





THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1847.

No. IV.

ART. I.—*Memoirs of the Life of the Rev. Charles Simeon, M. A., late Senior Fellow of King's College, and Minister of Trinity Church, Cambridge*, with a selection from his writings and correspondence; edited by the Rev. William Carus, M. A., Fellow and Senior Dean of Trinity College, and Minister of Trinity Church, Cambridge. The American edition edited by the Right Rev. Charles P. McIlvaine, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, for the Diocese of Ohio. New York, Robert Carter, 58 Canal street: Pittsburg, 56 Market street.

THE Rev. Charles Simeon was a burning and a shining light in the English church in his day. Although there were among his contemporaries, men of greater genius and greater learning, yet it may reasonably be doubted, whether any individual, during the period of his ministry, left so extensive and so deep an impression on the public mind, as Mr. Simeon. In our opinion, evangelical religion, in the Church of England, owes more to his exertions, under the blessing of God, than to the labours of any one man. The reader, however, will be better able to form a

judgment of this matter, when he has perused the following brief narrative of his life, derived entirely from the extended "memoir" contained in the volume, the title of which is placed at the head of this article.

Mr. Simeon was honourably descended, both by the father's and mother's side, and was born at Reading, September 24, 1758. At an early age, he was sent to the Royal College, at Eton; and after a due course of study, succeeded to a scholarship in King's College, Cambridge. The characteristics of his youth, which were most remarkable were, great sprightliness and vehemence of temper, and a strong propensity to exercises and sports, which required great bodily agility. In his moral conduct, though not free from juvenile faults, he was by no means profligate; notwithstanding the strong expressions of self-condemnation which he made use of, when his eyes were opened to see the malignity of sin.

His religious views and exercises may be best learned from the narrative which he has left of his own experience, written in 1823:

"I begin then with my early life. But what an awful scene does that present to my view! Never have I reviewed it, for thirty-four years past, nor even can I to my dying hour, without the deepest shame and sorrow. My vanity, my folly, my wickedness, God alone knoweth, or can bear to know. To enter into a detail of particulars would answer no good end. If I be found at last a prodigal restored to his father's house, God will in no ordinary measure be glorified in me; the abundance of my sinfulness will display in most affecting colours, the superabundance of his grace.

"On my coming to college, in 1779, it was but the third day after my arrival that I understood, that I should be expected in the space of about three weeks, to attend the Lord's Supper. What! said I, *must* I attend? On being informed that I *must*, the thought rushed into my mind, that Satan himself was as fit to attend as I, and that if I must attend, I must *prepare* for my attendance there. Without a moment's loss of time, I bought the old "Whole Duty of Man," (the only religious book that I had ever heard of) and began to read it with great diligence, at the same time re-calling my ways to remembrance, praying to God for mercy; and so earnest was I in these exercises, that in three

weeks I made myself quite ill, with reading, fasting, and prayer. From that day to this, blessed, forever blessed be my God, I have never ceased to regard the salvation of my soul as the one thing needful. I am far from considering it a good thing that young men in the university should be compelled to go to the table of the Lord; for it has an evident tendency to lower in their estimation that sacred ordinance, and to harden them in their iniquities.

“I continued with unabated earnestness to search and mourn over the numberless iniquities of my former life; and so greatly was my mind oppressed with the weight of them, that I frequently looked upon the dogs with envy, wishing, if it were possible, that I could be blessed with their mortality, and they be cursed with immortality in my stead. I set myself immediately to undo all my former sins, as far as I could, and did so in some instances which required great self-denial.

“My distress of mind continued for about three months, and well might it have continued for years, for my sins were more in number than the hairs of my head, or than the sands on the sea shore; but God, at last, in infinite condescension, began to smile upon me, and to give me a hope of acceptance with him. The circumstances attendant on this were very peculiar. My efforts to remedy my former misdeeds had been steadily pursued, and in a manner that leaves me no doubt to whose gracious assistance they were owing; and in comparison of approving myself to God in this matter, I made no account of shame or loss, or any thing in the world; and if I could have practised it to a far greater extent, with the ultimate hope of benefit to myself and others, I think I should have done it. In proportion as I proceeded in this work, I felt hope springing up in my mind, but it was an indistinct kind of hope, founded on God’s mercy to real penitents. But in Easter week, as I was reading bishop Wilson on the Lord’s Supper, I met with an expression to this effect, ‘That the Jews knew what they did when they transferred their sin to the head of the offering.’ The thought rushed into my mind, ‘What! may I transfer all my guilt to another? Has God provided an offering for me, that I may lay my sins on his head? then, God willing, I will not bear them on my own soul another moment longer.’ Accordingly, I sought to lay my sins on the sacred head of Jesus; and on the Wednesday began to have a hope of mercy; on Thursday, that hope increased; on Friday

and Saturday it became more strong, and on the Sunday morning I awoke early, with those words on my heart and lips, "Jesus Christ is risen to-day. Hallelujah, hallelujah." From that hour, peace flowed in rich abundance into my soul; and at the Lord's table in our chapel, I had the sweetest access to God, through my blessed Saviour.

"From the time I found peace in my own soul, I was desirous to impart to others the benefits I had received. I therefore adopted a measure which must have appeared most singular to others, and which, perhaps, a more matured judgment might have disapproved; but I acted in the simplicity of my heart, and I am persuaded that God accepted it at my hands. I told my servant, that inasmuch as she and the other servants were prevented almost entirely from going to church, I would do my best to instruct them on Sunday evening, if they chose to come for that purpose. Several of them thankfully availed themselves of the offer, and came to me, and I read some good book to them, and used some of the prayers of the Liturgy for prayer, and though I do not know that any of them received substantial benefit to their souls, I think that the opportunities were not lost on myself; for I thereby cultivated a spirit of benevolence, and fulfilled in some measure that divine precept, 'Freely ye have received, freely give.'

"In the long vacation, I went home, and carried with me the same blessed desires. I had a brother, eight years older than myself, living with my father and managing as it were the house. I wished to instruct the servants, and to unite with them in family prayer; but I had no hope that a proposal of that kind would be acceded to, either by my father or brother. I therefore proposed it to the servants and established it myself, leaving it to my brother to join us or not, as he saw good. To my great joy, after it was established, my brother cordially united with me, and we stately worshipped God in the family, morning and evening. I take for granted that my father knew of it, but I do not remember that one word ever passed between him and me on the subject."

Hitherto Mr. Simeon had no acquaintance with any truly religious persons, and he knew but little of the snares and temptations to which young disciples were exposed; and was very imperfectly instructed in what related to Christian duty. It was

not long, therefore, before Satan got an advantage over him, and led him into a disgraceful course. Having been accustomed to attend the *races*, he now went, without knowing it to be wrong; and an acquaintance engaged him in a game of cricket, and persuaded him to remain with him several days, at Windsor. "On Sunday," says he, "he proposed to go and visit a friend about fifteen miles off; and to that proposal I acceded. Here, I sinned against God and my own conscience; for although I knew not the evil of races and balls, I knew full well that I ought to keep holy the Sabbath day. He carried me about ten miles in his phaeton, and then we proceeded the remainder of the way on horseback. The day was hot, it was about the 26th of August, 1779; and when we arrived at the gentleman's house, I drank a good deal of cool tankard. And, after dinner, not aware of the strength of the cool tankard, I drank wine just as I should have done, if I had drunk nothing else; and when I came to return on horseback, I was in a state of utter intoxication. The motion of the horse increased the effect of the liquor, and deprived me entirely of my senses. Major B. rode before, and I followed; but my horse, just before I came to a very large heath, turned in to an inn, and the people seeing my state, took me off the horse. Major B., not seeing me behind, rode back to inquire for me; and when he found what condition I was in, he put me into a post-chaise, and carried me to the inn where we had taken our horses. Here we were forced to stop all night. The next morning we returned in his phaeton to Windsor. I do not recollect, whether my feelings were very acute that day; I rather think not. The next morning we went to a public breakfast and a dance, at Egham, which at that time was always on the Tuesday ensuing after the races. There I spent an hour or two, and after returning with him to Windsor, I proceeded on my way to Reading. I went through Salthill, and seeing Mrs. Marsh standing at her inn-door, I entered into a little conversation with her. She asked me whether I had heard of the accident which had happened to a *gentleman of Reading*, on the Sunday evening before, and then told me that a gentleman from Reading had fallen from his horse in a state of intoxication, and had been killed on the spot. What were my feelings now! I had eighteen miles to ride, and all alone. How was I filled with wonder at the mercy of God towards me! Why was it not myself in-

stead of the other gentleman? Why was he taken and I left? And what must have been my state to all eternity, if I had then been taken away? In violating the Sabbath, I had sinned deliberately, and for doing so, God had left me to all the other sins that followed. How shall I adore his name to all eternity, that He did not cut me off in these sins, and make me a monument of his heaviest displeasure !”

“After this, I went on comfortably, through the goodness of God, for nearly a year ; but having read a good deal in Hervey’s works, I was much perplexed in my mind, respecting the nature of saving faith.” . . . By the advice of some one, he applied to Dr. Loveday, for instruction, who lent him the third volume of archbishop Sharpe’s sermons on casuistical subjects. These he read with great profit ; “they showed me that Hervey’s view of saving faith was erroneous. And from that day to this, I have never had a doubt on the subject. I think it clear even to demonstration, that assurance is not of the nature of saving faith : a simple reliance on Christ for salvation, is what the word of God requires ; assurance is a privilege, not a duty.”

“Though by nature and habit of an extravagant disposition, I practiced the most rigid economy ; and in this I was very much assisted by allotting my small income so as to provide for every the minutest expense, and at the same time consecrating a stated part of my income to the Lord, together with all that I could save out of the part reserved for my own use. This made economy truly delightful, and enabled me to finish my three years of scholarship without owing a shilling ; whilst others, my contemporaries, incurred debts of several hundred pounds. To this hour do I reap the benefit of these habits ; for though my income is now very large, I never indulge in any extravagance. I have it is true, my establishment on rather a high scale in comparison of others ; but I never throw away my money in foolish indulgences, nor spend more of my income on myself, than I believe God himself approves. I appear to spend a great deal ; but by constant and careful economy, I in reality spend scarcely half what I should in general be thought to spend ; and of the indulgences I have, I am persuaded I could sacrifice far the greater part without a moment’s regret, if there were occasion for my so doing.

It appears from an inspection of his private accounts, that, at

this time, he was accustomed to give one third of his income in charity. And it may be mentioned in this connexion, that through his whole life, he managed his pecuniary affairs with the utmost exactness. In some cases this was perhaps carried to an extreme. On one occasion, in balancing his accounts for the year, a very small error was indicated, but it could not be ascertained without a laborious search how it originated. He could not rest satisfied until the matter was fully explained, he therefore gave £20 to a clerk, as a reward for going over the whole of the long and complicated account until he should find the true source of the error. How very different is this from the loose and inaccurate methods in which most clergymen keep their accounts. Economy is undoubtedly a Christian virtue, when it is practised with a view to doing justice to those to whom we are indebted, or when the motive is to save as much as possible for the treasury of the Lord.

Among the preachers who occasionally officiated at St. Mary's Church, Mr. Simeon watched carefully to see whether any of them preached the sentiments which he had been led to entertain. At length, he heard a certain Mr. Atkinson, who came nearer to the truth of the gospel as he viewed it, than any other; he therefore made it a point to attend, every Sunday, at St. Edward's chapel, where he preached; and was somewhat surprised that as he was the only gownsman who attended there, that the preacher never noticed him, nor invited him to come and see him. At length, however, Mr. A. did invite him to tea; but another gentleman, who appeared not to be religious, being present, no conversation on vital piety took place. Not long after Mr. Simeon invited Mr. Atkinson to sup with him, and being alone, he dropped some expressions which greatly surprised Mr. A., for all this time, he had taken him for a proud Pharisee. An intimate acquaintance and delightful fellowship ensued, which was quickly followed by an introduction to other evangelical Christians; particularly, to a young clergyman, by the name of Venn, the son of the excellent author of the "New Whole Duty of Man." With this young minister Mr. Simeon entered into a most intimate and endearing friendship, which continued uninterrupted through life. And by means of the son, he was made acquainted with his pious and venerable father. As far as can be learned from Mr. Simeon's narrative, there was not at

this time, a single serious, evangelical Christian in the University of Cambridge. It will be well to remember this fact, that we may form a just estimate of Mr. Simeon's influence in promoting true religion in that seat of science.

Mr. Simeon was ordained by the bishop of Ely, on the 26th of May 1762. His first labours were in the parish of his friend Mr. Atkinson, for whom he preached during the long College vacation. He appears to have entered on the work with zeal and diligence, for he informs us, that he not only preached in the pulpit, but visited every family in the parish, making no difference between the rich and poor, between churchmen and dissenters. After a few weeks, there was a considerable stir among the dry bones; the house was crowded with hearers, and three times as many came to the communion as before. He tells us, that while visiting the people, he had a friendly dispute with the dissenting minister about the doctrine of *election* which he could not then receive, because he could not see how it could be separated from the doctrine of reprobation. "But," says he, "I was not violent against it; being convinced as much as I was of my own existence, that whatever others might do, I myself, should no more have loved God if he had not first loved me, or turned to God, if he had not by his free and sovereign grace turned me, than a cannon ball would of itself return to the orifice from which it had been shot out. But I soon learned that I must take the scriptures with the simplicity of a little child, and be content to receive on God's testimony, what he has revealed, whether I can unravel all the difficulties that attend it or not; and from that day to this, I have never had a doubt respecting that doctrine."

Mr. Simeon was just on the point of leaving Cambridge, to reside with his father, when an event occurred, which gave a turn to his whole future life. Often, as he says, when passing Trinity church the wish would come into his mind, "O that I had the privilege of preaching the gospel in that house! but he entertained no more idea of the wish being realized, than of being placed in the see of Canterbury. But now, when his goods were partly packed up to leave Cambridge, the incumbent of Trinity died, and he wrote immediately to his father to apply to the bishop for the living. The parishioners, however, were violently opposed to him, and were in favour of Mr. Ham-

mond, who had been for some time the curate of the rector. They now immediately chose him to be their lecturer, knowing that without the income from this, the salary would be so inconsiderable that Mr. Simeon would not accept of it. They also sent a petition to the bishop, in favour of Mr. Hammond, informing him at the same time, that they had already chosen him lecturer. Finding how violent their opposition was, Mr. Simeon went to a public meeting of the parishioners, at the vestry, and assured them, that his only motive for wishing for the place, was, that he might do them good; and if *upon further reflection, it did not seem improper*, he would decline all further competition for the place. Accordingly, he went home, and wrote a letter to send to the bishop in accordance with this declaration, but he was too late for the mail. And reflecting on the subject in the night, it occurred forcibly to his mind, that his writing to the bishop was a foolish thing; for if the bishop did not intend to give the living to him, the letter would be useless, and if he did, he ought not to throw away an opportunity of doing good, which might never occur again. He determined then to wait the event; if the living should be given to Mr. Hammond, he should have nothing to do respecting it; but he determined if he should receive the appointment, he would appoint Mr. H. his curate and allow him the whole of the income; and thus while he fulfilled the wishes of all parties, he would have the door open, for future usefulness, if Providence should so order affairs. The parishioners, however, in their anxiety to keep him out, wrote to the bishop that he had declined, and urging the appointment of Mr. H. The bishop, somewhat provoked by their importunity, wrote to Mr. Simeon, that if he chose he might have the living, but that, in no case would he bestow it on Mr. H. The disappointment greatly irritated the people, and most of them put locks on their pews, and Mr. S. had no opportunity, for several years, of doing them any good. But he hired a room for religious meetings, which was soon too small for those who came, so that he had to hire a room in a neighbouring parish. Mr. Simeon's labours were not, however, without success; many persons seemed to have their eyes so far open and their hearts so far interested, that they were fond of attending his ministry; but having opportunity to preach only once in the week in his own church, he made it a practice to go about and preach wher-

ever he could get opportunity, among the neighbouring ministers. And he had good reason to believe that his preaching in this manner, was blessed to the saving conversion of many. From the commencement of his ministry, he took much pains in the preparation of his sermons; not only as to their matter, but also to their style and method, so as to render them clear and instructive. Indeed, sermonizing was the great business of his life. At first he adopted such rules as commended themselves to his understanding; and afterwards, when he became acquainted with "Claude's Essay," he was gratified to find that there was so perfect an agreement between his own principles of composition, and the rules laid down by this eminent man. Like other young preachers, however, he had his difficulties at the beginning. "When I began to write at first," says he, "I knew no more than a brute how to make a sermon. And after a year or so, I gave up my writing, and began to preach from notes, but I so stammered and stumbled, that I felt this was worse than before, and so I was obliged to take to a written sermon again. At last, however, the *reading* a sermon appeared to be so heavy and dull, that I once more made an attempt with [short] notes, and determined if I did not now succeed, to give up preaching altogether." This practice he continued until near the close of his life, when the decay of his powers rendered it necessary to make use of his written sermons. These sermons, however, he read over a number of times, so that he might have perfect ease in the delivery; and he was of opinion that it was presumptuous to expect the Lord's blessing on what cost him nothing. It was from an early period his custom, when he returned home from preaching, to write down the thoughts which had occurred to him in delivery or afterwards; and in this manner his twenty-one volumes of sketches, except such discourses as were written out in full, were prepared. His style of delivery, which to the last was remarkably lively and impressive, in his early days was earnest and impassioned, in an extraordinary degree. The intense fervour of his feelings, he cared not to conceal or restrain. His whole soul was in his subject, and he spoke and acted exactly as he felt. Sometimes, indeed, his looks and gestures became grotesque, from the violence of his feelings, but his action was entirely unstudied, and sometimes very striking and commanding, and always sincere and serious. At that time earnestness and much action, were

unusual in the pulpit ; and the prejudice against his preaching was probably as much owing to his manner, as to his matter. "My parish," says he, "after two or three years, made a formal complaint against me to the bishop ; they complained that I preached so as to alarm and terrify them, and that the people came and crowded the church and stole their books. The bishop wrote to me, and I answered him at length, vindicating my preaching, and denying the charges that were brought against me." . . . "In my preaching, I endeavoured to approve myself to God, with fidelity and zeal ; but I do not now think that I did it in a judicious way. I thought, to declare the truth with boldness, was the one object which I ought to keep in view ; and this is a very general mistake among young preachers. I did not sufficiently attend to the example of our Lord and his apostles, in speaking as men were able to bear it, and as administering milk to babes, and strong meat to men."

After Mr. Simeon had been about a year in the ministry, he formed an acquaintance with the Rev. Mr. Houseman, of Lancaster, of whom we gave some account in a former number, and this acquaintance soon ripened into intimate friendship, which continued through life. Indeed Mr. Houseman had good reason to esteem Mr. Simeon very highly in love, for he considered him his spiritual father ; and Mr. Simeon rejoiced over Mr. Houseman as the first fruits of his labours in Cambridge. On a certain occasion, when Mr. Houseman had to reside some time in college, Mr. Simeon took him into his rooms and gave him accommodations there for three months. The intercourse between these two congenial spirits must have been very delightful. Mr. Houseman's estimation of the religious character of Mr. Simeon, is strongly expressed in the following testimony : "Never did I see such consistency and reality of devotion—such warmth of piety—such zeal and love. Never did I see one who so abounded in prayer. I owe that great and holy man a debt which never can be cancelled."

This may be the proper place also to insert the opinion of the Venns, respecting Mr. Simeon. In the diary of the elder, it is written : "Our dear friend Simeon came over to see me, very much improved and grown in grace ; his very presence is a blessing."

And the Rev. Henry Venn, in a letter to his father, says :

“Your account of Simeon is very just ; my fears concerning him greatly abate. He appears, indeed, to be much more humbled from a knowledge of himself. He is a most affectionate friend and a lively Christian.”

Respect for Mr. Simeon, also evidently increased among the members of the university ; for in December, 1786, Dr. Gwynn, expecting to be absent, sent for Mr. Simeon, and invited him to take his place and preach in St. Mary’s ; and in the most friendly manner requested to see his sermon, for he observed, that the hearers would be critical. He looked it over and made a few corrections, and then told him he should be ready to defend it every where. At first, there seemed some disposition in the crowd of gownsmen present, to give some annoyance ; but when they heard the lucid arrangement of his exordium, and his serious and commanding manner, the most respectful and rivetted attention succeeded, and universal solemnity prevailed ; so that many went away with very different feelings from those with which they came. Of two young men, who came as scoffers, one was heard to say to the other, “Well, Simeon is no fool, however ;” to which the other answered, “Did you ever hear such a sermon?”

He now thought it expedient to establish a weekly lecture in his church, in the evening ; but such a service in a parish chapel in Cambridge, was entirely unknown ; and he met with many trials from the students, who often created a disturbance, especially at the close of the meeting ; he, therefore, made it a practice to go down to the front door immediately after sermon, and seize any man whom he found misbehaving ; and if they did not submit, he threatened them with the censures of the university. All this time, however, a large number of the pews were kept locked. On this subject, he consulted Sir William Scott, who said, that except by the bishop’s orders, no pews except faculty-pews could legally be kept locked. But he did not like to enter on litigation with nearly the whole parish.

Among the many excellent young men over whom Mr. Simeon exercised a salutary influence, and who became eminently useful in promoting evangelical religion, was Thomas Thomason. This young man, equally distinguished for piety and talents, writes to his correspondent, “Mr. Simeon watches over us as a shepherd over his sheep. He takes delight in instructing us, and has us constantly at his rooms. He has nothing to do with us as re-

spects our situation in college. His Christian love and zeal prompt him to notice us." And in a letter to his mother, he says, "God has heaped upon me more favours than ever. Mr. Simeon has invited me to his Sunday evening lectures. This I consider one of the greatest advantages I ever received. The subject of his lectures is Natural and Revealed Religion. These he studies and puts together, with much pains and attention. He reads the fruit of his labours to us, and explains it; we write after him. He then dismisses us with prayer." Again, "His kindness to us exceeds all bounds, and his example such as we shall do well to imitate when God in his providence shall place us in the church. . . His sermons are very useful and bold. It is astonishing how free he is from all fear of man. In this respect, his character is shining. Although his congregation on Sunday evening is partly composed of such as come to mock, yet he never spares them, but declares faithfully the whole counsel of God. What evidences his zeal in the cause of God, perhaps, more than anything else, is that after labouring and labouring for his young men, that his lectures may be as profitable as possible, he then kneels down and thanks God, that he makes him in any degree useful to his dear, dear young servants. This should be a great spur to us, that we may, as it were, cooperate with him, and live in continual dependence upon, and communion with God, that thus by every effort in our power, aided by the grace of God, we may at length realize his wishes concerning us."

In another letter, he says, "There are many Christians in this town, in Mr. Simeon's loving society, whose faith is lively, and whose experience is as deep in divine things, as any, perhaps, you ever met with. He has above one hundred whom he considers his flock, whom he has reason to believe the Lord has called and blessed. To these he pays every attention; not to mention, that he is continually visiting them, he meets them every week by themselves in a room in the town, which he has hired for the purpose. On these occasions he exhorts them in a close and heart-searching manner, and enters into the more deep and spiritual part of religion."

Mr. Simeon once visited Mr. Fletcher, of Madely, and the account he gives of his visit is truly delightful. As soon as he entered the house, Mr. Fletcher took him by the hand, and brought him into the parlour, where they spent a few minutes in prayer,

that a blessing might rest upon his visit. As soon as he had done prayer, he asked him if he would preach for him. After some hesitation, Mr. Simeon complied; and away they went to the church. Here Mr. Fletcher took a bell and went all through the village ringing it, and telling the people that a clergyman from Cambridge had come to preach to them, and they must come to hear him. The account which Mr. Simeon gives of his behaviour during the whole of the visit, gives one an equal idea of his goodness and zeal for the cause of God. He came to a smith's shop in the course of their walks, and to one, who was hammering the iron upon the anvil, he said, "Oh pray to God that he may hammer that hard heart of yours"—to another who was heating the iron, "It is thus that God tries his people in the furnace of affliction." To a third, "See Thomas, if you can make such a furnace as that, think what a furnace God can make for ungodly souls."

Mr. Marsden was one of Mr. Simeon's most intimate friends, and had access to him in his most retired moments. From him we have the following interesting anecdote: Calling one day on Mr. Simeon, he found him so absorbed in the contemplation of the Son of God, and so overpowered with a display of his mercy to his soul, that full of the animating theme, he was incapable of pronouncing a single word. At length, after an interval, with accents big, he exclaimed, glory! glory! glory! His biographer informs us, that he was much affected with this narrative. "I asked myself, why I was so much a stranger to this? Why such coldness in my soul? If I love, why am I thus? You have neither part nor lot in this matter; you are yet in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity; for certainly, I thought, that religion is vain, which is not built on the present possession of its joys." Such was my feeling, when coming to this child of God, I found him in tenfold more misery than myself. He could scarcely discourse now from a deep humiliation and contrition. Humbled before God, he could only cry out, my leanness! my leanness! and striking on his breast, uttered the publican's prayer. I now perceived that God dispenses his favours how and when he pleases; and suits his dispensations to our several states and wants, and that the best thing we can do is to be 'sober and vigilant,' to 'watch unto prayer.'"

As our chief object in this review is to exhibit Mr. Simeon's

religious character and usefulness, we will make no apology for introducing an extract of a letter from him to the Rev. Mr. Stillingfleet, an evangelical clergyman of the church of England:

MY VERY DEAR FRIEND AND BROTHER—

* * * “I find that an exceedingly close walk with God is necessary for the maintaining of fervour in intercession; sometimes an extraordinary sense of want may beget fervour in our petitions, or peculiar mercy enliven our grateful acknowledgments; but it is scarcely ever that we can intercede with fervour unless we enjoy a habitual nearness to God. There have been seasons, when the Lord has a little enlarged my heart, in this particular; but they have been rare; and I have found so little of it for these two or three years, that I am ashamed of myself, and afraid to say I will pray for any one. Indeed, from a consciousness of my weakness in this respect, I never go further than to say to those who desire a remembrance in my prayers, ‘I hope I shall be enabled to do so.’ This I can freely confess to you, because God has endued you with a sympathizing spirit; and I am the rather led to do it, because it is too plain that you think of me far above what I really am. Indeed, so far forth as a dissatisfaction exists, this is a mark of grace. I hope I may, without presumption, say that I am under a gracious influence; but there is nothing which I more condemn in others, or feel more strongly in myself, than a proneness to rest in the mere act of complaining, without getting my complaints removed. It is well our fellow creatures do not know us as God knows us, or even as we know ourselves, for they could not possibly bear with us; but the patience of God is infinite; and therefore, vile as beyond all expression I feel myself to be, I find a kind of complacency in saying, ‘Let me fall into the hands of God, for his mercies are great.’ Nevertheless, if I thought I should always continue as I now am, I should dread to have my existence protracted any longer. But I live in hope; I know that he who quickeneth the dead, can heal the diseased. I trust he has done something already towards healing me, in many respects. On a retrospect, I hope I can find, that in the space of several years, I have gained a little (though but a little,) ground. I think that I know more of myself than I once did; and that on the whole, I desire more to spend and be spent for the Lord. But oh! what

a blank! or, I should rather say, what a blot, is my whole life! God knoweth that I loathe myself, and that because I cannot loathe myself more. The Lord send me better days! What joy would it afford me, my dear brother, to see your face again, and to hold sweet fellowship with you! Could I accomplish it consistently with my duty, I am persuaded, I could not force my hand to write 'no;' but I have three sermons on the Sabbath, and shall in a week or two have one on a week day also, beside my private lecture, &c., &c. I must, therefore lay aside all thoughts of being absent again, on a Sunday; unless some friend that is both able and willing, shall stand in my place. The Lord mercifully endues me with ability to endure labour. My voice, hitherto, through his goodness, abides in strength; and I am, upon principle, paying all the attention to my health that I possibly can. I have a great work upon me, and much encouragement. Multitudes of gownsmen attend—prejudices wear away—the godly go on well. What can I wish for more to stimulate me? O that I had a mind to the work! such, I mean, as I ought to have, then we might hope the building would be carried up quicker. However, (thanks be to God), though we are 'faint, we are yet pursuing.' I have had two young Scotch ministers to dine with me to-day. They brought a letter from Edinburgh; and I have unspeakable cause for gratitude that they did: God has been with us in a special manner. Surely, some have unawares entertained angels. Dear Mr. Venn is much as usual; if his eye waxes dim, his heart does not wax cold. God is very abundantly gracious unto him. Grace and peace be multiplied unto you, my much honoured and most beloved brother, and with all my dearest brethren in your parts.

"Yours, &c.

C. SIMEON."

In the year 1790, Mr. Simeon, at the urgent solicitation of a Scotch minister, by the name of Buchanan, took a tour through Scotland, and preached extensively both in the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches. He said, that he felt fully authorized to preach in the latter, because Presbyterianism was the established religion of Scotland, as Episcopacy was of England. And his preaching, there is good reason to think, was blessed to many; and to some who were already settled in the ministry. One remarkable instance is related by his biographer, in which he was providentially prevented from going where he designed, and was

led to the parish of a Mr. Stewart, with whom he spent the Sabbath, and for whom he preached. To this clergyman he spoke privately, in a plain and pointed manner, and this conversation led Mr. Stewart to entertain new views on the subject of vital piety. Afterwards he corresponded with Mr. Simeon, and acknowledged him to have been the instrument of his conversion to God.

It may be as well to mention here, that through the solicitation of the same and other friends, Mr. Simeon repeated his visit to Scotland, and was again received with the utmost cordiality; and, as before, preached much and to great acceptance. But whilst he was welcomed by the evangelical party in the Scotch church, the dominant party, called *Moderates*, were not pleased with the fervour of his ministry; and at the next meeting of the General Assembly got an order passed, that no person except a regular licentiate of one of their Presbyteries, should be permitted hereafter to preach in any of the pulpits of the establishment.

A great change had taken place in the feelings of Mr. Simeon's parishioners as early as 1794, for in that year, he was chosen lecturer of Trinity church, and had the pleasure of having Mr. Thomasson for his curate. His greatest success, however, was in the conversion of two young men of the University, of the first rate abilities, both of whom had the honour, in their respective years, of being senior wrangler, in the mathematical competition. The first of these was Mr. Sowerby, tutor of Queen's College. His prejudices against Mr. Simeon had been exceedingly strong; but on one or two occasions he was induced by curiosity to hear him, and the truth was made effectual to his conviction, and it is believed, saving conversion. But the course of this very promising young minister was cut short by a rapid consumption. Mr. Simeon had the pleasure of administering to him the consolations of the gospel, in his last moments. The other person referred to, was the Rev. Henry Martyn, whose name and character are known throughout the Christian world. After his conversion, he took orders, and for several years, officiated as Mr. Simeon's curate; until, moved by zeal for the conversion of the heathen, he went as a missionary to the east.

As might be expected, Mr. Simeon entered into the benevolent enterprises of the Bible and Missionary Societies with all his

heart. To promote the objects of these societies he was willing to travel and preach, until his strength was exhausted.

The sun has its spots, and Mr. Simeon's character with all its shining excellencies, was not free from glaring imperfections. These, his biographer does not attempt to conceal; but makes them sufficiently prominent, and observes, "It is of great importance that the infirmities of the eminent servants of God should be faithfully recorded, in order that we may learn what trials and conflicts they had to endure, and how they gained power and strength to obtain victory against the devil, the world, and the flesh. Thus shall we be the more led to magnify God for his grace bestowed upon them, and at the same time derive comfort and hope for ourselves, when endeavouring to subdue our own besetting sins. Amongst other infirmities, acknowledged already, it may be observed, that Mr. Simeon was much tried at times by a certain irritability of temper, which was doubtless not a little aggravated by occasional attacks of gout. No one could, however, be more sensible of the evil than he was himself; and never was any one more ready to confess and deplore his failings."

Mr. Simeon lost Mr. Sowerby by death, and both Thomason and Martyn went as missionaries to India; but he rejoiced in the benefit which the missionary cause received from the accession of such men. He was not only deeply interested in the subject of foreign missions, for the conversion of the heathen; but in the latter years of his life, he entered with an uncommon ardour of zeal into the views and plans of those who formed the Society for the conversion of the Jews. To this object he devoted much attention and labour, and in the year 1818, went over to Holland, to ascertain the condition of the Jews, and to promote measures for their conversion.

In a letter from Mr. Simeon to the Rev. J. B. Cartwright, we have his views of the nature and progress of religion, when he was near the end of his pilgrimage.

"Religion, in its first rise in the heart is a personal matter between God and a man's own soul. A man desirous of obtaining mercy from god and peace to his own conscience reads the scriptures in order to find out the way of salvation, and marks with special care, those passages which assure him of acceptance with God, through the merits and mediation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

For a considerable time it is his own eternal welfare which engrosses all his attention, and almost exclusively occupies his mind: and even the salvation of the whole world is of chief interest to him, as warranting a hope, that he himself may be a partaker of the blessings so freely offered, and exclusively diffused. But when he has obtained peace with God, then he searches the scriptures to find how he may adorn his holy profession, and render to the Lord according to his stupendous benefits conferred on him. He sees that LOVE in all its branches is his bounden duty and his highest privilege; and he determines, with God's help, to live in the most enlarged exercise of that heavenly grace. Benevolence in all its offices, both towards the bodies and souls of men, is now cultivated by him with holy ardour, and every society that is engaged in imparting good to man is gladly encouraged by him. As religion advances in his soul, he takes deeper views of divine truth, and enters into considerations, which in the earlier stages of his career, found scarcely any place in his mind. He now enters into the character of Jehovah, as exhibited in the sacred volume, and his dispensations of providence and grace as there revealed. He traces up the great work of redemption to the eternal counsels of Jehovah, and regards all its benefits whether bestowed on himself or others, as the fruits of God's love manifested in Christ Jesus, and ratified with the blood of the everlasting covenant. He sees that covenant 'ordered in all things and sure,' and looks unto God to fulfil towards him all the engagements which from eternity He entered into with his only dear Son, and found his hopes of ultimate felicity, not only on the mercy but on the truth and fidelity of God. . . . He now longs to see God's glory advanced and his purposes accomplished; and in his prayers, as well as in his efforts, he labours to hasten forward this glorious consummation; yea, he determines to give God no rest till He arise and makes Jerusalem a praise on the earth. . .

"Thus, as it appears to me, Religion in its rise, interests us almost exclusively about *ourselves*; in its progress it engages us about the welfare of *our fellow creatures*: in its *more advanced stages* it animates us to consult on all things, and to exalt to the utmost of our power, *the honour of our God*."

As Mr. Simeon had, during the greater part of his public life, a considerable income; and in some instances large sums put at

his disposal for charitable uses, he had it in his power to do much good by promoting evangelical piety in the established church. One of the methods which he adopted, in common with some other benevolent rich men, was the purchase of advowsons or Church livings, and when they became vacant, supplying them with pious and evangelical ministers. The good effected by him in this way was great, and not confined to his own life time. Not long before his death, we find him taking a tour, for the purpose of visiting a number of parishes of which he had become the patron, and to which he had presented evangelical incumbents; and the result appears to have given him great satisfaction. But the influence of Mr. Simeon has been in no way so extensive and lasting as by his homiletical discourses. These fill twenty-one volumes, and furnish an evangelical commentary on the whole Bible; and have furnished the materials for the sermons of hundreds of preachers. Many by the use of Simeon's skeletons have become acquainted with evangelical doctrine; and no doubt others have used these skeletons in composing their sermons merely for convenience, who cared nothing about doctrine. And thus, the people have been fed with truth, while their spiritual guide had no experimental knowledge of its excellence. We would not, however, recommend the use of such helps to our young ministers: it has a tendency to encourage mental sloth; and prevent young men from exerting vigorously their own faculties of invention and arrangement.

We come now to the last scene of Mr. Simeon's career; his dying moments. His vigour and usefulness were continued until within a short period of his death. He had just entered on his seventy-eighth year, when he took a bad cold, while on a visit to his bishop, who had recently come into the see. After his return home, he seemed to grow better, but on a raw day he *would* ride out, and the effect was an increase of the indisposition under which he was labouring. Soon after this all hope of recovery was taken away. He was told, that "many hearts are engaged in prayer for you." He rejoined, "In prayer, aye, and I trust in *praise* too—praise for countless, endless mercies."

As his disease made rapid progress, on the 1st of October, about midnight he was raised up in his bed, when he said to those around him, "I am a poor fallen creature, and our nature is a poor fallen thing. There is no denying that, is there? It

cannot be repaired; there is nothing that I can do to repair it; well then, *that* is true. What would you advise in such a case?" As he seemed to pause for an answer, one said, "Surely, sir, to go as you always have done, as a poor fallen creature to the Lord Jesus Christ, confessing your sins, and imploring and expecting pardon and peace." He answered, "That is just what I am doing, and *will* do." He was then asked, "Do you find the Lord Jesus to be very present, and giving you peace?" With a very remarkable expression of countenance, he replied, "Oh! yes, that I do, and he does not forsake me now. No: indeed, that NEVER CAN BE." The next day, seeing his friends standing round his bed, he said, "Infinite wisdom has devised the whole with infinite *love*. And infinite power enables me to rest on that power; and all is infinitely good and gracious." One remarked, "How gracious is it that you should now have so little suffering." "Whether I am to have a little less or more suffering, it matters not a farthing. All is right and well, and just as it should be. Safe in a dear Father's hands—all is secure. When I look to Him (here he spoke with fervent solemnity) I see nothing but *faithfulness, immutability, and truth*. And I have not a doubt or a fear, but the sweetest peace. I CANNOT HAVE MORE PEACE. But if I look another way, to the poor creature—Oh, *there* is nothing—*nothing*—but what is to be abhorred, and mourned over. Yes, *I say that*, and it is true." After a season of stupor, he waked up, and began again, "What is before me I know not: whether I shall live or die. But *this* I know, all things are ordered and sure. Every thing is ordered with *unerring wisdom*, and *unbounded love*. He will perfect every thing, though at present, I know not what He is about to do with me. And about this, I am not in the least degree anxious." Overhearing one of the attendants use the word *despair*, he said, with surprising energy, "*Despair, despair*, who dares to advocate such a sentiment here? *Despair*—Oh, what a sweet peace, and joy, and affiance do I possess." Seeing his friends round his bed, he said: "You seem all to be anticipating what will not yet take place. I am not yet about to die, *I know* I am not. I am not yet *ready*." His friend said, "Dear sir, and what is wanting?" He replied, in a slow and solemn manner, "more humiliation—more simple affiance—and more entire surrender." It was replied, "He will make all perfect." "Yes," said he, "that he will." Observing many persons

in the room, he observed, "You are all on a wrong scent, and all in a wrong spirit. You want to see what is called a *dying scene*. 'THAT I ABHOR FROM MY INMOST SOUL. I wish to be alone with my God, and to lie before Him as a poor, wretched, hell-deserving sinner. Yes, as a poor hell-deserving sinner.'" He had often requested of his friend, Mr. Carus, that when that solemn hour arrived, no one but himself should be present. Therefore, next night, recollecting the number who had come into the room, he said, "Now I was much hurt at the scene last night—a scene.—*A death-bed scene I abhor from my inmost soul*. No: I am, I know, the chief of sinners, and I hope for nothing but the mercy of God in Christ Jesus, to life eternal; and I shall be, if not the greatest monument of God's mercy in heaven: yet the very next to it, for I know of none greater." And after a pause, he said, "And if we are to bring the matter to a point, it lies in a nutshell, and it is here, I look, as the chief of sinners, for the mercy of God in Christ Jesus to eternal life. And I lie adoring the *sovereignty* of God in choosing such a one, and the *mercy* of God in pardoning such a one, and the *patience* of God in bearing with such a one, and the *faithfulness* of God in perfecting his work and performing all his promises to such a one."

When his physician, Dr. Haviland, came into the room, he expressed strong satisfaction on seeing him, and addressed him in the most striking manner on the subject of religion. The doctor, though so accustomed to the clearness and precision of his manner, said, he had never before heard any thing from him comparable to this, for the propriety of the language, as well as the importance of the matter. After this, however, he so far rallied as to be able to dictate the outline of four sermons which he had intended to preach on Ephes. iii. 18, 19. And his life was protracted until the 13th of November. His mind continued to enjoy uninterrupted peace, but toward the close of life, his bodily suffering was intense. On one of these days, he said, "*The decree is gone forth, from this hour I am a dying man.*" Very near the close, he observed, "It is said, O death where is thy sting?" Then looking round with his peculiar expression of countenance, he asked, "Do you see any sting here?" It was answered, "No: indeed, all is taken away." He then said, "Does not this *prove* that my principles were not founded on fancy or enthusiasm, but that there is a *reality* in them; and I

find them sufficient to support me in death." The last chapter he had read to him was the first of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and the last words addressed to him were, "The Lord bless thee and keep thee, and make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee. The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee and give thee peace."

It was remarkable, that at the very moment when he expired, the bell of St. Mary's was ringing for the university sermon, which he was to have preached. The Lord granted him his heart's desire and prayer, the most perfect peace, and the full assurance of hope to the end, and without weakness or wandering of mind.

We cannot close this article more appropriately, than by inserting the testimony of bishop Wilson of Calcutta. "There is," says he, "no name that will continue more deeply infixed on the memory and on the heart of the writer of the following lines, to the last moment of life, than that of CHARLES SIMEON :

"Among the many holy and distinguished ministers of Christ whom he has known, and of whose advice and example he will have to give an account at the last great day, Mr. Simeon was in many respects the most remarkable. A more entirely devoted servant of Christ has not often appeared in the church, nor one whose course of service in point of time was more extended, more important, more consistent, more energetic, more opportune for the circumstances of the church, and by divine blessing, more useful."

Bishop Wilson after having spoken of the great principles of the gospel, as those which formed the character and governed the ministry of Mr. Simeon ; and also of the union of these principles with practical wisdom, proceeds to bring forward a number of causes which rendered the latter years of his ministry so much more popular and useful than the earlier. "Contrast," says he, "the commencement and close of his course. He was long opposed, ridiculed, shunned—his doctrines were misrepresented. His little peculiarities of voice and manner were satirized ; disturbances were frequently raised in his church. He was a person not taken into account, or considered a regular clergyman of the church. Such was the beginning ; but mark the close. He was invited repeatedly to preach before the university. The same great principles that he preached were avowed

from almost every pulpit in Cambridge. His church was crowded with young students." And every mark of respect was paid to him by the vice-chancellor, heads of houses, and doctors, and his sermons, of the most evangelical character, were heard with deep and respectful attention, by audiences embracing the most important members of the university. The reasons of this remarkable change bishop Wilson gives at length, a brief abstract of which is all that our limited space will permit us to insert. As these, however, furnish a fair outline of the whole character of Mr. Simeon, delineated by one who perfectly knew him, and was well qualified to judge, they deserve the special attention of the reader, and especially of the young clergyman and all candidates for the ministry.

1. The first reason assigned for the success of this eminent servant of God, in the latter part of his ministry, is, "*His occupying diligently with his appropriate talents.*" He seems to have applied himself to make the most of the particular opportunities afforded him. He wished for no change of station; he was deterred by no difficulties; he was seduced by no offers of a more easy or more congenial post. But where he was placed by a good Providence, there he determined to labour for his Master's glory. After he discovered the immense capabilities of his position in the university, he strove to acquire the knowledge and experience necessary for the best discharge of his duties. With this principle he began; and fifty-four years only added more and more to his faculties of usefulness. His talents multiplied beyond his own expectations and those of his friends. A STEADY MINISTRY IS LIKELY TO BE A SUCCESSFUL ONE. CHANGES RARELY ANSWER.

2. *Consistency and decision of character*, may next be mentioned. Confidence is generated by degrees. When once a character for sincerity, spirituality, consistency, boldness in the gospel is established, influence is rapidly acquired. Petty errors are overlooked—peculiarities, failures of temper, defects in judgment—all are lost after a number of years, in the general, and well known excellency of the life. Reports are no longer believed, prejudices are softened, accusations of enthusiasm and party spirit are examined before they are credited. No man upon earth was more open to misrepresentations than Mr. Simeon; but after a course of years almost every one estimated them at

their true value. He lived for more than half a century in the eye of the same university. He was the companion and instructor of fourteen generations of young students. He saw the disciples of his early days, the governors and professors of the university, in his latter. He was known never to have but one object; never to have preached but one doctrine.

3. "*Moderation on doubtful and contested points of theology*, contributed to his ultimate success. Not moderation as implying uniformity to the world's judgment of Christian doctrine—but the true scriptural moderation arising from a sense of man's profound ignorance, and of the danger of attempting to proceed one step beyond the fair and obvious import of Divine Revelation. In this sense, he was moderate. A reverential adherence to the letter of inspired truth was characteristic of his preaching. He never ventured to push conclusions from scripture into metaphysical refinement. Unless the conclusions themselves as well as the promises were clearly revealed, he was fearful and cautious in the extreme. . . . He did not consider it his duty to attempt to reconcile all the apparent difficulties in St. Paul, but to preach every part of that great apostle's doctrine, in its place and bearing, and for the ends for which each part was evidently employed by its inspired author.

4. "His eminently *devotional spirit* must be next mentioned. No man, perhaps, in these latter ages, has been more a man of prayer than Mr. Simeon. It is believed that not unfrequently he spent whole nights in prayer to God. This spirit of prayer counteracted the natural roughness of his temper, reconciled those who had taken offence, gave a certain charm to his conversation, moderated contentions, led to continual self-knowledge and growth in grace, and laid a foundation of wide influence. In his afflictions prayer was his refuge. There was an inteness of desire, a prostration of soul, a brokenness of heart before God, a holy, filial breathing after spiritual blessings, which can scarcely be conceived by those who only saw him occasionally. This habit of mind not only contributed to his general success by bringing down the grace of the Holy Spirit, but also by giving a certain softened tone to his whole character, which generated confidence, and which being joined with the occupation of his appropriate talent, his consistency and moderation in doubtful matters, shed a sort of unction over his conversation and ministry,

which in spiritual things is the secret of real influence over others.

5. "*The labour bestowed on the preparation of his sermons* must by all means be noticed. Few cost him less than twelve hours of study—many twice that time, and some several days. He once told the writer, that he had re-composed the plan of one discourse more than thirty times. He gave the utmost attention to the rules for the composition of discourses. His chief source of thought was the Holy Bible itself; on which it may truly be said, that he meditated day and night. When he had fixed on his text he endeavoured to ascertain the simple, and obvious meaning of the words, which he frequently reduced to a categorical proposition. He then aimed at catching the spirit of the passage, whether consolatory, alarming, cautionary, or instructive. After this his object was to give full scope to the truth before him: making it, of course, really harmonious with the analogy of faith, but not over studious to display a systematic agreement.

6. "Mr. Simeon's admirable care *in conciliating the affections and aiding the studies of the young men in the University*, had a large share in the remarkable success which attended him. In every part of the kingdom, he had, as it were, children in the gospel, who had derived benefit from his unwearied labours during a long life. Multitudes had first been led to serious religion under his energetic ministry, or had been awakened to greater earnestness. These recommended him to others. In various ways did he labour for the highest welfare of all who were thus brought under his influence. His public ministry was directed very much to their edification. An evening party was known to be open to any who wished for his counsel. And he delivered twice a year a course of lectures on preaching to such as had passed the earlier division of their college course. Thus he drew around him a constant succession of pious youth, whose minds he imbued with his own sound and laborious views of ministerial diligence. The last day alone will reveal the aggregate of good he thus accomplished. If we take only four or five cases now before the world, David Brown, Henry Martyn, John Sargent, Thomas Thomason and bishop Corrie, we may judge by them as by a specimen, of the hundreds of somewhat similar ones, which occurred during the fifty-four years of his

labours. There was an energy and sincerity in his manner, which, as he himself advanced in life, gave him a more than fatherly authority over the young men as they came up year after year.

7. "A different source, but a most copious one, of legitimate influence, *was the interest which he took in the great religious societies for diffusing the knowledge of the gospel.* . . . To the society for the conversion of the Jews, Mr. Simeon was prominently attached. In truth, he was, almost from the commencement, the chief stay of that great cause. The simple but affecting address which he dictated on his dying bed on this subject is before the world. Some of the finest sermons in his *Horæ* are on subjects connected with their wonderful history.

8. *His enlightened but firm attachment to our Protestant Episcopal Church.* [We may pass over what is said on this subject, as not applicable to this country; except so far as stability of character is concerned.]

9. "Another point may here be noticed—*His manner of learning opposition as it arose, and his victories over himself throughout life* contributed not a little to that remarkable success and authority which he at length acquired. Two thirds of his ministry were passed under very considerable discouragement. Had he complained loudly, had he resisted peevishly, had he deserted his post of duty rashly, the church and the world could have been comparatively very little benefitted by his labours. But he endured as seeing Him who is invisible. He mildly bore for Christ's sake the cross enforced upon him. He returned good for evil. He subdued the old man within him. He looked above creatures and instruments to the hand which sent them. He endeavoured to follow apostles, and apostles in the road of suffering, and in the spirit which they manifested. . . ."

10. "And the result, be it observed, was, that by these and similar causes that is, *the mere force of evangelical truth and holiness, thus exhibited during fifty or sixty years, and not by great talents, or extraordinary powers of judgment, or particular attainments in academical learning,* God gave him this wide and blessed influence over the age in which he lived. So far from being the man whom we should at first have abstractly selected for the delicate and difficult post of a university, we should perhaps have considered him peculiarly unfitted for it.

We should have thought him too energetic, too fervent, too peculiar in his habits, too bold, too uncautious: and we should have preferred some refined, and elegant, and accomplished scholar; some person of mathematical fame, some ardent student of philosophical discovery. And yet, behold how God honours simplicity and devotedness of heart in his servants. Behold how a man of no extraordinary endowments, yet occupying with his talents, consistent, moderate, with a spirit of prayer, laborious, consulting the good of the young, joining in all pious designs, attached firmly to the church, and learning in the school of painful discipline, rises above obstacles, is stretched beyond his apparent capabilities, adapts himself to a situation of extreme difficulty, acquires the faculty of meeting its demands, and ends by compassing infinitely greater good, than a less energetic and decisive character, however talented, could have accomplished.

To have been free from a thousand peculiarities, and petty faults, (which no man pretends to conceal in the case of Mr. Simeon) were easy, but to rise to his height of love to Christ, to feel his compassion for souls, to stand courageously and boldly forward in the face of difficulty, to bear down misapprehensions, to be a burning and a shining light in his generation, to lift up a standard of truth when the enemy had come in like a flood—this was the difficult task, and for this we glorify God in our departed friend.

“The mind, indeed, is astonished at the amount of this remarkable man’s ultimate usefulness. As a preacher, he was unquestionably one of the first of the age—as a divine, one of the most truly scriptural—as a resident in the university, the most useful person beyond all doubt, which these latter times have known. As a writer, he began early in life, and accomplished, after forty years persevering labour, a most extensive and valuable set of Discourses, on every part of scripture, for the guidance of divinity scholars.”

ART. II.—*History of the Presbyterian Church in Kentucky, with a Preliminary Sketch of the Churches in the Valley of Virginia.* By the Rev. Robert Davidson, D. D. New York. Robert Carter: 1847. Svo. pp. 371.

In our preliminary notice of this work, we did not enter into some particulars which it naturally suggests to an American Presbyterian. The attractiveness of certain topics, yet untouched, and those merits of the volume, which have already been acknowledged by us, will justify a somewhat longer series of observations.

The great and long-continued care of the author, in gathering and arranging his facts, and the affectionate zeal with which he dwells on all that tends to the honour of our church, demand of us such criticism as may introduce the book to readers who feel no previous drawing towards his theme. We can assure such, that they will everywhere find that they are conversing with an accurate and accomplished scholarship; and that the histories which he conveys will be in a style which is clear, elegant, and, (even if, in rare instances, too measured) always savouring of the best literary preparation.

We think it is undeniable, that multitudes of our people live in utter ignorance as to the real greatness of our Presbyterian body: perhaps these very expressions may occasion a smile, for ignorance is apt to smile. It is not our purpose to rehearse statistics, or to give tabular views of our census: such means would be meagre and insufficient. It is better, where one has the opportunity, to study the grandeur of our increase in the representative strength of our General Assembly; in the volumes of learning which at the moment of our present writing pass and repass in the great autumnal Trade Sales; in the philanthropic and missionary outlay, at home and abroad, which is an exponent of our expanding forces; or, best of all, in travel far and wide among our newer countries, and our opening West. Providence graciously made the Calvinists of our land the Americans of the Americans, or, as Burke has it, "the Dissenters of Dissent." The British Government, as we can prove, acknowledged the policy of relaxing the cords of established intolerance which their wretched emissaries in Virginia were tightening, as far as their puny arms would avail; and gave as a reason for this accommodation, that the frontiers were unsafe from savage incursion, but for the arms and valour of the Scottish Presbyterians, who formed a cordon on the mountain verge of Pennsylvania, Virginia and the Carolinas. The discipline which British pre-lacy and Laudian tactics had given their forefathers in Scotland,

was no bad preparation for Indian fighting; and the log cabins and block-houses of the West were in the period before the revolution reared to a great extent by men whose Celtic names have since spread all over our Presbyterian records. These are names of which we are not ashamed. How they bore themselves in the War of the Revolution is known by our elders, but has never been fully set forth in common histories. The warm and filial contributions of Mr. Foote, to this chapter of history, are among the best things extant, and should make his excellent volume on North Carolina welcome in every patriotic and Christian house. The researches of Mr. Reed of Philadelphia, though not in any degree ecclesiastical, have thrown out some startling revelations as to the question, Who were the Whigs of the Revolution. That man will go on a desperate adventure who shall proceed to hunt out the Presbyterian Tories of that day. Our ministers were Whigs, patriots, haters of tyranny, known abettors of the very earliest resistance; and often soldiers in the field. It was not they, nor any of them, who acted as guides for invading generals, or who wrote pasquinades for New York Journals, or who insulted Washington by scurrile letters. On these points, we ask no better task than that of printing a few documents, when the truths suggested shall be denied. The name of a Presbyterian Whig stank in the nostrils of truckling courtiers, renegade Scots, and non-juring semi-papists, as much in the Colonies as at home; and the revolutionary struggle was carried on in a large part of the Middle and Southern States, by the sinew, sweat and blood of Presbyterians.

The SCOTCH-IRISH people have certainly no charm in their hybrid name. It is not euphonious, and is often misunderstood, especially in New England. Dr. Davidson's account of them is too good to be lost or even abridged:

"After the subjugation of Ulster, in the reign of James I., the semi-barbarous natives were replaced by a colony of tenants from Great Britain—attracted thither by liberal grants of land. From that time the North of Ireland went by the name of the Plantation of Ulster. Owing to the vicinity and superior enterprise of the people of Scotland, the principal part of the new settlers came from that country; which circumstance afterwards gave rise to the appellation of Scotch-Irish, denoting not the intermarriage of two races, but the peopling of one country by the natives of another, in the same manner as we familiarly speak of the Anglo-Saxons, the Anglo-Americans, and the Indo-Britons.

"The colonists soon manifested a strong desire for the regular ordinances of public worship; but the English clergy being loth to relinquish their comfortable

benefices, the Presbyterian ministers who came over from Scotland were thereby left at liberty to organize the majority of the Churches after their own model. Archbishop Usher, more wise and tolerant than most of his order, consented to a compromise of ecclesiastical differences, in consequence of which there was no formal separation from the Establishment. It was not long, however, until the haughty Wentworth—instigated by that furious bigot, Laud—began to persecute the nonconformists of Ulster, and force them to turn their eyes to the New World, already known as an asylum for the oppressed. Having built a ship of one hundred and fifty tons burthen, to which they gave the name of the *Eagle-wing*, one hundred and forty of them embarked for New England, on the 9th of September, 1636. But being driven back by contrary winds, they were compelled to drop anchor in Loch Fergus, and finally to take refuge in the Western parts of Scotland; where they were soon joined by many others, fugitives like themselves from fines and other punishments. Had this enterprise succeeded, the *EAGLE-WING* might have attained as enviable a celebrity in the annals of American colonization as the more fortunate *MAYFLOWER*.

“After the death of Strafford, tranquillity was restored to Ireland, and in 1642, the year in which the civil war commenced, and the year after the Popish Massacre, the first Presbytery in Ireland met at Carrickfergus, on Friday, June 10th. One of their first acts was to petition the General Assembly of the Scottish Kirk to send them aid; and, in compliance with their request, several ministers were sent over during that and the two following years. From this period the progress of Presbyterianism was rapid, and many of the Episcopal clergy came forward and joined the Presbytery. Thus was founded the celebrated Synod of Ulster.

“With the restoration returned Prelacy, in no degree softened by its temporary deprivation. Both Charles II. and James II. were bent on carrying out their father’s policy of forcing Episcopacy on Great Britain, under the impression that its monarchical structure rendered it a fit tool for forwarding their own despotic views.

“In England, ever since the memorable St. Bartholomew’s day, all eyes had been anxiously directed to the Transatlantic settlements, notwithstanding they were as yet a wilderness; and while some fled to Holland, a great number, together with many of the ejected ministers, betook themselves to New England, Pennsylvania, and other American plantations. In Scotland, fines, imprisonments, and whippings, were abundant from 1662, when the Act of Conformity was passed, until 1688, when the Act of Toleration gave relief under the Presbyterian Prince of Orange. The Western and Southern counties, which, according to Hume, were the most populous and thriving, were the most obnoxious; and the severity of the persecutions surpassed, in the judgment of Bishop Burnet, the merciless rigors of the Duke of Alva. Many sold their estates and crossed over to the Scots of Ulster, where, for a time, unrestricted liberty was allowed. But the arm of intolerance soon followed them to this retreat; and the hunted down nonconformists felt that they had no resource short of absolute expatriation. In order that the fury of the prelates might have full sweep, the Presbyterians and their ejected ministers were forbidden to fly into Scotland to avoid it. Of these ejected ministers, both in Scotland and Ireland, Wodrow gives a catalogue amounting to four hundred.

“In consequence of the persecutions of 1679, 1682, and 1685, crowds of voluntary exiles sought an asylum in East New Jersey, Carolina and Maryland.

The North of Ireland shared in the general drain. The arbitrary measures pursued by James II., together with apprehensions of a general massacre by the Papists, emboldened as they were by the undisguised partiality of the king, caused such multitudes, despairing of safety, to fly to foreign climes, that trade declined, and the revenue languished. Successive emigrations from the North of Ireland continued to pour into Pennsylvania in such numbers, that by the year 1705 there were sufficient Presbyterian Churches in that province, in conjunction with those of the provinces contiguous, to constitute a presbytery, and a few years later, (1717,) a synod.

“While a portion of these emigrants preferred the Atlantic slope, others pushed into the interior, and spreading over what were then the frontier counties of Pennsylvania, extended their settlements southward, till they had crossed the Potomac and the Catawba. They served as a company of hardy and enterprising pioneers and first established the benefits of civilization and Christianity along the entire frontiers of Virginia and the Carolinas. Their posterity are a tall, muscular, and industrious race and they have inherited from their forefathers, independence and integrity of character, exemplary morals, and a deep reverence for the institutions of religion.”

Such was the race from which a large portion of our American Churches derived their origin; and but for which we may be assured neither the Independence of the States nor the present superiority of Presbyterianism would ever have been attained. We are not speaking of New England, with which our church connections are small, nor of the highly respectable colonies of brother Calvinists from France, Holland, the Palatinate and other parts of the Continent: for all these our reverence and affection shall never be wanting: our design is to point out, in passing, the settlers in portions of New Jersey, in the Great Valley of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia and the Carolinas, and, subsequently, in the North Western Territory, and in Kentucky and Tennessee. Some mixtures there were; but the men were chiefly of the Scotch and Scotch-Irish blood; as is plainly shewn by the names of their descendants, not only on our General Register, but in the lists of Congress and of the Army and Navy. They were Presbyterians; they were our fathers.

If we do not enlarge so fully as might seem proper on the settlement of the Valley of Virginia, it is because we hope for a fitter occasion, when the forthcoming work of the Rev. Mr. Foote shall make it our appropriate task. But we cannot refrain from brief allusion to the field opened by this liberal son of New England, in his work on North Carolina. His statements concerning the political sentiments of the Scotch Irish emigrants to

this country are highly important. They claimed, and persisted in claiming, as Mr. Foote justly says, the right to elect their pastors, to direct their own worship, and to frame their own doctrinal formulas. "They desired in Ireland what the Scotch are now asking in Scotland, the liberty of choosing their own ministry." They claimed, and persisted in claiming, that their ministers should be ordained by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, and not by prelates. But they found no second Usher. The principle of the House of Stuart, as Mr. Foote tells us, was *No Prelate, no King*: that of the Presbyterians was, "*King without prelates*—suffering rather than prelates—exile rather than prelates." It was but a step to a "Church without a Bishop, a State without a King;" that is, to American Presbyterianism, and American Independence. Let this simple series of truths account for the prominence of our fathers in the struggle of the Revolution. The siege of Derry, sustained against a league of church and state, had been good training for other sieges; and some of the men of Derry laid their bones south of the Potomac.*

The introductory chapter of Dr. Davidson, on the Valley of Virginia, illustrates much that we have said, and contains matter which possesses for us the deepest interest: but we must pass it by. The second, on the first settlement of Kentucky, is so full of information and so happily condensed, that we fear to touch it, in the way of abridgment: certain it is that no Kentuckian will be satisfied with our outline.

At the time of Braddock's expedition the whole region of the Ohio was known only to traders and hunters, some of whom had penetrated above the Cumberland Gap. The first permanent settlement was that of Daniel Boone, April 1, 1775, being a stockade with block-houses. There were next six years of proprietary government, on the south side of the Kentucky river, under Colonel Henderson; and at the same time plantations were advancing on the north side, where now are Frankfort, Louisville, and Lexington. Our authors' description is not too warm:

"The first explorers of Kentucky spread everywhere, on their return, the most glowing accounts of what they had seen. The luxuriance of the soil; the salubrity of the climate; the dimpled and undulating face of the country; the tall wav-

*Foote p. 124.

ing cane and native clover; the magnificent groves of sugar-tree and walnut; the countless herds of buffalo and elk; the pure and limped brooks; the deeply-channelled rivers, sweeping between precipitous limestone cliffs, several hundred feet in height; the verdure of the vegetation; the air loaded with fragrance; the groves resonant with melody; and the various charms peculiar to the spring; all conspired to invest the newly discovered region with an air of romance, that seemed to realize the dreams of the poets. Nature has, indeed, been lavish of her gifts to this favorite spot; and, although the buffalo has long since disappeared, and the face of the country, reclaimed from a state of nature, exhibits fewer of those wild features which made it so picturesque, the traveller still pauses to offer the tribute of his admiration.

"Upon Boone the view burst with the suddenness and splendour of enchantment. After a dreary route through the wilderness, he descried, from an eminence near Red river, clothed in all the loveliness of spring, that extensive champaign country in the very heart of Kentucky, on the border of which he was then standing; and which constitutes a body of land, if the united testimony of travellers may be credited, among the finest and most agreeable in the world; contrasted with the sterile soil of North Carolina, which he had just left, it appeared, to use his own words, a second paradise. The soberest historians are betrayed into hyperbole when speaking of this region, and style it a great natural park, the Eden of the red man."

"This extraordinary influx did not take place without opposition. Kentucky, inhabited by none of the Indian tribes, and exhibiting no traces of their villages, had been regarded as the common hunting-ground and battle-ground of all. Here the Cherokee of the South, and the Miami of the North, resorted to pursue the chase; and often the buffalo visited the salt-lick in safety, and the elk leaped upon the mountain, while the painted warriors expended their ferocity upon each other. The name *Can-tuck-kee*, pronounced with a strong emphasis, is said to owe its origin to the country having been the arena of frequent conflicts; being interpreted by some to mean, *The Middle Ground*, but most commonly, *The Dark and Bloody Ground*. Although the entire territory was over and over again purchased of the Indian tribes, and their title completely extinguished, the forewarning of the Cherokee chief to Boone, at Watauga, was amply verified, when he said, as he took him by the hand, 'Brother, we have given you a fine land, but I believe you will have much trouble in settling it.' Not a solitary wig-wam was ever burned on the soil, not a single red man expatriated by the negotiations; but the savages were incensed at seeing their beautiful hunting-grounds occupied by strangers; and nothing vexed them more than the erection of buildings. They made perpetual inroads, and were expelled only after repeated and desperate struggles; and no border annals teem with more thrilling incidents and heroic exploits, than those of the Kentucky Hunters. Their very name at length struck terror into the heart of the stoutest savage. Well did the soil earn the emphatic title by which it has been designated. And it may be added, as if the propensity was engendered by the climate, it has not unfrequently since been characteristic of Kentucky, to be the arena of personal, political, and ecclesiastical conflicts, more severely contested and more intensely exciting, than any other part of the Union has witnessed. To Kentucky may be applied what was said of Pontus, '*Omne quod stat Aquilo est.*' It is, consequently, rich in materials for history.

"Seldom has a country been peopled under circumstances so auspicious to the

formation of a bold, independent, magnanimous, homogeneous character. With the exception of an inconsiderable number from North Carolina, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and other quarters, the great body of the settlers was furnished by Virginia. It was but the Old Dominion expanded. They cherished the feelings and the name of Virginians; and to this day a frank hospitality, a manly bearing, and an irrepressible love of adventure, unequivocally indicate their parentage, especially in the rural districts. The military grants brought a number of gallant officers to Kentucky, who had served in the war of the Revolution, many of whom were in easy circumstances, and whose superior education and intelligence naturally caused them to be looked up to as leaders and models; and their influence, with the early introduction of female society, gave tone to the manners of the rising community, and polished the rudeness of the hunter-state. The stirring nature of the times; the free discussion of political questions; the frequent conventions; and the being left to fight their own battles and mould their own institutions without interference or co-operation from other quarters; generated an acuteness of intellect and a habit of independent thought, which hesitate not to grapple with any difficulty upon any subject. Hence the predominant characteristic of Western mind has come to be a restless activity, that takes no opinion on trust, and brooks no control; that laughs at caution, and is a stranger to fear. The natural tendency of such a disposition is to rashness on one hand, and caprice on the other; it is liable to be swayed by impulse rather than principle; and the excited feelings get the mastery of the cooler judgment.

“Scions of a noble stock, reared in the storm, and trained to self-reliance, it is not surprising that their strength of character should give them the ascendancy among the younger colonies of the Great Valley. The men that scaled the Alleghanies were no common men; they were young, or in the prime of life; of limited education indeed, but robust, shrewd, and enterprising. Kentucky has been justly styled the Mother of the West. Not only was she the State earliest settled; her sons have been everywhere foremost; and from the Falls of St. Anthony to the Gulf of Mexico, to have been born and reared in Kentucky has ever constituted a recommendation to the highest offices, as potent as the prescriptive claim which birth in Old Spain used to confer in her colonies. Emphatically may it be said of her, as of Bethlehem Ephratah, out of her have come forth governors to rule the people. Such is the commanding position of the State, of whose early beginnings we have furnished a hasty retrospect. The seed planted with difficulty and watered with blood, has taken deep root in the prolific soil; it has shot forth its branches like the goodly cedars, it has filled the whole valley, and the hills are covered by its shadow. Cradled between the Alleghanies on the one hand, and the Rocky Mountains on the other, lies a young giant, sporting in the greatness of his strength, and already putting forth energies the limits of which are absolutely incalculable.”

The reader of Kentucky annals will discern the footsteps of Scotch-Irish Presbyterians in every encampment during the close of the last century: the very names betray the lineage. This may account in part for the fact that the Presbyterian population of the state is at this moment so large in proportion, and so high in every social, literary and political relation. The

story of the McAFEE COMPANY ought to be read in detail. The five Virginians who set out for this new land, in 1773, were all men of religious principles; they were the McAfees, McCoun, and Adams. Their names are great in the Iliad of traditionary wars. After the war with Great Britain, these daring men, increased by valuable accessions, passed the Cumberland Gap with pack-horses, and fortified themselves at McAfee's station. In 1781 Joseph McCoun, a darling son of one just named, was burnt at the stake by the Shawnees; for as yet the savages were abroad in the whole land. Safety was at length restored by the expedition of General Clarke. During these times of perpetual danger, broken in upon by tragic disasters, and filled with the excitements of hair-breadth escapes and Indian fights, we must not look for much regular developement of religion, even in the families of good men. It is pleasant to know that, amidst other neglects, the old weekly catechetical usage was observed. We doubt not that the venerable formula of the Westminster Assembly has been recited hundreds of times, on the Sabbath evening, when all were on the alert, as not knowing when the war-whoop might invade their rest. We know of seven ministers of our church, of whom six are "the sons of one man," himself also a minister; the excellent mothers of whom were in childhood carried away captive by the Indians. Such are the connexions of American Presbyterianism with the early hazards of the frontier. Well might Samuel Davies, when abroad in 1757, urge on the servants of George the Second, that such men deserved something more from British power, than the privilege of worshipping God without fear of fine and dungeons. Well might such men shed the first blood of the revolution, on the Alamance. Well might men reared in such times and trials, stand forth in the earliest declaration of Independence, at Mecklenburg, on the twentieth day of May, *one thousand seven hundred and seventy-five!* Well might they also, after the access of peace, open their arms to ministers of Christ, holding their own truths, in all the newer settlements, including what is now Kentucky.

The records of the Old Hanover Presbytery contain the first notices of the origin of churches in Kentucky. We beg leave to add to what we find in this volume, that the Virginian copy of these records is one of the noblest specimens of clerical beauty

and uniform calligraphy which is extant in modern days, and is remarkable as having been the affectionate work of a venerable and beloved clergyman, who devoted to it the cunning of an only hand; his left arm having been maimed in early youth. We mean the venerable Drury Lacy, whose sons are among us, whose reverend form is in our memory, and whose ashes sleep in the burying-place of the second church in Philadelphia. In those records we find a church called the "Peaks of Otter;" from the twin eminences of the incomparably beautiful Blue Ridge. From that upland church, in 1783, went forth its pastor the reverend David Rice,* the pioneer of Christian Kentucky. The late Dr. Joshua L. Wilson, lately gone to his reward, heard Rice's first sermon at Harrod's Station; the text was Matt. iv. 16; the missionary was welcomed by the scattered and hungering disciples of these wilds. The Hanover Presbytery advised him to emigrate; and in the year 1785, three churches were already organized, and furnished with edifices. Mr. Rice was from the school of Davies, under whose voice he was converted, and of Waddel and Todd; he was a Princeton student and a beneficiary of Richard Stockton of Morven. He was the first teacher in the school which is now Transylvania University. He was a faithful and energetic man; with marked points of character, his piety was deep and his benevolence warm, and his compassion for perishing sinners most tender and active. He died in 1816, at the age of fourscore and two years. His labours and his published works are well known in the West.

In those times missionary work was serious. Men carried

* Dr. Davidson has omitted to give any account of the Rev. David Rice before he removed to Kentucky. As he spent some of the best years of his life in Virginia, it may be proper to mention, that after his marriage with the daughter of the Rev. Samuel Blair, of Fagg's Manor, he returned to Hanover, and when the Rev. Samuel Davies was translated to the College of New Jersey, Mr. Rice became his successor, either as a regular pastor of the Hanover congregation, or as a stated supply. But in consequence of a dispute between two leading members of the session, which threatened disastrous consequences to the congregation, he thought it expedient to leave them. Upon his separation from this congregation, he removed to the county of Bedford, where he was the pastor or stated supply of several congregations, of which the "Peek's Congregation" was one; the others were Pisgah near New London, and Concord (now in Campbell county.) There is now and long has been another place of worship called Salem; but whether it existed in Mr. Rice's time the writer is uncertain. But though there were several places of worship, there was probably but one church in the county of Bedford; for there was but one session, which governed the whole. Concord was always a separate and distinct church.

their guns to church-assemblies, as their covenanting fathers had done before; and sometimes, on their way home, parties were fired on by Indians. In 1790, Judge Innes stated, that within the foregoing seven years, fifteen hundred had been slain or captured, that twenty thousand horses had been carried off, and that the value of plunder amounted to fifteen thousand pounds. But the wall went up, notwithstanding troublous times.

While Mr. Rice was gathering assemblies in the country around Harrod's Station, other helpers were at work; so that in 1785 five congregations were represented at a general meeting, for conference, at Cane Run. At a later meeting, the same year, there were twenty-three representatives from twelve congregations. Our history may be profitably consulted, for sketches of the Reverend Messrs. Crawford, Templin, Craighead, and McClure. The complete re-organization of the Church, by the old Synod, did not take place until 1789. The Synod of Virginia embraced the Presbytery of Redstone, the Presbytery of Hanover, the Presbytery of Lexington, and the Presbytery of Transylvania; which last included the district of Kentucky and the settlements on Cumberland river, covering a part of what is now Tennessee. This Presbytery met in Danville, October 17, 1786. In the next few years it was reinforced by the Rev. Messrs. Shannon, McClure and others. In later years we find this Presbytery divided into three; the new ones being West Lexington and Washington. The Synod of Kentucky, at this moment reports six Presbyteries, including between seventy and eighty ministers.

As Kentucky was the daughter of Virginia, so her early ministers were for the most part missionaries from the Synod of the mother state. Eight of these entered the new territory in the last nine years of the last century. Of these, Dr. Davidson gives highly interesting memoirs. On some of these pictures we would gladly dwell, as for example, on that of Dr. Campbell. The estimate of this brilliant scholar and polemical divine is not exaggerated. Sketches are also given of others who came into the state, previously to the organization of the Synod in 1802. Among these a place is justly devoted to the venerable Dr. Blythe, whose name ought never to be mentioned without love and respect by any true-hearted Presbyterian.

While we fully agree with Dr. Davidson, in condemning the

absurd plan of sending weak and illiterate men to the new countries, we are not sure that his general remarks on the early preachers may not be injuriously applied to individuals, aside from his intention. Further than this, we are by no means sure, that, as applied to the whole class, they are altogether just. The alleged judgment of Mr. Rice, concerning his companions, requires careful discrimination, lest it strike good and true men, less polished it may be in the schools than their successors, but well fitted for an arduous work in which elegant scholarship might have retired before the difficulties. We think the success of their labours goes far to show that, at the least, a goodly proportion of the little band possessed both zeal and ability. Slow as we should be to vindicate an unlearned ministry, we are not prepared to say that the church did wrong in sending forth a number of the very men who founded Presbyterian institutions in the west, or that she could just then have done better. From the showing of our author, it appears that more than two or three were shining exceptions; unless we pitch our standard of comparison so high as to exclude some of the ablest champions of the faith, in every period of the church. To say the truth, we have, in several parts of this work been led to pause and inquire, whether too great prominence is not occasionally given to inelegancies of manner, and too much censure expressed or implied in regard to the awkwardness, slovenliness, and eccentricities, of sound, pious, and acceptable men. What we now mean is conspicuous in a few of the characteristic sketches, and of the anecdotes. Some of these are highly amusing; they are well told: they are doubtless on good authority; but they may peradventure disparage the memory of rugged but excellent men. From this criticism we except all the censure which is directed against those who were men of dull formality, doubtful morals, or unsound tenets.

The chapters on the Revival and its accompaniments and consequences, are among the most striking in the book. Good and evil are so mingled in the events of that period, as to make us feel more than before that nothing but the hand of God could have extricated our communion from such dangers, and elevated the church in the Kentucky to that eminence in which it now rejoices. Nowhere, perhaps, are the leading facts of those great excesses, so fully brought together as in these chapters. Dr.

Davidson has done this with an unflinching hand; sometimes with more of the ludicrous in his descriptions, than is promotive of that grief with which such enormous hallucinations should be regarded. His hypothesis of explanation, in respect to the bodily exercises, strikes us as philosophically just, and as felicitously expounded.

The question concerning these phenomena of excitement is one of the most important which can be discussed in any age; it belongs not simply to Kentucky, or to America, but to the human race. The root of these evils is in the depraved constitution of man; and this root under fit circumstances, will send forth the like evils again. The precise conditions under which the human body shall yield these particular results to intense excitement, are obscure; but not more so than many analogous phenomena of hysteria and epilepsy. The epilepsy was by the Romans called *morbis comitialis*, because it was caught from person to person during election-crowds; and the law was that if an individual fell with this disease, the comitia should be forthwith adjourned. This is precisely like the fallings at Methodist services or Western camp-meetings. The transports of popish fanaticism have shown the same results; as have those of Mohammedan dervishes and Hindoo fakeers. The excesses reported to us as existing in many assemblies of the Millerites, as well as numerous instances among excitable and ignorant negroes, come under the same law. For such things there never was a better field than in the new population of the West. And he who would be prepared for the next irruption of fanaticism, should make himself familiar with these strange cases in anthropology,

In regard to the question of the beneficial results of these religious excitements, we consider accuracy of determination to depend on adherence to the sternest and most critical judgment of individual cases. In many instances, we fear, the result was simple evil; and the frantic gathering was a *fomes* of perpetual heresy, schism, and vice. In others, where truth was propounded to a people who were in this morbid condition, we doubt not that the effect was saving, and that the evils were incidental. Between these extremes, there is room for wide oscillation; and hence the difficulty of deciding whether good or evil preponderated on the whole. To this very day, after almost half a century of cool reflection, wise and good men differ as to particular

meetings or revivals. That a spirit of error, of schism, and of enthusiasm, was the result in a multitude of persons; that origin was given to heretical organizations which still survive; and that great reproach was brought on true religious exaltation of feeling; we acknowledge, in concurrence with our author. And we likewise believe, that during this very period, and amidst these very evils, that truth of God which was widely proclaimed to assemblies roused and impressible in a degree which we can scarcely imagine, was made salutary to a multitude of souls, and was thus the means of that extraordinary predominance which God has given to our faith and order in the State of Kentucky. Dr. Davidson wisely reads the lesson of this memorable and mortifying experience, when he finds in it arguments against novel and inflammatory measures, the employment of novices, and the exercise of false-charity, and of loose discipline.

In the fertile and prolific soil of Kentucky, which gives animal and vegetable growth a propulsion, which is proverbial both for good and evil, and where forests and men are alike exuberant, we need not be surprised to find errors shooting forth with analogous rankness. It was therefore for some years the battleground, the very Flanders of our Presbyterian contentions. And it is never to be forgotten, as matter of thankfulness, that men were raised up on the side of truth, as hardy and courageous as the leaders of heresy, and far more learned and able. The controversies of that day formed, by their violent passages of polemic jousting, not a few of the most efficient defenders of the faith whom our communion has seen. Other controversies, touching several of the same points, were going on, near the same time, in parts of the Congregational bodies; but nowhere were the objections of Pelagian and kindred error brought out more grossly and offensively than within the territory of our Western Synods. We refer, as will be at once apparent, to the troubles caused by the New Lights, the Cumberland Presbyterians, and Craighead. Of all these a full and clear account may be found in the volume before us; and this has been to us its most interesting part. Dr. Davidson has written it in the spirit of a sound Presbyterian theologian; without affecting that impartiality, more properly called indifference, which renders much of the ecclesiastical history of our day exceedingly unsafe: and for this portion of his labours he has our hearty thanks. We

give a decided preference to histories of error, which fully reveal the tenets of the historian, whether these, as in the present instance, are our own, or are such as we repudiate. Such reading leaves us with our eyes open; and hence we feel more security in perusing the account of the Pelagian and Semi-pelagian controversies, in Jansenius, than in the doubtful, palliative, sketches of Neander; where the enormity of falsehood is scarcely described, by reason of the philosophical coolness, with which the balance is held between the two parties. It is unquestionably true, that there is room under this plaindealing method, for occasional injustice to persons: but, under the other, the injustice is done to truth itself.

It is instructive to see, as we pursue our inquiries into doctrine-history, how the same questions, slightly varied, recur ever and anon in distant ages. The African churches, occupying a country now given over to sandy desolation, were agitated in the fifth century by quarrels on the same doctrines of grace, which have since been impugned in the Sorbonne, the colleges of the Jesuits, the classes of the Remonstrants, and the schools and assemblies of Protestant America. In this general statement, we are not descending to the lessor differences of error as between Pelagians and Arminians. Every shade has reappeared in every age. And when we read the books of modern, and less famous men, in narrower spheres, we might imagine that we were dealing anew with Celestius, Julian, Cassian, and the men of Marseilles. So likewise, the anti-pauline opinions which were vented, with characteristic openness and recklessness, by heresiarchs in western camp-meetings, are often the very same which, with greater refinement of diction, and elegance of subterfuge, have been insinuated under the metaphysics of New England rationalists. It is this cyclical quality of error, which gives peculiar interest to contests, in remote districts, of which the individual combatants are dead and forgotten; and which prepares the mind of the theological historian for observing new evolutions of the same theories, without surprise or consternation. Certain persons who drove most furiously, in the excesses of the western revivals, and who, as is usual, employed false doctrine for excitement, received the name of *New Lights*. Scarcely had the Synod of Kentucky been organized, when, in 1803, its attention was drawn to innovations in doctrine, by Mc

Nemar, Thompson, and others. These persons withdrew themselves from the jurisdiction of the court, and constituted themselves a separate presbytery. Five ministers were suspended; and these succeeded in carrying their influence to a disastrous extent over the country, not only in the way of error, but in disgraceful indecorum and fanatical outbreaks. They assailed our formularies, in regard to the Decrees, the Atonement, and the Influences of the Spirit; and, taking the usual step of errorists, rejected all Creeds. In 1804, they dissolved their new presbytery, and published its "Last Will and Testament." By this act they declared themselves independents, as to church-government. They named themselves "the Christian Church." Some of their adherents seemed to vacillate towards a Gnostic or a Manichæan scheme. Some avowed Universalism. A committee of the General Assembly appeared in the Synod at Danville, in 1804, but failed to effect conciliation. The Assembly could only warn the churches against the enthusiasm and neology. The war went on, from pulpit and press; numerous publications were made, and able defences of truth were uttered, of which due notice is taken by the historian. Matthew Houston, a New Light preacher, and one of the five, became a Shaker, in Ohio, and continued to be such, until the latest accounts. He was followed by another. Meanwhile occurred the memorable controversy between Stone and Campbell. Stone did in the open field what later errorists have done under cover. He denied the Covenant with Adam, the inability of the creature, the expiatory work of Christ, and finally the Trinity. But there were endless diversities, among the rank and file under these leaders; and their banner was one of comprehensive latitudinary union. In 1811 two prominent ministers in the defection owned their errors, and were restored; thus leaving Stone sole champion, of the original five. These things, it may be noted, led the way for the career of the famous Alexander Campbell, the bane of the Baptist communion, in the South and West; who is, we believe, at this moment endeavouring to propagate his heresies in Scotland, the country of his birth. The followers of Stone and Campbell, as our history declares, were solemnly united, as recently as 1831. But Campbell is known to have since affronted many of his new allies, by a boast that he had given the death-blow to the New Lights: so that we can no longer vouch for the continuance of the ill-starred

conjunction. We are not informed of the existence of any record, in print, of these dissensions, so complete as that of Dr. Davidson: and, for reasons already given we regard the work as one of high value, full of warning to all who shall come after us.

The case of Craighead falls under a similar head, though as is justly observed, it was not attended by as disastrous consequences. The Rev. Thomas B. Craighead, originally of North Carolina, went to Tennessee, and made a sound profession of adherence to our standards, in 1805. But the next year he preached a sermon, in which full confirmation was given to some foregoing charges of heterodoxy. He maintained that the illuminating influences of the Spirit were now superseded by scripture; that the action of the word is the only operative principle; and that the mind is susceptible of regeneration, on the bare presentation of truth, just as the eye is susceptible of images from natural light. As these things were uttered before the Synod, they were immediately submitted to that court, by the Committee of Bills and Overtures. A firm but gentle admonition was the result. This proved ineffectual; and three years afterwards, Mr. Craighead published his Sermon on Regeneration, with an insulting address to the Synod. So far as can be gathered from an obscure and involved production, he held substantially the same opinions which have since been known as part of the New Theology. "He sneered, as bitterly as any infidel could do, at the doctrines of Election, Special Grace, and the immediate influence of the Spirit, which he called 'a Spirit without credentials.' He took the ground, (which Warburton had taken before him,) that we are in a different situation from the apostles and early disciples. They enjoyed the immediate guidance of the Holy Ghost, in the absence of written records; but since the completion of the Canon of Scripture, that guidance has been withdrawn, and we are left solely to the written Word. The Spirit in the Word is the sole cause of faith and sanctification. There can be no intellectual effects produced on the mind except by thoughts or ideas expressed in words. Any other opinion he pronounced enthusiastic. All moral attraction consists in motives. Believing is an intellectual, not a moral act; it is irresistibly dependent on testimony, and never independent or voluntary. Faith is necessarily a mediate gift; the testimony, not the disposition to believe, being supplied from heaven. A *divine* faith

is believing on the testimony of *God*. A man can no more resist the force of the divine truth of God, if he suffers it to enter his intellectual eye, than he can prevent his natural eye from seeing, when natural light enters into it. There is no new sense, perception, disposition or taste, serving as the root of holiness; and to expect it, would be as absurd as a law requiring us to taste sweetness in honey; the mind being always naturally influenced by the greatest good. He heaped no less ridicule on the idea of praying for faith. The examples of such prayers in Scripture were instances of the faith of miracles; and our Lord treated them as words without meaning. Christ's manner of preaching differed from the modern current cant: 'Pray to God to give you faith to believe. Pray, pray, strive, agonize, wait on, till Christ comes and delivers you.' "

In reply to this, the learned and lamented Dr. Campbell, whose name most justly fills a large space in this volume, appeared in 1810 in a series of five letters to Craighead. This timely, logical, and conclusive work was widely circulated, and was not answered for almost a year, when Craighead put forth a pamphlet, chiefly remarkable for incoherence, spleen and rancour against Calvinism. Dr. Campbell re-appeared, in a review, well known as the "Pelagian Detected." In this he fixes on his opponent the charge of having at an earlier date misled some who became prominent New Lights, and even some, including poor Houston, who descended to drivel with the Shakers. In 1811 Mr. Craighead, after due process, faithful dealing, and mild delay, was finally deposed; a judgment which was ratified by the General Assembly. After a protracted series of applications for new trials, and endeavours extended through several years, Mr. Craighead was restored to his ministerial standing, in 1824. For further particulars we refer our readers to the volume. The meager sketch which we have given will afford but a faint notion of the anxiety and excitement produced by these proceedings during the years which they occupied: the facts are fresh in the recollection of all our elder brethren.

We here give a slight notice, though out of its place in chronology, of the Cumberland Presbyterians, who fill an instructive chapter of Dr. Davidson's book. This schism had its origin in the necessities of a new country, and the want of qual-

ified ministers, which led to the licensure by the Transylvania Presbytery in 1802 of two unlearned men as preachers, and of three others as catechists. Soon after this, the Cumberland Presbytery was constituted out of a portion of the original body. This Cumberland Presbytery was solicited to license four persons, already catechists. These persons were not examined as to the languages and sciences. They received the Confession of Faith; but with this exception: "they professed to believe that the idea of Fatality was there taught, under the mysterious doctrines of Election and Reprobation, and objected accordingly." They were nevertheless licensed; and here we have the precise origin of the schism. The five dissentients, however, in protesting against this act, make no allusion to the doctrinal exception. The Presbytery went on to increase their forces by similar additions, sometimes from a body called the Republican Methodists: till the unlearned exhorters soon numbered seventeen. None were required to adopt the Confession, except *so far only* as they believed it to agree with the Word of God. The General Assembly was promptly advised of these measures, by a letter of Mr. Rice. The reply (see Digest pp. 148—151. Min. Trans. Pby. vol. iii. p. 87) will be found to be in agreement with the uniform and now prevalent judgment of the church. In the Synod of Kentucky, the matter came up, the same year, 1804, and a committee was sent down to the Cumberland Presbytery. In 1805 the whole difficulty came before the Synod, on the review of the Minutes: these records were reported as abounding in evidence of flagrant violation of the Rules of Discipline. The Synod appointed a Commission, of ten ministers and six elders, of which Mr. Lyle was to be Moderator, to confer with the Presbytery; and to adjudicate on their presbyterial proceedings. This Commission met, December 3, 1805. There were twenty-seven cases of irregular licensure and ordination. Twenty-four young men, contumaciously renouncing the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian Church, were solemnly prohibited, until the omission, from preaching under any authority from the Cumberland Presbytery. The court further cited Messrs. Hodge, McGee, and Rankin, to appear before the Synod, to answer charges of erroneous teaching. This citation was resisted, as unconstitutional. When the Synod met in 1806, Messrs. Hodge and Rankin were suspended; the Presbytery of Cumberland was

dissolved, and its members were reannexed to the Presbytery of Transylvania.

In 1807 the whole affair occupied the time of the General Assembly. It appeared then to be the prevalent opinion, that the Cumberland Presbytery had erred, but that the Synod had acted with too much rigour; and that they had transcended their power in suspending ordained ministers by a Commission. But a strong minority insisted on the authority and rights of Synods and General Assemblies. In a letter to the Synod of Kentucky, the Assembly advised a review of the proceedings, in order to a removal or mitigation of the evils. In another letter, to McAdow and his associates, the Assembly refer all the evils to the license of persons without qualifications, and without explicit adoption of our formularies, and pronounced the same highly irregular and unconstitutional.

The Synod reviewed its proceedings; but reaffirmed all its decisions. In 1808 the Synod was unrepresented in the Assembly, by reason of an accident in regard to their letter. In 1809 the proceedings of the Synod, now at length, fully before the General Assembly, and ably defended by Messrs. Lyle and Stuart, in a memorable debate, were sustained, without a dissenting voice. The decision was final, and was confirmed by the subsequent act of 1814.

In December 1809, the Transylvania Presbytery restored Mr. William Hodge. Two other persons, ordained irregularly, were authoritatively received as members of the body, after examination. By various casualties the recusant association was reduced to two members, and thus unfitted to act as a presbytery. But joining Mr. McAdow to their number, they in 1810 constituted themselves into an independent body, known as the Cumberland Presbytery. Mr. McAdow was suspended by the Transylvania Presbytery, in the same year. In 1811 intercommunion ceased between the Cumberland Presbyterians and those who adhered to the General Assembly. In 1813 the independent Presbytery became a Synod, with three Presbyteries and sixty congregations. In 1804 they proceeded "to model, to expunge, and to add to, the Confession of Faith:" such are their own words. They rejected the doctrines of eternal reprobation, definite atonement, and special grace, and maintained that the Spirit of God operates on the will, or coextensively with the

atonement, so as to leave all men inexcusable. In their Shorter Catechism they deny that God has decreed sin; but they are said to maintain the perseverance of the saints. In the same year, the General Assembly decided, that they could not be viewed as having any authority from the Presbyterian church nor be treated with except as individuals.* In 1825, it was decided that their ministrations are to be viewed in the same light with those of other denominations, not connected with our body. This decision is grounded on the opinion, that the act of the Assembly of 1814 precluded the propriety of Deposition, or any process in the case."

In the latter chapters of his work Dr. Davidson dwells at proper length on the condition of the Western Church during the war of 1812, and sketches the character of the brilliant McChord, whom the author succeeded as a pastor, in 1832. He fills a chapter with the origin and progress of Transylvania University, of which he was sometime president; and of Centre College, the Presbyterian Institution of Kentucky. His memoir of President Holley is equal to any part of the work in strength of drawing. The lineaments of that dangerous but captivating Socinian are given with a boldness and warmth which we believe to be salutary. In regard to the excellent and rising college at Danville, he is led to treat of a great topic of our church and day, in terms which we copy, in order that they may be collated with Dr. Van Rensselaer's able report on Parochial Schools.

"The necessity of DENOMINATIONAL EDUCATION, after a fair experiment, has been rendered of late years very apparent. To attempt to dispense with it is false liberality, and a pusillanimous surrender of the Church. Twice was the power of the Church evinced in the triumphant success of her own distinctive schools, (the Kentucky Academy, and afterwards Centre College,) while the State Institution was depressed.

"If the Church wishes to secure the proper and sound religious training of her sons, she must have the means under her own control; guarded against the likelihood of change. We have seen the radical mistake committed by the Presbyterians, both in 1783 and 1798. Had they, at the very first, asked for a charter, recognizing denominational control, they might easily have obtained it. Then they had the moral ascendancy; the field was perfectly free from competition, and sectarian jealousies were not yet awakened; as they afterwards found to be the

*"Dr. Baird, in his admirable work, *Religion in America*, p. 253, has been betrayed into an error in stating that the case had been brought by appeal before the Assembly. Though there was a correspondence opened on the part of the malcontents as individuals, no appeal was ever regularly taken. On the contrary, any such intention was openly disavowed, as has been already narrated."

case, when they established Centre College. Another error into which they fell was to depend on the arm of flesh, and court the patronage of worldly men, and the eclat of distinguished names. Hence, in the struggle of 1818 they were betrayed; and had to their mortification, (for the second time,) a Socinian president placed over them.

“The Presbyterians have often been accused of bigotry, when in truth the fault to which they have inclined, and for which they have severely smarted, has been excessive liberality and the dread of sectarian odium. Let them at last take warning from the crippled condition of various State institutions, and from the fate of Transylvania and Dickinson, originally founded by Presbyterians, and now fallen into the hands of the Methodists. Let them establish Denominational Schools, as the Roman Catholics and the Methodists do, and provide instruction of a superior and commanding character, and they need not despair of support. The public will always find out and sustain what is most deserving of patronage. Let them be on the alert, or they will find themselves thrown into the background, and stripped of their hard-earned advantages by denominations which a few years ago were clamorous against a learned ministry, but who have now seen their error, and stimulated by our example, are straining every nerve to become our most formidable rivals.”

The difficulty of reviewing this book lies chiefly in its abundance of matter; and of matter in which we take, as our author plainly does, the very deepest interest. For this reason, we have to stop short, without entering on his striking memoir of the New School controversy. To begin on this topic, would render necessary a re-opening of all those questions, in which, if in any thing, we have avowed our mind, and borne the consequences. That the records here given will prove distasteful to a large body of Presbyterians, we need not inform either the writer or the readers of the work. Yet, without necessity, we would not here discuss matters which involve the names and actions of so many living persons. This is plainly the most delicate part of Dr. Davidson's undertaking. That he has escaped every error of statement, is more than any man in like case ever justly claimed: that he has performed his task with due diligence, with fearless justice, and in the spirit of filial attachment to his Church, we heartily believe. We have no knowledge of any facts which contravene even the minuter portions of this painful narrative; and though we have learned that some of the statements have given offence, we are ready to believe that this was unavoidable, if the history were to be carried down to the point actually reached. And our conviction is firm, that if errors, even trivial shall be pointed out, by friend or enemy, they will be promptly corrected, in a work which must increase in value as time advances.

The general tenor of Dr. Davidson's historical style is admirable: we say the general tenor; because he sometimes fails to please us. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, it is very far above what is usual; in elegance, simplicity, and transparency; in the hundredth case, it offends us by a starched elaboration which mars the general effect. Our remark applies to the surface, and to a small segment of it. This opinion we have already expressed; and we have only to renew our declaration that the faults, as compared with the excellencies, of the work, are small; that it is characterized by impartiality and fidelity; and that the author has performed an acceptable service to the Church of his and our fathers.

- ART. III.—1. *Discourses on Christian Nurture.* By Horace Bushnell, Pastor of the North Church, Hartford Approved by the Committee of Publication. Boston: Massachusetts Sabbath School Society. 1847. 12mo. pp. 72.
2. *Dr. Tyler's Letter to Dr. Bushnell on Christian Nurture.* Svo. pp. 22.
3. *An Argument for "Discourses on Christian Nurture," addressed to the Publishing Committee of the Massachusetts Sabbath School Society,* By Horace Bushnell. Hartford: Edwin Hunt. 1847. Svo. pp. 48

THE leading idea of Dr. Bushnell's Discourses, is organic, as distinguished from individual life. Whatever may be thought of the expression, or whatever may be the form in which it lies in his mind, it represents a great and obvious truth; a truth, which however novel it may appear to many of our New England brethren, is as familiar to Presbyterians as household words. Strange, and in our view distorted, as is the form in which this truth appears in Dr. Bushnell's book, and incongruous as are the elements with which it is combined, it still has power to give his Discourses very much of an "Old-school" cast, and to render them in a high degree attractive and hopeful in our estimation. Apart from the two great illustrations of this truth, the participation of the life of Adam by the whole race, and of the life of Christ, by all believ-

ers, we see on every hand abundant evidence that every church, nation and society has a common life, besides the life of its individual members. This is the reason why nothing of importance can occur in one part of the church, without influencing all other parts. No new form of doctrine, no revival or decline of spiritual life can exhibit itself in New England, that is not effective throughout the Presbyterian church. We as a body owe, in no small measure, our character as distinguished from other Presbyterian communities to our participation, so to speak, of the life of New England; and the New England churches, are indebted, in like manner, for their character as distinguished from other congregational bodies, to the influence of their Presbyterian brethren. No community can isolate itself. The subtle influence which pervades the whole, permeates through every barrier, as little suspected and yet as effective as the magnetic or electric fluid in nature. This fact, may be explained in a manner more or less obvious or profound according to our philosophy or disposition, but it cannot be denied, and should not be disregarded.

We are therefore not uninterested spectators of the changes going on in New England. They are changes in the body of which we are members, and their effects, for good or evil, we must share. We are not therefore stepping out of our own sphere, or meddling with what does not concern us, in calling attention to Dr. Bushnell's book and to the discussions to which it has given rise.

The history of this little volume is somewhat singular. Dr. Bushnell was appointed by the Ministerial Association of which he is a member, to discuss the subject of Christian training. He produced two discourses from his pulpit, and read the argument before the Association, who requested its publication. To this he assented, but before his purpose was executed, a request came from a member of the Committee of the Massachusetts Sabbath School Society, that the publication should be made by them. The manuscript was forwarded to the committee who retained it in their possession six months, twice returned it to the author for modifications, and finally published it with their approbation. It excited no little attention, being favourably noticed in some quarters, and unfavourably in others. So much disapprobation however was soon manifested, that the committee felt called upon

to suspend its publication. We are not surprised at any of these facts. We do not wonder that the committee kept the book so long under advisement; or that they should ultimately venture on its publication; or that when published, it should create such a sensation, or meet with the fate which actually befel it. There is enough in the book to account for all this. Enough of truth most appropriate for our times, powerfully presented, to make the committee anxious to bring it before the churches; enough of what was new in form and strange in aspect, to create doubt as to its effect and its reception; and enough of apparent and formidable error to account for the alarm and uneasiness consequent on its publication. We cannot regret that the book has seen the light, and done, or at least begun, its work. We anticipate immeasurably more good than evil from its publication. What is wrong, we trust will be sifted out and perish, what is right, will live and operate.

The truths which give value to this publication, and from which we anticipated such favourable results, are principally the following. First, the fact that there is such a divinely constituted relation between the piety of parents and that of their children, as to lay a scriptural foundation for a confident expectation, in the use of the appointed means, that the children of believers will become truly the children of God. We do not like the form in which Dr. Bushnell states this fact; much less, as we shall probably state more fully in the sequel, the mode in which he accounts for it; but the fact itself is most true and precious. It is founded on the express and repeated declaration and promise of God. He said to Abraham: I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God to thee and to thy seed after thee. Deut. vii. 9. Know, therefore, that Jehovah thy God, he is God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his commandments to a thousand generations. Deut. xxxix. 6. The Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God, with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live. Is. lix. 21. As for me this is my covenant with them, saith the Lord, my Spirit that is upon thee and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the mouth

of thy seed's seed, from henceforth forever. In the New Testament the fact that the promises made to believers include their children, was recognised from the very foundation of the Christian church. In the sermon delivered by Peter on the day of Pentecost, he said, the promise is to thee and to thy seed after thee. And Paul assures us even with regard to outcast Israel, the children are beloved for the father's sake. It is, therefore, true, as might be much more fully proved, that by divine appointment the children of believers are introduced into the covenant into which their parents enter with God, and that the promises of that covenant are made no less to the children than to the parents. He promises to be their God, to give them his Spirit, to renew their hearts, and to cause them to live.

This promise, however, like all others of a similar character, is general; expressing what is to be the general course of events, and not what is to be the result in every particular case. When God promised that summer and winter, seed time and harvest should succeed each other to the end of time, he did not pledge himself that there never should be a failure in this succession, that a famine should never occur, or that the expectations of the husbandman should never be disappointed. Nor does the declaration, Train up a child in the way in which he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it, contain a promise that no well disciplined child shall ever wander from the right path. It is enough that it expresses the tendency and ordinary result of proper training. In like manner, the promise of God to give his Spirit to the children of believers, does not imply that every such child shall be made the subject of saving blessings. It is enough that it indicates the channel in which his grace ordinarily flows, and the general course of his dispensations.

Again, it is to be remembered that these promises are conditional. <God has never promised to make no distinction between faithful and unfaithful parents, between those who bring up their offspring in the nurture of the Lord, and those who utterly neglect their religious training.> The condition, which from the nature of the case is implied in this promise, is in many cases expressly stated. His promise is to those who keep his covenant, and to those who remember his commandments to do them. It is involved in the very nature of a covenant that it should have conditions. And although in one important sense, the conditions

of the covenant of grace have been performed by Christ, still its promises are suspended on conditions to be performed by or in his people. And this is expressly declared to be the case with regard to the promise of the divine blessing to the children of believers. They must keep his covenant. They must train up their children for God. They must use the means which he has appointed for their conversion and sanctification, or the promise does not apply to them. Then again, there is a condition to be performed by the children themselves. God promises to be their God, but they must consent to be his people. He promises them his Spirit, but they must seek and cherish his influence. If they renounce the covenant, and refuse to have God for their God, and to walk in the way of his commandments, then the promise no longer pertains to them.

It will naturally be objected, that if this is so, the promise amounts to nothing. If after all, it is not the children of believers as such and consequently all such children who are to be saved; if the promise to them is general as a class and not to each individual; if it is conditioned on the fidelity of parents and of the children themselves, its whole value is gone. What have they more than others? What advantage have the children of the covenant? or what profit is there in baptism? It is precisely thus the Jews reasoned against the apostle. When he proved that it was not the Jews as Jews, and simply because Jews, who were to be the heirs of salvation, and that circumcision could profit them nothing unless they kept the law, they immediately asked: What advantage then hath the Jew, and what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way, answered the apostle,—chiefly because unto them were committed the oracles of God. To them belonged the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service, and the promises: theirs were the fathers, and of them, as concerning the flesh, Christ came. Salvation was of the Jews. All the religion that was in the world was found among them. It was therefore a great advantage to be found among that favoured people, even although from the want of faithfulness, on the part both of parents and children, so many of them perished. In like manner it is a great blessing to be born within the covenant, to be the children of believers—to them belong the adoption and the promises, they are the channel in which the Spirit

flows, and from among them the vast majority of the heirs of salvation are taken notwithstanding the multitudes who perish through their own fault or the fault of their parents.

It is, therefore, a scriptural truth that the children of believers are the children of God, as being within his covenant with their parents, he promises to them his Spirit, he has established a connexion between faithful parental training and the salvation of children, as he has between seed-time and harvest, diligence and riches, education and knowledge. In no one case is absolutely certainty secured or the sovereignty of God excluded. But in all the divinely appointed connexion between means and end, is obvious.

That this connexion is not more apparent, in the case of parents and children is due, in a great measure, to the sad deficiency in parental fidelity. If we look over the Christian world, how few nominally Christian parents even pretend to bring up their children for God. In a great majority of cases the attainment of some worldly object, is avowedly made the end of education; and all the influences to which a child is exposed are designed and adapted to make him a man of the world. And even within the pale of evangelical churches, it must be confessed, there is great neglect as to this duty. Where is the parent whose children have turned aside from God, whose heart will not rather reproach him, than charge God with forgetting his promise? Our very want of faith in the promise is one great reason of our failure. We have forgotten the covenant. We have forgotten that our children belong to God; that he has promised to be their God, if we are faithful to our trust. We do not say that all the children of the most faithful parent, will certainly be saved, any more than we would say that every diligent man will become rich; but the scriptures do say that the children of believers are the subjects of the divine promise, as clearly as they say, the hand of the diligent maketh rich.

This doctrine is clearly implied in the circumcision and baptism of children. Why is the sign and seal of the covenant attached to them, if they are not within the covenant? What are the promises of that covenant but that God will be their God, that he will forgive their sins, give them his Spirit, renew their hearts, and cause them to live? These promises are therefore made to them, and are sealed to them in their baptism, just

as much as they are to their parents. This has been the uniform doctrine of the Christian church. It is avowed in all confessions, and involved in the usages of all communions.

In the Appendix to the Geneva Catechism, in the form for the administration of Baptism, it is said: *Quamobrem etsi fidelium liberi sint ex Adami corrupta stirpe ac genere, eos ad se nihilominus admittit, propter foedus videlicet cum eorum parentibus initum, eosque pro liberis suis habet ac numerat; ob eamque causam jam inde ab initio nascentis ecclesiae voluit infantibus circumcisionis notam imprimi, qua quidem nota jam eadem omnia significabat ac demonstrabat, quae hodie in Baptismo designatur. . . Minime dubium est, quin liberi nostri haeredes sint ejus vitae ac salutis, quam nobis est pollicitus; qua de causa eos sanctificari Paulus affirmat, jam inde ab utero matris, quo ab Ethnicorum et e vera religione abhorrentium hominum liberis discernantur. Belgic confession Act. 34. Nos eos (infantes) eadem ratione baptizandos et signo foederis absignandos esse credimus, qua olim in Israele parvuli circumcidebantur, nimirum propter easdem promissiones infantibus nostris factas. Et revera Christus non minus sanguinem suum effudit, ut fidelium infantes, quam ut adultos ablueret.*

Heidleberg Catechism: Ought young children to be baptized? Yes, because they as well as adults are embraced in the covenant and church of God. And because to them the deliverance from sin through the blood of Christ, and the Holy Ghost, are no less promised than to adults; they should therefore be united by baptism, the sign of the covenant, to the church, and distinguished from the children of unbelievers, as under the Old Testament was done by circumcision, in the place of which baptism is appointed.*

Helvetic Confession. II. 20. *Damnamus Anabaptistas, qui negant baptizandos esse infantulos recens natos a fidelibus. Nam juxta doctrinam evangelicam, horum est regnum Dei, et sunt in foedere Dei, cur itaque non daretur eis signum foederis Dei? cur non per sanctum Baptisma initiarentur, qui sunt peculium et in ecclesia Dei?*

These are only a specimen of the numerous recognitions by the Reformed churches, of the great truth, that the infants of

* This may not agree verbatim with the common English version of this Catechism. It is taken from the German, the only copy we have at hand.

believers are included in that covenant in which God promises grace and salvation. To them these promises are made. There is an intimate and divinely established connexion between the faith of parents and the salvation of their children; such a connexion as authorizes them to plead God's promises, and to expect with confidence, that through his blessing on their faithful efforts, their children will grow up the children of God. This is the truth and the great truth, which Dr. Bushnell asserts. This doctrine it is his principal object to establish. It is this that gives his book, its chief value. This and its consequences render his discourses so appropriate to the present state of the church; for there is perhaps no one doctrine to which it is more important in our day to call the attention of the people of God.

A second truth prominently presented by our author is that parental nurture, or Christian training, is the great means for the salvation of the children of the church. We of course recognise the native depravity of children, the absolute necessity of their regeneration by the Holy Spirit, the inefficiency of all means of grace without the blessing of God. But what we think is plainly taught in scripture, what is reasonable in itself, and confirmed by the experience of the church, is, that early, assiduous and faithful religious culture of the young, especially by believing parents, is the great means of their salvation. A child is born in a Christian family, its parents recognise it as belonging to God and included in his covenant. In full faith that the promise extends to their children as well as to themselves, they dedicate their child to him in baptism. From its earliest infancy it is the object of tender solicitude, and the subject of many believing prayers. The spirit which reigns around it is the spirit, not of the world, but of true religion. The truth concerning God and Christ, the way of salvation and of duty, is inculcated from the beginning, and as fast as it can be comprehended. The child is sedulously guarded as far as possible from all corrupting influence, and subjected to those which tend to lead him to God. He is constantly taught that he stands in a peculiar relation to God, as being included in his covenant and baptized in his name; that he has in virtue of that relation a right to claim God as his Father, Christ as his Saviour, and the Holy Ghost as his sanctifier; and assured that God will recognise that claim and receive him as his child, if he is faithful to his baptismal vows. The

child thus trained grows up in the fear of God; his earliest experiences are more or less religious; he keeps aloof from open sins; strives to keep his conscience clear in the sight of God, and to make the divine will the guide of his conduct. When he comes to maturity, the nature of the covenant of grace is fully explained to him, he intelligently and deliberately assents to it, publicly confesses himself to be a worshipper and follower of Christ, and acts consistently with his engagements. This is no fancy sketch. Such an experience is not uncommon in actual life. It is obvious that in such cases it must be difficult both for the person himself and for those around him, to fix on the precise period when he passed from death unto life. And even in cases, where there is more of conflict, where the influence of early instruction has met with greater opposition, and where the change is more sudden and observable, the result, under God, is to be attributed to this parental training.

✓ What we contend for then, is, that this is the appointed, the natural, the normal and ordinary means by which the children of believers are made truly the children of God. And consequently this is the means which should be principally relied upon, and employed, and that the saving conversion of our children should in this way be looked for and expected. It certainly has the sanction of God. He has appointed and commanded precisely this early assiduous and faithful training of the young. These words, saith the Lord, which I command you this day, shall be in thine hearts: and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down and when thou risest up. Ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath, but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. As this method of religious training has the sanction of a divine command, so it has also the benefit of his special promise. Success in the use of this means is the very thing promised to parents in the covenant into which they are commanded to introduce their children. God, in saying that he will be their God, give them his Spirit, and renew their hearts, and in connecting this promise with the command to bring them up for him does thereby engage to render such training effectual. Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it, is moreover the express assurance of his word.

There is also a natural adaptation in all means of God's appointment, to the end they are intended to accomplish. There is an appropriate connexion between sowing and reaping, between diligence and prosperity, truth and holiness, religious training and the religious life of children. If the occasional and promiscuous hearing of the word as preached, is blessed to their conviction and conversion, why should not the early, personal, appropriate application of the same truth, aided by all the influence of natural affection, and the atmosphere of a pious home, be expected to be still more effective? How sensibly is a child's disposition and character moulded in other respects by parental example and teaching. How much greater, humanly speaking, is the advantage which a parent possesses than any preacher can have, in his constant intercourse with his child, in his hold on its confidence and love, and in the susceptibility to good impressions which belongs to the early period of life. Surely contact with the world, the influence of evil passions long indulged, of opposition to the truth, to the dictates of conscience, and the strivings of the Spirit, must harden the heart, and increase the difficulties of a sound conversion. In no part of his Discourses nor in his Argument in their defence, is Dr. Bushnell so true or eloquent as in what he says of the natural power of parental influence, even before the development of reason in the child.

"Many persons," he says, "seem never to have brought their minds down close enough to an infant child to understand that anything of consequence is going on with it, until after it has come to language and become a subject thus of *instruction*. As if a child were to learn a language before it is capable of learning anything! Whereas there is a whole era, so to speak, before language, which may be called the era of *impressions*, and these impressions are the seminal principles, in some sense, of the activity that runs to language, and also of the whole future character. I strongly suspect that more is done, in the age previous to language, to effect the character of children, whether by parents, or, when they are waiting in indolent security, by nurses and attendants, than in all the instruction and discipline of their minority afterwards; for, in this first age, the age of impressions, there goes out in the whole manner of the parent—the look, the voice, the handling—an expression of feeling, and that feeling expressed streams directly into the soul, and re-

produces itself there, as by a law of contagion. What man of adult age, who is at all observant of himself, has failed to notice the power that lies in a simple *presence*, even to him? To this power the infant is passive as the wax to the seal. When, therefore, we consider how small a speck, falling into the nucleus of a crystal, may disturb its form; or how the smallest mote of foreign matter, present in the quickening egg, will suffice to produce a deformity; considering, also, on the other hand, what nice conditions of repose, in one case, and what accurately modulated supplies of heat, in the other, are necessary to a perfect product; then only do we begin to imagine what work is going on in the soul of a child during the age of impressions. Suppose now that all preachers of Christ could have their hearers, for whole months, in their own will, after the same manner, so as to move them by a look, a motion, a smile, a frown, and act their own sentiments and emotions over in them; and then, for whole years, had them in authority to command, direct, tell them whither to go, what to learn, what to do, regulate their hours, their books, their pleasures, and their company, and call them to prayer over their own knees every night and morning, who—that can rightly conceive such an organic acting of one being in many, will deem it extravagant, or think it a dishonour to the grace of God, to say that a power like this may well be expected to fashion all who come under it to newness of life?

“Now what I have endeavoured, in my tract, and what I here endeavour is, to waken, in our churches, a sense of this power and of the momentous responsibilities that accrue under it. I wish to produce an impression that God has not held us responsible for the effect only of what we do, or teach, or for acts of control and government; but quite as much, for the effect of our *being what we are*; that there is a plastic age in the house, receiving its type, not from our words but from our *spirit*, one whose character is shaping in the moulds of our own.”

If on this subject we appeal to experience, we shall find that religion has flourished in all ages and in all parts of the church, just in the proportion in which attention has been given to the religious training of the young. God prepared the world for the gospel by a long course of discipline. The law was a school-master to bring men to Christ. The Jews were scattered over the Roman empire to educate a people for the Lord. Every

synagogue was a preparatory school for the church, and it was from among those trained in these schools that the early converts to the gospel, were gathered. In the early church the instruction of the young was made a principal part of parental and ministerial duty. When religion began to decline, and men were taught that baptism wrought the change which God had appointed Christian nurture to effect, then religious education was neglected, and ritualism supplanted piety. When the gospel was revived, Christian nurture revived with it. Catechisms for the young were among the earliest and most effective of the productions of the Reformers. True religion from that day to this has kept pace, risen or declined, just as the training of the young has been attended to or neglected. Scotland is the most religious nation in Europe, because her children are the best instructed. When our missionaries go to the eastern churches or to the heathen, they find preaching to adults like talking to a brazen wall. They begin with the young. They take God's method, and train up a generation to his praise. If we look over our own country, we are taught the same lesson. Religion, what there is of it, is the inconstant and destructive fire of fanaticism, wherever children grow up out of the church and ignorant of God. With him indeed nothing is impossible—and therefore adult heathen, or ignorant and superstitious nominal Christians, are not beyond the reach of his power, and are often made the subjects of his grace; just as the thief was converted on the cross. But a death-bed is not the best place for repentance, nor are ignorant and hardened sinners the most hopeful subjects of conversion.

The truth here asserted has always been recognised in the church. The wisest and best men have known and taught that the ordinary and normal method of bringing the children of believers to the saving obedience of the truth, was Christian training. To this therefore all evangelical churches bind believing parents, by solemn vows, calling upon them to pray with and for their children, to set before them a godly example, and to teach them his word. Why is all this done, if it is not God's appointed means for their salvation? "I doubt not to affirm," says Baxter, "that a godly education is God's first and ordinary appointed means for the begetting of actual faith and other graces in the children of believers. . . . And the preaching

of the word by public ministers is not the first ordinary means of grace to any but those that were graceless till they come to hear such preaching, that is, to those on whom the first appointed means hath been neglected or proved vain." *Christian Directory*, vol. ii. c. 6, 4. "Every Christian family," says Edwards, "ought to be, as it were, a little church, consecrated to Christ, and wholly influenced and governed by his rules. And family education and order are some of the chief means of grace. If these fail, all other means are likely to prove ineffectual." Vol. i. 90.* This principle characteristically governed the conduct of our Presbyterian ancestors both in England and Scotland. They were accustomed to insist much on the relation of their children to the church and the covenant of God, to bring them up under the conviction that they belonged peculiarly to him, were under peculiar obligations, and had a special interest in his promises. They frequently reminded them of this peculiar relation, and called upon to renew their baptismal vows. The excellent Philip Henry, drew up for his children the following baptismal covenant: "I take God to be my chiefest good and highest end. I take God the Son to be my prince and saviour. I take the Holy Ghost to be my sanctifier, teacher, guide and comforter. I take the word of God to be my rule in all my actions; and the people of God to be my people in all conditions. I do likewise devote and dedicate unto the Lord, my whole self, all I am, all I have, and all I can do. And this I do deliberately, sincerely, freely, and forever." "This," says his biographer, "he taught his children, and they each of them solemnly repeated it every Lord's day in the evening after they were catechized, he putting his amen to it, and sometimes adding: 'So say, and so do, and you are made forever.'" Many parents may not be prepared to go as far as Philip Henry, or approve of calling upon children to make such professions, but we have gone to the opposite extreme. So much has this covenanting spirit died out, so little is the relation of our children to God and their interest in his promises regarded or recognised, that we have heard of men who strenuously objected to children being taught the Lord's prayer, for fear they should think God was really their father!

* Both these quotations are borrowed from Dr. Bushnell's *Argument*, pp. 10 and 15.

This shows to what an extent a false theory can pervert not only the scriptures, but even our strongest natural impulses and affections.

There is indeed great danger of this training and especially this covenanting with God degenerating into mere formality and hypocrisy. Parents and children may come to think that religion consists entirely in knowledge and orthodoxy; that they are safe because baptized and included in the church. This tendency was exhibited among the Jews, who thought themselves the true children of God, and heirs of the promise, simply because they were the children of Abraham. It has been exemplified in all ages of the church, and is still seen in many denominations of Christians, even the strictest and most orthodox. Children may be baptized, taught the catechism, and thoroughly instructed and carefully restrained, and thus grow up well-informed and well-behaved, and yet be destitute of all true religion; and what is still worse, deny there is any religion beyond an orthodox faith and moral conduct. This is a great evil. It is not however to be avoided by going to the opposite extreme, denying all peculiarity of relation between the children of believers and the God of their fathers, or undervaluing the importance of Christian nurture. There is no security from any evil, but the grace of God, and the real life of religion in the church. Men are constantly passing from one extreme to another. Neglecting entirely the covenant, or making external formal assent to it, all that is necessary. Our safety consists in adhering to the word of God, believing what he has said, doing what he has commanded, and at the same time looking constantly for the vivifying presence and power of his Spirit. Our children if properly instructed will not be ignorant of the difference between obedient and disobedient children of the covenant. They will be aware that if insincere in their professions or unfaithful to their engagements, they are only the more guilty and exposed to a severer condemnation. Dr. Bushnell says, that what he endeavoured in his Tract, and tried to accomplish in his defence of it, is to waken in our churches, a sense of the power of this early religious training, and of the momentous responsibilities arising under it. This is a high aim. It is a great and good work, and we heartily wish that his book may not fail of its object, so far as this is concerned.

We do not anticipate any dissent from the views hitherto advanced. All Christian parents who dedicate their children to God in baptism, believe them to be included in the covenant, and they do not hesitate to admit the obligation and importance of early religious education and nurture. But the question is, are not these truths practically neglected? Does not a theory of religion extensively prevail which leads believing parents to expect their children to grow up very much like other children, unconverted, out of the church, out of covenant with God, and to rely far less on the peculiar promise of God to them and to his blessing on their religious culture, than on other means, for their salvation? We cannot doubt that this is the case, and that it is the source of incalculable evil. Whether this state of things is to be corrected by rejecting what is wrong in our theory, and letting that regulate our practice; or whether we are to regulate our practice according to the scriptures, and trust to that to correct our theory, it may not be very important to determine. One thing however is certain that, if we act on the principles and rules laid down in scripture respecting Christian nurture, we must modify in some measure our theory of religion, or at least of the way in which it is to be promoted. We believe that all true Christians of every name and church agree substantially in what it is to be a Christian, or wherein Christianity subjectively considered, really consists. It is the recognition and reception of the Lord Jesus Christ as he is presented in the Gospel, and the consequent conformity of our hearts to his image, and the devotion of our lives to his service. It is to apprehend his glory as the only begotten of the Father, as God manifest in the flesh, for our salvation. It is the sincere recognition of him, as the proper object of worship, and the only ground of confidence before God for justification and holiness. It is making him the supreme object of affection, and submitting to him as to our rightful and absolute sovereign. Any man who does this is a Christian; and no man is a Christian, who does not do this, whatever else he may do or be. This of course implies a great deal. It implies regeneration by the Holy Spirit, by which the soul is raised from the death of sin, and is made partaker of a new principle of spiritual life. It implies a deep conviction of sin, leading to the renunciation of confidence in our own righteousness and strength; we must be emptied of ourselves in

action
faith

order to be filled with Christ. It implies such apprehension of the excellence and value of the things of God, as determines our whole inward and outward life, making it on the one hand a life of communion with God, and on the other of active devotion to his service. Now there are two classes of truths clearly revealed in scripture concerning the production and promotion of true religion as thus understood. The one is that it is supernatural in its origin, due to no power or device of man, to no resource of nature, but to the mighty power of God, which wrought in Christ when it raised him from the dead; by which power of the Holy Ghost we are raised from spiritual death and so united to Christ as to become partakers of his life; and that this life, thus divine or supernatural in its origin, is maintained and promoted, not by any mere rational process of moral culture, but by the constant indwelling of the Spirit of Christ, so that it is not we that live, but Christ liveth in us. Religion, therefore, or Christianity subjectively considered, is not something natural, it is not nature elevated and refined, it is something new and above nature; it is what the Bible declares it to be, the life of God in the soul. And therefore as our Saviour teaches us, incomprehensible and mysterious, though not the less real and certain. In intimate connexion and perfect consistency with these truths, there is another class, not less clearly taught in the word of God. This divine, supernatural influence to which all true religion is to be referred, always acts in a way congruous to the nature of the soul, doing it no violence, neither destroying nor creating faculties, but imparting and maintaining life by contact or communion with the source of all life. It is moreover exerted in the use of appropriate means, of means adapted to the end they are intended to accomplish. It operates in connexion with the countless influences by which human character is formed, especially with the truth. It works with and by the truth, so that we are said to be begotten by the truth, and to be sanctified by the truth. There is still another consideration to be taken into view. Human character is determined by a great variety of causes, some within and others beyond the control of the individual. Every man receives at his birth human nature with its hereditary corruption, but that nature as modified by national, family and individual peculiarities. Its developement is determined partly by his circumstances, partly by the energy of his own will, partly by the di-

vine influence of which he may be the subject. Now it is possible that our theory of religion may not embrace all these facts; or if it professes to embrace them all, it may give undue prominence to one and neglect the others. Because religion is supernatural in its origin and support, we may neglect the instrumentalities through which the work is carried on; or because these means are essential and appropriate, we may think the divine influence out of view, or merge it into the power of nature, making grace nothing but nature inhabited by divine energy. Or because our own voluntary agency is so important an element in determining our character and destiny, we may neglect every thing else, and attributing sovereign power to the will, assert that a man is and may become what he pleases by a mere volition. Character is thus made a mere matter of choice, and all influences which operate either prior to the will or independently of it, are discarded.

We think it can hardly be doubted that many of the popular views of religion are one-sided and defective. On the one hand there are many who, influenced by the conviction of the supernatural character of religion, greatly neglect to avail themselves of the instrumentalities which God has appointed for its promotion. Others again, resolve it all into a mere process of nature, or attribute every thing to the power of the will. The former class lose confidence in the effect of religious training, and seem to take it for granted that children must, or at least in all ordinary cases, will, grow up unconverted. They look upon conversion as something that can only be effected in a sudden and sensible manner; a work necessarily distinct to the consciousness of its subject and apparent to those around him. This conviction modifies their expectations, their conduct, their language and their prayers. It affects to a very serious degree both parents and children, and as it arises from false, or at least imperfect views of the nature of religion, it of course tends to produce and perpetuate them. We see evidence of this mistake all around us, in every part of the country and in every denomination of Christians. We see it in the disproportionate reliance placed on the proclamation of the gospel from the pulpit, as almost the only means of conversion; and in the disposition to look upon revivals as the only hope of the church. If these seasons of special visitation are few, or not remarkable in extent or power, religion is always

represented as declining, the Spirit is said to have forsaken us, and all our efforts are directed to secure a return of these extraordinary manifestations of his presence.

We shall not, it is hoped, be suspected of denying or of undervaluing the importance either of the public preaching of the gospel, or of revivals of religion. The former is a divine appointment, which the experience of all ages has proved to be one of the most efficient means for the conversion of sinners and edification of saints. But it is not the only means of divine appointment; and as it regards the children of believers, it is not the first, nor the ordinary means of their salvation, and therefore should not be so regarded, to the neglect or undervaluing of religious parental training. Besides, public preaching is effective, as already remarked, in all ordinary cases, just in proportion to the degree in which this early training has been enjoyed. As to revivals of religion, we mean by the term what is generally meant by it, and therefore it is not necessary to define it. We avow our full belief that the Spirit of God does at times accompany the means of grace with extraordinary power, so that many unrenewed men are brought to the saving knowledge of the truth, and a high degree of spiritual life is induced among the people of God. We believe also that such seasons have been among the most signal blessings of God to his church, from the day of Pentecost to our own times. We believe moreover that we are largely indebted for the religious life which we now enjoy, to the great revivals which attended the preaching of Edwards, Whitfield, and the Tennents; and at a later period, of Davies, Smith and others in Virginia. What however we no less believe, and feel constrained in conscience to say is, that a great and hurtful error has taken fast hold on the mind of the church on this subject. Many seem to regard these extraordinary seasons as the only means of promoting religion. So that if these fail, every thing fails. Others again, if they do not regard them as the only means for that end, still look upon them as the greatest and the best. They seem to regard this alternation of decline and revival as the normal condition of the church; as that which God intended and which we must look for; that the cause of Christ is to advance not by a growth analogous to the progress of spiritual life in the individual believer, but by sudden and violent paroxysms of exertion. We do not believe this,

because it is out of analogy with all God's dealings with men. Life in no form is thus fitful. It is not in accordance with the constitution which God has given up. Excitation beyond a given standard, is unavoidably followed by a corresponding depression. This depression in religion, is sinful, and therefore any thing which by the constitution of our nature necessarily leads to it, is not a normal and proper condition. It may be highly useful, or even necessary, just as violent remedies are often the only means of saving life. But such remedies are not the ordinary and proper means of sustaining and promoting health. While therefore we believe that when the church has sunk into a low state, God does in mercy visit it, with these extraordinary seasons of excitement, we do not believe that it is his will that we should rely upon them as the ordinary and most desirable means for the promotion of his kingdom. This conviction is confirmed by the experience of the church. These revivals are in a great measure, if we may so speak, an idiosyncrasy of our country. They are called *American* revivals. There is nothing American however in true religion. It is the same in its nature, and in its means of progress in all parts of the world. Every one who has paid any attention to the subject, has observed how much religious experience, or the form in which religion manifests itself, is determined by sectarian and national peculiarities. Moravian, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian religion, has each its peculiar characteristics. So has American, Scotch, and German religion. It is very easy to mistake what is thus sectional, arising from the peculiar opinions or circumstances of a church or people, for what is essential. Such peculiarities are due, in almost every instance to something aside from the truth as given in the word of God, and consequently is so far spurious. The very fact, therefore, that these revivals are *American*, that they are in a great measure peculiar to the form of religion in this country, that the Spirit of God, who dwells in all portions of his church, and who manifests himself everywhere in the same way, does not ordinarily carry on his work, elsewhere, by this means, should convince us that this is neither the common nor the best mode in which the cause of religion is to be advanced.)

No one can fail to remark that this too exclusive dependance on revivals tends to produce a false or unscriptural form of reli-

gion. It makes excitement essential to the people, and leads them to think that piety consists in strong exercises of feelings, the nature of which, it is difficult to determine. The ordinary means of grace become insipid or distasteful, and a state of things is easily induced, in which even professors of religion become utterly remiss as to all social religious duties of an ordinary character. We have been told of parts of the church, where the services of the sanctuary are generally neglected, but where the mere notice of a protracted meeting will at once fill the house with hearers, who will come just as long as those meetings last, and then fall back into their habitual apathy and neglect. How serious also is the lesson read to us, by the history of revivals in this country, of their tendency to multiply false conversions and spurious religious experiences. It is surely not a healthful state of the church, when nothing is done and nothing hoped for but in seasons when every thing is thrown out of its natural state, and when the enemy has every advantage to pervert and corrupt the souls of men. Perhaps however the most deplorable result of the mistake we are now considering is, the neglect which it necessarily induces of the divinely appointed means of careful Christian nurture. With many excellent ministers, men who have the interests of their people deeply at heart, it is so much a habit to rely on revivals as the means of their conversion, that all other means are lost sight of. If religion is at low ebb in their congregations, they preach about a revival. They pray for it themselves, and exhort others to do so also. The attention of pastor and people is directed to that one object. If they fail, they are chafed. The pastor gets discouraged; is disposed to blame his people, and the people to blame the pastor. And all the while, the great means of good, may be entirely neglected. Family training of children, and pastoral instruction of the young, are almost entirely lost sight of. We have long felt and often expressed the conviction that this is one of the most serious evils in the present state of our churches. It is not confined to any one denomination. It is a state of things, which has been gradually induced, and is widely extended. It is therefore one of the great merits of Dr. Bushnell's book, in our estimation, that it directs attention to this very point, and brings prominently forward the defects of our religious views and habits, and points out the appropriate remedy, viz: family religion and Christian nurture.

③ There is a third feature of this little tract which gives it great interest and importance in our view. Dr. Bushnell cannot sustain his view of the intimate connexion between the religion of parents and that of their children, without advancing doctrines, which we regard as of great value, and which according to his testimony and other sources of evidence, have been very much lost sight of especially in New England. The philosophy, which teaches that happiness is the great end of creation; that all sin and virtue consists in voluntary acts; that moral character is not transmissible but must be determined by the agent himself; that every man has power to determine and to change at will his own character, or to make himself a new heart; has, as every one knows, extensively prevailed in this country. The obvious tendency and unavoidable effect of this philosophy has been to lower all the scriptural doctrines concerning sin, holiness, regeneration, and the divine life. It represents every man as standing by himself, and of course denies any such union with Adam as involves the derivation of a corrupt nature from him. Divine influence, and the indwelling of the Spirit dwindles down to little more than moral suasion. Union with Christ, as the source of righteousness and life, is left out of view. His work is regarded as scarcely more than a device to render the pardon of sin expedient, and to open the way to deal with men according to their conduct. Attention is turned from him as the ground of acceptance and source of strength, and every thing made to depend on ourselves. The great question is, not what he is and what he has done, but what is our state and what have we done? Religion is obviously something very different according to this view of the gospel, from what it is according to the evangelical scheme of doctrine. The pillars of this false and superficial system are overturned in Dr. Bushnell's book. He has discovered that "Goodness, (holy virtue) or the production of goodness is the supreme end of God." p. 34. "That virtue must be the product of separate and absolutely independent choice, is pure assumption." p. 31. He, on the contrary asserts that "virtue is rather a state of being than an act or series of acts." p. 31. What mighty strides are here! "So glued," says he in his Argument, p. 39, "is our mental habit to the impression that religious character is wholly the result of choice in the individual, or if it be generated by a divine *ictus*, preceded, of absolute

necessity, by convictions and struggles, which are possible only in the reflective age, that we cannot really conceive, when it is stated, the possibility that a child should be prepared for God, by causes prior to his own will." "There was a truth," he says, Discourses p. 42, "an important truth, underlying the old doctrine of federal headship and original or imputed sin, though strangely misconceived, which we seem, in our one-sided speculations, to have quite lost sight of." Very true. But by whom has this important truth been more misconceived, misrepresented and derided than by Dr. Bushnell and his collaborators in New England? "How can we hope," he asks, "to set ourselves in harmony with the scriptures, in regard to family nurture, or household baptism, or any other subject, while our theories include, (exclude?) or overlook precisely that which is the basis of all their teachings and appointments?" A question those must answer, who can. It is precisely this one-sided view of the nature and relation of man, this overlooking his real union with Adam, and consequent participation of his nature and condemnation, that old-school men have been perpetually objecting to the speculations of New England. And we therefore rejoice to see any indication that the truth on this subject has begun to dawn on minds hitherto unconscious of its existence.

If as Dr. Bushnell teaches, character may be derived from parents, if that character may be formed prior to the will of the child; if the child is passive during this forming process, the period of its effectual calling, and emerges into his individuality "as one that is regenerated, quickened into spiritual life,"* (Argument, p. 32,) then of course, we shall hear no more of regeneration as necessarily the act of the subject of it, the decision of his own will; and then too the doctrine of the plenary ability of the sinner to change his heart must be given up. This latter doctrine is indeed expressly repudiated. "The mind," says Dr. Bushnell, "has ideals revealed in itself that are even celestial, and it is the strongest of all proofs of its depravity that, when it would struggle up towards its own ideals, it cannot reach them, cannot apart from God, even lift itself towards them." p. 26. How true, and yet how old is this! Again, "What do theologians understand by a fall and a bondage under the laws of evil, but evil, once entering a soul, becomes its master; so that it can-

* This we intend of course as an argument *ad hominem*, we do not hold to regeneration by parental influence as an organic power.

not deliver itself—therefore that a rescue must come, a redemption must be undertaken by a power transcending nature.” p. 37. Here then we have the avowal of most important truths, truths which sound Presbyterians have ever held dear. Happiness is not the chief good; virtue does not consist entirely in acts, but is a state of being; men are not isolated individuals, each forming his own character by the energy of his will; moral character is transmissible, may be derived passively on the one hand by birth from Adam, and on the other, by regeneration; when sin enters the soul it is a bondage, from which it cannot deliver itself, redemption must come from God. These are comprehensive truths. Dr. Bushnell seems surprised at finding himself in the company into which such avowals introduce him. He endeavours to renounce such fellowship, and to avenge himself, by unwonted sneers at those to whose doctrines he is conscious of an approximation. This can be easily borne. He sees as yet men as trees walking. Whether he will come forward into clearer light, or go back into thicker darkness, we cannot predict. There is much in his book which makes us fear the latter alternative. We hope and pray for the brighter issue.

We have brought forward the two great points in which we agree with our author, the fact of the intimate religious connexion between parents and children, and the primary importance of Christian nurture, as the means of building up the church. On these points, we have dwelt disproportionately long, and left less space and time for the consideration of the scarcely less important parts of the subject.

The fact being admitted that there is a divinely constituted connexion between the religion of parents and that of their children, the question arises, How is this fact to be accounted for? There are three modes of answering this question. The one is that which we have endeavoured to present, which refers the connexion to the promise of God and his blessing on faithful parental training. The second resolves it into a law of nature, accounting for the connexion in question, in the same way or on the same principles, which determine the transmission of other forms of character from parent to children. The third is the ritual or church system, which supposes it is by the rites and ministrations of the church, that this connexion is effected.

We understand Dr. Bushnell to take the second of these

grounds, and to maintain that there is no difference between that and the first. Some, he says, "take the exterior view regarding the result as resting on a positive institution of God. I have produced the interior view, that of inherent connexion and causation. But every theologian, who has gone beyond his alphabet, will see, at a glance, that both views are only different forms of one and the same truth, having each its own peculiar uses and advantages." Argument p. 18. Before stating our view of Dr. Bushnell's system, and our objections to it, it is proper to make two remarks. The first is, that it is very difficult to understand what a writer means, who employs a new terminology. It requires no little time to fix the usage of language, and the reader is very liable to attach to new terms some different shade of thought from that which the writer intended. Besides, it is a very small portion of his own thoughts that an author can spread out upon a written page; there is a fulness within which remains undisclosed, and which nothing short of frequent conference or communication, can adequately reveal. There is therefore a great difference between what a book teaches, and what the author himself may hold. The book teaches what in fact it conveys to the majority of candid and competent readers; though they may not gather from it precisely what the writer meant to communicate. In saying therefore that to our apprehension, Dr. Bushnell's book gives a naturalistic account of conversion or the effect of religious training, we do not mean to assert that he meant to give such an account. The second remark is that he distinctly declares himself to be a supernaturalist. "I meant to interpose," he says, "all the safe-guards necessary to save myself from proper naturalism, and I supposed I had done it. I really think so now. The very first sentence of my tract is a declaration of supernaturalism." p. 36. Again: "So far from holding the possibility of restoration for men within the terms of mere nature, whether, as regards the individual acting for himself, or the parent acting for his child, the incarnation of the Son of God himself is not, as I believe, more truly supernatural than any agency must be, which regenerates a soul." p. 34. Notwithstanding these explicit declarations, it is very possible that he teaches what others mean by naturalism, and that what he calls supernaturalism is something very different from what is commonly understood by that term. There is on page 14, of

the Discourses, a passage which we think is the key to his whole doctrine. "What more appropriate to the doctrine of spiritual influence itself, than to believe that as the Spirit of Jehovah fills all the worlds of matter, and holds a presence of power and government in all objects, so all souls of all ages and capacities, have a moral presence of Divine Love in them, and a nurture of the Spirit appropriate to their wants?" The Spirit of Jehovah is here recognised as everywhere present in nature influencing and governing its operations. On p. 35, of the Argument he speaks of "a supernatural grace which inhabits the organic laws of nature and works its result in conformity with them;" and on p. 32, of "organic power as inhabited by Christ and the Spirit of God;" on p. 38, of "natural laws inhabited by supernatural agencies." This, as we understand these expressions in their connexion, is nothing more than Theism. Dr. Bushnell rejects the mechanical theory of the universe. He is not a naturalist in the sense of the French School, which attribute all effects to the unconscious power of nature; nor in the sense of those who hold that God is entirely external to the world as a mechanist to a machine. He holds that his Spirit is everywhere present and operative in nature, guiding and giving power to mere natural laws. And on this ground he claims, to be a supernaturalist. And so he is, so far as this goes. But this is not supernaturalism in the ordinary sense of the term. There is here no distinction between God's providential agency and the operations of his grace. He is, according to this doctrine, in no other and in no higher sense the author of regeneration than of a cultivated intellect, or of a majestic tree. The intelligence and skill manifested in fashioning a flower, or forming an eye is not in organic laws, but in those laws as inhabited. to use Dr. B's language, by God and his spirit. The result is due to the supernatural element in the power which determines the effect. Now if conversion, if the regeneration and sanctification of the soul, is only in this sense a supernatural work, then it is as much a natural process, as much the result of organic laws, as any other process of nature whatever. This is naturalism, not as distinguished from Theism, but as distinguished from supernaturalism, in the religious sense of the word. The very thing designed by that term is, that conversion and other spiritual changes are effected, not merely by a power above any

thing belonging to nature as separated from God, but by a power other and higher than that which operates in nature. A man may be a theist, he may believe that the world is not a lifeless machine, but everywhere pervaded by the presence and power of God, and yet if he admits no higher or more direct interference of a divine influence in the minds and hearts of men, than this providential agency then he is no supernaturalist. God, according to this view of the subject, is as much the author of depravity as of holiness; for to his providential agency, to his "presence of power and government" all second causes owe their efficiency. Men are not born, their bodies are not fashioned, nor their souls created, without the exercise of his power. The organic laws by which a corrupt nature is transmitted from Adam, or corrupt habits fostered by parents in their children, or by society in its members, or by one man in another man, are inhabited by divine energy. If this therefore is all the supernaturalism of which Dr. Bushnell has to boast, he is not one inch further advanced than the lowest Rationalists. "Pelagianism," says Hase, "found its completion in ordinary Rationalism, which regarded grace as the natural method of providential operation."* And Wegscheider, the most phlegmatic of Rationalists, says: *Operationes gratiae supernaturales recte monuerunt neque accuratius esse definitas, nec diserte promissas in libris sacris, neque omnino esse necessarias, quum, quae ad animum emendandum valeant, omnia legibus naturae a Deo optime efficiantur, nec denique ita conspicuas, ut cognosci certa ratione possint. Accedit, quod libertatem et studium hominum impediunt, mysticorum somnia fovent et Deum ipsum auctorem arguunt peccatorum ab hominibus non emandatis commissorum. Omnis igitur de gratia disputatio ad doctrinam de providentia Dei rectius refertur.* *Institutiones*, §. 152. A passage remarkably coincident in spirit, though much more decorous in form, with one in Dr. Bushnell's *Argument*, p. 35. "If I had handled my subject wholly under the first form, or under the type of the covenant as a positive institution, I presume I should have found a much readier assent, and that for the very reason that I had thrown my grounds of expectation for Christian nurture the other side of the fixed

*Pelagianismus vollendete sich im gewöhnlichen Rationalismus, dem die Gnade als die naturgemässe Wirkungsart der Vorsehung erschien. *Dogmatik*. p. 304.

stars, whereby the parent himself is delivered from all connexion with the results, and from all responsibility concerning them. He will reverently acknowledge that he has imparted a mould of depravity, but the laws of connexion between him and his child are operative, he thinks, only for this bad purpose. If any good come to the child, it must come straight down from the island occupied by Jehovah, to the child as an individual, and does not in its coming take the organic laws of parental character on its way to regenerate and sanctify them as its vehicle. As regards a remedy for individualism, little is gained, even if the doctrine that children ought to be trained up in the way they should go is believed; for there is no effectual or sufficient remedy, till the laws of grace are seen to be perfectly coincident with the organic laws of depravity. Therefore it was necessary to keep to the naturalistic form." This we regard as a pretty distinct avowal that the author admits no divine influence other than that which "inhabits" organic laws. There is no other or higher efficiency in the effects of grace, than in propagation of depravity. If the parent is the mould or vehicle through which a depraved nature flows to his child, by a process just as natural, the believing parent is the vehicle of spiritual life to his offspring.

The account given in his Discourses of the rationale of this connexion between parent and child, confirms our impression that it is regarded as merely natural. "If we narrowly examine" he says, "the relation of parent and child, we shall not fail to discover something like a law of organic connexion, as regards character, subsisting between them. Such a connexion as makes it easy to believe, and natural to expect that the faith of the one will be propagated to the other. Perhaps I should rather say, such a connexion as induces the conviction that the character of the one is actually included in that of the other, as a seed is formed in its capsule; and being there matured, by a nutriment derived from the stem is gradually separated from it. It is a singular fact, that many believe substantially the same thing, in regard to evil character, but have no thought of any possibility in regard to good. . . . The child after birth, is still within the matrix of parental life, and will be more or less for many years. And the parental life will be flowing into him all that time, just as naturally, and by a law as truly organic as when the sap of a trunk flows into a limb. . . . We have

much to say in common with the Baptists, about the beginning of moral agency, and we seem to fancy there is some definite moment when a child becomes a moral agent, passing out of the condition where he is a moral nullity, and where no moral agency touches his being. Whereas he is rather to be regarded, at the first, as lying within the moral agency of the parent and passing out by degrees through a course of mixed agency, to a proper independency and self-possession. The supposition that he becomes, at some certain moment, a complete moral agent, which a moment before he was not, is clumsy and has no agreement with observation. The separation is gradual. He is never, at any moment after birth, to be regarded as perfectly beyond the sphere of good and bad exercises, for the parent exercises himself in the child, playing his emotions, and sentiments, and working a character in him, by virtue of an organic power. And this is the very idea of Christian education, that it begins with nurture or cultivation. And the intention is that the Christian life and spirit of the parents shall flow into the mind of the child, and blend with his incipient and half-formed exercises, and that they shall thus beget their own good within him, their thoughts, opinions, faith and love, which are to become a little more, and yet a little more of his own separate exercise, but still the same in character." Discourses pp. 26—31.

This the author admits is, at least as to its form, a naturalistic account of conversion. And to our apprehension it is so in substance as well as form. "As the Spirit of Jehovah fills all the worlds of matter, and holds a presence of power and government in all objects, so all souls of all ages and capacities, have a moral presence of Divine love in them, and a nurture of the Spirit appropriate to their wants," and it is this natural influence of mind on mind, this power which dwells in all souls according to their character and capacities, that moulds the character of the child, infuses little by little spiritual life into it, and causes it to emerge into its individual existence a regenerated being. Here all is law, organic natural law, as much so, to use his own illustration, as in the transmission of the life of the parent plant to the seed. To be sure the life is not in the plant, the solar heat is necessary to the vitality of the plant and to its transmission to the seed. The effect is therefore not to be referred to the laws of vegetation as independent of solar influence, but the solar in-

fluence is operative through those laws. In like manner the spiritual life of the parent does not exist independently of the Spirit of God, nor can it be transmitted to the child without his influence; but it is nevertheless transmitted in the way of nature, and as the result of organic laws. This, as before remarked, is mere Theism as distinguished from the Deistic or Atheistic theory of nature. There is nothing supernatural in this process, nothing out of analogy with nature, nothing which transcends the ordinary efficiency of natural causes as the vehicles of divine power. There is all the difference between this theory of conversion, and supernaturalism, that there is between the ordinary growth of the human body and Christ's healing the sick, opening the eyes of the blind, or raising the dead. Both are due to the power of God, but the one to that power acting in the way of nature, and the other to the same power acting above nature. And a man who should explain all the miracles of Christ as the result of organic laws, might as well claim to be a supernaturalist, because, he believes God operates in nature, as Dr. Bushnell. The whole question is, whether the effect is due to a power that works in nature, or above nature. The German infidel who refers Christ's miracles of healing to animal magnetism, regards magnetism as a form of divine power, but he is none the less an unbeliever in the supernatural power of Christ on that account.

That Dr. Bushnell's book admits no other or higher influence in regeneration than that power of the Spirit which is present in all worlds, is still plainer, if possible from his defence against the charge of naturalism. It goes no further than a denial of a reference of spiritual life, to organic laws considered apart from a divine influence dwelling in them and operating by them. "It is the privilege of the Christian, not that he is doomed to give birth to a tainted life and cease, but that by the grace of God dwelling in him and the child, fashioning his own character as an organic mould for the child, and the child to a plastic conformity with the mould provided, he may set forth the child into life as a seed after him—one that is prepared unto a godly life by causes prior to his own will; that is, by causes metaphysically organic. Thus every thing previous to the will falls into one and the same category. No matter whether it come through vascular connexion, or parental handling or control, it comes to the child, I said, 'just as naturally and by a law as truly organic,'

(i. e. just as truly from without his own will), 'as when the sap of a trunk flows into a limb.' At some time sooner or later, but only by a gradual transition, he comes into his own will, which theologically speaking, is the time of his birth as a moral subject of God's government; and if he takes up life as a corrupted subject, so he may and ought to take it up as a renewed subject—that is grow up a Christian." Argument, p. 32. In answer to a reviewer in the German Weekly Messenger, he says: "It was my misfortune that all the language of supernaturalism, I might wish to employ, was already occupied by that super-supernaturalism which he has described, and the 'fantastic' impressions connected with the same. In order, therefore, to bring the Spirit and redemption from their isolation, and set them in contact with the organic laws of nature, I was obliged to lean decidedly as the truth would suffer, to naturalistic language, and to set my whole subject in a naturalistic attitude. . . . If I take my position by the covenant of Abraham and hang my doctrine of nurture on that, as a positive institution, or, what is the same, on its promises; if I then contemplate God as coming by his Spirit from a point of isolation above, in answer to prayer, or without, to work in the heart of the child regeneration by a divine stroke or *ictus*, apart from all connexion of cause and consequent, the change called regeneration, and thus to fulfil the promise; I realize indeed a form of unquestionable supernaturalism, in the mind of those who accept my doctrine, but it is likely to be as far as possible from the reviewer's idea, of 'the supernatural in human natural form.' For all the words I have used will have settled into a form proper only to religious individualism. Now just as the reality of the rainbow is in the world's laws prior to the covenant with Noah, so there is in the organic laws of the race, a reality or ground answering to the covenant with Abraham; only, in the latter case, the reality is a supernatural grace which inhabits the organic laws of nature and works its results in conformity with them." Arg. p. 35.

The idea we get from all this is, that as there is at one period a vascular connection between the parent and the child, in virtue of which the life of the one is the life of the other, moulding it into its own image as a human being, so after birth there is a metaphysically organic connexion, in virtue of which just as naturally the spiritual life of the parent becomes that of the

child, so that, when it comes into its own will, it begins or may begin its course a regenerated human being. As the former of these two processes is a natural one, so is the latter; and as the vascular connexion is the vehicle of a divine efficiency, so is the metaphysical connexion, but in both cases that efficiency operates through organic laws. Or, as the rainbow is a product of natural laws, so it is a result of those laws that children should participate in the character and moral life of their parents; and as there would have been a rainbow whether God had ever promised it or not, so children would be like their parents, whether God had ever made a covenant to that effect or not. In both cases there is a natural "connexion of cause and consequent." Now it is precisely this connexion, in the case of regeneration, that supernaturalism denies. Any result brought about in the natural concatenation of cause and consequent, is a natural effect. Any result brought about by an influence out of that connexion, is a supernatural effect. The controversy with the infidel, is whether the works of Christ were brought about in the natural series of cause and consequent; and the controversy with the Rationalist or Pelagian, is whether regeneration is a natural sequence or not; whether its proximate antecedent, its true cause, is nature or grace, some organic law, or the mighty power of God. These two views are as far apart as the poles. They cannot be brought together, by saying God is in nature as well as in grace, for the two modes of his operation is all the difference. The whole question is, whether God operates in any other way than through nature. The naturalist says no, and the supernaturalist says, yes.

We are confirmed in our impression that we do not misinterpret Dr. Bushnell, by the ridicule which he heaps on the idea of any immediate interference of the Spirit of God. This he speaks of as God's coming from a state of isolation above, from beyond the fixed stars, from an island where he dwells. This he stigmatizes as the *ictic* theory, "Hanging," as he says Edwards does in his account of regeneration, "every thing thus on miracle, or a pure *ictus Dei*, separate from all instrumental connexions of truth, feeling, dependence, motive, choice, there was manifestly nothing left but to wait for the concussion. It was waiting, in fact, as for the arrival of God in some vision or trance, and since there was no intelligible duty to be done, as means to the end, the disturbed soul was quite sure to fall to conjuration to obtain the

desired miracle; cutting itself with the knives of conviction, tearing itself in loud outcries, and leaping round the altar and calling on the god to come down and kindle the fire." Argument p. 14. There is surely no mistaking such a passage as this. To us it sounds profane. It is ridiculing the doctrine that God operates on the soul otherwise than through the laws of nature. He therefore disclaims all belief in instantaneous conversion,* he appears to have no faith in what he calls an explosive religion, which comes suddenly with convictions and struggles. The whole tenor of his book is in favour of the idea that all true religion is gradual, habitual, acquired as habits are formed. Every thing must be like a natural process, nothing out of the regular sequence of cause and effect. If Dr. Bushnell really denied what is commonly understood by experimental religion, if he had no faith in conversion by supernatural influence, and meant to place himself on the Rationalistic side of all these controversies, he could hardly have more effectually accomplished his object, than by setting as he has done his "whole subject in a naturalistic attitude." Surely it ought not to be a matter of doubt on which side of such questions such a man stands.

The true character of the theory of religion taught in this department of his book, is further apparent from two additional considerations. In the first place, the author not unfrequently speaks "of generalizing the doctrines of grace and depravity, so as to bring them into the same organic laws." Argument p. 33. He teaches that "the laws of grace" are "perfectly coincident with the organic laws of depravity." p. 36. Now as Dr. Bushnell does not hold that depravity is propagated by any supernatural agency of God, we do not see how he can claim that grace is thus communicated, the laws which regulate both being identical. We take these passages to mean that as it is by a process of nature that depravity is communicated from parents to children, as this is the result of organic laws, so by a like process spiritual life is communicated from the parent to the child.

* "Take the doctrine (which I frankly say I do not hold) that regeneration is accomplished by an instant and physical act of God, to which act truth and all endeavours in the subject have no other relation, as means to ends, than the rams horns had to the fall of Jericho. Yet that instant, isolated act of Omnipotence may fall on the heart of infancy, as well as of adult years, and God may give us reason to expect it." Argument p. 33.

The result is brought about in both cases by parental character and treatment, as an organic power.

The second consideration is, that he avows it as one of his objects, to present the most comprehensive form of truth possible, so as to include the most discordant views. He says, "I had a secret hope before hand of carrying the assent of Unitarians." "In drawing up my view of depravity as connected with organic character, and also in speaking of what I supposed to be their theory of education, I did seek to present the truth in such a way that all their objections might be obviated." p. 27. He therefore exults in their approbation, and hopes they may approve every sentiment he may hereafter publish. He advocates towards them a very different course from that which has been hitherto adopted. He urges that great truths should be presented in such a shape as to secure their acceptance. Now it seems to us that all this argues either such an elevation that all differences of doctrine are lost sight of, as mountains and valleys seem one great plain to the aeronaut, or a great indifference to the truth. He must either suppose that the orthodox and unitarians are like children, disputing about words, when they really agree, had they only sense enough to know it; or that the points of difference are of so little importance they may be dropped in a statement of the truth common to both. Either of these assumptions is not a little violent. It is not likely that Pelagians and Augustinians in all ages have held the same doctrine without knowing it, waiting until some philosophical mind should arise to frame a statement satisfactory to both parties. Nor is it probable that the difference between them, if real, is now for the first time, to be shown to be of no account. Dr. Bushnell has done nothing. He has not advanced an inch beyond Pelagius. The latter was willing to call nature grace, and the former calls nature supernatural, and wishes unitarians and orthodox to consider that a solution of the whole matter. Unitarians are agreed, but the orthodox demur. And well they may, for supernatural nature is but nature still, and if salvation comes through nature, Christ is dead in vain and we are yet in our sins. Such compromises are nothing more nor less than ill-disguised surrender of the truth. And the truth is the life of the world.

Dr. Bushnell after quoting from various writers, passages

teaching, as he has taught, the intimate religious connexion between parents and children, and the paramount importance of Christian nurture, turns on the Massachusetts committee and speaking of his opponents, says: "These censors of orthodoxy have raised an out-cry, they have stirred up a fright, and driven you to the very extreme measure of silencing a book—in which it turns out they have been stirring up their heroism against Baxter and the first fathers of New England, against Hopkins, West, Dwight, and I know not how many others, to say nothing of the ancient church itself, as understood by the most competent critics. . . . And now what opinion will you have, what opinion will all sensible men have, two years hence, of this dismal scene of fatuity, which in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-seven, has so infected the nerves of orthodox Massachusetts as even to stop the press of her Sabbath School Society?" But how comes it that while Unitarians agree with Dr. Bushnell, they do not agree with Baxter, Hopkins, West or Dwight? Have they all along been mistaken as to what the orthodox taught, until Dr. Bushnell presented the subject in its true light? The fact is Dr. Bushnell is under a great mistake. The complaint against his book is not for what he has in common with Baxter and Dwight, it is not his teaching that the piety of the parent lays a scriptural foundation for expecting the children to be pious, nor that Christian nurture is the great means of their conversion, but it is for the explanation he has undertaken to give of these facts. It is because he has not rested them upon the covenant and promise of God, but resolved the whole matter into organic laws, explaining away both depravity and grace, and presented the "whole subject in a naturalistic attitude." It is this that renders his book so attractive to Unitarians, and so alarming, with all its excellencies, to the orthodox.

Our understanding of Dr. Bushnell's theory of Christian nurture is then this. Men do not exist as isolated individuals, each having his life entirely within himself, and forming his character by his own will. There is a common life of the race, of the nation, of the church, and of the family, of which each individual partakes, and which reveals itself in each, under a peculiar form, determined partly by himself and partly by the circumstances in which he is placed. As the child derives its animal life from its

parents, with all its peculiarities, so also he derives his moral and spiritual life from the same source. The organic connexion does not cease at birth, but is continued until the child becomes an intelligent, conscious, self-determining agent. Its forming period is prior to that event, during which it is in a great measure the passive subject of impressions from the parent, whose inward, spiritual life, of what sort it is, passes over or is continued in the child. Such is the condition in which men are born into this world, and such the power of the life of the parent, that natural pravity may be overcome by Christian nurture, and a real regeneration effected by parental character and treatment as an organic power.

Every one sees there is a great deal of truth in this, and that most important duties and responsibilities must grow out of that truth. But at the same time it is both defective and erroneous as a full statement of the case. It rests on a false assumption of the state of human nature, and of the power of Christian nurture. It assumes that men are not by nature the children of wrath, that they are not involved in spiritual death, and consequently that they do not need to be quickened by that mighty power which wrought in Christ when it raised him from the dead. The forming influence of parental character and life is fully adequate to his regeneration; education can correct what there is of natural corruption. In answer to the objection that this is the old Pelagian, Rationalistic theory of human nature and conversion, it is said, the Spirit of Jehovah fills all worlds, and every thing is due to his presence and power. This, however, is only saying that second causes owe their efficiency to God; a truth which few naturalists, and even few infidels, deny. This, therefore may be admitted, and yet all supernatural influence in the regeneration of men denied.

It can hardly be questioned that the Bible makes a broad distinction between that agency of God by which the ordinary operations of nature are carried on, and the agency of his Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of men. The same distinction has always been made in the church. In all controversies concerning grace, the question has been, whether apart from the influence of natural causes considered as the ordinary modes of the divine efficiency, there is any special and effectual agency of the Spirit in the regeneration of men. Dr. Bushnell may choose to

overlook this distinction, and claim to be a supernaturalist because he believes God is in nature, but he remains on the precise ground occupied by those who are wont to call themselves Rationalists.

We have already adverted to the difference which may exist between what a book teaches and what its author believes. This book to our apprehension teaches a naturalistic doctrine concerning conversion. The author asserts that he holds to the supernatural doctrine on that subject. He is of course entitled to the benefit of that declaration. All we can say is that he seems to use the terms in a different sense from that in which they are commonly employed, and that there is enough of a rationalistic cast about it to account for all the disapprobation it has excited, and to justify the course of the Massachusetts committee. For although it contains much important truth powerfully presented, and although it inculcates principles, considering the source whence they come, of no little significance and value, yet a book which in its apparent sense denies everything supernatural in religion, could hardly be expected to circulate with the approbation of any orthodox society.

Having presented what we consider the true ground of the admitted connexion between believing parents and their children, and considered Dr. Bushnell's views on the subject, it was our purpose to call attention to the church or ritual doctrine. This however, we can barely state. The church doctrine admits original sin, and the insufficiency of nature, or of any power operating in nature, for the regeneration of men. This power is found in the church. As all men partake of the life of Adam, by their natural birth, so they are made partakers of the life of Christ by their spiritual birth. He by his incarnation has introduced a new principle of life, which continues in the church which is his body. And as baptism makes us members of the church, and therefore members of the body of Christ, it thus makes us partakers of his life. Just as a twig engrafted into a tree partakes of its life, so a child engrafted by baptism into the church partakes of the life of Christ. It is this life thus supernaturally communicated, which is to be developed by Christian nurture, and not any thing in the soul which it has by nature. This doctrine is presented in various forms more or less gross or philosophical, according to the character and training of its advocates. It is however everywhere essentially the same whether

propounded at Rome, Oxford, or Berlin. The German philosophical form of the doctrine bids fair to be the popular one in this country, and is advanced with the contemptuous confidence which characterises the school whence it emanates. Every thing which is not ritual and magical is pronounced rationalistic. Nothing is regarded as spiritual but grace communicated by external acts and contacts. The true doctrine of Protestants which makes faith necessary to the efficacy of the sacraments, is denounced as Puritan, which is rapidly becoming a term of reproach. This doctrine rests on a false view of the church. The external body of professors is not the body of Christ, which consists only of believers. Transferring to the former the attributes and prerogatives which belong to the latter, is the radical error of Romanism, the source at once of its corruption and power. It rests also on a false view of the sacraments, attributing to them an efficacy independent of faith in the recipient. It assumes a false theory of religion. Instead of the free unimpeded access of the soul to Christ, we are referred to the external church as the only medium of approach. Instead of the life of God in the soul by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, it is the human nature of Christ, the second Adam, of which we must partake. The whole doctrine is nothing but a form of the physical theory of religion. It is a new anthropology palmed upon men, as the gospel. We are constantly reminded of the remark of Julius Müller that all attempts to spiritualize nature, end in materializing spirit. A remark which finds a striking illustration in the new philosophy in its dealings with religion. Its most spiritual theories serve only to reduce the principle of divine life to the same category with animal life, something transmissible from parent to child, or from priest to people. There is great reason to fear that religion, under such teaching, will either sink into the formal ritualism of Rome, or be evaporated into the mystic Rationalism of Germany. Schleiermacher, whose views are so zealously reproduced, and between which and his own Dr. Bushnell seems often at a loss to choose, taught that Christ introduced a new life-principle into the world. Human nature corrupted in Adam, was restored to perfection in Him. That life still continues in the church, just as the life of Adam continues in the race. Christianity is the perfection of nature, as Christ was the perfection of manhood. It is not with the historical, personal Christ that we have communion, any more than it is with Adam as an individual man with

whom we have to do. Both are reduced to a mere power or principle. Christ as the Son of God is lost. So also in his system the Holy Ghost, is not a divine person, but "the common-spirit," or common sentiment of the church. The Holy Spirit has no existence out of the Church, and in it is but a principle. In this way all the precious truths of the Bible are sublimated into unsubstantial philosophical vagaries, and every man pronounced a Rationalist, or what is thought to be the same thing, a Puritan, who does not adopt them.

Though we have placed the title of Dr. Tyler's Letter to Dr. Bushnell at the head of this article, the course of our remarks has not led us into a particular consideration of it. This is not to be referred to any want of respect. The subject unfolded itself to us in the manner in which we have presented it, and we should have found it inconvenient to turn aside to consider the particular form in which Dr. Tyler has exhibited substantially the same objections to Dr. Bushnell's book. Dr. T. however seems to make less of the promise of God to parents than we do, and to have less reliance on Christian nurture as a means of conversion. We are deeply impressed with the conviction that as to both of these points there is much too low a doctrine now generally prevailing. And it is because Dr. B. urges the fact of the connexion between parents and children, with so much power, that we feel so great an interest in his book. His philosophy of that fact we hope may soon find its way to the place where so much philosophy has already gone.

ART. IV.—*The Apostolical Succession.* *author?*

IN opposition to the doctrine, that Presbyterian ordination is invalid because not derived from a superior order of ministers. there is a twofold argument, negative and positive. The negative argument is founded on the fact, that there is no order of church-officers existing by divine right superior to Presbyters; that no such order can exist as the successors of the primitive Bishops, for these were identical with the primitive Presbyters; nor as successors of the Apostles, for these, as such, had no suc-

cessors. The positive argument is founded on the fact, that the primitive Presbyters actually exercised the highest powers now belonging to the ministry.

There is only one ground left, on which the validity of Presbyterian ordination can be called in question, viz. that it is not derived even from true Presbyters, that is to say, from the regular successors of the primitive Presbyters. This ground has commonly been taken by the advocates for the necessity of Bishops as an order superior to Presbyters. It is through such Bishops that the succession has been usually traced. The two doctrines are however not identical, nor even inseparable. Even granting what we have alleged—that there is no superior order, and that Presbyters have always rightfully exercised the highest powers now belonging to the ministry—it may still be said that this, at most, only proves modern bishops to be nothing more than Presbyters, and as such authorized to govern and ordain, but that these powers may not be claimed by those who cannot, like the Bishops, prove themselves to be the successors of the primitive Presbyters.

This argument against the validity of Presbyterian ordination, we propose to examine; but before we do so, it will be necessary to define the meaning of certain terms continually used on both sides of the controversy. The necessity of this arises from the fact, that much confusion has been introduced into the subject by the abuse of terms and by confounding, under one name, things which are materially different. The substitution of a sense in the conclusion wholly distinct from that used in the premises, must vitiate the argument, although the effect may pass unnoticed. Hence have arisen many current fallacies, the popular effect of which has been to give a great advantage to that party in the controversy, by whom, or in whose behalf, the stratagem is practised. Thus when the question to be agitated is whether apostolical succession is *necessary* in the Christian ministry, the term employed admits of two distinct interpretations. It may be said to be necessary, in the sense of being convenient, useful, desirable, and therefore binding under ordinary circumstances. The necessity here predicated of succession is an improper or a relative necessity, from the admission of which it would be most unfair to argue the existence of an absolute or strict necessity, as of a condition *sine qua non*, without which there can be no

valid ministry. Yet these meanings of the word are easily confounded, or the one supposed to involve the other, so that our theoretical admission of the value of succession, and our requiring it in practice, is regarded as a contradiction of our doctrine, that it is not essential, and the seeming inconsistency throws weight into the scale of the adverse argument. The fallacy consists in the assumption, that the utility and relative necessity of this arrangement springs from its absolute necessity, whereas it springs from its simplicity, convenience, and the want of any better method to perpetuate the ministry. If we are bound to effect a certain end, we are bound to effect it in the most direct and efficacious method; but if this method ceases to possess these qualities, our obligation to employ it ceases, while our obligation to attain the end remains unaltered.

The facility with which the two things here distinguished are confounded, may be made apparent by an illustration. It is a rule of most legislative bodies, that the qualifications of the members shall be judged of the body itself, and consequently that no new member shall enter upon his functions, until formally recognised and admitted by his predecessors. This practice has been found so useful and is reckoned so important, that with us it is inserted in the Constitution, and in England, whence it is derived, the House of Commons has by solemn votes asserted it to be a natural and necessary right inherent in the body. The historical fact, however, is, that this important power has repeatedly changed hands, and that very recently a proposition has been made to transfer it. Whatever may be thought, by those concerned and authorized to judge, of the expediency of such a change, it would evidently not affect the source or tenure or extent of legislative power in the members of the house. The obvious advantages belonging to the present system, and the force of habit and association, may have led men to believe, that reception by the sitting members is essential to the legislative standing of one newly elected; but in point of fact, it is derived from a source exterior to the body, and independent of it. This is not adduced as an argument against ministerial succession, but merely as an illustration of the fact, that a relative necessity may come to be confounded with an absolute necessity, or at least regarded as a certain proof of it.

The same discrimination is necessary in relation to the word

succession, which may either mean an uninterrupted series of incumbents, so that the office is never vacant, or a succession, in which the authority of each incumbent is derived directly from his predecessor. The material difference between these senses of the term, and the facility with which they may nevertheless be confounded, will be made clear by a single illustration. The Kings of England and the Presidents of the United States hold their office in a regular succession, equally uninterrupted and equally necessary in both cases. But the nature of the succession is entirely different. Each King derives his kingly office from his relation to his predecessor. Each President derives his office from the people, without any action on the part of his predecessor contributing to it, often against his wishes, and sometimes in direct opposition to his claims as a competitor. The former is a derivative succession; the latter a succession of mere sequence. Nor is this the only distinction to be made in the application of the word succession, which may sometimes have relation to whole bodies or classes of men, and sometimes to single individuals, in which respect it may be distinguished as general or particular succession.

With these preliminary explanations, we shall now proceed to consider the necessity of what is called the apostolical succession as a condition of a valid ministry. And let it be observed that the amount of evidence in this case should bear due proportion to the extent and the importance of the allegations in support of which it is adduced. If the question were whether an unbroken succession is lawful, or expedient, or an ancient practice, or of apostolic origin, much less would be requisite to establish the affirmative than is required to prove it absolutely necessary to the existence of a valid ministry. When a question of such moment is at issue, it is not too much to ask that the proof adduced be clear, conclusive, and if possible cumulative also. And especially may we expect the proposition to be confirmed by an express divine command, or in default of that by some clear scriptural analogy, or, at the least, by clear proof of some natural necessity arising from the nature of the ministry or its design. All these conditions might be fairly insisted on. The want of any, even of the least, would shake the credit of the adverse doctrine, much more the want of several and even of the greatest;

but if all are wanting, we must either reject the doctrine or believe without a reason.

To begin with the most important, if not indispensable: where is the express command, requiring an unbroken succession in the ministry? The only passage which can be made to bear such a construction, is that in which Paul writes to Timothy: "the thing that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."* In order that this text may be made to prove the doctrine now in question, it must be assumed, first, that it relates to a regular derivative succession in the ministry; then, that it makes such a succession absolutely necessary; and lastly, that it makes the succession more necessary than the other things mentioned in connexion with it, viz. faith or fidelity, ability to teach, and conformity of doctrine to the apostolic standard. Without this last assumption the argument will prove too much for those who use it, by proving their own orders to be vitiated by a want of ability or faith in any of their predecessors. But all these assumptions are gratuitous. The text speaks only of the transfer of authority to teach from Timothy to others, without mentioning the precise mode in which the transfer should be subsequently made. It is not even said, "who may be able to ordain others also," as might have been expected if the precept were intended to enforce the necessity of an unbroken ministerial succession. But even granting that it does enjoin such a succession, it does not so enjoin it as to make it more essential to the ministry than many other things which were enjoined by the Apostles upon their contemporaries, but are now regarded as no longer binding. Or if this be conceded, it is surely arbitrary in the last degree to make it obligatory as to this one circumstance of a succession, and not as to others which are mentioned with it. There are four things included in the requisition, the continuance of the office, faith or fidelity, ability to teach, identity of doctrine with that of the Apostles. Now the adverse argument supposes the first of these—and that not merely the continuance of the office, but its continuance in a certain form—to be rendered absolutely and forever binding, while the others are regarded as mere secondary circumstances. Either no such distinction is

* 2 Tim. ii. 2.

admissible between the parts of the command, or if it is, it may be differently drawn. If one may insist upon the mere succession as essential, another may, with equal right, insist upon fidelity, ability, or soundness in the faith. This last, indeed, may be contended for, not only with an equal but a better right, because the test of doctrinal conformity is elsewhere made essential, which is not the case with that of succession. All this would be true, even if uninterrupted succession in the ministry had been expressly mentioned in the text, whereas it is found there only by inference, so that if we adopt the meaning which the adverse argument would put upon the passage, we are under the necessity of supposing that which is not mentioned here, nor at all commanded elsewhere, to be more obligatory than other things, which are particularly named here, and especially enjoined elsewhere. If this is unreasonable or absurd, the text in question cannot be a proof of the necessity of an unbroken ministerial succession. And yet this, if not the only text, is much the strongest, that has ever been appealed to, in support of the position. There is no other which has even the appearance of an express command upon the subject.

It is necessary therefore to supply the want of positive explicit declarations, by the substitution of analogies, for instance that afforded by the succession of the Jewish Priests. As these were ministers in the church of God, it may be argued, that the requisition of uninterrupted succession, in their case, creates a strong presumption, that the same would be required in the Christian ministry. But can it prove such succession to be absolutely indispensable? Such a conclusion presupposes, 1. that the existence of succession in the old economy can be binding upon us without express command; 2. that the only analogy thus binding is that of the Levitical Priesthood; 3. that the succession of the Jewish Priests was of the same kind that is now contended for; 4. that in this Levitical succession, thus obligatory on us, there are some things which we may discard or imitate at our discretion.

Let us look at the ground of these assumptions, and first that we are bound by the analogy of Jewish succession. It will not be denied by either of the parties to this controversy that the churches of the old and new dispensations were essentially the same. As little will it be disputed that in some points they were extremely different, and that the differences were not

arbitrary or fortuitous, but characteristic. Now the grand distinctive features of the old dispensation, and of the church under it, were its ceremonial forms and its restrictions; the stress laid upon outward regularity, and the limitation of the church to one small country and a single race. And as some parts of the old economy were intended to be permanent, and others temporary, these must be distinguished by observing whether any given rite or usage bears the peculiar impress of the system which was done away in Christ. Let this test be applied to the requisition of an uninterrupted ministerial succession. With which economy does it more naturally harmonize? With that which was characteristically ceremonial, making spiritual interests dependent, to a great degree, upon external forms, or with that in which the ceremonial element appears to be reduced to its minimum? With that in which, by means of local restrictions, an unbroken succession might be easily secured and promptly verified, or with that in which the abolition of all national and local limitations makes the application of the rule precarious, if not impossible? Surely if any institution or arrangement can be said, in an extraordinary measure, to require and presuppose the peculiar circumstances of the ancient dispensation, the necessity of uninterrupted succession may be so described.

But this is not the only consideration which would lead to the conclusion that the official succession of the Jewish constitution was a temporary rather than a permanent arrangement. There is another reason which deserves attention. The ceremonial and restrictive character of the old economy naturally tended to produce and foster a certain spirit of exclusiveness and overweening attachment to external circumstances. This was, to a certain extent, necessary to the successful operation of the system, one important end of which was to keep the Jews distinct from other nations until Christ should come. But when he did come, this necessity being at an end, the disposition which before had been intentionally fostered, was discouraged and denounced. And even while the old economy subsisted, all excess of the exclusive spirit which belonged to it was checked and censured in a manner which most clearly intimated, that the institutions out of which it grew, and to which it attached itself, were of a temporary nature. Of these corrections and rebukes, which run through all the writings of the prophets, we have one re-

markable example near the first introduction of the Mosaic system, when seventy elders were selected as the subjects of a special inspiration. "And it came to pass that when the Spirit rested upon them, they prophesied and did not cease. But there remained two of the men in the camp, the name of the one was Eldad, and the name of the other Medad, and the Spirit rested upon them; and they were of them that were written, but went not out unto the tabernacle, and they prophesied in the camp. And there ran a young man, and told Moses, and said, Eldad and Medad do prophesy in the camp. And Joshua, the son of Nun, one of his young men, answered and said, My lord Moses, forbid them. And Moses said unto him, Enviest thou for my sake? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit upon them!" Num. xi. 25—29. Here we are expressly told, that these two men had all that was essential. "They were of them that were written," i. e. designated for this very purpose; this was their external qualification. "And the Spirit rested upon them"; this was their internal qualification. Yet simply because they were not visibly united with the rest, because "they went not out unto the tabernacle," but "prophesied in the camp," the zealous Joshua would have them silenced. The reply of Moses seems to have been designed not merely to check Joshua's excessive zeal for his master's personal honour, but to point out the error of postponing the highest to the lowest evidence of divine authority, and taking it for granted that God could not or would not grant his spiritual gifts beyond the bounds of a certain temporary organization.

A remarkable parallel to this instructive incident occurs in the New Testament. Even in the announcing of the new dispensation, John the Baptist had intimated that the Jewish prejudice in question would be wholly at variance with the changed condition of the church. "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." (Matthew iii. 9.) And yet no sooner was the apostolic body organized than a Judaic spirit of exclusiveness began to show itself, a disposition to regard external union with that body, as a necessary proof of authority derived from Christ. "John answered him saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us, and we forbade him, because he followeth not us.

But Jesus said, forbid him not, for there is no man, which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me." Mark ix. 38, 39. Some, indeed, are of opinion that our Saviour intended to express disapprobation of the man's proceeding as unauthorized; but of this there is no intimation in his language, and it seems to be directly contradicted by the words, "forbid him not." On the contrary, he seems to teach distinctly, that the evidence of connexion with him was of a higher nature than connexion with his followers, and derived directly from himself. To follow them was indeed a strong presumptive proof, that they who did it followed Christ; but to work a miracle in his name was a direct proof of the same thing. Christ had conferred the power of casting out devils on his personal attendants and immediate followers. We do not read that he had publicly conferred it upon any others. It was natural, therefore, that they should regard it as impossible for any others to possess it rightfully. But here was a man, upon whom Christ had bestowed it nevertheless, and he refers them to the possession of the gift itself, as a sufficient proof that he had so bestowed it. This he could not do without implying that the exclusive spirit, which occasioned his rebuke, was one belonging to the temporary system of the old economy.

From this, and from analogous expressions used by Paul in his epistles, in relation to the same contracted views, as well as from the intrinsic qualities which make an indispensable succession in the ministry peculiarly accordant with the forms and spirit of the old economy, we surely may infer, that the analogy of that succession cannot be absolutely binding upon us, unless enforced by an express command. But even if the mere example were thus binding, its authority must of course extend to all the great theocratical offices, and not to that of the priesthood alone, which was no more a divine institution, and no more a type of Christ's mediatorial character, than the offices of King and Prophet. But in the succession of the Kings there was a breach made very early, as if to warn us not to argue from a uniform custom to an absolute necessity. David was no less the successor of Saul than Solomon of David; and yet in the latter case there was derivative succession, in the former not. This, it is true, admits of another explanation; but as to the Prophets, there appears to have been no reg-

ular or uniform succession in their office. The general analogy of Jewish institutions, then, and even of the great theoretical offices, would lead to the conclusion, that an unbroken ministerial succession is by no means indispensable. Let us grant, however, for the sake of argument, that the only binding analogy is that of the levitical priesthood; it is not true that in it there was an uninterrupted derivative succession from the time of Moses to the time of Christ. Not to mention that the line of the succession of High Priests was twice changed during the period of the Old Testament history—which, as we shall see, was by no means an unimportant circumstance—it is notorious matter of history, that after the Roman conquest, the derivative succession of the priests was interrupted, and the appointing power vested in a foreign government. And yet the High Priests who, according to the adverse doctrine, could not be legitimate successors of the earlier incumbents, appear to have been recognised as such by the Apostles, and by Christ himself; for when officially adjoined by Caiaphas, acting in that character, he broke through the silence he had hitherto maintained.

But even granting that the levitical succession was in these respects precisely such as our opponents plead for, and that being such it binds us to exact conformity, this obligation must extend to every thing which necessarily entered into the levitical succession. But that succession was hereditary, and must therefore bind us, if at all, to a hereditary Christian ministry. If this conclusion be evaded by alleging, that the hereditary mode of derivation was a secondary circumstance, derivative succession being all that is essential, then the same thing must be true of the succession which is formed upon the Jewish model; that is to say, the only thing essential in our case is a derivative succession, the precise mode of derivation is an accidental circumstance. If so, hereditary succession, though not necessary, must be lawful, and if lawful entitled to the preference, because more ancient and accordant with the Jewish model, than the mode of ordination. If it be said, that God has changed the mode, but made the principle still binding, this assumes the existence of some explicit revelation on the subject; but if there were such a revelation, there could be no need of resorting to the analogy of Jewish institutions as a ground of obligation.

Again, if one may arbitrarily distinguish between the derivative

succession as essential, and the hereditary mode of derivation as an accident, another may, with equal right, insist upon a different distinction, and discriminate between a mere unbroken series, or constant occupation of the office, as essential, and a derivative succession, or the constant derivation of authority to each incumbent from his predecessor, as an accidental circumstance. This analogy then proves either too little or too much, for it either leaves the main point in dispute discretionary, or it invalidates all orders not derived, by a hereditary succession, from the primitive presbyters. This is the case, let it be observed, even after we have granted that the Jewish succession is a binding example, that this binding power is restricted to the priesthood, and that the succession of the priesthood was a derivative unbroken succession; all which, as we have seen, are mere gratuitous concessions.

It would seem, then, that the argument from analogy is no more conclusive than that from an alleged command; or in other words, that the necessity of uninterrupted succession can be neither indirectly nor directly proved from scripture. If this be so it must of course be fatal to the adverse doctrine, unless it can be shown that there is some inherent necessity for such a constitution, independent of a positive command, and springing from the nature of the ministry itself or of the ends it was designed to answer. Now it will not be disputed, that the end for which the ministry was instituted is the maintenance of truth and its inseparable adjuncts. But if uninterrupted ministerial succession is essential to this end, they must always go together. If the end can be secured by other means, the necessity of this means cannot be absolute. To say that a certain means is essential to a certain end, and yet that the end can be secured without it, is a contradiction. If then succession is essential to the maintenance of truth, they must be always found together. But that teachers of falsehood and apostates have been found in the line of the most regular succession, under both dispensations, is an undisputed and notorious fact. Some of the highest papal authorities admit that even in the series of the Popes there have been heretics and infidels. And few perhaps would question that the truth has been *de facto* held and taught by those who were externally irregular and without authority. The doctrines of what is called the Low Church are regarded by some high Episcopalians

as a serious departure from the faith; and yet these doctrines are maintained, not only by priests, but by bishops, in the boasted line of apostolical succession. The opposite opinions, on the other hand, have sometimes been espoused by men in churches charged with wanting this advantage, and before any change of their external relations.

Here then, according to the adverse doctrine, is succession without truth, and truth without succession. The latter cannot therefore, be essential to the ends for which the ministry was founded. The necessity, if any such there be, must have respect to the continuance of the ministry itself. It may be argued that no positive command is needed, because God undoubtedly designed the ministry to be perpetual, and to this end an uninterrupted succession is absolutely necessary. If so, the necessity must arise, either from something peculiar to the office of the ministry, as different from all others, or from something in the nature of office in general, something common to this office with all others. Now the only thing which makes the ministry to differ from all other offices is the peculiar relation which it bears to God; but this instead of making succession more necessary makes it less so. However indispensable such an arrangement might be thought in human institutions, its absolute necessity would seem to be precluded, in the church, by God's perpetual presence and unceasing agency. And as to office generally, that an unbroken derivative succession is not essential to its perpetuity, is very clear from the familiar case, before alluded to, of kings and presidents, two offices which surely may be equally perpetual, and yet in one of them derivative succession is entirely wanting. That a succession of mere sequence is essential to the perpetuity of office, is no doubt true; but to assert it is to assert an identical proposition: it is merely saying that in order that an office may be never vacant, it must be always filled. Since, therefore, a succession of the kind in question is essential neither to the ends for which the ministry was instituted, nor to the perpetual existence of the ministry itself, there seems to be no original necessity arising from the nature of the case, and superseding the necessity of positive explicit proof from scripture.

If, in default of all such evidence, the necessity of such succession is alleged to rest on the authority of the church, the question immediately presents itself, of what church? The practical use of the whole discussion is to ascertain what is a true

church, by establishing criteria of a valid ministry. To say then that the church requires something as the indispensable criterion of a true church, is to reason in a circle. It is, in effect, to take the thing for granted, without any reason; and to this, irrational as it may seem, there is a strong disposition on the part of many. But let them remember that besides the unreasonableness of such a course, it has this inconvenience, that it opens the door for an indefinite number of precisely similar assumptions. If one undertakes to say, without assigning any reason or attempting any proof, that apostolical succession, in the sense before explained, is absolutely necessary to a valid ministry, another may, with equal right, and equal want of reason, insist upon inspiration, or the power of working miracles, pretending at the same time to possess them. Nor would this claim be chargeable with any more absurdity than that which we have been considering, but on the contrary admit of a more plausible defence. If for example a follower of Irving, believing himself to possess an extraordinary gift of tongues, should make this the indispensable criterion of a valid ministry, and plead the promise of extraordinary powers to the apostles and to those who should believe, the actual possession of these powers in the primitive church, and their obvious utility as means for the diffusion of the gospel, he would certainly make out a very strong case, in comparison with that of him who pleads for the necessity of apostolical succession. The charge of mere delusion, or unauthorized assumption would admit of being easily and pungently retorted, and indeed no argument could well be used by the champions of succession against those of extraordinary gifts, except at the risk of having their own weapons turned against themselves.

The same is true, in an inferior degree, of many other requisitions which might be insisted on, if once the necessity of proof could be dispensed with. There is therefore no security against extravagant and groundless claims, except in the position that no, one however slight and seemingly innoxious, shall ever be admitted without clear decisive evidence, of which we have seen the one now under consideration to be wholly destitute. On this safe and reasonable principle, the failure to establish the necessity of apostolical succession, from the word of God or the nature of the ministry, must be regarded as an ample vindication of our orders from the charge of invalidity. To make assurance

doubly sure, however, we shall add to this negative view of the matter, several positive objections to the doctrine of apostolical succession, in the sense before repeatedly explained.

In the first place, it appears to be at variance with the doctrine, common to both parties in this controversy, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the supreme Head of the Church, and as such present with her to the end of the world. The doctrine of succession seems to rest upon a false and fanciful analogy, derived from human institutions, where the founder, being mortal, loses all control of his affairs by death, and is thenceforth inaccessible, except in a figurative sense, through those who have succeeded to the trust. In them he lives as "in a figure," (*ἐν παραβολῇ*, Heb. xi. 19:) and through them his will is supposed to be consulted and complied with. Now in such a case succession is the only link between the founder and later generations. It is indispensable, or may be so in certain cases, only because nothing can be substituted for it. But the church of Christ is no such corporation; for its founder, though once dead, is alive again and ever liveth to make intercession for his people, and as Head of the Church is still within their reach. True, he uses human intervention in the government of his church, i. e. the intervention of its present rulers; but to say that his communications pass through all the links of the immense chain which connects the church of this day with the church of the apostles, is to say that he was nearer to their first successors than he is to us; for if he was not, why must we resort to them as an organ or medium of communication?

And what seems especially remarkable is this, that those who plead for the immediate presence of our Saviour's body in the eucharist should deny his spiritual presence in the church, by deriving all authority, not from him directly, or through those whom he actually uses as his instruments, but through a long succession of dead men, reaching back to the apostles, as if Christ had never risen. Thus the popish doctrines of the real presence and of the sacrament of orders, by a strange juxtaposition, go together. The doctrine of succession seems to place the Saviour at the end of a long line, in which the successive generations of his ministers succeed one another, each at a greater remove from Him than that which went before it, and consequently needing a still longer line to reach him. But ac-

ording to our view of the true doctrine, Christ, as the Head of the Church, may, in some respects, be likened to the centre of a circle, and the successive generations of his ministers to points in the circumference, at various distances from one another, but all at the same distance from the centre of the system. Through those who thus surround him he may choose to act on others who are still without the circle, as for instance in the rite of ordination; but when this has brought them into the circumference, they derive their powers as directly from the centre as if none had gone before them. All valid powers are derived from Christ, and not from the apostles, or from any intervening men whatever. The agency of men in ordination is a simple, natural and efficacious method of perpetuating the ministry without disorder, recommended by experience, sanctioned by apostolic practice, and approved of God, but not essential to a valid ministry, when Providence has made it either not at all attainable, or only at the cost of greater evils than could possibly attend the violation of external uniformity.

The argument thus drawn from Christ's relation to the church may seem at first to prove too much by proving, that the scriptures are not necessary as a rule of faith, because the author of the scriptures is still living and accessible. The fallacy in this objection lies in overlooking two essential points of difference between the cases. The first is, that the word of God contains explicit declarations of its own exclusive claim to our obedience, and denounces curses upon any who shall venture to add to it or take from it; whereas the apostles put in no such claim for their direct successors, and utter no anathemas against all others who should claim to be Christ's ministers. The other difference is this, that in the scriptures there is no succession, as there is in the ministry. The bible of the present day is that of the first century, and claims the same respect that would be due to the original apostles were they still alive. This total want of correspondence in the circumstances takes off any force, which the objection drawn from the analogy of scripture might have had against our argument, that the necessity of what is called the apostolical succession supposes Christ to be no longer in reality, but only in name or retrospectively as matter of history, Head over all things to the Church.

Another positive objection to the doctrine is, that a different test of ministerial authority is expressly and repeatedly laid down in scripture. This is the test of doctrinal conformity, as taught by Paul, in reproving the Galatians* for abandoning the doctrine of gratuitous salvation, under the influence of erroneous teachers. That these teachers acted under the authority of a regular external warrant, may be inferred not only from the improbability that such influence could have been exerted by private individuals or self-constituted teachers, but also from the form of Paul's expressions—"if I or an angel from heaven"—which imply that the Galatians might naturally be disposed to justify their change by appealing to the authority of those by whom they were induced to make it. As if he had said, it is in vain that you plead the apostolical commission and authority of these false teachers, for if I myself or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel, let him be accursed. His reproof of the Galatians for their doctrinal defection necessarily implies that it might have been avoided, by refusing to receive the instructions of their teachers. But unless he meant to teach, in opposition to his teaching elsewhere, that they ought not to acknowledge any spiritual guides whatever, his meaning must be that they ought to have applied a discriminating test to those who came to them as public teachers. But what should this test be? The answer to the question is given in the words, "though I, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." The form of an anathema which Paul here uses, includes all possible degrees of censure; for one who was accursed of God could not be recognised as a member of the true church, much less as possessing authority in it, or entitled to the confidence and obedience of its members. The expressions are so chosen too as to extend to every class of persons whose pretensions could at any time be called in question. He does not say, "if any private individual or unauthorized public teacher"—he does not say, "if any ordinary minister, not of apostolic rank"—he does not say, "if any other apostle"—he does not even say, "if any human being"—but by mentioning himself and an angel from heaven, deliberately cuts off all claim to exemption from the operation of the

*Gal. i. 8, 9.

rule. The standard of comparison established is not something to be afterwards made known, but something notorious and fixed already. He does not say, "another gospel than that which we shall preach hereafter"—he does not say, "another gospel than that which is propounded by the church"—but "any other gospel than that which we have preached to you already."

Now if Paul could thus appeal to his oral instructions as establishing a standard from which he had himself no right to swerve, how much more may such a test be now insisted on, when the canon of scripture is complete, and a curse impending over any who shall venture to add to it or take from it. If Paul himself, or an angel from heaven, preaching any other gospel than the one which he had preached already, must be treated as accursed of God, how much more must any other man, departing from the standard of true doctrine now confirmed and sealed forever, be rejected as an unauthorized pretender to the ministerial office, whatever his external claims may be. If to this it be objected that a man may be accursed of God, and yet be entitled to respect and obedience as a minister, this can be true only where the curse remains a secret, not where, as in the present case, it is explicitly revealed. That Paul when he says ἀνάθεμα ἔστω does not speak merely of God's secret purpose, or of the ultimate perdition of false teachers, but declares the duty of the church respecting them, is evident from the imperative form of the expression, "let him be (treated or regarded as) anathema"—from the irrelevancy of a mere prediction to the writer's purpose—and also from a parallel passage in the second epistle of John, where the same test is established. "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." 2 John, 9. This might seem to relate merely to God's personal favour, without any bearing upon ministerial authority or standing; but such an explanation is precluded by the practical directions in the following verse. "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed," *ib.* v. 10, much less submit to his instructions, or acknowledge his authority, in order to avoid which even social intercourse with such must be forborne, "for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." *ib.* v. 11. In these two passages, by different apostles, and ad-

dressed to different persons, conformity of doctrine to the apostolic standard is emphatically set forth as essential to a valid ministry, the want of which could be supplied by no external warrant or commission. The apostolical succession, therefore, in its purest form and clearest evidence, can be of no avail without this doctrinal conformity, because the church is bound to treat not only the successors of apostles, but apostles themselves, and even angels from heaven as accursed, if they preach another gospel.

It may be said, however, that although this doctrinal conformity is necessary, it is not sufficient; that the apostolical succession is another test of valid ministrations, and one equally essential; that the rule which Paul prescribes to the Galatians presupposes an external regularity in the official character of those to whom it is applied; and that although it proves even apostolical orders to be worthless without purity of doctrine, it does not prove purity of doctrine to avail, apart from an apostolical commission. But does not the explicit and repeated mention of the one condition, as absolutely necessary, without the least allusion to the other, in the very cases where it was most important to enforce it, for the guidance of the church, and the prevention of pernicious misconceptions—does not this present a serious objection to the doctrine that the thing thus passed by *sub silentio* was no less essential to the being of a valid ministry than that which is expressly and exclusively enjoined? If the early Christians were as liable to suffer from the want of apostolical authority in ministers as from their want of orthodoxy, why are they frequently warned against the latter, but against the former never?

This objection presses with peculiar force on those who look upon external regularity (including apostolical succession) as the great security for truth of doctrine. If Paul and John had thus regarded it, they surely would have urged their readers to adopt so simple and effectual a safeguard, by submitting to the exclusive guidance of a duly sanctioned and commissioned ministry; their failure to do which is as decisive as a negative proof can be, that they did not even think of apostolical succession, as a preventive of the evil to be feared, but thought it necessary to direct attention to the evil itself, as one with which the people must contend directly, and from which they could escape unhurt only

by vigilance, a just discrimination, and a timely exercise of private judgment. Let it moreover be observed, that the value of the apostolical succession, as contended for, depends in a great measure on its furnishing a simple and sufficient method of determining who are and who are not true ministers, without the necessity of seeking other evidence or applying other tests. The very fact, then, that another is required after all, and that the worth of apostolical succession, even when it can be ascertained, depends upon the doctrinal correctness of the persons who possess it, makes it not indeed impossible but highly improbable that this external test was ever meant to be essential. The end to be attained, on any supposition, is the maintenance of TRUTH, in the most comprehensive sense of the expression; and the strongest recommendation of the doctrine which we are opposing is that it appears to furnish a convenient, tangible, and efficacious method of deciding between different opinions, without being under the necessity of canvassing their merits in detail. But what is the practical value of this method, if its application must be followed by an inquiry whether those who can abide this test are apostolical in doctrine also? This is equivalent to laying down a rule, that we are bound to receive as teachers of the truth all who have apostolical commissions—provided that they teach the truth.

An illustration may be drawn from military usage. The design of countersigns or watchwords, in an army, is to furnish those who act as sentries with a simple and decisive method of discriminating friends from foes. But what if the officer, in giving out the word, should add an exhortation to observe the dress, complexion, gait, and language of all persons who present themselves, and suffer none to pass who are not in these respects entirely satisfactory? Such a direction might be very wise and necessary; but it would certainly destroy the value of the simpler test to which it was appended; for if even those who give the word must be subjected to this further scrutiny, the only advantage of the watch-word would be to save a little unnecessary trouble in a few rare cases. Another illustration of a more pacific kind is afforded by the usage of the Scottish churches in admitting communicants to the Lord's table by means of tokens, bearing witness to the fact of their having been approved by the competent authorities. If in addition to this testimonial, an examination of

the person were required on the spot, the use of tokens would be soon dispensed with as an empty form.

It may be objected to this illustration, that it supposes proof to be required of the very thing which is attested by the token; whereas apostolical doctrine and apostolical succession are distinct and independent tests of ministerial authority. This is true, if apostolical succession is required simply for its own sake or the sake of some mysterious influence, actually derived from the apostles, through the line of their successors, which we have seen to be at variance with the doctrine of Christ's headship. But if, as we suppose will be admitted by most Protestants, the apostolical succession is of value as securing the possession of the truth, then the express command to judge of the pretensions of all ministers directly by their agreement with the apostolic doctrine, makes it highly probable, to say the least, that an indirect method of determining the same thing was not meant to be equally essential as a test, the rather as it is not even mentioned or referred to, in connexion with the other.

We have seen already that the doctrine of apostolical succession, as essential to the ministry, proceeds upon the supposition, that it may be clearly ascertained, and that it furnishes an easy and infallible criterion by which to try the claims of all professing to be ministers. Now if this were the case, it would be inconsistent with the whole scheme of God's providence respecting his church, as disclosed in scripture and verified by history. So far as his purposes are thus made known, it forms no part of them to place the church beyond the reach of doubt or the necessity of caution. There are promises of ultimate security and triumph, but none of absolute assurance and exemption from perplexity in the mean time. On the contrary the word of God abounds with warnings against error and deception, and with exhortations, not to outward conformity as a preventive, but to watchfulness and diligence and nice discrimination. Christians are there taught not to believe every spirit, but to try the spirits whether they be of God; to prove all and hold fast that which is good. "There must be heresies (or sects) among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." 1 Cor. xi. 19. This would seem to be a very unnecessary discipline, if the original organization of the church involved a simpler and less dangerous method of attaining the same end.

With these intimations of the scripture agree perfectly the facts of all church history, as showing that the means by which God has been pleased to preserve and to restore the knowledge of his truth have not been those afforded by ecclesiastical organizations, or implicit faith in certain teachers as successors of the apostles, but others involving the necessity of studying the truth and searching the scriptures, as the only sovereign rule of faith and practice.

When considered in this aspect, the alleged simplicity and perfect certainty of apostolical succession in determining all doubts, without the troublesome necessity of reasoning or investigation, far from proving it to be a necessary part of the divine economy in governing the church, would rather tend to raise a strong presumption, that it formed no part of it at all, because at variance with its other parts, and with its fundamental principles. And this presumption is abundantly confirmed by the fact, which may easily be verified, that no such facility or certainty as that alleged attends the process, but that, on the contrary, whatever it may seem to be in theory, it always must, in practice, be uncertain and precarious. Now if the apostolical succession, as we have already seen, is not explicitly commanded, and must therefore rest its claims on its necessity or usefulness, and if its only use can be to furnish a criterion of valid ministrations, it is clear that want of safety and efficiency in its application must destroy its claims to be regarded as a necessary part of the divine economy by which the church is governed.

That God has suffered apostolical doctrine and apostolical succession to be put asunder, in a multitude of cases, and so changed the condition of the church under the new dispensation as to render it unspeakably more difficult to ascertain a ministerial succession than it was under the old, are cogent reasons for regarding the hypothesis of its necessity as contradicted by the providence of God. And this leads directly to the last objection which we shall suggest, to wit, that apostolical succession, as a test of ministerial authority, is an impracticable one, and therefore useless. The official pedigree of no man living can be traced with certainty to the apostles. This state of the case might be expected *a priori*, from the very nature of the case itself. That every link in the immense chain should be absolutely perfect in itself and in its connexion with the rest; that no flaw should

exist, in any instance, from defect in the act of ordination or the ministerial rights of the ordainer, through a period of eighteen hundred years, and an extent of many nations, must, if looked at without prejudice, be seen to be an expectation too extravagant to be fulfilled, without an extraordinary interposition to effect it, of which we have neither proof nor promise.

The reason that it does not thus strike every mind, when first presented, is that the nature of the succession in question is apt to be obscurely or erroneously conceived. Many assume that nothing more is meant by it than the perpetual existence of a ministry, and its continuance by ordination. But that this is far from being the succession against which we are contending, is apparent from the fact, that it is not the test applied to non-episcopal communions. These are required to demonstrate the validity of their ministrations by an exact deduction of their orders from the first ordainers. That this should be possible, could never be expected *a priori*. That it is not possible, may easily be proved *a posteriori*, from the fact that even under the most favourable circumstances, where the line of the succession has been most conspicuous, most carefully guarded, and attended by the most abundant facilities for verifying facts—as for instance in the case of the Roman bishops—no such succession has been proved.

But apart from these considerations, the impossibility of proving a particular succession, in the case of any minister, is tacitly admitted, on the part of those who claim it, by evading the demand for proof, and alleging the fact to be notorious. The case of ministerial succession is compared to that of natural descent from Adam or Noah, which no man can prove, but which no man disputes. The fallacy of this analogical argument scarcely needs to be exposed. The descent of any individual from Adam is notorious only on the supposition that the whole human family is sprung from a single pair. This being assumed, the other follows of necessity. If all descend from Adam, so must every one. To make the cases parallel, we must suppose a plurality of races, and a dispute to which of these a certain individual belongs. In that case the appeal to notoriety would be absurd, and in the absence of explicit genealogies, the only proof available would be the correspondence in the physical characteristics of the progenitor and his alleged descendants. In the supposed

case this might be a difficult and doubtful process from the want of any accurate and authentic description of the ancestor. But in the case of ministerial descent, we have the advantage of a description not only exact but infallible, with which those who claim to be successors of the primitive ministers may be compared with rigorous exactness. Let us suppose that according to the scriptures men had sprung from two distinct originals, and that these were represented as distinguished by the same external marks which now distinguish Africans from Europeans. If any one should claim to be descended from either of these stocks, and his pretensions were disputed, the nearest approach that could be made to a solution of the question, would be by comparing the complexion, features, form, hair, &c., of the claimant, with the like particulars ascribed in scripture to the father of the race. The application of the rule might be precarious, but without specific genealogies, no better proof could be adduced, or would be called for.

This imaginary case affords a close analogy to that of apostolical succession. Certain bodies of men claim to be exclusively descended, by official derivation, from the primitive apostles, and reject the claims of others to a similar descent, upon the ground that they are not able to produce specific proofs of an unbroken succession. But when charged with the same defect in their own orders, they appeal to notoriety, as if there were no room to doubt or question their extraction. But it may be questioned, on the same grounds upon which they question that of others; and the only way in which the point at issue can be settled is by comparing the distinctive attributes of those who now profess to have succeeded the apostles in the ministerial office, with the corresponding traits of the apostles themselves. By this test we are willing to abide. We lay no claim to apostolical succession, except so far as we agree with the apostles and the primitive ministry, in doctrine, spirit, discipline, and life. And we consider our opponents as reduced to the necessity, either of submitting to the same test, or of proving in detail their individual descent from the apostles. The attempt to substitute for such proof the admitted fact, that the Anglican or Romish clergy of the present day are, as a body, the successors of the apostolic ministry, is to evade the difficulty by confounding general and particular succession, by insisting on the latter when our orders

are in question, and producing the former when their own commission is demanded. This, we say, is a virtual admission of the fact, which forms the ground of our last objection, viz. that apostolical succession, in the strict sense of the terms, and as a practical test of valid ministrations, is impracticable and therefore useless.

If then, as we have tried to show, this doctrine is not only unsupported by express command and binding example, and by any necessity arising from the nature of the ministerial office, or the ends for which it was established, but at variance with the doctrine of Christ's headship, superseded by the surer test of doctrinal conformity to apostolic teachings, contradicted by the providence of God, and practically useless even to its advocates; it is not perhaps too bold an inference from these considerations, that an incapacity to trace our ministerial authority by regular succession, step by step, to the apostles, is no conclusive argument, nor even a presumptive one, against the validity of Presbyterian orders. Here we might safely rest the defence of our ministrations against all attacks connected with this point of apostolical succession; but we cannot do justice to the strength of our position, without exhibiting the subject in another point of view. We have endeavoured to show, that the apostolical succession, which we are accused of wanting, is not essential to a valid ministry. This would suffice to justify our claims, even on the supposition that our opponents possess in the highest degree, what they demand of us, and that we, on the other hand, are utterly without it. But we have furthermore seen reason to believe that our opponents have it in a much more limited degree than that which they require of others. This, in addition to the unessential character of the advantage, would at least have the effect of bringing us nearer to a level with our neighbours, still supposing apostolical succession in the ministerial office to be altogether wanting upon our part.

But even this residuary difference between us, with respect to the validity of our pretensions, disappears when it is known, that so far as apostolical succession can be verified, the Presbyterian Church in the United States possesses it, as really and fully as the Church of England. In making this assertion, as in all the reasonings of the present article, we assume as proved already, that a superior order in the ministry to that of presby-

ters is not essential to the being of the church, but that from the beginning presbyters have exercised the highest powers now belonging to the ministry. If so, it is through them that the apostolical succession must be traced, and we accordingly maintain that our orders may be just as surely traced in this way up to apostolic times, as those of any other church through bishops. The denial of this fact has, for the most part, been connected with the false assumption that the ministry of our church has been derived from that of Geneva, and depends for its validity on the ministerial authority of Calvin; whereas we trace our orders, through the original Presbytery of Philadelphia, to the Presbyterians of Ireland, and the mother-church of Scotland, which is well known to have been reformed with the concurrence and assistance of men regularly ordained in the church of Rome. The principal admixture of this Scottish element, in our earliest presbyteries, was with New England Puritans, among whom only two examples of lay-ordination are believed to have occurred, and whose ecclesiastical system was originally founded by regularly ordained priests of the Anglican establishment. The proportion of those members, in our primitive church courts, whose ordination was derived from more obscure and doubtful sources, such as the Welsh and English Independents, was extremely small. Whatever then a regular succession may be worth, we can lay claim to it as far back and as certainly as any of our adversaries.

This fact is indeed so "notorious," that it has been met, for the most part, not with a denial of the fact itself, but with an allegation, that the only apostolical succession in existence is derived through Bishops, as superior to Presbyters. It is the need of something to destroy the force of presbyterial succession, as a fact which cannot be denied, that has occasioned the perpetual and almost universal combination of the doctrine of succession with the doctrine of episcopacy, as alike essential to the organization of the church. We have ventured, however, to discuss them separately, and have thus been led to the conclusion, that the highest powers of the church belong to Presbyters as such; that succession, if derived at all, must be derived through them; and that through them we possess it no less certainly and fully than the church of England or the church of Rome. We cannot indeed, show that every link in the long chain has been without

a flaw, but neither can our adversaries do so upon their part. Until the Reformation, the two lines are coincident, and since that time, the continuation of the series of Presbyters, in Scotland, England, Ireland, and America, is as certain and notorious as that of Bishops. Supposing, then, as we of course do, that the rank, which we have claimed for Presbyters, is justly due to them, it follows necessarily, that no objection to the validity of Presbyterian orders can be founded on the want of apostolical succession; partly because it is not absolutely necessary, partly because we are as really possessed of it as any other ministry or church whatever. When any urge this argument against our ministrations, they assume two facts, both essential to the truth of their conclusion; first, the fact that such succession is of absolute necessity, and secondly the fact that they alone possess it. If either of these assumptions is unfounded, it destroys the argument; for if succession is not necessary, it matters little who has or has it not; and if on the other hand we have as much of it as our opponents, they can have no pretext for impugning the validity of our ministrations. By disproving either of these two positions, the conclusion is destroyed. By disproving both, it is doubly destroyed, "twice dead, plucked up by the roots."

ART. V.—*Christ's Second Coming: will it be Pre-Millennial?*
By the Rev. David Brown, A. M., Minister of St. James' Free Church, Glasgow. Edinburgh: 1846. 12mo. pp. 386.

As early as the second century, there seems to have been a general expectation in the church, that Christ would return to the earth, and spend a thousand years with his disciples. The current notion of the happiness to be enjoyed throughout this period became gradually more and more debased, until the doctrine was itself rejected by more spiritual Christians, and by some of them along with it the book of Revelation, on a single obscure passage in which the chiliastic doctrine rested. After the lapse of ages, during which it seemed to be forgotten, a new interpretation of the Apocalyptic *millennium* became current. This supposed the *terminus a quo* to be the institution of the

Christian church, and the end of the world coincident with that of the tenth century. When the general agitation, which arose at first from this belief, had been allayed by the arrival of the dreaded epoch, the millennium again ceased to be a general subject of attention till the Reformation. The Reformers seem to have bestowed little thought upon it; but towards the close of the sixteenth century, it became a favourite theme of disquisition. Some agreed that the millennium was past, but differed as to the time when. This general doctrine was maintained by Usher in his work *De Ecclesia*. But a new face was put upon the controversy by the *Clavis Apocalyptica* of Joseph Mede, who held the millennium and the day of judgment to be one and the same period, during which the church is to be freed from all existing evils, and the Jews to be converted as a nation, in a manner similar to Paul's conversion and prefigured by it. It now became the common doctrine of interpreters, that the millennium was still future, and after the end of the seventeenth century, that it should precede Christ's second coming. To this anticipated period the descriptions of the future glory of the church in the Old Testament were now applied without hesitation, and the name *millennium*, thus understood, became universally familiar. When revivals of religion or awakenings became frequent, they were looked upon as signs of the approaching millennium, and enthusiasts indulged their imaginations freely in defining the precise time when it was to open.

Since the commencement of the present century the doctrine has again assumed a new form or rather has resumed an ancient one in which it now extensively prevails both in Britain and America. This is the pre-millennial theory, which makes the thousand years of the Apocalypse the period of Christ's personal reign at Jerusalem, and also teaches that the dead saints will then be raised and the living transfigured, while the wicked will remain in the grave until the thousand years are past. Some of the advocates of this opinion, not content with the period of a thousand ordinary years, enlarge it to 365,000, by applying the principle of a year for a day. This pre-millennial theory has led to a more extensive study of the prophecies in general, and especially of the Apocalypse, with many varying and strange results.

These speculations have especially prevailed among the

evangelical members of the Scotch and English Churches. Some, however, are beginning to recede from the ground which they once occupied. Among these is the author of the work before us, who has been reproached by his opponents, as "having once held the views whose untenableness he has endeavoured to show." But this we look upon as an advantage, since it gives him the authority of one who has attentively examined both sides of the question with the zeal of a believer, yet without the rancour of a renegade.

Mr. Brown begins by stating what is common to the parties. This is the more important because even Mr. Bickersteth, in his preface to a recent course of pre-millennial lectures by twelve clergymen of the Church of England, represents it as the common but erroneous doctrine, that the second coming of Christ will be a spiritual coming in the hearts of his people; a statement contradictory, not only to notorious fact, but to his own assertion, in his work on Prophecy, that "the great points of controversy among Christians are not with regard to the actual and personal coming of Christ, since all who believe the Bible believe that he will thus come."

As to the final destiny of the present physical system, there is no agreement upon either side. Some pre-millennarians believe, that the saints are to dwell forever in the "new heavens and new earth," to be formed out of the materials now existing. Others hold, that after the millennium, Christ and his people will forsake this world forever. And the same diversity is found in the opinions of the adverse party, as our author shows by a reference to particular discourses on the subject.

Mr. Brown admits the merit of the pre-millennial writers in awakening the attention of the church to Christ's second coming, which he holds to be the pole-star of the church, and shows to be continually held up to our view in scripture as an object of desire and hope, with which the entrance of believers at their death into a state of blessedness is never put in competition. To the arguments founded on expressions in the word of God which seem to imply that the second advent is at hand, our author opposes the irrefragable fact, that ages have elapsed since this conclusion was first drawn from the very same expressions. It is painful to observe that some of the pre-millennarian writers, in their anxiety to escape this difficulty, seem inclined to think

that the apostles were themselves deceived, a supposition monstrous in itself and irreconcilable with Paul's declarations to the Thessalonians.

Mr. Brown's first positive argument against the pre-millennial theory is drawn from the plainly revealed fact, that when Christ comes, all the redeemed will be partakers in that glorious manifestation. What then will be the condition and character of the other inhabitants of the earth during the millennium? The conclusion seems to be inevitable, that there will not be one righteous person or believer among them for successive ages. Some extreme writers admit the truth of this conclusion, but maintain, that the rest of mankind will be in a state resembling that of Adam before the fall, i. e. free from original corruption. A part of these, being left to the freedom of their own will, are to fall, as Adam fell, while the rest, though free from sin, and needing no redemption, are to be united to Christ and thus preserved from falling. This may serve as a sample of the follies into which a fanatical attachment to this dogma has betrayed some recent writers calling themselves orthodox and evangelical. It is not however an opinion generally held by pre-millennial writers, some of the most eminent of whom have undertaken to refute it, but without escaping from the pressure of the difficulty, to remove which this absurd scheme was invented.

That Christ, at his appearing, will have all his chosen people with him, they cannot deny. Indeed, in the "Lectures of Twelve Ministers of the Church of England," the latest work which has been published on the subject, they avow this doctrine in the most positive and emphatical language. The very first lecture in this volume, by the Rev. E. Auriol, maintains, in the most explicit terms, that the church which Christ will present without spot, at his second coming, "is composed of all those who have been given to him from eternity, by the Father." It comprises "all those for whom Christ in a special manner gave himself." In like manner, the Rev. Mr. Grimshaw asks, "What Church? It is all those who have been chosen in Christ, before the foundation of the world." "It is every one of those who is, or shall be born of the Spirit, and made new creatures, in Christ Jesus. Till all whom the Father hath chosen in Christ, out of mankind, are born again, and justified, the church will not be complete." All this is very correct. But if the church of

Christ be complete at the time of the second advent, it can admit of no additions; and the question returns, what will be the character and condition of the people on the earth, during the millennium, over whom Christ and his saints are to reign? If not Christians, and not restored to original purity, then they must all be unregenerate sinners; and what sort of a millennium, and what sort of a kingdom would that be?

By most pre-millennialists, this difficulty is scarcely noticed, and when noticed little effort is made to solve it. But there is one distinguished writer, the Rev. H. Macneile, who does attempt to grapple with this objection. He is, however, under the necessity of denying, that all the elected church of Christ will be with him, at his advent. And he argues forcibly, that the nation of the Jews, whose conversion he places after the advent, are a part of the redeemed and sanctified church; and he shows very clearly that Christian privileges and blessings are promised to the Gentiles in the millennium. This is perfectly scriptural. "But unfortunately," says our author, "his opponents can neutralize him, on his own principles, with a proposition equally scriptural with his, namely, that all that are Christ's shall appear with him at his coming, therefore, the nations being on the earth after his coming will *not* be in a Christian state."

Our author next considers the pre-millennial doctrine in relation to the mediatorial offices of Christ, and shows that these offices, together with the means of grace now in use, by divine appointment, must cease at the second coming of our Lord. It follows, as an inference from what was before proved, namely, that the number of the elect will be complete, and all gathered together, at the second advent; that there will be no room for the further exercise of Christ's mediatorial offices in the salvation of lost sinners. But the author does not rest his argument, derived from this topic, on the truth already established, which some pre-millennialists deny; but he adduces numerous texts of scripture, all which refer to the second advent, as the termination of the present dispensation; and he introduces quotations from their own ablest writers, in which they acknowledge and assert, that the sacred scriptures, as they now exist, will be by no means adapted to the state of things in the millennial state. But it is by the word and sacraments that Christ exercises his offices of prophet, priest, and king, for the salvation of his people; and therefore

when these ordinances cease, his mediatorial work must be at an end. And as the means of executing the prophetic office, as now enjoyed by the church, must cease, at the time of Christ's second coming; so his acting as the great High Priest of his people, by presenting the merit of his sacrifice on the cross, when he shall leave the highest heavens, where he now appears before God as an advocate, and ever lives to make intercession for us. The most holy place, or holy of holies, in the tabernacle and temple, was the only place where the High Priest could sprinkle the blood of the sin offering for all the congregation, on the great day of atonement. Now the apostle Paul teaches most clearly that this place was the type of the highest heavens, into which Christ entered, and this whole transaction on that sacred and memorable day, prefigured the exercise of the Mediator's sacerdotal office, by presenting before the mercy-seat on high, the blood of his atoning sacrifice. Evidently, therefore, when Christ shall leave his throne in the heavens, and take up his abode upon earth, his intercessions will cease; and how then can any more sinners be saved, as his ability to save to the uttermost all that come to God by him, is made to depend on his ever living to make intercession for them.

The argument from the kingly office is drawn out by our author, to a very great length, so as to fill up one half of the volume. He enters into a long discussion respecting what is meant in the New Testament by the phrase "the kingdom of God," and maintains, that this kingdom had its commencement with the institution of the Christian Church; whereas, the pre-millennialists maintain, that that kingdom is still future, and will not be set up until Christ shall come the second time; when he will assume the reins of universal government, and will sit on the throne of his father David, according to the prophecies. They lay much stress upon Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream; where after describing the rise of four successive kingdoms, it is said, "In the days of these kings, shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom," &c.

As our space is limited, we are under the necessity of passing over the points brought under discussion in this argument, from the regal office of the Mediator. We would remark, however, that a very undue proportion of the book is, in our opinion, devoted to the consideration of this point. The remaining argu-

ments against the pre-millennial scheme, are in our judgment, much stronger, than this on which so much labour has been bestowed.

The next argument, of the book under review, is derived from a consideration of the pre-millennial scheme, in relation to the scriptural doctrine of the resurrection. Their opinion is, that when Christ comes, the saints who are dead shall rise, and those who are alive on the earth shall be changed; but that the wicked will not be raised until after the millennium. "But how," you will ask, "do they dispose of another class of saints, unprovided for by the above scheme; the myriads of shining believers who are to flourish on the earth during the thousand years; and who by the scheme in question, are neither privileged to appear with Christ at the *beginning*, nor doomed to rise with the wicked at the *end* of the millennium? The answer to this question will startle the reader, if he happens not to be well read in the changes which this unsteady scheme has, from time to time, undergone, and if he be not acquainted with its latest modifications. The fact is the system is nowhere more at fault than here. It has positively got no scripture on the subject. For having exhausted all that scripture says about saints raised, or saints changed upon those that lived *before* the millennium, they find it silent, of course, about the raising or changing of the vast numbers they have to dispose of *after* the millennium. What do they do with them then? For the most part, the subject is avoided, those however, who grapple with it, are hurried into such revolting speculations, as I believe, will open many an eye to the true nature of the whole scheme."

His first statement is taken from a lecture of Mr. Bickersteth, in a recent volume, before referred to. "If," says he, "the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked, and the general judgment of all men, took place at one time, and in the same day, none would, none could be left, *as the heads and parents of a redeemed people on earth*, (that is, after the general judgment). But the holy scriptures reveal to us a progress in judgment, and that the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked are clearly distinct in time. This is the first resurrection of the saints, at the commencement of the millennium; and after the thousand years, the rest of the dead (the wicked) live and are judged. . . . At the close of the millennium, there is a last open apostasy of

the wicked, who during the thousand years had yielded only a feigned obedience. This finally separates all the believers, and removes them from the earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. The apostates are first slain by fire, and afterwards raised with the rest of the wicked dead for judgment. BUT NO CHANGE IS MENTIONED AS THUS PASSING ON THE JEWISH NATION, OR ON THE LIVING RIGHTEOUS, WHO CONTINUE FAITHFUL TO GOD, AS IN THE TRANSLATION OF THE SAINTS BEFORE THE MILLENNIUM. The object of the rebellion, to overthrow the camp of the saints and the beloved city, fails of its design. God protects them. The living righteous then after *the millennium* may continue A SEED TO SERVE GOD, and in successive generations, be TRAINED UP FOR HEAVENLY GLORY."

There is then to be no simultaneous change of those myriads of believers who have lived during the millennium, as of those who lived before the millennium. What then becomes of them? One by one, through successive generations, they get glorified—we are not told how, or on what principle—but *the race of them never dies out*; they live on and propagate their kind, to all eternity; "they continue a seed to serve God." These are the remarks of our author on Bickersteth's sentiments. But, in addition we may ask, whether the saints who shall be born and converted during the millennium, will die as saints did before the millennium, and be subject to the same infirmities, temptations, and afflictions? If so, what a strange incongruous state of society will the earth exhibit, in the days of the millennium. First, we have Christ, the Lord of heaven, keeping his court at Jerusalem, surrounded by all the pious who lived from the beginning of the world until the millennium, with incorruptible, immortal, spiritual and glorious bodies; and, of course, the holy angels will also be present to worship their king. Whether these celestial beings will need houses or any other earthly accommodation, we are not informed. But then, on the other hand, we have a succession of believers dwelling in mortal bodies, and dying as at present. Now what sort of society or intercourse will there be, or can there be, between those two classes of saints? Or can there be any communion between them? But this is not all. Mr. Bickersteth startles us with the information, that during the millennium, when we supposed there would be nothing but righteousness and peace, there will exist a body of wicked men,

who, during the thousand years, *yield a feigned obedience*, and who at last openly apostatize. We suppose, that he refers to the rebel armies of Gog and Magog, who, after the millennium, are to surround the camp of the saints; their number, according to the prophecy, will be exceeding great—even “*as the sand on the sea shore.*” Rev. xx. 2.

It is alleged, that the earth will undergo a great change before the millennium, and be so renovated, that it will be a suitable and glorious habitation for Christ and his saints. This theory might be received, if none were to inhabit the new earth but the risen, glorified saints; but the same habitation would not be suitable for those saints still inhabiting frail, dying bodies. These must still cultivate the ground, and feed upon its fruits. And as to the company of hypocrites, mentioned above, surely, they cannot have a part in “the new heavens, and in the new earth.” These are only a few of the incongruities of the modern pre-millennial scheme; they multiply on us, the more attentively we examine the system.

Now let it be considered, that this whole theory of a first and second resurrection rests on a literal interpretation of a passage in the twentieth chapter of the book of Revelation. No one, however rigid a literalist, would think of interpreting all the parts of this obscure prophecy in a literal manner. We are of opinion, that the key to unlock this sacred deposit of God's mysteries, has not yet been discovered. When we consider how many men of eminent learning have spent years in the laborious investigation of the Apocalypse, and yet, that there is a wide diversity in the interpretations of the whole of the commentators, can it be wise to found so important a doctrine on the literal interpretation of an insulated passage? But again, if we adhere to the letter of the passage in question, it will not sustain the doctrine derived from it. It is not said, in this passage, that all the saints shall have a part in the first resurrection; but only the martyrs—“The souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark in their foreheads, nor in their hands.” Even if we suppose the latter part of the description refers to other saints besides martyrs, still it refers only to such as lived after the rise of the apocalyptic beast.

The risen martyrs are to reign with Christ a thousand years; but the text says not where; neither is any mention made of their bodies. It is alleged, that if the resurrection of the body is meant in the latter part of the passage, then according to all just rules of interpretation, the resurrection mentioned in the first part, should be referred to the body. To which we answer, that there is no necessity which obliges us to consider the resurrection of the "rest of the dead" as being a literal resurrection, any more than the resurrection of the martyrs, in the first. When we read of the death and resurrection of the Two Witnesses, we do not understand a literal death and resurrection; and we are under no greater necessity of interpreting this passage literally; especially, when many things in the context cannot be so interpreted. Bishop Newton says, "We should be cautious and tender of making the first resurrection an allegory, lest others should reduce the second to an allegory too." The answer to this by Fraser of Kirkhill, is sensible and pointed. "The scriptures" says he, "frequently mention the second or new birth: the first is that of the body; is it necessary that the second should be so too?"

The next argument which Mr. Brown brings forward in opposition to the pre-millennial scheme, is taken from the nature and circumstances of the general judgment, as exhibited in the Holy Scriptures. This grand and awful transaction is constantly represented as having relation to all men, and to occur at the same time to the righteous and the wicked. It is, therefore, called "a day," "the day of the Lord," "the day of judgment," "the judgment of the great day," &c. In the xxv. chapter of Matthew, Christ himself says, "when the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered ALL NATIONS," &c. And the passage in this very chapter, on which the literalists lay so much stress, ought to satisfy them, that all men will be collected together at the day of judgment. "And I saw a great white throne, and I saw the dead small and great stand before God," &c. The attempts to do away the force of these testimonies, have led to such distorted and perverted interpretations as furnish a strong proof, that a scheme requiring such methods of support, cannot be founded in truth. For example, in one of the series of "Lectures, by Ministers of the Church

of England," in commenting on the xxv. chapter of Matt. says, by all nations should be understood "all Gentiles"—and the question, "when saw we thee an hungered," &c. is one of ignorance, asking information. Those, therefore, addressed, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you," are not Christians, but persons, who had no knowledge of Christianity!

We come now to the closing argument of our author, which relates to the general conflagration of the earth. On this subject, he says, "there is probably, nothing in scripture, so hard to bend to the pre-millennial doctrine, as that which relates to the conflagration and its issues." And then he cites 2 Pet. iii. 7—10, "But the heavens and the earth which are now, are kept in store reserved unto fire, against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men," &c. The difficulty in this scheme is, that it supposes the earth to remain during the millennium; whereas, this passage of Peter represents it as utterly destroyed by the general conflagration. To avoid the difficulty, some recent writers are for putting off the conflagration, until after the millennium. But this will not do; for the apostle connects it with the second coming of Christ. "The day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night, in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, and the earth, and the works that are therein shall be burned up." They allege that this day is one of a thousand years, and the conflagration may be as well at the end, as the beginning. Others suppose that the conflagration will not render the earth unfit for habitation; but what becomes of the inhabitants during the conflagration? The fire may indeed refine the earth, but it will be the "perdition of ungodly men." Mr. Bickersteth and Mr. Brooks appear to be much perplexed to reconcile the predicted conflagration with their pre-millennial scheme.

At first view, it might seem, that the pre-millennial doctrine was at least perfectly harmless; for what injury can it be to any one, to expect the coming of Christ soon; or to believe, that for any thing which we know, he may make his glorious appearance any day. Certainly, such a belief and expectation will have a tendency to withdraw those who entertain them from a too ardent pursuit of the objects of time and sense; and from the prominence given to the second advent, in the sa-

cred scriptures, it would seem, that it was the intention of the Holy Spirit to have the minds of Christians constantly occupied with this subject.

All this is very plausible; but what, in fact, has been the experience of the church on this subject? It cannot be denied, that the expectation of the near approach of the second advent has given rise, in different ages, to much enthusiasm and wild fanaticism, and in our own age, who has not heard of the lamentable excesses produced by Irvingism and Millerism? This, however, may be said to be an abuse of the doctrine; and no doctrine should be judged of by its abuse. It must be admitted, however, that the pre-millennial doctrine is extremely liable to abuse. It is believed, that even in regard to the most sober and pious of the advocates of this doctrine, it has a tendency to turn off the attention from the preaching of Christ crucified; which is the subject most necessary to be inculcated on sinners. Whether Christ will make his second appearance before or after the millennium is certainly no fundamental doctrine; persons may be equally safe in believing either side of the proposition. And it is dangerous to draw off the attention of the people from essential points to future events of an exciting character, and by which it is possible that the imaginations of many may be greatly affected, who are ignorant of the way of salvation. If the expectation is, that the second appearing of Christ may occur within a century or half a century, the belief will have very little effect on the minds of men, more than if it was believed, that this event would not take place until after the lapse of more than a thousand years. But if a confident expectation is created that the appearance of Christ is very near, and may be looked for every day, the effect will be great, and the excitement and agitation such as to disturb the serenity of the mind, and to interfere with the regular performance of the duties incumbent on men in the various relations of life. We have known some serious, well-meaning people to be thus agitated; so as to be capable of thinking of scarcely any thing beside. Paul evidently took pains to allay all undue excitement in the minds of the Thessalonian Christians, arising from the expectation of the near approach of the second advent.

On the subject of the millennium, we have very little to add. To what period the thousand years in the Apocalypse refers, we

profess, that we do not know ; and therefore we cannot be sure whether it is past or future. We are, therefore, neither millenarians nor pre-millenarians. But we believe, that before the second advent of our Saviour, there will be a far more glorious state of the church, than has yet been witnessed ; when the Jews shall all be converted to Christianity, and when the fulness of the gentiles shall be brought in. And we believe that this blessed state of the church will be brought about by the faithful preaching of the gospel and circulation of the holy scriptures, in the languages of the nations of the earth. One of our strongest objections to the pre-millennial scheme is, that it casts discouragement on all missionary efforts, in regard to both Jews and Gentiles. Many of the authors of the scheme have admitted, that the missionary exertions of the church can never accomplish the conversion of the world ; but that this glorious event will be the effect of Christ's advent and personal reign on the earth. Some, indeed, have, from this consideration withdrawn their efforts from missionary enterprises altogether ; while others, and these the more pious and evangelical, have still inculcated the duty of endeavouring to extend the knowledge of the truth to as many as possible ; but the strongest motive to exertion, their system paralyses ; for they have no hope that all these exertions, however multiplied, will be effectual to bring the nations of the earth, under the influence of the gospel. Their attention, therefore, is principally directed to the second advent, and their hopes of the world's conversion are associated with that event ; and it is not wonderful, therefore, that their missionary zeal should be greatly diminished. But we would ask, by what means do they expect the world to be converted, after the coming of Christ ? His glorious appearance will not of itself have this effect. No sinner was ever converted by an external appearance, however glorious. Thousands beheld Christ while he tabernacled on earth, who were not benefited by the sight ; and the whole race of men will see him in his royal majesty, when he sits as judge on his great white throne ; and yet none will then be converted by the spectacle. Suppose Christ to have taken up his residence on earth, would it not be necessary for the gospel to be preached by faithful ministers ? And will not the efficacy of the word depend then as now, upon the agency of the Holy Spirit ? And would not the success of

the gospel be as great while Christ is on his throne in the highest heavens, if accompanied by the same influence of the Spirit? If these questions must be answered in the affirmative, then the conversion of the world can be accomplished as effectually and speedily, before Christ's second advent, as it could be afterwards.

It seems to have been forgotten by these interpreters of prophecy, that the regeneration and sanctification of every one of the redeemed must be by the operation of the Holy Spirit; and that Divine agent, who, on the day of Pentecost, changed the hearts of three thousand enemies, even the murderers of Christ, is able, by the preaching of the gospel, to convert nations in a day. Christ told his disciples, that it was necessary, that He should go away, in order that the Paraclete might come; and as long as the work of conversion and sanctification is going on in the world, will not the same necessity of Christ's presence in heaven exist? While He there lives to intercede, salvation may be extended to the ends of the earth.

In every respect, the heaven of heavens is a more suitable residence for the King of kings and Lord of lords, than Jerusalem, or any other place on our diminutive globe. And if the Son of God should remove his residence and throne from heaven to earth; not only all the glorified saints, but the myriads on myriads of holy angels, of every rank and order, must also transfer their abode from heaven to earth, and heaven, where God in glory dwells and manifests himself, be emptied of its worshippers, and all its exalted praises for a thousand years be silent. Who can believe it?

Some, it is true, believe with Mede, that the millennium and the day of judgment are the same: that this day will continue for a thousand years, because a thousand years are with the Lord as one day, and one day, as a thousand years. But this is a mere conjecture, without the shadow of a foundation in the sacred scriptures. It is, moreover, a very improbable supposition, that Christ will be occupied a thousand years in the judgment. The time of the judgment is never represented as being extended through centuries: it is always spoken of as a *day*. They allege, that the word judgment, should not be taken in a strict sense, as meaning formal trial; but in a more general sense, as signifying such an administration of the affairs of the world, as will correct all the apparent irregularities which now exist in

the moral government of God; when the righteous will be rewarded and exalted, and the wicked convicted, condemned, and punished. But this representation does not correspond with the account of the holy scriptures; and, indeed, is utterly inconsistent with it. The judgment is uniformly described as a great assize, in which not only those who shall then be living on the earth, but all men who ever lived must appear before Christ the Judge, to answer for the deeds done in the body. How long this day will last, we pretend not to say; but the whole transaction is represented as taking place in a very summary manner; and there is no probability that a thousand years will be spent in the judicial process.

The whole practical benefit of believing the pre-millennial doctrine, as we have already seen, is the impression on the public mind that the second coming of our Lord may be very near; which will have a tendency to arouse the church from its state of stupidity, and lead the people of God to watchfulness and diligencé in preparing for the advent of the Redeemer. But this argument would have been just as forcible in the days of Paul; and yet he puts this day afar off, by assuring the Thesalonians, that it would not happen before a general apostacy should intervene. That apostacy has, indeed, already occurred, and the "man of sin," the son of perdition, has been revealed; but if there are other divine prophecies, which remain to be fulfilled before that event, we may say, in the language of the apostle, that that day shall not come until these predictions have had their fulfilment. And we believe that there are such, as for example our Lord says, "and this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world; for a witness unto all nations and then shall the end come." Matt. xxiv. 4.

We believe however that the Jews are to be brought into the church, and with them the fulness of the Gentiles—in short that the kingdoms of the world are to become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ, before the day of judgment shall arrive. For we are persuaded, that every attempt to place the conversion of the world after the second advent, must utterly fail.

We are also of opinion, that the pre-millennial doctrine has a tendency to disturb the minds of men, and turn them off from attention to those truths which are most essential to their spiritual prosperity, and to discourage the diligent use of the appropriate

means for extending the kingdom of Christ in the world, and the preaching of the gospel to the nations of the earth. If a man should believe that the coming of Christ was distant only half a century, it would have no more effect on him, than if he believed that it was thousands of years future; because he could not expect to be alive at the time. But if the impression was, that this grand event would probably happen in a few months or weeks, the effect would be to produce such agitation as would greatly interfere with the regular discharge of the common duties of life, and with the zealous use of the means for the dissemination of the truth by the universal preaching of the gospel. This is not now a theoretical opinion: it has been strikingly verified in the case of the Millerites, and other enthusiasts, who believed that the day of Christ's appearance was near at hand. God has wisely spread a veil of obscurity and mystery over the future, and more especially over this event. "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven." Matt. xxiv. 36. And in the parallel text in Mark xiii. 32, it is added, "*neither the Son, but the Father.*" That must indeed be a profound secret which was not only concealed from the angels, but from the human soul of the Mediator. Christ, therefore, after his resurrection, repressed all curiosity on this point in his disciples, by saying, "IT IS NOT FOR YOU TO KNOW THE TIMES AND THE SEASONS WHICH THE FATHER HATH PUT IN HIS OWN POWER."

SHORT NOTICES.

ART. VI.—*Miscellaneous Essays and Discourses.* By Mark Hopkins, D. D. President of Williams College, Boston: T. R. Marvin, 1847. 8vo. pp. 514.

THIS truly beautiful product of the Boston press gives us in a permanent form those numerous occasional discourses of President Hopkins through which his reputation as an author has been established. Those judgments which we ventured to express, somewhat at large, on a former occasion, in regard to his manner of thinking, and his consequent style, apply here in all their force, and need not be repeated. If we err in considering this

author one of the best American writers, our error is deeply seated; being confirmed by every page we have read. Young men who aspire to that rare accomplishment, the mastery of pure, beautiful, and energetic English, may be safely directed to these works. Some disappointment may result, in the case of those who, from a corrupt and transitory taste, have learned to measure the quality of style by its salient points: of such Dr. Hopkins' writings present few. They are simple, free from odd diction, and evincing artist's labour by exemption from all marks of the tool. In some instances, the rhetorical glow is far greater than in his Lowell Lectures: we would cite as an example the latter half of the sermon before the Massachusetts Convention. The views of Sin, taken in this discourse, are original and terrific, and such as open seasonable contemplation to those erroneous minds, which are under the fascination of the new, pantheistic scheme of Emerson and Parker. The argument from Nature, for the Divine Existence, is perhaps the most characteristic essay in the collection. It is impossible for us even to indicate its form, in this brief notice. At this juncture, when so many younger and feebler minds are straining after singularities of opinion, and following Coleridge and others, in regard to the doctrine of final causes, we believe such discussions to be timely: this disquisition evinces the originality of a profound thinker, on a common topic, without one trace of eccentric philosophy. In regard to the validity of the author's reasoning, we beg leave to reserve ourselves, lest we be tempted hereafter to treat it in detail. Nothing is more remarkable, than the ease with which the author changes his hand, passing from the icy heights of metaphysics, through the clouds of the passionate region, down to the gentle familiar level of great but domestic thoughts, such as enliven the address to the Medical Class. This implies the absence of all mannerism, and all adherence to a melodious rhythm, bringing with it a uniform fashion of period. As the author is never on stilts, he finds himself ready for a graceful diversion even into the fields of unambitious writing. President Hopkins' meditations have obviously turned much upon those great principles in which all Christians coincide. We earnestly desire to find his uncommon strength brought more distinctly to bear on the distinguishing doctrines of grace. How tenderly he clings to these, and how warmly he can press them, appears in

the passage first referred to by us. On some subjects of national importance, there are expressions, here and there occurring in these volumes, which seem to indicate opinions differing from our own. But we introduce the treatises to our readers, as among the most valuable and striking which have come within our observation.

Lectures on Divinity. By the late George Hill, D.D., Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews. Edited from his manuscript, by his son, the Rev. Alexander Hill, Minister of Dailly. New York: Robert Carter. 1847. Svo. pp. 781.

THE masterly work of Principal Hill stands in no need of our recommendation. Our own day has seen no exposition of Calvinistic theology, more remarkable than this, for perspicuity, candour, ingenuity, and close reasoning. For ourselves, we delight in the dispassionate and noble manner, in which the author gives full force to all the objections of adversaries, in order, after cautious examination, to establish the truth on a sure basis. This magnanimity of patient analysis, and liberal concession, while it lays the disquisitions open sometimes to a charge of coldness, tends in the majority of cases, to more complete acquiescence in his conclusions. It is a work of great originality. The whole method is the author's own: we remember no title of theology which is treated in the hackneyed way. The absence of scholastic stiffness makes it a pleasant book for cursory reading. And though it is less full, on some points, than we could wish, we have no scruple in naming it among the volumes, which no theologian can wisely deny himself.

Ireland's Welcome to the Stranger: Or an Excursion through Ireland, in 1844 and 1845, for the purpose of personally investigating the condition of the poor. By A. Nicholson. New York: Baker & Scribner. 1847. 12mo. pp. 456.

Mrs. NICHOLSON is a benevolent but eccentric woman, who chose to travel, chiefly on foot, over a large part of Ireland. In this way, she had opportunities of learning more about the people, than falls to the lot of common tourists. Consequently, her book affords numerous scenes and incidents, which are worth perusal. Her details are sometimes tedious, not to say frivolous; her notions in regard to regimen are extreme; her judgment is

often at fault; but her narrative bears abundant marks of truth, good intention, and kindness of heart, and is full of entertainment. Scattered through the pages are numerous facts well deserving the record which she has given them.

Romanism not Christianity: a Series of Popular Lectures, in which Popery and Protestantism are contrasted; showing the incompatability of the former with Freedom and Free Institutions. By N. L. Rice, D.D., Pastor of the Central Presbyterian Church, Cincinnati. New York. Mark H. Newman & Co. 1847. 12mo. pp. 364.

THIS work merits a more extensive review than can be afforded to it at the close of our number. It contains a complete refutation of Popery, in a clear, temperate, learned, and wise discussion; with the author's known and characteristic clearness, directness, conciseness, courage, and logic. If we should except to a few sentences, it is in no instance where his grand train of argument is concerned. The knowledge of the whole field of the controversy is surprising; and this is equalled by the fairness of the reasoning. It is eminently a book for the people, for the times, and for our country. We rejoice in its appearance, and desire for it a wide circulation.

The Evil Tendencies of Corporal Punishment as a means of moral discipline in Families and Schools, Examined and Discussed, &c., &c. By Lyman Cobb, A. M., Author of a series of school-books, miniature Lexicon, &c. &c. New York. Mark H. Newman. 1847. Svo. pp. 270.

THE author is evidently a man of tender and generous feelings, and of large observation: but that he has added anything to our stock of real principles in education, is more than we can assert. That corporal punishment admits of abuse, we knew before we read his numerous and alarming examples; anything beyond this these examples do not establish. His "substitutes and preventives" are sometimes odd enough. "The muscles of any child or pupil who is very obstinate, malignant, or self-willed, will become relaxed and yielding, by a tolerably profuse SWEATING." This, we are informed, may be effected by standing before the fire, or by "a large quantity of herb-tea." Of a truth, we prefer the wholesome birch, of the old practices, to this modern diapho-

retic. What Mr. Cobb says about the moral discipline of youth, the value of religious training, the regulation of temper, and the inculcation of truth, commands our unqualified respect. Letters from gentlemen of distinction, including the Reverend Dr. Cox, form an appendix to the work. We have never seen a book, in which so free a use is made of italics and capital letters. The anecdotes are amusing in a high degree. While we consider the employment of the rod as the *ultima ratio*, we feel no respect for this morbid dread, with regard to a gentle, sparing, and judicious application of the most humane and innoxious of all infant chastisements.

The Seaman and his family; or Storms and Sunshine. London: Religious Tract Society. Philadelphia: American Sunday School Union. 18mo.

ONE of the pleasant and instructive volumes for the young, which we always receive with gratitude from these sources.

Sketches of Protestantism in Italy. Past and Present. Including a notice of the origin, history, and present state of the Waldenses. By Robert Baird. Second thousand, with an appendix. Boston: Benj. Perkins. 1847. pp. 418.

THE subject is so interesting to Protestants, and it is treated with so much fulness, that we do not wonder at seeing a second thousand issued. It is now in the press in Great Britain, and there is some probability of its being soon translated into French. For those who have not seen it we say, that the book is intended to give a view of pure Christianity in Italy. The first part relates the history of the reformation in that country. The second part carries forward the history to our own day. The third part is devoted to the Waldenses. The map of their territory is a valuable accession to our stores; indeed, we consider no work as complete which wants this aid, in cases where minute topography is involved.

Since the first edition, Dr. Baird has visited the canton of Tessin, in Switzerland, and has gathered new information respecting the Italian Protestants in the Grisons: this appears in the appendix to the present edition. It is certainly most pleasing and instructive to find clusters of the Protestant vine still overhanging these secluded valleys. There are three small but

populous valleys, called Misocco, Bregaglia and Poschiavo, lying on the southern side of the dividing ridge of the Alps. In the second of these, which is more than twelve miles long, and very narrow, there are about 1800 souls, almost all Protestants. There are six churches, of which four have pastors. Poschiavo contains 4200 inhabitants, of whom 1600 are Protestants. As late as in 1845, these brethren were forced to go armed to church.

Dr. Baird describes a little parish called Bivio, 6000 feet above the sea, with a winter of eight months, and without trees of any sort: of its 230 inhabitants, 210 are Protestants. The pastor of this mountain-parish has been labouring in it for nearly 30 years: his salary is a little more than ninety dollars a year. In regard to these Italian Protestant churches in general, it may be remarked that the people are generally poor, yet contented. They raise wheat, and use the patches of grass for pasturage, but subsist to some extent on chestnuts. They have schools, but are in great need of books. The Sabbath is well observed: all flock to their churches at the ringing of the bells. There is a favourable state of morals, though without those evidences of inward experience which we should desire. All the pastors but one are Germans. Dr. Baird regards the valley of Tessin, west of the Grisons, and with a free government, as affording the best opening for Protestantism into Italy. The people all speak Italian, and are in constant communication with the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom. The great route over Mount St. Gothard traverses Tessin; and there is a daily diligence from that mountain to Milan.

We advise the reader to make himself acquainted with the portions of this volume which treat of the Waldenses: he will never regret it. Dr. Baird confirms the statement that their polity comes nearest to the Presbyterian. There is in each church a court called the Consistory, made up of the pastor, elders, one or more deacons, and a legal adviser: this is to all intents and purposes a church-session. The next court is the Table or Board: the name is familiar to early Scottish annals. It consists of three pastors, and two laymen. It is not so much a Presbytery, in one sense, as a Commission of the Synod. The supreme judicatory is the Synod, embracing all the pastors, and clerical professors, and two elders from each parish; the two elders have but one vote. The moderator has no diocesan power

but is simply president of the Synod and of the Table. He is elected for five years. He has no inherent right to ordain. There is nothing in these ancient churches which savours of prelacy; and in answer to inquiries, the pastors without exception stated that prelacy had never existed in their valleys, and that such had been the uniform tradition of their ancestors. But we must on this subject refer our readers to the highly interesting account given by the author; being convinced that it has not yet received that attention which its close connexion with our faith and order should secure for it among all Presbyterians.

The Protector: a Vindication. By J. H. Merle d'Aubigné, D.D. New York. Robert Carter. 1847. pp. 281.

As the author has thought it of importance (page vi) to correct the error of those who persist in calling him *Dr. D'Aubigné* whereas his name is *Dr. Merle d'Aubigné*, we are surprised that it should be disregarded in several reviews of the work itself, and even on the back of this very volume, which is lettered "*D'Aubigné's Cromwell.*" But under whatever name, the book will fly far and wide, and will mightily augment that returning tide of opinion, which for some time has been setting in favour of Cromwell, and especially since the great work of Carlyle. Those who know the graphic powers of Dr. Merle d'Aubigné will expect a biography of rare interest, and we think they will be gratified. Genuine protestant principles, in church and state, are plainly gathering force, all over enlightened Christendom, for a conflict, and, as we trust in God, for a triumph. Such books are powerful instruments in the work. In these remarks we do not mean to subscribe to the opinions of Oliver Cromwell, on those points where the Independents of England took their main position.

The Relation of the Sunday School System to our Christian Patriotism. Annual Sermon in behalf of the American Sunday School Union. By George W. Bethune, Minister of the Third Reformed Dutch Church of Philadelphia. 1847.

THIS is a short discourse on a great subject, and by a noted author. Few men in our country have acquired a wider reputation, for pulpit talents, than Dr. Bethune. We own ourselves to be warm admirers of his style. It is so uncommon for any one

to gain extensive popularity in preaching, without some sacrifice of simple diction and authentic English, that we find something particularly grateful in such an exception as is here afforded. Objections, we know, have been made to parts of this discourse; these have probably arisen from misconstruction. It is a sober, bold, patriotic discussion of two cardinal rules: the spread of truth, and the training of children. The application of these principles to our own country is felicitous, and we only wish it had been carried out much more largely. Opinions will vary, as to the prognosis concerning the popish gangrene; the author believes it can never have a general diffusion, and he argues strongly. The pages on the growth and prospective greatness of our commonwealth, are truly eloquent, and worthy of any pen. The sermon, as we observe, is justly admired by the public.

Physical Education, as influenced by the arrangements of the School-room. An Address delivered before the Society of Teachers and Friends of Education in New Jersey, at their quarterly meeting at New Brunswick, June 1847. By Samuel H. Pennington, M. D. of Newark, N. J. Published by order of the Society. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1847.

DR. PENNINGTON writes with science, earnestness, and philanthropy, on a topic of unspeakable greatness. He brings the acknowledged principles of physiology and psychology to bear on a matter, which, though concerning every human being, has been left to take care of itself. Second only to the close places on ship-board, or prisons, are those pestilential chambers, called school-rooms, where so many thousands, in other days, learned their rudiments and ruined their constitutions. The danger now is from over-meddling and pragmatism. Of this, we rejoice to observe, there are no traces in this address. The theme has fallen into good hands, and has been treated with diligence, great knowledge, sobriety and strong sense. In our judgment, the essay merits a more permanent form, and a general distribution among American schools.

Sons of Thunder. A tribute to the memory of Alexander Vinet and Thomas Chalmers. By Robert Turnbull. Hartford. 1847.

A beautiful memorial, in a lively style, affectionately offered

to two of the greatest Christian authors of our age. The memory of Chalmers will educe many discourses, and perhaps many volumes; and this is by no means to be regretted. We are here also reminded of an admirable sermon of Dr. Sprague, on this subject, not now within our reach, which has already been reprinted in Great Britain, and declared to afford the best estimate of the greatness and characteristic traits of Dr. Chalmers. Mr. Turnbull's discourse is fraught with valuable facts, many of which were altogether new to us.

Christianity; its past struggles—its present position—its future prospects. An Address, delivered before the Theological Society, Union College, on Sabbath evening, July 25, 1845. By Rev. Ebenezer Halley, Salem, N. Y. Albany. 1847.

MR. HALLEY has given us a fearless vindication of true Christianity, in a well-argued, learned, and glowing discourse. It is characterized by a contempt of the timid policy, prevalent on academical occasions, by which speakers are led to suppress half their individual opinions. Here there is no suppression. At the same time it is liberal and catholic. We welcome it as a timely blow struck at the irreligion and false charity of our day.

Party Spirit and Popery. By an American Citizen. New York: Baker & Scribner. 1847.

THIS little pamphlet carries a prodigious sting. It will grievously offend the Papists; it has so many truths, and the truth is not to be spoken at all times. It has become the cue of certain demagogues to flatter the Irish and German papists, in order to get their votes. This marriage between Romanism and politics is exposed in the work before us: yet it was published before the Oration at O'Connell's obsequies.

The History of the Manners and Customs of the North American Indians. New York: R. Carter. 1847. 18mo. pp. 245.

CHIEFLY compiled from Catlin, with spirited cuts; a good book for youth, and with decided religious tendency.

Pleasant Tales for Young People. New York: R. Carter. 1847. 18mo. pp. 239.

To say that this is one of Old Humphrey's books, is to tell all

about it. We regard Old Humphrey as not merely a harmless, but a useful visiter among our children.

Life of the Rev. William Tennent. New York: Robert Carter. 1847. 18mo. pp. 128.

THIS, so far as we are able to observe, is a simple re-print of Dr. Boudinot's Memoir, without addition or explanation. It is excellent and welcome; but we value re-prints far more, when they present us additional facts, such as are largely accessible in the present case. We have observed, in a popular Review, a sneering notice of this excellent little book; and are therefore more desirous to recommend it, as full of sound instruction and evangelical piety. It is high time for Christians to look about them, when the trade of criticism seems to be conducted under Socinian and Infidel auspices; when every thing good is said of Emerson and the sentimental pantheists, and every thing contemptuous of vital piety.

Solitude Sweetened, &c. By James Meikle, late Surgeon at Carnwarth. New York: Robert Carter. 1847. 12mo. pp. 286.

To our older readers we need not characterise a book which has given comfort and direction to thousands of old fashioned disciples. To the young, the busy, and those who have no turn for continued reading, we say, here is a book parcelled out by little and little, for just such persons. This has also been sneered at, by the same criticism which assailed the *Life of Tennent*. It is now thirty-eight years since the volume was justly recommended by Dr. Miller and Dr. Romeyn.

Minor Characters of the Bible. By John Hall, Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Trenton, N. J. Board of Publication. 18mo. pp. 105.

WE wish there were more of this book; for what there is is pithy and uncommon. It is in our book-making day a remarkable instance of reserve, that the author should throw out so many new and striking truths, with so little amplification. Even now, the volume might be expanded into an octavo, without adding any new topics. It evinces unusual acquaintance with the scriptures, and suggests a mode of biblical study which is not

frequently employed, but is highly important. Mr. Hall is an unambitious writer, but is second to none, in a certain exact and felicitous use of his mother-tongue, which, even in the simplest sentences, bewrays reading and correct taste. What is better, he writes with a manifest desire to promote true piety; and he has here given us, though one of his shortest, yet one of his best books.

The Loss of the Australia: a Narrative of the Loss of the Brig Australia, by fire, on her voyage from Leith to Sydney. With an account of the Religious Exercises, and final rescue of the crew and passengers. Edited by the Rev. James R. McGavin, Dundee. New York. R. Carter. 1847. 18mo. pp. 98.

AMERICANS go so much to sea, and are in numbers so great committed to the waters as their grave, that they especially need good books to prepare them for the perils of the deep. They will find here, in a plain narrative, a memorial of the loving-kindness of the Lord and his great goodness, in a time of extremity. It would be a blessed gift to a sailor, or to any one of the hundreds of thousands who go down to the sea in ships.

The Life of Col. James Gardiner, to which is added the Christian Warrior animated and crowned. By Philip Doddridge, D.D. New York. Robert Carter. 1847. pp. 208.

IN our present state of warfare, everything is appropriate, which may turn the minds of soldiers to God. Such is the tendency of this admirable book, which is too well known to need our feeble praise.

Bogatsky's Golden Treasury. New York. Robert Carter. pp. 384.

THIS work has been for many years a household treasure in Europe and America. It affords a brief meditation for every day in the year, and is full of gracious savour.

The History of the Reformation in the Church of Christ: continued from the close of the fifteenth century. By Thomas Gaillard. New York. M. W. Dodd. 1847. Svo. pp. 557.

To do this large and comely volume full justice would require a more thorough perusal and collation than our time allows. In

such portions of it as have been examined, all that strikes us is favourable. The subject is great; the plan is judicious; the best sources have been resorted to; the narrative is compact, perspicuous, and sufficient; the style is clear and unaffected; and the spirit of the whole is adverse to the pretensions of popery and prelacy. If the whole is equal to the parts which we have read, it will be a truly useful book for every class of readers, and especially for those who have no access to the larger histories.

The History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. By J. H. Merle d'Aubigné, D.D. (Complete in four volumes.) New York. 1847. Robert Carter. Svo. pp. 675.

AT one dollar, this is truly said to be one of the cheapest books ever published. It is from new stereotype plates, furnished by Oliver and Boyd of Edinburgh. It has engraved likenesses of Luther and Dr. Merle, and a new preface by the author. After all that we have heretofore said, we will not add a word in praise of the extraordinary production.

The Office and Work of the Holy Spirit. By James Buchanan, D.D., Professor of Divinity, New College, Edinburgh. From the sixth Edinburgh edition. New York. 1847. Robert Carter. 12mo. pp. 519.

EVERY great topic in theology requires to be treated afresh, in every age. For our day, this work is what that of John Owen was for our forefathers. It has received the approbation of sound Calvinistic theologians, at home and abroad. Dr. Buchanan is too well known as a great and good man, to need our introduction; every page shews the ripe divine, the eloquent writer, and the experienced Christian pastor. It is a felicitous mingling of argument and affectionate admonition; every way worthy of the author of the works on "Affliction."

The Works of the late Rev. Robert Murray McCheyne, Minister of St. Peter's Church, Dundee. Complete in two volumes. New York, 1847. Robert Carter. Svo. pp. 453, 518.

FIRST we have the Life of Mr. McCheyne, which, in our estimation, is the most awakening and touching piece of biography, since that of the beloved Martyn. We then have a series of his letters, full of gracefulness and spiritual unction. A number of

tracts follow, some of which are by far the best productions of his pen. Never have we read a juvenile biography, more simple, more pathetic, or more evangelical, than that of little James Laing. Seventeen Expository Lectures follow, which we would commend to all young preachers, as an aid in this neglected part of duty. The second volume contains ninety sermons. These vary in style and merit; but all are characteristic, many are unusually excellent; and some are beautiful, ingenious, holy and edifying, beyond most in our day. Faithfulness, pungency, affection, and fearlessness, mark the series, as a whole.

The Three Divine Sisters, Faith, Hope, and Charity, etc., etc.

By the Rev. Thomas Adams, Minister at Willington, Bedfordshire. With an Introduction by the Rev. W. H. Stowell, Independent College, Rotherham. New York. Robert Carter. 1847. 12mo. pp. 284.

THIS is the reprint of several Puritan treatises, remarkable for quaint brilliancy, and the peculiar wit and point of that day, sometimes united to great warmth, and everywhere replete with truth. Frequently the antithesis and the odd comparisons transcend the limits of modern rule, but no man will readily lay down the book, who has capacity for receiving its contents. Mr. Adams was in the ministry as early as 1612, and his works were published by himself in 1630. The titles will prove inviting: The Leaven—A Crucifix—Semper Idem—Heaven a Gate—Majesty in Misery—The Fool and his Sport—The Christian's Walk—Love's Copy—God's Bounty—Politic Hunting—and the Taming of the Tongue.

1. *Man. in his physical, intellectual, social, and moral relations.*
- 2. *The Dawn of Civilization.*—18mo.

Two charming little shilling-volumes concurrently published by the Religious Tract Society and the American Sunday School Union.

Washington and his Generals: by J. T. Headley, author of Napoleon and his Marshals, the Sacred Mountains, etc. In Two Volumes. New York. Baker & Scribner. 1847. 12mo.

THE fine plates and clear typography of these volumes are their least attraction. Even before our notice can reach the press, the sale of the work is such, as to show that the author

continues to be a popular favorite. No writer has a more acute perception of what will suit the American taste; no one excels him in rapid description. He is even too rapid, for we descry numerous blemishes of carelessness in language, which one who is likely to be imitated by great numbers is sacredly bound to avoid. The conception of the plan is happy, and many will read with avidity, and learn with ease, those parts of American history, of which they would otherwise have remained forever ignorant.

The Bible not of Man: or the argument for the Divine Origin of the Sacred Scriptures, drawn from the Scriptures themselves. By Gardiner Spring, D. D., Pastor of the Brick Church, in the City of New York. Published by the American Tract Society. 12mo. pp. 319.

THE excellent author of this treatise has bestowed profound thought and diversified labour on his topic; the Internal Evidence of Christianity. The result is a book which we should rejoice to see in the hands of every doubter in the land; and which will be equally welcome to the scholar and the Christian. Nothing strikes us more favorably in the argument, than its easy flow from beginning to end. Irrefragable reasoning is stripped of the awkward encumbrances of technical logic, and is presented in a style of grave and composed elegance, often animated to fervour, such as is familiar to all hearers and readers of Dr. Spring. At present, we are constrained to be content with giving our warm commendation.

A Method for Prayer, with Scriptural expressions, proper to be used under each head. By the late Matthew Henry, Minister of the Gospel at Chester. New York. 1847. pp. 248.

No book on Prayer is more widely known than this; and we are glad that no change in religious fashion is likely to make it obsolete. It will prove a valuable monitor in private devotion; will suggest forms of prayer to such as need them; will reveal the riches of scriptural phraseology in connexion with this privilege; and will be a perpetual help to the minister of the sanctuary. To say more would be superfluous.

The Pleasantness of a Religious Life opened and proved. By Matthew Henry. New York. Robert Carter. 1847. pp. 192.

ANOTHER work from the same venerable source. Perhaps no man was ever more remarkably fitted to treat this particular subject, than Matthew Henry. A heavenly smile plays over every page of his great Exposition, and proves how truly he could say, as he does in the preface: "This doctrine of *the pleasantness of religion* is what I have long had a particular kindness for, and taken all occasions to mention." To our apprehension, he has never produced a page, which is not both delightful and edifying.

Life of Joseph Hall, D.D., Bishop of Norwich, by James Hamilton, M. B. S. New York. Robert Carter. 1847. pp. 155.

THE memoir under consideration was prepared for an edition of Bishop Hall's Contemplations, but was separately published, at Edinburgh, in 1838. There is something rare in it, as being from the pen of one who has no Episcopalian leanings. Bishop Hall's genius, learning, and piety, his satiric and poetic vein, his sententious and apothegmatic style, and his connexions with king James, with the Synod of Dort, and with the Commonwealth, conspire to make this a highly interesting little book.

The Christian Remembrancer. By Ambrose Serle, Esq. Author of *Horde Solitariae the Church of God*, etc. New York. R. Carter. 1847. 18mo. pp. 349.

MR. SEARLE was a layman, long connected with the military expeditions of Cornwallis; a man of varied learning, especially versed in the original languages of scripture, and remarkable for the depth of his spiritual experience. He was an intimate friend of the Rev. William Romaine, of London, who addressed to him some of his most valuable letters. Some of his other works may be more full of erudition, but none of them is richer in saving truth, than this. It is a wonderful collection of such thoughts as fix the attention, build up the faith, and melt the heart with the balm of a free gospel. We hazard nothing in calling it one of the most useful manuals of the generation which has passed away.

An Essay on the Life and Writings of Edmund Spenser, (with a special exposition of the Fairy Queen). By John S. Hart, A. M. Principal of the Philadelphia High School. New York and London. Wiley & Putnam. 1847. 8vo. pp. 514.

ALTHOUGH well aware of Principal Hart's classical and general culture, it was not without a feeling of agreeable surprise that we received this proof of his untiring industry and rare capacity for literary labour in the midst of engrossing occupations. We have not waited to examine the volume in detail before expressing our satisfaction, that so interesting a portion of English literature has been taken up by a thoroughly educated scholar. The fault most likely to be found with the essay is the want of transcendental aesthetics, a want very happily supplied by the union of strong sense and scholarship with a sound and healthy taste, formed on the wholesome and substantial diet of our educated men before it became fashionable to feed on garbage. Besides the aid afforded by the critical analysis and copious specimens of Spenser's poems, the concluding pages contain ample proof of the author's talent for discriminating criticism. The volume will strike every eye as one of the best samples of American typography.

The Germanica and Agricola of Caius Cornelius Tacitus, with notes for Colleges. By W. S. Tyler, professor of the Latin and Greek languages in Amherst College. New York and London: Wiley and Putnam. 1847. pp. 186.

THIS is an excellent manual for the use of students in colleges. The editor is a sound and thorough scholar, who, by the experience of many years, has acquired a just apprehension of the peculiar necessities of the pupil, together with an intimate knowledge of the idioms and obscurities that mark the style of Tacitus. He appears to have availed himself carefully, of the researches of German editors and philologists for the elucidation of the author, and condensed the result into a series of brief and pertinent notes, just sufficient to illustrate the text, and quicken the interest and diligence of the scholar, instead of encouraging his indolence by a running exposition. The text, with the life of Tacitus, occupies 74 pages; the remainder is filled with notes. The mechanical execution of the work is uncommonly attractive, and highly creditable to the publishers. Tacitus is justly denominated by Macaulay, the greatest of Latin historians, and he might have added, the most profound and original of Roman writers. We rejoice that these two master-pieces of this author have been prepared for the perusal of American scholars in a form so in-

viting, by one who is able so skilfully to explore, and so happily to disclose the surpassing virtues of the original.

Classical Series. Edited by Drs. Schmitz and Zumpt. C. Julii Cæsaris Commentarii de Bello Gallico. Philadelphia: Lea and Blanchard. 1847.

THE numerous critical editions of the classics superintended by foreign and American scholars, issuing from the press in this country, is a very favourable indication of the progress of this branch of education among us. The Messrs. Chambers of Edinburgh, in connexion, it would appear, with Messrs. Lea and Blanchard of Philadelphia, have confided to the hands of Dr. Schmitz, rector of the High School of Edinburgh, and Dr. Zumpt, professor in the University of Berlin, the preparation of a series of the Latin classics usually employed in Schools and Colleges. It is proposed to furnish an ascending series of such publications, presenting the most correct text, furnished with explanatory notes, and embellished with maps and illustrative engravings, at a very reduced price. This edition of Cæsar is a duodecimo of 231 pages, and is a very cheap and serviceable work, containing a great deal in a small compass.

Titus Livius. Selections from the first five books, together with the twenty-first and twenty-second books entire. Chiefly from the text of Alscherfski. With English notes for Schools and Colleges. By J. L. Lincoln. Professor of Latin in Brown University. With an accompanying plan of Rome and a map of the passage of Hannibal. New York: W. Appleton and Company, 200 Broadway. Philadelphia: G. S. Appleton, 148 Chestnut street. 1847.

THIS work is one of the educational publications of Messrs. Appleton & Co, and is executed in the tasteful style and elegance of other works of this series. It appears, from the following extract from preface, that the author of the notes has a just sense of the assistance which the student should receive from an annotator. "It has been the aim of the editor to furnish such assistance in the notes as is needful to facilitate the progress of the diligent student; but above all things to avoid that pernicious help, whether in the form of its indiscriminate translation, or of unnecessary explanation, which precludes all effort on the

part of the pupil, and cripples his mental energies, by fostering habits of dependence and inaction."

Prof. Lincoln enters upon these critical studies under circumstances peculiarly favourable. A residence of two years at the universities of Berlin and Halle has made him familiar both with German scholarship, and with the German language, that vast storehouse of philological literature. He has also resided several months in Rome and visited many of the places which the historian has made the scenes of his masterly delineations. The work before us gives conclusive evidence that these advantages have been happily improved by Prof. Lincoln. The notes have been prepared with great care, and with continued reference to the best authorities. Among others we are happy to see that the reader is frequently directed to Freund's invaluable thesaurus of the Latin language, and to Zumpt's Latin Grammar. This work comprising more than 600 pages, and the result of more than thirty years study, by one of the most distinguished Latin scholars of the age, is reduced by the reprint of the Harpers to the price of our common Latin Grammars.

NOTE.

This Periodical has no one responsible editor. This arrangement, though it has its advantages, is attended by some inconveniences. No one writer can be sure that his colleagues agree with him in all the views which he advances, though there may be such a coincidence as enables them to give the work a decided and consistent character. While therefore there is a responsibility resting on the conductors as a body, so far as the general bearing of the Review is concerned, there must, from the nature of the case, be a special responsibility for each particular article, resting solely on its author. This we presume is generally understood. We make the remark now, because the article in our July Number on the General Assembly, both on the question of the right of our primary church courts to act by commission in judicial cases, and on the M'Queen case, does not express the views of all the conductors of this Review. The writer of those portions of that article, is the only person really responsible for what is there said.











