





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

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1846.

No. IV.

- ART. I.—1. *The Directory for the Worship of God in the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, as amended and ratified by the General Assembly in May, 1821.*
2. *The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America.*

IF any feel amazement at the variety of forms in which the religious sentiment of Christians seeks expression in mental and bodily exercises, while, in all the cases, the God who is worshipped, the end of the worship, and the spirit which guides the worshipper are the same, they have but to consider this obvious and significant fact: That the spirit of God in the mind of man expresses itself in the various languages, and the various forms of thought and of actions familiar to the persons who are the subjects of his operation. The different forms of Christian worship are different languages employed to express one and the same sentiment of religion.

The people of different nations, under their various forms of social organization, differing from each other in their climates, their education, and their occupations, and having little assimilating intercourse with one another, have their various forms of expressing respect and disrespect, love and hatred; while the

feelings themselves, as mere mental states, are of the same nature in all. Now if the diversities of religious forms among Christians coincide with the diversities of other social customs among the same people, they may imply no fault in the worshippers. If the Asiatic worship by prostration, the European by kneeling, the American by standing, the mutual non-conformity may betray neither darkness in the understanding nor perverseness in the heart. But when people of the same nation and of the same social usages, dissent from one another in their forms of religious devotion, and make their respective peculiarities matters of grave and conscientious scruple, their dissent "cometh of evil."

The infirmity of human nature which reveals itself in such dissensions became prominent in the earliest period of the Christian church. The Corinthian Christians, long before they appear to have thought of dividing their religious assemblies on points of form, indicated diverse preferences as to the manner in which their public exercises should be conducted; and the reproof of St. Paul was evidently directed against the germ of that contention for forms of speech and forms of worship which has at length rent the church with divisions, obliterated the natural and appropriate signs of her unity, and become the ecclesiastical scandal of Christendom.

That the spirit of true Christianity in the follower of Jesus and of the apostle Paul, should feel its unity violated, by these divisions is to be expected, as matter of course by all who consider what true Christianity is. It will also be expected that the "*vis medicatrix*," of the system will show itself in recuperative efforts wherever it can, without directly encountering the deep-seated ecclesiastical disorder. A frequent and rather amusing exhibition of this operation we have in the pulpit and platform eulogies of Christian union with which the public ear has grown familiar, by men who are not among the least distinguished for exclusiveness, and whose occasional ardour for union seems very like the fitful reaction of their Christian sentiment against the violence of their own habitual sectarianism. We have a more rational and amiable instance in the significant applause bestowed on Bible, Tract, or Sunday School Societies, which join many sects together on the field of their Christian philanthropy. We have another, almost worthy to be called stupendous, in which

the representatives of the various Christian sects of the world are invited to assemble for deliberation on some plan or basis of union. Now in all this we have the spectacle of a multitude of religious communions, each formed apart by its vicious law of intrinsic repulsion, yet all recoiling from their state of mutual diversity and antagonism, and breathing a common desire for some true index of that church unity of which every man has a conception in his mind, who has the love of Christ in his heart. The dislocated members of the body of Christ cannot rest as they are. The spirit of Christ in his people strives to express in some proper way the unity which it feels. But do Christians indeed dream of constituting an outward unity of the church by a confederation of sects?

The forms of worship in the various branches of the church, have arisen out of the reason and the pious emotions of Christians under a general influence of the holy scriptures. They take their character from the desire of the pious to select the most edifying and acceptable manner of expressing the united thoughts and feelings of many minds as an offering of worship to God. The natural history of forms of worship in the Christian church, written in the proper language and spirit of a Christian philosophy, would be, at any time, but especially in the present state of the protestant mind, a valuable addition to our religious literature. It would open, before many thinking people, a path of clear thought, on the internal and the external of religion, and the relation of the one to the other. We feel quite sure that very few if any of the religious topics which could engage the learned and active mind of our generation, would lead a writer and his readers through a more inviting and fruitful field of inquiry than this. To trace clearly those properties of our constitution which lie at the foundation of an outward form of devotion, and those inward laws by which that form is determined, and then to estimate the reflex influence of the form itself on the experience and character of the mind which has produced it;—to ascertain the general law by which the leaves of the spiritual tree are opened and shaped, and how they then become the inhaling and exhaling organs of the system, would lead our thoughts in the direction of sound wisdom, and of a rational and consistent charity.

Our present design does not lead us to attempt such a history.

It does not even require of us a chronological account of the various rites and ceremonies of the church. We see the protestant portion of the body of Christ divided scarcely less on forms of worship, than on articles of faith; and we desire that the few remarks of this essay may assist the candid and truth-seeking reader to discern the general standard by which our various forms of public religious exercise may be judged, and to which they ought to conform.

Of those who feel any interest in this subject, there are probably very few who would not gladly receive more accurate and extensive information than we now have concerning the exercises of the Christian assemblies in the days of the apostles.—The only general characteristic of those exercises, which we certainly know, is their extreme simplicity. The entire silence of the canonical epistles as to particular forms of public worship is remarkable. It seems hard to account for this important fact, on any other supposition, than that the apostles were content to commit the public devotions of Christians, as well as the private, to the direction of their own sense of propriety and their conscientious regard for mutual edification; that the apostles considered these guides safe for sincere Christians, while for those who lacked sincerity, prescriptions would be useless. The Holy Spirit seems, in this, to have honoured that law of human nature which renders the communion between the inner and the outer man most harmonious and effective when the latter is most strictly the offspring of the former.

The Christian assemblies of the apostolic age multiplied faster than the persons qualified to lead their public exercises. Those who would, in the proper sense be called public teachers, were, amongst the earlier Christian converts, very few. The seven deacons, elected and ordained at Jerusalem, were chosen from express regard to their piety and discretion. They were selected as men “of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, who might be set over this business” of distributing the charity funds of the church. Two of these deacons, Stephen and Philip, are represented as qualified, and on certain occasions, employed to give religious instruction. Among the men of approved faith, discretion and purity of morals, who were appointed under the general denomination of elders, while all appear to have had equal authority, to regulate the public exercises of worship, to

administer discipline, to superintend the ecclesiastical proceedings of their respective congregations, and unitedly to counsel and govern the church at large, there were some who were distinguished as "labouring in word and doctrine." But in the Christian meetings of those days, all persons who had peculiar spiritual gifts, or who deemed themselves qualified to speak to the edification of the assembly or who had a psalm, a doctrine, an exhortation or an interpretation, had liberty to speak in order. We hear of no elaborate discourses by persons officially responsible for such an exercise; no forms of prayer, approved and authorized to be used in all the churches; no compilation or version of psalmody, not even "David's Psalms," appointed by authority to be sung in public worship; but every one might offer his exhortation, his psalm or his interpretation, it being only required that "all things be done decently and in order."

No modern sect of Christians, so far as we know, insists that, as to the order and form of religious exercises, the church of Christ is to be confined to that primitive developement of her divine institutions. We certainly have no apostolic precept on this point; and as for the example, even if we had an explicit and an authentic record of it, we doubt whether many would feel themselves bound by it. The sense of the mass of intelligent Christians on this subject is doubtless expressed by the church of England, in the preface of her "Book of Common Prayer." "The particular forms of divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable, that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigencies of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as to those who are in places of authority, should from time to time seem either necessary or expedient." There is, therefore little to incite a strenuous adherence to any particular model as apostolical; and hence, so far as we have no authentic and definite information to the contrary, we are at liberty to assign the origin of our various forms of worship, as we do the origin of the various languages of mankind, to the properties and circumstances of human nature which guide men in such matters.

It is evident from the phraseology which has ever been employed to designate the leading purpose of the religious assembly

under the gospel, that this purpose has been conceived to be mainly that of worshipping God. We hence speak of the members of such an assembly as worshippers; and whatever else they are, in their various capacities as speakers, singers or hearers, they become such in order to what is deemed the worship of God. This seems farther evident also from the impression which we think to be universal among true Christians, that the more directly and intensely the mind of the assembly is exercised in proper acts towards God, the better does the character of the proceeding agree with its design.

As to the kind of exercises which may be chosen to serve this end: It seems easier to give satisfactory reasons why they should be prayer, singing and didactic and hortatory discourse, than why they should consist only of one or two of them, or why the number of the exercises should be greater. Both singing and prayer are convenient, as an expression of the devout sentiments common to the many minds of the Christian assembly; and both, being addressed to God, or capable of being so, are the most natural, simple and edifying expressions of religious faith. They are, of all conceivable exercises, the best adapted, when properly used, to awaken a sense of the presence and power of God in the mind of the worshipper. It is when speaking to God that we most clearly recognise his presence. While the act of addressing him is the natural utterance of our recognition of his presence, it enlivens the recognition it expresses. So long as those exercises of worship which proceed in the manner of direct address to God are the most engaging to minds of true and lively devotion, the disposition of our devout assemblies will continue favourable to singing and prayer as a prominent part of public worship.

These were an important part of the religious worship of the primitive churches. Both these exercises were performed in the manner of direct address to God through Jesus Christ, or to Jesus Christ himself. The report of Pliny to Trajan, that the Christians sang hymns to Jesus as to a God, favours the impression that the prevailing character of those Christian hymns was that of direct worship; that they were prepared with more reference to expressing the sentiments of the Christian heart in acts of united worship, than to their being used by one part of the congregation for effect upon another. Besides singing and

prayer, the only performances in many public meetings of the early Christians, were those of persons endowed with some peculiar and perhaps temporary gift of knowledge or of speech, or of both, by which the unbelieving hearers, or the non-gifted and silent Christians, might receive a useful impression.

There are three ideas which are susceptible of combination in our views of the design of the Christian assembly: First, That of rendering the united homage of the people to God; Second, That of instruction and the excitement of devout emotion by discourse; Third, That of a public celebration in honour of God, to commend religion to the world. The more reflecting and spiritual minds of the Christian church have manifestly always regarded the first of those as the fundamental idea of a public religious exercise. They conceive themselves as coming together, that, by the mutual assistance of many individuals, each may the better do what he feels to be his duty towards God. The development of this fundamental idea of a religious meeting will seem to be influenced by the second and third above mentioned, in a degree accordant with the character of the persons composing the assembly. And it is interesting to trace the operations of the Christian principle, as it manifests itself through the modifications which the character of religious assemblies has undergone; and particularly to observe its tenacity for the form of direct worship addressed to God in the public exercises.

The first worshipping assemblies under the new dispensation were composed almost exclusively of Christian communicants; believers in Jesus Christ, as distinguished from Jews and Pagans. In those days there was no such thing as a man of no religious profession. People did not habitually attend the Christian meetings until they were prepared to forsake their old religion, and become disciples of Christ. The professed unbelievers in the religious assemblies of those days were, therefore, very few; and the only modifications of the exercise with reference to such persons, were the miraculous use of various languages, and a preference for the vernacular on common occasions, to enable spectators to understand what was done. 1 Cor. xiv. 23, 24. In the miraculous use of tongues it was rather the manner of the performance than the matter of it, which was intended for the unbeliever. The impression was expected from the phenomenon, as a miracle and not from argument and exhortation thus

addressed to reason and conscience. The leading exercises of the assembly, being for the most part, unconstrained by the presence of a multitude of unbelievers, might confine themselves to the edification of the Christians.

But the usages of our evangelized communities have given the chief assemblies of most denominations a character altogether promiscuous. Our meetings for public worship, embrace believers and unbelievers with equal freedom. They unite both classes, indiscriminately in supporting the ministry, the conveniences of the assembly, and even the operations of evangelical benevolence. It is the remarkable truth, that in many of our congregations, unconverted persons compose the majority; and we have grown familiar with the spectacle of a multitude of persons not professing to be Christians, attending habitually upon the Christian institutions. Our exercises naturally assume a corresponding character. And to such an extreme of conformity have we gone in this way, that our sermons to the impenitent may almost be considered the general rule, and those to Christians the exceptions; our prayers, though, in form, directed to God, are often to a great extent conceived and uttered, in substance, as appeals to the impenitent; our hymns are composed with reference to the unconverted, and not unfrequently addressed to them in person; and even when the argument of the occasion is directed to Christians, the cases are very common in which the matter of the appeal is supplied by the condition and prospects of the unbelievers. These are a prominent part of the facts in relation to the exercises of our assemblies on the Lord's day, our chief day of stated convocation.

Out of this practice of treating our more public congregations with so prevalent a reference to the unbelievers, has arisen, among the most lively members of the church, the demand for the lecture or prayer meeting; a less formal and less promiscuous assemblage, once or twice in a week for exercises more strictly appropriate to Christians. The very general existence of these meetings among the more devout members of the church is a fruit of that inward impulse which gave the first Christian assemblies their devotional character. They arise from no specific precept of Christ or the apostles. They have their origin in the hearts of the disciples of Jesus; and they come to supply the want arising from the partial diversion of the Sabbath

exercises in the promiscuous congregation from the peculiar use and benefit of Christians. They are felt as such a compensation by those who enjoy them. They meet one of those wholesome desires in the Christian mind, which are the manifestation of true spiritual life and health. They come, not from ecclesiastical policy, but from the emergency of Christian experience. And their great help to those devout affections out of which they arise, has never been overrated; and we have deeply to regret that the proportion of the members of the church who attend them is so small; and that all do not find in them the pleasure and advantage which is so uniformly enjoyed by a few.

We must presume that the habitual attendants on these meetings will chiefly be members of the church and those who most nearly accord with them in their motives for being present. To have it otherwise would reduce the character of these exercises, to that of the exercises of the larger congregation, and thus defeat their object. The character of the assembly, then, renders it peculiarly proper that the prayers should be the expression of the Christian's intimate communion with God; that the sacred songs should be the harmonious utterance of the gratitude, confession, desire, and adoration, proper to believers in Jesus; that the lecture, if there be one, should awaken devout meditations in the assembly, and guide them in the way of truth and peace. To increase the entertainment and profit of the occasion, let all who officiate form just views of the object of the meeting as distinct from that of the more public congregation and conform first in their own feelings, and then, by consequence, in their expressions, to the character of the assembly. The purposes of these devotional occasions are more nearly comprehended in the edifying expression of Christian thoughts and feelings respecting God than is generally supposed. By such exercises Christians "prevail with God." With their spiritual principles thus warmed into life, and their souls endowed with a divine unction; with an enlivened view of the love of Christ for sinners, an invigorated faith, a vivid consciousness of their union with Christ and of their fellowship with the Holy Ghost, they are prepared to pray for every thing pertaining to the furtherance of the kingdom of Christ, and the welfare of men. This state of mind is itself a fervent effectual prayer that availeth much. While their desires reach after the impenitent, it is not by an unchastened

movement of natural pity for the misery of the unbeliever, or of natural horror at the prospect of his ruin, but by a calm, and consistent impulse of the Spirit of God towards the accomplishment of the divine will in the salvation of sinners. Let the professors of religion in our churches, who neglect the weekly lecture and the prayer meeting, and content themselves with the benefits of the more public and promiscuous assembly, consider both what they lack and what they lose. They lack the disposition out of which the primary forms of Christian worship arise; and, with their present spirit, they would, if placed in the circumstances of the early Christians, maintain no religious exercises at all. They lose the refreshment of direct personal communion with God, under the agreeable and effectual excitement of the social assembly; and they lose what is far more than the mere social excitement, the special and invaluable office of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of even two or three who unite to pray in the name of Jesus.

It is highly instructive to observe, how extensively this sort of exercise is felt by our more devout church members, as the most natural and faithful expression of the Christian sentiment, the most invigorating discipline of the Christian affections, and, therefore, the most proper culture for the true evangelical spirit in the hearts of believers. It is also the most effectual commendation of the gospel to the acceptance of all men. The ground of the great utility of the prayer meeting lies deep in the constitution of the people of God, and in the nature of true religion. The lively motions of religious feeling always bring the people together for prayer, and for mutual communion; not from any calculations of utility to either themselves or others, but by the social impulse of the Christian instinct; while the perception of utility comes, as in other operations of nature, after the act. Such is the tendency of true religion in man; and when the genuine tendencies of true religion are most freely indulged, the promotion of true religion is most sure. From the prayer meetings of Christians, therefore, we may most safely pronounce both upon the force of the true evangelical principle in the members of the church, and upon the rate of its propagation; while in these less formal and more simple and natural exercises of social devotion the minister of the gospel may find a very just crite-

tion of his own agreement with the genius and tendency of true Christianity.

From these examples of the natural operation of the religious principle in assemblies of Christians, we derive valuable hints concerning the proper conduct of our religious convocations on the Sabbath.

Our public assemblages on the Lord's day, nominally for the worship of God, but really to hear preaching, constitute our great occasions for the communication of the gospel with the popular mind. Such they have always been amongst people not "wholly given to idolatry." The sermon has come to be in the estimation of the body of the people, the chief end of the meeting; the scripture reading, the music, and the prayers are its accompaniments. Whether it ought to be so, we here neither affirm nor deny. We are chiefly concerned to observe that it is so; that as such it obviously is neither dissallowed by the most intelligent and lively piety of the protestant portion of the church, nor disrespected by our most rational schemes for the promotion of Christianity. It is not likely soon to be deposed from its pre-eminence. Its present position in our religious exercises is generally understood as a legitimate acquiescence in the apostolic commendation of "preaching to save them that believe." The popular intelligence of Christendom has for centuries demanded the sermon, and will still more demand it, as a support and guide to the intellectual exercises on the engaging and profound topics of religious truth. The great problem is, to determine the theme and style of preaching and the forms and manner of devotional exercise for its complement, which will constitute a homogeneous offering, conformed most strictly to the rational and scriptural idea of worshipping God.

We speak first of the preaching. The foundation of every sermon strictly evangelical, must of course be Jesus Christ; his works, his character, his authority; but above all, his death as a sacrifice for sin. No subject not directly chosen as a medium for setting forth the Saviour and directing upon him the attention and the reverence of the hearers, can have lawful admittance into a Christian pulpit. This remark will bear the widest and most rigid application. It would doubtless astonish many a preacher in its course of pulpit expurgation. Many a popular harangue on the economical and political utility of Christianity

would lose its place. Lectures on morals would be disallowed, except when they preach morality as a fruit of faith in Jesus Christ, and repentance unto life, and as the ornament and honour of the Christian character and profession. The preaching which is surest of immediate and manifest fruit, in true conversion and edification, is that which coincides most nearly with the tendencies of devout minds and consequently, with the work of the Spirit on the heart.

Such preaching will not be a mere auxiliary to spiritual worship, by giving the hearers a preparatory impulse. It will partake itself of the nature of worship. With this view the preacher does not quite comprehend all the conditions of a gospel sermon, when he fills it with instruction, and illumines it with exposition, cultivates a sense of the responsibility under which he is to speak and prays for the blessing of God to accompany his word. The worshipping posture of the mind in the preparation of a sermon, and especially in the delivery of it, will work an important modification in the order of the thoughts, and even in the thoughts themselves. Our idea on this point is not all included in the consciousness of speaking, in the name and by the authority of the Lord, and under a sense of his presence. There is a consciousness in the worshipper that the thing he does, he does unto the Lord; that he is rendering homage to the Saviour. This is what we now conceive as one of the conditions of proper preaching. Standing, as the preacher does, between the living and the dead, he may expect to be the better conductor of life, the more he himself has of conscious communication with the fountain of life.

In the selection of topics for pulpit discourses, we are sure the preacher would never be led amiss by a strict regard to the nature of the sermon as an exercise of divine worship. The attributes of the divine Saviour, as revealed in the scriptures and illustrated in the created universe, and in the work of redemption, never fail, when presented by a preacher of good sense and piety, and of the requisite knowledge and discipline, to engage the devout feelings of true believers and to gain the serious attention of unbelievers. The attributes of God are too little preached in our pulpits. They are, indeed, difficult themes. But their very difficulty is what all need to feel. It is the very incomprehensibility of God which awakens in

the believer the profound reverence and humility properly belonging to true religion. It requires, indeed, great wisdom to treat so mysterious a subject in a profitable manner; to turn its mysteriousness to good account; to illustrate the contrast between God and man, and make the hearers see how far and in what respects God is not altogether such an one as themselves. But though the work be difficult it is no small part of the work of preaching the gospel. To preach Jesus Christ and him crucified in all the extent to which that wonderful theme is fitted both to humble and to exalt the mind of man, we must preach him as God; and keep inseparably joined together in the minds of our hearers, his divine glory and his humiliation and death for sinners. To do this effectually, we must acquire distinct conceptions of the true characteristics of God, and guide the thoughts of the people in their endeavours to know him and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent.

It is no small part of the work of the Holy Spirit to open the eyes of the understanding upon the majesty and glory of Jehovah; and to cause the sinner to see that glory embodied in Jesus Christ, who died for us. That mental state in which clear views of God in Christ predominate, is the only consistent and rational state, of a religious human mind. This is an indispensable condition of permanence in our religious emotions, of genuine and joyful tranquillity, of healthy and symmetrical growth in spiritual knowledge and comfort, and of conscious conformity to the character and will of God. While the comforter is taking of Christ and showing it to his people, the preaching of the divine glory of Christ, the contemplation of the infinite and unsearchable perfection of Jehovah as set forth by the words and the works of Jesus, accompanies the heavenly operation in delightful and fruitful coincidence.

We just now alluded to the extreme difficulty of so treating this awful subject as to promote the legitimate work of the character of God upon the minds of the hearers. Crude, loose and confused declamation would do more harm than good. Dull common place, suggesting to the hearers nothing more than daily occurs to their own thoughts, would be useless. A formal argument in the way of proving particular points relating to the divine character, or the justness of his claims to the love and worship of his creatures, would not favour that posture of con-

templative devotion, which a judicious train of meditation is adapted to produce, and quite as effectually without the conclusion of a formal argument as with it. On the part of the hearers, the lack of general intelligence and of mental discipline deprives multitudes of the benefit of scientific illustrations of the power, wisdom, and goodness of God. It is hard indeed for a preacher to maintain a permanent interest in the character and works of God, in minds who seem capable of comprehending no goodness, but that which sheds its blessings directly upon them; no power, but that which is exerted for or against them; no justice but that which addresses them with threatenings and promises. Our pulpits are heavily oppressed with this difficulty, and almost universally, but it belongs to them, by the proper exercise of their functions, and by the blessings of God, to relieve themselves. The evil has its source in a very imperfect intellectual and spiritual culture. The pulpit is the only instrument adapted to remove it; and that the pulpit ought steadily to aim at its removal, we conclude from the habitual exercises of all intelligent and heavenly minded Christians, and from the obvious ways of God in the discipline of his people. Although the believer never forgets what God has been, is, and will forever be to himself, he nevertheless learns to contemplate God in other relations. He learns to adore power exerted for other purposes besides his own well being; wisdom, manifested in adapting things to other purposes besides his own use; goodness, which blesses others besides himself. This is religion of the higher sort. The Christian's own relations to God, engage his first attentions, but not his last. With his own feet upon the Rock of Ages, he enlarges the joys of his security by observing the solid extension of that Rock beneath the millions of other feet which rest with equal security upon it; until the distinct contemplation of his own safety is merged in the amazement of his soul at the eternal stability and grandeur of the rock itself. The enlightened and sincere believer, having found in Jesus the repose of his soul, goes joyfully forth into every accessible scene of divine manifestation, not with a self seeking zeal for personal advantage, but by a lively and healthful appetite for new views of his adorable Saviour. To such exercises the pulpit must bring its powerful help. This is its higher office. In this capacity it preaches Jesus Christ as he is, and as the mind of man is fitted to behold

and enjoy him. It is while the believer is led through these sublime fields, that his soul rises above earthly influence and affection, and is trained by the established and unobstructed laws of the divine operation, to the purity and joy of the spiritual life.

From our conception of the sermon in its proper connexion with the worship of God, we have a suggestion to which we venture to invite the attention of our brethren, in the form of an inquiry, whether the somewhat prevalent manner of addressing unconverted persons be the best adapted to accomplish the end in view. Our own impression is, and it becomes deeper by longer observation, that those discourses which produce the most desirable state of mind in the unconverted, are such as proceed with clear and forcible exhibitions of Christian truth, though no specific call be made on the attention of "impenitent hearers," and no professed and formal "application to the conscience" be attempted. The right sort of sermon is application throughout. Its statements of doctrine engage the hearer's interest and draw him by a secret but powerful persuasion. The recent history of great numbers of Christian churches abundantly illustrates the undesirable tendency on preacher and hearer, of an habitual specific expostulation with every class, in a formal and protracted strain, until the "appeal to the conscience" is regarded by some as the passing wind, and by others with secret but strong distaste. It is not uncommon to witness an open and lively attention to a discourse by persons whose countenances fall and whose feelings recoil when the preacher opens his battery of "application" upon the impenitent. And to explain such facts by referring to the natural aversion of the human mind for the truth, is unsatisfactory. The frequent examples of what is commonly called "gospel hardening" consist largely of persons who receive with manifest indifference or displeasure, these repulsive appeals.—There is no general law of persuasion which recommends them. Even in those cases in which they take apparent effect, it remains questionable whether their habitual use has resulted in advantage. Reflecting hearers find, in such form of address, little tendency towards the end in view, while they often discern much in the effects, on both speaker and hearer, which it would be desirable to avoid.

Considering preaching as one of the exercises of Christian worship, we judge that no form of the sermon conduces more to

the important object proposed, than that of exposition and meditation. There is an obvious affinity between the intellectual exercise of apprehending truth as stated in the holy scriptures, and the reverential address of our thoughts and feelings to God. Is there not a pleasing analogy between the submission of the mind to the word of God, and the offering of homage in prayer and praise? Every Christian sentiment recommends that preaching in which this mental posture is apparent. If we may refer, for an example, to the commentaries and sermons of Archbishop Leighton, as presenting some prominent qualities of an excellent model, we must not be understood as recommending such a literary dress for our times, nor such a selection and order of thought, for the common purpose of spiritual culture, but as commending an admirable example of a preacher who diffuses through his sermon the savour of his text; who does not so often resolve his chosen portion of scripture into a formal proposition of systematic theology, and treat that proposition first with statement and explanation, second, with proof, third with practical application, as diffuse the heavenly flavour of the divine words through his own mind, and then draw out from his fulness, whatever his text, his heart, and the occasion jointly suggest. The evident increase of this sort of preaching among the more disciplined, spiritual and rich furnished minds of our pulpit is attended with an equally evident increase of edification to Christians; and is more uniformly effectual than any other preaching, in the conversion of men.

There are serious reasons for regret when the pulpit is given to disputation on occasions of public worship. As there is no theological truth which does not stand opposed to some error existing or believed to exist in the community, there is no subject which does not permit the preacher to assume the controversial air; and in the majority of cases the temptation to the polemic attitude is strong. It coincides with the propensity to sarcasm, caricature, and denunciation; it favours the inclination to perpetual antagonism and where there is a lack of true spiritual sensibility, it furnishes almost the only incitement of fervour. Besides these facilities for controversy, there is an exaggerated estimation of its utility in settling important views of religious truth, and maintaining a pure faith in the church; and with all these causes combined, the polemical turn of the protestant pul-

pit in many quarters may be said to have become a habit, more prevalent than, without consideration, most of our brethren would be prepared to believe. It is worthy of serious inquiry indeed how far the errors, which require refutation in the preaching of the gospel, have been generated by the disputation which they seem to provoke. But so far as the pulpit is involved in this matter, it labours at a disadvantage. We are sure that for a worshipping assembly the polemical aspect is the least profitable of all the aspects under which the doctrines of the gospel can be presented. The intellectual state produced in a congregation by the controversial presentation of religious instruction is unfavorable to devotion, and incongenial to the spiritual mind. The history of pulpit controversy furnishes instructive illustration of the fact that so far as preaching has for its object to sustain the mind of the hearer in the posture of devout worship, it defeats its end when it involves the hearer in theological warfare. If it be the office of the sermon to help the public devotion of the assembly, and if it be so regarded by enlightened and devout people, the good sense and piety of our ministry will cause a continual approximation towards the devotional standard, and the pulpit of our country will gradually direct more of its luminous and powerful issues into the channel of scripture exposition and devout meditation.

Another form of expressing the united worship of our religious assembly is that of sacred song.

The two principles in which the use of song in public worship originates are these: The instinctive impulse in the members of an assembly of men to unite in some vocal expression of their common sentiments; second, the natural relish for music, which determines them to give their united voices the order of musical harmony.

The natural office of psalmody in the congregation would therefore be that of giving an orderly and convenient utterance to religious devotion. So far as it fulfils this office, it has a peculiar power to enliven and strengthen devotional feeling in the worshippers, and impart it to others. By means of this power it often comes to be esteemed and used chiefly for the sake of its secondary and incidental office; its primary office is disregarded, and an important portion of its benefits as an exercise of worship thereby prevented.

The idea of giving devout sentiments a musical expression appears to have been co-eval with that of expressing religious sentiments in any form by the union of many voices. The art of music was one of the earliest arts of mankind. From the fact that the first instance of devotion to the culture of music appeared in one of the descendants of Cain, we may infer that if the false religion of that race of men assumed any public form, it may have presented the first examples of the public use of music. But the first instance now certainly known was one in which music was used in a public procession in honour of the true God. *Ex. xv.*

The earliest use of vocal music in the worship of God, was attended with the sounds of such instruments as were supplied by the arts of the time and were agreeable to the taste of the people; together with those bodily movements which were regarded as emphatical indications of the lively emotions of the soul. All these practices were, of course, susceptible of change with the varying taste of the people; and when the same ceremonies became common to the worshippers of the true God and idolaters, and by being associated with idolatry became snares to the people of God; they were in some cases abandoned by common consent, or expressly forbidden. In such cases, the religious caution of the people or the authority of God, for special and peculiar reasons, regulated an exercise which would otherwise have been left to the public taste. The use of music in connexion with the alluring and profane practices of irreligion, and the intimate associations they formed between it and impure and degrading sentiments and feelings, have always caused more or less embarrassment in the use of it among Christians. Especially has instrumental music lost, with many devout people, all its devotional utility on account of its mirthful and profane associations. Even those instruments which have been confined chiefly to sacred uses, have lost their sacred character by association with a corrupt religion or with an obnoxious administration of spiritual affairs. To redeem these powerful agents from their present disrepute, and render them acceptable and efficient aids to public devotion, will require a great advance in that mental culture in which a taste for music shall have prominent place. Indeed, against a highly cultivated style of poetry and music in general for the purposes of public worship, the force of preju-

dice has in many circumstances, been peculiarly strong. If schisms prevail among the worshippers of God, and one party regard another with jealousy and aversion, the parties associate the offensive peculiarities of their respective opponents with their most prominent public ceremonies; and as sacred music is one of the most prominent and captivating parts of public worship, the times of ecclesiastical discord and division have generally been times of great fluctuation in the music of the Christian assembly. In those communities in which the taste for music was least cultivated, the use of music, as such, was at times almost abandoned; and the worship rendered by the united voices of the people, have but a very remote relation to true musical expression.

The psalmody of the Christian assembly has generally partaken largely of those characteristics of thought and expression which arise from the circumstances of the people. In a divided state of the church, when the different denominations are zealous for their respective forms of doctrine and worship, the lyric poetry becomes strongly argumentative, and polemical; addresses men rather than God; and is employed to defend and inculcate theology, and to confirm the attachment of the people to their peculiar articles of faith. Hence each sect has its psalmody. Both policy and conscience are deemed to require the hymns to coincide in sentiment throughout with the creed of the sect. And the doctrines are not only stated in poetical language, or language professedly poetical, and dwelt upon in a strain of devout meditation, but are frequently inculcated in a sort of metrical argument and appeal, to persons not supposed to believe them. Some religious assemblies are so trained, by the peculiar administration of the word and ordinances of the gospel among them, as almost to abandon the idea of worshipping God in the public meeting, and to consider it the leading object of the meeting to impress the irreligious. To this view of public religious exercises among Christians many compilations of psalmody are accommodated. The hymns either express or address every state of mind which is conceived to exist in any individual of the assembly. In those churches in which the "Psalms of David" are scrupulously retained, in a literary dress which for every other purpose is obsolete, we have an example of the stronger prevalence of the notion of worship, as the end of public

psalmody, in distinction from the notion of utility in inculcating doctrine and correcting states of mind amongst the hearers; while in this case we have also an example of the force of circumstances in interrupting the natural connexion between the habitual use of a public form of social exercise, and the influence of taste in the particular arts employed.

That the fundamental idea of Christian psalmody is that of a poetical and musical expression of devout sentiment in the manner of worship, we infer from the superior satisfaction which all true Christians feel in the exercise, when the poetry and the music help the elevation of their thoughts directly to God; when the words of the song and the strains of the harmony are sensible signs of that reverence, and of faith and hope and love which rise towards God as incense from the altar of the heart. It is only by the stress of circumstances that the pious heart consents to the diversion from God to embrace the intermediate ends of our earthly state. Mature and elevated piety is by nature contemplative; and those outward exercises, whether public or private, which present God in Jesus Christ most directly to the view, are most congenial to its tendencies. And if it should, upon enlightened observation, be found that in the evangelized parts of the world, the simple, fervent, spiritual worship of Christians by scriptural meditation, prayer and sacred song, constitutes, under God, the great power of the public assembly for the conversion and edification of the heirs of heaven, it will be what the instruction of Christ and his apostles teach us to expect.

The matter of our sacred songs then, will be the more appropriate, the more it consists of those sentiments only which are common to all the sincere worshippers of God who take part in the exercise. These sentiments will be for the most part, of a general character. The special and peculiar views and feelings of individuals cannot ordinarily be sufficiently known and appreciated by the congregation to be interesting matter for united expression in an act of worship; and for the whole assembly to engage in singing the language of those thoughts or emotions which are entertained by only one or two members seems incompatible with any proper idea of the nature of united worship. We do not consider the use of such special matter entirely unprofitable to any of the religious purposes which may be an-

swered by such public exercises; nor would we discourage the introduction of any evangelical subject in which the cordial interest of the Christian worshippers can be engaged. But the highest edification of the assembly requires that our sacred poetry should express the sentiment of those who use it; that it should be strictly devotional, and treat of those subjects in which the worshippers must be presumed to feel a common interest.

In determining the proper manner of performing this part of our worship we are encompassed with difficulty. The difficulty, however, does not lie so much in forming a clear and satisfactory conception of the proper style of church psalmody, as in realizing that conception in the execution.

There are very strong considerations which recommend that the address should be to God, the object of the worship, other things being equal, the song is most inspiring when it addresses God in the second person, or uses the third in a way which implies the second, as in the twenty-third psalm. The thanksgiving, the petition, the confession, the adoration and praise, being all intended for God, accord best with the tendencies of the truly devout mind when addressed directly to him. The interhortatory form of praise, by which the performers incite one another to the animated expression of their faith and joy in God, may be conceived as a figurative style of addressing God himself. It presumes a cordial unanimity of devotion by which the worshippers exclaim with united voices, "O, come let us sing unto the Lord." The original effect of this style is however partly lost with the choral responses which formed a prominent part of the ancient celebrations, but which are chiefly dismissed by modern taste, from public ceremonies strictly religious. Other classes of hortatory hymns, together with didactic and polemic pieces, interspersed in many compilations, have been suggested by the local and varying relations of men to one another, and are generally found to require peculiar circumstances to reconcile them with the common sentiments and feelings which are felt by all Christians to be essential in the nature of public worship. Many of these hymns have found their way into the congregations, through confusion of what is proper to the exercises of the public assembly, with what is proper to the private exercises of individual Christians. Although a formal expurgation of our lyric poetry, according to these principles, is

to be neither expected nor desired, yet occasional suggestions of some of the principles involved in the preparation and use of psalmody for public worship may be useful guides to our thoughts on this interesting subject, and may contribute to an edifying uniformity of practice among the people of God.

The conception of psalmody above stated, as a part of public worship, obviously requires that the exercises should be sustained as far as practicable, by the voices of all the worshippers. The great practical difficulty of this part of our religious ceremonies has always been found here. The natural laws which act their part in the regulation of this matter are these: 1. The spontaneous impulse to vocal exertion by all in the assembly whose thoughts and emotions are expressed in the performance; and 2. The necessity that the voices submit to the laws of harmony. These principles have revealed their agency in all the phenomena of sacred song from the earliest period of its use, and will be found in combination with each other, and with the circumstances of the times, to account for the interesting series of facts which constitute the history of church music.

At the grand celebration of deliverance on the shore of the Red Sea, the triumphal procession was conducted with all the public demonstrations of joy which the people then knew how to use. A prominent part of the ceremony was music, instrumental and vocal, joined with the utterance of joyful and devout sentiment. The very brief description given us of the scene, leaves the impression on the reader, that in some form and to some extent, the voices of all the people were engaged in the ceremony. The people were rude, and the instruments of music and the art of execution as rude as the people; and we have here the only conditions of the general participation of a multitude in a musical performance; namely, that of the composition of the music and the style of performance required, correspond with the taste and capacity of the most uncultivated portion of the people.

The days of Solomon were distinguished by many signs of social culture; but the mass of the people had been hitherto occupied in war. The kind and degree of civilization requisite to sustain a taste and capacity for a cultivated style of music, the body of the people had not attained. Many of them, at their time of life, could never attain it. The alternative presented

to Solomon was, either to submit to the use of rude music, in the temple service, or appoint select performers. His choice of the latter is commended by the laws of social improvement, and by the most intelligent regard for the elevating and devotional effect of public worship. Here occurs the conflict between the two laws of nature mentioned above; the disposition of all to join their voices in the expression of thoughts and feelings which are common to all; and the necessity that the united voices consult the taste for harmony.

In the early Christian assemblies, as we judge from the general simplicity of their exercises, in the absence of direct testimony their singing was performed by the whole assembly. And this would naturally continue to be the practice while the regulation of the public exercises was with the people, or with persons whose taste agreed with the popular standard. But when the whole control of the assembly was assured by a few cultivated and powerful persons in the respective churches, and at length by a hierarchy, there was introduced a standard of musical performance which was above the people; proficients only were selected and assigned to the service, the idea of divine worship was dissociated from the exercise in the minds of the performers; and in process of time, the music of the church, became little else than a professional display. During the middle ages, the external unity of the church, and the entire withdrawal of the regulation of its affairs from the people to the hierarchy, produced as strict a uniformity in the exercises of public worship, as the difference of language and of social manners and customs would permit. Through all that period, the music of the religious assembly was performed by agents employed by the hierarchy, as a part of the system of worship by priestly meditation between the people and God. The music itself was of a higher order. It was one of the arts of which the church became a constant and munificent patron. But instead of being properly responsive to any devout sentiment of the people, it was a mere instrument of agreeable excitement.

From the reformation downwards, church music, in the different branches of the protestant church, has existed in perpetual fluctuation, and in all conceivable diversity of spirit and style. No one settled and uniform conception of the nature and design of the exercise prevailed among the different churches. Yet in

all the diversity we see these two requisitions combining their influence in various proportions: first, that the people sing; second, that the singing be in true harmony. Amidst all the diversity of views, we do not detect any which requires the assignment of the music to select performers, except by a choice of evils; it being the only condition of obtaining the harmony demanded by the common sense of the worshippers. Nor do we, on the other hand detect any view which requires or allows discordant and unskillful performance, except by a choice of evils; it being the only condition on which the congregation can sing with the union demanded by the common sense of the worshippers.

The style of the poetry has had its influence on the manner of performing the music. The early versions of the Psalms of David, had in their poetical texture, but a feeble affinity for cultivated music, if indeed they would at all consent to union with it. But among the people who have used, and still use the literal versions, there has prevailed a strong and uniform preference for singing by the whole congregation, even at the sacrifice of refinement in the music. The peculiar style of devotional poetry to which they become attached, together with their lively interest in the united song of the assembly, produces contentment with such a style of singing as the congregation can perform; while, in the more refined communities, the desire for improvement in the music shows itself in the precentors, whose taste is generally in advance of the people, and who consult it not unfrequently by propounding pieces in the public worship which they are permitted to sing chiefly by themselves.

The ascendancy of the desire for improved harmony over the desire for the union of all voices, has appeared in the organization of the choir, consisting of persons who have some special training in the art of music, and who take the charge of this part of the public service, with the aid of such instruments as their skill, and the taste and means of the congregation may supply. This arrangement provides more nearly for realizing the legitimate results of the two laws concerned in this part of public worship, than any other which has been devised. It is in most cases a voluntary service on the part of the members of the choir; is undertaken with the countenance and frequently with

the patronage of the congregation ; and becomes, by that means, a virtual index of the conception of musical propriety in the congregation, and instrumental of general improvement.

The execution of this plan encounters these two difficulties ; that of having performers in the choir who are not supposed to be sincere worshippers of God, and that of having selections of music ill-suited to the taste of the congregation, and the purposes of devotion. The first of these difficulties is to be diminished by maintaining in the congregation and particularly in the persons immediately concerned the proper views of the design of the exercise, and the qualifications for performing it ; the other must be removed through the discretion of the leader. When these inconveniencies have been diminished as far as possible by these means, what remains of them may be alleviated by the consideration that the singing of persons who are not sincere worshippers is incidental to that exercise in any form ; and that music becomes appropriate by use.

These inconveniences, however, are slightly felt against the advantages of a judiciously conducted choir. We speak with some assurance on this subject from the evident tendency of the churches towards the general adoption of the choir ; and from the reluctance with which the choir is relinquished where its proper benefits have once been felt. To ascertain its legitimate office and judge of its utility, when properly used, we must keep in view the two properties of church music which all seek to realize : the general union of voices, and true harmony. We are then prepared to designate for the conduct and office of the choir, some such rules as the following :

Its performances should be pervaded by the spirit of true and sincere worship in the hearts of the members. Though not indispensable to the usefulness of the service to others, the sincere mind is strictly indispensable to propriety and rectitude on the part of the performers. They must be governed in this respect by those rules which are applied to ministers of the gospel, and all who have leading parts in spiritual services. They are a portion of the congregation who profess to worship God, and are rendered conspicuous in this profession by the prominence they voluntarily assume. Though the sentiment of the congregation may be indulgent towards them in this respect, and may not exact sincere Christian devotion as the condition of their service,

it does not relieve them of responsibility to God for this duty. The congregation may err in their judgment of propriety in this matter. Many unquestionably do. A very low sense of the solemnity of this part of divine service prevails in many quarters, yet many sensible and pious people are grieved with this laxity who do not express their feelings; and who endeavour to overcome all disturbance of their minds from such sources, and to use the musical aid afforded them to express and elevate their own devotion. The duty we now urge is the same which is to be urged on every person who sings in the congregation, whether he be a member of a choir, or not. It is the duty of worshipping God in spirit, while making the signs of worship with the voice. The singing of the congregation is not less solemn and significant than the prayers. And for an undevout person to take the language of prayer upon his lips, because it might be the custom of the assembly to pronounce the prayers, would be felt by every serious mind as an extreme impropriety. We do not say that such persons ought to keep silence, and not to join in the sacred song, but we do say that they ought not to sing insincerely and undevoutly. By so doing, they sin; they violate the sense of righteousness in all pious minds, and even in their own. Having said these things, we add, that those persons in our respective congregations whose natural gifts, and whose taste and opportunities for improvement, facilitate their performance of this pleasing exercise, and enable them to hold a prominent place among the worshippers of Christ, have great occasion of thankfulness for a valuable endowment. It adds vastly to the delight with which they can praise God; and they wrong themselves, and lose the precious fruit of a heavenly gift, if they do not make their talent the brilliant censer in which they offer to God the incense of the pure and joyful heart.

The true theory of church music forbids, that either the choir or the congregation should consider the select company of singers as official performers of the music for the congregation. The spirit of the movement by which the singing sometimes falls into the hands of a few persons of superior musical gifts, doubtless claims for the choir the sole office. This spirit is too often entertained by both parties. The choir assume the office, and the congregation leave it to them. But this way of conducting church music satisfies no one who considers the singing an aid to

devotion. The duties of the members of a choir, as they arise out of the views we have taken, are these; to consider themselves still as so many members of the congregation assembled for the worship of God; to take their most convenient position in the assembly from which their voices can exert the greatest power on the whole, to consider themselves as the leaders of the congregation in raising the song of praise to Jehovah, and exert all their power to engage the hearts of the assembly in symphony with theirs. For this purpose they must cultivate their talent for singing by the rules of a judicious discipline. They must have their hearts in tune for the praise of God. They must subject their taste to a sound discretion in judging of the strains of harmony best adapted to the purposes of the congregation; and in all suitable ways encourage the assembly to unite in singing under their direction.

The influence of a well conducted choir, in this matter is very desirable and very great. We are confident that for training a whole congregation to unite their voices in worshipping God in the strains of a sacred and delightful harmony, no other means can be so effectual as this. To assemble a whole congregation or any considerable portion of one, for drilling in sacred music under a professional teacher, is out of the question. To introduce music with which the assembly is not familiar, and so impress it on them by the voice of a single leader that they will acquire the use of it with tolerable facility and despatch, is, in common cases, impracticable. But with a choir properly instructed and employed, the most appropriate music can be introduced, with such distribution of parts, and such power and correctness of harmony, as will carry the congregation along with it, impress it speedily on the minds of the people and provoke all to join in the song who can sing with any propriety. Then, with such a generation, as we trust is not very remote in the future—a generation trained in the principles of music as a part of their common education; made familiar with sacred music in the Sunday school, and prepared for true spiritual worship by the grace of God, the sacred song adopted by the laws of nature as one of the forms of our divine worship, will reach the standard which nature and grace unitedly instruct us to attain.

Many an attentive Christian observer has witnessed the musical developments of our generation in some important quarters

of the church in this country with devout gratitude and hope. The names of Thomas Hastings and Lowell Mason, will be held in long remembrance, from their association, not perhaps with the original and fruitful genius like those which produced "The Messiah," or "The Creation," but with such a combination of musical genius and skill, with sound practical views of the high office of music in Christian worship, as has given the church a powerful impulse in the way she should go. The general style of church music to which they have given their valuable sanction, has already diffused a charm through the stated worship of many thousand congregations, and is destined to attend the progress of the Christian assembly towards the attainment of what all devout minds, by nature, conceive as the perfection of the sacred song;—the union of all voices in a perfect harmony.

ART. II.—*Evangelische Kirchen-Zeitung.* Herausgegeben von C. W. Hengstenberg. Dr. der Phil. u. d. Theol. der letzteren ord. Professor an der Universität zu Berlin. Jahrgang 1845.

GERMANY, more perhaps than any part of the world, has of late years been the seat of religious agitations. The leading parties, or the principal elements in the struggling mass, are the German Catholics, the Rationalists, and the advocates of the standards of the church. The subdivisions under these heads are almost endless. The fermentation is the product of so many conflicting principles that it is no easy thing to form any intelligent conception of the religious state of that interesting country. We propose from the sources within our reach, to give some account of the more important movements which have marked its history during the past year.

Our readers are all aware of the hopes almost universally excited by the first appearance of Ronge. The absence of any decisive evidence that the Spirit of God was the source of his convictions and declarations, and the want of any clear indication of either a knowledge or zeal for evangelical truth, gave rise from the beginning to many misgivings. But as the movement in the first instance was in the right direction, as Ronge's protest

was against error and tyranny, and as the first declaration of faith made by the German Catholics asserted the supreme authority of the scriptures and the doctrines common to the whole church, it is not wonderful that favourable anticipations were entertained. These hopes however were soon dissipated, as it became more and more apparent that Ronge and his party were endeavouring to emancipate themselves not only from the errors and oppression of Rome, but from the gospel itself. This remark is intended to apply to the general character of the party, for no one is disposed to question that it includes men of very different principles and aims. Dr. Hengstenberg, though from the beginning an open and even an extreme opponent of the whole movement, does not hesitate to admit the truth of the following paragraph from a recent work by Dr. Ullmann. "No impartial observer," says that author, "can deny that the mass of those who have withdrawn from the Romish church, is composed of very different materials. There are among them some truly pious men, who long for the liberty of the gospel, who separated from the visible head of the church of Rome, in order to be the more intimately united to the invisible head of the church universal. Others are intelligent, honest men who feel the need of some better means of moral and religious growth than they had heretofore enjoyed. Others doubtless desired in freeing themselves from the church of Rome, to free themselves from all ecclesiastical restraints, and to give themselves up to general notions of civilization, human progress, virtue and perfectibility. And others there are, who form the advance guard of the movement party, men who are destitute of principles, opposed to all authority, and ready to take part in every scheme of agitation." Hengstenberg admits the presence of all these elements, remarking however as to the first, that a piety which includes so little of the power of "judging of spirits" can hardly be any thing more than a susceptibility for good and a natural fear of God. But the important question, he says, is, what is the governing element? What is that which forms the character and determines the influence of the whole movement? That the irreligious, rationalistic element is the governing one, Hengstenberg considers plain for the following reasons. In the first place, though the party in general terms say they wish to abide by the scriptures, yet in these days when language has lost its

ordinary meaning, and the most orthodox terms are employed in teaching heresy, this amounts to nothing. The real position of the party to the scriptures is apparent from their Leipzig confession, according to which not only the interpretation of the Bible, but the question whether it is to be regarded as historical or mythical, is left open. The fact that that confession passes over almost entirely the events of Christ's life, and makes no mention even of his resurrection, shows that its authors had no serious intention to adopt the scriptures as their rule of faith. This is still plainer from the work published by Ronge at Dessau in 1845. This little book, which consists of collections from the scriptures, is designed not merely for use in public worship, but to serve as a substitute for the Bible. In the preface, he calls on the wealthier portion of his disciples to furnish their poorer brethren with "this gospel." He says he has selected those passages which condemn tyranny over faith and conscience; those which declare the mere profession of doctrine (*Wortchristenthum*) insufficient; and those which serve to confirm Christian doctrine, especially the love of our neighbour, and which enjoin the spiritual and moral elevation of men, and the improvement of their physical condition. The book is made up of passages which have a polemical bearing, and of such as appear to allow an interpretation favourable to the Fourier community theory. The gospel here appears simply as a new Law, of its precious kernel there is scarcely a trace. The declarations against the Pharisees are freely quoted, but there is not a single passage relating to the divinity of Christ, and scarcely one relating to what he has done for us. Of the history of Christ nothing is given beyond what must be read on feast days; there is no miracle, no healing of the sick, brought forward. The weary, the heavy laden, the tempted find in this gospel, designed only for the happy, no consolation. What there is of power in these disjointed fragments, is in a great measure spoiled by a modernised, and, in many cases, designedly perverted translation. For "Holy Spirit" is regularly substituted "holy disposition." Even Matt. xii. 3, incredible as it may seem, is rendered, "Whoso speaks against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but he that speaks against the disposition that is pure and holy, to him it shall not be forgiven, neither in this life nor that which is to come." 2 Cor. xiii. 13, is rendered, "The salvation of our

Lord Jesus Christ, love to God and the communion of the holy disposition be with you all." "From all this," says Hengstenberg, "it is plain that a congregation which receives from its leaders such a patch work as this, is not far from renouncing the scriptures altogether, and that it is a piece of wretched hypocrisy to say that they are founded on the word of God. Our church is, in this respect, nearer to that of Rome, who gives even to its laity more of truth than is presented in this book of Rouge's."

Another indication of the real spirit of this party, is found in the fact that the daily press, the organ and mouth piece of the world, every where has hailed it with delight and aided its progress. The press knows what it is about, and it is to be lamented that Christians, instead of looking at things as they really are, allow themselves so often to be influenced and carried along by the spirit of the world, and then have to excuse themselves with the humiliating confession, "we did not think."

Again, he appeals to the personal character of the leaders. There is no depth, no earnestness, no power in them. Every thing about them is superficial, common, pelagianish. Contrast Rouge's declaration that he wished "to bring up the young to independence of thought and action," with Luther's dictum, "If you let a youth grow up out of his own soil, you will have a real devil on your hands."*

With regard to the speeches and writings of the German Catholics Dr. Ullmann has truly said, "Through them all there appears a superficial humanitarian principle; a certain antipathy to every thing historical and positive, a lively sympathy with the religious and moral abstractions of the day; and it can scarcely be unjust to say, that if they would speak out, the majority would confess themselves more or less determined Rationalists."

It is, however, by adverting to the history of their several confessions, that the character of this party is most clearly seen. The first confession emanating from Schneidemühl and Berlin, was of a Christian character. That this did not fairly represent the spirit of the movement, is plain from the joy with which the Breslau confession was hailed, which was composed according to the taste of Bretschneider, who gave the two fold evidence to

* As every thing Luther ever said is untranslatable we give his own words: So du einen Jungen in seiner Sode aufwachsen lässtest, wird ein wahrer Teufel daraus.

the German Catholics, "Make your confessions short," and "Set forth your faith only for what it is, that is, the faith of the present generation, *your* faith;" as though a faith not conscious of its own eternal perpetuity was worthy of the name. The whole Christology of this confession is crowded into the sentence, 'our Saviour, who by his doctrines, life and death has redeemed us from the bondage of sin,' and to this is prefixed the declaration that freedom of investigation and interpretation must be restrained by no outward authority. This seemed to be as far as any community, claiming to be Christian, could go, but the Leipzig confession took a further step into emptiness. Even the shadow of a Christology which was found in the Breslau declaration, disappears; nothing is left but a profession of faith 'in Jesus Christ our Saviour.' This miserable production met with almost universal acceptance; only here and there a congregation availed themselves of the liberty allowed them to add to this meager formula. The uselessness of such attempts was soon manifest. In Berlin the effort to join the first confession to that of Leipzig, failed; and after warm disputing it was decided to abide by the latter as it stood. And finally the failure of Czerski to produce a reaction and to give a more Christian character to the movement, proves its true nature. In the Provincial Synod of the German Catholics at Marienwerder, it was unanimously resolved to abide by the principles adopted at Leipzig, and with like unanimity the Synod declared against Czerski, and determined that if he would not consent to these terms and withdraw his objections, he should no longer interfere in their ecclesiastical concerns. Only a few hundred persons have taken part with Czerski, showing how decided and self-conscious is the anti-Christian spirit of the party. The conclusion to which Hengstenberg arrives after this survey is, that the German Catholic movement is only an outbreak of the anti-Christian spirit of the age, manifesting itself in the Romish church, because its corruptions gave the movement a plausible excuse; because the authority of that church presses more upon its members; because intolerance and arrogance provoke opposition; because that church has been for years the object of attack by the public press, and because less liberty of opinion is there allowed than among the Protestants and there was less hope, from the external power of the Papacy, that the infidel movement could there gain ascendancy.

The hope has often been expressed that good may still come of this movement. Having cast off the chains of popery, we may hope that the truth may gradually gain access to the people. We are ourselves inclined to cherish this hope; not on the extreme and unchristian ground, that infidelity is better than popery, but that the former is less powerful and durable than the latter. A community can live as Papists, but not as infidels. The children of these German Catholics will be either Romanists or Protestants. They cannot stand where they are, and the probability is, that having once escaped from the thralldom of the Pope, the majority will find their way into some Christian church. Hengstenberg, whose account of this matter, we are condensing, looks at the matter in a different light. "Can men, he asks, gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? As the germ decides the character of a tree, so the beginning of any religious movement, if it has a distinct character, determines its progress and its end." He sees also in the purely democratical character of the constitution adopted by the German Catholics, another reason for despairing of their improvement. Every thing seems devised to deprive the clergy of influence. The provincial synod of Silesia declared the independence of the several congregations to be the foundation of their constitution. The clergy, who are to bear no other title than preacher, have no vote in presiding at the meetings of the congregation or local synods, and they cannot sit as delegates from the congregations in provincial synods. In the synod at Breslau, "all cure of souls" was denied to them. There, and also at Stuttgart, the right of voting was granted to widows, married women, and to maidens. So much the better, in our judgment. This democratical character of the movement, bodes good. The people, and especially the women, cannot live on infidelity. We do not believe, indeed, that a community thus organized can long sustain a separate existence, but the freer it is, the more hope there is of dissolution in that form and of the assumption of a better.

Dr. Ullmann is disposed to give these new Catholics the credit of honesty. As they ceased to believe in the doctrines of Rome, he honours them for renouncing their allegiance to her; and intimates that those hostile to the doctrines of the Evangelical church, would do well to pursue a similar course. To this Hengstenberg replies, the German Catholics have not only left

their own church, but undertaken to found a new one, and to set forth a new confession. If a man has no inward bond to any church, he acts most honestly when he remains in the church within whose pale he was born. In that case he makes no profession, separation becomes a duty, only when explicit profession is required; and even in that case, it would be better to allow himself to be excommunicated, than voluntarily to withdraw. Is it not dishonest to feign a zeal for the church, to pretend to be concerned for its welfare, and to desire to found a pure society when a man cares nothing about the matter? The Leipzig confession is itself dishonest, when it professes faith in the Holy Ghost, meaning thereby not what the whole Christian church understands, but "good disposition." How much is implied in: I believe! How much is required honestly to say: I believe in God, as the maker and preserver of the world. The man should tremble, who ventures to say: I believe in Jesus Christ our Saviour, unless he believes in his true and perfect Godhead, for only on that assumption is he a Saviour or an object of faith. The very name of this new church is dishonest. The Jansenists had a right to call themselves Catholics, for they held the catholic faith; but this body rejects not only what is Romish but what is Christian. For what purpose then can the name catholic be retained but to deceive themselves and others? If they would be honest, the leaders at least of this movement, ought to acknowledge that their object is not to found a church, but an anti-christian society, which only for a time out of regard for the weak brethren and for fear of the civil government, assumes the guise of a church. That this is the real state of the case, is evident to any one who notices the public worship of these people. They make a miserable figure in the church. It is only when they get to the tavern that they feel themselves at home. There in the midst of feasting, ringing of glasses and calling of toasts, we could acknowledge a certain geniality in them, did we not remember they just before had been arrayed as clergymen, and dispensing the Lord's supper.

The future of this new church may be divined from the past. It has as yet found entrance only where unopposed. It has no strength to triumph over resistance. Its members are almost confined to the middle classes in the cities. It owes all its success to the daily press, a most uncertain ally. As soon as a new

subject of interest arises, this will be forgotten. The people will soon get tired of monotonous declamations against popery, and go elsewhere. The public will more and more see the inconsistency between infidelity and a church. It is only in Germany, where such a thing is no novelty, that the incongruity of such a combination could for a moment escape detection. The inordinate admiration of the heroes of the movement will soon be turned into contempt, and the new church will then be left to its own resources, and it will then be seen whether it can find the means of living.

Our author goes on to remark that as far as the Romish church is concerned, much depends upon the mode in which they deal with these new opponents. If they act on the principle involved in the words of Augustin, *christianus mihi nomen, catholicus cognomen*, they may gather strength from the conflict. But if they reverse the matter, and make the Catholic more prominent than the Christian, and fight this battle with Romish instead of Christian weapons, they will find that although they may triumph over their present weak antagonists, they will raise up others a hundred fold more formidable. In our days, says our author, it is hard enough to maintain the common faith of Christians, which has in its support the witness of the Holy Ghost in the heart, as to the traditions of men, blessed is the church that is free from them. If in this spirit we turn to the pastoral address of Princebishop of Diepenbrock, Breslau 1845, we shall receive a melancholy impression. It is from beginning to end Romish instead of Christian. It begins with the assurance that the bishop is in fellowship with the Pope, the central point of Christian unity, from which rays of light are shed over the earth. Then follows a long detail of the usual arguments for the authority of the Romish see; then an account of the seven sacraments; then mention is made of "the only saving church, and finally of the virgin Mary, to whose intercession the church looks for safety. In the conclusion there is something which at first view looks like Christian truth. "Humble faith" says the Bishop, "and pure love, Fenelon truly declared to be the sum of Catholicism;" but we are immediately informed that "humble faith is that which receives the doctrine of the infallible church, and pure love is self-denying obedience to that doctrine in all the relations of life." One would think the bishop considered himself to be writing

against men who received the common faith of Christendom as expressed in the three œcumenical creeds, and rejected only the peculiar doctrines of Rome, whereas they reject not Popery only, but Christianity.

Our author next notices, "The Mission of the German Catholics, Heidleberg' 1845," by Gervinus, a work which from the celebrity of its author, and from its falling in with the governing spirit of the age, has produced a great impression. The Christian faith, according to Gervinus, is superannuated; the church's day is over. Such a bond, as three hundred years ago, one half the German nation formed with Luther, can never be formed again. For centuries after his time, there appeared no history which was not instinct with faith, and in which every thing was not viewed in a religious light. All science, art and literature were imbued with the same spirit. It is in vain to expect that this Lutheran faith can ever be revived, or that another with like power can take its place. Those in our day who think so are strangers and pilgrims from a former age. Any new orthodox church must now play the subordinate part of a lost sect.—The Goethes and Schillers, the Vosses and Jean Pauls, the Winklemanns and Wielands, the Fosters and Lichtenbergs, have all cast off the shackles of doctrinal Christianity, and the cultivated part of the nation have followed their example. To attempt to bring them back, would only provoke a retort like that of the old Normans, who said, 'They would rather be in hell with their brave companions, than in heaven with the monks. The problem of our time is not to found new churches, but to heal the national wounds inflicted by the old ones. We must have a broad system of universal toleration, which shall supercede this strife for particular confessions, and introduce a national church union. This problem cannot be solved, without the assistance of the state. The civil authority should set forth the vaguest possible confession of faith, and require all to submit to it. Under this all comprehending rule of faith, the minor and stricter associations should not be allowed to exist. The German Catholic church has the high vocation of showing on a small scale, what should be done on a broad one. Its true significancy is not religious, but patriotic and politic. We may see in this movement the germ of a new revolution to last for centuries. True there is much reason to fear that the German Catholics, will be found

unequal to their calling. It is essential to success that the people should be pure, and their leaders sincere and earnest. Things have already occurred which seem to portend an abortive birth from the labouring mountain.

To all this, Hengstenberg remarks, first, that it truly sets forth the alienation of the great body of the educated classes from the church; and he thence infers the infatuation of those who, under existing circumstances, are calling for a democratical, by which he means, a presbyterian organization of the church. Secondly, that the writer correctly apprehends the nature of the Ronge movement, as not religious, but anti-christian. It is merely a new free-masonry. In this respect also he shames those pious people who refuse to open their eyes to the real state of the case. Thirdly, he remarks on the effrontery with which the writer avows that the spirit of the world is the spirit of God. He is thoroughly pantheistic; to him whatever is, is the product of reason; of sin, he has no conception. His confidence that all is over with the Christian faith rests on this pantheistic view. That faith, however, has conquered more formidable enemies than her present opponents, and that she is still to conquer, we may well hope from the progress she is now making in every land, and even in Germany, which to the writer, is the whole world. But admitting that the triumph of infidelity is definitive, it would only show that the last day is near at hand. Fourthly, as to the love and tolerance of which the infidels talk so much, we may learn something from what is now going on in Switzerland, and from the writer's own remarkably frank declaration. "The state," he says, "has nothing to do but to exclude the extreme parties from the common church union, to prevent all foreign (Roman) interference, and to forbid all secret religious exercises in associations and corporations; and then to incorporate, i. e., to take under the shield of its sanction, only those who adopt the vague confession of the new church." Here we see the very spirit which in the canton de Vaud has shut up all the places for prayer. Whoever does not submit to the despotism of an infidel state, whoever remains faithful to the creeds of the church, is not to be allowed to worship God; but as this he must in conscience do, the only remedy is the dragoons. Such, according to Hengstenberg, are the love and toleration of pantheistic infidelity.

Having thus followed the main stream of the new Catholic movement, our author turns to the "Protestant or Christian Catholics." Over the rise of this party, he sincerely rejoices, acknowledges they have already accomplished much good, and wishes them blessings and success. He however dissents from those who think that this party should at once be acknowledged as a separate church, for which opinion he gives the following reasons. Their numbers are comparatively small; they are divided among themselves; on the one hand, Czerski and his congregations, and on the other, the Berlin Protestant Catholics. The party has no controlling responsible leaders; it has no original, independent character of its own. It has every appearance of being the result of the influence of the "evangelical church" (i. e. the United Church of Prussia, formed by the union of the Lutherans and Reformed,) but not yet fully imbued with its spirit. This is a case in which it is wise to act on the counsel of Gamaliel, often as that counsel is misapplied.* Every thing is in favour of waiting. How little room there is between the Romish and Evangelical churches, for new ecclesiastical organizations, is proved by the history of the Jansenists, who, with all the elements of life which they possessed, were not able to accomplish a durable ecclesiastical existence. The case would be very simple if the Protestant Catholics would adopt, as for a while they seemed inclined to do, the Augsburg Confession. Then they could be acknowledged as a part of the Evangelical church, and every liberty allowed them as to their organization and mode of worship. To the formal adopting of that confession, however, they have not been able to bring themselves; partly because they have not entirely freed themselves from the Romish doctrine; partly because of their fondness for the name of Catholic, and partly because they fear their influence on their former brethren would thus be weakened. Of one section of the Protestant Catholics it is stated, "The assembly of ministers and deputies of the Christian Catholic congregations of Schneidemühl and Thorn, has not adopted the Augsburg confession as a creed, (*Grundlage des glaubens,*) though they avow their agreement therewith, and have entered into a friendly relation-

* BENGEL on Acts, v. 38, 39; *Causae apertae bonae assentiendum, aperte malae resistendum, sed in re subita, nova et dubia, eximie salutare est Gamalielis consilium.*

ship thereto. Still they have the purpose of framing their own confession, and of adopting a form of government and worship for themselves, and intend to retain the name of a Christian Catholic religious communion." Under these circumstances they cannot be acknowledged as "a communion friendly to the Augsburg Confession." Every thing depends on the question, whether, as in the case of the Polish Moravians, to which they refer, their difference from that confession is merely formal, or whether it is essential. If the former, then the ecclesiastical and civil authorities would be justified in acknowledging them on the ground of the Augsburg Confession as a Christian church. The investigation of their own confession is the more necessary, as by their own acknowledgment, their assent to our confession was a matter of constraint. They say they took this step "as the only means of securing a recognition from the state." Their confession is still in a forming process; serious changes have been effected in it during the past year, and therefore any immediate recognition would be premature.

Besides this movement outside of the evangelical church, others of still greater interest have been going on within its pale. Our readers have doubtless heard of the "friends of light," who have their representatives and organs among the Germans in this country. They are the extreme left of the Rationalists; the aggressive portion of the party that has long renounced its faith in the standards of the church. Its most prominent leaders are three pastors, Uhlich, Wislicenus and König. These men introduced a plan of agitation and combination. Holding, until forbidden by the government, public meetings at various points, at which full utterance was given to their anti-christian sentiments. Dr. Guericke of Halle, who belongs to the strict Lutheran party,* was present at the time of one of those meetings, and sent an account of its proceedings to Dr. Hengstenberg's Journal, by which means the information was widely diffused. In this narrative, Dr. Guericke states that the pastor, Uhlich, a man of shining gifts and called the "protestant apostle" by his party, delivered, as president of the convention, a discourse with great skill and power, in which he specified as doctrines which

* At the time of the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches in Prussia, a portion of the Lutherans refused to accede to that union.

were to be rejected, "that of original sin, of atonement by the blood of Jesus, the trinity, the divinity of Christ, and the doctrine of the church (for the church is chargeable with all the misery that is in the world,) and all science not founded on common sense." The Pastor Wislicenus, having ascended the desk, delivered a discourse on the text "Ob Schrift? Ob Geist?" "Scripture? or Reason?" in which he openly rejected the authority of the Bible as a rule of faith. In the course of his speech he said, "We do not believe that Jesus was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of a virgin, but we believe he was born just like any other man."*

As there is nothing in all this that the Rationalists had not said a hundred times before, it is not at once apparent why the avowal of such sentiments should all of a sudden produce so general an excitement. The explanation of this fact, may perhaps be found in a measure in the following considerations. In the first place Rationalism had hitherto been in a great measure confined to the learned, to the universities, or to writings not immediately addressed to the people. In the present instance there was a direct appeal to the people, a formal declaration that instead of attempting to secure the seats of learning, they would direct their effects to the masses. "For a long time," says König, "it was considered one of the rules of war that one fortress after another must be taken. Modern heroes have disregarded this rule, and been victorious. Our universities are the fortresses, with their orthodox garrisons more or less numerous. Their heavy artillery of Fathers, Schoolmen and Confessions, we allow to rest in peace. We will turn these old bulwarks, and press into the heart of the land. The heart of the land is the people."† Again, it must be remembered that of late years a great change has been going on in Germany. The Rationalismus vulgaris, as it is called, has been losing caste. It has no representatives except a few old men, in any of the theological faculties, except that of Giessen. Unbelief has taken a much more profound and scientific form; more really infidel no doubt, yet less suited for popular effect, at least as it had been presented in philosophical and theological works. At the same time a very great increase has been going on in the number and zeal

* Kirchen Zeitung, Juni, 1844. s. 363.

† Quoted in the Kirchen Zeitung, Jan., 1845. s. 34.

of the friends of evangelical doctrine. The number of those therefore who would be wounded by the open avowal of infidelity in the church, is far greater now than it has been for years. This avowal of infidelity coming from pastors, who daily repeated the creeds, and being made in a promiscuous assembly of clergy and laity, of educated and uneducated men, of citizens and peasants, was adapted to produce a much stronger impression than any similar declaration contained in learned works or public journals. Besides this, we doubt not, much of the effect produced is due to the conviction that bad as rationalism is, pantheistic atheism is unspeakably worse. So long as this pantheism was confined to books, which few would read, and still fewer understand, the evil might be borne. But when it came to be popularized and adopted by pastors in their addresses to the people, it was felt that such men ought no longer to be tolerated in a Christian church. Such at least is the best solution we can give of the general excitement produced by this new outbreak of rationalism.

It is indeed not to be doubted that the "Friends of Light" or "Protestant Friends," (for they assume and receive both titles,) include in their ranks all classes of opponents to the doctrines of the church. But we think it can as little be doubted that as pantheism or self-deification, is the prevailing form of German infidelity, it is the governing spirit in this association of unbelievers. "When Hegel," says Ulrici in Tholuck's *Anzeiger*,* "within his impenetrable system, in the obscure language of his philosophical terminology, and double tongued dialectics, set forth the proposition: God and man are one, God comes to self-consciousness only in the human soul, the history of the world is the history of God,—it concerned only certain philosophers and votaries of science by profession. But when Strauss with fluent tongue, announced the same propositions, applied them to theology, and with clearness and discrimination deduced their consequences, they produced universal commotion. They were hailed, on the one hand, as a new gospel, and denounced on the other as a revival of heathenism. Those consequences were; That not Christ, but mankind is the true Son of God, the absolute identity of the divine and human natures; that the development of

* See *Literarischer Anzeiger*, 1845, No. 34.

the religious human consciousness, is the continual self-revelation of God; and hence the newest, the present spirit of the world, is ever the truest and the best; the old, simply because old, is of no account. These conclusions Feuerback enthroned when he declared: Theology is nothing but anthropology, and religion, so far as it believes in the existence of an independent divine Being distinct from the human soul, is an illusion." If the publication of such doctrines by Strauss, a theologian, in a theological work, produced a general commotion among theologians, their adoption and proclamation by pastors among the people might well arouse the indignation of pastors who still believed in God and Christ.

Dr. Hengstenberg states* that as he was correcting the sheets of Dr. Guericke's account of the meeting at Köthen, he received a visit from a member of the Pastoral conference, then in session in Berlin. To him he gave the account to lay before the conference prior to its publication. There it excited the greatest feeling, and from that meeting the excitement was propagated through all parts of the church. This excitement was increased by the publication of a work by König in which he declared it to be a sin and folly to pretend to feed the people with the Augsburg confession, ridiculed the blood of the atonement and the confession of sin read every Sabbath from the altar, and profanely declared, "We do not fear the wrath of God, and seek no means of propitiation." It would be strange indeed, if the faithful servants of a church could calmly sit still and hear the most sacred doctrines and services of that church thus profaned by those who still acted as its pastors. They did not sit still, but united themselves in every part of the country in declarations against such an abomination. These declarations proceeded from a number of voluntary associations of pastors, from several synods, and from numerous individual clergymen. The substance of these protestations, was, that those who held the doctrines of the "Friends of Light," put themselves out of the pale of the Christian church; and if ministers they ought not to be allowed to retain their offices. This was evidently the drift of these communications, which appeared from time to time, in Dr. Hengstenberg's Journal. We translate one of them as a specimen of

* See Zeitung, Jan. 1845. s. 36.

the whole, though they differ much in their language and explicitness. "We the undersigned feel constrained, by our office and conscience, in common with many of our dear brethren, in various provinces of our common country, to declare before God, our congregations and the whole church, that we can no longer regard as rightful ministers of this church and faithful stewards of the mysteries of God, those men, who in recent times, (such as Wislicenus, König and others,) partly in public assemblies, and partly through the press, reject the Bible as a divine revelation, and the only source and rule of our faith; who boldly deny the divinity of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and renounce the fundamental doctrines of our evangelical church; and we commiserate the congregations which in their most precious interests are committed to such men.

"Since however, at the present time, apostacy from the word of life and from our holy faith is so great and so general, and since the temptations to depart from saving truth are for every one, who ceases to watch and pray, so dangerous, though we would not on this account excuse the errors of these men and of their followers, we would the more earnestly and importunately pray that God would speedily open their eyes, that they may sincerely repent, acknowledge the evil and scandal they have occasioned, and confess before the whole world, with us and all believing Christians, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father."

It is encouraging to know that such declarations have been signed by upward of a thousand clergymen. And even this number does not indicate the whole strength of the evangelical party, as many who fully sympathized with the subscribers doubted the expediency or propriety of such public renunciation of fellowship with ministers in their own church.* As these declarations were looked upon, if not exactly as excommunications, yet as tending to invoke the interposition of the government, they gave great offence not only to those against whom they were directed; but to many others. The impression was

* Some even of the avowed members of the evangelical party came out openly against those declarations, giving as their reason, that when one minister had any ground of complaint against another, he should deal with him privately, and if unsuccessful, appeal to the authorities immediately above them, and not until this method also had failed, should such public measures be adopted, confounding private offences, with the case of public declarations of infidel opinions.

very generally received that the evangelical party, of which Hengstenberg is the acknowledged head, and his *Journal* the organ, were desirous of securing the strict imposition of the Augsburg Confession as a term of ministerial communion. And as the government was known to be friendly to this church party, serious alarm was felt lest the authorities might attempt to enforce such a measure. As great latitude had ever been allowed in Germany in receiving the symbols of the church, just as has ever been the case in England, the apprehension of a new mode of proceeding, in the existing state of things, was well suited to produce uneasiness. It was this apprehension, more than any thing else, which seems to have induced many, who have been regarded as pious and believing men to take part against Hengstenberg and his *Journal*. Certain it is, that during the past year, he and it have been the objects of unexampled denunciations and obloquy, even magistrates and church authorities openly joining in the effort to curtail or destroy his influence.

The most remarkable exhibition of this spirit took place in Berlin on the 15th of August, 1845. A protest was drawn up, directed against Hengstenberg's *Journal*, which was signed by eighty-seven men, many of them of great distinction and influence. They were generally disciples of Schleiermacher, embracing others, however, who had been long recognised as among the zealous advocates of the truth. Thus three parties were formed; that of Hengstenberg, composed of the more determined adherents of the standards of the church; that of the "Friends of light" including all shades of avowed unbelief; and this middle party composed chiefly of the followers of Schleiermacher. The protest of this last mentioned party, having made its appearance in August, was reviewed and answered by Hengstenberg the following October. Of that answer we submit to our readers the following brief outline.

The school of Schleiermacher consists of two divisions; the one composed of those who by his influence were brought to Christ, and then from Him, the only true Master, learned the truth. The other consists of mere disciples, who are as anxious to maintain the wood, hay and stubble of their master's system, as the truth which it contains, yea, who regard the former as their most precious treasure. To the first of these divisions belong many of the most distinguished and useful of the

present race of German theologians. The second division, constituting properly the Schleiermacher school, found themselves, since the death of their master, in a false position. Deprived of the influence derived from his personal character, comparatively few in number, desirous of retaining the status quo, while the age is rapidly advancing, striving to preserve the incongruous union of church doctrine and rationalism which distinguished Schleiermacher's system, while all other men were becoming more and more convinced of the necessity of separating these discordant elements, they were like men who insisted on going about in the clothes of their childhood.

In this party a decided hostility had been for some time manifested towards the friends of the church.* This hostility Hengstenberg says, was unprovoked. He asserts that he had ever cheerfully acknowledged the great service rendered by Schleiermacher, and had ever treated him with forbearance. The only article unfriendly to him that ever appeared in the Church Journal was provoked by a gross attack of Schleiermacher, in which he said, referring to the evangelical party, "The ground is heaving beneath our feet, and miserable worms are crawling out from religious crevices, who regard all speculation, beyond the circumvallation of the ancient letter, as satanic." Our main object, says our author, being to resist the rationalists proper, we were disposed to be on friendly terms with this middle party. It was long evident however that an explosion must come. This is not a time to occupy middle ground. When so many openly deny Christ, those who are for him, must openly confess him.

The Protest begins with the following sentence: "A party has arisen in the Evangelical church, which stiffly insists on that view of Christianity, which has been inherited from the beginning of the Reformation." It is a matter of gratitude, says Hengstenberg, that at the very outset, we have their acknowledgment that our differences relate to doctrine. The case, however, is not fairly stated. The difference does not relate to any symbols set forth at the reformation, which we retain, and they reject; but it concerns the essential facts of the evangelical his-

* The class of men to which Hengstenberg belongs is designated by various terms. By their opponents they are called, "Pietists." "The Strict Orthodox;" "The Church Magazine Party," &c. They call themselves, "The Church-minded;" "Friends of the Confession," &c.

tory, and fundamental doctrines. It does not relate to theology but to faith, not to Dogmatic, but to the catechism. It does not begin with the Augsburg Confession, but with the ancient creeds. Many of the signers of the Protest would have hesitated long before subscribing their names, had they seen the matter in its true light. To us the scriptures are the word of God, which we do not judge, but by which we are judged, whence we derive all our religious knowledge. They are at once the source and the rule of our faith. Schleiermacher's position in reference to the scriptures was entirely different. The authority which we, in common with the whole Christian church, ascribe to the word of God, he ascribed to 'the Christian consciousness,' 'to the inward experience, which every one formed for himself on what he found in Christianity.' The Bible was to him a mere human book, of great authority indeed, because in it are to be found the original expressions of Christian feeling, but by no means free from serious faults; the Old Testament being essentially on a level with the productions of heathenism; and the New, in its most important parts, mixed with fables (Myths,) and even with errors in doctrine, from which Christ himself was not free except in what related to his own immediate vocation, as Schleiermacher understood it. The testimony of the New Testament in behalf of any fact or doctrine, only creates a demand for careful examination; the decision rests, on the one hand, on feeling, on the other, on science. In proof of the correctness of this representation of Schleiermacher's relation to the scripture, a long quotation is given from his letter to Lücke in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1829. s. 489, from which it is very plain that he considered the scriptural doctrine of creation, the New Testament miracles, the canon of the Old Testament, the messianic prophecies, types, special revelation and inspiration, and many portions of the New Testament, as incapable of defence at the bar of reason. Even the most prominent facts of the evangelical history, the miraculous conception of Christ, his ascension to heaven, his predictions of his second advent, the resurrection of the dead, which Paul regarded as a fundamental doctrine of the Christian church, are all yielded to his remorseless criticism. It is only in reference to the person of Christ that Schleiermacher admitted anything supernatural, in every

thing else he was confined to the sphere of natural cause and effect.

Though some of his disciples may, in some points have raised themselves above his position, yet as a school, their relation to the scriptures is just what his was. Were this not the case they could not so unconditionally call him master, nor would they, says Hengstenberg, be so enraged against the position assumed by the Church Journal. For they are well aware that all that the editor of that Journal is labouring to effect, is that the scriptures should be restored to their authority in the church; that the confessions have authority for him only as compends of the contents of the scriptures, unnecessary for those who are confirmed in the faith, but demanded by the necessities of the church.

The Protest itself gives clear indication of the real position of its authors in reference to the scriptures. It sets forth as the only essential point of Christian doctrine, that "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day and forever, is the only ground of our salvation;" every thing beyond this is changeable, like the web of Penelope, unraveled as fast as woven. If the signers regarded the scriptures as the source and rule of faith they could not consider this one point the only one clearly determined by their authority, or that all other doctrines were to be left as open questions in the church. In further support of his position as to the character of this school, in this particular point, the author quotes from the writings of several signers of the Protest, various declarations of similar import with those quoted from Schleiermacher himself. These our limits will not allow us to give, and they are not essential to a fair understanding of the merits of the case.

In the second place, the difference between the signers of the Protest, (or rather the disciples of Schleiermacher) and the evangelical party, relates to the apostle's creed, the foundation of the Christian faith. Of this creed very little is adopted by this school. They reject the distinction of three persons in the divine essence, and therefore deny the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, in the sense in which the creed affirms the faith of the church. See Schleiermacher's *Glaubenslehre* Th. 2. § 170. In the place of the eternal Son of God, we have "a divine revelation (revelation of God) in the person of Jesus, from which all may and should

derive spiritual life ;” or, as Dr. Schweizer expresses it, “ a man imbued with the fulness of God ;” an ordinary man in whom the (*Gottesbewusstseyn*)* consciousness of God was all powerful. To pray to him must be idolatry, to look to him for help must be useless. In vain did he declare that “ before Abraham was, I am,” and in vain did John testify that in the beginning the word was with God, for Schleiermacher says that Christ, as the Logos of God, apart from his manifestation in a particular person, is one of those church doctrines which is foreign to his system. *Sendschr.* S. 260. In place of the Holy Ghost this school gives us “ the common spirit of the Christian church.”

Faith in ‘ the Almighty maker of heaven and earth ’ is of course greatly changed by their doctrine of an eternal world. This school also strikes out that part of the creed which says that Christ was ‘ conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, descended into hell, rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven.’ So also the declaration that he is to come again to judge the quick and the dead. See Schleiermacher’s *Glaubensl.* Th. 2. § 160, where the coming of Christ to judgment, is contested, and § 162, where the last judgment is explained away. The ‘ resurrection of the body is only a figurative mode of teaching the immortality of the soul,’ § 159 ; a doctrine which Schleiermacher brought himself to acknowledge in the interval between the publication of his *Discourses on Religion* and his *Theology*. Personal immortality and the consummation of the church, are the only points in what the Bible and the church teach concerning ‘ The Last things ’ that are admitted to be real. All else is figure.

The third point taken up, is the charge against the evangelical party of slavish adherence to the letter of the Augsburg confession. In answer to this Hengstenberg says that his position in reference to the Symbols of the church has always been a liberal one. He always admitted that with the simple doctrines of faith there was in the confession an element due to the time

* The word *Gottesbewusstseyn*, cannot be translated because its English equivalent does not express the idea the German word is intended to convey. The *Gottesbewusstseyn*, according to the Pantheistic theory which lies at the foundation of Schleiermacher’s system, is the *Seyn Gottes* in man. In Christ, according to his doctrine, this was absolute, all-controlling ; in us it is merely in the process of development. By “ consciousness of God ” must therefore, in the language of his school, be understood “ the being of God ” in man.

in which it was drawn up, and to which the church was in no measure bound. Even as to matters of faith, he distinguished between the strictly fundamental doctrines and those of less importance, and only in reference to the former, had asserted the right and duty of the authorities to maintain them. Even in reference to such serious departures from the faith as those chargeable on the school of Schleiermacher, he had never thought of invoking the interference of the government. It was only in reference to the open denial of the fundamental doctrines of the church by such men as Gesenius, Wegscheider and Wislicenus, that such a call was ever made. He refers in explanation of his views on this subject, to his preface to the volume of his *Journal* for 1844 where he had taught, 1. That the confessions were binding only as to matters of faith; or as he elsewhere expresses it, as to those things which come under the Rubric of *credimus, confitemur, docemus*. Theological explanations, arguments and proofs do not belong to the confession as such, and never were and are not now obligatory. 2. That the church authorities (such as they have in Prussia, i. e. the state,) have no right to alter the confessions. In such a state of things as the present, the duty of the government is to uphold those fundamental doctrines common to all Christian churches, and the doctrine of justification by faith, and to go further only as the increasing faith of the church demands. 3. That consent to the confession, though remaining the same in form, is modified by the character of every particular age. In such an age as the present, he says, a man may with a good conscience remain in the ministry of the church, if he sincerely adopts her fundamental doctrines, provided he leaves untouched those articles to which he does not assent; for to speak against the confession should in no case be allowed. If this deserves to be called stiffness and slavery to the letter, he adds, then the charge lights on the whole theological faculty of Berlin, who, without hesitation, signed a paper expressing precisely the same sentiments.

It is one of the devices of the Schleiermacher school to profess adherence to the substance of the confession, and dissent only from the form, when what they refer to the second category, by the common sense of mankind, belongs to the former. Take for example what is taught in the second article of the Augsburg Confession, concerning original sin. "It is further taught by us,"

it is said, "that since the fall of Adam, all men, born in the ordinary course of nature, are conceived and born in sin, that is, they all from the womb are full of evil concupiscence and desire, and cannot by nature attain true faith or fear of God; that this innate corruption and original sin is truly sin, and subjects all to the everlasting wrath of God, who are not born again by baptism and the Holy Ghost. . . Hence we reject the Pelagians and others, who do not admit this hereditary corruption to be sin, in order that they may hold that our nature may be made good by its own powers, thus doing despite to the sufferings and merits of Christ." In opposition to all this, Schleiermacher teaches that sin is nothing positive, that it has its ground in the law of progress and development, that it is nothing more than a lower stage of what is good, the incitement by which the development of good is carried on. There has been no fall of man. Sin is connate, a necessary attribute or condition of our nature. *Glaubensl. Th. 1. s. 442.* Since sin has its origin in God and the necessary imperfection of our nature, death cannot, as the scripture and the church teach, be its penalty, death was prior to sin. Now we ask, says our author, does this difference relate to the form or to the essence of the doctrine?

It is obvious that the consequences of this difference must reach very far. Schleiermacher's Christology is intimately connected with his doctrine on this point. If sin is a mere imperfection, there is no necessity for the incarnation of the eternal Son of God, in order to subdue it; a man absolutely good (in whom the consciousness of God is all powerful) is sufficient, as all that is needed is that the undeveloped good in man should be called forth. The miraculous conception of Christ may be referred to the class of Myths, for human nature is not so corrupt but that an individual man might be raised up by the Spirit out of the corrupt mass, and be perfectly free from sin. We need no Christ *for us*, to bear the sins of the world, and by whose wounds we may be healed, for God cannot be offended at that which he himself created, nor regard that as guilt for which we are not to blame. All that we need is Christ *within us* to free the indwelling 'conscience of God' from what hinders its development.

Fourthly, it is said we make the confession "our Pope," to whose authority we bow not from inward conviction but from

outward constraint. This, says Hengstenberg, is a serious charge, made undoubtedly on the part of some of those who signed it against their own better knowledge and conscience. He does not maintain that he had arrived at his present conviction fortuitously, without the aid of the church, her confession and especially her hymns. He refers with gratitude to what he owes to the Augsburg Confession, when it came to him, in the time of his awakening faith, as a guide through the labyrinth of various and apparently conflicting views which his unassisted study of the Bible had not enabled him to master; and with no less gratitude to the strength derived from the hymns of the church, in times of temptation and conflict. Few, if any, he supposes, would arrive without the church, to the clearness and decision of the church's faith. But a mere outward submission to the doctrines of the church, no man among us, he affirms has ever been chargeable with. We have tried the confession by the scripture, and found it to stand the test. We have not put it on as a ready made coat, but our progress in doctrine has gone hand in hand with our progress in life. One after another the principles of "the wisdom of the world," have been renounced, which had become so incorporated in our nature, that only by the most painful operation could we be freed from them. At last we attained a fully coincident but perfectly free conviction as to doctrines with the church. We no longer need to seek our faith in the Augsburg Confession, which as far as we are concerned, might cease to exist, for its contents are written on our hearts, not with ink, but by the finger of the living God. He calls upon his opponent to lay their hands on their hearts and say whether they find in the evangelical party, the vacillation and doubt which always attend a faith founded on authority. Do we not rather, he asks, make on you and on all who hear us, the impression of men who say what they say from an inward necessity? How else can you account for the power which attends our preachers, who even from the Rationalists extort a confession of their sincerity and ardour?

Fifthly, the charge of striving after dominion in the church, is answered by saying that they seek dominion in no other sense than Paul did, when he said to Agrippa, I would to God that not thou only, but all who hear me this day, were not only almost, but altogether as I am, save these bonds. The church party

strive for nothing more than to have it acknowledged that no man should be a minister in the church who does not receive the fundamental articles of its faith. The accusation that the friends of the Confession are the cause of constant disturbance and conflict, is met by quoting at length Luther's noble answer to a similar charge made against him by Erasmus. The sum of which is, that the disturbance which attends the truth is not to be laid to the charge of those who adhere to God's word, but to those who oppose it: and that the outward evils thus occasioned, are not to be compared with the inward evils of which the truth is the only remedy. In proof of this Hengstenberg appeals to the deplorable state to which rationalism had reduced the church twenty years ago, and to the vast improvement which had taken place since the revival of the gospel.

The signers of the Protest say that the whole tendency of the course pursued by the opposite party, is to destroy brotherly love and to produce divisions in the church. To the disciples of Schleiermacher it is natural that division should be regarded as the greatest of evils, but the Bible teaches us that there are other evils far more to be dreaded. To the Schleiermacher school indeed, division must cause great embarrassment. They would have to separate from themselves and from part of their own hearts, before they could tell which side to take. They profess to go on the principle that every thing should be left free in the church, regarding Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day and forever, as the only ground of our salvation, every other doctrine should be unconstrained, proceeding from Christ and tending to him. To understand this, it should be remembered that according to this school the only thing true and eternal in religion, is feeling. Doctrine is merely the imperfect, and necessarily faulty form in which that feeling expresses itself. So that if the feeling is right, it matters little what the doctrine is, and therefore doctrine is a matter which should be left for every one to decide for himself. The cause of this unnatural dualism between faith, (or rather feeling) and knowledge, is to be found in the peculiar circumstances of the author of the theory. When he came on the stage, the whole sphere of knowledge was filled with error. Into that sphere religion could not enter and live. Schleiermacher therefore sought for it a refuge in the dark chamber of feeling, and nobly laboured to guard it from all assaults. Whoever has

made the transition from unbelief to faith, must remember being tempted to adopt a similar device, whenever his faith, still feeble, was affrighted at its own image in the glass of doctrine. This theory also performed the welcome service of getting rid at one stroke of confessions of faith and of leaving an open field for individual development. Faith when strong, rejects a theory so foreign to the Christian church; a theory which divides what God has joined together, which gives the church up to perpetual vacillation, destroys all courage and all confidence in truth, prevents the possibility of church communion, and contradicts the most intimate conviction of every Christian, who has the same confidence in the objects of his faith, as in his faith itself. It is singular that the advocates of such a theory should represent themselves as the friends of progress, and us as its enemies. Progress in any science is possible only because one man stands on the shoulders of those before him. He who rejects the acquisitions of former ages, and insists on beginning everything anew, must always be at the beginning. And he who regards all the labour of the church for eighteen hundred years as establishing nothing, is just where the pastor Hermas was in the first century. If he denies the possibility of fixed doctrine conformed to truth, if doctrine in its very nature is the transient form of feeling, the flower which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, he makes progress an impossibility. The church on this plan is gathering water in a sieve; ever learning and never coming to the knowledge of the truth. We, on the contrary, have the true foundation of progress, the firm basis of the past, and the living conviction that the Lord of the church has not left her to blind feeling, but has given her firm, clear and shining truth, and that he is leading her evermore into a deeper knowledge of that truth. We are far from believing that the church has attained the full measure of the stature of Christ, or that the rich treasures of the scriptures have all been brought to light.

But what is meant by the followers of Schleiermacher when they say that "Christ is the only ground of our salvation?" According to their doctrine, Christ was nothing but what we are to become, so that at last, he will be but the first among his equals, a thought at which every feeling of the Christian heart revolts. Dr. Schweizer brings out this idea distinctly when he says, "Christianity does not perish, when we have become equal to Christ

(wenn wir Christo gleich geworden,) for he will forever remain the first among many brethren. We can never renounce him without renouncing God, and falling into sin. We become his equals only because he, his divine inward life, has formed itself in us." The original meaning of this formula therefore is, that Christ is the ground of our salvation, because he was the first man in whom the divine consciousness was absolute, and by whom that principle in us is aroused, and little by little attains the same power in us it had in him.

This is the original sense of the formula, but it is not the only one. It was designedly so framed that those who hold far lower views of Christ might sign it. How could these men frame a confession which should exclude from the church those "worthy men," the Rationalists, as Schleiermacher calls them, or such a man as Uhlich of whose "honest intentions," superintendent Schultz is so well convinced? In point of fact it does not exclude them, the names of genuine Rationalists, and of Helegians of the extreme left are found among the signers of this declaration. The confession therefore that Christ is the only ground of our salvation admits of a wide interpretation.

The Protest concludes that the only remedy for existing evils is to abstain from all arbitrary exclusions from the church, to give full liberty of opinion, and to grant to the church a free constitution and the right of self-government. By arbitrary exclusions must, says Hengstenberg, in this connexion, be understood deposition from office. This declaration, therefore, is meant for the government. It is intended to deter them from the exercise of their right and the discharge of their duty. The design is to get all church power into the hands of the people, i. e. the world; and then whatever is opposed to the spirit of the age, the evangelical party on the one hand, and some of the extremest rationalists, on the other, may be excluded. The school of Schleiermacher will then occupy a central position, guiding every thing at their pleasure, having the moderate friends of the church doctrine on their right, and on the left, the followers of the excellent Uhlich. Then will come the Millenium, when the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. This, however, is all an illusion. This school deceive themselves if they expect by a change of its constitution to obtain dominion in the

church. Whether it will be decided faith or open unbelief that shall then have the ascendancy, is known only unto God, whose mercy is broad as the sea, but whose judgments also are fearful. But that a school which is neither one thing nor the other, can have only a temporary importance is as clear as day, to every one who really understands the age in which he lives.

To the charge of favouring the Romish church, Hengstenberg answers, that if by this is meant that he prefers Romanism to a Rationalism which rejects not only the Augsburg confession but the apostle's creed, he readily admits the charge. He yields to Popery no one point in controversy between the Evangelical church and Rome, but he refuses, on account of these differences to overlook what the two churches have in common, or to take part in cheering on the enemies of a church which with all its corruptions has more of truth than all the "friends of light," "German Catholics" and its "unevangelical opposers" put together.

Our readers can have a very inadequate idea of the power of this manly defence of himself, from our imperfect outline of its contents. Its effect was soon visible. It was published in October last, and on the tenth of November appeared "An explanation from the signers of the Protest of the 15th of August," written in a very different spirit from that exhibited in the Protest itself. It contains a much more distinct testimony against the friends of light, and much more of Christian doctrine. The signers of the explanation acknowledge the leading facts of redemption, the appearance of Jesus Christ, as the manifestation of God in the flesh, and the redeemer of the world; they acknowledge also his sinless life, his death and resurrection. If this acknowledgment of the incarnation of the Son of God, says Hengstenberg, is made in the sense of John 1, then the signers have renounced the Sabellianism of Schleiermacher, and they have admitted the true divinity of Christ, and thus in one main point escaped from the magic authority of their master. At any rate, the explanation is practically a retraction of the Protest, and is so regarded, for many who signed the one, refused to sign the other. Of retraction, however, the signers say nothing; on the contrary, they say they take back nothing. Is it then so hard to confess an error?*

* Kirchen Zeitung, Jan. 1846, s. 35.

In reply to the numerous rejoinders to his answer to the Protest of August 15th, Hengstenberg, in the preface to his Journal for the current year, vindicates himself from the charge of having attacked the dead instead of the living. In reference to this point, he says, he could not do otherwise. Determined to go at once to the root of the matter, he was obliged to turn to the master, as the scholars had written so little to which he could refer. This necessity however was a welcome one. Since the death of Schleiermacher a position has been assigned him by the grateful admiration of his friends, which is altogether false. He has been held up the "Church Father" of the present century. This perversion of the real judgment of the public has had a very injurious effect. Inexperienced young men, have been led to read his writings without suspicion, and have thus been made sceptical or unbelieving as to many important doctrines. Hengstenberg says he had long observed this evil, but waited for some providential call to speak his mind freely on the subject. This has now in part been done; a beginning and only a beginning has been made. A warning has at least been given. Schleiermacher himself would have approved of this, for nothing could have been less acceptable to him than the canonization which has been forced upon him, who during his life was well aware of the mixed origin and character of his system. As to his representation of Schleiermacher's opinions, our author retracts nothing. He was careful not to bring up any points about which there could be any doubt, and therefore abstained from referring to the pantheistic basis of his system, which is apparent even in his latest writings.

Two other subjects of great interest have agitated the German church during the past as well as preceding years; the constitution of the church, and the obligation of its symbols. As to both of these points the country is divided into two great parties. As to the former, the one is in favour of the gradually improvement of the existing constitution; the other insist on the introduction of a free presbyterian organization. In the general, the evangelical party are in favour of the existing form; the friends of light, the disciples of Schleiermacher, and the other elements of the party opposed to that to which Hengstenberg belongs, are in favour of independent presbyterianism. The king of Prussia, as is well known, is anxious to free himself from the power and

responsibility which belong to him as the *summus episcopus* of the church, as far and as rapidly as it can be done consistently with the best interest of the church itself. To attain this object he has endeavoured in various ways to call out an expression of the wishes of the church. For this purpose he summoned together synodical meetings in the several provinces of his kingdom; and more recently assembled a conference from all parts of Prussia to meet at Berlin. Of the doings of this convention we have no particular information. Of the proceedings of several of the provincial synods our German periodicals contain a particular account. The principles of the party which are desirous of a free presbyterian organization are presented in the most advantageous light in the following summary of the report of a committee of the Synod of Brandenburg, which met at Berlin, November 8th, 1845. "Christ is the only head and Lord of the church, which he governs by his Spirit, and his word, and in obedience to the powers that be. The christocratical idea, therefore, should be realized in the church, and hence neither a Pope nor Prince should stand as head of the church, nor should any clerical order be regarded as the exclusive representatives of Christ. Hence it follows that no individual, no corporation, no class or office, can exercise the power of Christ in the church, which emanates from the Holy Spirit, which Christ has promised and which he gives to these that believe on him. Since the church, in its essential character, is neither a political nor a hierarchical institution, the civil power has not the government of the church, in its spiritual concerns, and cannot exercise any positive or direct influence in these matters. On the contrary, the church orders all her internal affairs as free and independent. To the head of the state belongs the general oversight of the church, since this is a necessary attribute of sovereignty; to him belongs a veto on the doings of the church, and he gives them the *Placet*, and exercises the general right of protection."*

If we omit the veto and *placet* clauses, this might have been written by Dr. Cunningham. And no one at all conversant with the state of opinion and feeling on this whole church question in Germany, can fail to see the influence of the Free Church controversy in Scotland. The principles there avowed and acted

* *Kirchen Zeitung*, April, 1845. p. 255.

upon, are working like leaven in the whole protestant European mind. A very decided majority of the Synod was in favour of this report. It was however strenuously opposed by the minority, and finally through the influence and skillful management of the president, the bishop Neander, a compromise was adopted, which affirmed the following propositions. 1. The present organization of the church is not satisfactory. 2. In order to such an organization, the co-operation of the congregations must be included. 3. In this co-operation laymen should participate. The whole subject was then referred to a permanent commission.

The leading objections to this scheme, for a free Presbyterian constitution, as urged by Hengstenberg in various articles in his *Journal*, are the following: 1. According to the principles of the Evangelical church, the question of organization is altogether subordinate to that of doctrine. The former, therefore, must be postponed to the interests of the latter. The only essentials of a church, are the word and sacraments; where these are found, religion may and does flourish under any form of government. 2. In a fallen state of the church, the proper course is to labour for the revival and propagation of the truth, and when that has taken effect, a living church will assume an appropriate form. 3. That in the present state of Germany, it would be most unwise to throw the power of governing the church into the hands either of the people or the clergy. The great mass of the educated classes are alienated from the gospel; and the same is true of the majority of the clergy, especially of those whose age and station give them most influence. You cannot make a free church out of men whom the Lord has not made free. 4. The true mode of improvement is not by the sudden rejection of long established principles and usages, and the introduction and application of abstract principles without regard to the historical circumstances of the case, but to act upon the basis of what is historically given, and gradually correct what is wrong and introduce what is good. He is therefore for taking the existing consistorial organization, giving it more power and independence, infusing into it more of the direct influence of the church, as the progress of the church itself demands.

As to the continued obligation of the symbols of the church, this also was vehemently debated in several of the synods.

Those of Westphalia and the Rhine provinces are perhaps the most thoroughly orthodox of any of the provinces, though we are not informed of any recent decisions on their part, on this subject. The Synod of Pommerania was decidedly in favour of the authority of the confessions; that of Magdeburg representing the province of Saxony, very decidedly the other way.* In the synod of Brandenburg the obvious majority was, according to the report in Hengstenberg's Journal, hostile to the confession, or to its imposition. In this case, however, as in the decision concerning the constitution of the church, after vehement debate, the skilful president prevented any decided vote; the synod agreeing to leave the status quo untouched. These decisions are interesting as indicating the state of opinion in the church, though these bodies being called together merely to give advice had no power to give effect to their resolutions.

Few parts of the world present so much to interest the Christian as Germany in its present state. Its elements of power for good or evil are immense. Those elements are now in a state of active fermentation. Much depends on the present and the immediate future, and we therefore venture to hope that the foregoing statements may have the effect of exciting the people of God to remember Germany in their prayers. It has been one of our objects, in preparing this paper, to make our readers better acquainted with Hengstenberg, who is probably doing and suffering more for the cause of Christ than any other man in that part of the church. What he is called to endure may in a measure be inferred from a letter addressed by the Doctors Thomasius, Kaifer, Hoefling and Hofmann, dated, Erlangen, December 30th, 1845. "What induces the undersigned members of the theological faculty in this place, to address to you this communication, is the performance of a duty intimately connected with the confession of evangelical truth. It arises from the very nature of the gospel, and from the spirit of the world, that a decided confession of that gospel should at all time be attended with reproach. This is especially true at the present time, in which indifference or enmity against divine truth, and decided opposition to every open testimony in behalf of Christ, have gained complete ascen-

* *Zeitung*, January, 1845. s. 71. According to this account, only three-eightieths of the Synod were in favour of the authority of the confession, fifteen-eightieths against it.

dency. As this should not prevent the followers of Christ from openly confessing him and his word, it imposes also upon them the duty of confessing one another, and of assuming as a common burden the reproach, which for the Lord's sake, any one of their number suffers. You, beyond most others, have been counted worthy to bear such reproach. We know that you cannot regard this as any strange thing, for you remember what the apostle says, 1 Peter iv. 14. Two things however, have doubtless caused you peculiar pain. The silence of many who are of the same faith, and the open hostile declaration of some whom we have regarded, if not as decided confessors yet as friendly disposed towards the gospel. It is the Protest against you from this source, that has filled us with astonishment and pain. We feel it under these circumstances to be our duty, respected sir, to testify our fellowship in the faith with you. The ground of the reproach and hostility which from so many quarters are directed against you, is not the points in which we may disagree,* but those we hold in common. It is nothing proper to you, no peculiarity in theology, no matter of the schools, much less of a party, but the one faith in one Christ, the one confession of that faith which the church has made from the beginning. It is especially the precious confession of the Protestant church from the Reformation to the present time. In this confession we join from the bottom of our hearts—and as we see you assailed and reproached on account of that faith, we are constrained to avow our sympathy with you, and to share in the reproach which is cast on you. We commend you therefore to God and the word of his grace. Continue to fight the good fight of faith, and with the weapons of the Spirit contend against the common enemy of your church and of ours. The Lord be your shield and your exceeding great reward. May he strengthen you in faith and patience, and make you and us ever more ready to do his will!" We leave our readers with the savour of this letter on their spirits. May the blessing of God rest on all such men!

* The writers belong to the Lutheran, not to the united, or Evangelical church of Prussia.

ART. III.—*The complete Works of the Rev. Andrew Fuller, with a Memoir of his life.* By Andrew Gunton Fuller, reprinted from the third London edition. Revised, with additions; by Joseph Belcher, D. D. In three volumes. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society. 1845.

Few men of the last age, have left a deeper impression of their labours on the public mind, than Andrew Fuller. Without any other education than what he received at a common English school, he rose by his own vigour of mind, and indefatigable industry, to be one of the first theologians, and one of the most useful preachers of an age which abounded in distinguished men. But though his native talents were powerful, and his cultivation of them assiduous, yet his humble, fervent, and habitual piety must be considered the mainspring of his usefulness, and that without which, he never would have reached that eminence to which he attained. His religion was not one of sudden impulses, but was a deep-seated, steady principle, which gave consistency and energy to his exertions, and enabled him, under all discouragements, to render the most effectual aid to the cause of missions. Indeed, after the venerable Carey, Fuller must be considered as having done more to sustain the Baptist Society for Foreign Missions, than any other, and perhaps, all other men. In fact, he wore out his life in arduous labours to procure funds, and to conciliate friends, to this pious enterprise. On this business, he, four times, visited Scotland, went once to Ireland, once to Wales, and traversed nearly all the counties of England, beside the labour which devolved upon him, as the corresponding secretary of the Society.

But our object is, to make some estimate of the productions of his pen, which are now given to the public, in a new and more complete edition, than any which preceded it. His writings are principally in defence of the cardinal doctrines of our common Christianity, and are characterised by perspicuity and vigour; by candour, and the love of truth. His first work of any size, was "THE GOSPEL WORTHY OF ALL ACCEPTATION," the object of which was to prove that the offers of the gospel were freely made to all who heard it, and that it was the duty of all to exercise a true faith in the gospel. Although among us, it would seem

to be almost superfluous to take much pains to establish truths, which nearly all are ready to admit; yet, in Great Britain, the Particular Baptists had generally adopted a system, which led them to say little in their preaching to the unregenerate, and to maintain, that the duty of saving faith was peculiar to the elect, and not incumbent on men in general. Under this system Fuller was educated, but when he began to preach, and examined the principles commonly received by his denomination, he was constrained to dissent from them; and he felt it to be his duty to publish his views, which he did in the above named treatise. This, however, involved him in much painful controversy with his brethren, and with some whom, on account of their age, learning, and piety, he greatly venerated. This work was not only assailed by hyper-Calvinists, but also by Arminians. Against all these he wrote a "Defence," which is remarkable for its sound argumentation, and its clear discrimination. While we do not subscribe to all his opinions, we think his publications on this subject, have been the means of extensive good, especially to his own denomination, both in Great Britain and America. Indeed, we are of opinion, that the religious creed of the Baptist Church has undergone a great revolution during the last half-century; and that the system of Crisp, Gill, and others, is now adopted by few of that denomination, and this, we believe, is very much owing to the writings of Andrew Fuller. And as men are prone to swing from one extreme to another, it is probable, from all the information we have, that the tendency in many preachers of that denomination is now rather to Arminianism, or the new divinity, than to antinomianism.

Fuller's next important work, was, "THE CALVINISTIC AND SOCINIAN SYSTEMS EXAMINED AND COMPARED AS TO THEIR MORAL TENDENCY." This, we are of opinion, is his ablest performance, as it certainly has been the most popular. It is a truly excellent work, both in the candid, Christian spirit in which it is written, and in the skill and ability with which it is executed. Perhaps no work in our language, is better adapted to remove objections to the Calvinistic system than this: we have heard men who had no love to the peculiar doctrines of Calvin speak in terms of strong commendation of this performance. The book was widely circulated and generally read, and raised, at once, the reputation of the author very high.

He attempted a work, on the same principle, against the Deists, entitled, "THE GOSPEL ITS OWN WITNESS." This is also an able work, and perhaps displays as much talent and as much judgment, as his book against the Socinians; but there are reasons why the same plan would not be so effective in this case as in the former. As the work of the infidel Paine had extensive circulation before this treatise was written, the author made it a point to give a solid answer to some of the most plausible objections brought out by this impious enemy of Christianity. Particularly, he has given a full and solid answer to the popular objection to redemption, derived from the magnitude of creation, according to the discoveries of modern astronomy.

Fuller was also engaged in controversy with the Universalists and with the Sandemanians. He moreover had a long correspondence with the Rev. Mr. McClean, Baptist minister of Edinburgh, on the nature of faith; whether, strictly considered, it included any thing more than the full assent of the understanding; which McClean, with much ingenuity and plausibility, maintained, but which Fuller denied, and with his usual ability endeavoured to refute. This is a controversy more of words than things; but we do not wish to engage in any discussion of the subject at present.

Fuller was not only much engaged in polemic theology, in defending the citadel of evangelical truth from the assaults of its enemies; but he appeared before the public, as an expositor of scripture. His "Expository Discourses on the Book of Genesis," to the number of fifty-eight, and on the Apocalypse to the number of thirty-one, are written with so much good sense, and contain such a savour of piety, that they may be read with pleasure and edification, by any one who loves the truth. All these were delivered to his congregation, at Kettering; and are pregnant proofs of the fidelity and diligence as well as the theological ability of the pastor.

Though Fuller was so much engaged in controversy, he possessed nothing of that contentious spirit which takes pleasure in disputation. On the contrary, he was, in an eminent degree, of a meek, humble, and peaceable temper; and had he followed only his own inclination, he would have employed his pen chiefly in discourses on the nature and evidences of vital piety. Among the treatises of a practical kind which he composed, his "BACK-

SLIDER" possesses rare excellence. We have had, during the last age, few works equal to it, in the knowledge which it displays of the nature of experimental religion, and the vicissitudes of light and shade, of growth and decline, to which the Christian pilgrim is subject in his journey through the world.

His treatise on "SPIRITUAL PRIDE" is another of the same kind, and will be found profitable to the most advanced Christians.

Fuller's Dialogues and Letters on Total Depravity, Substitution, Imputation, Particular Redemption, and other disputed points in divinity, are characterised by remarkable candour and kindness, and manifest the operations of a very comprehensive mind, as well as one of nice discrimination. Seldom have these disputed points been discussed with so much of the calm, kind spirit which is so becoming in controversies among Christians. The arguments on both sides are stated with great impartiality; so that readers will be likely to agree with the one or other of the speakers, according to his pre-conceived opinions.

As there had been a tendency to a species of antinomianism in the Baptist denomination, in the period prior to that of Fuller, he thought it necessary to write on that subject. This treatise is entitled, "ANTINOMIANISM CONTRASTED WITH THE RELIGION TAUGHT AND EXEMPLIFIED IN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES." He points out the nature and evil tendency of this system in a very clear and pointed manner; and though the treatise is brief, it is important and seasonable. This system of error has been seldom exposed to public view in its odious features than most others; any thing, therefore, written by a man who was so thoroughly acquainted with it as Fuller, should be prized; for there is a strong tendency in human nature to embrace errors of this kind, as affording false peace to the troubled mind.

We were somewhat surprised to find, a large part of the first of these volumes, filled with sermons. With his other works we had been acquainted from the time of their publication, but we had never met with many of his discourses, in the form of sermons. And now our time does not admit of our doing more than running our eyes over the subjects which he treats, and which we find to be very interesting, and we entertain no doubt that they are truly instructive and edifying discourses.

In enumerating the variety of subjects which engaged the

attention and employed the pen of this excellent man, we must not forget to mention that excellent piece of biography, which he prepared upon the decease of his friend, the Rev. Samuel Pearce, A. M. Had Fuller written nothing besides this biography, he would have been a benefactor of the Christian public. Few men with whose lives we are acquainted, better deserves to be held up as a model to young clergymen, than Samuel Pearce, of Birmingham; and we would take this opportunity of recommending the book to all who are seeking the ministry, or who have recently been entrusted with the sacred office. After Carey and others had gone to India, and were there labouring for the conversion of the heathen, Pearce found no rest to his ardent spirit, until he, after much prayer and great conflict, made up his mind to leave all and follow them. But when his case came before the Board of Missions, they refused to send him; not on account of any deficiency of qualifications—for in all respects he was eminently gifted—but because they were of opinion, that he could not be spared, and ought not to vacate the important station which he so ably occupied; and they expressed their persuasion that he could more effectually serve the cause of the Redeemer, by remaining in England than by going to India. This is a remarkable case, and serves to illustrate an important point in relation to foreign missions; namely, that every man who is well qualified to be useful in the foreign field, and who is willing to go, ought not to be sent. Every man should labour, where, as far as can be judged, he can be most useful in advancing the kingdom of Christ. Fuller himself effected much more for the conversion of the Hindoos by his labours in Great Britain, than if he had gone as a missionary to Hindustan. Humanly speaking, without his energetic and persevering labours in support of the mission at home, the cause could not have been sustained. There is a pleasant anecdote in circulation respecting Carey and his brethren. It is, that when going away he compared himself to one going down into a deep mine, and his brethren to those who stood at the windlass; and that he should have said, "Well I will go down if you will hold the rope." It seems doubtful from Fuller's biography, whether Carey ever made this speech. It seems rather to have been the view which Fuller himself took of the responsibility of the brethren left at home. The account there given is as follows: "Friends," said

Fuller, "talk not to me about coadjutors and assistants, but I know not how it is, I find a difficulty. Our undertaking to India, really appeared to me, on its commencement, to be somewhat like a few men who were deliberating about the importance of penetrating into a deep mine, which had never been explored. We had no one to guide us, and while we were deliberating, Carey, as it were, said, "Well I will go down, if you will hold the rope." But, before he went down, he, as it seemed to me, took an oath from each of us, at the mouth of the pit, to this effect, that while we lived, we would *never* let go the rope. You understand me, there was great responsibility attached to us who began the business."

Andrew Fuller, not only served the cause of missions by taking long journeys, and preaching many discourses, but by his pen. When certain persons who had long resided in India, and who had been high in office there, on their return to England, fiercely denounced the whole missionary enterprise, as one fraught with incalculable danger to the British possessions in that country, Fuller came forward with an able defence of missions among the heathen in India. These men came before the public with such bold representations as were calculated to produce serious alarm in the public mind, and were intended especially to produce an influence on parliament, to prevent them from tolerating the ingress of missionaries into the country. The ground taken by them, however, was so anti-christian, that it gave a fair opportunity to the friends of missions to rebut, with success, all their arguments and representations. They alleged, that the religion of the Hindoos was good enough, and suited them better than Christianity; and that any attempt to propagate Christianity among them, would certainly give rise to insubordination and insurrection; and a few occurrences not at all connected with missionary operations, were seized upon, exaggerated and distorted, to excite the apprehensions of danger, in the public mind. The persons who took the lead in this opposition to missions were, Thomas Twining, Esq., and Major Scott Waring. Several persons stepped forward in defence of Christian missions, now so formidably assailed; but no one with more ability and more thorough acquaintance with the subject, than Andrew Fuller. His reply to the allegations of these men, is entitled, "AN APOLOGY FOR THE LATE CHRISTIAN MISSIONS TO INDIA, IN THREE

PARTS, WITH AN APPENDIX." The texts of scripture which he prefixed to the pamphlet, as a motto, were most appropriate.

"There are no such things done as thou sayest, but thou feignest them out of thine own heart." NEHEMIAH.

"And, now, I say unto you, refrain from these men, and let them alone; for if this counsel and this work be of men it will come to nought, but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found to fight men against God." GAMALIEL.

This "Apology for Christian Missions," as now published, consists of various addresses and observations, intended as an answer to whatever had been published on the other side. It is believed, that by these seasonable, sensible, and convincing publications, Fuller contributed in no small degree to the victory, which the friends of Christianity gained at that time over worldly politicians, not only before the public, but also in parliament.—Except Dr. Buchanan, perhaps no other writer made a stronger impression on the public mind, than our author. It may be remarked, that the opposition was directed more especially against the British and Foreign Bible Society, than any other body; but the friends of missions made it a common cause, as they ought.

These volumes contain a large number of short essays, inserted in some of the periodicals of the day, but we have neither time nor space to notice them. It will be found, however, that nothing has proceeded from the pen of Fuller, however hastily written, which is not marked with strong good sense, a manifest love of truth, and a desire to be useful to his fellow men.

It would be no disagreeable task to give an analysis of the theology of Andrew Fuller; and freely to express both our agreement and disagreement with all his published opinions; for, although, we judge him to be, in the main, truly orthodox, yet there are minor points on which we should take the liberty of differing from him. But such an examination as this, would require time which is not at our disposal; and it is unnecessary; for his theological opinions have been for years before the public, and, perhaps, no theological writer of modern times, would have more of those now termed Calvinists, agreeing with him. And for ourselves, we greatly prefer the theology of Andrew Fuller, to that of Crisp and Gill, and feel truly gratified to think, that his views appear to be so generally embraced by the ministers of

his own denomination; and they are equally popular with Presbyterian and orthodox Congregational ministers. We have made up our minds never to contend with any man for agreeing, in doctrinal points, with Andrew Fuller; and it is in hope of increasing the number of those who shall read his works, that we have been induced to write this review. And in doing this, we have scarcely adverted to the fact, that Fuller was a decided antipedobaptist, and an Independent. Of course we do not agree with him on these points. But while we can so cordially agree, on every important doctrine of Christianity, we do not feel disposed to lay undue stress on a difference in matters merely external. He remained in the church in which he was brought up, and with which his family were connected for generations past. We feel, that such men as Andrew Fuller are our brethren, and belong to the same church, whatever bars to actual, external communion, may be interposed. Few men have lived, in our time, of the sincerity of whose religion we entertain a better opinion than of his. We like the unaffected humility which appears in every record, in his diary; and we admire the calm, sober, unpretending frame of his dying hours, more than most of the obituaries which speak of extacies and raptures. In the last, and trying hour, he deeply felt his own utter unworthiness, and would not hear mention of any of his works of piety and benevolence; but trusted for salvation, as he did during his life, simply but firmly, to the all-sufficient merits and perfect righteousness of Jesus Christ.

May we, and all our readers, have such humility, and such trust in our dying hour!

ART. IV.—*A Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*, edited by John Kitto, D. D., F. S. A.; editor of the Pictorial Bible; author of the History and Physical Geography of Palestine. Illustrated by numerous engravings. 2 vols. Svo. New York: 1846.

THE utility of Bible Dictionaries or (to use the more ambitious name now current) Cyclopaedias is attested by the frequency of their appearance, and the constant sale which they command. They are indeed indispensable aids in that minute

study of the scriptures, without which systematic treatises on Criticism and Antiquities are unavailing. While the latter afford general views and the means of synoptical comparison, the former are intended for continual reference at every step of the student's progress. So great are the facilities afforded by the alphabetical arrangement, that even the humblest and most unpretending books of this class may be used, at least occasionally, with advantage, by the ripest scholar. Those things are most likely to be soon familiar, which we know precisely where to look for. Hence the necessity of dictionaries on particular subjects, not as substitutes for systematic works, but as auxiliaries to them. A subject learned exclusively in this way, even if complete in its details, could scarcely fail to be distorted and confused in the arrangements of its parts. This evil can be obviated only by the use of systematic treatises. But when the outline has been accurately drawn in this way, there is no more certain method of filling it up than by the constant use of well constructed dictionaries as books of reference. The habitual reliance upon such books by those who use them at all, gives them, of course, an influence which makes it highly important that they should be made as correct and complete as possible. He who acquires the habit of referring to a dictionary, of whatever kind, for the solution of his doubts on any subject, is far more likely to be governed by it in his judgments than he would be by the continuous perusal of a work in systematic form. Nor is it merely upon readers that such books exert a powerful though often unsuspected influence. It extends no less to writers, and through them operates in a constantly enlarging circle. This kind of literature has a peculiar tendency to propagate itself. By an easy process, in a great degree mechanical, one dictionary may be made to furnish the materials of another, without any overt signs of plagiarism or even imitation. This facility arises from the unconnected form of such works and their want of any plan or general aspect which could give them individuality. All that they present to the continuous reader or the casual observer is a multitude of separate and minute points, without any bond of union but their common relation to a general design or subject, which makes little impression, because not embodied and made palpable by any systematic combination of the parts, but left to exist only in idea. Now as every one of these detached parts is

essential to any complete book upon the subject, and as only some of them can be expected to exhibit much variety in different hands, the reader or the public, having no key or clew to the parts which would afford an equitable standard of comparison, is apt to take the whole for granted, and to give the writer credit for as much originality and independence as the nature of his task would allow him to exhibit. Hence it is that of all books extant, those in the dictionary form afford the most temptation to the plagiarist, because they afford the fewest facilities for his detection. Hence too the endless reproduction of the matter of such works in new forms and under new names, but without any real or material addition to the general stock of knowledge.

This unlucky facility of propagation without progress makes the class of books to which it appertains as dangerous in one view as they are useful in another, by adapting them to serve as vehicles for the indefinite perpetuation of mistake and falsehood, often wholly unintentional and even accidental in their origin. The very errors of the press may thus be treasured up or rather coined anew and thrown into circulation with a fresh stamp to authenticate and give them currency. A curious chapter in the history of printing would be one detailing or exemplifying this incidental evil, which though not created has been vastly multiplied, wherever it occurs at all, by that sublime invention. If to this accidental source of error we add those arising from the usual infirmities of authors and compilers, and connect both with the special facilities and motives to an indiscriminate imitation which exists in this class of writings, and with the continual demand for them created by their cheapness in proportion to their contents and the mechanical facility of using them, it must be owned that they are not more indispensable than dangerous and liable to abuse.

The practical conclusion to which these considerations lead, is not that such books ought to be prohibited, but that they ought to be frequently re-written. This is the only means by which the old leaven can be certainly or thoroughly purged out. However liable to error the new writer may in this case be, there is very little chance of his repeating independently the blunders of his predecessors. His resort to fresh materials and original authorities will certainly enable him to shun the most of them. His own mistakes will probably be altogether different, and even this may

be regarded as a salutary change from an inveterate monotony of error. It is like the substitution of a fresh wound for an old running sore. This would be so even on the supposition that the chances of mistake remain the same as in the first instance; how much more when they are greatly diminished by every fresh recurrence to the fountain head of information.

But besides the utility, or rather the necessity, of thorough reconstruction in this class of writings, for the purpose of correcting old mistakes and purging out inveterate corruptions, the same process is required for an equally strong and yet a wholly independent reason. Even if the old books had been faultless in their origin, and free from all deterioration in their reproduction, it would still be necessary to re-write them, in order to keep up with the advance of learning, or at least with its vicissitudes. It is no very hazardous assertion, that in reference to the subjects usually treated in such books, there is a constant movement onwards, an addition to our stores of knowledge, an enlargement of our field of vision, and a favourable change of what the Anglo-Germans call our "standing point." But even granting that there has been no such actual advance or augmentation since Bible Dictionaries came into vogue in the early part of the last century, it would be paradoxical to question that the old knowledge has assumed new forms, and entered into new combinations, of which some at least may be considered as facilitating Biblical study, or if that is too much, as necessary to the comprehension of the modern writers. If our books for elementary instruction in arithmetic, geography, and so forth, have assumed a new form, even where there has been no material change of substance, why may not such a change be equally admissible, if not unavoidable, in other and higher parts of education? We have thus a double reason for maintaining that the class of books in question should from time to time be thoroughly re-written; first, because it is the only means of purging out the errors which this kind of literature tends peculiarly to breed and to perpetuate; and secondly, because it is the only means of bringing up our popular biblical literature to the rising standard of improvement and discovery.

With these prepossessions on the general subject, we are of course prepared to welcome such a work as that before us, as a timely addition to the biblical apparatus previously extant in

our language. Much must of necessity depend upon the editor, and more especially upon his views as to the only way in which the work can be constructed so as to effect its purpose. Dr. Kitto comes recommended, even to those not acquainted with his other writings, by the well-known general facts of his experience and success as a book-maker, and of his long familiarity, in this capacity at least, with biblical subjects. A feeling of more personal interest in him and his literary labours must exist in the minds of all who have read his account of the providential circumstance which transformed him from a mason's apprentice to a *helluo librorum*, to wit, the total loss of hearing by a fall from a ladder at the age of twelve. All this, however, could but raise a general presumption in his favour, and one liable to be destroyed by any indication of erroneous judgment as to the true method of constructing such a book to most advantage. We are glad to find, however, that his views on this essential point, as theoretically stated in his preface, and practically realized in the body of the work, are in a high degree enlarged and elevated, equally free from blind attachment to old errors and from wild proclivity to new ones. We shall do no more than an act of justice to a laborious and enlightened scholar by illustrating briefly this general commendation in a few particulars.

The first thing which strikes us as indicative of good sense and acquaintance with the general subject is the limitation of the ground to be occupied, as laid down in the preface. We cannot, it is true, commend either the wisdom or the good taste of inserting a lecture on *Encyclopädie*, such as are yearly delivered in the German universities, an honour which may very possibly have been enjoyed more than once by this identical performance from the pen of Dr. Credner at Giessen. Neither the doctrinal "standing point" nor the literary fame of this professor entitles him to such distinction; and even if they did, there would be something laughable in using an awkward English version of an awkward German lecture, for the purpose of apprising English readers what is meant by "Cyclopaedia" and by "Biblical Literature." All that was necessary in the way of definition has been far more clearly given in a few words by the editor himself than in Credner's elaborate distinctions and citations of his own German works. What we approve in Dr. Kitto's plan, apart from this unfortunate interpolation, is the

distinct delineation of his subject as including only Archaeology and Criticism or rather Introduction in the German sense. This affords ample matter for two volumes of the size before us, nor could any other extensive topic have been introduced without a hurtful sacrifice of fulness and precision or a very undesirable increase of price. At the same time, what is here embraced is really, as it claims to be, preparatory and auxiliary to interpretation. It may indeed be all reduced to introduction in its widest sense, as comprehending criticism, geography, natural history, and antiquities in all their branches, religious, political, social, and domestic. These are the topics upon which a faithful student of the Bible would desire to make constant use of such a work as that before us.

Another favourable symptom is the editor's avowed determination to construct the work truly and entirely *de novo*. To the grounds for this conclusion there is no need of reverting; it is enough that they are here appreciated and reduced to practice. Dr. Kitto seems particularly anxious to disclaim all direct dependence upon Calmet, and no wonder, when we take into consideration the interminable progeny of which that meritorious work has been the parent. A slight sketch of its history, as given in the preface of the work before us, may be not devoid of interest and use. Calmet's *Dictionnaire Historique, Critique, Chronologique, Géographique, et Littérale de la Bible*, containing in an alphabetic form the substance of the author's *Commentaire Littérale*, was originally published at Paris, in two volumes folio 1722, and eight years later more complete in four volumes folio. The only important work of the same kind which had appeared before it was the *Hierolexicon* of Rechenberg, published at Frankfort and Leipzig, in 1714. The first English version of Calmet was that of D'Oyley and Colson, in three volumes folio, 1732. This was the great *officina* of Bible Dictionaries, large and small, got up by various hands, to meet the wants of different denominations, until 1795, when a fresh material was afforded for this kind of manufacture by Charles Taylor's abridgment of Calmet in two volumes quarto, accompanied by two more of his own called *Fragments*, and containing a farrago of varied learning, and eccentric speculation on a vast variety of subjects, some of them having but a distant bearing on the scriptures and no tendency at all to illustrate or ex-

plain them. This foreign matter having been laboriously condensed and incorporated with the abridged Calmet by succeeding book makers, resulted in a product which can only be compared to some of the adulterated wines of the American and European liquor market. Dr. Robinson's abridged edition (1832) has been consulted in the present case only for the sake of his additions, "but more in the early than in the latter part, where the sources of such additions were rather sought in the German authorities from which they were found to be derived." Of Winer's *Biblisches Realwörterbuch* the editor professes to have made more frequent use, but in a way which shows his just appreciation of its character, viz. "rather as an index than as a direct source of materials," a most accurate description of that wonderful chef-d'œuvre in the way of multifarious and condensed citation.

The next thing which has favourably impressed us is the editor's not undertaking to prepare the entire work himself or only with the aid of his immediate friends and usual *collaborateurs*. Such a course might probably have saved much trouble, time and money, in the end, but it would far more certainly have lowered the literary merit of the work to an indefinite degree, and robbed the editor of all the praise now due to him for justly estimating the importance, not to say necessity, of executing such a plan at this day by an extensive division of labour. This view of the matter was already familiar to the English public, through a number of the recent examples in other works of literature, such as Smith's Dictionary of Classical Antiquities, and the Biographical Dictionary of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. But such examples are so often thrown away, especially on scholars of a different department, that we think the present editor entitled to much credit for the zeal with which he seems to have sacrificed his pride of authorship to this great law of learned compilation. He has boldly and faithfully acted on the principle that such a plan can be worthily executed, in the present state of learning, only by distributing its parts among many hands, and such hands too as have been fitted by anterior experience to perform them most successfully. In order to secure this advantage he was willing to forego that of entire uniformity in method, style, and even sentiment, a bold

choice but, in our opinion, under the circumstances of the case, a wise one.

Another question of some delicacy which has been judiciously decided, is the question with respect to the use which was to be made of German sources and authorities. A right decision is the more commendable in this case because error was so natural and easy, not in one but in opposite directions. A superficial sciolist, inoculated with the notion that whatever is expressed in German must be true and wise, would have made the book a parrot-like reiteration of absurd neologisms. A prejudiced alarmist, convinced that all impiety and error may be shut out by a rigorous embargo upon German books, would have put the literature of the work back half a century at least, to preserve it from all tincture of outlandish infidelity. The editor has wisely and successfully avoided both extremes, at least so far as his design and purpose are concerned, by opening the door to the results of German learning, without opening the windows to the pestilential atmosphere of what may still unhappily be called German principles. In other words, he has enriched the book with references to many valuable German works, down to the date almost of publication, and enlisted the services of writers thoroughly familiar with the modern German learning but entirely exempt from the skepticism by which it is poisoned, so that they are able to maintain sound opinions not in ignorance but in defiance of assaults upon them. The difference between this course and that which some would have pursued, is the same as that between escaping from an enemy by running and by beating him in battle.

We have no hesitation in expressing the opinion that justice cannot now be done to the subjects handled in these volumes without drawing largely upon German sources. The very fact that neological propensities have led the scholars of that country to plough up the whole field for themselves and to examine every clod and pebble with a microscopic scrutiny, makes it certain that they must have turned up something which was not upon the surface, and which others never would have found if the soil had remained undisturbed, although they may be far better qualified to estimate and use what is discovered than the discoverers themselves. The true course with respect to German labours and researches is not to look away from them or cover them

with dust, but to seize upon their valuable products and convert them to our own use in the very face and teeth of those who after bringing them to light are often utterly unable to dispose of them.

Among the auxiliaries whom the editor has thus enlisted, some of the most eminent are not only masters of German erudition but Germans themselves. Besides Credner, whose contributions, in our judgment, are of little value, a number of interesting and important articles are from the pen of Tholuck, Hengstenberg, and Hävernick. These names will suffice to show what class of German principles is represented in the Cyclopaedia, and how far the coincidence of modern scholarship and infidelity is from being necessary or invariable. It is indeed a curious fact that while some of the most orthodox opinions here asserted are maintained by Germans, some of the most lax and latitudinarian notions are propounded by members of the Church and Universities of England, a sufficient proof that such comparisons must rest on other data than ecclesiastical or national distinctions. Besides the German writers just enumerated, we observe in the List of Contributors, the name of Ewald, but have not detected any article with his initials during two perfunctory examinations of the work. His contributions must be very few. The editor appears to have employed means to obtain a contribution from Neander on the subject of Baptism, for the singular purpose of producing "freshness of effect" upon a topic which seemed to be exhausted in England. It rather looks as if the motive had been to admit from Germany opinions which, if written by an Englishman, might seem to be sectarian. At any rate, the excellent Neander, with a naïveté which will not appear strange to those who know him, pleads the pressure of his other labours and devolves the task upon his dear friend, J. Jacobi, of Berlin, as fully qualified to do it justice. Whatever be the merit of Jacobi or his article, the substitution must provoke a smile from English readers, who are perfectly aware that Neander's name alone would have recommended anything which he had written, a virtue not transferable even by himself to the person or the writings of his "dear friend, J. Jacobi." As to the article itself, it fully meets the editor's demand for something different from the customary exhibitions of the same theme in English, and must greatly gratify his Baptist brethren by propounding in

the boldest form Neander's doctrine as to the non-apostolicity of infant baptism.

Besides the native representatives of German learning who have now been mentioned, there are several English scholars whose numerous articles exhibit intimate acquaintance with the biblical literature of that country. Of these, the names which meet the eye most frequently are those of the Reverend J. F. Denham, M. A., St. John's College, Cambridge F. R. S.; the Rev. John Nicholson, B. A., of Oxford, and P. D. of Tübingen; the Rev. William Wright, M. A. and LL.D. of Trinity College, Dublin; and the Rev. F. W. Newman, late Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. The last named, unless we mistake the man, is a near kinsman of the famous Newman, and seceded from the English Church before him, but in an opposite direction. In addition to these Anglican divines, the same kind of learning is apparent in the contributions of some eminent dissenters, and especially in those of the Rev. Dr. Samuel Davidson, Professor in the Lancashire Independent College, and the Rev. Dr. Alexander, a distinguished Congregational minister in Edinburgh. The editor himself displays a like familiarity with German sources, although not precisely of the same class, on account of the particular field to which he has confined himself. This observation furnishes an opportunity of briefly stating how the subjects treated in the work have been distributed.

The department which the editor reserves for himself is that of antiquities, religious, social, and political, a choice no doubt determined by his taste and by the course of his previous studies. For the same reason he has likewise contributed a large proportion of the articles on geography, in which he has made ample use of Robinson and other recent writers on that subject. The Natural History of the Bible has been treated with particular attention, in original articles expressly written for the work by two distinguished naturalists. The Botany of Scripture was entrusted to Dr. J. F. Royle, Professor of Materia Medica and Therapeutics in King's College, London. This gentleman, while resident in India, was commissioned by the medical authorities in Bengal, to investigate the medicinal plants and drugs of India, for the purpose of ascertaining how far the public service might be supplied with indigenous medicines instead of importing them from foreign countries. This even-

tually led to an extensive collation of the most celebrated oriental writers on materia medica, as well as to a careful investigation of the substances themselves. Such labours could not fail to yield many valuable fruits in reference to the Natural History of Scripture. They are not, however, without some accompanying disadvantages, arising from the circumstances of the case. It is impossible that one whose mind has thus been occupied with a certain branch of science for its own sake, and especially when it has been pursued in an original and novel manner, should be able to confine himself to that precise kind and amount of information which is necessary for an incidental purpose, not particularly interesting to the man himself. His own favourite designs will be continually getting the advantage of the object temporarily presented, and inducing him to dwell upon particulars which really contribute nothing to the immediate end in view. With this fault Dr. Royle's contributions to the work before us are unquestionably very often chargeable. The space assigned to certain subjects and to certain parts of subjects is sometimes wholly disproportioned to their practical importance as illustrative of scripture. The same remark is applicable, in a less degree, to the articles on Scriptural Zoology, by Colonel Hamilton Smith, President of the Devon and Cornwall Natural History Society. That this fault did not strike the editor is probable because in his own part of the work there is observable a disposition to push archaeological detail far beyond the point of exegetical utility. To such details there can of course be no objection in their proper place; but where economy of time and space is so important to the reader and for his sake to the writer, there is something more than a utilitarian argument against the disproportion here complained of. This mistaken view of archaeology, considered as a source of illustration to the scriptures, has been characteristic of a certain school in England and America, as may be seen in the appropriation of whole pages to huge wood-cuts of animals, plants, and musical instruments, where all the light derivable from this source could be imparted in a single sentence without any diagram at all. The abuse, however, is by no means confined to these "pictorial illustrations:" it exists no less in the superfluous descriptions of familiar or irrelevant objects and the endless extracts from oriental travellers, the insertion of which is regarded as a kind of

meritorious *opus operatum*, whether any useful end is answered by the same or not. This diluted learning has been far more common among English writers than in Germany, where criticism and emulation constantly exert a restraining and inciting influence on writers of all classes. Even there, however, something of the same kind has been known, as in the case of Hendewerk who takes occasion, from Isaiah's mention of the ass, in ch. i. 3, to go into an elaborate description of that animal, with due care to discriminate between the European and the oriental asses; as if any light whatever could be thrown upon the prophecy by this impertinent parade of asinine zoology.

We are far from meaning to insinuate that Dr. Royle and Colonel Smith have done no service to the cause of scriptural interpretation by their learned contributions, or that the fault which we have mentioned is not vastly overbalanced by the scientific precision and the oriental learning of these articles. On the contrary, we reckon them among the most original and valuable elements which enter into the composition of the work, and cheaply purchased even by the sacrifice of space and symmetry, which we have mentioned only as a blemish, which in subsequent editions may be rectified, if such a process should be necessary to secure room for other matter more directly bearing on the great end of the compilation, than some of the botanical and zoological details in question.

The other great department of the work is that of Criticism in the wider sense, or what the Germans technically call Introduction, including every thing connected with the text of scripture and the genuineness of its parts. This important class of subjects has, in the work before us been committed to safe and able hands. The topics constituting General Introduction have been chiefly furnished by Dr. Davidson, who may be said to have given here the substance of his valuable lectures on Biblical Criticism, the best elementary book on the subject in the English language, as combining, more successfully than any other, ancient principles with modern learning. There are also from the same pen, special articles on Chronicles and Revelation. Those on the Pentateuch and its component parts and on the book of Daniel are by Hävernicks, who has here given the results of his valuable Introduction. Those on Job, Ecclesiastes, and Isaiah, are by Hengstenberg; on Samuel, Kings, Jonah, Zephaniah, and Zech-

ariah, by Dr. Eadie of the United Secession Church; on Esther, Canticles, Micah, Obadiah, and Nahum, by Dr. Wright of Dublin; on the Psalms and Nehemiah by Dr. Benjamin Davies; on Amos and Joel by Mr. J. E. Ryland; on Jeremiah and Ezekiel by the Rev. Mr. Gotch of Trinity College, Dublin; on Ruth by Professor Bush; with several others by contributors whose names are not included in the catalogue prefixed to the first volume.

In the New Testament, the special introduction has been chiefly furnished by Dr. Tholuck of Halle, Dr. Wright of Dublin, and Dr. Alexander of Edinburgh. The philological articles are chiefly from the pen of Messrs. Newman, Wright and Nicholson, the last of whom is well known as the English translator of Ewald's Hebrew Grammar, the authority of which work seems to be more generally recognised than that of any other in the volumes now before us.

Besides the more frequent contributors of whom we have already spoken, the editor appears to have entrusted several selected subjects to distinguished writers for special reasons which are not always obvious. This is the origin of the articles on Adam and Paradise by Dr. John Pye Smith, of those on the Creation and the Deluge by Professor Baden Powell of Oxford, and of those on Miracles and Inspiration by Dr. Woods of Andover. Occasional articles in different departments have been furnished likewise by the Rev. Dr. Doran, Secretary of the Church Missionary Society; the Rev. Mr. Jamieson, editor of Paxton's Illustrations; the Rev. N. Morren of the Church of Scotland; the Rev. Dr. Stebbing, of St. John's College, Cambridge; and the Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D. We observe upon the list of contributors, without having yet been able to identify their articles, the names of Dr. Baur of Giessen, and the late Dr. Welsh of Edinburgh, with several others, British and American, to which we are obliged, with shame, to acknowledge ourselves strangers.

The particulars already stated will suffice to show the scale on which the work is projected, and the extent to which the editor has availed himself of the division of labour in its execution. They will also show the pains which he has taken to avoid either sectarian or national restrictions and to levy contributions upon every accessible province in the republic of letters. As many of his applications may have been unsuccessful, it is proba-

ble that what we have stated gives but an imperfect view of the praiseworthy efforts made to render this new Dictionary worthy of the subject, and of the advanced state of biblical learning.

To this account of Dr. Kitto's plan we have little to add in the way of criticism on its execution. A particular estimate of the contents would be forbidden by our limits, even if not precluded by the cursory nature of the only examination which we have as yet made of the work in its complete form. As to style and manner, we can only say, that the German contributors fare worst, as might have been expected from the fact that they appear in the disguise of a translation, often awkward and unskilful, sometimes even ludicrous in consequence of its retaining German idioms for which there are perfectly good English equivalents. In some cases too, the sense is wholly obscured by this gratuitous adherence to the form of the original, as it is in others by evident mistake upon the part of the translator. This is the more to be regretted as the originals are not accessible, and as these articles, in some respects, are the most interesting part of the collection. The best written articles, in reference to style alone, appear to be those of the Anglican contributors, who, for some reason, have an ease and refinement in the use of their own language, which is often wanting even in Dissenters of great learning, such as John Pye Smith and Samuel Davidson. The editor himself is a good writer, and the body of the work does credit to its authors, as a specimen of skilful book-making and correct composition.

It is a much more serious question how far the opinions broached in this work can be reckoned sound and healthful in their influence on that class of readers who are most likely to make use of it. That the general spirit of the work is good, and that its principles are in the main both orthodox and evangelical, may be asserted even on the ground of a perfunctory perusal. But it is equally certain that its character, in this as in other respects, cannot be uniform. This was distinctly foreseen by the editor as an incidental evil inseparable from the enlarged plan upon which the work has been constructed. It is for this reason that the initials of the authors are appended to the articles, in order that the responsibility may rest upon themselves. In this arrangement there is no doubt something unsatisfactory, a want

of unity and even homogeneousness, which in a systematic work would be intolerable, and which even here can be regarded in no better light than that of a necessary evil. That it is necessary seems to us however no less clear than that it is an evil. Between such a work, with all the disadvantages arising from this cause, and the consistent uniform production of a single individual or *clique*, without the benefit of varied labour, no enlightened student of the word of God can hesitate. All that is necessary to prevent the evils which may be anticipated, is to bear in mind the general fact that this work owes its literary merit, in a great degree, to the number and variety of its compilers, who belong to different nations, churches, schools, and parties, and that every part must therefore be received with due consideration of its source, although, as we have said, the exceptions to the general harmony of principle and spirit will probably be found few in number and by no means of an aggravated character.

With this qualification we are free to recommend the Cyclopaedia of Dr. Kitto, as a marked improvement upon all preceding works of the same kind, and as the most convenient means, accessible to English readers, of securing the valuable fruits of modern biblical investigation. If this be so, the variety of pens employed upon it rather adds to its value than detracts from it, by justifying the assertion of the editor, that the English language has no other book which eminent foreign scholars have co-operated with our own in producing, and certainly no other which embodies the combined labour of writers who are of different communions here, and are known by different names among men, but have the same hope in this world and but one name in heaven.

ART. V.—1. *Historical Sketch of the Evangelical Alliance*, by Rev. David King, L. L. D.

2. *On the Evangelical Alliance*, by Rev. Dr. Chalmers. Edinburgh.

WE propose to give in the present article a brief historical

sketch of the remarkable movement to which these two pamphlets refer. The Evangelical Alliance which has just been formed, may be said to be the offspring of the Bicentenary commemoration of the Westminster Assembly, which took place in Edinburgh, in July, 1843. The object then in view, gave to the proceedings, no doubt something of a denominational character; but the spirit which pervaded them was enlightened and benevolent, and the allusions to other bodies of evangelical Christians, were all in the way of lamenting their absence. Among the thousands attending that great meeting, there was one gentleman present upon whose mind and heart the exercises of the occasion, and especially some expository remarks on Phil. iii. 15, 16, by the late Dr. Balmer, made a deep impression. There is now no indelicacy in saying that we refer to John Henderson, Esq., of Park,—a gentleman distinguished alike for his wealth and his Christian excellence—a most enlightened and munificent friend of Christian union. He was roused to consider whether any means could be devised for the removal of the many unhappy divisions existing within the visible church of Christ. His first measure was to get up a volume of Essays on Christian union, by ministers belonging to different portions of the church. The authors of these essays were handsomely remunerated, and many copies of the work were gratuitously circulated in Great Britain and America, through the munificence of Mr. Henderson.

In one of these treatises, the idea was thrown out of a convention of Evangelical Christendom, for the purpose of considering and promoting the visible union of the friends of the Redeemer; the suggestion proved not to have been in vain. After much prayerful and deliberate consideration of the subject by brethren in Scotland, (among whom Mr. Henderson's name deserves to be mentioned with special honour,) it was resolved to make an experimental effort. Accordingly a circular was addressed to "the Evangelical church in England, Wales, and Ireland, inviting them to hold a conference at Liverpool, to devise measures for the promotion of Christian union among themselves, and if possible, to prepare the way for a convention of evangelical Christians from all parts of the world. The document is in the following terms:

"GLASGOW, August 5th, 1845.

"DEAR BRETHREN:—You are aware of the proposal which

has emanated from various quarters, that a great meeting of evangelical Christians belonging to various churches and countries should be shortly convened in London, to associate and concentrate the strength of an enlightened Protestantism against the encroachments of Popery and Puseyism, and to promote the interests of a scriptural Christianity. To us it appears that a preliminary meeting comprising delegates from the various denominations in Great Britain and Ireland, might, with advantage, be held this summer, in some town in England. This subordinate measure has been submitted to various sections of Scottish Christians, and has obtained their cordial approbation; and most of the subscribers to this letter have been appointed to use their best endeavours for carrying it into execution. We earnestly and respectfully invite you to join in the movement. On your co-operation its success depends; for, if limited to Scotland, it would be diminutive and ineffectual.

“As to the objects of the preliminary meeting, we think it better not to speak with precision. The delegates will shape their own course; and we abstain from any remarks or suggestions which might appear to invade the freedom of their deliberation. To any, however, who might object to the want of a defined aim, we would reply in general, that there is, in our opinion, no want of work for the combined energies of evangelical Christians. The very fact of meeting together would be a feast of charity to themselves, and would present an exemplification of brotherhood highly honouring to their religious professions. By this would all men know that they were Christ's disciples, because they loved one another.

“When assembled, they might engage together in devotional exercises; hear strong appeals to their individual and collective duties; indicate the basis of the greater meeting to be called at their instance; and organize, or even set on foot, a series of measures, whether by books, tracts, or lectureships, or otherwise for diffusing through all European countries, a scriptural knowledge of the salvation of Christ, and exploding the sceptical and superstitious system so lamentably prevalent, by which the doctrines of the Cross are expressly denied, or buried under a heap of inventions and delusions.

“We sincerely hope that you will give the subject your favourable consideration. It is easy to anticipate objections, but

the end is too great and good to be abandoned on slight grounds. We suggest the 1st of October as a day of meeting, and Liverpool as the place."

This requisition was signed by ministers and elders belonging to the Free Church of Scotland, the United Secession, the Relief, the Reformed Presbyterian, the Original Secession, the Congregational and the Baptist churches; and the response given to it by those to whom it was addressed was in the highest degree cordial and gratifying. A large proportion of the persons invited to join in the movement, complied with the summons; they were joined by others to whom the circular had not been specially sent, but who felt a deep interest in the cause of Christian union, so that not less than two hundred and sixteen persons drawn from seventeen different denominations of Christians, assembled in Liverpool on the 1st day of October, 1845. Of course the Liverpool meeting was a purely experimental one, it being impossible to determine beforehand how far its members could proceed together, or what would be the issue of their deliberations. However, the spirit of brotherly love seems to have been poured out upon it in an eminent degree; indeed all who had the privilege of attending it, unite in testifying that it would not be possible to convey to those who were not there, an adequate impression of the spirit and tone of that surprising assembly—an assembly in which churchmen and dissenters, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists, the representatives of parties but a few years ago engaged in the hottest controversies, now sat side by side, owning each other as brethren, confessing their past sins against each other, and giving utterance to expressions of mutual and fraternal love. Some confessed that they had come to the meeting with no sanguine hopes of a happy result; others came full of anxiety and apprehension; but when, upon the unanimous adoption of a basis of common truth, the whole assembly rose almost instinctively, and with one consent sang a hymn of praise to their common God and Saviour, there was produced in every heart the deep and joyful conviction, that the set time had arrived for a general and vigorous effort to remove the alienations so long existing in the church of Christ.

The opening exercises of the meeting were, with great propriety, wholly of a devotional character;—these services would scarcely fail to elicit a conscientiousness of mind and heart. No dis-

inction of sects could be discovered from the songs or the supplications in which they joined, and thus at the very outset, a beautiful and impressive proof was given that amid all the diversity of names and opinions, there existed a real and precious unity. "There has been," said Dr. Leifchild, "a singular unity in our devotions; in the prayers we this day presented, no one could have told to what body of Christians those who offered them belonged. I made an observation of this at the time, and I feel that it must have been made by all of us; this fact demonstrates the existence of a real unity of heart."

Without entering into a full account of the Liverpool conference, we would observe, that to all its members the way seemed quite open for summoning a convention of Christians, not of the British empire alone, but from all parts of the world, to carry forward the work so auspiciously begun. It may also be mentioned that at an early period of the Conference, the following important resolution was unanimously adopted:

"That, in the prosecution of the present attempt, the Conference are clearly and unanimously of the opinion, that no compromise of their own views, or sanction of those of others, on the points on which they differ, ought to be either required or expected on the part of any who may concur in it, but that all shall be held as free as before, to maintain and advocate their views with all due forbearance and brotherly love. Further, that any union or alliance to be formed, should be understood to be an alliance of individual Christians, and not of denominations or branches of the church."

The principle embraced in this resolution, and which is now embodied in the constitution of the Evangelical Alliance, is well fitted to remove a host of misgivings. There is nothing which a good man values more highly than his religious belief. The matter may be minute, but if he believes it to be a part of the revealed mind of Christ, he cannot sacrifice it without feeling himself guilty of a sort of treason. Every scheme of union which demands such sacrifice is eventually vicious. But in joining the Alliance no man is asked either to surrender or conceal his conscientious convictions; the strictest member of the strictest sect, may feel at ease about his doctrinal peculiarities, for there is to be no compromise of his own tenets or sanction of another's. All are free to maintain and advocate their views, on the

single condition that such advocacy of them be conducted with all due forbearance and brotherly love. And if the Evangelical Alliance can only be instrumental in recommending this article to the adoption of Christendom, that the expression of religious views shall be at once frank and affectionate, and that when so conducted it shall be held inoffensive, its formation will not have been in vain.

But a great point yet remained to be determined, viz: who should be invited to the Conference to be held in London,—a question, which under the circumstances of the case, was just equivalent to this—who should be admitted as members of the Alliance. It seemed manifest that there must be discrimination of some sort; accordingly the Liverpool Conference resolved that “the persons who shall be invited to the future meeting shall be such as hold and maintain what are usually understood to be evangelical views” in regard to sundry matters of doctrine which we shall presently mention. We shall only add in regard to this Liverpool meeting, that it is determined to call a more general assembly to be held in London, and at the same time appointed a large provisional committee, comprising four divisions, viz: one for London, a second for Liverpool, a third for Glasgow, and a fourth for Dublin.

Meanwhile the project of an Alliance on the proposed basis encountered in various quarters, the most decided opposition. Evangelical Episcopalians deemed it a Jesuitical scheme to entrap the church of England; Scottish Freechurchmen declared that by such an union, the recent testimony of their church respecting the headship of Christ would be compromised, while English Dissenters were afraid that if they entered into it, their mouths would be shut upon the subject of establishments. In various judicatories of the Free Church the matter was canvassed; and particularly in the last General Assembly there was an earnest and able debate on the subject. Besides this, domestic opposition to the proposed Alliance, other clouds arose to darken the prospect of its formation. As the day fixed for the London Conference approached, the idea seemed to prevail that those with whom the measure originated, had gone too far and too fast in proposing an Ecumenical Alliance, and that the actual result of the Conference would be the organization of a British Alliance, with a view of concentrating the energies of churchmen

and dissenters against the growing power of Popery in Britain. Then there was the ill-judged resolution of the Provincial Committee in April, to the effect that no slave holder should be invited—a resolution, which not only awakened the fear that the American delegation would be virtually excluded from the Conference, but which also gave great offence to some of the most eminent and able friends of the movement. On this point Dr. Chalmers, in the pamphlet mentioned at the head of this article, very justly observes: “We must regret the resolution at Birmingham, of April 1st, withholding invitations from those ‘who, whether by their own fault or otherwise, may be in the unhappy position of holding their fellows as slaves.’ If not by their own fault, the laying on of such a stigma is an act of cruelty and injustice to those ministers, of whom, we doubt not there is a number in the southern states of the American Union, who mourn over slavery in all its abominations. These form the very class who were most likely to send over their representatives to this country. But even as to those who are in fault, the more of them the better. By this resolution then, we have thrown away a glorious opportunity of holding converse with ministers who might otherwise have come to us from that tainted region. We should have greatly preferred the actual presence of these men, and to have held oral converse with them, rather than distant letter writing. The Alliance we hope will, by their open protest both against Popery and Puseyism, hold their face as a flint against the most powerful of this world’s hierarchies. But let independence have its perfect work. There is a party of injudicious Abolitionists in America who have greatly distempered and retarded the cause of emancipation; and let us not give way to the fanatic outcry that they are attempting to excite throughout the misled and deluded multitudes of our own land.” These clouds were happily dispersed; the proceedings at the final meeting of the Committee in August, the only one which the American and other foreign brethren were enabled to attend, were of such a nature as to make it evident that if an alliance was formed, it would be one of a comprehensive character, according to the catholic views of those with whom the thing had originated.

On the 19th of August, there was gathered in Freemason’s Hall, London, a vast and unique assembly, such an one, in certain

respects, as Christendom had never before witnessed. In that splendid hall there met brethren from many and distant lands from England, Scotland, Ireland, France, Germany, Switzerland, Canada, and the United States—brethren who represented nearly all the branches into which the Evangelical church of Christ is divided. The exercises of the first sitting were very properly of a devotional nature, while the remainder of the day was taken up with the appointment of officers, and of various standing committees.

The business of the meeting was not fairly entered upon until the third session, when the following resolutions were proposed and unanimously adopted, viz :

“ I. That this Conference, composed of professing Christians of many different Denominations, all exercising the right of private judgment, and through common infirmity, differing among themselves, in the views they entertain on some points, both of Christian doctrine and Ecclesiastical Polity, and gathered from many and remote parts of the world for the purpose of promoting Christian union, rejoice in making their unanimous avowal of the glorious truth, that the church of the living God, while it admits of growth, is one church, never having lost, and being incapable of losing its essential unity. Not, therefore, to create that unity, but to confess it, is the design of their assembling together. One in reality, they desire also, as far as they may be able to attain it, to be visibly one ; and thus, both to realize in themselves, and to exhibit to others, that a living and everlasting union binds all true believers together in the fellowship of the church of Christ, “ which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.”

“ II. That this Conference, while recognizing the essential unity of the Christian church, feel constrained to deplore its existing divisions, and to express their deep sense of sinfulness involved in the alienation of affection, by which they have been attended, and of the manifold evils which have resulted therefrom, and to avow their solemn conviction of the necessity and duty of taking measures, in humble dependence on the divine blessing, towards attaining a state of mind and feeling more in accordance with the word and spirit of Christ Jesus.

“ III. That, therefore, the members of this Conference are deeply convinced of the desirableness of forming a confederation, on

the basis of great Evangelical principles held in common by them, which may afford opportunity to members of the church of Christ of cultivating brotherly love, enjoying Christian intercourse, and promoting such other objects as they may hereafter agree to prosecute together; and they hereby proceed to form such a confederation under the name of "The Evangelical Alliance."

The next point that came up for consideration, and which produced a protracted discussion, was the basis as set forth in the following minute, viz:

"That with a view however, of furnishing, the most satisfactory explanation, and guarding against misconception in regard to their design, and the means of its attainment, they deem it expedient explicitly to state as follows:—

"I. That the parties composing the Alliance shall be such persons only as hold and maintain what are universally understood to be Evangelical views, in regard to the matters understated, viz:

"1. The Divine Inspiration, authority, and sufficiency of the holy scriptures.

"2. The unity of the Godhead and the Trinity of Persons therein.

"3. The utter depravity of human nature in consequence of the fall.

"4. The incarnation of the Son of God, his work of atonement for sinners of mankind, and his mediatorial intercession and reign.

"5. The justification of the sinner by faith alone.

"6. The work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of the sinner.

"7. The right and duty of private judgment in the interpretation of the holy scripture.

"8. The divine institution of the Christian ministry, and the authority and perpetuity of the ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

"9. The immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the judgment of the world to come by our Lord Jesus Christ, with the eternal blessedness of the righteous, and the eternal punishment of the wicked.

"It is however distinctly declared: First that this brief summary is not to be regarded in any formal or ecclesiastical sense, as

a creed or confession, nor the adoption of it as involving an assumption of the right authoritatively to define the limits of Christian brotherhood, but simply as an indication of the class of persons whom it is desirable to embrace within the Alliance. Second—That the selection of certain tenets with the omission of others is not to be held as implying that the former constitute the whole body of important truth, or that the latter is unimportant.

“II. That the Alliance is not to be considered as an Alliance of denominations, or branches of the church, but of individual Christians, each acting on his own responsibility.”

As we have already stated this basis gave rise to a very protracted discussion. Some were of opinion that as the proposed design of the Alliance is to manifest the unity actually existing among the true followers of the Lord Jesus, by whatever name they may be known, there should be no doctrinal basis, since some part of it might and probably would exclude from the Alliance persons respecting whose Christian character, no reasonable doubt could be entertained. Such is the view of the subject expressed by Dr. Chalmers in his pamphlet. “We hold that we should abandon every idea for the present, of an initial declaration of faith, however brief or however general. We would have no articles of agreement save one, or at most two,—the first a willingness to co-operate in all such present measures as themselves might deem advisable for defending a purely scriptural religion against the encroachments of Popery: and secondly, a willingness to co-operate in all such prospective measures as themselves shall afterwards deem advisable for perfecting and making palpable to the world that union which ought to subsist among true Christians of all denominations. No other qualifications should be exacted for an entry into this Alliance than a simple approval of these two specific objects.” Others again objected not so much to a basis of doctrinal views, as to particular expressions and particular articles of the one before the Conference. In particular the 5th was objected to because it would exclude evangelic members of the Society of Friends; and the 9th—which was introduced into the basis at the instance of the American brethren—was objected to because it would exclude many excellent persons on the continent, who while they adopted the evangelical system as a whole, at the same time

doubted or disbelieved the doctrine of the eternity of future punishment.

As our design in the present article is to give a narrative of the measures of the Alliance, rather than to discuss their merits, we go on to say that the basis contained in the preceding articles, and explained in the accompanying statements, was adopted by the meeting *nem. con.* A few who could not vote for it, declared that they would not vote against it. The discussions, as we have said were protracted and earnest—yet we are bound to add, that they were in an eminent degree imbued with the spirit of faith and love; in fact they come nearer to our idea of Christian discussion, than any to which we ever before listened.

In addition to the article explanatory of the basis, it was further resolved,

“III. That in the prosecution of the present attempt, it is distinctly declared, that no compromise of the views of any member, or sanction of those of others, on the points wherein they differ, is either required or expected, but that all are held as free as before to maintain and advocate their religious convictions with due forbearance and brotherly love.

“IV. That it is not contemplated that this Alliance should assume or aim at the character of a new ecclesiastical organization, claiming and exercising the functions of a Christian church. Its simple and comprehensive object, it is strongly felt, may be successfully promoted, without interfering with or disturbing the order of any branch of the Christian church to which its members may respectively belong.

“V. That while the formation of this Alliance is regarded as an important step toward the increase of Christian union, it is acknowledged as a duty incumbent on all its members carefully to abstain from pronouncing any uncharitable judgment upon those who do not feel themselves in a condition to give it their sanction.

“VI. That the members of the Alliance earnestly and affectionately recommend to each other in their own conduct, and particularly in their own use of the press, carefully to abstain from and put away all bitterness and wrath, and anger and clamour, and evil-speaking with all malice; and in all things in which they yet differ from each other, to be kind, tender-hearted,

forbearing one another in love, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven them; in every thing seeking to be followers of God, as dear children, and to walk in love as Christ also hath loved them."

The next great subject which came up for consideration was the objects of the Alliance. These as provisionally adopted and proposed by the conference at Liverpool were: "The counteracting the efforts of Popery, and other forms of superstition and infidelity, and promoting the common Protestant faith in this (Britain) and other countries; and with this view it is deemed necessary to obtain correct information on such subjects as the following, viz: 1. The facts bearing on the growth of Popery; 2. The state of Infidelity, and the form which it assumes in the present day; 3. The facts relating to the public observance of the Lord's day; and 4. The amount of the existing means of Christian education."

In the course of the somewhat protracted and animated discussions to which this subject gave rise, it became very manifest that the diversity of opinion existing among the members in relation to it was too great to admit of any very definite statement of the objects of the Alliance. Some of the English dissenting members were afraid of its becoming a mere anti-popery society, or a Lord's day protection society, yet with singular inconsistency, they were not only willing, but laboured hard to make it, as we shall presently see, an anti-slavery association. The statement of the objects, as finally adopted is as follows.

"I. That inasmuch as this proposal for union originated in a great degree in the sense very generally entertained among Christians, of their grievous practical neglect of our Lord's 'new commandment' to his disciples, to 'love one another,' in which offence the members of the Alliance desire, with godly sorrow to acknowledge their full participation—it ought to form one of the chief objects of the Alliance to deepen in the minds of its own members, and, through their influence, to extend among the disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ generally, that conviction of sin and short coming in this respect, which the blessed Spirit of God seems to be awakening throughout his church; in order that, humbling themselves more and more before the Lord, they may be stirred up to make full confession of their guilt at all suitable times, and to implore, through the merits and interces-

sion of their merciful head and Saviour forgiveness of their past offences, and Divine grace to lead them to the better cultivation of that brotherly affection which is enjoined upon all who, loving the Lord Jesus Christ, are bound also to love one another for the truths' sake which dwelleth in them.

“II. That the great object of the Alliance be, to aid in manifesting as far as practicable, the unity which exists among the true disciples of Christ; to promote their union by fraternal and devotional intercourse; to discourage all envyings, strifes and divisions; to impress upon Christians a deeper sense of the great duty of obeying our Lord's command to ‘love one another,’ and to seek the full accomplishment of his prayer, ‘that they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee: that they all may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.’

“III. That in the furtherance of this object, the Alliance shall receive such information respecting the progress of vital religion in all parts of the world as Christian brethren may be disposed to communicate; and that a correspondence be opened and maintained with Christian brethren in different parts of the world, especially with those who may be engaged amidst peculiar difficulties and opposition, in the cause of the gospel in order to afford them all suitable encouragement and sympathy, and to diffuse an interest in their welfare.

“IV. That, in subserviency to the same great object, the Alliance will endeavour to exert a beneficial influence on the advancement of Evangelical Protestantism, and on the counteraction of Infidelity, of Romanism, and of such other forms of Superstition, Error and Profaneness as are most prominently opposed to it, especially the desecration of the Lord's day; it being understood that the different Branches of the Alliance be left to adopt such methods of prosecuting these great ends, as may to them appear most in accordance with their respective circumstances, all at the same time pursuing them in the spirit of tender compassion and love.

“In promoting these and similar objects, the Alliance contemplates chiefly the stimulating Christians to such efforts as the exigencies of the case may demand, by publishing its views in regard to them, rather than accomplishing these views by any organization of its own.”

The third and last important subject of consideration was, the *Organization* of the Alliance. According to the plan proposed by the Business Committee, the members were to "consist of those, in all parts of the world, who shall concur in the principles and objects adopted by the Conference." It was moved by Mr. J. Howard Hinton, to insert the words, "not being slaveholders," after the words "persons,"—a motion which not only called forth a long and earnest debate—but for a time threatened to scatter the newly formed Alliance to the winds. We have neither time nor room to enter into any very minute account of this debate, and it is the less necessary, inasmuch as the motion was ultimately rejected. But we cannot forbear noticing the extreme inconsistency of these abolitionists. When the Basis was under discussion, Mr. Howard Hinton and others whose names we need not mention, were so strongly opposed to the insertion of the eighth and ninth articles, as to intimate their possible retirement from the conference, in the event of their adoption. Indeed they wished to have no doctrinal basis whatever, so that the door might be open for the admission of *every* Christian by whatever name he might be known. And yet the very persons who were so urgent for the admission of the Quaker and the Universalist, were just as urgent that the door should be peremptorily closed against every Christian who happened to be the owner of slaves.

Whether Mr. Hinton and those who acted with him, are prepared to affirm that it is impossible for a slave-holder to be a Christian, we do not know; but unless they do take this absurd position, their conduct in the conference can neither be explained nor justified. One thing seems to us very certain, that if this be their opinion, they are the last persons who should join in such a movement as the present, for the promotion of Christian union.

As we have already intimated, the Alliance when near the close of its session, was brought into deep waters through the agency of the abolitionists. The whole matter, after much debate, was referred to a large special committee, in the hope that some proposition might be framed which would meet the views of all. The deliberations of the committee extended through nearly the whole of one day, Saturday the 29th August. It was a day of profound and painful anxiety to all, but especially to the American and other foreign delegates; from time to time word was sent to the meeting that the committee had not yet

been able to agree, and requesting that united and earnest prayer should be presented on their behalf for divine light and guidance. At last towards the close of the day, a report was given in, which recommended that no branch should admit to membership "slaveholders, who by their own fault, continue in that position, retaining their fellow men in slavery, from regard to their own interests." Strange to say, this report was adopted by the Alliance, under the conviction, as we suppose, that something must be yielded to the clamours of fanaticism and bigotry. But on the next Monday, a better spirit prevailed; during the sessions on this day, the American brethren were allowed to state their views on the subject with great fulness; and the facts and reasonings presented by them were sufficiently influential to induce the Alliance to rescind the offensive resolution of Saturday, and thus to the great joy of all the dark clouds which had so suddenly collected, were as suddenly dispersed. The nature of the "General Organization" as finally arranged, may be learned from the following resolutions:—

"I. That, whereas brethren from the continents of Europe and America as well as in this country are unable without consultation with their countrymen to settle all the arrangements for their respective countries, it is expedient to defer the final and complete arrangement of the details of the General Alliance, of which the foundation has now been laid, until another General Conference.

"II. That the members of the Alliance be recommended to adopt such organization in their respective countries, as in their judgment may be most in accordance with their peculiar circumstances, provided that no branch of the Alliance shall be held responsible for the proceedings of another; on the understanding that when an organization shall be formed, the brethren who have been present at the Conference, or have been enrolled as members, and corresponding members of the Provincial Committee shall act collectively for the formation of it. That, in furtherance of the above plan, it be recommended for the present that a branch be formed in each of the following districts, viz: 1. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; 2. The United States of America; 3. France, Belgium, French Switzerland, and the Waldensian Valleys; 4. The North of Germany; 5. South Germany and German Switzerland; 6. British North

America; 7. The West Indies. And that additional branches be from time to time recognised as such by the concurrence of any two previously existing branches.

“III. That an official correspondence be maintained between the several organizations, and that reports of their proceedings be mutually interchanged, with a view to co-operation and encouragement in their common object.

“IV. That the next General Conference be held at such time and place, and consist of such persons, as by correspondence between the branches of the Alliance in different countries, and under the guidance of Divine Providence shall hereafter be unanimously determined. A Conference of any two or more of the branches may be held at the pleasure of the branches desiring it.

“V. That the Alliance shall consist, first of all such Members and corresponding members of the Provisional Committee as shall still adhere to its principles and objects, and secondly, of such branches as may hereafter be formed in consistency with them. That persons who may be hereafter admitted members of any Branch of this Alliance shall be regarded as members of that branch only to which they have been admitted until the occurrence of a general Conference, when they may be, by its authority, admitted members of the Alliance.”

Various other resolutions were passed expressing the sympathy of the Alliance with all Evangelical missionaries in all parts of the world, urging upon all the duty of offering special prayer for a Divine blessing upon this movement, and recommending that the week beginning with the first Lord's day in January of each year be observed by the members and friends of the Alliance throughout the world as a season for concert in prayer in behalf of the great objects contemplated. These, we have not room to insert, we cannot however forbear giving the Address presented to the Conference at the close of its deliberations, in the name of the American delegates, and which was ordered to be engrossed with the minutes:

“The undersigned, as a Committee of the American members of the Alliance, beg leave, on behalf of our countrymen, to say in these concluding scenes of our conferences, that they feel it proper to express the grateful satisfaction which they have experienced during these sessions. They have witnessed the piety, the intelligence, the benignity of European and especially of

British Christians, as well as their hospitality, their large hearted Catholicism, their steady pursuit of the objects and interests of our cherished Alliance, and also their self-denial, their generous expenditure to a very large amount, in preparation for our Conference, and in connexion with it; and their hearts have responded with divine delight, glorifying God in them. Accept these sincere utterances of their gratitude and fraternal feeling. They commend you all, and especially the Honorable Baronet, Sir Culling Eardley Smith, who has so ably and kindly presided over our deliberations, with all their hearts, to the covenant favour of God our Saviour; they will gratefully remember you when far absent, should it please God to reconduct them in health and safety over the vast ocean to their beloved native country, and to the incomparable endearments of 'home, sweet home,' in the circles of their own families; they ask a kind remembrance in your prayers; and trust that we shall all, and mutually strengthen the bonds of Christian amity and cordial appreciation between our two related countries, by all our proper influence in regard to them; and they conclude with the prayer, that our blessed Alliance may have and enjoy, the patronage and favour of God Almighty, in whom, through our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, is all our hope: and with these sentiments they desire to bid you all a most affectionate Farewell." (Signed) STEPHEN OLIN, SAMUEL H. COX.

We have thus laid before our readers so much of the history and proceedings of the Alliance, as will enable them to form a judgment respecting this scheme for the promotion of Christian union. In some future number, we may perhaps enter more fully into the merits of the scheme; at present, we only add, that whether the Alliance is destined to experience an early dissolution, or a vigorous and useful existence—its first (and possibly its last) meeting in London from the 19th of August to the 1st of September 1846, will be remembered with peculiar delight by all who were permitted to attend it.

ART. VI.—1. *The Catholic News Letter, St. Louis.*

2. *The True Catholic, Louisville.*

THAT such a man as the late John Breckinridge, D. D., should be charged with having turned Papist, and such men as his surviving brothers, with having refused his dying request to see a Romish priest, and with having denied him Christian burial, is, to those having the least knowledge of the parties, so violent an absurdity, as to shock all belief. It is difficult for those who see the inherent folly and falsehood of the charge, to believe that the authors of the calumny could themselves credit it, or that any man whose opinion was worth regarding would give it the weight of a feather. Our first impression, therefore, was, that an accusation so preposterous hardly merited a contradiction. We admit, however, that it is not safe to judge by ourselves, those whose whole circumstances and state of mind are entirely different from our own. Although our conviction, therefore, of the falsehood of the charge, is no stronger now since it has been refuted and retracted, than it was before, we think the relatives of Dr. Breckinridge have judged correctly in condescending to prove to strangers, what friends knew without such proof. It is not for the purpose of satisfying any of our readers that we advert to this subject, but we are desirous of placing on such record as our pages afford, the fact that the charge above mentioned having been advanced, and an abortive attempt having been made to sustain it, has been formally retracted by its authors. We give, therefore, the original accusation as made in the *Catholic News Letter*; the denial and refutation of it by the Rev. Dr. William Breckinridge, and the recantation of the charge by its authors.

Statement of the News Letter, June 27th.

“The Rev. Mr. B. was celebrated, a few years since, for the active part he took against the Catholic Church in Baltimore, and other eastern cities. He had several memorable controversies with Catholic priests on the subject of our religion, and conducted a newspaper, which was, if possible, still more malignant in its character, than the *Herald of Religious Liberty*. Having spent some years in this unholy warfare he came to die. He had two brothers, clergymen, like himself, of the Presbyterian

Church. Seeing his end approaching, he called them to his bedside, and in the solemn tones of a dying man, struck to the heart with a sense of his sins, warned them never to raise their voice against that Church, in traducing which he had so zealously employed his own. He then asked to see a Catholic priest, that he might make amends for the outrages he had committed against the Church of God, and that he might die in peace. But his entreaties were refused, and his brothers—brothers as well by blood, as by the fellowship of a common ministry—suffered him to die, bewailing his sins, and praying in vain for the means of a reconciliation with the Church whose holiness and truth he had habitually outraged.”

The Reply of Dr. W. Breckinridge in the True Catholic.

“On the supposition that the late John Breckinridge and his brothers are the persons alluded to, we pronounce it an unqualified, malignant and shameless calumny—such a falsehood as we might expect to be uttered by the children of the father of lies. We dare say, however, that it will be believed by papists, for it is not as hard to be believed as that a bit of bread is God. If these priests believed it, it is a little strange they kept it a secret so long. For ourselves, we have never heard the most distant intimation of it, until we opened the *Catholic Advocate* of last Saturday. We have no idea that other men believe there is the least foundation for the story, and therefore we deem it sufficient to give it this absolute and indignant contradiction.

“We demand of the editors of the *CATHOLIC NEWS LETTER*, who speak with so great confidence on the subject, that they give us the names on whose authority they have uttered this audacious slander of the living—this most atrocious outrage on the dead.”

The atrocity of the original charge was greatly aggravated by the attempt to justify it on preposterous evidence, and by the addition of a still more offensive accusation against the surviving brothers of the deceased :

“When we wrote the article of the 27th June, we were well aware that the circumstances to which we then thought proper to confine ourselves, were dependent upon testimony which it would not be in our power to make public, for the reason that it would involve the breach of private confidence ; nor should

we have even alluded to those circumstances, but for the fact, that, should our statement ever be questioned, we felt assured that there were other matters, of a less private nature, to which we might resort for the substantiation of our narrative. We confess that the death bed scene we have alluded to, is beyond our power to *prove*, because its authenticity is under the seal of confidence—that is, so far as relates to the name of the person by whose testimony it has been described. But this much we are at liberty to state, that a lady, still alive, as we believe, who attended Dr. B. in his last illness, related the facts as we have stated them. She was either a relative of Dr. B., or otherwise a person in whose good offices he placed great confidence, and the surviving brothers will no doubt apprehend who she may be. But be this as it may, it is not the strongest evidence of what we asserted, but only corroborative of the leading fact. That on which we chiefly rely is a matter of public notoriety, and when mentioned, there will be little need to wish for the name of the death-bed witness, since there will be no room in any mind for a doubt upon that head.

“What we mean is this: that the Rev. John Breckinridge, notorious, if not distinguished, as a minister of the Presbyterian Church—a man who had been greatly flattered and applauded, for his zeal in opposing the ancient and only true Christian faith—having at last paid the debt for which all nature are in arrear, instead of being buried with the honours that are usually bestowed on the remains of eminent men, was, by his brothers, privately interred, if we mistake not, at Lexington, Ky. Such a fact did not fail to excite the astonishment of the people of that place; and when the reason was asked for so unusual an act, his Reverend brothers, with a callousness no where to be found but in the stern and unnatural creed to which they belong, gave out that he had lost his faith, and was unworthy of a Christian burial.”

“In reply to the complicated falsehoods,” of the above account, says Dr. W. Breckinridge, “I oppose the following statement, and for its correctness, I appeal to those who were in the region where the events took place:

“In the month of May, 1841, my brother, then in a very low state of health, reached the old family residence, some miles from Lexington—the abode of our father in his lifetime, then and

still of our aged mother—where he lingered till the 4th of August, when he expired in the faith and hope of the gospel, giving glory to God. His remains were interred the next day, as is the custom of the country, in the presence of a large number of persons—the kindred, friends, and neighbours of the family; his personal friends and brethren in the ministry; persons not only from the immediate neighborhood, but also from Lexington, and as is distinctly remembered, from Frankfort, twenty-five miles distant. In short, there was just such an assembly as is usual in this country under similar circumstances. The funeral services were conducted by the pastor of the church to which the family belong, the Rev. John Simrall. The body was borne to the grave, if I mistake not, by ministers of the gospel, followed by the brothers who are now charged with denying it Christian burial, and by many sympathizing friends. It was deposited in the old family burying ground, where the members and some friends of the family, have been buried for nearly fifty years, along with the remains of our father, John Breckinridge, and our elder brother, Joseph Cabell Breckinridge, men known and honored in their times, and with precisely the same demonstrations of respect and sorrow, both private and public, with which their dust had been deposited in that spot.

The other members of the family having devolved upon myself the duty of giving directions for the monument, I caused to be inscribed upon it the following. You may not admire the taste which dictated it, but you must admit that it utterly falsifies your story :

JOHN BRECKINRIDGE,

MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL.

Born July 4, 1797.

Died August 4, 1841.

“And I heard a voice from heaven, saying unto me, write, Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, from henceforth, yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours, and their works do follow them.”

This statement was so complete a refutation of the charge in question, that the authors of the calumny, out of regard to public sentiment, if from no higher motive, were constrained to retract the accusation.

The editors of the News Letter say in reference to the above statement, “We cordially acknowledge it bears upon its face an

air of truth which induces us to believe it. It is due, however, to the gentleman who wrote the former articles of the *News Letter*—and who is at present absent from the city—to say that nothing but a firm belief in the truth of the statements made by him could have prompted him to make them public. We know him to be a gentleman of high and honorable principles, utterly incapable of asserting anything touching the actions or the characters of others without the strongest convictions of its truth. We are confident that no one will more heartily approve of this act of justice to Dr. Breckinridge, than he, and we can safely say for ourselves and him, that whilst we regret the appearance of the misstatement in the columns of the *News Letter*, we rejoice that Dr. B. has been enabled to satisfy us of its incorrectness, and afforded us the opportunity of correcting it.” See *Catholic Advocate*, Louisville, September 5, 1846.

Thus ends this discreditable affair. The memory of a man dear to the whole Presbyterian church, has been vindicated in such a manner as to force an acknowledgment from the unwilling lips of those who have evinced a disposition to say and to believe anything, however preposterous, which they thought could gain credit with the most ignorant and prejudiced of his enemies.— Since even they have recanted, it is hoped no one can hereafter be found of sufficient hardihood to renew the charge.

ART. VII.—*Lectures on Mental Philosophy, and Theology.* By James Richards, D. D., late Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary at Auburn, New York. With a sketch of his Life, by Samuel H. Gridley, Pastor of the Presbyterian congregation, Waterloo, New York. New York: William M. Dodd. 1846. Svo. pp. 501.

JAMES RICHARDS was born in New Canaan, Connecticut, October 29, 1767. His father was a farmer, a man of good sense, and esteemed for his social and Christian virtues. His mother, Ruth Hanforth, was a woman of vigorous intellect, of consistent piety, and of uncompromising faithfulness in all matters of social duty,

of whom her son was accustomed to say, "She governed her family with her eye and forefinger."

Though of a delicate constitution, the subject of this memoir made such early progress in his studies, that at the age of thirteen, he taught a common district school with such success as to secure a renewal of his appointment as a teacher. His desire to secure a public education, was met with the difficulty that his father was not prepared to furnish him with the requisite means. He therefore turned his attention to some mechanical appointment, and became an apprentice to a cabinet maker. When, however, in his nineteenth year, he was brought personally to embrace the gospel, and to turn his heart to God, he determined to devote himself to the work of the ministry, and to seek the necessary literary preparation. His master kindly released him from his obligations, and he commenced his preparation for college under the Rev. Justus Mitchel, pastor of his native village. He entered Yale College in 1789, but, failing to avail himself of a foundation to meet his necessary expenses, he was obliged to leave the institution at the close of the freshman year. He subsequently pursued his studies privately, principally under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Burnet, of Norwalk, and of Dr. Dwight, then of Greenfield. In 1793 he was licensed to preach the gospel by the Association of the Western District of Fairfield Co., and the following year he received a call from the Presbyterian congregation, Morristown, N. J., and in 1797 was ordained as its pastor by the presbytery of New York. His success in his ministerial work was very great, and he rapidly gained the confidence and respect, not only of the congregation with which he was connected, but of the whole church. At the age of thirty-seven, he was elected the moderator of the General Assembly.

In 1809, Dr. Richards removed to Newark as successor of the Rev. Dr. Griffin in the pastoral charge of the first Presbyterian church in that city. He was early elected a trustee of the college of New Jersey, and in 1812 when the Theological Seminary was established at Princeton, he was chosen one of its directors. His name is connected with the origin and early history of several of the great benevolent institutions of the country. In Newark, as in Morristown, his ministry was eminently successful. After fifteen years of laborious service of the church of which he was the pastor, he removed to Auburn, in 1823, as professor of theology,

in the fifty-sixth year of his age. The Seminary in that place was established by the Synod of Geneva in 1819, with the sanction of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church. It was incorporated by a law of the state of New York in 1820, and by the act of incorporation was placed under the care of a Board of Trustees and a Board of Commissioners; the latter to be chosen annually, by the presbyteries named in the act and by other presbyteries which might afterwards associate with them. In 1821 the Seminary went into operation with three professors and twelve students. Not a professorship, however, was endowed, no sufficient library had been collected, and at the end of two years the number of students had diminished rather than increased. About this time Arthur Tappan, Esq., of New York, gave fifteen thousand dollars for the endowment of a professorship of Christian Theology. This donation and the election of Dr. Richards gave the institution a new impulse, and from that time it may be considered as firmly established. Owing to the inadequate provision, however, for its support, much of Dr. Richards's time and attention was devoted to financial matters, and it is to his influence and efforts that its successful establishment is in a great measure to be referred.

The years 1826 and 1827 were years of new and peculiar trial to Dr. Richards. The new divinity, the new measures, the new spirit, and new style of preaching connected with the name of Rev. Charles G. Finney, were then producing their appropriate fruits of fanatical excitement and spurious conversions. While the storm lasted every one who did not bend to it, it strove to break. Dr. Richards firmly and perseveringly bore his testimony against the false doctrines and evil spirit with which the churches in that region were infatuated. He was regarded as standing in the way of the Lord. He was preached against, prayed against, and every effort was made "to break him down," that is, to destroy the reputation and influence of a man who could not conscientiously join in these new measures. The result was such as might have been anticipated. The truth prevailed. The course taken by Dr. Richards was at last seen to be wise even by those who were not able to see so soon and so far as he did; and his reputation for discretion and piety only rose the higher for the efforts made to detract from it.

“The years 1837 and 1838 are never,” says Mr. Gridley, “to be forgotten in the Presbyterian church. The act of the General Assembly, in its summary excision of four synods, was matter of extreme pain and mortification to thousands of the best men of the church, and to none more than to Dr. Richards. He lived in the heart of one, and in the immediate neighbourhood of two more of the synods thus cut off. His position furnished him means of knowing their character both as to doctrine and practice. He was engaged in teaching theology, in a seminary specially fostered by these synods: and if views of doctrine and church order had prevailed upon this field essentially different from those taught in its own seminary, he must have known it. Yet he was able to see no adequate cause for the amputation which took place. Though he had taken occasion to resist some new measures, which at different times and in different places had found some favour, and also some innovations in doctrine, which, originating in other fields, had been brought into western New York; yet he firmly believed that the church and ministry connected with these synods, as a whole, deserved a place among the first in the order and faith of the Presbyterian name. And though he regretted to be separated from the ecclesiastical recognition of brethren, to whom his soul had been knit through all his Christian ministerial history, yet (to use the language of Dr. Cox, one of his colleagues) he preferred to be of the excised rather than of the excising.”

The regret here attributed to Dr. Richards was warmly reciprocated by his brethren. In the peculiar circumstances in which he was placed it was scarcely to be expected that he would take any other view of duty than that taken by the synod of which he was a member. We have no intention to discuss the question how far error in doctrine or fanaticism prevailed in western New York; nor do we feel disposed to detract from the high character which Mr. Gridley assigns to the churches and ministry of those synods. These questions have really nothing to do with the propriety or impropriety of the course adopted by the General Assembly. Its act was not passed on the ground of the corruption of those churches. The act bears upon the face of it, its own interpretation. The Assembly declared its willingness to remain in ecclesiastical connexion with those synods, on condition, not that they should become orthodox, not that the

ministers or members should become better men, but on the simple condition that they should become presbyterian. The act of union adopted in 1801, allowed in feeble and frontier settlements the admission of congregationalists as such to presbyterian churches and judicatories. Under this plan, and unknown to the church generally, there had grown up a vast heterogeneous body of presbyteries, synods and churches, which were neither one thing nor the other; which were all represented in the higher judicatories of the church, and had equal authority in the decision of all questions of presbyterian doctrine and discipline. In this way men who were never ordained, who had never adopted our standards, who were not subject to our tribunals, came to determine what presbyterianism was and what presbyterians should do. It was their votes which helped to decide whether certain doctrines were consistent with our standards, whether we should be allowed to have Boards of Domestic and Foreign Missions, and other matters no less vital to our interests. This was just as anomalous, and just as unfair as it would be for France to send members to the English parliament and appoint men to sit in English courts to administer English laws for Englishmen. The General Assembly determined that this unjust and anomalous system should cease. They therefore abolished the plan of union, which had been thus abused; and then required that all churches, presbyteries, and synods forming a part of the presbyterian church, and represented in the General Assembly, should conform to the presbyterian constitution. This was all they did. Is there anything so horrible in this? In applying this obviously just principle the Assembly had to deal with two classes of cases. The one, to which the synods of New Jersey and Albany belonged, was composed of those judicatories in which the congregational element was small. These judicatories the Assembly ordered to give the congregational churches within their bounds, the option of conforming to the constitution or of quietly withdrawing from our connexion. The other class, to which the synods of the Western Reserve, and those of Western New York belonged, consisted of judicatories in which the congregational element was either very strong or actually predominant. Those belonging to this class the Assembly dissolved, and directed them to reorganize, including no churches or ministers who were not willing to adopt our standards and conform to the

constitution. It is possible that the Assembly may have erred in judgment as to some of these synods. That to which Dr. Richards belonged might perhaps have been more properly included in the former of these two classes with those of New Jersey and Albany, than placed in the same category with that of the Western Reserve, some of whose presbyteries did not contain a single presbyterian church. But this was a mere error in judgment; a discourtesy and an inconvenience to that synod, but no real injury. The act excluded no presbytery, minister, or member from the presbyterian church. All they were required to do, was either to separate from the congregationalists, or to report that they had no congregational churches or ministers. Instead of doing this, all the synods concerned met in convention at Auburn, and resolved that they would not separate from the congregationalists; that they would not conform to the constitution of the church, while they insisted on being regarded as one of its constituent and governing portions. This we think was a mistake. We think the time cannot be far distant when it will be universally regarded as preposterous that any body not presbyterially organized should claim to be part of a presbyterian church, and as such exercise authority over presbyterians. We think too that those who took this step are beginning to see their error. As they refused to separate from congregationalists, congregationalists are beginning to separate from them. A western convention has already pronounced the Plan of Union an injustice and an absurdity, and a system of agitation in behalf of congregationalism is now in operation, which threatens to convince those who were slow of faith, that the decision of the Assembly of 1837, that presbyterians ought to be presbyterians, was neither unjust nor unwise.

The separation of the church was not effected by the decision of the Auburn convention to disregard the abrogation of the Plan of Union. That separation was accomplished by a still more extraordinary act. When the Assembly met in 1838, the delegates from all these presbyteries, some of them not including a single presbyterian church, presented themselves to be enrolled as members. They handed their commissions to the standing committee on commissions, which met before the meeting of the Assembly, and were rejected, the committee feeling that whether the action of the preceding Assembly was right or wrong, they

had no authority to reverse it. The course prescribed in the constitution when the commission of a delegate is rejected as irregular or invalid, is to refer the question to the house for decision. These delegates, however, took a different course. Instead of waiting until the house was organized, instead of waiting until the question could be entertained whether they were entitled to sit, while the officer appointed by the constitution was in the chair, one of their number rose and said, I move Dr. so and so take the chair, his associates said, aye. The new moderator then put the motion to adjourn, and walked out of the house followed by his followers, leaving the constitutional moderator and the great body of the Assembly behind them. Thus the separation was consummated. When the question, whether this seceding body was a secession or the true Presbyterian Church in the United States, entitled to all the corporate funds, institutions and powers of the church, was submitted to the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, that body pronounced them a secession, one judge dissenting. Time and the Providence of God have already, we think, pretty distinctly ratified this decision. As our New School brethren still continue to denounce the injustice of what they call "the excising acts" of 1837, it is necessary to repeat the statement of the case as it appears from our point of view, for the benefit of those to whom the history of those days is not familiar.

The lectures contained in this volume are not designed to form a system either of philosophy or theology. They are confined to a few points, such as the will, creation, second causes, the fall and depravity, extent of the atonement, election, effectual calling, justification, the prayer of faith, apostacy, ability and inability. They will sustain and extend the reputation of Dr. Richards as a man of vigorous sense and scriptural knowledge. His theology has much of a biblical form, and approaches far nearer to what is called old-schoolism, than what generally passes for new school divinity. There are few points, we presume, in which a little explanation as to the meaning of terms, would not have satisfied Dr. Richards that he and his Old School brethren were substantially agreed. This volume contains on the one hand little evidence of extensive reading of any kind; that is, there is very little reference either to the history of opinions, or to the writings of others; and on the other, it contains decisive

evidence that the author's reading had not been expended on the theological works of the Reformers and their successors of the seventeenth century. He frequently gives a sense to forms of expression, or statements of doctrine, which no one acquainted with those writers could suppose them to bear, and makes objections which presuppose a view of doctrines which they constantly disclaim.

The lecture on the extent of the atonement contains a great deal of truth, well presented, and differs we apprehend more in modes of expressions, than in reality, from the common doctrine of Calvinistic churches on that subject. The question is very loosely stated in the first instance. He asks, "Whether Christ died for all men, or for a part only?" which is a question which he himself would have to answer differently, according to the meaning put upon it. He understands those who said, "Christ's death was sufficient for all, and efficient for the elect," as meaning, "that while Christ's death opened the door for the salvation of all, so far as an expiatory sacrifice was concerned, it was designed, and by the sovereign grace of God, made effectual to the elect. Their belief was that Christ died intentionally to save those who were given to him in the covenant of redemption; but it does not appear that they supposed his death, considered as an expiatory offering, had any virtue in it, in relation to the elect, which it had not to the rest of mankind." p. 303. To all this he agrees; and to all this, though we should not prefer this language, we agree. We understand it to mean, that Christ died in execution of the covenant of redemption and with the specific, or as Dr. Richards repeatedly calls it, the ultimate, design of saving his own people; and that in accomplishing that object he did precisely what was necessary for the salvation of all men; so that his righteousness is just as well suited to one man as another, just as sufficient for the whole as for a part. This view of the matter which we understand to be that taken by Dr. Richards, is radically different from the common theory of a general atonement. According to that theory, God first willed the salvation of all men, then made salvation possible for all, and seeing none would accept it, elected some to eternal life. If this is so, then Christ did not come in execution of the covenant of redemption to save his own people, but in execution of a purpose to make salvation possible to all. Agreeably to the view given in our

standards God having elected some to everlasting life, sent his Son to redeem them. The purpose to send Christ is thus made subordinate to the purpose of election. According to the opposite view, the purpose of election does not precede, but follows the purpose of redemption. God purposes to redeem all men, and then to apply that redemption to some. The question is not which of these views is the more scriptural, we only remark that these are the two modes of apprehending the subject which distinguish the advocates of the opposite theories as to the design and extent of the atonement. And of these views Dr. Richards, under the influence of his scriptural knowledge, decides for that which distinguishes the advocates of the doctrine that Christ's death had a special reference to his own people, and that he did not die in any proper sense of the words, equally for all men. Dr. Richards very evidently does not understand this doctrine, in the sense in which it is really held by its advocates, and therefore he argues against it, while he really admits the great principle for which they contend. This of course leads to a misapprehension of the details of the system, and of the arguments by which it is sustained; and gives this lecture an aspect of being decidedly hostile to the common doctrine of the Reformed churches, when it is really directed against a doctrine those churches never held. We do not mean to say that mutual misapprehension is at the ground of the whole difference between Dr. Richards and Old School men on this subject; but we are well satisfied of two things, first, that far the greater part of the difference is to be referred to that source; and second, that the doctrine of Dr. Richards is immeasurably higher, better, more scriptural, saving and sanctifying than that taught by the younger President Edwards, and after him by such writers as Dr. Beman and Mr. Jenkyns.

Much the same remarks may be made of the Lecture on Justification. According to Dr. Beman's doctrine, Christ did not fulfil for us the demands of the law, he did not satisfy the justice of God, he simply opened the way for the pardon of sin. There is no such thing as justification; the possibility of pardon is all Christ has procured for us. Dr. Richards goes much beyond this. In answer to the question, What is justification? he quotes the reply to that question in the Shorter Catechism and the eleventh chapter of the Confession of

Faith, as containing "a clear and concise view of the subject." He represents the only proper ground of a sinner's confidence towards God to be "the meritorious obedience and sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ."

In reply to the question, "What is that righteousness on account of which God justifies us?" he argues to show first that it is not our personal righteousness according to the law; secondly, that it is not faith and its fruits, and thirdly, that it is the righteousness of Christ, and that this righteousness includes two things; "satisfaction to the penalty and obedience to the precept of the divine law." The two points in the lectures on this doctrine, in which Dr. Richards fails, it appears to us, to come up to the views given in our standards, are, his answer to the questions, "What is implied in our being justified before God?" and, "What is intended by the imputation of righteousness?" As to the former, while he rejects the idea that justification is mere pardon, and while he makes it consist in pardon and a title to eternal life; and teaches that it is founded on a righteousness, and therefore called a justification, p. 389; he says, "It is not pronouncing the sinner just in view of the law;" "the law is not made the rule of judgment, nor is the sentence pronounced according to this rule;" "God, in justifying men, therefore, in this way, does not proceed according to law, but as a sovereign judge, acts above law, in the same manner as the supreme magistrate acts above law, when he pardons a man condemned by the laws of his country." We of course, understand and admit the importance of the object intended to be answered by these cautions. Dr. Richards wishes to make it clear that there is nothing in the doctrine of justification which is inconsistent with the personal unworthiness and guilt of those who receive that blessing; to make it apparent that when God is said to justify men, he does pronounce sentence in their favour "on the ground of their personal innocence." This of course we admit. Justification is of grace; those justified are ungodly, and worthy of condemnation. Still we cannot admit that the modes of expression above quoted are strictly accurate or agreeable to scripture. A justification that is not according to law, in which the law is not made the rule of judgment, is a contradiction in terms. We can understand an act of pardon being above law, but an act of justification, as the word imports, must be

according to law. It is a declaration that the demands of the law are satisfied, as it relates to those in whose behalf the sentence is past. The ground of that sentence may be their personal innocence, or it may be, as we learn from scripture, the righteousness of another. Still it is no justification if it be not according to law, if it does not declare the law to be satisfied.— This, as we understand it, is the precise nature of the justification of believers, for Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. God justifies no man who has not the righteousness which his law demands; if not his own, he must receive as a gift the righteousness of Christ, and on the ground of that righteousness is not merely pardoned but justified.

The diversity of statement between Dr. Richards and ourselves on this subject, is no doubt due mainly to different modes of training. Still we regard the right or scriptural method of stating a doctrine so fundamental as justification to be a matter of no slight importance.

On the second question, What is intended by the imputation of Christ's righteousness? Dr. Richards says, "Every one who admits that the righteousness of Christ is the meritorious ground of our acceptance with God, must, to be consistent, admit that it is in some way imputed to us or reckoned to our account. But the question is, how is it imputed, and what is the nature of this imputation?" In answer to this question he says, 1. It is not so imputed as to become our personal righteousness. "The righteousness of one can never be so transferred as to become really and truly the righteousness of another. Sin and holiness, virtue and vice, are, in the very nature of things personal." 2. "The righteousness of Christ is imputed to the believer, much in the same manner as the worthiness of Joseph was imputed to his brethren, when they were kindly received by Pharaoh, and had the land of Goshen, the best part of Egypt, assigned to them." p. 401. "Herein is his righteousness reckoned or imputed to them, since by means of it they are treated in various important respects as they would have been, had they themselves been righteous. This is imputation, and the whole of it, so far as the question before us is concerned." p. 402.

With the negative part of this account of imputation we fully agree, but not with the positive part. We contend for no such imputation as implies a transfer of moral character, making a

man inherently sinful or holy. On the other hand, however, we do not admit, that the righteousness of Christ is in no other sense imputed to us, than the worthiness of Joseph was imputed to his brethren. This would imply that there is no more connection between believers and Christ, than between Joseph and his brothers. The union between Christ and his people is a legal, federal, vital union, established by God himself. No such union existed in the other case. Joseph did not perform his duty to Pharaoh in the name and for the sake of his brethren, and upon condition that they should have the land of Goshen. That gift was no part of the stipulated reward of Joseph; and his worthiness laid no foundation in justice, that Goshen should be assigned to his family. But Christ's righteousness was wrought out in the name and for the sake of his people, and upon the condition that on the ground of that righteousness, they should be justified. His righteousness therefore does lay a foundation in justice, for the salvation of believers, a claim arising out of no merit of theirs, and therefore not vesting in them, but arising out of the covenant of God and vesting in Christ. We understand, therefore, by the imputation of righteousness, such an ascription of the merits of Christ to believers, on the ground of the union between him and them, as to lay a foundation in justice for their complete justification in the sight of God. In himself, indeed, the believer is most unworthy, but inasmuch as God has covenanted to pardon and accept all those for whom Christ wrought out that righteousness, and forasmuch as that righteousness is a full and fair satisfaction to the demands of the law, those to whom it is imputed become entitled to eternal life. A title which presupposing their personal unworthiness, is founded in the transcending worthiness of their Lord and Saviour. This is a doctrine, therefore, in which grace and justice strangely meet, and therein is its blessedness and glory.

We cannot pursue this subject farther. While we are sensible that Dr. Richards's theology is not in all respects accordant with that which we have been taught to believe and made to love, we rejoice in the evidence furnished by this volume of his high moral and intellectual worth, and of the agreement between him and his old-school brethren in the great substantial points of evangelical doctrine.

ART. VIII.—*Dr. Martin Luther's Hauspostille, oder, Predigten über die Evangelien auf die Sonn-und vornehmsten Festtage des ganzen Jahrs.* Erste amerikanische Auflage nach Veit Dietrich. New York, Heinrich Ludwig. 1846. pp. 646. royal 8vo.

THE *Hauspostille* are discourses on the gospel for the day through the ecclesiastical year, and were delivered by Luther to the inmates of his own family. They comprise a series of instructions on the life of Christ. No writings of the reformer are more marked with his character than these. They are very simple, full of naïveté, proverbial pungency and sting; and to this day they speak to the very heart of every true German. What is better, they are full of the gospel. Christ is the one subject, from first to last, and he is held up in every variety of aspect, for the contemplation of believers. We rejoice in the publication of this book, at so low a price, and would gladly do anything within our power to ensure its circulation among our German population. After the holy scriptures, we know of nothing which is more likely to bring them back to the simplicity of the gospel. And we would respectfully urge on such of our readers as are interested in this portion of our people, to give currency to this edition. We are pleased to learn, that the same publisher proposes a similar edition of the *Kirchenpostille*, a larger work, which will be equally welcome.

Sacred Philosophy of the Seasons; illustrating the perfections of God, in the Phenomena of the Year. By the Rev. Henry Duncan, D. D. Ruthwell. *Autumn*, pp. 394. *Winter*, pp. 394, 12mo. New York. R. Carter. 1846.

WE have heretofore noticed the 'Spring' and 'Summer' of this series. This is the first genuine American reprint, though some of our readers may find on their shelves a Boston edition with the same title, adapted by a Socinian preacher, whose name we forget, to American, that is to Unitarian readers. The book is too good to be spoiled by such handling. Our approval of it has increased, as the work has gone on. It is a pleasing and most profitable means of introducing our youth to the connexion of Nature with Revelation, and it has the advantage of bringing

forward the latest discoveries and most advanced theories pertaining to physical history. These four volumes will sweeten each of the seasons to Christian hearts, especially in rural districts.

Owen Gladdon's Wanderings in the Isle of Wight. By Old Humphrey. New York. 1846. 18mo. pp. 213. R. Carter.

THE worthy old gentleman, who, under the name of 'Old Humphrey' has written so many books for the Religious Tract Society, has in our opinion used his measure of talent to the greatest possible advantage. Without being, in any sense of the word, a great man, he has been the instrument of great good. We may give his books to our children, with an assurance that they are innocent. Further than this, they convey a great deal of most useful matter, without the vehicle of romantic fiction; and they breathe the spirit of the gospel. Besides this, there is a chirping pleasantry about the gossip of the good old gentleman, which always disposes the reader to good humour, and if his poetry is often like that of Bunyan, it is but just to say, that his prose now and then reminds one of the immortal Dreamer's superior vein.

The Christian Contemplated, in a course of lectures, delivered in Argyle Chapel, Bath. By William Jay. American Tract Society. 18mo. pp. 378.

THERE is a charm about Mr. Jay's writings, which renders him an almost universal favourite. Though not so exuberant as Hamilton, we know of no living writer of religious works who may compare with him in freshness and vivacity. The perpetual varying of the theme brings to our mind the *ramage* of some happy summer bird. And what can we demand of a Christian writer, more than to give us the old, yea the oldest, truths, in the newest garb? This Mr. Jay does; and he who could weary of reading him, would weary of a nightingale. The very best portion of this work, if we may judge, is in the small type of the preface. Nowhere have we met with more valuable hints on preaching. Coming as they do from the pen of an aged, a successful, and a great preacher, they ought to be pondered by all young ministers. To such, and to all students in divinity, we recommend them, in the nature of a caveat against the prim

method and stilted dullness which are threatening our pulpits. The influence of the ministry must rapidly decrease, unless our young preacher can put off the coldness and precision, and absence of all juvenile efflorescence, which better befits septuagenary orators, than such as might be expected to rise and address us with the vehemence and *abandon* of early zeal.

Thoughts and Counsels for the Impenitent. By the Rev. J. M. Olmstead. New York. R. Carter. 1846. 18mo. pp. 284.

THE author is pastor of a Presbyterian Church in Flemington, N. J. His work needs no apology. Of sound and affectionate invitations and warnings to impenitent sinners, we cannot have too many. The work is earnest and fitted to do good. While the author has spent his chief strength on the awakening topics, indicated by the title, he has not left out of view the glorious remedy. Yet we should be gratified, if, in subsequent editions the matter of the last chapter could be somewhat enlarged; so as to render more prominent the work of Christ, the nature of conversion, and especially that faith by which the soul is united to Christ. The suggestions of the writer on these subjects strike us as altogether conformed to the orthodox system.

A Greek Reader, selected chiefly from Jacob's Greek Reader, adapted to Bullions' Greek Grammar, with an Introduction on the Idioms of the Greek Language, Notes, critical and explanatory, and an improved Lexicon. By Peter Bullions, D. D., Professor of Languages in the Albany Academy; and author of the series of grammars, Greek, Latin, and English, on the same plan, etc., etc. New York. Pratt, Woodford & Co. 1846. 12mo. pp. 540.

ON opening this volume, we perceive that it has one grand excellency as a class book; it is beautifully printed, in large and clear type. So far as we have been able to examine it, every part shows the care, labour and erudition, by which all Dr. Bullions' writings have been characterized. Though not altogether favorable to the use of *Collectanea* in teaching the classics, we are fully aware that the popular current in this direction is too strong to be resisted, and we therefore rejoice to see the compilation of such manuals in safe hands. The introduction, on Greek idioms, is plainly the fruit of much labour, and contains

matter of the highest value on this important subject. It may, however, be questioned whether, at the stage of progress for which this selection is adapted, the necessity of a treatise separate from the ordinary grammar is sufficiently great to justify such an enlargement of the volume. But we nevertheless prize and commend the performance. The Lexicon is remarkably convenient, and the references and notes constitute a body of apparatus, which must be equally helpful to teacher and scholar.

The Genuineness, Authenticity, and Inspiration of the Word of God. By the editor of "Bagster's Comprehensive Bible." New York. R. Carter. 1846. 12mo. pp. 337.

THIS work appeared in London in 1831. It is a compendious introduction to the Holy Scriptures, and evinces much diligence and fidelity of compilation. It treats, with more detail than is usual in a book of the size, of the Genuineness of the Sacred Scriptures; of their Authenticity; and of their Inspiration. The amount of references to the text is truly surprising. A large portion of the treatise is made up of just such matter as will fit the pious though unlearned reader to cope with the infidel cavillers of our day.

Protestant Episcopal Views of Baptism, explained and defended.

By J. H. Fowles, Rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia. Philadelphia: H. Hooker. 1846. 18mo. pp. 196.

EVERY page of this little book goes to show that the author is an affectionate adherent of the great evangelical doctrines of the Reformation, which have been so violently impugned in our day. His mode of reasoning also bears witness to training of mind in the same masculine school. His argument in favour of Infant Baptism, and his vindication of the mode which we employ, are specimens of sound reasoning. More especially does he appear in opposition to the Tractarian doctrine of the Sacraments; and in all that he has written on this point, we recognise him as a strong and faithful son of the Reformation. No American writer, on this subject within our knowledge, has uttered a more full and and distinct testimony to evangelical truth.

We are not so well satisfied, when Mr. Fowles proceeds to defend the phraseology of the office for the Baptism of Children. He has here assumed a difficult task, and one in which above all

others Evangelical Episcopalians labour at a great disadvantage. The Book of Common Prayer, as a human composition, is not immaculate, and retains some lingering blemishes of the Romish liturgy, from which it was compiled. With all respect and charity for those who think otherwise, and who in the fondness of affection would acknowledge not even a mole upon the cheek of their beloved mother, we must be allowed to consider these passages as unguarded and ensnaring. Mr. Fowles admits that the Baptismal offices have been the occasion, though innocent, of mischief; that under them, even Romanists have found a hiding-place within the fold; that *multitudes* have deemed themselves thereby authorized in, if not absolutely forced to, the adoption of the worst Tractarian errors. He admits also that "those very individuals, whom the minister, at the font, has declared to be born again, he is bound (when the hope in their case has been proved by their after life to be vain,) to address as impenitent, unrenewed, the children of wrath, and heirs of hell." Now these are admissions, which are of themselves fitted to make any charitable mind pause, before he would impose such phraseology upon all who come to a divine ordinance.

To one who, with the Papists, believes in the *opus operatum* of the sacraments, these declarations are easy and natural; they need no cautious or ingenious explanation: and we might well challenge any one to frame a form of speech, which in so few words should more explicitly and completely body forth their tenet. This may well awaken inquiry, whether amidst the acknowledged tendencies of mankind toward such abuses, these are the best and safest phrases for the inculcation of the pure doctrine.

The author fully clears himself from the possibility of suspicion that he favours these errors: he has triumphantly refuted them; and we know not that we have a syllable to add or to alter, in regard to his doctrine of the sacraments. But in the very same proportion is it difficult for him to sustain the forms in question.

These forms are in language of great strength. Thus, in the Catechism: "Baptism; wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven." In the Office for Public Baptism: "We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate

this child." And in the Office for Private Baptism: "We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit." These expressions we understand Mr. Fowles not only to allow, but to contend for. He even warns objectors, lest they implicate in their fault-finding, the Lord Jesus Christ himself, and the Spirit of Inspiration, throughout the Holy Volume.

After a candid and assiduous examination of the pages which discuss this point, we consider all the arguments of the author as reducing themselves to two. *First*, that men, who cannot read the heart, when admitted to church-seals, may speak of one another as possessing the graces, of which such seals are the sign. We do not knowingly weaken or modify the reason here alleged; it is, after all, the only one of any weight; and we yield to it a certain degree of speciousness. The prophets, it is alleged, addressed ungodly men, as the people of God. The apostles, without discrimination, addressed, as saints, communities in which were unrenewed souls. We are therefore justified (such is the argument) in declaring to God that in a given instance, regeneration has taken place. But, according to the author's own showing, in the case both of prophets and apostles, there are phrases of caution and qualification in the context, which so limit the sense in which those of old were called God's people, that they are the very phrases which our author brings to prove that these were 'corrupters' and unrenewed. And there are no such qualifying expressions in the Baptismal Office. Again, it is one thing to address a collective body as holy or as saints, even though some of its members may not be such; and another thing, to address God with regard to a given individual, with the assertion that he is regenerated by the Holy Ghost. In the former case, agreeably to the maxim, *nomen a potiori*, we entitle the whole after its better or supposedly larger part; and in the last resort the words uttered are really addressed to those who are true believers. Again, it is one thing for us to address one another, as in charitable belief that we are sanctified, and another thing to declare to God, that a given individual is such. There is no hypothetical phrase: all is categorical. And the most solemn and weighty of all asseverations is that which is made to God. There is something very serious, to our apprehension, in making a declaration to the God of heaven, which, according

to the admissions, must in a number of instances be contrary to the facts. The plain state of the case is this: Almighty God is solemnly told, in repeated instances, that he has regenerated such and such persons, whom he has not regenerated at all. The imposition of a formula which has such results, is, in our judgment, unwarrantable.

We unite with Mr. Fowles, in the joyful belief, that infant souls are capable of regeneration, and welcome him as an able champion against some in his own church as well as ours; we grant that many are renewed in childhood, and some we doubt not, during the very sacramental administration. And could we know this, in any case, we should rejoice and give thanks for it. But no degree of faith in a parent, short of the {faith of inspiration, can enable him to declare to God that a given infant is actually regenerated. Such belief is no act of faith; for faith is correlative to revealed truth; and least of all is it such, in those numerous acknowledged instances, where the proposition believed is the direct reverse of the fact.

Again, this whole argument, from charitable estimate of our neighbour, fails of all application to the words in the Catechism. Here the judgment is not of another but of *himself*; and the catechumen is instructed to say of himself, "I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven."

Secondly, our author vindicates the office, for this reason, that great efficacy is sometimes attributed to baptism by inspired men. But *what* efficacy? not the inseparable adjunct of inward renewing grace; this is Popery, this is Puseyism, this is what Mr. Fowles, no less than we, abhors. For so much efficacy as is always present in the sacrament, we are ready to give thanks to God. For so much efficacy as is probably communicated, we are ready to give thanks, as hopeful expectants. But the instance of a baptized, unregenerate child, is one concerning which we dare not make declarations to the infinite Majesty, contrary to the truth of events; and this we should day by day run the risk of doing, in the use of such formularies.

That our author, and those who are likeminded, offer these devotions in humble sincerity and good faith, without quibble or subterfuge, we are right sure. They have accustomed themselves to accompany the words with necessary cautions, such as

are here given. Such cautions, in our humble judgment, should without delay be incorporated into the Office.

It is but in a few pages of the work that this matter is treated. As a whole, we receive it gladly, as a noble attestation to those doctrines in which the churches of the Reformation are united. And it is our earnest desire, that the able and excellent author may continue to favour us with similar productions.

Companion to the Font and the Pulpit. By the Right Rev. William Meade, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Virginia. Washington: 1846. pp. 147.

THIS work, like the preceding, is a treatise on Baptism. Like that, it is also distinctly evangelical, and openly opposed to Puseyism. Here and there we alight on an expression which indicates a system somewhat lower in doctrine than that in which we have been educated; but the work is able and pleasing, and its tendency is generally in favour of just views in theology. It is written in a gentle and persuasive manner, which does not detract from the cogency of its serious and strong denunciation of prevalent error. In regard to the Baptismal offices, Bishop Meade discusses the meaning of the terms 'regeneration' and 'born again.' As applied to this ordinance, he does not consider them as importing a moral change. He rejects the doctrine of a germ of grace, or incipient act of the Spirit, coincident with the baptismal act. If we understand him, he regards the words in question as employed in an ancient and patristical sense, to indicate a change of ecclesiastical relation. We most freely admit the excellence of much that Bishop Meade says on these points, but at the same time find ourselves unable to follow him in his argument for the formulary. It is manifest that the terms need much explanation; quite as much as the first collect in the office of Confirmation, which was amended, we believe, in 1836. The bishops, in proposing this change, urged as a reason, that it was to "correct injurious misapprehensions as to the meaning of certain terms." We lament that in a case of equal danger and misapprehension, some amendment has not been offered.

Memoir of Mrs. Catharine M. Dimmick. By L. M. Dimmick,

Pastor of the North Church, Newburyport. Boston: T. R. Marvin. 1846. 12mo. pp. 214.

THERE is something sacred in the affectionate tribute of a Christian minister to the memory of a departed wife; and such a tribute was deserved by the subject of this memoir. It is prepared with unusual modesty, and a singular freedom from exaggeration. Mrs. Dimmick was a woman of well-balanced powers, good education, sound judgment, enlightened zeal, and multiplied labours. The effusions of her pen are all worthy of preservation. There is a uniform sobriety in the memoir, which is well conformed to the character which it portrays; and we think it may prove a valuable aid to Christian women, in the prosecution of their work.

A History of the Churches of all Denominations, in the City of New York, from the first settlement to the year 1846. By Jonathan Greenleaf, Pastor of the Wallabout Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn. New York: E. French, 136 Nassau street. 1846. 18mo. pp. 379.

NONE but those who have undertaken such labours, will duly appreciate the time and toil necessary to the production of a statistical book like this. We welcome every such contribution to our history, and especially to our church-history. From our knowledge of the respected author, we expected a work of diligent research and scrupulous accuracy; and we have not been disappointed. The reader will here find the history of two hundred and seventeen existing churches, and of sixty others which are now extinct. The account of the venerable Dutch Church is particularly interesting. The old stone church within the fort was erected in 1642. The beginnings of Presbyterian worship are also related. Among other interesting facts, there are some which relate to the Jewish population of New York. As many as nine synagogues are here noticed, and we are informed that another has been founded since the publication of this volume. As a most valuable book of reference, we need only name this production to our readers, to secure their attention to it.

Memoir of the late Alexander Proudfit, D. D., with selections from his Diary and Correspondence, and Recollections of his life, &c., by his Son. By John Forsyth, D. D., Minister of

Union Church, Newburgh. New York: 1846. 12mo. pp. 384.

IN consideration of the intrinsic value of the book, and of our respect for its subject, an earlier notice should have been taken of this volume. The truth is, it has first reached our hands only at an hour when the impression of our number is almost complete. Dr. Proudfit is one of those men, whose name will be held precious in eternity. He was a sound, accurate, and able theologian, an earnest and laborious preacher, a zealous philanthropist, and a warm and affectionate servant of the doctrines of grace. We would that we could point to many more, presenting, like him, the type of genuine, ancient Presbyterianism. Far more gladly would we live his life, than that of hundreds, whose reputation has more eclat. We counsel the friends of truth and piety not to remain ignorant of this volume.

The Night of Weeping; or Words for the suffering Family of God. By the Rev. Horatius Bonar. From the third London Edition. New York: Robert Carter. 1846. 18mo. pp. 180.

IN the present great revival of religion in the Free Church of Scotland, it is by no means the least pleasing sign, that books of an experimental and practical kind are proceeding from her ministers. Here is one from a member of a family which has presented many sons to the ministry of Christ. The little book is fraught with consolation. In this it is very unlike a large class of American volumes on religion, which are hard, legal, wiry, forbidding, and in the same proportion un-Christ-like. It is plain but lively, reminding us of the writers of two centuries ago. Without the brilliancy of Hamilton, Mr. Bonar has much of his animation and all his unction. Our young preachers would do their hearers a kindness, if they would catch some of this glow. We could find in these pages offences against good taste and against English usage of language; but what are these flaws in the vessel, when it carries to our lips the sincere milk of the word?

The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, &c., &c. By Joseph Butler, D. C. L. Lord Bishop of Durham, and Daniel Wilson, D. D., Bishop of Calcutta. New York: Robert Carter. 1846. Svo. pp. 436.

WE know not that Mr. Carter has ever issued a finer specimen

of typography from his prolific press. It merits more than this passing notice. Of Butler's immortal work, we have scarcely a word to say. We might apply to it Quintilian's famous remark concerning Cicero: it has been a favourite of all great minds. No one would for an instant think of placing Bishop Wilson on the same level; and least of all would that excellent and truly distinguished man so deem of himself. He has aspired only to help the common reader up to the threshold of the Analogy; and this is an introductory process which Butler unquestionably demands. Bishop Wilson's Essay gives a review or summary of the work, as an aid to the inexperienced reader. But his principal aim is to point out the connexion of this argument, with the other main branches of the Evidences of Christianity; to notice its uses and importance; and to offer some remarks on Butler's particular view of Christianity itself, and on the adaptation of his argument to practical religion. By this means, a defect of warmth, which every one feels in the original work, is supplied, and the consolation and life of the Gospel are shown to be not inconsistent with this great intellectual process of defence.

Union to Christ. By R. Taylor, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Shrewsbury, N. J. New York. M. W. Dodd. 1846. 12mo. pp. 96.

THIS is an excellent little book. The whole subject of which it treats, is presented in a very simple and condensed form, under the following heads. The nature of the Believer's Union to Christ, stated first negatively, and then positively. The importance of this union. The Perpetuity of it. The Benefits derived from it. Evidences of this Union, and the practical inferences from the subject. We regard the work as creditable to its author and adapted to promote truth and piety.

Uses of Adversity, and the Provisions of Consolation. By Rev. Herman Hooker, author of "The Portion of the Soul," "Popular Infidelity." Philadelphia. H. Hooker. 1846. 12mo. pp. 151.

MR. HOOKER has won for himself a distinguished rank among our practical religious writers. The little work before us evinces the same refinement of thought, the same chasteness of man-

ner, and the same tone of spiritual feeling apparent in the other productions of his pen. No one can read this book without profit ; without feeling how rich are the sources of comfort open to us in the intercession, sympathy, and providence of Christ. We believe fully with Mr. Hooker, that "Love is the true solvent of grief." "Philosophy and pleasure do but intrude upon and aggravate our grief. But love, the light of God, may chase away the gloom of this hour and start up in the soul trusts, which give us the victory over ourselves. The harp of the spirit, though its cords be torn, never yields such sweet notes, such swelling harmony, as when the world can draw no music from it." This, as the author shows, is true, even when the object of love is our fellow men, and more abundantly true when the soul is filled with the love of God. The joy of that consolation absorbs and elevates all co-existing emotions, and makes even grief an element of blessedness.

Lectures on the Moral Imperfections of Christians; designed to show that while sinless perfection is obligatory on all, it is attained by none. By Seth Williston, author of the "Harmony of Divine Truth," "A Vindication of the Doctrines of the Reformation," &c. New York. M. W. Dodd. 1846. 12mo. pp. 262.

THERE is a great deal of quiet strength evinced in this book, and much of the authority of scriptural truth. The author first examines the arguments of perfectionists in support of their doctrine, and then produces the evidence of the truth of the position that Christians, while on earth, never reach a state of sinless perfection. The eleventh lecture is founded upon 1 John i. 8, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us," and is designed to show that "a claim to sinless perfection is a sign of an unregenerate state." The author first shows that such a denial of sin as is intended in the text, is declared to be a proof of a graceless state ; and then that the text does not suppose a claim to perfect innocence, but to perfect sanctification, and consequently that this latter claim is a proof of the unregenerate condition of those who make it. John does not teach that if we say "we have never sinned the truth is not in us," but if we say, "we are completely sanctified the truth is not in us." Mr. Williston therefore teaches that

“the claim to perfect sanctification, should be considered as decisive proof that they who make it have no sanctification at all.” We cannot resist his arguments in support of this position. We must remember, however, that logic, at least our logic, often leads to conclusions which are contrary to facts. We believe that Mr. Williston’s reasoning is sound and his conclusion just; and yet we believe that many good men have asserted a claim to complete sanctification. The difficulty lies in the meaning of the terms. Such freedom from sin, such complete sanctification, as Mr. Williston has in his mind, we believe no true Christian can ever claim in this life. And what our author means by these expressions, we doubt not is just what they naturally mean, and what the scriptures intend. And such freedom from sin, as excludes the idea of a present sense of ill-desert, a consciousness of present defilement and unworthiness in the sight of God, or which precludes the necessity of daily and hourly confession and prayer for pardon, we cannot conceive any man to claim who knows his own heart or the law of God. And we fear it is precisely this kind of freedom from all sin, that multitudes who claim to be perfect, do really intend. But we doubt not that many avail themselves of the distinction between legal and evangelical perfection, and while they admit that judged by the law they are constantly in a state that would lead to their condemnation; yet when judged by the gospel, there is nothing in them that calls for such condemnation. They thus contrive to reconcile their Christian experience with their vicious theory. We do not wish to depreciate the evil of Perfectionism under any form; but merely to state how it is that while we admit the soundness of Mr. Williston’s reasoning, we are not prepared to admit that all who claim complete sanctification, give decisive evidence of having no sanctification at all. That depends upon what they mean by complete sanctification. If they mean by it what the phrase properly means, and what Mr. Williston means, we think the conclusion just. But if they mean what some good men doubtless do intend when they claim to be free from sin, though it proves great mystification and great error as to the nature of the gospel, it does not prove that they are in an unregenerate state. The doctrine is bad enough in its best form. And as to the form in which it is presented by Wesley in his Sermon on Christian Perfection, we must say we cannot conceive

how any man, who is not in a very low state of sanctification, can claim the perfection which he there describes. We never saw a man perfect in his own esteem, who did not give lamentable proof of imperfection to all others.

The Annual Address delivered before the General Union Philosophical Society of Dickinson College. By Rev. T. V. Moore. Philadelphia. 1846.

MR. MOORE chose for the topic of his address, "The relation of Christianity to modern civilization." The plan of the discourse is stated in the following paragraph. "I propose" says the writer, "to discuss the proposition announced first, by taking up Roman civilization, at the point where Christianity came in contact with it, exhibiting those inherent defects in it that produced its destruction, and showing the peculiar adaptation of Christianity to supply these defects; then by showing the actual influence of Christianity on the successive forms of society that have issued in the form now existing; and finally, by deducing from this historical induction, its present relation and future agency in the prevailing form of the world's civilization."

This plan is carried out with clearness and force, giving to this address a much higher character than commonly belongs to productions of this kind.

1. *A First Latin Book.* By Thomas K. Arnold, M. A., carefully revised and corrected by Rev. J. A. Spencer, A. M. Appleton & Co. 1846.
2. *A Practical Introduction to Latin Prose Composition.* By Thomas K. Arnold, M. A., carefully revised and corrected by Rev. J. A. Spencer, A. M. Appleton & Co. 1846.
3. *Cornelius Nepos: with answered questions and imitative exercises. Part I.* By Rev. Thomas K. Arnold, M. A. Revised and corrected by E. A. Johnson, Professor of Latin in the University of the City of New York. Appleton & Co. 1846.

WE have seen few school books issued in a style equal to these three. The paper, type, binding, and, so far as we have explored them, the mechanical accuracy of these volumes, is equal to any reasonable demands of the purchaser. We have not a sufficient acquaintance with them, as yet, to express very definite opinions

of their intrinsic merits, though the partial examination we have been able to make, has impressed us favourably. There is, it seems to us, no more serious desideratum in the current teaching of Latin, than the introduction of more thorough, frequent, and persevering composition in that language. We fully believe that the work should begin simultaneously with the rendering of Latin into English, and go on with it *pari passu*. A competent instructor may effect this, we are aware, by means of those manuals which are already in use, or without the assistance of a book at all. At the same time we venture the opinion that no one of those in use is altogether satisfactory to any experienced classical teacher. We know that the only true criterion of a class book is actual experiment in the school-room; but as far as our inspection warrants an opinion, we should prefer the first and second of the above volumes to any we have yet employed. To those teachers who use Nepos as an elementary book, this edition, we doubt not, will be very acceptable. The diligent use of such books can hardly fail to lay the foundation of accurate and thorough scholarship.

Manliness in Youth. A Discourse delivered in the North Dutch Church, New York, and published at the request of the young men who heard it. By the Rev. D. Magie, D. D., of Elizabethtown, New Jersey. Printed by Daniel Fanshaw, 150 Nassau street. 1846. pp. 32.

THIS is a well digested discourse, abounding in wholesome counsel, and written in a pleasing style. It aims to impress the minds of young men with the obligation resting upon them, to acquire such mental culture, and to form such habits, as will make them men of elevated views and feelings, and will qualify them to discharge in a proper manner, all their personal and relative duties. Most cordially do we commend the lessons inculcated to the serious consideration of all young men, who may have any respect for our judgment, as it is our belief that an ingenuous youth cannot fail to derive benefit from a careful perusal of this truly excellent discourse.













