. i. p. 99. After all, such history as this will be read, and that, if

we mistake not, by thousands who have never before been beguiled into the perusal of a religious history. We need more books of this sort, which, without betraying the truth shall not disguise it in the dress of dullness; for truth is more interesting than fiction, and no romance can compare, for grand, awakening, and unexpected events, with the history of the Reformation. As a pleasant specimen of the author's biographical tact, we give the following sketch of Hans Sachs:—

“He was the son of a tailor named Hans Sachs, and was born at Nuremberg, the 5th November, 1494. He was named Hans (John) after his father, and had made some progress in his studies, when a severe illness obliging him to abandon them, he applied himself to the trade of a shoemaker. Young Hans took advantage of the liberty this humble profession afforded to his mind to search into higher subjects better suited to his inclination. Since music had been banished from the castles of the nobles, it seemed to have sought and found an asylum amongst the lower orders of the merry cities of Germany. A school for singing was held in the church of Nuremberg. The exercises in which young Hans joined, opened his heart to religious impressions, and helped to excite in him a taste for poetry and music. However, the young man's genius could not long be confined within the walls of a workshop. He wished to see that world of which he had read so much in books, of which his companions had told him so much, and which his youthful imagination peopled with wonders. In 1511, he took his bundle on his shoulders, and set out, directing his course towards the south. The young traveller, who met with merry companions on his road, students who were passing through the country, and many dangerous attractions, soon felt within himself a fearful struggle. The lusts of life and his holy resolutions contended for the mastery. Trembling for the issue, he fled and sought refuge in the little town of Wels, in Austria, (1513,) where he lived in retirement, and in the cultivation of the fine arts. The emperor Maximilian happened to pass through the town with a brilliant retinue. The young poet was carried away by the splendour of this court. The prince received him into his hunting establishment, and Hans again forgot his better resolutions in the joyous chambers of the palace of Inspruck. But again his conscience loudly reproached him. The young huntsman laid aside his glittering uniform, set out, repaired to Schwartz, and afterwards to Munich. It was there, in 1514, at the age of twenty, he sang his first hymn, ‘to the honour of God,’ to a well known chaunt. He was loaded with applause. Every where in his travels he had occasion to notice numerous and melancholy proofs of the abuses under which religion was labouring.

“On his return to Nuremberg, Hans settled in life, married, and became the father of a family. When the Reformation burst forth, he lent an attentive ear. He clung to that holy book which had already become dear to him as a poet, and which he now no longer searched for pictures and music, but for the light of truth. To this sacred truth he soon dedicated his lyre. From a humble workshop, situated at one of the gates of the imperial city of Nuremberg, proceeded sounds that resounded through all Germany, preparing the minds of men for a new era, and every where endearing to the people the great revolution which was then in progress. The spiritual songs of Hans Sachs, his Bible in verse, powerfully assisted this work. It would perhaps be difficult to say to which it was most indebted, the prince elector of Saxony, administrator of the empire, or the shoemaker of Nuremberg!” Vol. i. pp. 115, 116.

The first book treats of the state of Europe prior to the

Reformation. It is a dark picture, crowded with horrid visages, but it is none the less true on this account. In the attempt to give great compression to his matter, the author has here, more than any where else, allowed himself to write in a manner which seems ragged and abrupt. The rapid succession, in particular, of very short periods, in a continuous narrative, checks and disappoints the ear, and produces an unmelodious ripple in the stream of discourse; and this *style coupe'* is rendered disagreeably prominent by the English translator. Take, as a specimen, the account of Alexander the Sixth.

“Alexander had a favourite named Peroto, whose preferment offended the young duke. Cæsar rushed upon him, Peroto sought refuge under the papal mantle, clasping the pontiff in his arms;—Cæsar stabbed him, and the blood of the victim spirted in the pontiff’s face. ‘The pope,’ adds a contemporary and witness of these atrocities,—‘loves the duke his son, and lives in great fear of him.’ Cæsar was one of the handsomest and most powerful men of his age. Six wild bulls fell beneath his hand in single combat. Nightly assassinations took place in the streets of Rome. Poison often destroyed those whom the dagger could not reach. Every one feared to move or breathe lest he should be the next victim. Cæsar Borgia was the hero of crime. The spot on earth where all iniquity met and overflowed was the pontiff’s seat. When man has given himself over to the power of evil,—the higher his pretensions before God, the lower he is seen to sink in the depths of hell. The dissolute entertainments given by the pope and his son Cæsar and his daughter Lucrezia, are such as can neither be described nor thought of. The most impure groves of ancient worship saw not the like. Historians have accused Alexander and Lucrezia of incest, but the charge is not sufficiently established. The pope, in order to rid himself of a wealthy cardinal, had prepared poison in a small box of sweetmeats, which was to be placed on the table after a sumptuous feast: the cardinal, receiving a hint of the design, gained over the attendant, and the poisoned box was placed before Alexander. He ate of it and perished. The whole city came together, and could hardly satiate themselves with the sight of this dead viper.” Vol. i. pp. 51, 52.

But it is the second book on which the author most lays out his strength, because it brings him to his favourite subject, and it is this in which the English or American reader will find the most that is new: the subject is the Youth, Conversion, and Early Labours of Luther. Indeed, throughout these volumes, the real picture is Luther; all beside is mere framework and appendage. The author has alighted on the true secret of writing the history of the Reformation.

“The opening period of a man’s life,—that in which his natural character is formed and developed under the hand of God,—is always important. It is especially so in Luther’s career. The whole Reformation was there.

“The different phases of this work succeeded each other in the mind of him who was to be the instrument for it, before it was publicly accomplished in the world. The knowledge of the Reformation effected in the heart of Luther himself is, in truth, the key to the Reformation of the Church. It is only by studying the work in the individual, that we can comprehend the general work. They

who neglect the former, will know but the form and exterior signs of the latter. They may gain knowledge of certain events and results, but they will never comprehend the intrinsic nature of that renovation; for the principle of life that was the soul of it will remain unknown to them. Let us then study the Reformation of Luther himself, before we contemplate the facts that changed the state of Christendom." Vol. i. pp. 118, 119.

We read these sentences with delight, and we insert them in the hope that they will arrest the attention of all who are interested in the conflict now waging between the gospel on the one part, and the papists and ritualists on the other. We shall greatly mistake the true character of the Reformation, if we look upon it as a mere ecclesiastical or even doctrinal revolution. It was the revival of true religion. The principle of the new life in the soul of Martin Luther and the other reformers was its moving power. Our author does well, therefore, when he proposes to go into the depths of Luther's personal experience. Nowhere have we met with so much about the reformer's childhood and youth. We are made acquainted with his parents, his playmates, and his teachers; we sympathize with his servile terrors, and seem to hear his Christmas carols, among the poor boys at Magdeburg; we smile when we find him solacing his weary hours with the lute and the flute, and we accompany him to the university, a pale and timorous student. The manner of relating all this is admirable, at once rapid and full, and the story is delightfully interrupted by the always interesting sayings of Luther himself. How touching the following passages!

"But never did Luther feel ashamed of the time when, pressed by hunger, he sorrowfully begged the bread necessary for the support of life and the continuance of his studies. So far from this, he thought with gratitude on the extreme poverty of his youth. He considered it as one of the means that God had made use of to make him what he afterwards became, and he thanked him for it. The condition of poor children who were obliged to lead the same kind of life, touched him to the heart. 'Do not despise,' said he, 'the boys who try to earn their bread by chaunting before your door, 'bread for the love of God,' *Panem propter Deum*. I have done the same. It is true that in later years my father maintained me at the university of Erfurth, with much love and kindness, supporting me by the sweat of his brow; but at one time I was only a poor mendicant. And now by means of my pen, I have succeeded so well, that I would not change fortunes with the Grand Seigneur himself. I may say more; if I were to be offered all the possessions of the earth heaped one upon another, I would not take them in exchange for what I possess. And yet I should never have known what I do, if I had not been to school, and been taught to write.' Thus did this great man acknowledge that these humble beginnings were the origin of his glory. He was not afraid of reminding his readers that that voice whose accents electrified the empire and the world, had not very long before begged a morsel of bread in the streets of a petty town." Vol. i. pp. 127, 128.

"The young student spent in the library of the university the moments he could snatch from his academical labours. Books being then scarce, it was in



his eyes a great privilege to be able to profit by the treasures of this vast collection. One day, (he had been then two years at Erfurth, and was twenty years of age,) he was opening the books in the library one after another in order to read the names of the authors. One which he opened in its turn drew his attention. He had not seen any thing like it till that hour. He reads the title:—it is a Bible! a rare book, unknown at that time. His interest is strikingly excited; he is filled with astonishment at finding more in this volume than those fragments of the gospels and epistles which the church has selected to be read to the people in their places of worship every Sunday in the year. Till then he had thought that they were the whole word of God. And here are so many pages, so many chapters, so many books, of which he had no idea! His heart beats as he holds in his hand all the scripture divinely inspired. With eagerness and indescribable feelings he turns over these leaves of God's word. The first page that arrests his attention, relates the history of Hannah and the young Samuel. He reads, and can scarcely restrain his joyful emotion. This child whom his parents lend to the Lord as long as he liveth; Hannah's song in which she declares that the Lord raiseth up the poor out of the dust and lifteth up the beggar from the dunghill, to set him among princes; the young Samuel who grows up in the temple before the Lord; all this history, all this revelation which he has discovered, excites feelings till then unknown. He returns home with a full heart. 'Oh!' thought he, 'if God would but give me such a book for my own!' Luther did not yet understand either Greek or Hebrew. It is not probable that he should have studied those languages during the first two or three years of his residence in the university. The Bible that had filled him with such transport was in Latin. He soon returned to the library to find his treasure again. He read and re-read, and then in his surprise and joy, he went back to read again. The first gleams of a new truth then arose in his mind.

"Thus has God caused him to find his word! He has now discovered that book of which he is one day to give to his countrymen that admirable translation in which the Germans for three centuries have read the oracles of God. For the first time, perhaps, this precious volume has been removed from the place that it occupied in the library of Erfurth. This book, deposited upon the unknown shelves of a dark room, is soon to become the book of life to a whole nation. The Reformation lay hid in that Bible." Vol. i. pp. 131, 132.

But it is the history of Luther's conviction and conversion which, more than any part of this work, interests and affects us. It extends through many pages, and cannot therefore be extracted; nor would we willingly do any thing which might make our pages a substitute for the volume itself. A few paragraphs, however, we must offer to the reader, in the hope that after this specimen, he will peruse the whole account. After a minute and most instructive recital of the anxieties and mental conflicts experienced by the young monk, while yet under the condemnation of the law, and vainly endeavouring to procure peace to his conscience by rites and penances, the following interview is related between him and Staupitz, vicar-general of the Augustine monks of Germany. It will be seen, that even amidst the errors and abuses of the monastic life, this good man had discovered what was the way of salvation.

"The heart of Luther, which had remained closed under harsh treatment, at last opened and expanded to the sweet beams of love. 'As in water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man.' (Prov. xxvii. 9.) Staupitz's heart responded to that of Luther. The vicar-general *understood him*. The monk felt towards him a confidence till then unknown. He opened to him the cause of his sadness, he described the horrid thoughts that distressed him, and hence ensued, in the cloister of Erfurth, conversations full of wisdom and instruction.

" 'It is in vain,' said the dejected Luther to Staupitz, 'that I make promises to God; sin is always too strong for me.'

" 'Oh, my friend,' answered the vicar-general, looking back on his own experience, 'I have vowed to the holy God more than a thousand times that I would live a holy life, and never have I kept my vow! I now make no more vows, for I know well I shall not keep them. If God will not be merciful to me for Christ's sake, and grant me a happy death when I leave this world, I cannot, with all my vows and good works, stand before him. I must perish.'

"The young monk is terrified at the thought of divine justice. He confesses all his fears. The unspeakable holiness of God—his sovereign majesty fills him with awe. Who can endure the day of his coming! Who can stand when He appeareth?

"Staupitz resumed. He knew where he had found peace, and it was in his heart to tell the young man. 'Why,' said he, 'do you distress yourself with these speculations and high thoughts? Look to the wounds of Jesus Christ, to the blood which he has shed for you; it is there you will see the mercy of God. Instead of torturing yourself for your faults, cast yourself into the arms of the Redeemer. Trust in him,—in the righteousness of his life, in the expiatory sacrifice of his death. Do not shrink from him; God is not against you; it is you who are estranged and averse from God. Listen to the Son of God. He became man to assure you of the divine favour. He says to you, 'You are my sheep; you hear my voice; none shall pluck you out of my hand.'

"But Luther could not find in himself the repentance he thought necessary to his salvation; he answered (and it is the usual answer of distressed and timid minds,) 'How can I dare believe in the favour of God, so long as there is no real conversion? I must be changed before he can receive me.'

"His venerable guide proves to him that there can be no real conversion, so long as man fears God as a severe judge. 'What will you say then,' cries Luther, 'to so many consciences, to whom are prescribed a thousand insupportable penances in order to gain heaven?'

Then he hears this answer from the vicar-general;—or rather he does not believe that it comes from a man; it seems to him a voice resounding from heaven. 'There is,' said Staupitz, 'no true repentance but that which begins in the love of God and of righteousness. That which some fancy to be the end of repentance is only its beginning. In order to be filled with the love of that which is good, you must first be filled with the love of God. If you wish to be really converted, do not follow these mortificatory and penances. *Love him who has first loved you.*'

"Luther listens, and listens again. These consolations fill him with a joy before unknown, and impart to him new light. 'It is Jesus Christ,' thinks he in his heart; 'yes, it is Jesus Christ himself who comforts me so wonderfully by these sweet and salutary words.'

"These words, indeed, penetrated the heart of the young monk like a sharp arrow from the bow of a strong man. In order to repentance, *we must love God!* Guided by this new light, he consulted the scriptures. He looked to all the passages which speak of repentance and conversion. These words, so dreaded hitherto, (to use his own expressions,) become to him an agreeable pastime and the

sweetest refreshment. All the passages of scripture which once alarmed him, seemed now to run to him from all sides, to smile, to spring up and play around him.

“‘Before,’ he exclaims, ‘though I carefully dissembled with God as to the state of my heart, and though I tried to express a love for him, which was only a constraint and a mere fiction, there was no word in the scripture more bitter to me than that of *repentance*. But now there is not one more sweet and pleasant to me. Oh! how blessed are all God’s precepts, when we read them not in books alone, but in the precious wounds of the Saviour.’” Vol. i. p. 149—152.

We fear these instructions are far too evangelical for some who in our day assume the direction of inquiring souls; they refer too much to the work of Christ, and too little to the work of the sinner. Yet it was these views of the freeness of the gospel which brought peace to the soul of Luther; these were the grounds of hope which he ever afterwards preached as the support of sinking souls; and these were the pillars of the Reformation, wherever it was established in Europe.

It is no part of our intention to follow the train of events, as they are here related. In their general aspect, they are familiar to our readers, and our author’s peculiar way of presenting them can be learnt only by a perusal of his work. He has shown the happy art of bringing before us, with all the interest of novelty, occurrences with which we have been made acquainted long since by the common histories. As an example of this, let us cite his graphic description of Tetzels and his traffic.

“A great agitation reigned at that time among the people of Germany. The church had opened a vast market on the earth. Judging from the crowd of buyers, and the noise and jests of the dealers, we might call it a fair; but a fair held by monks. The merchandise they extolled, offering it at a reduced price, was, said they, the salvation of souls!

“The dealers passed through the country in a gay carriage, escorted by three horsemen, in great state, and spending freely. One might have thought it some dignitary on a royal progress, with his attendants and officers, and not a common dealer, or a begging monk. When the procession approached a town, a messenger waited on the magistrate: ‘The grace of God, and of the holy father, is at your gates!’ said the envoy. Instantly every thing was in motion in the place. The clergy, the priests, the nuns, the council, the schoolmasters, the trades, with their flags,—men and women, young and old, went forth to meet the merchants, with lighted tapers in their hands, advancing to the sound of music, and of all the bells in the place; ‘so that,’ says an historian, ‘they could not have given a grander welcome to God himself.’ Salutations being exchanged, the whole procession moved toward the church. The pontiff’s bull of grace was borne in front, on a velvet cushion, or on cloth of gold. The chief vender of indulgences followed, supporting a large red wooden cross; and the whole procession moved in this manner, amidst singing, prayers, and the smoke of incense. The sound of organs, and a concert of instruments, received the monkish dealer and his attendants into the church. The cross he bore with him was erected in front of the altar; on it was hung the pope’s arms; and, as long as it remained there,

the clergy of the place, the penitentiaries, and the sub-commissioners, with white wands in their hands, came every day after vespers, or before the salutation, to do homage to it. This great bustle excited a lively sensation in the quiet towns of Germany.

"One person in particular drew the attention of the spectators in these sales. It was he who bore the great red cross, and had the most prominent part assigned to him. He was clothed in the habit of the Dominicans, and his port was lofty. His voice was sonorous, and he seemed yet in the prime of his strength, though he was past his sixty-third year. This man, who was the son of a goldsmith of Leipsic named Diez, bore the name of John Diezel or Tetzel. He had studied in his native town, had taken his bachelor's degree in 1487, and entered two years later into the order of the Dominicans. Numerous honours had been accumulated on him. Bachelor of theology, prior of the Dominicans, apostolical commissioner, inquisitor, (*hereticæ pravitatis inquisitor*,) he had ever since the year 1502, filled the office of an agent for the sale of indulgences. The experience he had acquired as a subordinate functionary had very early raised him to the station of chief commissioner. He had an allowance of 80 florins per month, all his expenses defrayed, and he was allowed a carriage and three horses; but we may readily imagine that his indirect emoluments far exceeded his allowances. In 1507, he gained in two days at Freyberg 2000 florins. If his occupation resembled that of a mountebank, he had also the morals of one. Convicted at Inspruck of adultery and abominable profligacy, he was near paying the forfeit of his life. The Emperor Maximilian had ordered that he should be put into a sack and thrown into the river. The Elector Frederic of Saxony had interceded for him, and obtained his pardon. But the lesson he had received had not taught him more decency. He carried about with him two of his children. Miltitz, the pope's legate, cites the fact in one of his letters. It would have been hard to find in all the cloisters of Germany a man more adapted to the traffic with which he was charged. To the theology of a monk, and the zeal and spirit of an inquisitor, he united the greatest effrontery. What most helped him in his office was the facility he displayed in the invention of the strange stories with which the taste of the common people is generally pleased. No means came amiss to him to fill his coffers. Lifting up his voice and giving loose to a coarse volubility, he offered his indulgences to all comers, and excelled any salesman at a fair in recommending his merchandise.

As soon as the cross was elevated, with the pope's arms suspended upon it, Tetzel ascended the pulpit, and with a bold tone began, in the presence of the crowd whom the ceremony had drawn to the sacred spot, to exalt the efficacy of indulgences. The people listened and wondered at the admirable virtues ascribed to them. A Jesuit historian says himself, in speaking of the Dominican friars whom Tetzel had associated with him:—"Some of these preachers did not fail, as usual, to distort their subject, and so to exaggerate the value of the indulgences as to lead the people to believe that, as soon as they gave their money, they were certain of salvation, and of the deliverance of souls from purgatory." Vol. i. pp. 209—211.

That the history is sufficiently minute, will appear from the fact that the second volume takes us down no further than the Diet of Worms, in 1541. This fulness of the narrative contributes, in no small degree, to the vivacity of the work; for nothing is more tedious than a mere book of annals, in which events are recorded in general terms, without the thousand circumstances which characterize the scenes, and give individual prominence to the actors. In



the eighth book, we are introduced to the reformer Zwingli, and the beginnings of the reformation in Switzerland; a subject which is treated with all the enthusiasm and affection which we might expect in one living upon the borders of the land of which he writes. Zwingli is brought before us, with the same delightful particularity and brilliancy of delineation which we have remarked in the case of Luther.

We commend these most engaging volumes to every class of our readers. If sometimes, from the stirring nature of the recital, they should imagine that they are perusing the inventions of romance, they must attribute this to the skill of the historian, assured by his perpetual citation of original authorities, that every statement is drawn from authentic memorials. The book breathes the spirit of piety, and of that piety which is not indifferent to truth. There is no attempt to conceal those doctrines which offend the natural heart, and which, after being the powerful weapons of Luther and Zwingli, have been laid aside by so many of their successors. The history is evidently written in the very spirit in which its great deeds were enacted. That such a spirit is reviving in France and Switzerland, especially at a time when, as in the Canton of Vaud, the ancient landmarks are suffering violence from the hand of infidel governors, is matter of thanksgiving and of hope.

*By Prof. J. Addison Alexander*

ART. VI.—*The Prelatical Doctrine of Apostolical Succession Examined, and the Protestant Ministry Defended against the Assumptions of Popery and High Churchism, in a Series of Lectures.* By Thomas Smyth, Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Charleston, S. C. Boston, 1841. Svo. pp. 568.

THIS book does no small credit to the industry and talent of the author. The importance of his subject, the correctness of his views, and the abundance of materials which he seems to have had at his command, entitle his performance to the most respectful notice. It is true, the circumstance last mentioned is, in one respect, a disadvantage, as all makers of books know. Selection from a great mass of materials, including the rejection without mercy of whatever may be spared, is one of the most arduous duties of

an author. To be well performed, it calls for time and patience. It is not surprising, therefore, that the work before us should exhibit imperfections as to this particular. The faults which strike us are excess in the number of quotations, and occasional confusion of arrangement, with too frequent reference to books of small authority. The author does the reader and himself injustice when, without necessity, he says in borrowed words, what he might have expressed better in his own, and also when he makes his text a mere thread, upon which to string a series of quotations. But in all these cases he errs upon the safe side, and, we may add, upon the modest side too. Where he gives us two authorities in the place of one, there are authors of repute who would have given none at all, but dealt in mere assertion; and where he adopts the words of another to express his own ideas, there are some who would have borrowed both ideas and expressions, and forgotten to enclose them in inverted commas. The great fault of the work is one which easily besets all rapid and prolific writers. It is not so much a finished composition as an ample collection of the best materials. In the present instance, this may have arisen from the book's having been written in the form of public lectures, and corrected for the press, but not remodelled. We are strongly of opinion that the same form and cast of composition are but seldom suited equally for speaking and for printing. We believe that multitudes of published sermons, which are never read, would be acceptable and popular, if cast into another mould, and transformed into books. The same thing is certainly not true in the same degree of popular lectures, such as those before us. It is true, however, in a less degree; and we believe that little more is wanting to convert this volume into a complete and standard work upon the subject, than a change of form from that of detached lectures to a systematic treatise, with a greater condensation both of matter and expression, and a little more attention to exactness of style and purity of diction, than the author, in the first flow of his composition, seems to have thought necessary. These ideas we indulge the hope of seeing realized in subsequent editions. In the mean time, however, we must not allow the reader to suppose that the defects, which we have spoken of, are any thing more than superficial blemishes. There may be too much matter; but a large proportion could not be dispensed with. Some of the quotations

might be spared ; but all the rest are of the highest value, as examples and as proofs of what High-Church Episcopalianism is. The author's mind is not only strong but lively, and his book exhibits traces of both qualities. The natural and (may we not say?) national vivacity with which he seizes on his topics and discusses them, enlivens, in a very satisfactory degree, even those parts of the subject which might otherwise have proved most irksome and fatiguing. In a word, the book (which, by the way, is elegantly printed) may be freely commended to the favourable notice of the public, and we doubt not that, wherever it is read, it will be useful in apprising those who read it what the High-Church doctrine really is, and on what grounds it may be most triumphantly and easily refuted. Instead of undertaking an analysis or more minute description of the work before us, which would be not only difficult but altogether needless, we proceed to give expression to some few thoughts of our own upon the spirit and the doctrines of High-Churchism, as they are brought to light in Mr. Smyth's performance.

We begin with what may seem to be an inappropriate truism, that man consists of a body and a soul, and that these are distinct but (until death) inseparable parts of the same complex being. There is, however, this important difference between them. If you kill the body, the soul still lives ; but if you can annihilate the soul, the body dies. It dies if you even take the soul away from it. There is, therefore, a vast difference between those evils which affect the body only, and those which affect the soul, or both together. Life, in its present form, consists in the union of soul and body. In the future state, they will again be reunited. But between these two, there is an interval of separation. During this interval the state of the two parts is very different. While the soul still lives, the body is not only dead, but decomposed. Now apply this to religion. Christianity has both a body and a soul. The body is that part of it which strikes the senses. The soul is the principle which animates the body. In the present state, it is the will of God that they should be united. But there are certain causes operating constantly to put them asunder ; and, to some extent, the separation is effected. Some professed Christians have endeavoured to sustain the soul of piety, without the body, by rejecting ordinances of an outward kind. Others have tried as hard to keep the body alive, af-

ter the soul had left it. The religion of the first class is beyond the reach of observation and experiment. That of the other bears the same relation to living Christianity, that mummies do to living men and women. The body is preserved from dissolution by the help of artificial means; but it is dead, discoloured, and so wrapped up, that you scarcely can believe it human. Yet it is not inconceivable, that the embalmers may become so fond of their own handiwork as actually to prefer a mummy to a man. For aught we know, the old Egyptian mummy-makers worshipped the integuments and unguents which they used, and we think it not unlikely that they learned at last to look upon a human soul as of much less value than the dried and stuffed and bandaged carcass which it had forsaken. The same thing may happen in religious matters. Men may operate upon the body of religion till the soul forsakes it, and when this takes place, they may embalm it, and imagine that the whole is still in their possession. If you tell them that the body is worth nothing without the soul, they will tell you in reply that the soul cannot be kept without the body, or perhaps will laugh at the idea of a soul, as something too intangible for men of sense to think about. And woe be to the sacrilegious hand that ventures to disturb the habiliments of death. Every thread, every pin, is of essential value. An invisible church is a mere chimera; but a church which is all visible, an outside without inside, a dress without a body, a body without a soul, is something altogether rational. If you speak of spiritual and internal piety, as something necessary to religious life, something which may be fostered by the proper use of forms, but which may possibly exist without them, you are set down a fanatic or at least a puritan. But talk of religious life, as consisting in the outward forms themselves, and the stigma disappears. The "beauty of holiness," when understood of any thing invisible and inward, is a mere cant phrase; but if it means a surplice, and an organ, and an altar at the east end, and a lectern, and a faldstool, and a candle in the day-time, it is perfectly intelligible, scriptural and orthodox. Regeneration is a transcendental notion, if restricted to the soul, but highly philosophical if so explained as to include not only the bodies of men, but those of baptized bells. It is absurd to look to Christ himself for spiritual benefit from sacraments, but not absurd to make the benefit depend upon the priest's official pedigree. That a communicant should



be refreshed, because of Christ's spiritual presence at his table, is a wild conceit; but that the same effect should follow, because the Reverend Mr. Smith was ordained by the Right Reverend Dr. Thompson, is a thing of course. In all these contrasts, the distinctive feature is the same. It is body on one side, and soul, or rather body and soul together, on the other. The antithesis is that between spiritual and ritual religion. By the former we are far from understanding the mere disembodied soul of Christianity. We mean the soul and body in a vital union. Our objection to a ritual religion, therefore, cannot possibly be met by corresponding objections to a fanatical rejection of all outward forms. We disclaim such a rejection. We hold fast to the body of religion, as the vehicle and dwelling of its spirit. But we do not hold fast to the body by itself. Because the spirit is beyond our reach without the body, does it follow that the body is enough without the spirit? Or, to change the figure, because you cannot drink conveniently without a cup, does it follow that an empty cup will slake your thirst? The grace of God is the water of life. The church, with its ordinances, is the cup. The enlightened Christian thankfully accepts of both. The fanatic dashes the cup down upon the earth, and tries to gather up the water with his hands or tongue, while the ritualist cherishes the empty vessel. Does the folly of the one excuse the folly of the other? Is the value of the vessel any reason for not filling it? Or has it any value when deprived of its contents? The solution of these questions is decisive of the issue between High-Church Christianity and what we hold to be the truth. We have proposed them in a figurative dress, not merely for the sake of illustration, but in order to enable all who will, to answer them without any bias from association. It is on this ground that High-Church errors ought to be encountered. We attach but small importance to mere questions of historical detail, until the principles at issue are determined. The question in dispute is not a question of mere circumstances, but of life and death; it is not a question as to meat and drink, but as to righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. To this fact we invite the attention of our readers. We are not sure that Presbyterians generally have correct ideas of this controversy. Some regard it as too trivial to be noticed. Others waste their strength on incidental questions. Both we think are in the wrong. It is certainly not

worth the while of Christian men to squabble about vestments, postures, and the like impertinences, simply for their own sake ; but it is well worth their while to fight against a system which exalts these impertinences to an equal rank with the essentials of religion. We ought to fight against the system, not because it includes usages which we think inexpedient, but because it breathes a spirit which we think destructive. The sole ground, upon which we can be justified in waging war against High-Church, is this, that its predominance would tend directly to destroy what we believe to be the soul of all religion. This is a point on which it would be idle to address High-Churchmen, not merely because they would not hear us, but because there is a total contrariety of judgment in relation to the very nature of the matter in dispute. We divide upon the question, what is true religion ? This want of any common ground on which to fight our battles, ought, perhaps, to put an end to all direct contention, and to make each party seek the confirmation of its own friends in what it believes to be the truth. We do, in fact, regard it as the most important end of publication on the subject, to acquaint Presbyterians with the nature of the controversy, and to show them how it ought to be decided upon Presbyterian principles, or rather upon principles which Presbyterians look upon as fundamental, and as paramount in authority to all church polity and legislation. If we labour to convince the High-Church prelatist himself that his peculiar tenets are destructive to what we call evangelical religion, he will not dispute the fact, but call in question the correctness of our definition. But in writing for Presbyterians, we may take for granted the reality and paramount importance of a spiritual Christianity, distinct from all external forms, and reason on the postulate that whatever tends to its destruction must be false in principle and wrong in practice. And if this, which is admitted to be true in general, can be established in its application to the High-Church system, such a demonstration ought to have immeasurably more weight, in the judgment of consistent Presbyterians, than any possible amount of antiquarian research into the origin of liturgies, or surplices, or bishops. We do not mean to say that such points may not be discussed. We only mean to say that such discussions are of little moment, when compared with the grand question, whether High-Church principles are fatal, in their tendency, to that religion of the heart, which scripture shows to be essential,

and without which all external forms are folly, and the practice of them sin.

In proof of the tendency with which we charge the system, we appeal to the writings of its advocates and organs. But in so doing, we must guard against a very easy misconception. Some of those referred to make a free use of the terms which have been employed by writers upon evangelical and practical religion. But they make a novel application of them. The feelings which we have been wont to hear expressed, in regard to spiritual views of divine truth, are now expressed by many, in relation to mere outward ceremonial matters. The venerable fathers of the Church of England were familiar with the exercise of holy joy and godly sorrow. But their joy sprang from the sense of divine favour, and their sorrow from the sense of their own sin. The one was never higher, and the other never deeper, than at those times when external forms were hidden from their view by the superior brightness of the spiritual objects, which they merely represented. When they wept, it was not because the pulpit was too high above the reading desk. When they exulted, it was not because the altar had been thrust back to the east end of the chancel. When they repented, it was not because they had tasted goose on Friday.\* When they thanked God, it was not for bells and organs and baptismal fonts. Their communion was with God and with his Son directly, not circuitously through a line of priests or bishops. Their delight was in the word of God itself, not in the spread eagle upon which it rested. The graces which distinguished them were not those of a posture-master. The cross in which they gloried was the cross of Christ, and not that of the carpenter, the gilder, or the silversmith. They kept it at the bottom of their hearts, and not upon the tops of their houses. In a word, they walked by faith and not by sight, looking not at things which are seen, but at things which are unseen. And yet now, their apostolical successors use the very same expressions, in relation to their baubles and their mummeries, which these old worthies used in reference to spiritual and eternal objects. What they said of the foundation, their successors say of the wood, hay, and stubble, heaped upon it. Let our readers be upon their guard against this dangerous abuse of evangelical expressions. Let them not

\* See Mr. Froude's Remains.

be satisfied with frequent mention of devout joy, sacred grief, holy rapture, and the like, until they see in what connexion these familiar terms occur. We bring no railing accusation against High-Church writers, of intentional deception in this use of language. We are willing to believe that they deceive themselves. It is one of the best proofs of the intrinsic vice of their whole system, that it actually makes them exercise religious feelings towards external objects. That must indeed be a strong delusion which can lead a man to spend his repentance, faith, hope, joy, and kindred feelings, upon rites and rubrics, or a system of church government, while sin, and holiness, and Christ, are in the back ground, or completely out of view.

If we are asked whether that which we understand by spiritual religion is, in its nature, incompatible with much attention to external forms, we answer—no. To a certain point, the life of piety within is really promoted by external observances, because God has connected the observance and the blessing. But the point, to which this influence extends, is fixed by God himself. He has given us a church, with an outward organization, and with outward ordinances. These are few and simple. He has given us so much of them, because they are adapted to our nature and condition. He has given us no more of them, because excess would be destructive of the very end for which he gave them. Food is the appointed means of life; but life is something more than food. The temperate and wise man does not live to eat; he eats to live. He neither starves nor stuffs himself; for he is neither an ascetic nor a glutton. In the highest sense, the food of all religion is the truth; but in a lower sense, it may be justly said, that the external part of our religion is the food by which our piety is nourished. But in order to be nourished, we must take it in the quantity, as well as in the form, which God prescribes. If we take too little, we shall die of famine; if we take too much we shall die of surfeit. And yet human nature tends to these extremes, both in temporal and spiritual matters; and in either case, the bias to excess is much the strongest. For one fanatic who believes it wrong to eat, you will find a thousand epicures, who seem to regard eating as the great end of existence; and for one enthusiast who rejects external ordinances, you will find a thousand who regard them as the very sum and substance of religion. Our position, then, is not that the observance of external forms, or even some excess in that



observance, is wholly incompatible with spiritual life, any more than we would say that food, or even excess in food, is necessarily destructive to natural life. But we maintain that there is a disposition to excess, and that any system, either of corporeal or spiritual regimen, which strengthens and encourages this disposition, has a fatal tendency, although it may not always have a fatal effect. When a sick man's only hope of life is in a meagre diet, it would, no doubt, kill him to withhold all food, but it would also kill him to allow too much. And if any of his friends should encourage him to eat, and try to stimulate his appetite, their mistaken kindness would be justly chargeable with tending (not intending) to destroy him. Now the Christian system is a dietetic system for the soul of man. It prescribes the quantum of material aliment compatible with spiritual life and health. Repletion is as dangerous as inanition; and whatever tends to the one should be as carefully avoided as what tends to the other; or in plain English, ritual religion is as dangerous as that kind of fanaticism which rejects observances ordained by Christ.

This is our quarrel with the High-Church form of Christianity, and in this quarrel every sincere Christian should be ready to take sides. If there is no such thing as the religion of the heart, distinct from the religion of the lips, and the religion of the knees; or if the High-Church notions do not tend to the promotion of the last, at the expense of the first; then we admit that there is really no cause for opposition and alarm. But if the contrary be true, it is our duty and our interest to be upon our guard against the creeping in of these insidious heresies among ourselves. What we have cause to apprehend is not the going over of predestinated prelatists from us to our neighbours, but the coming over of a High-Church spirit from our neighbours to ourselves. They are heartily welcome to as many reformed Finneyites, Independents, anti-sectarians, men-milliners, and "stickit ministers" as they can get, if they will only spare us an infusion of their spirit into what remains. It is not the open adversary that we fear, but stragglers and camp-followers and spies and renegadoes. An attempt was made, a few years since, to introduce a kind of Presbyterian High-churchism, with its cant about the decencies of public worship, and the dangerous effects of private judgment in religion; and we heard it said that some were greatly smitten with this starveling ape of

prelacy. We even heard of the erection of a third School, in addition, and in opposition, to the Old and New. But this precocious Infant School has disappeared, we hope for ever. *Requiescat in pace.* Let the Presbyterian body be awake to the intrusion of mock-popery among themselves; but let them not obstruct the free escape of those who are already tainted. It is better to lose blood until we faint, than to retain a virus in our veins. But we have no great fear of syncope. We think a little of our strength remains. It is easy to forgive men for the mischief which they would have done but could not, and we trust that nothing harsher will be said of those alluded to, by any Presbyterian, than that "they went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out THAT THEY MIGHT BE MADE MANIFEST that they were not all of us." And if any still behind are in the same predicament, we do not wish to hurry them, but merely to remind them of the excellent old proverb, *bis dat qui cito dat.* We certainly have no wish to promote the spread of error; but we must confess that when we see men of a certain spirit, and a certain mental calibre, begin to kick at the restraints of wholesome discipline and nauseate sound doctrine, we are strongly tempted to prescribe a certain regimen by which they may, in time, become respectable High-Churchmen. We shall not disclose our nostrum, any further than to say, that it includes a rapid alternation of the hot, cold, and tepid bath; the hot bath of fanaticism, the cold bath of frivolity, the lukewarm bath of jesuitical profession. The transforming power of this process is so great, that he who worshipped Finney when he went into the water, will be perfectly prepared to worship Pusey when he leaves it. That is no feeble agency which thoroughly converts a man from Oberlin to Oxford, and enables him thenceforth to be, at one and the same time, a Hierarchist and an Anabaptist.\* The cure however is not always instantaneous. It may be protracted by prudential motives. It may be precipitated by a sudden pique. But,

\* As this is a name well known in history, and just now unappropriated, we propose to grant at least the temporary use of it to that part of the Anglo-American-Catholic church which has recently adopted the uncanonical, schismatical, heretical, and very inconvenient practice of baptizing those who are baptized already. The head-quarters of this interesting little sect are in the city of New York, where, in one case, trine immersion, with the face towards the east, is said to have been practised in the Hudson river. We are very much afraid that the oil, salt, and spittle, were entirely forgotten.

in the mean time, we exhort all *bona fide* Presbyterians to be jealous, not so much of High-Church forms, as of the tendency and spirit of the system. Let us guard ourselves without assaulting others. We protest against that spurious liberality, which makes concessions to the very arrogance which ought to be resisted; but we also deprecate an imitation of the very arrogance which we condemn. A gentleman will never drop that character, because he is insulted by a person of a different description. He will rather take a lesson in good manners from the want of it in others. Let our Presbyterian readers do the same, however hard may be the trial to their temper. Let them cultivate good humour, by occasionally laughing at the follies, which would otherwise provoke their wrath. The use of ridicule, we know, has been proscribed by Dr. Pusey, and is virtuously frowned upon by most of his adherents, for an admirable reason. It appears to us that some of his worst errors might have been avoided, but for this erroneous doctrine. If the new sect had the faculty of seeing any thing to be absurd, they would have found themselves out long ago. But what we speak of more particularly, as a theme for laughter, is the high tone of pretension now so commonly assumed by every fopling, who, with Dogberry, can boast of being "one that hath two gowns and every thing handsome about him." Indeed the High-Church generally have an ugly trick of unchurching other people, and consigning them to what, in their slang, they call uncovenanted mercy. We have heard the question asked, how such pretensions should be treated; and we answer, just as Europeans and Americans treat the claims of the Chinese to be regarded as the only civilized nation upon earth. High-Churchmen are, in this respect, the Chinamen of Christendom. The points of resemblance are too glaring to be missed—the same awful reverence for trifles—the same enlightened scorn of weightier matters—the same self-worship—the same polite compassionate contempt of others—the same serene determination to sweep every thing before them—and the same success in doing it. High-Church and the Celestial Empire fill corresponding blanks in civil and church history. Both are highly respectable and highly useful. We have no more doubt that the one exists for some important end, than that the other does. But what the final cause, in either case, may be, we should not like to determine. We are very unwilling to believe that a

whole people exists only to be laughed at. And yet how is it, that the greatest nation upon earth, in point of numbers, is the only one which history exhibits in an aspect purely ludicrous? Other people have their oddities, but these have nothing else. It is not merely their costume and physiognomy. Their most solemn acts of government, of legislation, of negotiation, and of war, are comic, and, in many cases, farcical. It is impossible to read of them without a smile. There is something so intrinsically droll about them, that the gravest writers are compelled to be amusing. The characteristic feature of the Chinese manners is a sort of grave buffoonery, the more diverting as the Chinaman is always solemnly unconscious of his own absurdity. In every national and individual act, they seem to say, We are the people and wisdom shall die with us. It is not to be wondered at, that such a nation should include a Board of Ceremonies in its constitution. To them life itself is but a series of ceremonies. Every thing is ceremony. Man is a ceremonial puppet, made to go through certain evolutions and manoeuvres, to assume certain postures, and to utter certain words, at the bidding of a Hang Quo or master of ceremonies, or under the bamboo of a red-button Mandarin. It is just the same with Sinicism in religious matters. If you wish to place religionists of any sect beyond the reach of ridicule or reason, you must begin by making them as unreasonable and ridiculous as possible, and then they are forever proof against both wit and wisdom. As soon as any one has learned to look upon the paring of his nails and the adjustment of his eye-brows as a vital matter, he is perfectly impregnable. You cannot reach him. Reasoning, of course, is thrown away upon him. Ridicule he looks upon as sinful, because nothing is too small for him to reverence. And after this perversion of the intellect has gone to certain lengths, the smaller a thing is, the greater it becomes in his esteem. Matters of life and death are little in comparison with matters of arrangement or grimace. Tell him that what he eats is wholesome or unwholesome, and he hears you not. But tell him which way he must look, and in what posture he must eat, and he is all attention. Tell him that what he is about to drink is poison, and his only answer is a vacant stare. But tell him that the cup is in the wrong hand, or the wrong edge next his mouth, and he is thankful. When a man has reached this point, he might as well shave his head, and be thenceforth



inaccessible to all approaches, except such as may be made through the Ho Ping or ceremonial code, and the decrees of the Lee Poo or ceremonial council.

One effect of such a system is to make those who live under it supremely self-complacent. What do the Chinese care for foreign trade? They have every thing they want at home. What is geography to them? They are content to know that China is the centre of the universe. They allow the savage English and Americans to leave the howling wilderness, and clamour at Canton for tea; but when the English become smugglers they determine to destroy them. This contempt of other nations seems unconquerable, even by hard blows and bloodshed. Through the smoke of battle they are still seen as grotesque and self-important as before. Every junk that puts out from the coast is to destroy the British fleet; and when it fails, they are as confident as ever that the next will be successful. And when all has failed, they purchase their own safety with some millions of bad dollars, and then publish in the *Government Gazette*, that 'though the English demons made a bold attack, the imperial commander, with his rumbling thunder, considerably damped the ardour of the fierce barbarians.' We think we have seen battles gained at home in the same manner; and we fear that even bishops might be found who, as to both these articles of spurious silver and rumbling thunder, might successfully compete with all the Mandarins of the Celestial Empire. We commend this illustration to our friends, who are annoyed by the absurd pretensions of their High-Church neighbours. When they hear the latter prate of an "unauthorized ministry," "uncovenanted mercy," and the "danger of dissent," let imagination conjure up before the hearers some familiar form from the Chinese Museum, and we venture to assure them they will find it much more difficult to keep their countenances than to keep their temper.

*Charles Hodge*

ART. VII.—*Sermons on Important Subjects. By the Reverend Samuel Davies, A. M. President of the College of New Jersey. With an Essay on the Life and Times of the Author. By Albert Barnes. Stereotype Edition, containing all the Sermons of the Author ever published. In three volumes. New York: Dayton & Saxton. 1841.*

THAT religion is founded upon truth may be considered an axiom in theology. How can a man revere and love a God of whom he knows nothing? How can he obey a law of which he is ignorant, or believe a gospel of which he has never heard? Religious experience is, and must be the conformity of our inward exercises with our views of truth; and hence if those views are inadequate or erroneous, our religious experience must be in like degree defective or spurious. It must indeed be admitted that two men may have substantially the same opinions on religious subjects, and yet their religious experience be very different. But this arises from the one having clearer views of the truth, more faith, and larger measures of divine grace than the other. In both cases, as far as there is any real or spiritual apprehension of the truth, there is a conformity of the exercises of the mind to the truth that is apprehended. It may also be admitted that men may apparently differ very widely in their views of doctrine, whose religious experience is very much alike. But in such cases the difference is only in words. Many men are accustomed to deny the doctrines of election, efficacious grace, imputation of righteousness, &c., who nevertheless agree with those who hold those doctrines. We know of Methodists who sing with great zest the hymn on Election in Dr. Nettleton's village collection.

Making due allowance for the cases in which men profess to believe doctrines of which they have no real or adequate apprehension, and for those in which they reject the words in which certain doctrines are usually expressed, while they believe the doctrines themselves, it may certainly be affirmed, that a man's religious experience is in accordance with his views of religious truth; and consequently that a harmless error, in matters of religion, is as much a contradiction, as a true falsehood, or an innocent sin. Truth

and holiness, error and unholiness are so inseparable as to be rather identical, than united. They are different phases of the same thing. What is light to the eye is warmth to the hand. What the mind apprehends to be true, the heart feels to be good. Hence in scripture the word truth often stands for moral excellence, and the belief of the truth includes the love of holiness. Zeal for the truth, therefore, when enlightened and real, is only another name for zeal for holiness; and indifference to the truth is a disregard for moral excellence. We admit that there may be a zeal for truth, which is mere bigotry; that is, an attachment to certain doctrines, for other reasons than their intrinsic excellence, and which, consequently, is indiscriminating and generally malicious. But this does not affect the correctness of our position that zeal for the truth, when enlightened and real, is but another name for zeal for holiness. The men, the churches, or the party, therefore, do but proclaim their own shame, who make a boast of their latitudinarianism, though they may endeavour to deceive themselves and others, by calling it charity.

No enlightened friend of religion, therefore, can fail to regard with regret and anxiety, the disposition which has been increasingly manifested in this country, to make light of differences in doctrine; to regard it as a matter of little moment whether the doctrines of grace as taught in the Bible, or the Arminian perversion of those doctrines, or the Pelagian denial of them, should prevail in our churches. The indications of this indifference are too numerous, and of too frequent occurrence, to escape the notice of any who are not themselves indifferent. The loose doctrine of subscription to the Confession of Faith, as though it included nothing beyond assent to the absolutely essential doctrines of the gospel, which has been openly advocated among us; the avowal of erroneous doctrines by ministers in connexion with professedly orthodox denominations; the countenance shown to those who adopt such errors, by licensing, ordaining, and commissioning them as pastors and missionaries, and by resisting all attempts to exercise ecclesiastical discipline for opinion's sake; the loud opposition to the advocates of what was once thought orthodoxy, as heresy-hunters and bigots; the numerous publications of all kinds constantly issuing from the press either defending error, or pleading for its indulgence, are only a few of the many evidences of this low estimate of the value of the truth. This

indifference is often unconsciously manifested. Men can prepare and publish in various forms, essays on the kind of preaching which the age demands, with scarcely any reference to the importance of sound doctrine, beyond loose declamation in favour of the Bible, and in opposition to creeds and confession. They can draw the character of the distinguished preachers of other days, and ascribe to them every real, and many imaginary excellencies, without an allusion to their theological opinions. This could not be done by men who felt the importance of truth, or who were aware of its vital connexion with religion.

With regard to President Davies, who while living was probably the most admired preacher in the Presbyterian church, and whose sermons have certainly proved the most generally acceptable ever published in this country, it is surely a question of no little interest, What were his theological opinions? This question has the greater interest at the present time, as an edition of his Sermons has just been published under the auspices of our New School brethren, who are lavish in their encomiums on his character and usefulness. "He became," it is said, "perhaps, the most eloquent and accomplished pulpit orator that this country has produced; and was more successful in winning souls to the Redeemer, than any other minister of the age in which he lived, if we except, perhaps, Whitefield and Edwards."\* The theological opinions of such a man, cannot be a matter of indifference.

It is well known that there are two very different systems of doctrine prevailing more or less among the Presbyterian and Congregational churches. The one has obtained the name of the New Divinity, and the other for distinction sake, is called Old School Theology. The former rejects what has always been understood by original sin; that is, it teaches that men come into the world free from guilt, or liability to punishment on account of the sin of Adam, and free from any moral, hereditary corruption of nature. Both these ideas are included in this doctrine according to the general faith of the Reformed churches, though the term, original sin, is very often confined to the latter. Both are rejected by the advocates of the new system. Imputation of sin is hooted at as an absurdity, and execrated as inconsistent with the first principles of justice. And, since ac-

\* Mr. Barnes's Introductory Essay, p. xi.



According to the new theory, all morality consists in acts, and all sin in the voluntary transgression of known law, there can be no moral corruption, until we become moral agents, capable of understanding the law, of feeling obligation, and of knowingly transgressing the command of God. Corruption of nature, or inherent hereditary depravity, is thus excluded. Men are born without any moral character, as Adam was created in *puris naturalibus*. He, under the influence of self-love chose God, as his portion, and made himself holy; we under the same influence, choose the world, and make ourselves unholy. There is in us no unholy disposition or principle, which accounts for this universal and ruinous preference of sin to holiness. There is therefore nothing of a moral character within the soul, which is beyond the dominion of the will. If we choose the world from an innocent desire of happiness, we can, on more mature deliberation, from the same motive, choose God. There is nothing prior to this act of choice susceptible of change; as there is no corrupt principle leading to the choice of the world, there is no holy principle leading to a choice of God. Hence the doctrine of plenary ability. As there is nothing in the soul but its essence, with its necessary attributes, which are destitute of a moral character, and its acts; and as the acts of the will are determined by the simple constitutional principles of our nature, we have the same ability to will right as wrong; this ability belongs to us as moral agents, and is entirely independent of any influence of the Spirit of God. Regeneration therefore is our own act; it is a right choice or determination of the will, brought about by the power of self-love, or the desire of happiness. There may be a divine influence inducing men to form this determination, but it cannot be necessary, in the sense that without such influence men are unable to make this choice; nor can it be called efficacious in any proper and acknowledged sense of that expression. For according to this system, God cannot control the acts of moral agents; he can neither prevent sin nor the present amount of sin in a moral system; and, at all times and under all circumstances, he does all he can to bring men to repentance. His influence is therefore general; and if effectual in some cases, and not in others, it is not because of its peculiar nature, or superior power in such instances of success, but because some men choose to yield to it, while others choose to resist it. An influence which, in point of fact, is unsuccessful, in the great

majority of cases, though exerted to its utmost extent, cannot in its own nature be effectual. Justification, also, according to this system, is very different from what it has been commonly represented. There is no imputation of our sins to Christ, or of his righteousness to us. It is denied that Christ suffered the penalty of the law, or that his sufferings were of the nature of punishment; or that he made, in any proper sense, a satisfaction to divine justice. His death is represented as a kind of display or expression of God's disapprobation of sin, designed to prevent the evils of gratuitous forgiveness. It therefore merely opens the way for the exercise of mercy to sinners, on such terms as God sees fit to appoint.

This we believe to be a fair exhibition of the leading features of the New Divinity. We wish it, however, to be distinctly understood, that we are far from supposing that this system is adopted by all those who belong to the New School division of the church. We know, on the contrary, that there are many who not only reject it for themselves but condemn it in others. Unfortunately, however, the New School as a body are chargeable with harbouring, and protecting this system, and with endorsing it as harmless, having officially pronounced its peculiarities to be mere "shades" of doctrines. No man who believes that there is an intimate connexion between truth and religion, can believe that a system which rejects original sin; which asserts the plenary ability in the sinner to change his own heart; which makes regeneration our own act, a mere change of purpose; which denies the doctrine of efficacious grace; which explains away the atonement into a mere governmental display or symbolical expression, can fail to produce a kind of religion which is superficial and delusive. Happily, its influence is in a good measure counteracted by the better knowledge of the people on whom it is inculcated, and by the application of the truth, as exhibited in the Bible, to their hearts and consciences by the Holy Spirit. But this does not alter the tendency of the system, which is in so many points opposed to that which we believe is revealed in the word of God; a system which admits that our race had a fair probation in Adam, that his sin, on the ground of his representative character, is imputed to us, that is, that it forfeited for us as it did for him the favour of God; that consequently all the natural descendants of Adam come into the world out of communion with God, and as

there can be no holiness where there is no communion with the source of holiness, they are born without the divine image, without any disposition to delight in God, as the supreme excellence, but on the contrary, with hearts prone to the earth, and filled with the moral darkness and disorder implied in the absence of the light and power of a governing disposition to love and serve God;—a system which recognizing this corruption of nature, affirms that the power which the sinner has over the course of its own thoughts and purposes of his own mind, is entirely inadequate for his recovery from this spiritual death; that he is unable of himself to turn unto God, but must be renewed in the temper of his mind, by the mighty power of God; that this inward renovation therefore is not the sinner's own act; it is not a natural change effected by any of the principles belonging to our fallen nature, whether self-love, or natural conscience; but is a supernatural work, effected by the Holy Spirit, and consisting in a change not of the substance of the soul, nor yet of its acts merely, but of its moral state, communicating to it spiritual life, of which principle of life, conviction of sin, repentance, faith, and holy living, are the appropriate and certain results. This system, moreover, teaches that as the sinner cannot of himself produce that holiness without which no man can see God, so he cannot do any thing to merit the pardon of sin or acceptance with God; that the ground of his justification is not his own righteousness, but the perfect righteousness of Christ, consisting in his obedience and sufferings, whereby the demands of the law are fully satisfied, so that God can be just in justifying him that believes in Jesus; and that this righteousness of Christ is imputed unto us, and received by faith alone. This view supposes that Christ assumed our place, that our sins were imputed to him; that he bore the penalty or curse of the law, in our stead; that the obedience which he rendered to the law, and the sufferings which he endured, constitute that righteousness which as mediator he wrought out for his people, and which forms the only ground of their justification.

It is this system which we firmly believe is taught in the word of God, and has been, and still is the life and support of true religion in the church. It is this system which has of late years been so much derided as effete, and powerless, except for evil, and is still a standing mark for the shafts of denunciation and ridicule.

As President Davies is revered both by the advocates and opposers of this system, and as the latter seem disposed to assert a claim of peculiar relationship to him, we proceed to inquire what are the doctrines which he taught.

I. And first, as to the imputation of Adam's sin. "The angels," he says, "stood every one for himself, but Adam was constituted our representative; our concerns were lodged in his hands, and we fell in him."\* "By the sin of our first parents and representatives, our principle of spiritual life was forfeited, and the forfeiture is continued, and spiritual death brought on us by our personal sin. That Adam was constituted the representative of his posterity, and consequently that his sin is imputed to them, I shall take for granted, not having time to prove it. And if this be granted, then we are destitute of spiritual life; for that disobedience may be punished, consistently with reason and justice, by the judicial privation of our power to obey, cannot be denied; if these reasonable *postulata* be conceded: That it is consistent with the justice and goodness of the Deity to suspend the continuance of the powers of upright moral agency conferred upon his creatures, on the condition of their right improvement of them: That when such powers are abused and misimproved, they may be justly withdrawn: And that, when withdrawn in consequence of their being forfeited by a criminal misimprovement, God is not obliged in justice to restore them."†

It must frequently happen, in making these extracts, that passages cited in proof of Davies's opinion on one point, exhibit his views on others. Thus in the above passage we have, 1. A distinct assertion of the imputation of Adam's sin. 2. That his posterity are destitute of spiritual life. 3. That they are destitute of the powers of upright moral agency, which is a much stronger statement of the sinner's inability than we are wont to hear from the most strenuous of the modern assertors of that doctrine.

"I now proceed," he says in another sermon, "to the illustration of the great truths the apostle has chiefly in view in this verse (Rom. v. 17); and I begin with the first. That by the sin of Adam, all mankind are subjected to the power of death. It is the more necessary to insist on this, as the doctrine of original sin, as it is commonly called, is not only

\* Vol. ii. p. 189.

† Vol. ii. p. 404.



disputed in our age and country, but too generally denied, and represented as a Calvinistic fiction, supported neither by scripture nor reason, inferring blasphemous reflections upon the divine perfections, and degrading the dignity of human nature.

“ We now hear panegyries upon the powers of man, the dignity of his nature, and I know not what; as though these powers had never been shattered by the first fall. We often hear and read such harangues as these—‘ Can we suppose that a righteous and good God would inflict punishment upon millions of millions of his own creatures for an offence committed by another so long before they had a being; an offence in which they had no concurrence, and which they could not possibly have prevented? Is this consistent with the merey or justice of God?’ . . . . . We are also told, that as this is not the doctrine of reason, so neither is it that of revelation; that there are but few passages of scripture that so much as seem to countenance it; and that these will easily admit of another sense; that this, however, cannot be the sense of them, because it is contrary to reason, which a revelation from God can never contradict. . . . . You may observe that it is not my present design, nor that of my text, to consider that part of original sin which consists in the corruption of our nature derived from Adam, but only that which consists in the imputation of his guilt to us, or our exposedness to punishment on account of his sin.”\* In proof of this imputation he appeals first to the difference between the present and primitive state of the earth; then to the prevalence of death, especially over infants, with regard to whom he says, “ It is computed that at least one-half of mankind die under seven years old; and the greater part of this half die before they are moral agents, or capable of personal sin or duty, even in the lowest degree. Whatever therefore they suffer, must be for the sin of another, even Adam their common father, whose offence subjected him and all his posterity to the power of death and the various calamities that precede it.” The standing answer to this argument is, that brutes die. To this he replies, “ First, That we have no evidence from scripture or reason, that the brutal creation was formed for immortality. . . . . It is no punishment to a brute that it does not enjoy the privileges and immunities of man in

\* Vol. iii. p. 298.

his original state; because these were never intended for the brutal nature. But if Adam's posterity are stripped of these privileges and immunities which belonged to their nature in him, and which were insured both to him and them, if he continued obedient, and if they are stripped of these on account of his sin, then it is evident that his sin is imputed to them, and they are punished for it."\*

II. Original sin, or innate depravity. In the extracts already given we find Pres. Davies speaking of "the corruption of our nature derived from Adam;" and throughout his sermons the doctrine of the innate hereditary moral depravity of our race, is variously stated or assumed. In his discourse on the nature and universality of spiritual death, we find this doctrine not only asserted but proved. After stating that the apostle declared the Ephesians to be dead in sin before their conversion, he adds, that he passed the same sentence upon himself and the whole body of the Jews. "We all, as well as they, walked in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires and inclinations of our sensual flesh, and of our depraved minds, for these were tainted with spiritual wickedness, independent of our animal passions and appetites; and we are all, even by nature, children of wrath even as others: in this respect we Jews are just like the rest of mankind, corrupt from our very birth, transgressors from the womb, and liable to the wrath of God. . . . As we are children of disobedience by our lives, so we are all without exception, children of wrath by nature; but when we were all dead in sins, when Jews and Gentiles were equally dead to God, then, even then, God, who is rich in mercy, had pity upon us; *he quickened us*; he inspired us with a new and spiritual life by his own almighty power, which raised the dead body of Christ from the grave. . . . This is the obvious meaning and connection of these verses; and we now proceed to consider the text, *dead in trespasses and sins*; you dead, we dead, Jews and Gentiles all dead together in trespasses and sins. A dismal mortifying character! 'This one place,' says Beza, 'like a thunderbolt dashes all mankind down to the dust, great and proud as they are; for it pronounces their nature not only hurt but dead by sin, and therefore liable to wrath.' "

He then proceeds to illustrate the nature of this spiritual death, and to show wherein it agrees and wherein it differs

from natural death. Spiritual death is consistent with feelings and activity about worldly things, and even about the external duties of religion. Though the unregenerate sinner, he says, "can commit sin with greediness, though he is capable of animal actions and secular pursuits, nay, though he can employ his mind about intellectual and spiritual things, and is capable of performing the external duties of religion; yet there is something in religion with regard to which he is entirely dead; there is a kind of spiritual life of which he is entirely destitute; he is habitually insensible with regard to things divine and eternal; he has no activity, no vigour in the pure, spiritual and vital exercises of religion; he has no prevailing bias of mind towards them. . . . In short, he is so inactive, so listless, so insensible in these respects, that death, which puts an end to all action and sensation, is a proper emblem of his state; and this is the meaning of the apostle in my text. He is utterly unable to quicken himself. He may indeed use means in some sort; but to implant a vital principle in his soul, but to give himself vivid sensations of divine things, and make himself alive towards God, this is entirely beyond his utmost ability; this is as peculiarly the work of almighty power as the resurrection of a dead body from the grave. As to this death, it is brought on him by, and consists in, trespasses and sins. The innate depravity and corruption of the heart, and the habits of sin contracted and confirmed by repeated indulgences of inbred corruption, these are the poisonous, deadly things that have slain the soul; these have entirely indisposed and disabled it for living religion."\*

In the sermon entitled, 'The success of the Ministry owing to a divine influence, we find such declaration as the following: "Such is the present degeneracy of human nature, that all the ministrations of the gospel cannot remedy it, without the concurring efficacy of divine grace. . . . The metaphors used in scripture to illustrate this case, sufficiently prove the degeneracy of mankind, and their entire opposition to the gospel. They are represented as spiritually dead, Eph. ii. 1, John v. 25; that is, though they are still capable of the exercises of reason and animal actions, yet they are really destitute of a supernatural principle of spiritual life, and incapable of suitable exercises towards God. . . . Sinners are also represented as blind, 2 Cor. iv. 4.

\* Vol. i. pp. 76, 78.

Now what can feeble mortals do for such? We can exhibit divine things before them; we can expose the horrid deformity of sin, and its tremendous consequences; we can display the glories of God, the beauty of holiness, and the allurements of redeeming love; but alas! all this is but like exposing colours to the blind." In the same page he says, men, "naturally delight in sin," and adds, "Now, since the innate dispositions of men are thus averse to the gospel, it is evident that nothing but divine power can make it effectual for their sanctification."\*

In a sermon already quoted, he says, "If men have lost that holiness which adorned their nature, when first formed, and are morally corrupt and depraved, if this, I say, be the case, then it is evident, we are a fallen race, and lie under the penal effects of Adam's offence."† "There is a visible disparity between the present and original state of our world and human nature; and this disparity is penal; that is, it is inflicted upon Adam and his posterity as the punishment of his sin."‡

In the discourse on Evidences of want of love to God, he says: "The love of God is not in you, if the native enmity of your hearts against him has not been subdued. This will appear evident to every one that believes the scripture account of human nature in its present degenerate state. By nature we are children of wrath; and certainly the children of wrath cannot be the lovers of God while such. 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh;' and they savour of the flesh, or, as we render it, 'the carnal mind is enmity against God,' Rom. viii. 7. And hence it is, that 'they that are in the flesh cannot please God,' Rom. viii. 8. . . . From these things it is evident, that, according to the scripture account, the present state of nature is a state of disaffection and hostility against God. . . . Now it is most evident, that since you are by nature enemies to God, your natural enmity to him must be subdued, or, in the language of the New Testament you must be reconciled to him, before you can be lovers of him."

We have in the preceding extracts a complete account of original sin, in the widest acceptation of that term, as including the imputation of the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of our nature. Mr. Davies teaches that Adam was the represen-

\* Vol. ii. p. 526.

† Vol. iii. p. 300.

‡ Vol. iii. p. 304.



tative of his race, that we fell in him, that we are born destitute of that holiness which originally belonged to our nature, that our nature is now corrupt, that this corruption is innate, that it is derived from Adam, that it is of a moral character, so that by nature we are children of wrath, and the enemies of God. A fuller assertion of this doctrine it would be difficult to find; sure we are that we never heard so much on these points in all the Old School sermons we ever listened to, as is to be found in these discourses of President Davies.

III. Inability. Intimately connected with the foregoing subject, and necessarily involved in it, is the inability of sinners to change their own hearts, or to yield acceptable obedience to God. On this point these discourses are unusually full and explicit. "The exceeding greatness of his mighty power is exerted towards us that believe, as well as it was upon the dead body of Christ to restore it to life, after it had been torn and mangled on the cross, and lain three days and three nights in the grave. What strong language is this! What a forcible illustration! Methinks this passage alone is sufficient to confound all the vanity and self-sufficiency of mortals, and entirely destroy the proud fiction of a self-sprung faith, produced by the efforts of degenerate nature."\* "The mind of man, in his present fallen state, like a disordered eye, is incapable of perceiving divine things in a proper light, however clearly they are revealed; and therefore, till the perceiving faculty be rectified, all external revelation is in vain, and is only like opening a fair prospect to a blind eye. Hence this great Prophet carries his instructions further, not only by proposing divine things in a clear objective light by his word, but inwardly enlightening the mind, and enabling it to perceive what is revealed by his Spirit?"† "When I exhort sinners to look to Jesus, I would not intimate that they are able to do this of themselves. No; I am very sensible that all the exhortations, persuasions, invitations and expostulations that a feeble mortal, or even the most powerful angel in heaven can use with them will have no effect, but vanish into air, without the efficacious operation of almighty grace. And yet such exhortations are neither useless, improper, nor unscriptural; they tend to convince sinners of their inability to believe,

\* Vol. i. p. 75.

† Vol. i. p. 253.

which is necessary to their believing aright; and it is while such arguments are addressed to their understandings, that the Holy Spirit is wont to work upon their hearts.”\* Our New School brethren say that is necessary that sinners should believe and feel their ability to obey the calls of God, before they can feel their obligation; President Davies says they must feel their inability before they can believe aright. This shows a radical difference in their views of experimental religion. If it is true that they have this ability, then they ought to feel it; but if it is true they have it not, then genuine religious experience will make them feel their helplessness. This subject, however, will come up again, in the sequel.

“Regeneration,” says our author, “is a change so great, so noble, and divine, that from thence alone we may infer it can be produced only by divine power. And the nature of man, in its present state, is so corrupt and weak, that it is neither inclined nor able to produce it. . . . Here then, sinners, you see to whom you must look for this blessing. You can no more regenerate yourselves, than you could beget yourselves at first. And this you must be deeply sensible of.”† “The awakened sinner betakes himself to the use of the means of grace with redoubled vigor and earnestness, and strives to change the principles of action within. But alas! he finds his heart is a stubborn thing, and altogether unmanageable; and after repeated strivings to no purpose, he is effectually convinced of his own inability, and the absolute necessity of the divine power to make him truly good. Therefore he lies at the throne of grace, as a poor, anxious, helpless sinner, entirely at mercy, and unable to relieve himself.”‡

The sermon on Divine Life in the soul, is a continued argument on this subject, but as we shall have occasion to refer to that discourse for another purpose, we content ourselves for the present with the following short, but sufficient extract. “How many content themselves with a self-begotten holiness! They have formed to themselves a system of natural, self-sprung religion, (I mean that it is natural originally and subjectively, though it be pretended to be divine objectively, because its patrons acknowledge objective revelation,) in this they acquiesce as sufficient, as though they knew not that *that which is born of the flesh*

\* Vol. ii. p. 263.

† Vol. ii. p. 383.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 384.

*is flesh.* The cogitiveness of matter seems to me to be a notion very like this; for I think it might be demonstrated as clearly, that our mere natural powers, in our present lapsed state, without the infusion of any divine supernatural principle, are incapable of living, evangelical holiness; as it can, that mere matter, without the superaddition of a principle entirely distinct from it, is incapable of thinking, however much it be polished, or however differently it be modified.”\* If any man has ever stated the doctrine of the sinner’s inability in stronger terms than this, we are ignorant of the fact.

Let us now see how President Davies answers the excuse which men make for not believing, founded on this doctrine. “Before I proceed any further,” he says, “I would remove one stumbling block out of your way. You are apt to object, ‘You teach us that faith is the gift of God, and that we cannot believe of ourselves, why then do you exhort us to it? Or how can we be concerned to endeavour that which it is impossible for us to do?’ In answer to this I grant the premises are true; and God forbid I should so much as intimate that faith is the spontaneous growth of corrupt nature, or that you can come to Christ without the Father’s drawing you; but the conclusions you draw from these premises are very erroneous. I exhort and persuade you to believe in Jesus Christ, because it is while such means are used with sinners, and by the use of them, that it pleases God to enable them to comply, or to work faith in them. I would therefore use those means which God is pleased to bless to this end. I exhort you to believe in order to set you upon the trial; for it is putting it to trial, and that only, which can fully convince you of your own inability to believe; and till you are convinced of this, you can never expect strength from God. I exhort you to believe because sinful and enfeebled as you are, you are capable of using various preparatives to faith. You may attend upon prayer, hearing, and all the outward means of grace with natural seriousness; you may endeavour to get acquainted with your own helpless condition, and as it were place yourselves in the way of divine mercy; and though all these means cannot of themselves produce faith in you, yet it is only in the use of these means, you are to expect divine grace to work it in you; never was it yet produced in one soul,

\* Vol. ii. p. 395.

while lying supine, lazy, and inactive.”\* How much more true, scriptural, rational and pious is this, than the hard-hearted repetition of the mere command believe, believe, repent, repent, you have all the requisite power, you can if you will; for if you were unable you would be excusable; your ability is the measure of your obligation. A style of address which contradicts the consciousness of every hearer, is at variance with the experience of every Christian, and which either bewilders and distresses those who are seeking salvation, or deludes them into a confidence in what President Davies calls “a self-begotten holiness.”

The most interesting point, however, connected with this subject, is the practical bearing of this doctrine. We are accustomed to hear it denounced as destructive to the souls of men, as tending to produce indifference and neglect, as encouraging procrastination, a waiting God's time, nay, as exonerating the sinner and throwing the whole responsibility of his perdition on God. We are willing to admit, as remarked above, that if the doctrine is false, it must be destructive: but on the other hand if it is true, then those who know their own hearts know it to be true; and they must know it, in order to receive the grace of God. The whole plan of salvation is arranged and executed with a design to prevent all self-reliance and all boasting. Not only our forgiveness, but our conversion, the apostle says, is of God, in order that no flesh should glory in his sight. If therefore we feel that we can change our own hearts, that we can make ourselves good, that we are able without divine aid to repent, believe, and be holy, then is our experience opposed to the truth of God, it is inconsistent with the plan and design of redemption, and is so far spurious. We have already seen that President Davies tells his readers that a conviction of their inability to believe is necessary to their believing aright, or to their receiving strength from God, but it may be worth while to see more fully how this successful preacher and experienced Christian regarded the practical bearings of this important doctrine.

In his sermon on the Nature and Process of Spiritual Life, he traces the exercises of a real Christian; he describes him as first roused by the threatenings or promises of God to some sense of the importance of religion, but being unacquainted with the odious nature of sin, and “the entire,

\* Vol. i. p. 50.



universal corruption of his own nature," he contented himself with mere external reformation. But when God was pleased to carry on his work in him, he was made to see "the corruption of his heart, the awful strictness of the divine law, his utter inability to yield perfect obedience, and the necessity of an inward change of the inclinations and relishes of his soul. These," he adds, "and a great many other things of like nature, broke in upon your minds, with striking evidence and a kind of almighty energy; and now you saw you were still *dead in sin*, weak, indisposed, averse towards spiritual things; *dead in law*, condemned to everlasting death and misery by its righteous sentence." The effect of these convictions, he says, is to lead those who feel them "to set about the duties of religion with more earnestness than ever," but these renewed efforts only make them "more sensible than ever of their weakness." "Alas," he says, "you found yourselves quite helpless, and all your efforts feeble and ineffectual, then you perceived yourselves really dead in sin, and that you must continue so to all eternity, unless quickened by a power infinitely superior to your own: not that you lay slothful and inactive at this time; no, never did you exert yourselves so vigorously in all your life, never did you besiege the throne of grace, with such earnest importunity, never did you hear and read with such eager attention, or make such a vigorous resistance against sin and temptation; all your natural powers were exerted to the highest pitch, for now you saw your case required it; but you found all your most vigorous endeavours insufficient, and you were sensible that, without the assistance of a superior power, the work of religion could never be effected." "Now the process of preparatory operations is just come to a result. Now it is time for God to work, for nature has done her utmost, and has been found utterly insufficient; now it is proper a divine supernatural principle should be infused, for all the principles of nature have failed, [self-love and all,] and the proud sinner is obliged to own it, and stand still, and see the salvation of God."\* Thus according to Davies, it is a necessary part of Christian experience, that we should be convinced of an inability, which our modern teachers assure us does not exist. Surely they and Davies must differ greatly as to their ideas of the nature of religion.

\* Vol. i. p. 104, and the whole sermon.

“He that is poor in spirit,” says our author, “is sensible of his need of the influences of divine grace to sanctify him, and enrich him with the graces of the Spirit. . . . Holiness is the one thing needful with him, which he desires and longs for above all others; and he is deeply sensible that he cannot work it in his own heart by his own strength; he feels that without Christ he can do nothing, and that it is God who must work in him both to will and to do.”\*

He represents a convinced sinner as using the following language: “Lord, though I am sensible of the necessity of turning to thee, though I exert my feeble strength in many a languid effort to come, yet I cannot so much as creep towards thee, though I should die on the spot. Not only thy word, but my own experience now convinces me that I cannot come unto thee, unless thou draw me. Others vainly boast of their imaginary power, as though, when they set themselves about it, they could perform some great achievements. Thus I once flattered myself, but now, when I am most capable of judging, that is, when I come to the trial, all my boasts are humbled. Here I lie, a helpless creature, unable to go to the physician, unable to accept of pardon and life on the easy terms of the gospel, and unable to free myself from the bondage of sin; and thus I must lie forever, unless that God from whom I have revolted, draws me back to himself.”†

To the same effect in another sermon, he says, “Thus the blessed Spirit convinced you of your own weakness, and the necessity of his influence, to work this divine change;” and then asks his readers, “Have you ever been reduced to this medicinal self-despair? It is the humble heart alone that is susceptible of the image of the meek and lowly Jesus.”‡

“Faith supposes the supernatural illumination of the mind and renovation of the heart, by the power of divine grace. . . . Hence many a believer has found that it was easier for him to work up his heart to any thing, than to believe in Jesus Christ, and that God alone could enable him to do this.”§

“Faith is not of ourselves; but is expressly said to be the gift of God, Eph. ii. 8. Nay, the implantation of faith is represented as an exploit of omnipotence, like that of the resurrection of Christ.”||

\* Vol. i. p. 122.

† Vol. i. p. 236.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 322.

§ Vol. ii. p. 509.

|| Vol. ii. p. 531.

“It is our duty to use the most vigorous endeavours to obtain those graces promised, because it is only in the use of vigorous endeavours that we have reason to expect divine influences. And yet these endeavours of ours do not, in the least work those graces in us, and therefore there is certainly as much need of the promised agency of divine grace to effect the work, as if we should do nothing at all. Our utmost endeavours fall entirely short of it, and do not entitle us to divine assistance; and this we must have a humble sense of, before we can receive the accomplishment of such promises as the effect of free grace alone.”\*

In the conclusion of the same discourse he says, “Hence we learn, how essential and important the doctrine of divine influence is to the church of God. The very life, and the whole success of the gospel depend upon it. And since this necessarily supposes the utter depravity and spiritual impotence of human nature in its fallen state, that doctrine also must be frequently and plainly preached. Alas! the great defect of the system of divinity too fashionable in our day, and one great cause of the languishing state of religion in our age, and of the prevalence of vice and impiety! Since it has been the mode to compliment mankind as able to do something very considerable in religion, religion has died away. Since it has been the fashion to press a reformation of men’s lives, without inculcating the absolute necessity of divine grace to renew their nature, there is hardly such a thing as a thorough reformation to be seen; but mankind are evidently growing worse and worse. Since men think they can do something, and scorn to be wholly dependent on divine grace, the Lord, as it were, looks on and suffers them to make the experiment, and alas! it is likely to be a costly experiment to multitudes. God withholds his influence in just displeasure, and lets them try what mighty things the boasted powers of degenerate nature can do without it; and hence alas! they lie all secure and asleep in sin together.”†

It is abundantly evident from these extracts that Davies held that the unrenewed man is entirely unable to change his own heart, to repent, or believe, or perform any really holy act. Indeed we never heard or read any series of sermons, in which this doctrine is so frequently and plainly inculcated. It is moreover evident that he considered it to be

\* Vol. ii. p. 530.

† Vol. ii. p. 589.

a doctrine of great practical importance, entering deeply into genuine religious experience, and the inculcation of which he felt to be necessary to all real success in preaching the gospel. It is still further evident, and will be much more so from what follows, that he regarded this inability as something more than a mere unwillingness, though it is that too. His doctrine, and the common doctrine of the church, is, that by the fall men lost communion with God, and with that communion, his moral image; that they have no disposition, or taste for holiness, that they are blind to the excellence of divine things, that the mere natural principles of our nature, reason, conscience, self-love, sympathy, &c., are inadequate to the production or support of spiritual life, that there must be, in his language, a new and supernatural principle, not a new faculty, but a new principle, infused into the soul, and that when this is done, then there are new views, new feelings, and a new life. All this is clearly taught in the passages already cited, but will be brought more distinctly into view, when we present those which relate,

IV. To the nature of regeneration and the influence by which it is effected. It will be seen that so far from regarding regeneration as a mere change of purpose, he represents it as a change of nature, or of the moral state of the soul by communicating to it a principle of holiness; and so far from its being our act, he declares it to be the act of the mighty power of God.

Though these points are frequently introduced in these sermons, we shall content ourselves with a few extracts from the two discourses on the Divine Life in the Soul, requesting the reader, who may feel interested in the subject, to refer to the sermons themselves. "Spiritual life," he says, "supposes a living spiritual principle. There can be no life, no vital actions, without a vital principle, from whence they flow, e. g. there can be no animal life, no animal sensations and motions, without a principle of animal life. . . Now a holy principle is something distinct from and superadded to the mere natural principle of reason. By virtue of this a man can think and will; but experience teaches and assures us that thinking and willing, abstractedly considered, or under sundry modifications which they are capable of, are very different from thinking and willing in a holy manner, or with those peculiar modifications which spiritual operations bear. . . . It may be urged, That all the acts



of spiritual life may be resolved into the acts of reason, namely, thinking and willing in a holy manner; and therefore the principle of the former is the same with that of the latter." This he admits with regard to reasonable beings "who still continue in their original uprightness; but the principle of reason may be so maimed as to lose this power, and yet not lose its nature; that is, it may become incapable of that manner of operation which spiritual life produces, and yet continue a principle of reason still. Now the principle of spiritual life supplies this moral defect; it adds to reason a capacity of exercising itself suitably about spiritual things. Such a capacity is a separable adjunct of reason, and by the corruption of our natures it is actually separated from it; and consequently till it be superadded to our rational powers, we are incapable of spiritual operation, I mean such a manner of spiritual operation as is morally good and acceptable to God. . . . When a sinner is quickened by efficacious grace, a power of acting in a fit manner with respect to these things, is superadded to his rational powers; and before this there is nothing in him out of which such a power may be educed."\*

"Spiritual life implies a disposition to a holy operation, a spontaneous inclination towards holiness, a willing that which is good. . . . There is a savour, a relish for divine things, as essential to spiritual life, as our natural gusto and appetites are to natural life."†

"Spiritual life implies a power of holy operation. A heavenly vigour, a divine activity animates the whole soul. It implies more than an inefficacious disposition, a dull, lazy velleity, productive of nothing but languid wishes. . So every kind of life implies a power of operation suitable to its nature."‡ He concludes this part of his subject with "a caution against a common mistake, viz. that our mere natural powers, under the common aids of divine grace, polished and refined by the institutions of the gospel, are a sufficient principle of holiness, without the addition of any new principle. You see a principle of spiritual life is supernatural; it is a divine, heaven-born thing; it is the seed of God; a plant planted by our heavenly Father. . . . Let us also improve what has been said, to remove another equally common and pernicious error, namely, That gospel holiness consists merely in a series of acts materially good.

\* Vol. ii. p. 390.

† Vol. ii. p. 392.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 395.

Some imagine that all the actions they do, which are materially lawful, and a part of religion, have just so much holiness in them; and as they multiply such actions their sanctification increases in their imagination. But alas! do they not know that a principle, a disposition, a power of holy acting must precede, and be the source of all holy acts? That a new heart must be given to us, and a new spirit put within us, before we can *walk in God's statutes and keep his judgments, and do them*. That we must be created in Jesus Christ unto good works, before we can walk in them." Again, as to the difference between morality and religion he says, "Spiritual life is of a divine original; evangelical holiness flows from a supernatural principle; but mere morality is natural; it is but the refinement of our natural principles, under the aids of common grace, in the use of proper means; and consequently it is obtainable by unregenerate men."\*

In his second discourse on this subject, he proves that spiritual life is communicated in regeneration, and that a power of living unto God is not universally conferred on mankind at creation, by such arguments as the following: "1. If spiritual life were communicated in creation, there would be no propriety or significancy in the expressions used to denote the communication of it. There would be no need of a new, a second birth, if we were spiritually alive, by virtue of our first birth. . . . 2. The implantation of spiritual life is not only posterior to creation, but also to corrupt principles, which are innate. We are first dead in sin before we are quickened. . . . 3. The implantation of a principle of spiritual life is eminently an act of special grace, which the concreation of our natural endowments is never said to be. . . . 4. To this I may add that spiritual life is always represented as communicated through Christ as mediator and for his sake: but our natural endowments are not said to be given through him. . . . From all this it appears that spiritual life is wholly supernatural, it is a divine extract, and heaven-born in a peculiar sense."†

He then proves that this life is instantaneously communicated, because it is impossible it should be acquired by acting or by a series of acts, for "the acts of one kind of life, however often repeated, will never acquire a life of quite a dif-

\* Vol. ii. p. 327.

† P. 399, 400.

ferent kind ; e. g. the largest course and the most frequent repetition of animal acts will never acquire a principle of reason. . . . So let our natural principles be exercised about spiritual objects with ever so much frequency and permanency, that will never produce spiritual life. They are so depraved that there remains nothing out of which it can be educed, without the communication of something supernatural." Again, the terms, creating, quickening, &c. denote an instantaneous communication ; and thirdly, "spiritual life is represented as prior to and the source and principle of all acts of evangelical holiness ; and consequently it cannot be gradually acquired by such acts, but must be implanted previously to the putting forth of any such acts, as reason is not acquired by reasoning, but is the pre-requisite and principle of all the acts of reason."

"Hence we may see the vanity of that religion which is gained in the same manner that a man learns a trade, or an uncultivated mind becomes knowing and learned, namely, by the repeated exercises of our natural powers in the use of proper means, and under the aids of common providence. We have seen that a principle of spiritual life is not a good act, nor a series of good acts, nor any thing acquirable by them, but the spring and origin of all good acts. Let us then, my brethren, try whether our religion will stand this test."†

There is much more to the same effect ; but this is enough, and more than enough to show that Davies had no faith in that kind of regeneration which is a man's own act, and which flows from the mere natural principles of our constitution. The importance which he attributed to this subject, may be inferred from the following passage : "Without union with Christ we cannot have an actual interest in his righteousness, or be the special objects of that quickening influence, whereby the spiritual life and activity of his people are maintained ; and without these our persons and performances cannot be accepted, unless our own righteousness be sufficient, without an interest in his, to procure the pardon of sin, and reinstate us in the divine favour ; and unless human nature, labouring under the maladies of its present degeneracy, be capable, without the special aids of divine grace, to yield suitable obedience to the law ; neither of which can be asserted **WITHOUT VIRTUALLY RENOUNCING THE WHOLE GOSPEL.**"†

\* Vol. ii. p. 402.

† P. 410.

It is certainly unnecessary, after the above exposition, to trouble the reader with proofs that President Davies believed the change effected in regeneration to be the result not of moral suasion, but of the power of God. In his sermon on Eph. ii. 1 and 5, before referred to, he says, "The apostle had observed in the 19th and 20th verses of the foregoing chapter, that the same almighty power of God which raised Christ from the dead, is exerted to enable a sinner to believe. *We believe*, says he, *according to the working or energy of his mighty power, which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead.* The one, as well as the other, is an exploit of omnipotence. . . . The same exertion of the same power is necessary in one case and the other; because as the body of Christ was dead, and had no principle of life in it; so, says he, ye were dead in trespasses and sins, and therefore could no more quicken yourselves than a dead body can restore itself to life."\*

"I must turn my address," he says in another sermon, "to another set of persons in this assembly; but where is the Lord God of Elijah, who restored the Shunamite's son to life by means of that prophet? I am going to call to the dead, and I know they will not hear, unless he attend my feeble voice with his almighty power. I would pray over you like Elijah over the dead child, *O Lord God, let this sinner's life come into him again.*"†

"And who, do you think, can work this happy change in your hearts? If you are so vain and ignorant as to flatter yourselves that you can effect it in your own strength, make the trial and you will soon be undeceived. It is God alone that can work in you both to will and to do. My text tells you, it is He that prepares the vessel of mercy for glory; it is the Holy Spirit alone that is equal to the arduous work."‡

Having seen President Davies' views on the natural state of man, on the nature of that change which he must experience in order to be saved, and the power by which it is effected, we proceed to exhibit his opinions with regard to the other great fundamental doctrine of the gospel,

V. Justification by faith. This doctrine assumes that the law demands a perfect righteousness; that all men being sinners are destitute of such a righteousness, and justly exposed to the penalty of the law; that Christ assumed our place, obeyed the precepts, and suffered the penalty of the

\* Vol. i. p. 75.

† Vol. i. p. 111.

‡ Vol. ii. p. 286.



law in our stead, and thus satisfied all its demands ; that this perfect righteousness is imputed to all believers, that is, to all who receive and trust upon it as the sole ground of their pardon and acceptance with God.

This view of the doctrine supposes the union of Christ and his people, or that he assumed their "law-place," or acted as their legal representative ; that our sins were imputed to him, that he bore the punishment of them, or endured the penalty of the law. By the penalty of the law, however, is not meant any special kind or degree of suffering but such sufferings as were judicially inflicted, on account of sin, and for the satisfaction of justice, and therefore were not mere afflictions or calamities, but were strictly penal. It assumes, moreover, that his obedience, no less than his sufferings, was vicarious, i. e. performed for others, and is imputed to those who believe.

Every one of these points is brought up with a frequency, and urged with a force in these sermons, such as to prove, that in the view of the author they entered deeply into the very nature of the gospel. It is impossible to quote a tithe of the passages which relate to this subject, or to separate the several points just stated, as all are often embraced in a single paragraph. As to the nature of justification, and the necessity of a perfect righteousness, the following extract may be considered sufficient : " To receive a pardon is a very different thing, in common language, from being justified. When a man is pardoned, it supposes that he has broken the law, but that the law is dispensed with, and the threatened penalty not executed ; but when he is justified, it supposes that he has a righteousness equal to the demands of the law, and therefore that he may be acquitted according to justice. These, you see, are very different things ; but in the affair before us, they are happily united. The sinner is said to be pardoned and justified at once ; and the reason of this unusual dialect is this: the sinner has broken the divine law, and has no obedience to answer its demands, and therefore his being freed from the guilt of sin and its threatened punishment, is in this respect a gracious, unmerited pardon. But by faith he has received a righteousness of Christ, and God imputes it to him as though it were his own ; and this righteousness answers all the requisitions of the law, and it has no charges against him ; so that in this respect he is justified, or pronounced righteous according to law and justice. Hence it

follows, from the very meaning of the terms used in this case, that no righteousness can justify us in the sight of God, but that which is equal to all the demands of the divine law. It must be perfect, and conformed throughout to that standard ; for if it be not, we cannot be pronounced righteous in the eye of the law, but the law charges and condemns us as transgressors, and its sentence lies in full force against us.”\*

Wherein this perfect righteousness of Christ consists, is clearly stated in the following passage : “ In justification we are considered as guilty, law-condemned sinners, entirely destitute of all personal righteousness ; and we are pardoned and accepted only and entirely upon account of the righteousness of Jesus Christ, imputed to us, and accepted of God for us, as though it were our own. I say, the righteousness of Jesus Christ, or his yielding a most perfect obedience to the precept of the law, and suffering its dreadful penalty for us, or in our stead, is the only ground of our justification. This is a righteousness as perfect as the law of God requires. And consequently, the law is not repealed when we are justified in this way ; it is in full force ; and all its demands are answered by this righteousness, which is equal to the severest requisitions of the covenant of works ; only it is dispensed with in one particular, namely, that whereas the law properly requires personal obedience from every man for himself, now it accepts of the obedience of Christ as a surety in our stead, and is satisfied by his righteousness imputed unto us, as though it were originally our own. . . . . When an humble sinner despairing of relief from himself, renounces all his own righteousness, and trusts only and entirely to the free grace of God in Jesus Christ, when he places all his dependance upon his righteousness only, and most earnestly desires that God would deal with him entirely upon that footing, then he believes, and then and thus this righteousness is made over to him, and accepted for him, and God no more views him as a law-condemned sinner, but as one that has a righteousness equal to all the demands of the law, and therefore he deals with him accordingly ; he pronounces him just, and gives him a title to life and every blessing, as though he deserved it upon his own account, or had a claim to it upon the footing of his own obedience to the covenant of works. My brethren, I am bold to pronounce this the gospel method of salvation ; and

whatever scepticism and uncertainty I feel about many other things, I have not the least scruple to venture my soul, with all its guilt, and with all its immortal interest, upon this plan. If I have thoroughly searched the scriptures for myself in any one point, it is in this.”\*

“ The righteousness of Christ, on account of which we are justified, signifies the obedience and sufferings of Jesus Christ, to answer the demands of the law, which we had broken, or, as it is usually expressed, ‘his active and passive obedience.’ He obeyed the law, and endured its penalty, as the surety or substitute of sinners; that is, he did all this, not for himself, but for them, or in their stead.”†

“ The scheme of salvation through Jesus Christ, supposes that all are sinners, exposed to condemnation, and unable to make satisfaction for their offences, or merit the divine favour by any thing they can do or suffer; and represents the Lord Jesus as substituting himself in the place of the guilty, bearing the punishment due to their sin, obeying the law of God in their stead; and it represents our injured Sovereign as willing to be reconciled to such of his guilty creatures on this account; but then, that in order to enjoy the blessings of righteousness, they must, as guilty, helpless sinners, place their whole dependance upon it, and plead it as the only ground of their justification; and that, though they may abound in good works, yet they must not make these in the least the ground of their hopes of pardon and acceptance. This is the substance of the testimony of God in the gospel.”‡

“ A method of justification by the righteousness of another, by the obedience and death of an incarnate God; by his perfect obedience to the law, and complete satisfaction to justice in stead of the sinner, a method by which sin may be pardoned, and in the mean time the honours of the divine government advanced, and the divine perfections gloriously illustrated; this is a mystery which was hid for generations and ages.”§

As to the nature of the union between Christ and those for whom he acted, and the punitive character of his sufferings, a very few extracts will be sufficient, In his sermon on the method of salvation, having said that “Jesus Christ was above law, that is, not obliged to be subject to that law which he had made for his creatures, and consequently his

obedience to the law not being necessary for himself, might be imputed to others ;” . . . he asks, “ Was it necessary that the holiness and justice of God should be displayed in the salvation of sinners ? See how bright they shine in a suffering Saviour ! Now it appears that such is the holiness and justice of God, that he will not let even his Son escape unpunished, when he stands in the law-place of sinners. . . . Go to the cross of Christ, then, ye fools that make a mock of sin ; there learn its malignity and its hatefulness to the great God. There you may see it is so great an evil that when it is but imputed to the man that is God’s fellow, as the surety of sinners, it cannot escape punishment. . . . . If the darling of heaven, the Lord of glory, though personally innocent, suffers so much when sin is but imputed to him, what shall the sinners themselves feel, who can claim no favour upon the footing of their own importance or personal innocence ? If these things be done in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry ?”\*

“ We cannot be saved through Jesus, till his righteousness be so far made ours as that it will answer the demands of the law for us, and procure the favour of God to us ; but his righteousness cannot be imputed to us, or accounted ours in law, till we are so united to him as to be one in law, or one legal person with him.”†

“ Mercy (is displayed) in transferring the guilt from the sinner upon the surety, and accepting a vicarious satisfaction ; justice in exacting the satisfaction, and not passing by sin, when it was but imputed to the darling Son of God. . . . The precept of the law which they had broken, was perfectly obeyed ; the penalty which they had incurred, was fully endured, not by themselves indeed, but by one that presented himself in their place ; and it is only on this footing that they are received into favour.”‡

“ An offering for sin is when the punishment of sin is transferred from the original offender to another, and that other person suffers in his stead. Thus the Lord Jesus was made a sin-offering for us. The punishment of our sin was transferred to him, and he bore it in his own body on the tree. He became our substitute, and took our place in law, and therefore the penalty of the law due to us was executed upon him. It is in this, my brethren, that we have any hope of salvation.”§

\* Vol. i. pp. 39, 40.

† P. 43.

‡ P. 452.

§ P. 480.



As might well be expected, Davies represents this doctrine of justification as entering essentially into the experience of Christians. He tells his hearers that if they ever truly believed in Jesus Christ, "You saw, you felt yourselves lost forever without this righteousness; you found yourselves shut up to faith." He represents the believer as saying, "I now most cheerfully consent to the method of salvation revealed in the gospel, not only because I must, but because I choose to do so. I see it is a scheme well ordered in all things and sure, and therefore it is all my salvation and all my desire. I would not only be saved, but I would be saved by thee, blessed Jesus! I am willing, I am desirous, that thou, and not I, should have the glory of it. I would rather see thy grace honoured than my own vanity and pride flattered, and therefore I cheerfully renounce my own righteousness, and count it but dross and dung, in comparison of thine, which I embrace with all my heart. Pardon is sweet to a guilty criminal; salvation is sweet to a perishing soul; but oh! pardon by thy righteousness, salvation through thy grace, this is doubly sweet! Such, my brethren, has been, such still is the language of your hearts, if you have ever received the righteousness of Christ through faith."\*

Such, then, is the theology of President Davies, and we should unfeignedly rejoice if we could regard the publication of his Sermons, as indicating approbation of his theology. If our new school brethren are beginning to see that the doctrines which they have hitherto opposed are the doctrines of God, that they enter deeply into the religious experience of his people, and that they cannot be denounced without sin, nor opposed without injury to the souls of men, then we may hope that better days await the church in this country, than we have been wont to anticipate.

After what we have said, it is unnecessary to add that we rejoice in the publication of these volumes; we hope that they may be widely circulated and extensively read. We doubt not they will scatter blessings in their path. We regard them as among the best sermons in the English language, not by any means the ablest, but combining so much truth, so much piety, so much zeal, so much good sense, so much knowledge of the heart, and of religious experience, as to place them among the first rank of practically useful books.

\* Vol. ii. p. 508.

QUARTERLY LIST  
OF  
NEW BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

---

Two Addresses, delivered at Oxford, Ohio, on occasion of the Inauguration of the Rev. George Junkin, D.D., as President of Miami University. Cincinnati. 8vo. pp. 48. 1841.

The first of these Addresses is by the Rev. HENRY V. D. JOHNS, the Rector of one of the Episcopal Churches of Cincinnati. The object of it is to illustrate and sustain the proposition—"That a religious and patriotic obedience to duly constituted authority, is a primary obligation of American citizenship." The author has executed his task well. He is manifestly a sound thinker, an enlightened patriot, and a polished, impressive writer. We do not, indeed, think the style faultless. It is occasionally circuitous, and exhibits the use of some words in an unusual sense. But the whole address possesses so much substantial excellence, that we have no disposition to dwell on minor blemishes.

The second Address is from the pen of the Rev. DR. JUNKIN, and delivered by him at his Inauguration as President of the Miami University, Ohio. It is well known that Dr. Junkin was, for several years, the President of La Fayette College, at Easton, Pennsylvania, where his character for talents, learning, piety, energy, and unwearied diligence, were the means of securing to that infant Institution, amidst many difficulties, a large measure of success. Early in the present year he was called to the Presidentship of the Miami University, a much older, and more amply endowed Institution, over which the venerable DR. BISHOP had presided for a number of years. Dr. Junkin accepted the appointment; entered on the duties of his office on the 12th of April last; and on the 11th of August following, was inaugurated, with much solemnity, and in the presence of a large assembly. It was on that occasion that the address before us was delivered.

It was gratifying to the friends of Dr. Junkin, when he thought it his duty to remove to the West, that he had the prospect of entering on a larger and more important field of action than he had occupied in the East. It was their earnest hope that, placed at the head of one of the most wealthy and powerful literary Institutions in the valley of the Mississippi, his vigorous mind, ample furniture.

and large views, might prove an eminent blessing in that country of gigantic character and influence. We confess that the Address before us has raised our expectations still higher that these hopes will be realized. The author has acquitted himself as "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed." Instead of dwelling on "common places," he has taken strong, clear, comprehensive views of a subject seldom treated on such occasions, and yet lying at the foundation of all order and useful progress in Seminaries of learning. His subject is—*The Origin, Unity, and Power of Moral Law*, especially in regard to College discipline.

Dr. Junkin discusses no subject superficially. He is in the habit of resorting to first principles. His ideas of Collegial government and discipline appear to us to be sound, wise, and well adapted to practical use. We hope that both the old men, and the young men, who have any thing to do with the Miami University, will duly appreciate their excellence, and cordially bear him out in carrying them into execution. We have long been of the opinion that both the honour and usefulness of literary institutions are more deeply involved in conformity to these principles, than the popular impression has hitherto recognised. Our best wishes attend him on the great theatre on which he is called to act. We hope he will find in the West, that just and elevated sentiment which will honour and sustain a gentleman so well qualified to bear onward the cause of sound education.

An Ecclesiastical Catechism of the Presbyterian Church; for the use of Families, Bible-Classes, and private members. By Thomas Smyth, Pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church, Charleston, S. C. 18mo. pp. 124. 1841.

Mr. Smyth must be regarded as among the most efficient and active authors in the Presbyterian Church. His valuable work on the *Apostolical Succession*, reviewed in a preceding part of this number, is a monument of his reading and industry which has been extensively acknowledged. The *Ecclesiastical Catechism* before us is another present to the Church with which Mr. Smyth is connected, which we think adapted to be universally esteemed and highly useful. It is, as all such manuals should be, brief, comprehensive, simple, adapted to weak capacities, and yet sufficiently instructive to gratify the most intelligent minds.

The scriptural quotations to illustrate and establish the principles which he lays down, are perhaps, in some cases unnecessarily numerous; and, in a few instances, of questionable application. But it is, on the whole, so well executed, and possesses so much solid merit, that we hope it may be extensively circulated and used.

The Life and Times of Red Jacket, or Sa-go-ye-Wat-Ha; being the Sequel to the History of the Six Nations. By William L. Stone. 8vo. pp. 484. New York: Wiley & Putnam. 1841.

Our readers will recollect, that, in the volume of our Review, for 1839,

we took a highly favourable notice of a larger work by the same author, containing an account of the life and times of *Joseph Brant*, the famous Mohawk Chief. We have here another volume from his pen, on the Life and Times of Red-Jacket, a celebrated orator of the Seneca Nation. We propose to give a more detailed account of this highly interesting work in our next number. All that we intend by the present notice is, to announce its appearance to our readers, and strongly to recommend it to their perusal.

The Poetry and History of Wyoming: containing Campbell's *Gertrude*, with a Biographical Sketch of the Author, by Washington Irving, and the History of Wyoming, from its discovery to the beginning of the present century. By William L. Stone. 12mo. pp. 324. New York: Wiley and Putnam. 1841.

Colonel Stone wields so able and pleasant a pen, that we are glad he does not permit it to be idle. Here is another real favour conferred by him on the public. Who has not heard of the beautiful Valley of Wyoming? Who has not heard of the controversies, and the sanguinary conflicts of which that valley has been the theatre? And what admirer of poetry has not perused the "*Gertrude of Wyoming*," by the author of the "*Pleasures of Hope*?"

Col. Stone, we think judged well in supposing that the Poem by Campbell, would make an acceptable prefix to the main subject of the volume. He has, therefore, given it at large, with a highly interesting Biographical Sketch, by Washington Irving, and adorned with plates. These occupy fifty pages. The remainder of the volume, divided into eight chapters, is devoted to the "*History of Wyoming, from its discovery to the beginning of the present century.*" These chapters have given us the most distinct and satisfactory impression of the real character and bearing of the Wyoming controversy that we have ever received. We feel ourselves debtors to the author for this production of his pen. He has shown himself well qualified to describe at once, and with spirit, the beauties of nature; the terrors of the battle-field; and the smiling improvements of cultivated society.

Address delivered in Easton, Pennsylvania, August 18th, 1841, on the occasion of the Author's Inauguration as President of La Fayette College. By John W. Yeomans. 8vo. pp. 32. Easton: 1841.

The ceremony of inducting into office the Rev. JOHN W. YEOMANS, A. M., as President, and the Rev. CHARLES W. NASSAU, A. M., as Vice President, of La Fayette College, took place in the Presbyterian Church, in Easton, Pennsylvania, on the 18th day of August, A. D. 1841, in the presence of the Board of Trustees, the Faculty, and a large audience. On this occasion, after an appropriate address by JAMES M. PORTER, Esq., President of the Board of Trustees, and a solemn induction of the President elect into office, President Yeomans delivered the Address of which we have above given the title.

President Yeomans is an original, vigorous, and polished writer. Any competent judge, who attends on his instruction, either from the pulpit or the



press, cannot fail to feel himself in the hands of a master. Clear, profound views, and unusually lucid and happy expression, appear in all his writings. The whole of this address will reward the perusal. We were especially interested in his remarks on the connection between the cultivation of the intellectual faculties in the present state, and the elevation and enjoyment of the mind in the life to come. On this subject we have no objection to his ingenious thoughts; and they are certainly very happily expressed.

We think that La Fayette College, after losing so able a head as Dr. Junkin, has been fortunate in gaining one so accomplished as President Yeomans. We trust that his success in his new station, will equal the high hopes entertained by the friends of the Institution over which he presides.

*Old Age: a Funeral Sermon, preached in the F Street Presbyterian Church, in Washington, September 15, 1841, on the occasion of the death of Joseph Nourse, who was fifty-three years in the service of the government, and still longer a member of the Church. By Cortlandt Van Rensselaer a minister of the Church. Washington, D. C. 8vo. pp. 23. 1841.*

This is an excellent sermon. It does equal honour to the head and heart of the author. It is a simple, unostentatious, and yet striking portrait of a most amiable and exemplary Christian.

The late Joseph Nourse, of the City of Washington, was a native of the city of London. He was born in 1754, and bred in the bosom of the Episcopal Church. After his removal to America, his religious preferences, we are told, induced him to become a member of the Presbyterian Church. Of that church he was a beloved and edifying member, and for many years, a Ruling Elder, distinguished for his holy example, and for every good work, up to the close of a long life of eighty-seven years. He was appointed by Washington to the office of Register of the Treasury of the United States, which office he retained, amidst all the changes of party, for forty years—having served his adopted country previously, in various offices, for ten years. He was President, Vice President, Patron or Director of many Societies, religious, and benevolent, so that he might be considered not only as a leading, but as a constant and indefatigable labourer in the cause of religion and humanity, until he was called to his reward in 1841. It was our happiness to know this excellent man, long and intimately; and we think that Mr. Van Rensselaer, in drawing his portrait has executed his task with great fidelity.

*Address to the Alumni Society of the University of Nashville, on the Study of Theology as a part of Science, Literature and Religion. Delivered at Nashville, Tennessee, October 5th, 1841. By the Rev. Le Roy J. Halsey, A. M. With an appendix, containing a Catalogue of the Alumni, and certain proceedings of the Society. Nashville. 8vo. pp. 48. 1841.*

This is an address of no common merit. It abounds in sober thought and correct sentiment, well arranged, and happily expressed. Instead of contenting himself with mere rhetorical display, or the recitation of mere every-day topics, on such an anniversary occasion, the author pleads the cause of Theo-

logy, as a part of liberal education, with the dignity of a scholar, the skill of a theologian, and with the ardour and solemnity of one who deeply felt the practical importance of his subject. We have seldom met with a pamphlet containing more just and weighty opinions; more sound thinking; more wise counsel. We hope it will mark the commencement of a new era, not only in the Institution in which it was delivered, but in many others in our land. It is truly gratifying to see a young man, himself having just left the elementary hall of the science of which he speaks, making such a just estimate of its importance; taking such large views of its extent; and urging its universal study with so much ardour, and true eloquence.

Pantology; or a systematic survey of Human Knowledge; proposing a classification of all its branches, and illustrating their history, relations, uses, and objects; with a synopsis of their leading facts and principles; and a select catalogue of books on all subjects, suitable for a cabinet library: the whole designed as a guide for advanced students, in Colleges, Academies, and Schools; and as a popular directory in Literature, Science, and the Arts. By Roswell Park, A. M., Professor of Natural Philosophy and Chemistry in the University of Pennsylvania, and Mem. Am. Phil. Society. Philadelphia: Hogan and Thompson. 1841. 8vo. pp. 587.

This large and slightly volume professes to afford nothing less than a classification of all human knowledge; an outline, which may direct the learner, and serve for the storing away of his successive acquisitions; and index to all other volumes; indeed a system of systems. The classification of Professor Park bears some resemblance to that of Ampère, from which, however it was not borrowed. All human knowledge is divided into four great Provinces: 1. Psychonomy, including the laws of Mind, or Intellectual Sciences; 2. Ethnology, or the study of Nations, geographically and historically; 3. Physiconomy, or the Laws of the material world; and 4. Technology, or the study of the Arts. These provinces are further divided into Departments. Thus, under Psychonomy, we have four, viz. Glossology, Psychology, Nomology, and Theology; under Ethnology, four, viz. Geography, Chronography, Biography, and Callography; under Physiconomy, four, viz. Mathematics, Acrophysics (including Mechanics, Astronomy, Optics, Ceraunics or the Electro-magnetic field, and Chemistry,) Idiophysics or Natural History &c., and Androphysics; and under Technology, four, viz. Architechnics, (which includes Hylurgy, Machinery, Architecture, and Navigation) Chreotechnics, or the Useful Arts; Machetechnics, and Callo-technics.

The partition is by no means inelegant, and will be recorded with some which have engaged the attention of the greatest minds. In is no small recommendation of the nomenclature, that with few exceptions, the new terms explain themselves to any Greek scholar. We have not been accustomed to set a very high value upon works of this kind, yet they have their uses, and it would be the height of presumption in us to disparage a species of labour which occupied the assiduous thoughts of such men as Plato, Bacon, and

Descartes. As a guide and reference the book before us may be used with much advantage, while it is at the same time a little Encyclopaedia of varied and wonderfully compressed information. It has evidently been prepared with the greatest labour, and we are especially pleased with the earnest and Christian manner in which the respected author has spoken of religious subjects. While therefore many, perhaps most parts of the work, are altogether out of our line, we think we may safely recommend it to our readers, as accomplishing what it promises, and as a useful book of reference for any library.

Juvenile Songs, Religious, Moral, and Sentimental, with brief Exercises, adapted to the purposes of primary instruction. By Thomas Hastings, Professor of Sacred Music, &c. &c. &c. New York. Daniel Fanshaw. 1841. pp. 128.

Mr. Hastings has been a fertile author in every department of music, and we are always ready to welcome his productions. The one before us is well suited for children at the fireside and in schools. A great deal of trash has been issued from the Northern presses under the denomination of juvenile music. It seems to have been taken for granted, that any sort of composition would do for children. But we have learnt a different lesson from experience. There must be real melody to catch a child's ear; and nothing is so hard to learn or to execute as unmelodious strains, made to sell. Again, much of the so-called poetry of the juvenile singing books has been stark nonsense. The book before us contains good sense and good sentiment set to good music. We dare say, like other human productions, it has faults; we leave these to be detected by professed musicians; we are none.

The Holy War, made by Shaddai upon Diabolus, for the regaining of the Metropolis of the World; or the Losing and Taking again of the Town of Mansoul. By John Bunyan, Author of the Pilgrim's Progress. With a Sketch of the Life of the Author. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union. 1841. 18mo. pp. 347.

This beautiful edition is, very nearly, a copy of that of 1682, retaining such of the side-notes as illustrate the text. To praise the work would be superfluous; it is enough to say, that this reprint of it is one of the most inviting we have seen, being ornamented with fine engravings, and in every respect fitted to form an acceptable and useful present to Christian readers whether young or old. It is with no ordinary satisfaction, that we observe the sound theology which, so far as we know, without exception characterises the works which are proceeding from the American Sunday School Union.

The principles of Latin Grammar; comprising the substance of the most approved Grammars extant, for the use of Colleges and Academies. By the Rev. Peter Bullions, D.D., Professor of Languages in the Albany Academy; Author of Principles of English Grammar; and Principles of Greek Grammar. New York; Collins, Keese & Co. 1841. 12mo. pp. 303.

This completes the series proposed by the learned author, who has now furnished us with an English, a Latin, and a Greek Grammar, which have this

peculiar recommendation, that they are arranged in the same order, and expressed in the same terms, so far as the differences of the languages permit. The basis of this manual is the well-known grammar of Adam, an excellent summary, but at the same time one which admitted of retrenchment, addition, and emendation, all which have been ably furnished by Dr. Bullions. We have not made a business of perusing the work laboriously; to accomplish this feat in regard to a grammar requires special enthusiasm; but we have looked over the whole, and bestowed particular attention on certain parts; and therefore feel at liberty to recommend it with great confidence, especially to all such teachers as have been in the habit of using Adam's Grammar. The typography is excellent. We would ask the attention of instructors, who take the book in hand for examination, to the rules for the subjunctive mood, §§ 139, 140, 141, and to the whole Fourth Part, where the subject of Prosody is presented with much clearness.

1. The Amaranth—A Gift for all Seasons. 2. The New Year's Gift. 3. Gift for the Holidays.—4. Scenes in the Holy Land.

It is not our custom to notice in detail the publications of the American Sunday School Union, but the extraordinary excellence of the prints with which these books are adorned has attracted us in no common degree. The first and the fourth of those above named, we may safely say, have never been equalled, as it regards the engravings, by any children's books in America. The contents seem to be sound and useful.

*Iddo*: an historical sketch, illustrating Jewish history during the time of the Maccabees, B. C. 167—150. By the author of *Omar*. American Sunday School Union. 1841. 18mo.

We greatly need juvenile books which, like this, shall attract attention to the historical period between the Old and the New Testament canon. The Maccabean era is especially important. Some act as if they thought the subject had been defiled, because handled by the writers of the Apocrypha. To such we would recommend the perusal of this attractive volume.

*Brown's Explication of the Assembly's Catechism*, with the original scripture proofs referred to, and inserted at large. Newburgh: David L. Proudfit. 1842. pp. 107.

The peculiarity of this *Explication* is, that the whole body of scripture proof-texts is introduced as answers to simple questions. Besides these, there are other questions and answers, into which those of the *Shorter Catechism* are dissected. The book and its author are too well known among Presbyterians, to need any observations of ours.

*The Persecuted Family*; a Narrative of the Sufferings of the Covenanters in the reign of Charles II. By Robert Pollok, A. M., Author of the "Course of Time," "Helen of the Glen," &c. New York: Robert Carter. 1841. 18mo. pp. 115.

This is one of the minor productions of that good and gifted young man, whose poem has made so deep an impression on many Christian minds. It is a favourite work with some pious judges, and will continue to be read with



great interest by that large portion of Presbyterians, who delight to trace their origin to the saints of Scotland.

Decapolis; or the Individual Obligation of Christians to save Souls from Death: An Essay, by David Everard Ford. From the Sixth London edition. New York: Robert Carter. 1841. 18mo. pp. 120.

This is another of the useful books which Mr. Carter is month after month sending forth from his prolific press. We do not know any man who is doing more to spread the knowledge of divine truth, and we wish him long and increasing success in this blessed undertaking. No one, we are persuaded, can read this Essay, without having his conscience penetrated; and the circulation of it among private believers as well as ministers of the gospel, would do much for the salvation of souls. There is a paragraph on the 41st page, which is objectionable, as seeming to treat as a theological nicety, what, in common with all Calvinists, we prize as a truth of revelation. One word as to the typography. In noticing the works of Chalmers, we commended the worthy publisher, for adhering to the established orthography of the language: we cannot repeat the praise in regard to this volume. We are among those who cannot consent to write 'Savior' for 'Saviour,' until we meet with some good English authority: it is a mere provincialism in spelling.

Hymns for the Vestry and the Fireside. Boston: Kendall, Gould and Lincoln. 1841. 18mo. pp. 200.

A neat and convenient selection of hymns is here added to the large number already in use. It contains many of our best specimens of sacred song, including many by our own poets. In this, as in almost every collection within our knowledge, we have to lament the mutilation and alteration of favourite hymns. As instances, we point out hymns 30, 32, 33, 42, 60, 85, 156, 269. No. 389, entitled 'Doxology,' is not a doxology, but a prayer.

Life and Death of the Rev. Joseph Alleine, A. B., Author of "An Alarm to the Unconverted." Written by the Rev. Richard Baxter, his widow, Mrs. Theodosia Alleine, and other persons. To which are added his Christian Letters, full of spiritual instructions, tending to the promoting of the power of godliness, both in persons and families. With a recommendatory preface, by Alexander Duff, D.D., one of the Church of Scotland's Missionaries to India. From the last Edinburgh edition. New York: Robert Carter. 1840. 12mo. pp. 275.

The names upon this title-page are themselves a recommendation; and if the representation of heavenly-minded piety can make a book attractive, this must become so. There are few such specimens of Christian autobiography. The Letters have caused some to call Alleine the 'English Rutherford.' Let every reader, who can afford it, procure this book, that he may learn how high the peace and joy of an assured heart can rise. The circulation of it among ministers of the gospel and theological students would do much to raise the standard of personal holiness in the church.

*The Believing Spirit*: a Discourse delivered before the New Hampshire Alpha of the Phi Beta Kappa Society; at Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.; on the 28th July, 1841. By Taylor Lewis, Esq., Professor of Greek in the University of the city of New York. New York. pp. 39. 8vo.

There are many books coming under our critical survey, which are mere symptoms of the times, the offspring and likeness of popular feeling or fashion. Such is not the discourse before us; which, on the other hand, breathes the life of another age, and is redolent of ancient Greek wisdom. The subject is the nature and importance of the believing spirit, as distinguished on the one hand, from the saving faith of the scriptures, and on the other, from that speculative belief of the intellect, which is derived principally from natural theology, and the external evidences of Christianity. The discourse is remarkable at once for its deep thought and its learning. No man in America, we suppose, is more at home in the original works of the ancient philosophers, than Professor Lewis; and this is true in a special manner, as it regards Plato, whom he always cites with the reverence and affection of a genuine Academic. With this we find no fault, believing that a Christian and discriminating Platonism will serve as a fair antagonism to the superficial tendency of the age. But when the author allows himself to speak with gentle forbearance of the German transcendentalists, we must needs pause, and let him go on alone. With genuine Platonism, the later Germans have no kindred; as little, we think, with Professor Lewis. The latter might have given his hand to Jacobi, or Schleiermacher; we are sure he would shudder at the touch of Hegel or Rosenkranz. Their systems are subversive of all revelation, nay of all religion, whereas that of Mr. Lewis is eminently and essentially religious and supernaturalistic. But there are many points in this truly original production, on which we might be tempted to enlarge, and some on which we should wish to hear the learned author again, before we signify assent; especially the cases where he seems almost to disparage natural philosophy, if not natural theology. It is cause of regret, that, without waiting three months, we cannot enter largely upon these topics. We therefore reluctantly dismiss them, with the declaration that we never take up any thing from the pen of this author, without recognising in him one of the staunchest defenders of old-fashioned education and old-fashioned truth.

*Wickliffe and his Times*, by the Rev. Enoch Pond, D.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Bangor, (Me.) American Sunday School Union. 1841.

A good subject, simply and instructively treated, by a well known and able hand.

*Anti-Popery, or Popery unreasonable, unscriptural, and novel.* By John Rogers, member of the Society of Friends and Counsellor at Law, with a Preface, Notes and Index, by Rev. C. Sparrow of New York. Printed and Published by D. F. Fanshew. 1841.

This is undoubtedly a remarkable work, in almost every respect; and it

has accordingly excited much attention, and elicited much commendation from the transatlantic periodicals. The first remarkable thing about it is, that it is the production of a *Quaker*. We cannot recollect, that any one of the Society of Friends, has ever before waged battle on this arena. Indeed, the ground occupied by the Quakers, in regard to the sacraments, renders it very difficult for them to assail the Romanist errors on this topic, without, at the same time, attacking the greater part of the Protestants also. We were, therefore, not a little curious to see how our polemic would manage this part of the controversy. But we find nothing from which we wish to dissent, even here. It may be inferred, however, that in the first edition, there was something on the subject of the sacraments, which could not have been received by other Protestants, as the writer somewhere intimates that certain parts had been omitted, to render the work more generally acceptable to Protestants. There is reason to think, that in other respects the work is much improved, since the first edition; for in the close of the introduction, he has the following remarkable and pleasing statement. "The former part of the present article was written more than a year ago, and correctly describes my then state or condition, relative to personal piety, or real, practical, or experimental religion. Since writing the former part, however, I have made a move forth in vital piety; have gone forward in the divine life, and am nearer to the Lord, than I was then. I now love God and human kind more than I did, being more anxious for the glory of the former, and the salvation of the latter. Blessed be the Lord for the onward movement, however small! Would that I were more like God than I am! Would that I loved him and his creatures far more than I do!" But in regard to the seven sacraments of the Romish church, the author, in this edition, proceeds thus: "Of Baptism and the Eucharist I now affirm nothing. Of the other five, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, I affirm, that they are no sacraments at all, and that they are utterly without the sacramental character." And perhaps the argument on this point was never more clearly and cogently stated than Mr. Rogers has done it, in the compass of only fifteen duodecimo pages.

The next remarkable thing, in this writer, is, that he is a *lawyer*. Gentlemen of this profession seldom enter the field of theological controversy. They have commonly their hands full enough of controversies of another kind. We have, it is true, the example of Charles Butler, Esq. on the Popish side; and we sincerely wish that all of that communion possessed the amiable and candid spirit of that gentleman; but among Protestants, where do we find a counsellor at law, troubling himself with religious polemics. And yet it is much to be desired, that men whose whole course of study is so well calculated to discipline the mind to close reasoning, and to weigh evidence with scrupulous exactness, should sometimes leave their usual track, and exercise their talents and dialectics in defence of important religious truth. It is not difficult, in this volume, to trace the footsteps of the astute and logical law-

reasoner. The author has a power of condensation, or concentration, which we have never seen surpassed. And as to logical clearness and conclusiveness, geometry can furnish nothing more convincing, than many of his brief arguments.

A third thing remarkable in this author, and indeed almost singular, is his propensity to change old words into a new form, and to coin words entirely new. He may possibly have belonged to the school of Jeremy Bentham, or may have been accustomed to read his works. In this respect, we cannot admire the liberty which the writer has taken with the established language of his country. It savours strongly of affectation. And no man who introduces so many new forms of speech can reasonably hope that his innovations will be adopted generally, and they undoubtedly place a stumbling block in the way of many readers, and will so effectually disgust a part, that they will lay down the book, and never take it up again. And, if every ingenious writer should use the same liberty as this author, how soon would the English language be like the tongues of Babel? To show what liberties Mr. Rogers has used in respect to language, take the following. Instead of Popish or Papal, he says *Papite*; for Romanist, *Romanite*; for priestly, *priestal*; for primacy, *primaty*; for supremacy, *suprematy*; for hercafter, *nowafter*, for perhaps, *perhap*. &c.

We greatly regret that so sensible a writer should have deformed his style by so many unauthorized terms; not that it materially detracts from the force of the argument, but it produces disgust, lowers our opinion of the judgment of the author, prevents many from reading the work, and hinders the effect on the minds of those who do read.

As the volume is small, we shall not give any large extracts, for we wish every one to read it for himself; and if any will do so, and not feel his convictions strengthened, that *P* *v* is an enormous mass of corruption and superstition, we shall be much disappointed.

The only part of the work which we shall extract is merely the titles of the points discussed, in the volume. 1. Papal Primaty. 2. Infallibility. 3. Vulgate, Apocrypha, Tradition. 4. Knowledge a proscribed thing, and the Bible a forbidden book. 5. Unknown Tongue: or the Latin the general language of Popery. 6. Transubstantiation. 7. The Sacrifice of the Mass. 8. The Worship of the Host. 9. Half Communion; or no cup to the laity. 10. Idolatry. 11. Merit. 12. Purgatory. 13. Priestal Absolution, and Excommunication. 14. Auricular Confession. 15. Celibate of the Clergy. 16. The Seven Sacraments. 17. Priestal Intention. 18. Superstition. 19. Blasphemy.

The Christian community are indebted to the Rev. Mr. Sparrow, for bringing out this volume so seasonably, from the American press; and for a copious index, which adds much to the value of the work. As the book is cheap, we strongly recommend to all who may read this notice, to buy it and read it, for pleasant entertainment, as well as sober conviction. The



writer is sometimes severe and even harsh in his language, but never ill-natured or malignant.

Churchman's Library. No 3. The Authority of Tradition in matters of religion, By the Rev. George Holden, M. A. Philadelphia : Hooker and Agnew. 1841. pp. 124.

In a preceding number we commended to our readers the enterprise of Messrs. Hooker and Agnew, in the execution of which the third number of the Churchman has just appeared. While so many and such vigorous efforts are making to introduce into Protestant churches, the spirit and tenets of the Romish apostacy, it is the duty of all who have the interest of religion at heart, to do every thing they can to vindicate and propagate the truth. The question as to the rule of faith is the pass of Thermopylae in the contest between Protestants and Romanists. If we, Protestants and Presbyterians, maintain the ground that the Bible is the rule of faith, all is safe; if we lose that position, all is lost.

Mr. Holden's book is worthy of an attentive perusal, as he vindicates in a satisfactory manner the main points in the true doctrine, as to the rule of faith.

The Sermon before the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in General Convention, at the consecration of the Rev. Alfred Lee, D. D., to the Episcopate of the Diocese of Delaware. By the Right Reverend Charles P. McIlvaine, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of Ohio. Published by order of the convention. New York : 1841.

The character of this discourse may be inferred from that of its author. It is faithful. The text is a pregnant one. *Take heed unto thyself and the doctrine; continue in them; for in so doing thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.* "The preaching of the gospel," says Bishop McIlvaine, "as distinct, though not separated, from all other means, is the one great ordinance for the bringing of sinners to repentance, and for the building up of penitent believers in their most holy faith." He thus takes ground against the doctrine that the sacraments are the great means of communicating spiritual blessings; the sacraments as administered by men prelatially ordained; and hence, that those who do not receive those sacraments at the hands of such men, are out of the pale of salvation: and those who do receive them, even without faith, provided they do not positively resist their influence, are saved. This is the great doctrine of antichrist. The pith and spirit of the dreadful apostacy, by which religion is transferred from the heart, to outward ceremonies. We know nothing in the history of the present century which forbodes greater evil to the church of Christ and the souls of men, than the revival of this doctrine among nominal protestants.

Another great truth to which the Bishop bears his testimony is that the Holy Scriptures are the only divine rule of faith and practice. So long as this is maintained, the church, under God, is safe. But when tradition is brought in, either as "an authoritative interpreter," or as "a joint rule of

Faith," then the allegiance of the church is transferred from God to men. Now, as in the days of Christ, men make void the law of God by their traditions, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men. If any man wishes to know what tradition comes to, let him look into the twenty folios of the Talmud, containing the mass of folly with which the Rabbins have perverted and made of none effect the law of Moses; or into the ritual and formulas of the Romish church, which contain the perverse inventions with which the Christian Pharisees have set aside the gospel of the grace of God. But what has been, will be. Though we admire the fidelity with which Bishop McIlvaine and others of kindred spirit, resist the mystery of iniquity which doth already work, we greatly fear that the evil will not be arrested, even among us, till that Wicked be fully revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming.

*A Grammar of the New Testament Dialect.* By M. Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover. Second edition, corrected, and mostly written anew. Andover: Allen and Morrill. New York: Day and Saxton. 1841. pp. 312.

Prof. Stuart states that his object in preparing this work, was to make "a Grammar which in itself would serve to introduce any student to a knowledge of the κοινή διάλεκτος of the Greek, with appropriate notices of departures from this by the writers of the New Testament." It may be commended for this end, to the students of Greek, as a copious, satisfactory, and elegantly printed book.

*The Retrospect or Review of Providential Mercies; with anecdotes of various characters.* By Aliquis, formerly a lieutenant in the Royal Navy, and now a minister in the Established Church. From the Seventeenth London Edition. New York: Robert Carter. 1841. pp. 255.

Any work that reaches a seventeenth edition, must possess solid merit, or great attractions. There is in the above work such a mixture of naval adventures and pious remark, that we should not be surprised if the popularity of the work in America, should equal its success in England.

*Onesimus: or the Apostolic Directions to Christian Masters, in reference to their slaves, considered.* By Evangelicus. Boston: Gould, Kendall, and Lincoln. 1842. pp. 53.

This is a calm, scholar-like, and Christian examination of the teachings of the sacred writers as to a most important class of duties. Its whole spirit and tendency are the opposite of the Anti-Slavery publications, which have produced so much evil. It states simply, and, as far as a cursory examination enables us to judge, correctly, the leading principles of Christian duty, on the subject of which it treats.



