VOL. II. NEW SERIES. NO. 2.

THE

# BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

# THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

EDITED BY AN

*ASSOCIATION OF GENTLEMEN IN PRINCETON, AND ITS VICINITY.*

APRIL 1830.

Philadelphia:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

JAMES KAY, JUN. & CO. LIBRARY, NEAR FIFTH STREET.

SOLD ALSO BY

TOWAR, J. & D. M. HOGAN, 255 MARKET ST.

*Price* $3 *a year, in advance.*

1830.

## *James Kay, Jun. & Co. Philadelphia,*

PUBLISH

*The Beauties of History;* or Pictures of Virtue and Vice, drawn from Real Life. Designed for the Instruction and Entertainment of, and dedicated to the Youth of the United States. By *L. M. Stretch.* First American from the Eighteenth English Edition. In 2 vols 18mo, very closely printed.

This work, which has met with such extensive sale in Great Britain, is now offered to the American Public. It consists of Historical and Biographical Anecdotes, with interesting and improving remarks, under the heads of the different virtues and vices; which are arranged alphabetically. A few of the subjects are subjoined. Affection: Conjugal, Parental, Filial, and Fraternal. Ambition. Beneficence. Clemency. Compassion. Conscience. Constancy. Courage. Cruelty. Disinterestedness. Drunkenness. Education. Equity. Faith, Public. Fidelity in Servants. Flattery. Friendship. Gaming. Generosity. Happiness. Honour. Humanity. &c. &c.

---

*Mackenzie's Five Thousand Receipts* in all the Useful and Domestic Arts: constituting a Complete Practical Library, relative to Agriculture, Bees, Bleaching, Brewing, Calico Printing, Carving at Table, Cements, Confectionary, Cookery, Crayons, Dairy, Diseases, Distillation, Dyeing, Enamelling, Engraving, Farriery, Food, Gardening, Gilding, Glass, Health, Inks, &c. Jewellers' Pastes, Lithography, Medicines, Metallurgy, Oil Colours, Oils, Painting, Pastry, Perfumery, Pickling, Pottery, Preserving, Scouring, Silk, Silk Worms, Silvering, Tanning, Trees of all kinds, Varnishing, Water Colours, Wines, &c. &c. &c. Fourth American, from the latest London edition. With numerous and important Additions generally; and the medical part carefully revised and adapted to the Climate of the United States; and also a new and most copious Index. By an American Physician. 1 vol. 8vo.

This stereotype edition contains *above* 1000 *receipts more* than the third, or any preceding editions.

Persons disposed to purchase this work, are particularly requested to order "*James Kay, Jun. & Co.'s Edition.*"

---

*The Improved Common Place Book*, or Literary Diary; to which are prefixed, an Explanatory Treatise; an Abridgement of the Aurifodina of Drexelius, by Bishop Horne; and an Index, formed, with some variations, on the celebrated plan of Mr Locke. In 1 vol. 4to.

"There is no need I should tell you how useful it has been to me after five and twenty years experience."—*Locke.*

---

*Poetical Quotations:* being a complete Dictionary of the most elegant Moral, Sublime, and Humorous Passages in the British Poets. By John F. Addington. In Four Volumes, 12mo.

*

## JOURNAL OF THE PHILADELPHIA COLLEGE OF PHARMACY.

This Journal is devoted to the objects of Pharmaceutic Research, viz. Chemistry, (General and Pharmaceutic), Materia Medica, Zoology, Botany, Mineralogy, &c. &c. Intended for the benefit of the Apothecary, it merits his patronage and support.

It is published Quarterly, in an octavo form ; each number consisting of 80 pages. The paper is of good quality, the type large and clear, and attention paid to neatness in the general execution.

Subscriptions received by John Grigg, Bookseller, James Kay, Jun. & Co. and any of the Publishing Committee, consisting of Daniel B. Smith, Charles Ellis, S. P. Griffitts, Jun. Benjamin Ellis, M.D. and George B. Wood, M.D. Price $2 50 per annum.

---

## *James Kay, Jun. & Co. Philadelphia,*

### PUBLISH

*The North American Medical and Surgical Journal*, in Quarterly Nos. of 200—250 pages each. Price $5 per annum.

The No. for April 1830 contains full *Analytical and Critical Reviews* of TESTA on the Diseases of the Heart, (Italian;) Journal of the Philadelphia College of Pharmacy; DESRUELLES on the Hooping Cough, (French;) DENMAN's Practice of Midwifery, (English;) CLARK on the Influence of Climate, (English;) Stoker's Pathological Observations, (Irish;) EDWARDS and VAVASSEUR's Materia Medica, (French.) Also *Original Articles*, by Doctors GIBBONS, HEWSON, MEIGS, WARING, and GERHARD; and the usual copious *Quarterly Summary*, prepared expressly by the Editors, from the American, English, French, German and Italian Journals.

Subscriptions received by *James Kay, Jun. & Co.* Philadelphia ; and also by *Carter and Hendee*, Boston ; *E. Bliss*, New York ; *W. C. Little*, Albany ; *W. and J. Neal*, Baltimore ; *O. A. Roorbach*, Charleston, &c. &c.

---

*The Analytical Instructor*, for the Piano Forte. *By Benjamin Carr*, Professor of Music, and a Conductor of the Concerts of the Musical Fund Society of Philadelphia. Price three dollars. In three parts. Embellished with a Copperplate Engraving.

"To Teachers, *particularly those who are resident in country towns* where music is difficult to be procured, it is believed that this book, containing ample matter for instruction, will prove a valuable assistant in the performance of their professional duties.

"And where tuition is not to be obtained, Ladies who have learnt the Piano Forte in their youth, may easily recover their own knowledge, or communicate the elementary part to their children, by the use of it."

# CONTENTS.

---

*The Review of "Essays and Dissertations in Biblical Literature," which was promised in our last Number, did not come to hand in time to be inserted. We regret that such has been the case; and the article (which has been delayed in consequence of the distance of the writer from the press) may be expected in the number for July.—Ed. Bib. Rep.*

THE

BIBLICAL REPERTORY, AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

FOR APRIL 1830.

## CHURCH MUSIC.

*How shall a reform in the music of our churches be effected?*

In a former number of this Journal, we endeavoured to show, by comparing the original design of church music with the art in its present state, that a reform is both necessary and practicable. The argument, thus far, we presume, has been satisfactory. But here, in the minds of many, a serious difficulty presents itself. A good thing, which is in its own nature practicable, cannot always be carried into effect against the habits and prejudices of the community. To obviate this difficulty, it is necessary to show, somewhat in detail, how a reform can be effected. This is the object of the present article.

We shall take it for granted that in the present day of activity, some share of enterprise and self-denial might be easily enlisted in favour of a reform in church music, if once its full importance were to be distinctly seen. There are men in our country who know how to give an impulse that will be felt in every portion of the land. Only let it be seen that such an impulse is really needed, that the best interests of religion and of good order in the community require it, and the thing will be certainly done.

Time was, within the period of our own recollection, when this position would not have been granted us. Who would have believed, thirty years ago, for instance, that missionary, Bible and tract operations could have been carried forward to such an extent and with such rapidity? Who could have believed that theological seminaries, Bible classes, Sunday schools, infant schools, societies for African colonization, for the observation of the Sabbath and for the promotion of "entire abstinence" would have thus succeeded? But times have changed. Every good thing which is taken in hand at the proper season, and urged forward with christian principle and pious zeal, is found, under the blessing of God, to prosper. Prejudices and habits, are every where to be encountered, but they form no insurmountable obstacle. Nothing of this nature can stand before an impulse which has once been given. The prevailing motto is Onward. Nothing is now seen of a retrograde movement in all this mighty field of effort.

And who that has clearly reflected upon the subject will say that a reform as to the praises of Zion's King is unworthy to be made the object of christian enterprise? Is there any portion of public worship which may continue to be offered in an empty, formal, thoughtless manner, without offending the great Master of assemblies? Yet we have seen distinctly that there is one portion of the exercises of the sanctuary which does in general bear these exact characteristics. Church music, according to the design of the institutions, requires peculiar solemnity, fixedness of thought, and elevation of feeling; but for the most part it is associated with special indifference, and often with weariness and disgust. The words have been instituted as the very basis of song, but these are seldom heard in singing. Music should be superadded to the words in such manner as to operate like a refined species of elocution; yet, in singing, we destroy the character of the words even where the enunciation is in some measure preserved. It is in fact the tune that we are endeavouring to sing, and often a most miserable one it is, and wretchedly executed; while, at the same time, characteristic expression and pious emotion appear to be considerations of no more than secondary interest. Musical cultivations in the Jewish and the apostolic times, and in the days of the reformers, was conducted, as we have seen, under the special guardianship of the church; and men of

ardent piety, as well as of respectability and influence, had the entire charge of it; but for these many years past the reverse of this state of things has been witnessed. Not only the higher ranks of cultivation, but all the subordinate ranks have been occupied by men of the world, and men too, who, to say the least, have generally exerted an anti-religious influence. Quite at the head of the musical list stand a class of artists who are generally destitute of religious principle, and often grossly immoral, like the Byrons and the Moores of a sister art. Next stand the class of professional performers, who spend most of their life in the theatre. Next in order are the celebrated conductors of concerts and oratorios, and the professional organists, who are all more or less associated with theatricals, copying their style and manner, and too often their licentious practices. And as for the teachers of our psalmody, the greatest proportion of them are either, on the one hand, the pupils of this same school of the theatre, or on the other, the imitators of self-taught men, who are alike destitute of almost every requisite qualification. Church music, which originally emanated from the schools of the prophets, has now, properly speaking, no school of its own. Our primary singing schools have indeed been, in every point of view, so miserably conducted, that men of distinguished piety have uniformly looked upon them as serious hinderances to the progress of vital religion. And it is nor surprising that they have thus regarded them, when the whole business of management has been conducted chiefly on the principles of amusement and display, and associated more or less with ignorance, lightness and profanity. Publishers, also, have largely participated in the degeneracy. Up to the present time their chief object has been to make books which would sell; and for this purpose catch-pennies have hitherto proved the most valuable. The church has its authorized selections of psalms and hymns; but nothing that answers to them which she can call her own in the musical department. The latter, by common consent, has been abandoned to the mercy of the booksellers. Add, also, to the list of musical grievances, that the clergy are in the habit of sanctioning them by complimentary addresses, as often as they are officially called upon for this purpose, while at other times they treat the whole subject with marked neglect; and it is easy to see that the reform for which we are here pleading is one of no common character. If it is

a solemn fact, that those who worship God must worship him in spirit and in truth. If it is true that our God is a God of order and not of confusion, that he is a God that searcheth the heart, a jealous God, a God that will not be mocked; then surely the enterprise of restoring to the order and dignity and power of spiritual worship, that which has long since degenerated into lip-service, is worthy of the most serious consideration before we presume to pronounce upon it as hopeless or unprofitable.

We have said that an impulse can be given to the public mind. For this purpose, let the periodical press be put in requisition. Let our quarterly reviews and journals, our monthly magazines and miscellanies, our weekly gazettes, religious, literary and political, be made to speak upon the subject. Let lectures also be given in our theological seminaries, our colleges and academies, and before the various ecclesiastical judicatories. Let the subject be brought up at the anniversaries of our benevolent societies, and presented before the churches in our cities and principal towns; and if it should be thought advisable, let some missionary be appointed for this especial purpose. Let it be the object every where, and by every proper means, to show that psalmody has been prostrated, and that christians are bound to raise it up from its degradation, instead of suffering it to remain in the churches as an instrument of systematic profaneness. Let such efforts as these be continued with earnestness, and with heartfelt dependence upon God, until the consciences of christians are enlightened and brought to feel upon the subject; let all this be done, and our word for it, the work of reform will have been half accomplished. And who will say that there is any insurmountable obstacle to the performance of all that is here proposed? If the single vice of intemperance, with all its forbidding aspects and disgusting associations, can call forth far more effort than this for years together, till ecclesiastical bodies become temperate societies, and whole towns and counties and states begin to follow the example; if all this can be done, and done with propriety, for the suppression of one single vice in the community, let it not be said that the enterprise of reforming one of the constituted ordinances of the church, which has, by long neglect, and by abuses innumerable, been reduced to empty formality and systematic profaneness,—let it not be said in a land of christian privileges, and in a day

of christian effort, that such an enterprise as this may be lightly esteemed, or accounted too difficult to be undertaken. We are proposing here no useless work; we are pointing out no difficult labour. We ask for no acts of supererogation, but we plead for the performance of an important duty, which ought to be better known, a duty which cannot be neglected when it is understood, without incurring great criminality.

When the christian community shall have been thus convinced that the work of reform ought to be commenced, then let them begin to act consentaneously and with due intelligence, discretion, energy and perseverance.

Here the first object, and, indeed, the only one respecting which the least difficulty is to be apprehended, is that of making a just, practical discrimination between the style of the church and that of the concert-room and oratorio. These styles should, in practice, be kept as distinct from each other as the style of pulpit oratory is distinct from that of a mere political harangue; and the efforts which have recently been making throughout the country to produce an amalgamation of these styles, have probably done more than all other things combined towards the deterioration of true christian psalmody, and towards destroying the little remaining interest which had latterly been felt in this solemn ordinance. So much, indeed, has been done—unwittingly, as we presume —to corrupt the public taste in this respect, that the very power of discrimination seems to have been lost. The exact lines of distinction cannot at once be drawn. The circumstantials of amusement and exhibition have become so interwoven with the forms of worship, wherever music has been much cultivated, either in composition or execution, that it is impossible for the most accurate observer to say at once what precise features are to be ultimately retained and what rejected. Nor is this necessary at the outset. Experience will decide many a question of propriety, which lies beyond the reach of abstract speculation. A few points of discrimination, however, can be fixed upon at the commencement; and others can be afterwards adopted, as occasion requires. The same identical plan may not be suited to all places or circumstances. Prejudices, habits and practices on this subject are various and contradictory. Different obstacles are to be encountered, opposing interests to be harmonized, and, in not a few instances, it may be supposed that direct hos-

tility will show itself. For, depend upon it, an important field, which has so long been held by the adversary of souls in quiet possession, will not be relinquished without a struggle. The contest may, for a time, appear doubtful, but the victory will be sure. Christian effort, rightly conducted in this department, will not be lost. The signs of the times, if we mistake not, already invite us to action; and, in a few instances, the work appears to have been actually begun. What, therefore, we have further to offer, will not be regarded merely in the light of an experiment.

1. Every one acknowledges that union is power. Let a number of religious societies, therefore, comprising perhaps a whole presbytery or synod, be organized into a general association for the cultivation of devotional music, and to this association let the individual churches or religious societies become directly auxiliary. Let the primary object be, not the cultivation of music as one of the fine arts for the purpose of tasteful gratification or display, but chiefly that of redeeming the music of the sanctuary from its deadening influence and unhallowed associations. This point of discrimination, as has been just intimated, must be kept distinctly and constantly in view, or all efforts towards a radical reform will be impracticable.

2. In every auxiliary association, the church, as a body, must become interested. This regulation is evidently one of prime importance. If the office of sacred praise is to be rendered highly spiritual, then obviously the cultivation of it should be chiefly under the guidance of those who are spiritually minded. The same principle holds good in every department of practical religion. The Bible will be read and explained to little purpose by those who have not been taught by the Spirit. The preacher of righteousness must himself be righteous, or at least be esteemed so in the judgment of charity, if he would preach to edification. Nor in social prayer should we think to be edified by the mellifluous tones or the appropriate language of one who makes no pretensions to vital religion. And is church music to be esteemed an ordinance of a less spiritual nature? If it is, then let us no longer embrace in it themes which are pre-eminently spiritual and holy, lest by so doing, our professions of penitence, and faith, and hope, and love, and fixedness of thought and purpose, should prove but as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.

Devotional music never has flourished, and it never will flourish, without the effective co-operation of christians. And here, as in social prayer, whether they can take an active part in the exercises or not, they must be frequently present, if they would cultivate the habit of social worship. The habitual neglect of any christian privilege will, of course, be visited by leanness of soul. Let the christian neglect his closet, his Bible, his hours of meditation; let him undervalue the preached word or the ordinance of the Lord's Supper—could he thus maintain the habitual fervour of devotion? The thing would be impossible. In social worship, too, especially in that department of it which we are now considering, much depends on the cultivation of right associations of mind. These, to a certain extent, are favourable to the production of legitimate emotions. They do by no means constitute the essence of religion, yet they are the necessary concomitants of devotion. Nor are they peculiar to persons who have a musical ear, but, on the contrary, may be cultivated by every one who has a feeling heart. The christian, therefore, whether he has musical susceptibilities or not, should be often present at the meetings for musical improvement, if he would learn to derive any advantage from the ordinance of church music.

3. Meetings for improvement should be conducted strictly in a christian manner. . Let anti-christian executants and amateurs occupy their own sphere, and let the gay and the thoughtless, and the lovers of pleasure follow in train, enjoy their amusement, and receive all the reward they are seeking. The church is at present in no condition to interfere with them, even if she had the disposition. She must first begin her own proper work, and set the example of reform. She must begin at once in earnest, and with a christian spirit. The voice of prayer, as well as of praise, must be heard at the meetings, or the lovers of prayer will never be edified. The meetings must, on the whole, be rendered profitable in a spiritual sense to those who are spiritually minded, or the latter will soon forsake them, and feel themselves entirely justified in so doing. Here, as in Sunday schools and Bible classes, there can be no amalgamation of conflicting interests without defeating the whole design of the institution. Let the meetings be begun, continued, and ended, strictly in a christian manner, and then the church will be edified; and those who are of a serious mind, even

among musicians, though not real christians, may still remain and assist in the performances with becoming solemnity, while those who choose to separate themselves may do so without finding any real cause for complaint.

The necessity of abiding by this rule is, in every possible case, absolute and indispensable. Not one step can be taken towards a radical reform without it. Set aside this rule, and you open the door at once for every species of influence in the whole circle of musical refinement, which is foreign from the purposes of devotion. Here is the very rock upon which every enterprise of reform has hitherto failed. Nothing, absolutely nothing, can be effected without the entire predominance of christian influence. Well conducted Sunday schools and Bible classes, and meetings for social religious conference, where the influences of the Spirit are really felt, may serve to exemplify the character of the meetings here required. The christian who lives near to God delights to visit such places when every thing is regular, solemn and impressive; but how is his heart pained when the savour of vital godliness is wanting! He is quick to discover it when it exists, and nothing can satisfy him when it is withdrawn.

4. The exact manner in which religious influence is to be promoted must, in some measure, depend upon circumstances. Then, as in other religious meetings, different persons may adopt different methods, and yet the same ends be accomplished. In all cases, however, the voice of prayer, instruction and exhortation must be intermingled more or less with the voice of song. All who wish to be benefited must frequently meet together at the request of their pastor; and if any are not willing thus to meet, perhaps the time may at length come when it will be found expedient to request them to remain silent on the Sabbath. Where the singing has been conducted with a choir, a considerable number of whom give evidence of piety, and all maintain a character for decency and outward morality, the choir should have its own separate meetings for improvement, and special efforts should also be made for replenishing its numbers. Most choirs are too small and too little disciplined. Children and youth, as well as adults, should be instructed, and schools for this purpose should every where be constituted under the care of pious teachers, when these can be obtained. At least the teachers should be such as seriously respect religion; and if this is the case, the clergyman or some of the lay

members can lend the necessary influence by leading in prayer and offering an occasional word of instruction or exhortation. Indeed elementary schools of this character are every where indispensable. However the singing may have hitherto been conducted, whether by a choir or by a whole congregation, or by both united, there must be trained up a select number of performers, whose talents and influence shall be such as future circumstances may require. Doubtless great improvements might also be made in the method of teaching.

5. There is, at the present time, some difficulty to be apprehended in obtaining good teachers. The number of these, however, has been latterly increasing. Twenty years ago, there could scarcely be found an eminent musician who was distinguished for piety; at present, several of the first musicians of the country are no less eminent for their christian standing in the churches than for their musical attainments. An unprecedented number of pious youth are also now preparing for this department of labour; and the numbers would soon be found to increase with the progress of reform. But besides these considerations, which are certainly encouraging, it should be recollected that a very small number of teachers would suffice for the commencement of the work. One only, whose influence is of a commanding character, would serve for the partial superintendence of all the schools embraced in a general association. The introduction of the monitorial plan of instruction might afford still further facilities. Choristers and private singers would thus act as temporary instructers, and at the same time be fitting themselves for a higher charge. We speak advisedly on this subject, and ours is the language of personal experience, not of visionary speculation.

6. We have said that the schools should have their separate meetings for improvement. It is no less important for them, as has also been intimated, to meet often in connexion with the whole church and congregation. The manner of conducting such meetings has been specified, so far as regards the commencement of the work of cultivation. But when a school has made considerable advances in the art, the church and congregation must be apprized of the fact; and be induced, through their example, as explained and illustrated by the teacher, to sing collectively, in an improved manner. This, though an undertaking of some delicacy, is

by no means impracticable. It was accomplished by the ancient Jews, by the primitive christians and by the modern reformers. Examples of the kind are still found in Europe; and they are not altogether unknown in our own country. Only let a high measure of christian influence be carried into the meetings, and the work can be easily accomplished. Let the devotional exercises be entirely separated from the business of criticism, that the heart may be at full liberty to pour itself out before God: but in some of the brief intervals for the business of necessary practice, let the criticisms and illustrations be presented before the meeting in an acceptable manner, and the majority of the numbers present will soon be found to possess the powers of successful imitation. At this stage of improvement the cultivated singers will occasionally sing by themselves a few lines or stanzas of a delicate character, while the congregation are ready, at some concerted signal, to join in full chorus. Sometimes the cultivated singers may also be divided according to ancient custom, into two bands, and placed opposite to each other, in the extreme parts of the house, with the congregation between them. Here they may sometimes sing in response, and at other times together, or with the whole assembly, after the manner of the prophets, apostles and reformers. The following two stanzas will illustrate this method of performance:

1st Band alone. "We seek a rest beyond the skies,
In one eternal day;"

2d Band, as if by objection. "Through floods and flames the passage lies,"

1st Band in reply. "But Jesus guards the way."

Both bands in concurrence. "But Jesus guards the way."

Chorus: both bands with the whole congregation. "The swelling flood, the raging flame,
Hear and obey his word:
Then let us triumph in his name,
Our Jesus is the Lord."

An occasional recurrence to this method would be attended with the happiest results. How far it should be re-

stored to the church is a point which, like many others, must be determined by experience. The same, too, may be said as to the frequency of the meetings we have been describing. Every thing of this nature must be managed in such a way as at once to keep up the general interest, and secure the great ends of spiritual worship.

7. Similar meetings to those we have just described should occasionally be held by deputations from the auxiliary societies. The advantages of such a measure must appear sufficiently obvious. These meetings would, of course, be made to differ entirely from the popular concerts of the day; which, under the pretence of sacred music, are really secular in their character and influence. Let there be no rhetorical flourishes from the pulpit on these occasions. Let there be no passing of compliments, or commendations, or criticisms among the people assembled, and no efforts of display among the singers. Let all the business of the day, the prayers, the exhortations, and the performances, be conducted in the most solemn manner, as in the presence of the heart-searching God. Such meetings cannot fail to give increasing impulse to the work of reform; and they will do perhaps more than every thing else towards enabling us to make practical discriminations in the manner of our performances.

8. In the selection of tunes, recourse must first be had to the simplest of the approved specimens, and in afterwards proceeding to such pieces as are more refined or intricate, reference must continually be had to the immediate production of devotional interest. Music may be intrinsically excellent, and yet be ill adapted to the public taste, or to the circumstances of the choir or congregation. It may also be elaborate to little purpose, or simple without effect. Much, also, that is applied to sacred words, and associated with names of the highest celebrity, will be found to answer almost any other purpose than that of real worship or religious edification. If the selection of the tunes is wholly fortuitous, such, also, it is probable, will be the result of the performances. Or if the selection is left wholly to the decision of mere amateurs, then there will be endless differences of opinion, without accomplishing the chief end in view. But let the experience of results actually witnessed by the numbers associated be made the criterion, and there will be unanimity of feeling and of effort, and the great ends of selection and adaptation will thus be, in a measure, answered.

9. When the principles of reform, as thus laid down, shall have been carried so thoroughly into the schools and the meetings as to produce in some measure the anticipated result, then, and not till then, should a change in the order of things be attempted at church on the Sabbath. A disregard to this rule has often led to disastrous consequences. A church, for instance, has sometimes been known to rise up suddenly to effect a reform, without plan or concert, and to drive out the singers from the orchestra, without having any thing prepared as a substitute. But let every arrangement be first matured. Let the required influence be carefully cultivated and secured; let a band of singers, composed of suitable persons, receive the necessary instruction; and let leaders be appointed, and thoroughly drilled to their employment; let all this be done, and then not the smallest difficulty need be anticipated. Some plan may then be adopted by the general consent, at least for a time, as an experiment. Afterwards, if necessary, another plan can be substituted in its place; and this again, if need be, can be laid aside for a third, and that for a fourth, till the best practicable method shall have been thus discovered.

Where there is an organ, the player must, by all means, be made to co-operate systematically, thoroughly, and sincerely, or be dismissed from the service. Something more than mere professional skill must be required of him. Indeed, there is much, very much of this, which must be laid aside, while there must be substituted in the place of it, chaste simplicity, and perfect consentaneousness of purpose, if he would not defeat the whole object of this enterprize. And when we reflect how much power there is thus entrusted to the player, and how few there are to be found who would not persist in abusing this power, we may well call in question the propriety of the general introduction of the organ into our churches, at least till experience has given us further proof of its practical utility.

Congregations that have hitherto employed the organ, either with or without a choir, will generally find their advantage in placing one band of singers in the orchestra, and another (a smaller one perhaps) in the opposite end of the house below. Here each band may have its leader; the leaders can readily co-operate with each other, and the bands can sing separately or consentaneously; and, by a concerted signal, the whole congregation can unite as occasion re-

quires. Or where there is no organ and no established choir, the two bands of singers may both sit below, so as to act simultaneously upon the two extreme parts of the congregation. In case their numbers are too small for this arrangement, they may be united under a single leader, near the desk. This last method will answer where the congregation is small and compact, and too deficient in musical cultivation.

But before either of the above, or any other plan of a similar nature is attempted on the Sabbath, it will, of course, be necessary to call the whole congregation together for the purpose of discussion and preparation, so that there may be no misunderstanding or dissatisfaction, and that the influence of novelty may, as far as possible, be done away previous to the stated time of worship.

But not to enlarge, the preceding hints are offered as the mere outline of a plan which is at once plain and practical. Other things might have been suggested; but the sole object at this time has been to show, that the proposed work of reform is no less practicable in the present state of things than it ever was at any former period. If this point be now admitted, nothing remains before us but the plain question of duty. A reform is certainly needed. There can be no doubt of this. A reform in itself considered must, of course, be practicable; unless, indeed, we are to suppose that the whole institution of sacred praise has become a perfect nullity. This, also, was fully demonstrated in a former article. We have now seen that there are no insuperable objections to the immediate commencement and prosecution of the work. Obstacles there are, but these may be easily overcome. Nothing is wanting in this respect but pious activity. Religious influence, rightly directed, is the simple charm which alone will dissipate every obstacle. Nor is the necessary labour to be regarded as disproportioned to the importance of the object. Nothing valuable can be acquired without labour. And, in the case before us, nothing is demanded which does not bring with it a present reward. The grand secret of enjoying church music is to practise it; to practise it habitually and intelligibly on christian principles; to practise it in the schools, at the meetings, and at the family altar. This has always been the secret of musical influence among christians; and what is there in it that is too laborious? Nothing, absolutely nothing. There are

no lions in the way. There is no Sylla or Charybdis to prevent us from safely embarking in the enterprise. Nothing but sloth, criminal sloth. This is all. Whether this will longer serve as an apology for the neglect of a plain practical duty, our readers may now be permitted to judge. The subject is before them. The undertaking is fairly proposed: nor is it too much to believe, that the great Master of assemblies is ready to smile upon the efforts of those who will faithfully engage in its accomplishment. And more than this, some portion of the work has been partially commenced. A kindling impulse is now felt in various portions of the land. Discussions have been afloat. Experiments have been made. And in all that has here been proposed, not a single item is found which has not the advantages that are to be derived from careful and repeated personal observation.

---

## REVIEW.

*Provincial Letters; containing an Exposure of the Reasoning and Morals of the Jesuits. By Blaise Pascal. Originally published under the name of Louis de Montalte. Translated from the French. First American edition. New York and Boston.* 1828. *Pp.* 319. 12*mo.*

The works of Pascal, "that prodigy of parts," as he is called by Locke, belong to the treasury of literary and religious property, which can never become obsolete, and which pertains to every age. Among the writings of this wonderful man the Provincial Letters justly hold the highest place; as well from the intrinsic merits of the book, as from the events to which the production gave rise. "In these letters" says Voltaire "is concentrated every species of eloquence. There is not one word that, during a hundred years, has suffered the change which alters so frequently all living languages. To this work must be attributed the *fixation* of the French language. I have been informed by the bishop of Luçon, son of the celebrated Bussy, that Bos-

suet, the bishop of Meaux, having been asked by him what work he should most desire to have written, if he had not produced his own, replied *The Provincial Letters.*"* It is therefore with great satisfaction that we welcome this work of genius, in an English dress and an American edition, as eminently adapted to open the eyes of our countrymen to the insidious designs of that order, which appears to have selected the United States as the most promising field for its operations. Although the inimitable graces of style, and often the poignant severity of satire, must be lost in a translation, yet there is in this production a merit higher than the beauty of exquisite language or even the glow of impassioned eloquence; a ground-work of sacred truth and irresistible argument, which no version can impair. The form and outward grace may perish in the transfusion, but truth, like the gold which passes the furnace, remains unaltered in its essential excellence.

The controversies between the Jesuits on the one part, and the Jansenists and Dominicans on the other, may be said to have fairly commenced at the opening of the seventeenth century. The council of Trent had taken all practicable measures for the suppression of the Augustinian doctrines concerning grace and human ability, which were subsequently espoused by Jansenius and his followers. It was left for the order of Jesuits to urge still further this warfare against the truth. The leader in this controversy was Louis Molina, a Spanish Jesuit, who about the year 1588 had published a work in which he treated of the freedom of the will, the co-operation of man with divine grace and the decrees of God, and maintained the semi-Pelagian doctrines upon these heads. Upon all these points the Jansenists came forward in a body, taking shelter under the authority of Augustine.

A still more tempting mark for opposition, however, was held up in the casuistry of the Jesuits, which had now received its form, and become a subject of public disputation. In the mysterious assemblies of the order a system of morals had been framed, upon which we can hardly look without horror; a mixture of equivocation, licentiousness and contempt for the divine law, which would seem too gross to have been

---

* Sur le Siecle de Louis XIV.

tolerated even in the darkest age of paganism. The press teemed with elaborate works upon casuistic theology, in which every imaginable case of conscience was resolved, and we might add, every lust and wicked propensity made venial. That we do not err in attributing to the society of Jesus (for so they profanely styled themselves) the tenets which were avowed by individual casuists, will appear from the fact that it was contrary to the rules of the order that any work should be published without the licence of the superior. And as no age or nation has ever been inundated with such a multitude of ingenious, learned and voluminous works on morals, all marked with the appalling signature of the same lawless spirit, we cannot but view them as emanating from a great and united body, in unholy concert for the demolition of public virtue.

Here, in a christian land, by a body of men who almost monopolized the instruction of youth, were taught principles so monstrous as to disgrace the church which gave them toleration. Here was promulgated the doctrine of *probable opinions;* according to which, if but one authority could be found for a certain questionable act, there is that degree of probability that it is justifiable. "An opinion is called probable" says Escobar "when it is founded upon reasons of any consideration. Hence it is that sometimes a single doctor of eminence may render an opinion probable." (*Letter* 5.) Nay, by some of their writers it was maintained, that one might proceed to act upon such an opinion, even when there was reason to fear that the authority might have erred; and of two probabilities the least might be chosen, although contrary to Scripture and to the conscience of the very man who acted upon it.

Here, in the very heart of the Romish church, it was established as a principle, that a *good intention* was sufficient to sanctify any action. By this we are to understand, that the purpose to sin is necessary to constitute any act a sinful act. He who commits a crime, is, according to this doctrine, exempt from guilt if he does not deliberately purpose to offend God; and unless a man at the moment of transgression should be thinking of the divine law, he cannot be said to violate that law. It was taught, moreover, that the slightest degree of sorrow for sin, the smallest measure of *attrition*, as the Romanists call it, would suffice to appease the wrath of God, even though it rose no higher than the

natural dread of misery. To this may be added their well known permission of equivocations, mental reservations, pious frauds and perjuries. For an ample exposure of these anti-christian tenets the reader is referred to the authorities cited by Pascal himself. (*See also Heidegger, Historia Papatus, per.* vii. § 283.)

In the imaginary conversation between the writer and a father of the order, the latter reveals the secrets of this easy method of avoiding all pangs of conscience; yet not without exciting the astonishment of his questioner.

"'But father, in such cases it must be very embarrassing to know which to prefer.' 'O no, not at all; it is only to follow the one which is most agreeable to yourself.' 'But what if the other opinion should be the most *probable?*' 'It does not signify.' 'But what if it should be the most *sure?*' 'Still it does not signify; only observe the explanation of father Emanuel Sa, of our society, in his Aphorisms *de Dubio*, p. 183:—"A person may do what he conceives to be permitted by one probable opinion, although the contrary be more sure; but the opinion of one grave doctor is sufficient."' 'But suppose an opinion is both *less probable* and *less sure*, is it permissible to follow it, rejecting that which is believed to be *more probable* and *more sure?*' 'YES, once more; hear that great Jesuit Filiutius, *Mor. Quæst.* tr. 21. c. 4. n. 128. "It is allowable to follow the opinion which is less probable, though it be also less sure. This is the concurrent sentiment of modern authors." Is not this explicit?'"—P. 77. "'They (confessors) are obliged to absolve penitents who hold some *probable opinions*, upon pain of committing a mortal offence; so that they can never be at a loss. This is luminously stated by our fathers: amongst others, by father Bauny, tr. 4. *De Pœnit.* q. 13, p. 93. "When the penitent" says he "follows a probable opinion, the confessor must absolve him, although his opinion be contrary to that of the penitent."' 'But, father, he does not affirm that it would be a mortal sin not to absolve him.' 'How hasty you are! Hear, hear! he proceeds with this express conclusion: "To refuse to absolve a penitent who acts conformably to a probable opinion, is a sin in its own nature mortal;" and he quotes, in confirmation of this sentiment, three of our most distinguished divines, Suarez, tom. 4. dist. 32. sect. 5; Vasquez, *Disp.* 62. c. 7; and Sanchez, n. 29.'"—P. 78.

There was still left, however, even in the bosom of the Romish church, enough of sound morality, and as we cannot but believe of genuine piety, to forbid the silent connivance at such abuse and perversion of all that is sacred. Jansenius became an opponent of the Jesuits, while he was a professor at Lyons; and when he afterwards was promoted

to the bishopric of Yvres, in Flanders, he continued his opposition. It was the study of Augustine's works which opened his eyes to the errors of the Romish theologians, and although he did not, like Luther, awake to a full sense of the corruption of the man of sin, he nevertheless defended the doctrines of grace with a zeal and constancy which might cause many protestants to blush. The book called *Augustinus*, a posthumous work of this great and good prelate, contained a defence of the doctrines of original sin, total depravity, the necessity of spiritual influences, and other fundamental doctrines of grace, upon almost the same principles with those which were maintained at Geneva; indeed, his followers found it no easy matter to exculpate themselves from the charge of Calvinism. In the year 1641 the book was proscribed by the inquisition at Rome. In 1643 Urban VIII. condemned it by a bull, and in 1653 Innocent X. condemned five propositions which the Jesuits professed to have extracted from the work. The great question now at issue was, whether the pope was competent to determine the *fact* that Jansenius had taught such doctrines as those which were condemned: the Jansenists professing to join in the condemnation, but denying that any such propositions were contained in the book *Augustinus*. In this controversy the Jesuits, as sworn defenders of the papal infallibility, and deadly enemies of Jansenius, took the highest ground known among papists, and contended that by the decision of the pope it became a matter of faith that the fact was as stated by him. On the other hand, the fathers of the Port Royal, a monastery of St Bernard, in a lonely vale near Paris, among whom were the celebrated Arnauld, Nicole, and Quesnel, espoused the cause of the Jansenists. It was at the instance, and with the aid of these men, that Pascal, under the feigned name of *Montalte*, composed and published the Provincial Letters.

The first of these letters bears date January 23, 1656; and was intended chiefly to expose to ridicule the intemperate debates which had originated in a caustic epistle of M. Arnauld to a doctor of the Sorbonne; but to the astonishment even of those who were in the secret, it became the most interesting topic of conversation throughout the whole city of Paris. Learned and unlearned men, all classes of society, found themselves attracted by the brevity, the *naïveté*, the gentle sarcasm, and the finished elegance of this anonymous

production. The dispute in the Sorbonne resulted in the condemnation of M. Arnauld's book, and the expulsion of himself from the theological faculty. Pascal, animated at the same time by zeal for the honour of his friend, and indignation at the intrigues of the Jesuits, produced in rapid succession the second, third and fourth letters. When, however, he entered upon the discussion of the casuistry and morals of the order, he found himself involved in a work where haste would have been criminal. So unchristian and odious did the precepts of their writers appear to him, that with the patience of a veteran in controversy, although this was among his first works, he sat down to examine and digest the shapeless mass of abominable error which is spread through these volumes. We are told by his biographer that he spent twenty days upon a single number, and that he wrote the 18th letter over as many as thirteen times. (*Mémoires sur la Vie de M. Pascal, prefixed to Les Penseés.*)

The first ten of these letters were directed, by a happy fiction, to a provincial of the order, and the person meant is said to have been M. Perrier, a resident of Clermont. The remainder of the work was drawn forth by the futile attempts of the Jesuits to prove, first, that their casuists had not maintained the opinions which were attacked by Pascal, and then, that these opinions had been long taught and received by the church. All Paris was now solicitous to discover this wonderful Montalte, confessedly the finest writer in France, and yet unknown before; familiar with all the doublings of the casuists, and yet firmly and piously attached to the church and to pure morals; while chagrin and consternation pervaded the ranks of the Jesuits. It was alarming to find that homicide was no longer forbidden; for, according to a passage of Hurtado de Mendoza,

"When a gentleman who is challenged to a duel is known to be not remarkably pious, but daily commits sins without the least scruple, plainly evincing that his refusal to accept the challenge does not proceed from the fear of God, but from timidity, he may be called a chicken, and not a man: *gallina et non vir.* He may, in order to preserve his honour, proceed to the appointed place, not indeed with the express intention of fighting, but only of defending himself, if his antagonist should unjustly attack him, and this action would be in itself altogether indifferent. For what harm would there be in going into a field and defending oneself against any attack?"—P. 99.

Falsehood and perjury were authorized under various forms:

"Because (said the father) 'it is the *intention* which stamps the quality of the action:' and the latter, (Filiutius), in page 328, furnishes another and surer method of avoiding lying. After saying in an audible voice, *I swear that I did not do this*, you may inwardly add *to-day;* or after affirming aloud *I swear*, you may repeat in a whisper *I say;* and then, resuming the former tone, *I did not do it.* Now this you must admit is telling the truth." "I own it is," said I, "but it is telling truth in a whisper, and a lie in an audible voice." —P. 135.

The crime of simony had been rendered easy to the most sensitive conscience; for according to Sanchez, as quoted by Escobar, (tr. 6, ex. 2, no. 40): "If temporal possessions be given for spiritual ones, not as the price, but as the motive to induce the patron to confer it," it is no longer simony; and if we may believe another, "it is a probable opinion, and taught by the majority of catholic divines, that there is no simony and no sin in giving money or any other temporal consideration for a benefice." Let us hear Pascal upon this subject:

"Nothing more, surely, can be required: for, according to all these maxims, simony is so uncommon, that Simon Magus himself, who wished to purchase the Holy Ghost, could not be convicted of it, in which he is the very model of your simonists who buy it; and Gehazi, who took money for a miracle, is the representative of your simonists who sell it. It is indisputable that when Simon, in the Acts, offered money to the apostles to confer this power, he did not use the words *buying*, *selling*, or *price*, he did nothing more than offer some money as a motive to induce the bestowment of that spiritual gift; which, according to your writers, being no simony, he would have been perfectly fortified against the anathemas of St Peter, had he been lucky enough to have known your modern doctrines." "This ignorance was also very unfortunate for Gehazi, when he was smitten with the leprosy by the word of Elisha; for only taking money of the prince who was miraculously cured, as an acknowledgment, and not as an equivalent for that divine virtue which had operated the miracle, he might have obliged Elisha to cure him again, under pain of a mortal sin. In such a case, he would only have acted in conformity to your grave doctors, who require all confessors to absolve their penitents in such circumstances, and to cleanse them from their spiritual leprosy, of which the corporeal is but a figure."—P. 135.

The celebrated Boileau, in a letter to M. Arnauld, says of

this work: "Without examining which of the two parties is right or wrong, I constantly make a boast of these letters to the Jesuits themselves, as the most perfect work in prose which has appeared in our language."—*Oeuvres de M. Boileau Despréaux, par M. l'Abbé Souchai.*

We forbear attempting to communicate any adequate idea of the excellencies of this work by further quotation of isolated passages; to every reader it may be recommended as an able and unsparing exposure of the hypocrisy and corruption of an order which has again begun to threaten, not Europe only, but the whole of protestant christendom. To the Provincial Letters may be traced the first impulse towards the destruction of this iniquitous system. At the time of their being published, the order was "in the high and palmy state" of honour and power, an engine for counteracting all the labours of the reformers, a body possessed of immense wealth, numbering in its religious houses some of the nobility and a large share of the learning of the world, controlling the institutions of literature and even the councils of kingdoms, and, according to a proverbial saying, "a drawn sword whose hilt was at Rome." The wounds received in this controversy were never healed. The suspicions awakened towards the Jesuits extended throughout Europe; and when, a century after this, the order was entirely suppressed by the bull of Pope Clement XIV, it was but the natural consequence of the investigations in which Pascal had led the way.

It is not, however, the fall, but the recent restoration, of this fearful institution, which leads us to regard the subject with a solicitous interest. We have it upon record that two hundred and fifty years ago Francis Borgia, general of the order, uttered a prediction in the following striking words: "Like lambs have we crept in; like wolves we are ruling; like dogs shall we be driven out; but like eagles we shall renew our strength*." Heathen oracles have sometimes spoken truly; and while it is our prayer that God may avert the evil, we are not without our fears as to the accomplishment of the augury.

It would not be easy to determine which is the more remarkable, the unexampled rise and rapid progress of this

---

* Conversations-Lexicon. Vol. 5, p. 732. Ed. 7th, Leipsick.

truly wonderful institution, or its restoration to something of its pristine honours within our own recollection. Although the enormity of its principles, and its extended power strike us with astonishment, yet the development of the mystery of iniquity was gradual; by gentle advances, and cautious innovations, it gained the disastrous ascendency which first corrupted and then convulsed the nations of Europe. Its operations were not in the victorious march of open warfare, but those of the mine, dark, silent and subterraneous. But that an order signalized by a concert in iniquity, detected in the work of subverting morals, convicted of legalizing crime, exposed to the eyes of an indignant world as an instrument of treason, licentiousness and persecution; that so monstrous a combination of secret scepticism, dark intrigue, and successful malice, after being unmasked, condemned, and apparently extirpated, should now, in this nineteenth century, not merely show its unholy front, but court and receive the attention and patronage of the public, almost passes belief.

In the year 1801 the order was re-established in the western part of Russia and in Lithuania, by his holiness, Pius VII, and in 1804 in the island of Sicily. The policy of the measure was not to be mistaken; it is darkness which best befits the schemes of an institution which has scarcely ever accomplished a purpose except by stratagem. In 1806 the same pontiff proclaimed the canonization of a Jesuit; and his first important act after enlargement from prison was the restitution of the whole order, by a bull bearing date August 7, 1814. By Ferdinand VII. they have been restored to the enjoyment of all their former temporalities in Spain; and even in the Helvetic Canton of Freyburg they have opened their colleges anew. In Germany they are tolerated, and in France, although the question is undecided, they have a powerful party of adherents. In order to show what their standing is at Rome, we quote the following extracts from a letter written late in the last year, and published in a German magazine:

"On the 31st day of July 1828, the festival of St Ignatius (Loyola) was attended here by a concourse of all classes of society, greater, if possible, than in preceding years. The order of Jesuits, like the phœnix, is rising from its ashes, and exhibiting a life more active than before its suppression. I shall confine my remarks to what is taking place here. While the whole of the secular and

monastic clergy appear to have vowed eternal hatred towards the Jesuits, avoiding their fellowship with excessive caution, so that even in literary associations the members of other orders make it an explicit condition that no Jesuit shall be admitted; still, the laity and men of the world are all engaged in their support. A worthy citizen of Rome, in good circumstances, who had been improved by travelling abroad, but was still a good catholic, had afforded to his hopeful son a complete and, for Italy, a splendid education, and had destined him to the profession of the law. Scarcely sixteen years old, and hitherto an example of good conduct, diligence and obedience, the young man began suddenly to bewail the manifold cares of worldly business, and with a sort of enthusiasm to extol the solitary life of the monastic clergy. Within a short time he was absent from home, on a certain afternoon, to the great distress of his parents. In the evening a messenger appeared with a note from the son, declaring that he could no longer resist the impulse to devote his life to God and spiritual contemplation, and that he had entered the Capuchin convent, as a novice. The father, educated in the spirit of the Roman people, was soon consoled, and found but two causes of grief, one that he had thrown away so much money upon his son's education; and the other, that the latter had not attached himself to the Jesuits."

"About the commencement of the present year, two sons of two most distinguished families of the city, the second son of prince Altieri, senator of Rome, and the eldest son of prince Patrizi, made a profession among the Jesuits. Some months ago, prince Altieri celebrated his birth day, and sent a request to the general (of the order) that his son might have leave to dine with him upon this occasion. This was denied, but the young prince was suffered to come in during the time of the dessert, for a quarter of an hour, under the inspection of an elder Jesuit, with orders to abstain from eating or drinking. A few days after, the young prince said mass, and the parents, remaining after the service, had the honour of kissing their son's hand at the altar. The novitiate of the Jesuits is more severe than that of any other order, with the exception perhaps of the Trappists. Its length, however, is not defined. There are cases in which, for the purpose of scrutinizing profoundly the individual peculiarities of the subject, it has been protracted to ten years. During this period the novice is bound to endure the most severe labour, to go upon mendicant excursions by night, to work in the garden or the kitchen by day, to be ready to leave his bed at any moment, and sometimes to take his meals with the cats and dogs, and out of the same vessel. If the slightest token of disgust is manifested, the offender is often confined for weeks, upon bread and water. The same punishment is inflicted for any thoughtless expression contrary to the rules of the order; uttered, perhaps, in

supposed privacy, but caught up and duly reported by the spies. Were it not for these austerities, the half of Rome would go over to the Jesuits. I am myself acquainted with six young men who returned to their parents before the end of the first year, were married, and are now engaged in useful employments. This strictness, let it be observed, is relaxed by no favour to individuals. Every one is admitted who chooses to apply, and in process of time may be received by *profession*, after having passed through the novitiate. It is alleged that the order sends no one back; it is sufficient, however, that by intolerable austerities they so terrify the novice in whom they find no promise of usefulness, as to constrain him, of his own accord, to depart. The life even of the professed Jesuit is by no means so full of charms as the uninitiated are apt to imagine. It is true that the privations and torment of the novitiate are brought to an end; yet he has no control over a single moment of his life. The canonical hours must be observed with scrupulous exactness, even in their colleges. No one dares to go abroad, except in the company of an elder member; and then, only to take a walk, or to purchase a book, or to execute some spiritual commission for the order. It is forbidden to the professed Jesuit to visit any one in his house, and especially to take a meal there; nay, he dares not even to converse with an acquaintance. Hence it is that no Jesuit is ever seen to linger, or enter into conversation, in the streets, or in any dwelling; a freedom which even the Carthusians sometimes enjoy. Observe, likewise, that while the order is necessarily excluded from all secular honours, it seeks none which are ecclesiastical. No one of its members can receive an office in the hierarchy. The society numbers among its sons no pope, cardinal, or dignitary of the church. It is the lot of every individual to live in a state of constant subordination, without the freedom of a moment; to yield a blind obedience to the general, and at his pleasure to journey even a thousand miles from home. Remember that the Jesuit receives nothing in return for these privations, except the bare supports of life; and you will be ready to ask 'what is it then that these men seek?' 'A mere conceit,' is the reply; the conceit of *spiritual domination.* Let the order become rich beyond measure, and powerful, even above crowned heads; what is gained by the individual member? Nothing. At his death he cannot dispose of the paltry shoes which he has worn in his life time. Other ascetic orders who have renounced worldly honours, as, for example, the Carthusians, have at least some regard to the life beyond the grave. While they deny themselves earthly gratifications, they are sustained by the hope of endless happiness. Not so the Jesuit. He does all for this world, and yet can never enjoy even this world, with any degree of peace."—*Röhr's Prediger-Bibliothek. Vol. IX. p.* 1151.

Such is the success of the efforts for the *repristination,* as

it is denominated, of this dangerous society; and if, in a city where their doctrines have been condemned, their order suppressed, and their estates sequestrated; where, but a few years ago, a Jesuit would have been scarcely tolerated, they are now able thus to lord it over the consciences of men, what may they not accomplish in a country such as ours, where prejudice is unawakened, and where no barrier can be erected to prevent their inroads? To such suggestions it is usually replied, that the spirit of the age, the diffusion of knowledge, the freedom of our institutions, and the inquisitive temper of our people, afford a sufficient pledge that Popery, and above all Jesuitism, can never obtain any extensive prevalence; and that the temper and policy of the papacy have been greatly meliorated by the increase of light. But why are we so ready to be seduced into the belief that the church of Rome has undergone a change since the days of Loyola? Has the infallible Pontiff manifested any diminution of enmity towards the schismatics and heretics who defraud him of his vaunted honours? Has the unchanging creed of the self-styled Catholic church been improved since the council of Trent? or has it ceased to proscribe the Word of God? And is there any alteration which may not be very plainly traced to a subtile and temporary yielding to unconquerable opposition in public sentiment? Are not the Jesuits, as a body, strewing through our states the principles of Romanism, and *with the authority* of the Pope himself? Let the reader weigh such sentences as the following, from the Bull *Solicitudo omnium*, Aug. 7th, 1814. "We declare besides, and *grant power*, that they may freely and lawfully apply to the education of youth *in the principles of the Catholic faith*, to form them to good morals, and to direct colleges and seminaries." "We take under our tutelage, under our immediate obedience, and that of the Holy See, all the colleges, houses, provinces, and members of the order, and all who shall join it." (p. 20.) The spirit which once fulminated bulls against reformers, can now do no more than condemn the distributors of the Bible; but the spirit is the same. The politic zeal which, in 1622, established the Congregation De propaganda fide, and in 1627 attached to it the college of the same name, and which ordered into Germany an army of anti-protestant missionaries, betrays itself in the appropriations made for the Valley of the Mississippi, the seminaries which are spring-

ing up in silence throughout our land, and the presses which send forth, in our enlightened times, the doctrines and legends of the middle ages. It is not for lack of malice that the vision of good John Bunyan is accomplished in this country. "Though he be yet alive, he is, by reason of age, and also the many shrewd brushes that he met with in his younger days, grown so crazy and stiff in his joints, that he now can do little more than sit in his cave's mouth, grinning at pilgrims as they go by, and biting his nails because he cannot come at them." (*Pilgrim's Progress, Part I.*)

It is by no means true, as we are sometimes disposed to flatter ourselves, that, as Americans, we are placed above the perils and disasters of other people. Great as are our national favours, human nature has not so changed under the genial skies of liberty, as to make that harmless to us, which has carried desolation into the fairest and the most enlightened regions of the other continent; nor is our population so mature in knowledge and piety, as to be shielded against the "cunning craftiness" of wily controvertists. On the contrary, we can hardly open our eyes upon the remote districts of this Union, without observing that the rankest growth of wild fanaticism and varied error is springing up, and that there is scarcely a heresy noted in the books of the polemic, which has not its lineal descendant in America. In the imposing ceremonial, the entertaining rites, the pomp of outward worship, the indulgences to transgress, the frequency of confession, and the easy absolutions of Romanism, there is every thing to attract the eye, seduce the heart, and subdue the conscience of the natural man. And the minister of the gospel who goes forth unprepared to cope with the insidious and polished Jesuit, and is called upon to attack this system of error, which has not sprung up in a moment, but attained the firm and symmetrical growth of centuries, may regret, when it is too late, that he has considered the elaborate volumes of his predecessors useless lumber upon his shelves, and instead of toilsome study of the controversy, has yielded to supineness, incredulity, and contempt of the danger.

## REVIEW.

*Elements of Mental and Moral Science: designed to exhibit the original susceptibilities of the mind, and the rule by which the rectitude of any of its states or feelings should be judged. By George Payne, A.M. J. Leavitt. New York.* 1829. *Pp.* 451. 8*vo.*

We have ever entertained a high opinion of the importance of mental philosophy, and regard with pleasure the increasing attention which it is receiving. Notwithstanding the slow progress it has hitherto made, and the difficulties it has still to encounter, we believe that it will continue to advance, and at length attain a pre-eminent rank among the sciences. All efforts, therefore, to direct to it the public attention and to promote its advancement, are viewed by us with warm approbation. Hence we were highly pleased to meet with the work which stands at the head of this article, and which we propose to introduce to the notice of our readers. Its occasion and design are thus indicated by the author in his preface.

"The subsequent pages owe their origin to the professional engagements of the writer. Expected to impart instruction to the students committed to his care, in the philosophy of the human mind, as well as on subjects strictly theological, he devoted all the time he could command to the task of drawing up a course of lectures on the Elements of Mental and Moral Science, which should be made to combine, as far as he found it practicable, comprehension with brevity, and might be used as a text book in his future prelections.

"His object in the preparation of his lectures was not originality, but usefulness. His sole desire was to guide the minds of his pupils to what he regarded as the right decision upon the multifarious topics of inquiry which his plan embraced; and whether he attained that end by presenting to them the statements of others, or what might be more properly denominated his own, was to him a matter of no importance whatever.

"In the prosecution of this object, the quotations made from the works both of living and departed genius were of course numerous. In short, it appeared to him that to present to his young friends a statement of the sentiments of our most approved writers in relation to the important subjects to which he directed their attention,

combined with an effort to guide them to the truth amidst this conflict of opinions, would prove one of the best modes he could adopt for securing a competent acquaintance with those subjects; nor when he afterward proceeded to prepare his manuscript for the press, did he see reason to adopt a different course of proceeding.

"The preceding statement will account for the free use which he has made, in the following pages, of the writings of those illustrious men to whom the friends of mental science are under such deep obligations. He ventures to state, however, that the present work is not a mere compilation. He has endeavoured at least to think for himself; and though he has mainly adopted the views and the system of the late Dr T. Brown, the attentive reader will perceive that he differs from that writer on several important points—whether justly or not, must of course be left for the public to decide; the difference will at any rate show that he does not slavishly follow any leader, or consent to hold his mind in bondage to any man."

After reading the above remarks, the reader will not be disappointed to learn, that the volume consists of a perspicuous and condensed exposition of the philosophy of Brown, together with quotations from Locke, Reid, Stewart and others, illustrative of their views on the subjects discussed. Mr Payne has indeed differed from his master on several important points, which we shall notice in their proper places.

The object of mental science is very properly stated to be the mental phenomena, as both in matter and mind the qualities, not the essence, form the subject of inquiry. But though it is

"Unphilosophical to speculate concerning the *positive* essence of the mind, it is not unphilosophical to attempt to show that that essence is not *material*. The importance, not to say necessity, of doing this, is greater, we conceive, than Mr Stewart, or even Dr Brown, seems disposed to allow. The former indeed says, that 'the conclusions to which we are led, by a careful examination of the phenomena which mind exhibits, have no necessary connexion with our opinions concerning its nature.' This statement is surely not correct. Are we not in the constant habit of contending that the complexity, which we cannot but ascribe to the mental phenomena, cannot be similar to that which is produced by the union of two or more substances, so as to form one physical whole, *because* the mind is a simple indivisible essence? Do we not *assume* the indivisibility of the mind, in many of our speculations? And have we any right to do this, without previously proving the immateriality of mind, *i. e.* that its essence, though unknown, is different from that of matter?

"Into an extended argument on this subject my limits will not permit me to go: it must be sufficient to glance at the proof which may be adduced. Two distinct classes of phenomena, viz. extension, divisibility, gravity, form, colour, attraction, repulsion, &c., and perception, memory, reasoning, joy, grief, &c., become known to us, in radically different ways; the one, through the medium of the external senses—the other, by consciousness. Are these phenomena the qualities of the same substance? Is it reasonable to suppose that properties so opposite to each other, the knowledge of which is obtained in so different a manner, inhere in the same permanent subject? If the qualities are thus essentially different, must not the essence be essentially different? The argument is, however, yet but partially developed. Some of these qualities are incompatible with each other, so that like length and shortness, when the comparison is with the same objects, they cannot possibly be the qualities of the same substance. Sensation and thought belong to one of the classes of properties which have been specified; divisibility is included in the other. If sensation and thought were properties of matter, they must be divisible, because matter is divisible, every separate particle of the thinking and feeling whole, must possess a separate portion of sensation and thought; as every separate particle possesses the power of attraction. But sensation and thought are not divisible, consciousness being judge; the permanent subject, therefore, of these qualities, *whatever be its positive nature*, is certainly not material."

We think with Mr Payne, that a treatise of this nature should commence with a demonstration of the immateriality of the thinking principle; a circumstance which both Stewart and Brown have omitted. No objection can be offered to the reasoning above employed, without denying to matter those qualities which the Newtonian philosophers deem essential. We know not why those who do this, may not as properly be termed immaterialists as materialists; a remark which Dr Priestley, if we recollect aright, has made in reference to himself.

We have here to object to the phraseology used in reference to the phenomena or operations of the mind. It is as follows. "With reference to these phenomena, let it be observed, that they are not to be regarded as constituting something distinct from the mind, but as being the mind itself in different states." "Our notions, thoughts, and ideas, then, are nothing more than the mind itself in different states." "The same thing may be said of the varied affections of the mind; they are the mind itself," &c. We suppose these phrases are intended to express what all late

philosophers have taught, that the mental phenomena are simply acts of the mind, not something distinct, like the *ideas* of Plato, or the species of the schoolmen; for we are told that these successive "states" "do not constitute the mind," which would differ little from the doctrine of Hume, but that the mind is the "permanent exhibitor" of these phenomena. If we have stated above what was intended to be expressed, why this parade of new terms? If we have not, then the language is unintelligible.

From the frequency with which these terms are repeated, we have sometimes been inclined to think, that Dr Brown and his followers supposed they had made a nearer approach to the essence of mind, or rather that they had acquired more definite conceptions of the mode of its existence and operation than preceding philosophers. It was a fine remark of Locke, "I endeavour, as much as I can, to deliver myself from those fallacies which we are apt to put upon ourselves, by taking words for things."

The nature of the powers of the mind is next treated of, and here the language employed is equally exceptionable. The powers of mind we are told "are not to be considered as separate portions or members of the mind," which no one ever taught or believed, "but as capabilities imparted to it by its Creator, of existing in various states of thought and feeling which constitute the whole phenomena of the mind," they "denote the constitution it has received from its Creator by which it is capable of existing in all those states, which form the consciousness of life." The term faculty is entirely discarded by Dr Brown. Mr Payne has employed it in one or two instances. We can see no reason for rejecting a term sanctioned by usage, and in perfect accordance with our consciousness. We feel that the mind has the power of exerting itself in various ways, or in reference to various objects. For instance, we can perceive external objects, or we can pursue a process of reasoning. Where then is the impropriety in saying that the mind has the faculty of perception, &c.? Why resort to the circumlocutory mode of expression, that the mind is capable of existing in a state which constitutes perception or reasoning? Is this necessary to prevent the notion that the faculties are something distinct from the mind, as the members of the human frame are from the body? We are not aware that any other distinction between the mind and its

faculties has been held, than that which obtains between a substance and its powers.

Dr Brown was led to the adoption of this phraseology by his views on the subject of cause and effect, which lie at the foundation of his system. As this subject has been treated at large in a former number of our work, we shall not dwell on it now. On this point, Mr Payne differs from Dr Brown, though he has scarcely offered a reason for so doing. On a subject of such importance, he should have, at least, more definitely expressed his opinions. In reference to the succession of thought, he says, that mere invariableness of antecedence and consequence does not constitute the relation of cause and effect, but "there is an aptitude in certain feelings or states of the mind to precede and to follow one another." From this we should suppose that he adopts the common theory, but in another part of his work he speaks of "the prevailing misconception of the meaning of such terms as causation," &c.

And again "it is impossible for the old philosophy to explain how one affection of the mind produces another affection. But if we entertain those notions of causation, &c. which have been advocated in the preceding part of this work," &c. We should like to be informed what these "notions of causation" are, and wherein they differ from "the old philosophy." We only know that he rejects the theory of Brown. To be consistent, he should reject the phraseology occasioned by his peculiar views.

An assertion is made with regard to the operations of the mind, which we should not notice if it were not employed in subsequent reasonings. We are told, that the mind can exist but in one state at a time; that is, if the expression have any meaning, the mind can perform but one operation at a time. On such subjects our appeal must of course be to our consciousness. Can we not perceive external objects at the same time that we are listening to a strain of music, or engaged in a process of reasoning? If such is the fact, the above is a mere assumption.

"The manner in which our knowledge of the mental phenomena is obtained," or consciousness, is the subject of discussion next in order. All philosophers before the time of Brown have considered it a distinct power, having the operations of the mind for its object. Dr Reid says, "it is a power by which we have a knowledge of the operations of

our own minds." Stewart's view is the same. But is a distinct power necessary to make us acquainted with the existence of feelings whose very existence consists in being felt?

"Dr Brown maintains, that consciousness is not a distinct power of the mind—that the word consciousness is a general term expressive of the whole variety of our feelings; so that the phrase, the whole consciousness of life, denotes all the feelings we experience during life; he states that to be conscious of a sensation, and to have that sensation, is the same thing. Referring to Dr Reid's statements, he says, 'To me, I must confess that this attempt to double, as it were, our various feelings, by making them not to constitute our consciousness, but to be the objects of it, as of a distinct intellectual power, is not a faithful statement of the phenomena of the mind, but is founded partly on a confusion of thought, and still more on a confusion of language. Sensation is not the object of consciousness, different from itself, but a particular sensation is the consciousness of the moment; as a particular hope, or fear, or grief, or resentment, or simple remembrance, may be the actual consciousness of the next moment.' 'In the mind,' he tells us, 'that there is nothing but a certain series of feelings, or of transient successive states;—that the consciousness we have of them is nothing more than the thoughts and sensations themselves, which could not be thoughts and sensations if they were not felt;'—'that the evidence of consciousness is nothing more than the evidence implied in the mere existence of our sensations, thoughts, desires,—which it is utterly impossible for us to believe to be, and not to be; or, in other words, impossible for us to *feel*, and not to *feel*, at the same moment.'"

With these statements Mr Payne expresses his agreement. He thinks the doctrine of those who regard consciousness as a distinct power liable to two objections. The first is, that it supposes the mind to exist in two different states at the same time. But this objection is founded on the assumption we have noticed above.

"Secondly, Dr Reid's doctrine, that consciousness is a distinct power of the mind, by which we gain the knowledge of its present thoughts, sensations, &c. necessarily supposes that, without this faculty of consciousness, an impenetrable veil would hang over all the mental phenomena,—that we might, and indeed must, remain in a state of utter and hopeless ignorance of our infinitely diversified thoughts and feelings; in other words, that we should think without thinking, and feel without feeling; a statement which involves in it direct contradiction; for a sensation which is not felt, is not a sensation at all."

Another objection may be urged to this doctrine, which in our opinion fairly overthrows it. If the operations of our minds are made known to us by a distinct power, by an act of consciousness, something must make us acquainted with this act, or we have operations of which we are ignorant, feelings which are unfelt. Each act of consciousness, then, requires another to make it known to us, and so on *ad infinitum,* which is absurd.

The subject of identity is next discussed, and is disposed of in a few pages. Our author briefly states the opinions of Stewart and Brown, and his assent to those of the latter. Stewart thinks that we cannot properly be said to be conscious of our existence, but only of our present thoughts and feelings; that this notion arises by an original law of the mind, on the first exercise of sensation. Brown contends that it could not arise from one exercise of sensation, there must be a succession, and in the remembrance of these is involved the belief of our identity, which he considers to be the same notion, "expressed in different words," as the knowledge of our minds as a substance. Payne makes a distinction between the *notion* of *self* and of identity. "The former," says he, "would seem to me to be the conception of mind, as the permanent subject of our thoughts, feelings, &c.; the latter the conception of mind as unchanging." We confess that we cannot see the difference between the mind's being the "permanent subject" of our thoughts and feeling, and its being unchanging. The subject of personal identity has been encumbered with many difficulties, as is always the case when men attempt to reason concerning intuitive truths. The belief of our identity is intuitive, and to inquire on what it is founded is absurd. Hence the great labour which Brown bestows on this subject is worse than useless. There is an accumulation of words and a semblance of reasoning, that tend to darken, and to create difficulties where really there are none. He, indeed, finally refers our belief of it to intuition, but from his explanation of the circumstances in which he conceives it to arise, we should be led to suppose that he founded it on memory. He also uses the term mental, instead of personal identity, the propriety of which change we do not perceive.

The "analysis and arrangement of the mental phenomena" is the next subject of attention.

"To this difficult and important work we now proceed. I have avoided the common phraseology, viz. division of the powers of the mind, because though I admit there is an obvious distinction between the *susceptibilities and powers* of the mind, and the actual *phenomena* of the mind,—*i. e.* its varied states of thought and feeling,—it is not less manifest, as we have intimated, that the only method of classifying these powers, &c. is to classify the phenomena. The process to be instituted has a direct reference to the *actual states* of mind. These are to be analyzed, and arranged in classes, as referrible to different corresponding susceptibilities, or powers; so that, in fact, a classification of the mental phenomena, is a classification of the mental susceptibilities, &c."

We see no good reason why this "common phraseology" should have been avoided, since it is admitted, that "to classify the phenomena" is to classify or enumerate the powers by which they are exhibited or produced.

Before proceeding to give a view of the classification which he has adopted, our author examines the correctness of the division of Reid and Stewart into the intellectual and active powers. It certainly cannot obtain, when considered in reference solely to the operations of mind, for the mind is no less active in reasoning than in passion. In all its operations it is essentially active. But do not some more immediately lead to action than others? May not this division then with propriety be made when the operations are considered in reference to their effects? Dr Brown says not, and with great labour, and some unfairness, endeavours to prove his assertion. Mr Payne differs from him. "Is it not apparent," says he, "that what Dr Reid classes with our active powers—our appetites, passions, desires, &c. are the springs, so to speak, which keep the whole machinery of the mind in motion? There would be no intellectual activity were there no curiosity, no desire, no susceptibility of pleasure or of pain."

He still however objects to the division, that there are some operations or states of mind which must rank under the active powers which do not lead to action, and some which cannot properly be included in either. But he has not sufficiently developed these objections to give them force. He proceeds,

"It may, also, be further objected against any such division of the powers of the mind, that it is adapted to perpetuate those false views of the nature of those powers, to which such frequent reference has been made. 'No sooner,' says Dr Brown, 'were certain

affections of the mind classed together, as belonging to the will, and certain others as belonging to the understanding, than the understanding and the will ceased to be considered as the same individual substance, and became immediately, as it were, two opposite and contending powers in the empire of mind, as distinct as any two sovereigns with their separate nations under their control; and it became an object of as fierce contention to determine, whether certain affections of the mind belonged to the understanding or the will, as in the management of political affairs, to determine whether a disputed province belonged to one potentate or to another. Every new diversity of the faculties of the mind, indeed, converted each faculty into a little independent mind.' "

All terms are doubtless liable to misconstruction, but that the "common phraseology," which has long been used by the best philosophers, has produced or "perpetuated" "false views," or that it is more adapted to do so than the nomenclature Dr Brown has used, we have yet to learn. Let us see how Addison understood these terms; whether they led him to entertain "false views." "The soul consists of many faculties, as the understanding and will, &c. or to speak more philosophically, the soul can exert herself in many different ways of actions." Again, "notwithstanding we divide the soul into several powers and faculties, there is no such division in the soul itself, since it is the whole soul that remembers, understands, wills or imagines." *Spect. No.* 600. Again, let us hear the language of the late professor Scott of Aberdeen, whose "Elements of Intellectual Philosophy" consist chiefly in a clear exposition of the doctrines of Reid. "The terms *faculty*, *operation*, or *power* of *the mind* have long been employed to denote the various phenomena of human thought. It ought, however, carefully to be remembered, that by the various faculties of the human mind, we do not mean any independent and separate energies, which may be supposed to unite in forming the mind itself, but merely different modes of action of the same thinking principle." Dr Brown, we think, could not object to the above view of the nature of the mental powers. It may be thought that we lay too great stress on *words*, but it should be remembered that by the variation and want of precision in the use of these, the science of mind has been greatly retarded, and hence we desire that no further changes should be made except such as are necessary; unless some man should arise who should be able to accomplish what seems almost hopeless, the invention and general adoption of a new philosophi-

cal language. The following is the classification of Brown, copied from his Physiology, a work published just before his death:

"'Of these states or affections of mind, when we consider them in all their variety, there is one physical distinction that cannot fail to strike us. Some of them arise in consequence of the operation of external things—the others in consequence of mere previous feelings of the mind itself. In this difference, then, of their antecedents (*i. e.* as being external or internal,) we have a ground of primary division. The phenomena may be arranged as of two classes,—THE EXTERNAL AFFECTIONS OF THE MIND; THE INTERNAL AFFECTIONS OF THE MIND.

"'The *former* of these classes admits of very easy subdivision, according to the bodily organs affected.

"'The *latter* may be divided into two orders; Intellectual states of mind, and Emotions. These orders, which are sufficiently distinct of themselves, exhaust, as it appears to me, the whole phenomena of the class.'"

This classification our author considers "original, simple, distinct and complete," and in its "leading divisions so much in accordance with nature" that he "cannot anticipate the time when another shall be suggested so worthy of adoption." It is "in accordance with" Dr Brown's new theory of cause and effect, or rather flows from it. Having denied the existence of power, and regarding the phenomena of matter as a succession of changes, in no way related but by antecedence and consequence, he must apply the same doctrine to mind, taking from it its powers, and regarding its phenomena as a mere succession of changes, or *states*. We object then to this classification, that it is founded on the supposition that the mind is a mere passive recipient of changes which follow the presence of external objects, or of preceding states. We hold this to be contradicted by our consciousness.

We have other objections to this classification, which will appear as we examine its parts in order. To this we proceed.

The external affections, those states of mind which follow the presence of external objects, are divided into the less, and more definite affections. Dr Brown calls them all sensations, but Mr Payne contends that the term should be confined to those "states of mind originated by impressions upon the organs of sense." Under the latter division are included our sensations, properly so called; under the former,

our appetites, and the pains and pleasures arising from the state of our muscular system. According to this system, our appetites are not to be ranked among the principles of our constitution, because, when analyzed, they are found to be composed of an uneasy sensation and a desire.

"There is nothing peculiar in the pain which constitutes one element of our appetites; there is nothing peculiar in the desire which constitutes the other. Why then, should the pain and desire co-existing, be thought to require a particular designation, and to constitute what is called a power of mind in this case, and not in others? A man falls into a pit; his situation is painful; it originates the desire of relief. Why should we not say he has the *appetite* of ascending, as well as that we have the *appetite* of hunger? It will be replied, perhaps, that the complex feeling, denominated hunger, recurs at regular intervals, and that, on this account, it ought to be regarded as being specifically distinct from any accidental case, in which there is a union of pain and desire. But what is the reason of this regular recurrence of the appetite? Is it not that God has so formed the body, that it is, at these intervals, in that state which is necessary to the existence of the elementary uneasiness involved in appetite? This we suppose will be admitted. And should it be so, how can it be thought that that circumstance can impress a peculiar character upon the mental feeling itself? Suppose the individual, referred to a short time ago, should fall into the pit at regular intervals; that the result should invariably be bodily pain, and desire of relief; would the circumstance of the accident happening habitually, and regularly, convert this complex mental feeling into an appetite? This will not be pretended. And yet the reply of our opponents ought to be in the affirmative."

But after this parade of analysis, we are told, "it is not wished to discontinue the use of the word appetite," but that "we must guard against supposing, that the term denotes an original power of the mind." The term power of mind is not used in reference to our active principles; but that our appetites of hunger, thirst and sex, are original principles of our constitution, cannot be doubted.

Previously to an examination of the sensation peculiar to their respective organs, some judicious remarks are made on sensation in general, the connexion between matter and mind, the different theories of perception, &c. Sensation and perception are not considered as distinct powers. Sensation is a feeling which follows the impression on an organ of sense: "perception is the reference we make of our sensations to something external as the cause of them."

With the general doctrine we agree; on some of the re-

marks in illustration we might make some strictures, if we thought the errors of moment.

The sensations belonging to each organ are next examined, with a view to determine the sensations which each originally afforded. These, it is said, are mere feelings of the mind, and cannot give us the knowledge of the existence of any thing but themselves; our reference of them to external causes being the result of experience. Whence then is acquired the knowledge on which this experience is founded? Dr Reid believed that the sense of touch gave us the notions of hardness and extension, and hence arise our conception and belief of external objects. But Dr Brown contends, that the sense of touch gives us originally no more information than that of smelling. To account for the origin of our notion of matter, he calls to his aid a sixth sense, "our muscular sensations," and makes the first idea of resistance and extension, to which he reduces the qualities of matter, arise from impeded muscular effort. Let us examine the process as he describes it. Suppose a series of muscular efforts, such as the opening and closing of the infant's fingers, this occasions a series of feelings; a body is interposed, which prevents this contraction, and hence interrupts the series of feelings, and here the notion of resistance from something without arises. Here Dr Brown thinks he has acquired the idea of resistance, one of the elements of matter and of outness. Passing by the absurdity of the infant's remaining in ignorance of the existence of its body, till it has acquired the knowledge of matter in the manner above described; that it can be fondled, and take its nourishment in the same ignorance, unless indeed it defer the last till it has performed the acute reasoning Dr Brown ascribes to it; let us see whether these notions of extension and *outness* could arise even on the author's own principles.

The opening and contraction of the fingers produce a series of feelings; the presence of a body interrupts the contraction, and hence produces a new feeling, which gives us the notion of something external and resisting. But how can the notion of resistance arise, when the existence of the muscles which are resisted is, according to hypothesis, unknown? A new feeling is indeed occasioned, but it is a mere sensation. It will not be said that it resembles resistance or *outness*, or the body that resists. Why then should this sensation give us these notions, sooner than the pre-

ceding ones? The light entering the eye of the infant occasions a certain feeling; the interposition of an opaque body between the luminous one and the eye would occasion a new feeling. Why would not the notions of outness arise in this case as well as in the former?

But let us see whether the notion of extension, the elements of which are length and breadth, could be acquired in this manner. "The series of muscular feelings," says Dr Brown, "of which the infant is conscious, in incessantly closing and opening his little hand, must, on these principles, be accompanied with the notion, not indeed of the existence of his hand, or of any thing external, but of a certain length of succession; and each stage of the contraction, by frequent renewal, gradually becomes significant of a particular length, corresponding with the portion of the series. When any hard body, therefore, is placed in the infant's hand, though he cannot indeed have any knowledge of the object, or of the hand, he yet feels that he can no longer perform the accustomed contraction, or to speak more accurately, since he is unacquainted with any parts that are contracted, he feels that he can no longer produce his accustomed series of feelings; and he knows the quantity of contraction which remained to be performed, or rather the length of the series which remained to be felt." *Vol. I, page* 360. These portions of the series becoming significant of particular lengths, when a body is interposed it not only gives the idea of *outness* and resistance, but that its length is equal to that quantity of contraction which the infant "knows is yet to be performed." This is the manner, according to Dr Brown, in which the notion of length is acquired. Were but half the contraction allowed to be performed, the infant would know that the resisting body was *half as long as its feelings*, a notion of length, when applied to matter, which we leave to the advocate of this view to explain.

But supposing that the notion of length should arise in the manner above described, how do we arrive at the other constituent of extension, viz. breadth? According to Dr Brown, it is as follows: When a body, for example a ball, is placed in the hand, it interrupts the contraction unequally, and thus we acquire the notion of a number of co-existent lengths, which is "our very notion of breadth." Here, even granting the premises, the conclusion does not follow; for each

of the co-existent lengths must be without breadth, or the thing sought for is assumed. Now, how can a number of co-existent lengths, each without breadth, constitute breadth?

Such is Dr Brown's account of the origin of our knowledge of external things. It does not rest, he thinks, as some philosophers contend, on any peculiar intuition, but is to be traced "to that more general one by which we consider a new consequent in any series of accustomed events as a new antecedent."

The opinion of Mr Payne is different, though he adopts the distinction between the muscular and *tactual* feelings.

"On this most difficult subject, I am rather disposed to agree with those who ascribe our belief in the existence of an external world to a peculiar intuition. A body comes in contact with the palm of the hand—the fingers close upon it—they instinctively press it—the feeling of resistance is experienced; and that feeling, by a law of the mind, instantly suggests the notion of something external, and antecedently to all experience, is referred to it as its cause. There is nothing in the mere tactual feeling, as we have seen, which appears adapted to originate the idea of any thing external. Nor does the muscular feeling seem to me more likely to awaken it. It is a mere sensation, which will indeed lead to the conception of a *cause*, but which no more involves the notion of an *external* cause, than the fragrance of the violet or the rose."

For ourselves we have never experienced any great difficulties on this subject. We have always thought that we acquire our knowledge of external objects by perception. To make known to us the existence of matter and its qualities is precisely what our senses were given us for, not to lie dormant till our muscles have given them objects to act on. What were our first feelings and notions we can never know, as memory does not inform us. All that we can affirm from experience is, that from our earliest recollection, our senses have contributed to increase the extent and accuracy of our knowledge of matter.

In treating of vision it is asserted that our perception of distance of objects is wholly the result of experience. We are not disposed to admit this. It is founded on the so often quoted case of Cheselden, which, if correctly reported, is but a single case. We recollect to have seen an account of two similar operations, in which the results were entirely different. Animals, as soon as born, perceive distance, and why should not children? Though experience adds to the accuracy of our knowledge of distances, yet we do not

believe that all objects appear equally near to the eye till otherwise informed by experience.

We now proceed to notice the second general class of the mental phenomena, viz. the internal affections, states "which do not directly at least depend on the body; which have for their immediate antecedents, not impressions made upon the organs of sense, or the brain, but previous feelings or states of the mind itself." The class is divided into, 1. Intellectual states, and 2. Emotion. The former is subdivided into simple and relative suggestion. Mr Payne does

"Not altogether approve of the terms by which Dr Brown designates these two classes of our intellectual states, especially of the latter. To the word Suggestion, an unusual latitude of signification is attached. When the sight of a painting is followed by the conception of the painter, it is in perfect harmony with the ordinary use of the term, to say it suggests the latter idea; but the perception of a horse, and a sheep, can scarcely be said to suggest the points in which they agree. Dr Brown, however, uses the term Suggest in this connexion, merely to intimate that one state of mind immediately follows another state. Relative Suggestions are feelings which arise by a law of the mind, from co-existing perception, or conception, or two or more objects. Bearing these remarks in mind, we need not hesitate to adopt Dr Brown's phraseology; and, for reasons formerly stated, it is deemed better not to depart from it."

Perhaps it would not have been amiss to have "stated" some "reasons" for its adoption.

By simple suggestion is meant association of ideas. The reasons adduced by Brown for discarding the latter appear to us to be without weight. It is a term which is sanctioned by long usage, is woven into our most common language, and conveys no erroneous impression. Why then should it be dropped, and a term having already another signification attached to it substituted? Dr Brown thought that all the laws of suggestion might be reduced to contiguity in time or place. He however enumerates three general laws, by which the succession of thought is regulated; viz. resemblance, contrast, and contiguity. This arrangement is adopted by Mr Payne. The illustrations of this subject are highly valuable, on account of their connexion with the principles of philosophical criticism. These are in a few instances deduced and applied. We regret that Mr Payne has copied from Brown a *hyper-criticism* on one of the most beautiful stanzas in Gray's Elegy.

Nine secondary laws are enumerated, all of which no doubt influence the train of thought, as also do many other circumstances not noticed: "for there is no possible relation among the objects of our knowledge which may not serve to connect them together in the mind; and, therefore, though one enumeration may be more comprehensive than another, a perfectly complete enumeration is scarcely to be expected." We concur with the remark of Stewart; "a perfectly complete enumeration" would require an enumeration of all the relations which exist among the objects of our knowledge, which is of course impossible.

To this "faculty of suggestion" (Mr Payne uses this form of expression, though Brown does not) attention, conception, memory, imagination and habit, are reduced. Attention is thus explained. Emotion may co-exist with thought, forming a complex state of mind. It is a law of mind that emotions communicate peculiar vividness to the thoughts with which they co-exist, and cause others that may be on the mind to fade so as scarcely to be perceptible.

An object of perception is presented to the mind, a desire, which, according to this system, is an emotion, of knowing it more perfectly arises, co-exists with the perception, and gives it peculiar vividness. Attention then is perception combined with desire.

Though we do not consider attention a distinct faculty, yet we cannot adopt the above explanation. It is liable to the objection we have already made to the system in general, viz. that it represents the mind as the passive recipient of changes; having no control over its operations. This we say is not in accordance with our experience, particularly in an act of attention. Attention, in regard to external objects of perception, seems to be, as our author remarks in a note, "an effort to preserve the muscles in that state of contraction which is most favourable for gaining the information desired." But what is the mental act in this process? Is it not an *act* of *will* to which the muscles are obedient? And is it any thing other in regard to the *internal affections*? When we endeavour to fix our attention on the operations of our minds, are we conscious of any thing but the exercise of *will*? It is the continued exercise of will directing the thoughts to a particular object, and confining them often to some one point. It will be perceived then that we, con-

sidering attention as an act of will, of course do not refer it to suggestion.

But it is here proper that we should state our views of suggestion or association, as a prominent objection to the classification under consideration will be thereby developed. We will endeavour to express ourselves with clearness, and at each step our appeal must be to the consciousness of our readers for the truth of our assertions.

The term *faculty*, as we have before observed, expresses an action of the thinking principle in a particular manner, or in reference to particular objects. Every class of those mental operations, then, which are sufficiently distinct from others, is to be referred to a distinct faculty. Thus the mental operations in the perception of external objects are distinct from others, and are referred to the faculty of perception. Again, the mind has the power of treasuring up knowledge or recalling past thoughts and feelings, &c. Now is not this class of operations sufficiently distinct from perception, from reasoning, from emotion, from all the mental phenomena, to require a distinctive name?—to be referred to a separate faculty? This is commonly termed memory. We have the authority of Locke for using as a general term *the retentive faculty*. Of this, memory, recollection and conception express different modes. But of this hereafter. Again, the mind has the power of forming combinations from remembered scenes, and of *originating* new ones, or *ideal creations*. This surely is a sufficiently distinct mode of mental exercise to require a distinct faculty. This is usually called imagination, but we should prefer a more general term, of which imagination and fancy express different degrees or modes. We would propose the *creative faculty*. The term has not, we believe, been used by any philosopher; we frequently, however, meet with the expression, *creative* imagination, *creative* genius, among the best writers.

The operations of mind in the process of reasoning, we think it will be admitted, are sufficiently distinct to be referred to the *reasoning faculty*—a phrase which has already the sanction of usage. It must not be supposed that we are attempting to give a complete enumeration of our faculties. The above partial one is made that we may explain our views on association. To this we proceed.

Let us attend to the process of the mind in the exercise of its various faculties. For example, what is the mode of

operation in remembering? Do we not recall past thoughts by their relations, such as resemblance, contrast, antiquity, and a thousand other relations, though more usually by the first mentioned.

In forming ideal creations, do not our thoughts succeed each other according to the same relations? Also in reasoning? But this succession of thought, according to certain relations, is association of ideas, or suggestion. What then is association but the order of the mind's action by its various faculties? It is a general term, expressive of the mode of action of the mind in all its operations; expressive of our thoughts as successive and related. If this view is correct, then the classification of the system under examination is radically wrong. It reduces all the mental faculties to that which is not a faculty.

Conception, as we have already hinted, is not a faculty distinct from memory. It is commonly defined to be the power that gives us copies of former objects of perception. What is a conception then but a remembrance? It may be an imperfect act, the idea of time may not arise, or may not be attended to; but if it be the prerogative of memory to recall the past, why is another power thought necessary?

We next proceed to a consideration of those mental operations which are termed by Dr Brown Relative Suggestions.

"We cannot long observe two or more objects together, without becoming sensible of certain relations which they mutually sustain: the states of mind which constitute the notion, or conception, of these relations, are what Dr Brown calls Relative Suggestions;—the power, by which we are rendered capable of experiencing them, is Relative Suggestion. 'I perceive, for example, a horse and a sheep at the same moment. The perception of the *two* is followed by that different state of mind, which constitutes the feeling of their *agreement* in certain respects, or of their disagreement in certain other respects.'"

These relations are divided into those of position, resemblance, proportion, degree and comprehension. Those of resemblance and comprehension only are illustrated by our author. The former is the foundation of generalization, the latter of reasoning. The following is an account of the process of generalization, or of the origin of general terms.

"On perceiving various objects simultaneously, the power of relative suggestion enables us to recognise the various points in which they resemble each other; and hence to classify them, or arrange them in different divisions,—for classification is grounded on resem-

blance, those objects being placed in the same division, which bear this relation to one another. Were we possessed of the power of perception merely, the resemblances, of which we speak, would no more strike us than the brutes around us. Endowed, however, as we are, with the faculty of recognising relations, we become immediately aware that some agree, in contradistinction from others, in possessing a principle of vitality. Of these, some have reason, others not. Of the irrational tribes, some are covered with hair, others with scales, others again with feathers; many have four legs, several only two. And thus what would otherwise have been an indiscriminate mass of beings, separates, in our mental vision, into distinct classes; while, to give utterance to those notions of resemblance which arose in our minds on the perception of these objects, and which were the spring and the guide of this mental classification, or rather perhaps which constitute it, we invent general terms, *which are words designed to express the common resemblance recognised by us in objects which we thus class together.* 'That in looking at a horse, an ox, or a sheep, we should be struck with a feeling of their resemblance, in certain respects,—that to those respects in which they are felt to resemble each other, we should give a name, as we give a name to each of them individually, comprehending under the general name such objects only as excite, when compared together with others, the feeling of this particular relation; all this has surely nothing very mysterious about it. It would, indeed, be more mysterious, if, perceiving the resemblances of objects that are constantly around us, we did not avail ourselves of language, as a mode of communicating to others our feelings of the resemblance, as we avail ourselves of it in the particular denomination of the individual, to inform others of that particular object, of which we speak; and to express the common resemblance which we feel by any word, is to have invented already a general term significant of the felt relation.'

"No process could be more simple and beautiful, than the one which is thus described by Dr Brown. That great Being who formed the mind, has imparted to it, not merely the power of perceiving the individual objects by which we are surrounded, but also of recognising the resemblances which exist among them. This notion of their resemblance, constitutes what we call a general idea—which idea, or notion, is embodied in a general term, as a particular notion, or our notion of an individual, is expressed by a particular term or a proper name. 'In the first place,' says Dr Brown, 'there is the perception of two or more objects; in the second place, the feeling or notion of their resemblance, immediately subsequent to the perception; and, lastly, the expression of this common relative feeling by a name, which is used afterward as a general denomination, for all those objects, *the perception of which is*

*followed by the same common feeling*' (*or notion*) '*of resemblance.*'"

The above is simple, clear, and convincing, and will, we trust, set at rest the question concerning nominalism and realism. The praise of strict originality, however, is not due to it, as nearly the same doctrine is taught by Locke, though he seems to have been understood by but few of his followers. It is surprising that Stewart should have adhered to the absurdities of nominalism, especially as a number of passages occur in his works which express nearly the view given by Dr Brown. He speaks of "the common properties" of a class—the circumstances in which the subject of our reasoning resembles all the individuals of the same genus"—"the particular quality or qualities in which the individuals resemble other individuals of the same class; in consequence of which a generic name is applied to it." This language, as Mr Payne remarks, seems to imply all for which this system contends.

We proceed to give a view which this system affords of the process of reasoning. In this instance we take our quotations from the Lectures of Brown. "The brief expression, or result of the feelings of resemblance, is a general term—but when all which we feel, in our relative suggestions of resemblance, or in any other of our relative suggestions, is enunciated in language, it is termed a *proposition*, which, notwithstanding the air of mystery that invests it in our books of logic, is the expression of this common feeling of relation, and nothing more. The word *animal*, for example, is a general term, expressive of the particular relation of resemblance that is felt by us. *A horse is an animal*, is a *proposition*, which is merely a brief expression of this felt resemblance of a horse to various other creatures, included by us in the general term. It is the same in all the other species of relations which we are capable of feeling." *Vol. II. p.* 221.

"In every proposition that which is affirmed is a part of that of which it is affirmed, and the proposition, however technical in language, expresses only the singular feeling of this relation. When I say snow is white, I state one of the many feelings which constitute my complex notion of snow. When I say man is fallible, I state one of the many imperfections which, as conceived by me, together with many better qualities, constitute my complex notion of *man*. These statements of one particular relation are simple propositions,

in each of which a certain analysis is involved. But, when I reason, or add proposition to proposition in a certain series, I merely prosecute my analysis, and prosecute it more or less minutely, according to the length of the ratiocination. When I say man is fallible, I state a quality involved in the nature of man, as any other part of an aggregate is involved in any other comprehending whole. When I add, he may therefore err, even when he thinks himself least exposed to error, I state what is involved in the notion of his *fallibility*. When I say, he must not expect that all men will think as he does, even on points which appear to him to have no obscurity, I state that which is involved in the possibility of his and their erring even on such points. When I say, that he therefore should not dare to punish those who merely differ from him, and who may be right even in differing from him, I state what is involved in the absurdity of the expectation, that all men should think as he does. And, when I say, that any particular legislative act of intolerance is as unjust as it is absurd, I state only what is involved in the impropriety of attempting to punish those who have no other guilt than that of differing in opinion from others, who are confessedly of a nature as *fallible* as their own."

"In all this reasoning, though composed of many propositions, there is obviously only a *progressive analysis*, with a feeling, at each step, of the relations of parts to the whole, the predicate of each proposition being the subject of a new analysis in the propositions which follows it. Man is fallible. He who is fallible may err, even when he thinks himself least exposed to error. He who may be in error, even when he thinks himself safest from it, ought not to be astonished that others should think differently from him, even on points which may seem to him perfectly clear; and thus, successively, through the whole ratiocination, the predicate becomes in its turn a subject of new analysis, till we arrive at the last proposition, which is immediately extended backwards to the primary subject of analysis, *man*—as involved in that which is itself involved in that primary complex conception, or aggregate of many qualities. There are, perhaps, minds which merely by considering *man*, and *opinion*, and *punishment*, would discover, without an intervening proposition, that fallible man ought not to set himself up in judgment as a punisher of the speculative errors of fallible man; there are others, perhaps, who might not perceive the con-

clusion, without the whole series of propositions enumerated, though the conclusion is involved, as an element, in the first proposition—*man* is fallible; and according as the particular intellect is more or less acute, more or fewer of the intervening propositions will be necessary."

"In every such case of continued intellectual analysis, it is impossible for us not to feel, when we have arrived at the conclusion, that the *last* proposition is as truly contained in the first, as any of the intervening propositions, though it is not seen by us, till exhibited, as it were, in its elementary state, by the repetition of analysis after analysis." *Vol. II. p.* 224, 225.

The foregoing account of the origin of general terms, and of the process of reasoning, form, perhaps, the most valuable contributions of Dr Brown to mental science. They are indeed worthy of all praise. Thus far the views exhibited are so simple and so accordant with our consciousness, that they need but to be presented to the mind to receive its assent. But in further treating of the process of reasoning, some assertions are made which we deem erroneous. That a series of consecutive judgments or perceptions of relation may constitute reasoning, we have seen that "it is essential that the predicate of each of the propositions constitute the subject of the proposition which immediately follows it," and so on in a connected chain. But how do these perceptions of relation arise in this order? Not by volition, for to will a particular feeling, is to have it already. We are told that they arise by the laws of suggestion, and that the variety in the trains of thought, or the operation of different laws of suggestion, oblige mankind to differ in their opinions. Now, as we cannot control these laws, it follows, that if a man disbelieves the existence of Deity, he cannot be accountable; this opinion was owing to the operation of peculiar laws of suggestion. He may be considered unfortunate, but cannot be accounted guilty.

This inference, so absurd, and so opposite to our moral feelings, is sufficient to prove the incorrectness of the doctrine which is the result of the view of association on which this system is founded. Hence, we are confirmed in the opinion that the view we have taken of the subject is the true one.

In the exercise of the reasoning faculty our thoughts indeed succeed each other according to certain relations; but

this is but the mode of its exercise. The power of reasoning was bestowed for the discovery of truth, and truth is not variable. We cannot indeed *will* the perception of an unknown truth, neither that of a landscape which is hid from our view by an intervening wall. But we know that in circumstances in which light from the landscape can reach the eye, the perception will follow: so in reasoning, when the object is clearly before the mind, the perception of relations will arise. All truth is intuitively perceived, the object of reasoning is to bring it before the mind; to do this is in our power: hence if from neglect of the proper means we fall into error, the fault is our own. The difference in opinion that exists, can be accounted for from the influence of prejudice, passion, &c. without resorting to necessity.

Reason, judgment and abstraction, which by some have been considered as distinct faculties, are by Brown reduced to relative suggestion; or to use intelligible language, to the reasoning faculty. Mr Payne agrees with him that judgment is but a single act of reason, or the perception of a single relation, while in regard to abstraction he differs from him. He thinks it is merely intense attention to a single object, and his opinion appears to be correct.

Abstraction has generally been considered a faculty by which we generalize, but this process has been explained without its aid. Stewart defines it to be

"'That power by which certain qualities are considered apart from the rest.' 'Attention,' he defines, 'as an effort of mind to detain the perception of an object, (or a quality,) and to contemplate it exclusively of every thing else.' Unless, then, Mr S. makes some nice distinction between an *effort* to contemplate qualities apart from the rest, and the actual *contemplation* of them, Abstraction and Attention are, on his system, identical. If this distinction is made by him, it follows that the actual consideration of a particular quality is abstraction; and that the mental effort thus to consider it, is attention; a statement which is, to my mind, almost equivalent with the declaration, that attention is an effort to be attentive!

"And if the consideration of certain *qualities* apart from the rest, be regarded as an exercise of the faculty of Abstraction, why should not the notice which is given to thousands of individual *objects*, every day of our lives, be considered a manifestation of the same faculty? The sound of thunder is heard, we listen to nothing else. A meteor darts across the sky, we see nothing else. An officer pursues a suspected thief through the intricacies of a

crowded city, he observes nothing else. Is the separate consideration which is thus given to these things, an effort of abstraction?"

On Stewart's own principles, then, abstraction does not differ from attention.

On the second order of our internal affections, viz. our emotions, we shall detain our readers with but few remarks. Under the term emotion, are included our passions, affections, desires, &c.; in short, all the active principles of our nature, except the appetites. The words emotion, affection, and passion, in this system, express different degrees of intensity in the same feeling. This we are not disposed to admit. There is a distinction between emotion and affection, which appears to be this. The former is unattended with desire, and is transient; the latter has desire for a constituent element, and hence becomes permanent. Thus we speak of the emotion of beauty, and the affection of love. The term passion is applied to certain of our emotions and affections when they exist in greater strength.

In treating of our emotions, Mr Payne adopts the arrangement of Brown, which considers them as *immediate*, retrospective and prospective. To this we have to object, first, that it is productive of no utility, which we can see; and secondly, it arranges, in different classes, feelings which belong to one principle.

Thus, moral approbation and disapprobation are in the first class, remorse and self-approbation in the second; these are but different operations of the moral faculty. We think that in treating of our active principles, we should follow the order of their development. A treatise of this kind, truly describing their operation, their influence on the intellectual phenomena, and the cultivation each should receive, would be invaluable. Such a work could be written only by one who had long studied the workings of these principles in himself, and those around him, and also in the pages of Homer, Shakspeare, Burns, and other masters of human passion.

As yet we have scarcely any thing on this subject which is worthy to be termed philosophy. Hence, we shall notice but a few points in this part of the system under review.

Respecting the emotions of beauty and sublimity, our author differs from Dr Brown. The latter believed that some objects have an original adaptation to awaken these emotions, though their power may become greatly modified and

changed by the influence of association. Mr Payne adopts the opinions of Messrs Allison and Jeffrey, who think, that the power of objects to excite these emotions, is derived wholly from association. Philosophers have contrived to render this subject, simple as it is in itself, extremely perplexed and difficult, by their mode of treating it. But if we follow the common principles of induction, we shall have no difficulty in determining, whether there is any thing in objects themselves, that is adapted to produce the emotions of sublimity and beauty. Universal consent of mankind proves the truth of a proposition relating to man's nature. Now, can there a class of men be found who do not consider the "spangled heavens," the rainbow or the landscape, as beautiful, and the cataract or thunder-storm as sublime? If not, how can this uniformity be accounted for but on the principle of original adaptation? Were there none in these objects, we should be as likely to find men regarding them with disgust as with pleasure, which surely will never be asserted. Again, these emotions could never have arisen in the first place, had there been no adaptation in objects to awaken them: so that the very theory of association is founded on the principles it attempts to overthrow. There is perhaps scarcely a subject in philosophy on which more words have been employed to no profit, than on this. Dr Brown considered the emotions of beauty and sublimity, as the same, differing only in degree. Mr Payne contends that they are distinct emotions, and his reasonings in support of his opinion, appear satisfactory.

In treating of our moral emotions, some excellent remarks are made by our author. Dr Brown asserts that our emotions of approbation or disapprobation are not preceded by moral judgments. Mr Payne contends, in opposition to this,

"That a perception or conception of an action as right or wrong, invariably precedes an emotion of approbation or disapprobation. That we have moral judgments—*notions* of actions as virtuous, or the contrary—will scarcely be denied; and that such judgments are presupposed, in our moral emotions, is manifest from the circumstance, that the latter are uniformly governed, and may be reversed, by the former. Let an action be ever so praise-worthy, it excites no feeling of approbation, if we do not *regard* it as a *right* action. And, on the contrary, let it be ever so flagitious, it awakens no feeling of condemnation, if it be not *considered* an *improper* action. Persecution, on the ground of religious opinion, will be allowed to

be censurable and criminal; yet the mind of the persecutor Saul did not disapprove either of his own conduct, or of that of his companions in iniquity, because he verily thought *that he ought* to do many things contrary to the name of Christ. Did not judgment precede and govern feeling in this instance? How can it be doubted, especially as we find, that at a future period, when his moral judgment was reversed, his feelings also underwent a change; and that he then so strongly condemned the conduct he had once approved, as to include it in the catalogue of his greatest sins, that he had persecuted the church of God.

"And how are we to account for the different state of feeling with which the same action is contemplated, unless we ascribe it to the different views which are taken of its moral character? To say nothing of parricide, infanticide, the offering up of human sacrifices—practices abhorred by us, but approved, at least not disapproved, by multitudes—how is it to be explained that one half of the inhabitants of this country practise habitually, without any self-reproach, certain modes of conduct, which the other half cannot witness without powerful feelings of disapprobation? Is it not the case that their moral judgments differ, and that, from this difference there results a corresponding difference of moral feeling? And the only way to produce harmony of feeling, is to produce harmony of judgment. Let us only succeed in lodging a conviction, in the judgments of those whose conduct we condemn, that it is morally wrong; and, however fatally the heart may be entangled, the feeling of moral disapprobation will infallibly arise.

"We do not then merely form notions of actions as right or wrong, but we approve of the one, and disapprove of the other. The mind has an original susceptibility of moral emotion; but this emotion does not arise on the mere contemplation of an action; it follows and is governed by the moral judgment which the mind forms of it. Even Dr Brown himself, in attempting to account for that diversity, and even contrariety of moral emotion, to which I have alluded, is obliged to ascribe it to the different view which is formed of the result of the action. There is, on his scheme, an exercise of the intellect—a decision of the judgment; but that decision is, not that the action is right or wrong, but that it is beneficial, or the contrary. Those actions which are conceived, by the individuals who contemplate them, to issue in good, excite necessarily, without any notion of their rectitude, the emotion of approbation; and those whose tendency is to evil, awaken the feeling of disapprobation. The notion of rectitude, is, he thinks, subsequent to the emotion, and built upon it. I apprehend this statement is at variance with consciousness. We do not first *feel* an action, if I may so speak, to be wrong, and then *judge* it to be wrong. That would be a backward motion of the mechanism of the mind, if I may em-

ploy such a figure. Nor do we, I conceive, in point of fact, judge an action to be beneficial or injurious: but we judge it to be right or wrong; and the judgment is instantly succeeded by a corresponding emotion of approbation, or disapprobation."

If the above remarks be admitted, and we do not see that they can be denied, there can be no dispute as to the existence of a moral faculty. The diversities of moral feelings among men, which are often urged as an objection, flow from the diversities of moral judgments, and these from diversities of cultivation. To the moral, as well as to the reasoning faculty, culture is necessary; nor is there a greater difference among men in the operations of the former, than in those of the latter. In both, it is the result of different degrees of cultivation.

On the subject of volition we differ from this system. It maintains, that there "is no radical distinction between desire and will." "A volition is a desire springing up in peculiar circumstances, and so appropriating to itself a particular name." Desire receives the name of *will* when it is followed by muscular action. Whether this is the only distinction between desire and will, our experience must decide. Are we not conscious of an operation of mind when we *will* to move our hand, different and distinct from the mere desire of moving it, which may exist when we have not the power to effect the movement? Have we not, when our limbs have been under a momentary paralysis, been conscious of performing the same act of mind which in other circumstances is followed by motion? If so, the desire and volition are distinct.

The last sixty pages of the work before us are devoted to ethics. This subject has not received that full consideration, either from Brown or Payne, which its importance demands; and as ground is given for the expectation that Mr Payne will hereafter resume the subject, and present to the public a more detailed and thoroughly digested system of morals than is contained in the volume under review, we choose to defer our remarks on this part of the work to some future occasion.

From the strictures we have made on this system, it must not be inferred that we do not highly estimate the labours of Mr Payne. On the contrary, we think he has the merit of furnishing the best text book on mental science that has yet appeared, which is certainly no small praise. He is evi-

dently possessed of a strong, clear, discriminating mind, appears sincere in the pursuit of truth, and evinces an extensive acquaintance with writers of mental philosophy. We most cheerfully recommend his work to the attention of the public.

---

## THE AMERICAN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION.

*The Annual Reports of the American Sunday School Union, from* 1825 *to* 1829 *inclusive.*

In perusing the history of mankind, from their origin down through the successive ages to the present, we find scarcely any fact so much calculated to arrest our attention as the occurrence of discoveries and inventions whose effects upon society have far exceeded the expectations, and even conceptions, of those by whom they were made. To prove this assertion, we might refer to a hundred instances, in which results have flowed from the inventions which science, or experiment, first indicated, which never had a place even in the excited imaginations of their sanguine authors. Little did Schwartz, or Guthenberg, or Galileo, or Copernicus, or Jenner, or Harvey, or Newton, or Franklin, or Arkwright, or Watt*, or Lancaster, conceive of the stupendous consequences which have resulted from their wonderful inventions and discoveries.

Even the *moral* and *political*, not less than what may be denominated the *physical*, history of man, strikingly illustrates the truth of the remark which is contained in our first sentence. How often has the adoption of principles in morals and religion, which seemed in themselves to be purely speculative, and comparatively unimportant, produced, by the doctrines inferred from them, the most astonishing

---

* The inventor of steam engines constructed upon the principle now universally adopted.

effects upon the opinions and conduct of men! And have not the assumption of certain abstract political principles or axioms, and the inferences which have been deduced from them, broken up long established orders of things, and overturned, and are destined still to overturn, the thrones of kings, and even to obliterate the very names of regal authority?

And even those remarkable events which characterize the more recent history of our race, and which, one would suppose, were likely, from their nature, to excite the highest anticipations of those who were actors in them, might be adduced to show how far the results have transcended the thoughts and expectations of those by whom they were brought about. Ardent as was the mind of Columbus, little did he dream of the amazing consequences which have resulted to mankind, and will yet result to the latest period of time, from the discovery of the continent which we inhabit. Little did the pilgrim fathers of our country foresee of the grand, and truly astonishing, effects which their faith, and zeal, and love of liberty of conscience, were destined to accomplish upon the history of mankind. Strong as was their faith, and large as were their hopes of great and good results to the church of Christ and to posterity, which they believed would flow from their self-denial, and patience, and zeal for God and his religion; could they have foreseen what has since been evolved in the dispensations of the Highest in regard to his church and the world, as the rewards of their labours and sufferings;—the re-establishment of freedom upon the earth, and the revival and wide diffusion of the religion of the gospel, which have followed their settlement in this western world;—they would have breasted the difficulties which they had to encounter, with redoubled (if possible) alacrity and perseverance. Little did that band of devoted Christians, which met in London in 1804 to provide means to supply the poor in Wales with Bibles, expect that their deliberations would issue in the formation of a Bible Society to supply the whole world with the sacred scriptures; and that before a quarter of a century should elapse, nearly ten millions of copies of the sacred oracles should be distributed among the nations, by the influence of that society, and that they should hear of whole states, and even an *entire nation of twelve millions of inhabitants, resolving to supply every destitute family within their boundaries, with the holy Chart of life!* And little did the origi-

nator of Sabbath schools know what an instrument he had found for the moral renovation of the world, when he first resolved to carry into operation the idea which a benignant providence suggested to his mind!

Having made these remarks, which we deem not inappropriate as preliminary to the consideration of the interesting subject which we are about to discuss, we proceed to take an extended view of Sabbath schools, and particularly of the noble Institution named at the head of this article, and whose annual reports we have recently re-perused with great delight. And that our remarks may be somewhat methodically arranged, we shall consider this subject under a variety of aspects.

I. *We shall give, in the first place, a cursory view of the origin and progress of Sabbath schools.*

With regard to the inquiry, "who was the founder of Sabbath schools," we have some hesitation in saying that this high honour must be accorded to him whose claims to it seem to be almost universally admitted to be valid. We mean the late Robert Raikes, Esq. of the city of Gloucester in England. For Sabbath schools were unquestionably established throughout the diocess of Milan, a most beautiful and fertile region included between the Alps and the Appenines, by Charles Borromeo, Archbishop of that diocess, in the sixteenth century. But these schools were designed mainly, as far as we can learn, to instruct youth in the rudiments of the Christian religion, and, particularly, in the peculiar tenets of the Roman Catholic faith. They were therefore chiefly catechetical; and although reading and writing were taught in them, yet instruction in the Catholic catechism appears to have been the primary object. The following extract of a letter written in the year 1823, during a tour in Italy, by the Rev. Daniel Wilson, the excellent author of the "Evidences of Christianity," a brief notice of which is contained in our last number, gives us some interesting intelligence respecting these schools.

"After our English service, we went to see the catechizing. This was founded by Borromeo in the sixteenth century, and is peculiar to Milan. The children met in classes of ten or twenty, drawn up between the pillars of the vast cathedral, and separated from each other by curtains, the boys on one side and the girls on the other. In all the churches in the city there are classes also. Many grown people are mingled with the children. A priest sat in the midst of

each class, and seemed to be familiarly explaining the Christian religion. The sight was quite interesting. Tables for learning to write were placed in different recesses. The children were exceedingly attentive. At the door of each school the words Pax Vobis, "Peace be unto you," were inscribed on boards; each scholar had a small pulpit with a green cloth in front, bearing the Borromean motto, *Humilitas*. Now, what can, in itself, be more excellent than all this? But mark the corruption of popery; these poor children are all made members of a fraternity, and purchase indulgences for their sins by coming to school! A brief of the Pope, dated 1609, affords a perpetual indulgence to the children, in a sort of running lease of six thousand years, eight thousand years, &c. and these indulgences are applicable to the recovering of souls out of purgatory; then the prayers before school are full of error and idolatry. All this I saw with my own eyes, and heard with my own ears, for I was curious to understand the bearing of these celebrated schools. Thus is the infant mind fettered and chained. Still I do not doubt that much good may be done on the whole; the Catholic catechisms contain admirable instruction, and evangelical matter, though mixed up with folly and superstition."

It appears also, from a discourse delivered at Edinburgh, before the Sabbath School Union for Scotland, by the Rev. Dr John Brown, "that the honour of establishing the first Sabbath Schools in Protestant countries, for the purpose *solely of religious instruction*, is due to Scotland."

But although it seems quite certain that Mr Raikes was not the founder of the *first* Sabbath school, yet there can be no doubt that his exertions in this noble cause led, through the Divine blessing, to the glorious result, which the world now witnesses, of nearly, if not quite, *one million seven hundred thousand youth* receiving instruction in Sabbath Schools! And as there is no reason whatever, as far as we can learn, to suppose that he knew of any similar efforts being made elsewhere, and the schools which we have mentioned, conducted as they were, were not likely to be rapidly multiplied, let the meed of praise, which is due, not be denied to Mr Raikes, certainly one of the greatest benefactors of the human race.

The incident which led Mr Raikes to engage in this work is thus related by himself. "One day in the year 1782, I went into the suburbs of my native city to hire a gardener. The man was from home; and while I waited his return, I was much disturbed by a group of noisy boys, who infested the street. I asked the gardener's wife the cause of these

children being so neglected and depraved. "Oh sir," said she, "*if you were here on a Sunday, you would pity them indeed; we cannot read our Bibles in peace for them.*" Can nothing, I asked, be done for these poor children? Is there any body near that will take them to school on Sundays? I was informed that there was a person in the neighbourhood who would probably do it. I accordingly hired a woman to teach these poor children on Sundays, and thus commenced the first Sunday school." Three other schools were shortly afterwards established in Gloucester by Mr Raikes, to which he and the Rev. Mr Stock gave much of their personal attendance every Sabbath, and superintended the instruction given, which was chiefly confined to reading, and committing to memory the Church Catechism.

Mr Raikes used to relate this anecdote, that when he was revolving in his mind the practicability of establishing a school on Sunday, the word "TRY" was so powerfully impressed on his mind as to decide him at once for action. And he remarked to a friend, "*I can never pass by the spot where the word* TRY *came so powerfully into my mind, without lifting up my hands and heart to Heaven, in gratitude to God for having put such a thought into my heart.*"

In the year 1785, three years after he had established these schools, Mr Raikes was induced, by seeing their happy influence upon the morals of the children and their parents, to publish in the Gloucester Journal, which he edited, some account of their success, and shortly afterwards gave a more extended account of the mode of conducting them, in a letter to Col. Townley. This letter being published in the Gentleman's Magazine and other journals throughout the kingdom, brought this novel plan and its success into universal notice, so that schools were established in all parts of England in a few years. In the same year (1785) "the Society for the establishment and support of Sunday schools throughout Great Britain," was formed; and in the succeeding year the Dean of Lincoln, and the Bishops of Salisbury and Landaff, openly espoused the cause of Sunday schools. And so did Bishop Porteus, then Bishop of Chester, and the Rev. John Wesley, the founder of Methodism; the latter of whom, then in the 84th year of his age, in a letter to the Rev. Mr Rodda, says, "I am glad you have taken in hand that blessed work of setting up Sunday schools in Chester. It seems these will be one great means of reviving religion

throughout the nation. I wonder Satan has not yet sent out some able champion against them."

Successful efforts were made in the year 1789 to introduce Sabbath schools into Wales. Through the instrumentality of the Rev. Mr Charles, many schools, both for children and adults, were established. Perhaps in no other part of the world has this institution flourished as much as in that Principality. One consequence of its introduction into that part of the kingdom was a greatly increased demand for the word of God, which led ultimately to the formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society, in the year 1804, one year after the formation of the London S. S. Union, which was the first Society in Great Britain which assembled under its banner Christians of all denominations, and thus, in some degree, lowered the walls of prejudice and mutual alienation, which had too long and too widely separated the "Lord's redeemed." Subsequently to this event Sunday School Unions for Scotland and Ireland were formed; and so great was the progress of this blessed institution that, in the year 1811, when Mr Raikes ended his benevolent course on earth, there were more than 300,000 youth under its salutary influence. And it has continued to make progress ever since, and has spread over various parts of the world, so that now the number of youth in Sabbath schools in Great Britain, Ireland, and other foreign lands, is probably not less than 1,200,000.

In the year 1791 the first Sabbath school instituted in our country, as far as we can learn, was established in the city of Philadelphia. A meeting composed of "the Right Rev. William White, D.D., Dr Benjamin Rush, Dr William Currie, Mr Thomas Mendenhall, Mr Thomas P. Cope, Capt. Nath. Falconer, Mr Sharpless, and others, was held on the 19th of December 1790, for the purpose of taking into consideration the establishment of Sunday schools in the city." The measures adopted at that meeting led to the formation of the "First Day, or Sunday School Society," on the 11th of January 1791. This Society supported three schools for many years, and employed teachers whose salaries were paid from its funds, which were raised from the voluntary contributions of its managers and friends. From 1791 to 1800 more than 2,000 pupils were admitted into these schools, and during the nineteen years' existence of the Institution before 1810, $7,639 63 were received into its treasury, and almost

wholly expended in paying teachers' wages. The Society we believe continued to employ hired teachers until 1815, when, as far as we know, this practice entirely ceased in this country.

In the mean time, Sabbath schools were slowly introduced into various other places. In New York they were commenced by the late excellent Mrs Isabella Graham and Mr Bethune, in the year 1803; and about the same time in New Brunswick, N. J. and in other towns and cities. About the year 1816, the Institution began to be more generally known and introduced, by means of the intelligence which was diffused through the medium of religious newspapers, which were commenced about that period. In the year 1817, "The Philadelphia Sunday and Adult School Union" was formed. This Society commenced with about 5,000 scholars, and at the expiration of seven years had nearly 50,000 children in its connexion. One of the principal objects of this Union was to supply the neighbouring schools with the requisite books and apparatus, of the best kind, and at the least expense; and the advantages of such an establishment were so obvious, that in a few years auxiliaries to this Society, of every sect, were found scattered through seventeen states, and its publications, during the last year of its existence, exceeded 210,000, consisting of reward books, tracts, spelling books, &c. &c. for the use of schools. Having thus become national in character, not by any wise scheme of man, but imperceptibly and unexpectedly—a fact which itself proves the necessity of such an Institution—the Society assumed a general name, in conformity with the wishes, and at the suggestion indeed, of several large Unions, in different parts of the country, which proposed to co-operate with it.

Accordingly, on the 25th of May 1824, the American Sunday School Union was formed in the city of Philadelphia. The capital and schools of the Philadelphia Sunday and Adult School Union were transferred to the National Society. The schools generally throughout the country soon attached themselves to it, and enrolled themselves under a common standard. This Society, like its predecessors, is composed of different religious denominations, and is under the direction of a Board of 36 Managers, of whom 24 reside in Philadelphia and its vicinity. These gentlemen are all laymen, and among the most distinguished and efficient mem-

bers of the different denominations of Christians in our land. And in the organization both of its Board and its Committee of Publications, there is every security that there need to be, that no undue influence will be attained by any one denomination represented in the Society. The Union commenced in 1824 with 723 schools, 7,300 teachers, and nearly 50,000 scholars, and the good hand of the Lord being upon it during an existence of *five* years, there were reported to be in its connexion in May last (1829) 5,901 schools, 52,663 teachers, and 349,202 scholars! At present the number of schools is probably above 6,000, teachers 60,000, and scholars at least 400,000, and its auxiliaries are to be found in all parts of the country. We ought to add, that in the Society's publications every thing like *sectarianism* is studiously and conscientiously excluded. And with the *peculiar* doctrines taught in the schools connected with the American Sunday School Union, there is not the slightest interference,—these being left, where we think they should be, to the regulation of the different churches to which the schools are attached; so that there is no sacrifice of principle, or compromise of duty, in the union of the friends of Sabbath schools.

During the period which we have just passed over, an "Episcopal Sunday School Union" was formed, embracing that portion of the denomination which is called High church. This union contained at its last anniversary about 18,000 scholars. And within two years a "Methodist Episcopal Sunday School Union" has been established, embracing the largest portion of that church. This Society has about 130,000 scholars. The peculiar organization of the Methodist church, and especially the circumstance of their having a large book and printing establishment, belonging to the General Conference, were the causes which led to the formation of a Union of their own. The Lord has blessed, and we hope and pray that he will continue to bless, both these Societies, which are engaged in the same good work with the General Union. May this emulation be a holy emulation. May the sweet bond of Christian love and harmony never be severed. And let not the spirit which dictated "we forbade him, because he followeth not with us," ever influence those who are engaged in the same good work. There is enough for all to do, and let all be saluted with a cordial "God speed you."

II. Having glanced at the *origin and rapid increase* of Sabbath schools, we shall notice some of the *improvements* which have been successively made in the course of instruction pursued in them.

1. At first, Sabbath schools were confined to the instruction of the children of the *poorer classes;* but now they embrace the children of the *rich* as well as of the *poor.* And even the children of those who bestow most care upon the religious instruction of their offspring, are now to be found richly participating in the spiritual blessings which are constantly descending upon the Sabbath school.

2. At first, and for a long time, they were taught by *hired* teachers; and in England these teachers generally received at the rate of about thirty-three cents per Sabbath—that is, about $17 16 per annum. But now, with the exception of some schools belonging to the established church in England, and some in places where voluntary teachers cannot be procured, they are taught by those who give their services *gratuitously,* and who desire no other reward than what they have in their own bosoms, and in seeing the improvement of their pupils. Sabbath schools are now so arranged into classes that much more attention is bestowed by several teachers, than can possibly be given by one. We may add that if the teachers belonging to the American S. S. Union were to be compensated for their labours at the rate above mentioned—although it is so low that few teachers would teach through the week at the same rate, amounting to but $102 96 per annum—it would require an amount, annually, exceeding $1,000,000. And this sum ought to be considered as really given by the teachers towards the instruction of the rising generation.

3. Sabbath schools at first were chiefly *secular* in their character, and differed but little from common schools. Writing and arithmetic were taught in most schools. *Now,* more attention is bestowed upon the religious instruction of the scholars. It is true that the art of reading is taught in almost every school; but it is subsidiary to the moral cultivation which is now esteemed of paramount importance. And the fact that thousands and tens of thousands have become pious in these seminaries, attests the great importance of cultivating the *heart,* by rendering the mind acquainted with the pure word of God.

4. The fourth improvement consists in the formation of

Sunday schools for *adults*. This was first attempted, with great success, in Wales, by the Rev. Mr Charles, in the year 1811. And in the year 1814, he wrote as follows to Dr Pole, "In one county, after a public address had been delivered to them on that subject, the adult poor, even the aged, flocked to the Sunday schools in crowds; and the shopkeepers could not immediately supply them with an adequate number of spectacles." In this country adult schools are confined to the coloured population, thousands of whom are learning to read. And indeed Sunday schools may be said to hold out to this unfortunate portion of the community the only hope that it may not for ever be said of them

> "But knowledge to their eyes her ample page,
> Rich with the spoils of time, did ne'er unroll."

5. The introduction of *libraries* indicated the commencement of a new era in the institution of Sabbath schools. These libraries consist of books of various sizes, and on various subjects, and adapted to various ages—from the very small book suited to the capacities of a child of six years old, to the larger volumes, intended for youth of fifteen or twenty years of age. The American S. S. Union has published more than two hundred different kinds of such books, and is making great exertions not only to bring forth new ones, but improve what it has published. Of the importance of this improvement no adequate idea can be formed. A better device, it seems to us, could hardly be thought of, to make the whole population a reading one.

6. The next improvement consists in the introduction of the plan of learning definite portions of scripture, with books of questions relative to these lessons. The Society has published two volumes of such questions. No doubt, improvement will be made upon this course. It may be found best to study the scriptures in a manner less broken and interrupted; or upon the plan exhibited in the Help to the Gospels. Improvements will doubtless be made in the questions which have been published. But we are sure that the present system is preferable to the old one—at least whilst teachers are, as they generally are, very inadequately prepared for their work,—which allowed the scholars to commit as many verses as they could or pleased, whether they understood what they repeated or not. Where the new

system is adopted every Sunday school is an interesting assemblage of Bible classes, as far as it regards those that can read.

7. Another improvement consists in the introduction of higher Bible classes, for those who have passed through the age which is ordinarily spent in the Sabbath school. In these classes they pursue the study of many things highly interesting and profitable, such as Sacred Geography, Jewish Antiquities, Evidences of Christianity, &c. &c., and are thus prepared to become teachers themselves. And it is found that many who would otherwise leave the school with unrenewed hearts, are here brought into a state of cordial reconciliation with God, and obedience to his gospel. This improvement is recent, but it has been introduced into a few schools with great advantage.

8. The last improvement which we shall notice consists in an extension of the Bible class system above described, so as to include the whole congregation in the Sabbath school. In some of the congregations where this system has been adopted, the course pursued is the following. The interval between the forenoon and afternoon services, varying from one to two hours, is devoted to the Sabbath school. The children are formed into classes, and instructed by their teachers in one part of the church; whilst that portion of the congregation which is adult is formed into larger Bible classes, under the instruction of the officers of the church, and other competent persons; or into one class, and taught by the Pastor, who has a general supervision of the whole. This may be appropriately called a congregational Sunday school, and where circumstances require it, might be held in the afternoon, or during an hour before the regular services of the sanctuary commence. In some of the schools of this description which we have heard of, are to be found men of the greatest respectability,—the young man in the vigour of life, and the old man whose head is white with the blossoms of age. We are happy to learn that the plan exhibited in Dr Alexander's "Suggestions," has been carried into operation in a church in a neighbouring city, under prosperous omens. Now what can be more desirable than to see a whole congregation engaged every week, not simply in the *reading*, but in the *study* also, of God's Holy Word, the most wonderful Volume in the world?

We have specified some of the improvements which *have*

*been* made. But as the system is yet in its infancy, many more improvements will doubtless be introduced into it; and as this is one of the principal objects of the American S. S. Union, let us not cease to beseech the God of grace to impart to the Board of Managers richly of that wisdom that cometh only from above.

We shall now turn our attention to another topic, which we intend to consider somewhat more fully :—

III. *The plans and operations of the American Sunday School Union.*

The objects of the American S. S. Union are two: 1. *To improve the character of Sunday schools which are already established.* 2. *To promote their establishment wherever they are needed.* We shall briefly consider these two departments of the Society's labours in the order in which they are named.

1. *The improvement of Sabbath schools.* For the purpose of accomplishing this, the Society, in addition to what is done by its agents and missionaries, and which we shall hereafter notice, has devoted much of its attention to its publications. It publishes a most valuable Monthly Magazine for Teachers, designed not only to convey much information to them relative to the best modes of giving instruction, the best helps for qualifying themselves for their important work, and of the books which are published for the use of children, but also to advance the interests of education generally. We cordially and earnestly recommend this valuable miscellany not only to Sabbath school teachers, every one of whom ought to read it, but also to *parents* and the friends of education. Two other small publications are issued monthly for the benefit of scholars. Besides these, the Society has published large quantities of New Testaments*, Sunday School Spelling-books, Hymn-books, Catechisms of different Churches, Union Questions, Manuals for Teachers, &c. &c.

But in addition to all these, the Society has published more than 200 different kinds of books for rewards and for libraries. The first *six* series of these books, embracing those that are quite small, containing from 8 up to 54

* The Society has wisely, we think, relinquished to Bible Societies the publishing of the *Bible.*

pages, 32mo. each, and costing from 60 cents to $6 25 per hundred copies, include more than 100 different kinds, and are designed for rewards, although they may be profitably used in beginning a library. Those above the 6th series, and containing from 72 pages to 250 and more, and costing, when bound, 18 cents and upwards, per copy, amount now to more than 100 different kinds.

The object of the Society in publishing these books, is to supply the youth of our country with interesting and profitable reading—a most important object certainly. Every one who remembers what was the character of the books read by youth 15 or 20 years ago, will at once say that more silly, useless, and pernicious books could hardly be written. With the exception of a very few, we had none that were fit to be put into the hands of children of 10 or 12 years. And as it regards those of 5 or 6 years, we had absolutely nothing which they could comprehend. We believe that one great reason why so few men comparatively are fond of reading, is to be attributed to the fact, that after having spent months in the drudgery of learning to spell, without acquiring a single new idea, they were then made to read what they could not understand. The consequence is, that although a child may learn to read at 5 or 6 years of age, yet, because it finds nothing which it can read understandingly and with pleasure, it soon dislikes the sight of a book; and years roll away before knowledge can be acquired by reading, and by that time the mind has contracted a disgust for the practice, or has become absorbed by other objects of pursuit. Now to prepare books for little minds is a far more difficult task than many suppose. It is not simply necessary to write a *little* book; but the author must, as it were, again "think as a child and speak as a child." We do not indeed think that all the small books which the Society has published have attained this perfection. Some of them are certainly deficient in simplicity. Shorter sentences, smaller words, a more childlike (if we may use such a word to denote a character of style) form of expression, without any thing low however, would render many of them more intelligible to very young minds. Perhaps there are none of them that are not susceptible of improvement; and we have no doubt they will be improved in subsequent editions. But notwithstanding this partial defect, we believe that much has been done towards supplying the rising gene-

ration with a most valuable set of volumes: such as have not been possessed by the youth of any other country or age. A large portion of these books is biographical, and highly interesting and useful. A number of those which are less substantial in their character may be dispensed with, especially as more valuable ones can now be substituted for them. On this point we know that our views fully accord with those of the Committee of Publications. We are happy also to be able to say that great efforts are making to increase the number of valuable books, especially such as are intended to aid Sunday school teachers, and parents who desire to render themselves better acquainted with the sacred Scriptures. Works on the Evidences of Christianity, Biblical Antiquities, Biblical History, Sacred Geography, Canonical Authority of the Scriptures, &c. have either been recently printed or will be soon. A most valuable Dictionary of the Bible has just been published, and there is a prospect that a commentary for teachers will ere long be prepared. Some of the ablest pens in the country are now enlisted in writing books for the Society. And if the Christian public do not withhold the means, there will be hereafter no want of suitable publications for Sunday schools. We would however most respectfully suggest to the Committee of Publications the importance of making every effort to improve what they have published, to discontinue such as are least valuable; and if they publish but *ten* works in a year, and let it cost what it may to get them, to see to it that they be such as possess great excellence. We are not indeed of the number of those who think that books for a Sunday school library should be ponderous with solid theology. They should however be not only *interesting*, but also instructive, and always calculated to make good moral impressions, and lead the youthful mind to a clear knowledge of duty and eternal life.

We would add that all the books which are published by the Society, must be approved by the publishing committee, which is composed of an equal number of persons belonging to the Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, and Episcopal churches. That this committee hold a most important post, and need to be sustained by the prayers of the friends of Sunday schools, is most obvious. That they should never commit a mistake as to the character of a book, seeing they read such a vast number, not one in five of which probably

is approved by them, is what ought to be expected of no men living. Few we believe *know* the immense labours of this committee, which, it should be stated, are wholly *gratuitous*. It is no trifling affair to read a large number of volumes, many of them in manuscript, and often far from being very legible.

To those who are disposed to find fault with the publications of the Society, we have only two things to say. 1. The Society has aimed at doing the best it could in the circumstances in which it has been placed. It cannot *create* by a volition just such books as it wants. It has had to take the best it could obtain. Most of those published in England do not suit us, and many of them are very useless. And it is but very recently that men of talents in this country began to think of the importance of writing books for children. 2. Let them prepare better ones, and we undertake to assure them that the Society will most readily publish them.

2. The second branch of the Society's operations relates to *the establishment of Sabbath schools wherever they are needed.*

The importance of this department of their labours is unquestionable. For Sabbath schools must be increased *sixfold* before they are established wherever they are needed. Only a beginning has been made. We remarked in another place that at the last anniversary of the American S. S. Union there were about 350,000 scholars in the Sunday schools in its connexion. If we suppose the number now to be 400,000, and estimate the youth belonging to other Unions at 150,000, we have 550,000 as the total number of Sabbath scholars in the United States. But the number of children and youth who ought to be in such institutions is not far from 3,000,000; if we may judge from the census of New York taken last year. From this we see that not *one-fifth* of the youth are yet gathered into these nurseries of piety and knowledge. And when we consider the mournful fact that the majority of them receive little or no religious instruction from any other quarter, our tenderest sympathies must be awakened. Not one parent out of five in our country makes a profession of religion! When we cast our eyes over the fifteen states which lie east of the great Alleghany mountains, containing a population of eight millions, we cannot select *one*, where one-fourth of the children are in Sabbath schools! And when we look beyond, to the great valley of the Mis-

sissippi—a region of immense extent—embracing nine states, parts of two others, two large territories, and a vast extent beyond not yet redueed to organized territories,—already containing a population of 4,000,000, and destined to be the abode of a population equal, at least, to that of Europe,—we find that out of at least 800,000 children, who ought to be in Sunday schools, there are not more, in all probability, than 75,000! Indeed there are not quite 42,000 belonging to the American S. S. Union! And exeepting the state of Ohio, no legislative provision has yet been made in behalf of common schools! And even in that state the effort is only inehoate. Now, what is to be done? Is it not certain that the population of that vast eountry will in 20 years exeeed that of the other parts of our eountry? And is not the tide of infidelity and Romanism setting strongly into that great valley? Is it not known that missionary societies are forming in Austria and other Catholie eountries in Europe, to send forth missionaries into that region? And is it not well known that a large number of Catholie missionaries have already eommenced their labours, and that these labours are direeted mainly to the establishment of *free schools, and female seminaries*? All this is doing by those whom we believe to teach the most ruinous doctrines; and yet the Protestant eommunity is doing little or nothing to promote Sabbath schools in that important part of our eountry!

We have given this survey, to show how mueh remains to be done. Appalling as the picture is, we feel encouraged, by the sueeess which has attended the feeble efforts whieh have been made, to hope for great results when the friends of this eause awake fully to a sense of its great importanee, and put forth their energy to promote it. Now it has been found by experience that the most effeetual way, both of establishing schools where they are needed, and improving those which already exist, is to employ suitable men, who shall inform themselves well on the whole subjeet of Sabbath schools, and the best modes of eonducting them, and who shall devote themselves entirely to this business. And sueh a Sunday school missionary or agent will not only establish Sunday sehools himself, but also interest others, who, in their respeetive spheres, will do mueh to establish and sustain these institutions. There are thousands of neighbourhoods in our eountry where there are no ministers of the gospel, or missionaries to promote Sunday sehools. And

where there are ministers, it is a lamentable fact, that many do very little, and some nothing, to establish Sunday schools, or sustain them when established! This often arises from an unwillingness to undertake any new labour. But if it can be demonstrated that Sunday schools afford great facilities for the discharge of ministerial labour among the young, and are really a labour saving machine to the pastor who employs it aright, no faithful minister, who cares for the salvation of his flock, will refuse to promote them with all his might. It is often the case that ministers are unacquainted with the best modes of conducting Sabbath schools, and also of the benefits to be derived from them. To such a minister, a good Sunday school missionary may be of great service. We are well acquainted with a congregation in the country, covering an extent of about 10 or 12 miles in diameter, and under the pastoral charge of an active, eloquent, and excellent young man, who had taken but little interest in Sunday schools, until he was visited by a Sunday school missionary from the American S. S. Union, about three years since. The missionary addressed the congregation, for a few minutes, after the sermon of the pastor, exhibited the advantages, and explained the new system, of Sabbath schools. The people and the pastor were deeply interested. And the next Sabbath a school was commenced, which soon had a library which cost from 10 to 15 dollars,—embraced more than 100 scholars, and was taught by about 20 teachers. Now mark the results which have taken place in that congregation from one or two visits of a Sunday school missionary. 1. The pastor has become devoted to the cause; before, he thought little about this interesting institution. 2. The number of the schools increased the first summer to *five;* the second summer to *ten*, and the last to *fourteen*, taught by more than 100 teachers, and embracing nearly a thousand youth, and coloured adults. 3. All the elders in that church are superintendents of schools, and the most intelligent people, old and young, are teachers. 4. Every school has a library; which has created a great thirst after knowledge among parents as well as children. The books are read with great avidity. 5. Many more religious papers and magazines are now read by that congregation, than formerly, and the general intelligence of the people is rapidly improving. Private libraries are consequently increasing. 6. So great is the interest which is felt in the Sunday school

cause that several new houses for their accommodation have been erected. 7. The schools are all held on the afternoon of the Sabbath, so that the pastor preaches only in the morning and at night, and spends the afternoons in visiting the schools in succession; where he examines the scholars on the Bible lessons, addresses the children, teachers, and parents, who attend often in crowds to hear him. 8. The teachers of each school spend an evening together, every week, in going over the Bible lessons for the Sabbath, and thus preparing themselves for their several tasks. 9. A far deeper interest in the grand benevolent operations and movements of the day is felt, and five times as much money is contributed to promote them, as was given before. And lastly, *nearly* 200 *persons have become hopefully pious*, the majority of whom received their serious impressions from instruction received in the Sabbath school, from the private exhortation of the teacher, the perusal of the books, or, as in most cases, from the addresses of the pastor! We may add that the gospel has gained access to many parents through their children, and has led the careless to frequent the house of God! See here the good resulting from the labour of a Sunday school missionary in a congregation which has a pastor. And similar results have often occurred.

But it is with painful emotions that we have to state that the Society has not been able to support any thing like the number of missionaries which the wants of the country require. At least two or three devoted labourers of this sort should be employed in every state. Instead of this, the Society had only fourteen last year, and most of them only for two months. And during the present year it has but sixteen missionaries and agents, and it is doubtful whether it will be able to increase that number. Now we ask again, what is to be done? Will not the churches awake to the consideration of this subject? Will they not sustain this Society, and give it the means of planting, with the co-operation of sister unions, a Sabbath school wherever there is a sufficient population? Will they not give the Society the resources requisite to support the Sunday School missionaries, whom it ought to employ? Why should not an association be formed in every church, to contribute annually to this object, as is done with reference to our Missionary, Bible, Tract and Education Societies? Is this institution less important, or doing less for the salvation of our coun-

try? And yet the whole amount which it received last year in the shape of donations, was less than a fourth part of what was contributed to the American Home Misssionary Society, the smallest of our national Institutions. We do not wish other institutions to be diminished, but *this* to be supported in a manner corresponding with its vast importance. Sunday School missionaries, we repeat it, must be employed, and at least, to the extent mentioned above, if the blessings of this institution are to be extended to every neighbourhood in our country. And we put it to *patriots*, to real *statesmen*, as well as to the *Christian*, to say in what other way as much can be done, and in as good a manner, to preserve our admirable civil institutions? Let a Sunday school with its library be established in every neighbourhood, and it will do more to purify the morals of the community than any other means whatever, save the faithful proclamation of the gospel. Shall the Society then have the means of establishing this noble institution, so simple, and yet efficient, in its machinery—this cheap defence of the nation—*in every neighbourhood throughout our country?* Shall it possess these means *soon?* Or must it wait until the combined, systematic, and powerful, foreign efforts* to propagate error and superstition throughout our land, shall be brought to bear upon us with all their influence? Shall not contributions be made in all our congregations, and that speedily, to enable the Society to go forward immediately? The answer to this interrogation belongs to others. Let them consider it.

We will farther add, that the necessity for employing Sunday School missionaries is not superseded, as some may suppose, by the missionaries sent forth to destitute places, by other societies. It is indeed true, that this cause is greatly promoted by the labourers employed by the Home Missionary Society, and the Board of Missions of the General Assembly. But these men confine their labours to but small spheres comparatively, and their devotedness to another object will not allow them to do much beyond the circles of

---

* It is, we believe, admitted by Roman Catholics themselves, that twenty-seven missionaries were sent to this country from Europe last year, and one hundred thousand dollars expended in propagating their doctrines by tracts, books, and schools.

their ministerial labours. And we may also say, that the ministerial labours of Sunday School missionaries, who are ministers of the gospel, are worthy of the compensation which they receive; and the labours of those who are not ministers do much incidental good, in promoting often a greater attention to the subject of education, and other important religious concerns.

We wish, in passing, to say a word or two on the pecuniary condition of the American Sunday School Union, to counteract an erroneous opinion which is entertained by some, that the Institution has become *rich*. This is far from being the case. It commenced with but a small amount of capital, and our readers can judge of the probability that it could accumulate wealth. Its sources of income can only be *two;—donations*, and *profits on the sales of its publications**. With regard to the first, they have not amounted in any one year, to six thousand dollars, and have not averaged $4000 annually. With regard to the second, the prices of the Society's books are so low, for the accommodation of the schools, and with a view to render them every possible advantage, and in many cases so long a credit is required, that the profits are much smaller than is commonly supposed. On the other hand, the expenditures which must be defrayed from these sources of income are great;—in the necessary expenses incident to carrying on so large a system of operations—the employment of clerks and other hands—the expenses connected with the branch depositories, although as small as possible, are yet considerable,—the employment of a corresponding Secretary and an editor of the Magazine, who is also the superintendent of the publications generally, a work requiring the most indefatigable industry, and exceedingly arduous,—the support of the Sunday School missionaries and agents employed, men who have as hard labour to perform as can be undertaken,—and lastly, the interest upon a large amount of borrowed money used as a capital; for the society has had to depend

---

* It is hardly necessary to say, that when we speak of "profits on sales of books" in this article, we do not use the expression in its strict commercial acceptation. We use it to denote the excess of the price of the books, over the cost of manufacturing them. The prices at which they are sold, are fixed at an advance upon the cost, sufficient to pay the incidental expenses of the business.

mainly on such a capital. From this statement it is apparent that the Society cannot be *rich*. It is struggling along, and endeavouring to accomplish as much good as possible. It has not invested a dollar in permanent funds, unless any one chooses to call their buildings such, which were purchased, and have been partly paid for, by the extraordinary efforts of a number of the friends of the cause in the city of Philadelphia, without touching a dollar of the ordinary resources of the society.

Although the society has encountered, and is still encountering many embarrassments from want of that support which it needs and merits, we would not convey the idea that it is *insolvent*. Its excellent Board of managers, in which are some of the most distinguished merchants in our country, have conducted its affairs with great care and prudence. And although they will probably not deem it judicious to go much further in borrowing money, or depending upon borrowed capital, they have not proceeded in a reckless manner. No institution maintains a better credit. Its stock of books, stereotype plates, and debts due from auxiliaries, will always be sufficient to counterbalance what it owes. So that it is safe, unless some very calamitous event should occur. Let therefore the Christian public grant it the means of establishing schools wherever they are wanted, and this glorious cause will, with the blessing of God, continue to prosper.

We have sometimes heard this question propounded,—"Wherein consist the advantages of a union of all denominations of Christians in this work?" We answer, that by this means greater resources are obtained and concentrated. The principle of Christian union is itself good, sustaining and encouraging, where nothing essential is compromitted. But especially this is gained, that schools may be established in many places, by a society of a catholic nature, where they could not be, by a denominational, or as it would be considered, *sectarian* Institution. The agent of a Society, constituted upon the former plan, can easily repel objections arising from a suspicion that sectarian influence is at the bottom, and enlist in the school the feelings of all. But the representative of a sectarian society could do nothing, except where there are enough of his own denomination to form a school; which is not the case in some thousands of neighbourhoods in our country. And if every denomination

had its own society, and depositories, not only would great additional expense be incurred, but a vast population in our land, belonging to no denomination, and having strong prejudices, would exclude themselves from the benefits of Sunday schools; for none are more afraid of *sectarianism* than those that have no religion at all. And further, should those who manage any school desire to have other books besides those published by the Union, and any that may contain such peculiar views or doctrines as are held in their neighbourhoods, they need have no difficulty in obtaining them; for the Union, although it does not publish such books, is always disposed, we believe, to procure them from the booksellers, and furnish them, on as reasonable terms as they can, to any school that may order them.

We entirely approve of the course which the Society pursues with regard to *catechisms*. It publishes, and has constantly on hand for sale, the catechisms of all the denominations belonging to the Union, and leaves it to the proper authorities of every congregation to decide what catechism, if any, it is expedient, in their circumstances, to use in their schools. With regard to their use, we believe that the propriety of it will depend greatly upon circumstances. If the school is composed of children belonging to *one* denomination, there can be no difficulty in their use. But where the scholars belong to several denominations, or many of them to none at all, and especially where but one school can be sustained, as is the case in the country generally, it would be great folly to force the study of the catechism upon the school at the hazard of destroying it. We, as Presbyterians, do *ex animo* approve our catechisms, and wish to see our youth well indoctrinated in them; but we entertain no fears that Calvinism and Presbyterianism will perish from the church, unless the Westminster or the Heidelberg catechisms are used to sustain them. We have no fears from the simple study of the plain Bible. And we further believe that it is the duty of every *pastor* himself carefully to instruct the youth of his charge in the doctrinal catechisms of his church. This need not interfere with the Sabbath schools. It is the appropriate work of the pastor. And that minister of the Gospel who neglects it, or attempts to crowd it into the Sabbath school, in order to deliver himself from the labour, neglects, in our opinion, a most important duty.

We shall notice a few objections which have been made

to the Society, and then take leave of this part of our subject.

The enemies of this Institution say that "it is a great money making concern, designed to enrich its managers." With regard to the first part of this charge, we have already said enough to convince any candid man that it is untrue; and as to the *second*, we only name it, to have the opportunity of saying that there are few men in the world that would render the same amount of service for the public good *wholly gratuitously*, or incur pecuniary responsibilities as great as those of the Board of Managers of the American Sunday School Union.

It is brought as a charge against this society that it aims at the "Union of Church and State." Verily this is a charge, one would suppose, too silly for even the credulous opposers of all that is good, to believe. If to teach children to read, and then to instruct them in the duties which the *Bible* inculcates, is going to unite church and state, they must have a singular affinity for each other! The American Sunday School Union has nothing to do with politics. Its only aim is to promote knowledge and piety. Not a word about political measures is ever heard in Sunday schools.

The Society is charged with monopolizing the printing of books, and ruining both printers and booksellers. But the most intelligent booksellers in Philadelphia have publicly stated that the American Sunday School Union is doing more for them than any other Institution in the country, as it is raising up an immense reading population; which indeed is already manifest in the great demand for books for youth. It is believed that quite as many books of this kind have been published by the booksellers in our principal cities, within five years, as have been published by the Society. What has created this demand for such books, but Sunday schools? And who has been benefited by it, but the booksellers and printers? The society owns no printing presses, but pays for the printing which is done for it, just as fairly as any bookseller does. Would the most of the books, which the Society has published, have been published at all, if the Society did not exist? Besides, a whole set of the Society's publications would not make ten octavo volumes of 400 pages each!

Another charge has been brought against the Society, that its committee of publications has taken unwarrantable lib-

erty in modifying the books which they have republished. On this point we have to say, that we presume all will allow that there is no impropriety in abridging a book which is not a copy-right book and which is of course *public property.* This liberty has been often taken, and is not denied by any one. Again, we suppose that modifications may be made in such books as are public property, so as to leave out passages which it may not be adviseable, for some cause, to retain, *provided that it is explicitly stated that such modifications have been made,* so that those who prefer the original work may not be deceived. Perhaps the Society has not given such explicit and full statements, as ought to be given, of the modifications which they have made in the books which they have republished. But the best remedy for difficulty on this point, is that the society should direct its attention mainly to the publication of original works, prepared for its use. There is sufficient native talent in our country to furnish all the books needed by the Institution, and all that is wanted now is proper encouragement to elicit it.

Again; the Society has been charged with extravagance in purchasing buildings, &c. We said enough, in reply to this, when we said that they were purchased by the extraordinary efforts of its friends, without touching a dollar of the money not contributed for this specific object. It was real economy to procure such buildings, which can always be sold for what they cost, because of the increasing value of the property in that part of the city.

And lastly, the Society is said to be a sectarian Institution. But that this cannot possibly be the case, we have already shown. The society has not done a single act which could support such a charge. And surely the gentlemen composing the Board, and belonging to various denominations, have quite as good opportunities as its enemies to know whether the Institution is sectarian. Or can any one believe that they would all combine to render it such? He that can believe this, has strong *credulity.* We proceed now to another topic.

IV. We shall briefly consider *some of the influences of Sabbath schools.*

1. *Their literary influence.*—They are promoting literature, inasmuch as they are affording opportunities of learning to read to thousands, who, if it were not for Sabbath schools, would live and die with minds unillumined by the

pages of written instruction. This fact ought of itself to render the *true patriot*, the *real statesman*, as well as the *devoted Christian*, their decided friend, and unfailing supporter. They are cultivating the minds of our youth by directing their energies to the study of the most wonderful volume in the world. And whether we consider the amazing truths and doctrines which this volume contains, or their affecting relation to *us*, we shall be convinced, that the *Bible* is the best book in the world to arouse, invigorate, and discipline the mental powers. They are promoting literature by raising up a vast reading population by means of the libraries attached to them. Already has their influence in this respect become immense. Valuable neighbourhood and congregational libraries are arising out of Sunday school libraries. Nor is their influence on the parents and other members of the families less remarkable than upon the children. The books written for youth are just such as are calculated to interest the great mass of the people, whose education and reading have been very limited. Many will read a little book because it is a *little* one. Nothing is more common now, where the Sabbath school library system prevails, than to see whole families spending their evenings in reading the books obtained from this source. Now let this system become *universal*, and what a delightful spectacle will our country afford! Many men of fine talents, and who are now rising to important stations in our country, received their first desires after knowledge in the Sunday school. In many places Sunday schools have improved the character of common schools; and a manifest difference is perceptible in the common school, between those who attend the Sunday school and those who do not. We venture to assert that if the friends of this institution do what they ought to extend its influence to every neighbourhood, within *twenty-five years* there will be an amount of reading and general intelligence among all classes of people, and an increase of valuable private libraries, and a circulation of newspapers and other periodicals, such as the world has never witnessed, nor the most sanguine amongst us have ventured to hope for.

2. *The moral influence of Sabbath schools.* The moral influence of Sabbath schools has been perceptible in every neighbourhood, village, town and city where they have been for any considerable length of time established. They fur-

nish indeed what has long been a *desideratum* in the business of education. The secret of their success lies in the circumstance of their supplying a remedy for a most ruinous defect in the ordinary systems of education, which aim almost exclusively at the cultivation of the *intellectual* powers of the mind. Now the excellence of Sunday schools is that they aim at the cultivation of the *moral* nature of man. And this they accomplish by bringing the influence of *moral truth* (with the co-operation of the Holy Spirit) to bear upon the *heart;* and this too at the proper period of life, the season of childhood and youth, and under the most favourable circumstances; for their instructions are kindly and gratuitously bestowed upon those who voluntarily receive them, and no coercion is used, save the irresistible force of kindness and love. "The Law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul."

Our limits will not allow us to refer to many facts to confirm these remarks. We will however present a few, out of thousands.

"It was stated before a Committee of the House of Commons in England, by persons who had been extensively engaged in Sunday schools, that *they had never known one of their pupils become a common beggar.*"

"At Botany Bay, the grand receptable of the most abandoned and profligate of the English nation, General M'Quaine, the Governor, declares *that in consequence of the establishment of Sunday schools, only one of the children of the convicts, during the whole of his administration, had been convicted of a single offence.*"

And the effect is the same in this country. In a letter addressed to the editors of the New York Observer, the chaplain of the State Prison at Sing-Sing, writes as follows: "I have lately made pretty thorough inquiry among the convicts here, for the purpose of learning who, and how many, have ever enjoyed the advantages of a Sabbath school. The result is, *that out of more than five hundred convicts, not one has been found who has ever been for any considerable time a regular member of a Sabbath school; and not more than two or three who have ever attended such a school at all.*" The testimony of the Rev. Mr Dwight, who is the secretary and agent of the Prison Discipline Society, and who has explored many of the prisons in our country, is *that he has seldom found a Sunday scholar in a prison.* And

let it be remembered that a large portion of our convicts are under twenty-five years of age, and nearly *half of the whole* under thirty!

These facts in regard to the moral influence of Sabbath schools need no comment. They speak for themselves, and ought to secure the cordial friendship and support of every patriot as well as of every Christian.

The great moral influence of this institution was early foreseen by Dr Adam Smith, the celebrated author of the "Wealth of Nations," who says, respecting them, "No plan has promised to effect a change of manners with equal ease and simplicity, since the days of the Apostles." To this striking testimony,—the more remarkable coming as it does from an infidel,—let us add that of our own distinguished Chief Justice Marshall. In a letter to the Board of Managers of the American Sunday School Union, he uses the following language: "I can not be more perfectly convinced than I am, that virtue and intelligence are the basis of our independence, and the conservative principles of national and individual happiness; nor can any person believe more firmly, that Sunday School Institutions are devoted to the protection of both."

To this decided and illustrious testimony in behalf of Sabbath schools, we will add that of the beloved and venerated Washington to the importance of such institutions as promote religion and knowledge. It forms a striking contrast to the sentiments of another distinguished man who has followed him to a Bar where every decision knows no error or partiality. And this testimony is the more needful now when irreligion is rushing in like a torrent through the floodgates which infidelity is opening:

"Mobilitate viget, viresque acquirit eundo."

When the Father of his country was about to retire from the toils of office to the shades of domestic life, in the last legacy, which he bequeathed to a grateful people, he thus expresses his views on this subject: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labour to subvert these great pillars of human happiness,—these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and

cherish them. Promote then, as an object of *primary* importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, *it* (public opinion) *should be enlightened.*" Such sentiments need not our commendation.

3. *The religious influence of Sabbath schools.* Scarcely a week passes without bringing to our ears tidings of joy, respecting the hopeful conversion of children and teachers in Sunday schools. We seldom see an account of a revival of religion in which the Sabbath school, if there is one within the sphere of the Spirit's powerful influence, is not mentioned as having shared largely in the heavenly blessing. This, however, is no more than what we might reasonably expect. And not unfrequently do we hear of the conversion of parents, through the influence of the truth carried home to them from the Sunday schools by their children. Blessed be God for the establishment of Sabbath schools in our land! "No one," remarks one of the ablest civilians in our country, "can form an idea of the spreading influence of infidelity, who does not mingle much with the world. I see much of it in the courts. And there is this remarkable difference between the progress of infidelity thirty years ago, and at the present; *then*, it was confined to the educated, and to the higher ranks of life; *now*, it abounds among the lower classes. *And there is, in my opinion, no remedy but in Sunday schools.*" Who does not say, let them be established every where? And who can read facts like the following, and not lift up his heart in prayer for, and put forth his hand to help, an institution which has accomplished so much spiritual good?

"From the Reports of the American Sunday School Union we learn that *nine thousand seven hundred and fifty-eight* teachers and scholars are reported as having professed religion during their connexion with the Sunday schools belonging to that society; and this is supposed by the Managers not to be one half of the whole number who have been taught by the Holy Spirit, and have publicly professed their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, since their connexion with this institution.

"In the Report of the New York Sunday School Union, auxiliary to the American Sunday School Union, for the year 1828, it is stated that *eighty-six* of those who were once connected with the schools belonging to that Union *are now either in the ministry, or preparing to enter it.*

"It is stated that a large part of the devoted ministers of the Gos-

pel and friends of religion in England, under forty years of age, and nineteen twentieths of the missionaries who have gone from that country to the heathen, are the fruits of Sunday Schools. Morrison and Paterson and Henderson became pious at Sunday schools."

At the last anniversary of the London Sunday School Union, held on the 12th of May, the following striking testimonies were borne to the influence of Sunday schools upon missions. The Rev. Dr Philip, a distinguished missionary in South Africa, said in his speech, that "he commenced his labours in the cause of Christ as a Sunday school teacher. The first prayer that he offered up in the presence of others was in a Sunday school. The first attempt he ever made to speak from the Holy Scriptures was in a Sunday school. And he was fully persuaded that had it not been for his humble exercises in the capacity of a Sunday school teacher, and the advantages which he there acquired, he should never have had the confidence to become a minister of the gospel, or a missionary of Jesus Christ." He was a teacher in the Sunday school in Dundee. "During the period that he laboured there, twelve or fourteen young men went out into the field of ministerial labour, many of whom became missionaries. One of them was the lamented Dr Milne; another was the amiable Keith."

The Rev. Mr Hands, late missionary in India, said that "like the Rev. gentleman who had already addressed them, *he* might say that he owed every thing to the Sunday schools; for it was there that the heavenly spark had first caught his soul. It was there that he had first lifted up his voice for the purpose of imparting Christian instruction to others. If it had not been for that opportunity he should probably never have offered himself to the Missionary Society. Therefore he had every reason to bless God that he had begun by being a Sunday school teacher."

The Rev. Mr Mundy, also a late missionary in India, said, "he had been for some years a labourer in India, and he might safely say that if he had never been a Sunday school teacher he should never have been a missionary."

And what must be the influence, on the minds of our youth, of the examples of such men as Schwartz and Buchanan and Martyn and Brainerd and Obookiah and Mills and Parsons and Fisk and Pearce exhibited in the books contained in the Sunday school libraries? Will they not elevate, among the rising generation, the standard of piety, benevo-

lence, and Christian enterprise, and enlist deep sympathy in behalf of "men benighted?" We can add nothing on the necessity of Sunday schools to prepare multitudes to read the tracts and Bibles which are now distributing, and even to hear the preaching of the gospel in a profitable manner, as our limits forbid it.

V. *The respective duties of those who are concerned in Sabbath schools.*

1. *Duties of teachers.* To them is committed a most responsible work. The great object which their office contemplates is the formation of the characters of the children for "eternal life." And since they undertake to teach God's Word, what labour should they bestow upon their preparation for the serious task! Every help should be diligently employed, and the teaching of the Holy Spirit earnestly invoked. What exemplary conduct should be exhibited! What pains taken to give the children clear and definite ideas of what they learn! What ingenuity ought to be exercised in the choice of suitable and familiar illustrations, and simple modes of enforcing truth! It is a great thing to be a good Sunday school teacher. And the teacher that would win the hearts of his pupils to Christ should have strong *longings of soul* for their conversion, which will lead to much wrestling in prayer, and to faithful instruction. But we can do no more than glance at this important topic.

2. *Duties of Parents.* Dr Chalmers has rightly remarked in his "Christian and Civic Economy of Large Towns," that "family religion is not superseded by these schools so as to make Christianity less the topic of mutual exercise and conversation between parents and children, than before the period of their institution." If any father supposes that because his children go to the Sunday school he is relieved in any measure from the duty of instructing them himself, he has greatly and grievously erred in his notions of his duty as a father. Not only should parents co-operate with the school, so far as to send their children constantly, but they are bound to follow up the instruction there given, by their own faithful inculcation and holy example at home.

Nor should parents ever be absent from the monthly concert for Sabbath schools. This we regret to know is very greatly the case. Whom should we expect to be at such a meeting to pray for the conversion of children, if not their parents? Do parents mean to consign not only the *instruc-*

*tion* of their children to others, and these generally young persons, but also the solemn work of *praying* for them? That parents who can afford to do it should contribute most liberally to support Sunday schools, the rich benefits of which their children are constantly receiving, is a most manifest duty. But surely there is a great deficiency here, or else this valuable institution would be a hundred fold more amply supported. And we are decidedly of the opinion that every parent who has health, and is not prevented by domestic duties, should enter the Sunday school as a *teacher*, if he is at all capable. And if he is not capable, he ought to go to work to render himself capable as speedily as possible; for he is certainly not capable of performing the duties of a parent, if he is incapable of teaching a class in a Sabbath school. Parents ought to make the very best teachers, inasmuch as they have had opportunities of acquiring much experience. It was long ago thought that "days should speak, and multitude of years should teach wisdom." We rejoice indeed that a change is taking place in this respect, and that some parents of great respectability and affluence in our cities, and even judges and legislators are now to be found as teachers and superintendents in Sabbath schools. May this noble example be universally imitated!

3. *The duties of ministers of the Gospel.* We believe it to be the duty of every pastor to become the patron and general superintendent of the Sunday schools in his congregation; to visit them in succession; to spend much of his time in this work; to take measures to have a Sunday school established wherever there is none, if it be at all practicable to accomplish it; to induce suitable persons to become teachers, and to instruct and prepare them for their work; to examine frequently all the scholars assembled in the church, and thus display to parents the progress of the children and the importance of the institution; to see that suitable books are selected for the libraries; to attend the monthly concert for Sunday schools, and enjoin it upon parents as well as teachers to be there; to *study* the utmost simplicity in his manner of exhibiting the truth to juvenile minds;—a point in which ministers greatly fail, and sinfully so, because it is a defect which every one can overcome, if he is determined to do it. In a word, we could hardly express our views better than by holding up the example of

faithful ministerial labour in Sunday schools which we presented in another part of this article. We cannot conceive how a minister, who does not preach in more than one place on a Sabbath, could do more for the cause of Christ, than by spending the afternoon of the Sabbath in promoting Sunday schools throughout his parish, and even beyond it, if it interfere with no other labourer in the vineyard. To be training up several hundred youth in the knowledge of the Scriptures is a great work. Ministers have devoted an undue proportion of their labour to those that are grown up; whilst the young, by far the most hopeful part of their congregations, have been almost wholly neglected. It has been justly said, that there is reason to believe that the amazing want of success in the use of the divinely appointed means of saving men, has been owing in part to the fact, that we commence our efforts to lead mankind into the paths of holiness at a period of life too late by ten or fifteen years. There has been, and still is, too little instruction of the youth.

And is it not the appropriate work of ministers to promote Sunday schools? Do not all expect it of them? Does it not coincide exactly with their occupation and business? And would it not often open a way for them into the houses and affections of those (for there are such within the bounds of every congregation) who seldom attend the preaching of the Gospel? What would be the effect of a minister's spending much of his time in his Sunday schools, talking kindly and faithfully to his dear children, encouraging the timid, leading the inquiring to Jesus? Would it not be of the most desirable kind? A Sunday scholar becomes sick; the pastor hears of it, and kindly visits the little sufferer, talks to him of the love of Jesus, exhorts him to put his trust in Him, prays with him and his afflicted parents, soothes his fears, assists him in preparing to die, sustains his feeble head in the last agonies of failing nature, and closes his fixed, and now sightless, eyes. Oh! will not such kindness open the heart, however long and fast it may have been closed by prejudice, and furnish the opportunity, long desired by the faithful minister, of doing good to the souls of a whole family which had hitherto been without the pale of his influence?

God commands his pastors to care for the lambs of his flock. Our blessed Lord whilst upon the earth did neither despise nor forget them. He tenderly took them into his arms and blessed them. It had been predicted of him, that "He would carry the lambs in his bosom." And it was one

of his last commands, addressed to one of the most distinguished of his apostles, "Feed my lambs." Oh! how blessed will be the lot of that faithful Shepherd who has been the means of saving many of the precious lambs of his flock! Who will be able to say, at the coming of the Great Shepherd, "Behold I, and the children which God hath given me!" But how awful will be the condemnation of that unfaithful pastor who now permits the lambs to wander from the fold, on the dark mountains of sin, to become a prey to ravenous wolves ever ready to devour!

This cursory view of the history of Sabbath schools, their importance, and the operations of the American S. S. Union, we design as an introduction to our future labours in this department. Our readers may expect often to find in the succeeding numbers of the Repertory brief reviews of books prepared for the instruction of our youth, and especially such as are written for Sabbath schools.

---

## REMARKS ON A CERTAIN EXTREME IN PURSUING THE TEMPERANCE CAUSE.

Messrs Editors.

Every friend of religion, of good morals, and of human happiness must, undoubtedly, have rejoiced to witness the recent triumphs of the Temperance cause. The formation of Temperance Societies in every part of our country, and the zeal manifested by many of these associations in enlightening the public mind, in overcoming prejudices, and in rescuing to all appearance multitudes of the young and the old from the jaws of that monster which is daily swallowing up thousands;—cannot be contemplated by any benevolent man without heartfelt pleasure; without cordial thankfulness to that God who has put it into the heart of his people to take these measures, and who has been pleased thus far to crown them with an abundant blessing.

It is also the firm opinion of the writer of this article, that

the plan upon which all Temperance Societies ought to be formed—the *only* wise and efficient plan, is that of *total abstinence* from ardent spirits, unless when prescribed by a physician as a medicine; and a physician, too, who is not himself a tippler. The idea of parleying or treating with such an insidious enemy is as hopeless as it is criminal. He keeps no faith with his votaries. There is every reason to adopt with decision the opinion of the venerable and eloquent *Dr Dwight*, that he who *habitually* drinks *any portion* of ardent spirits, *however small*, ought to deem himself, and to be regarded by others, as in the high road to intemperance, and as in real danger of coming to that deplorable result. Indeed it is delightful to perceive that the public mind is more and more approximating to the conclusion—undoubtedly the correct conclusion—that for persons *in health, of all ages*—WATER is the only proper drink: the most healthful, the most strengthening, and in every respect the most salutary drink. Our *children* ought to be trained up in this habit, both by example and precept; and no one who wishes to live out all his days, and to make the most both of his mind and body, ought ever to allow himself in any other habit. There can be no mistake about this matter. That *all* stimulants, in proportion to their concentrated power, consume the vital principle, and thus undermine the physical strength, is just as demonstrable as any proposition in mathematics. The only wonder is, that enlightened and thinking people should have been so extremely slow in coming to a conclusion which ought, centuries ago, to have been universally admitted and acted on. And here, Messrs Editors, I cannot help expressing my gratitude to the "American Temperance Society," for taking the lead in this business, and for a large amount of benefit which that Institution and its numerous auxiliaries have been the means of conferring on our nation and the world. When I reflect on what has been done, in the course of two or three years, to inform and influence the minds of the American population on this subject, I am filled with wonder, and am constrained to exclaim, 'What hath God wrought!'

That there is a special call for these voluntary efforts in our own country, seems to be generally granted. If we were inhabitants of *France*, of *Spain*, or of some other countries, where, however enormously prevalent other forms of

vice may be, intemperate drinking is comparatively rare ; I should not feel that we were called upon to make any such special efforts. But *here* the appalling predominance of the evil certainly demands a peculiar system of measures. But it is of the utmost importance that our course of proceeding be cautiously devised, and such as, in all its stages, will command the approbation of our wisest and best citizens. The intemperate and infidel part of the community will rejoice to see us doing any thing calculated to produce distraction and division among ourselves.

Now nothing appears to me more fitted to retard the progress, and to discredit the character of this great cause, than adopting, with the honest design of promoting it, such rash and extreme measures as cannot fail to shake the confidence of many in our general system ; totally to alienate others ; and, in the end, to produce a serious counteraction, which may prove deeply injurious, if not finally destructive, to the great plans which we are pursuing. It is by no means a new thing under the sun, that indiscreet, rash, and extravagant friends should do more to injure the cause which they advocate, than the most determined open enemies.

These remarks have been prompted by the intelligence, received through various channels of religious information, that a number of churches in New England and some within the bounds of the Presbyterian church, have adopted the pledge of total abstinence from ardent spirits, unless when prescribed as a medicine, by a physician, as a term of christian communion. So that, from this time, no one shall be admitted to membership in their respective churches, unless he will give this pledge. I observe, also, a notice in the public prints, that a benevolent individual has offered a premium of $250, for the best *Tract*, to be devoted no doubt to the support of the same system of measures. I must say, that I have read these statements with deep regret, and with no little apprehension that, if they be correct—of which I fear there can be no question—the consequences can scarcely fail to be unhappy.

I am altogether at a loss to know on what authority it is, that the pledge in question can be required as a term of christian communion. We are accustomed to believe and say, that as the church is Christ's property, and governed by Christ's laws, it is not consistent with our allegiance to him, to " teach for doctrines the commandments of men," or to

erect standards of faith or practice which he never sanctioned. Now, though intemperance is undoubtedly forbidden in scripture, and is, therefore, a proper ground of exclusion from the privileges of the church; yet I have never seen in the Bible a law which forbids the use of ardent spirits, or any other kind of stimulating drink, in all degrees, and in all cases whatsoever. Of consequence, if a person be in the habit of drinking a small portion of this kind of strong drink every day, under the sincere impression that it does him good, and I have known many such people, however much it may be to be regretted, and however entire our conviction may be that such an individual is labouring under an entire mistake; still if he manifest no intemperance; if none of the visible effects of the intemperate use of strong drink are discernible in his case; by what law of Christ is he to be excluded from the church? Does the great Head of the church require, in his word, such a pledge as that which is now in question? It may be confidently affirmed that he does not. From what source, then, is it derived? Who gave man authority to demand it? And who, of course, gave authority, if it be refused, to make it the ground of exclusion from the sacred family?

It cannot be doubted that there are thousands ready to concur in the "total abstinence" system, and ready to give a personal voluntary pledge to that amount, who would steadfastly resist every attempt to make that pledge a term of communion. Thus, by the adoption of such a measure, churches would inevitably be distracted and divided, and the cordial friends of the temperance cause arrayed against each other.

Will it be said that the principle on which the demand of such a pledge is maintained, is that on which Paul acted when he said, "For meat commendeth us not to God; for neither if we eat are we the better; neither if we eat not, are we the worse. But take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to those who are weak. For if any man see thee, which hast knowledge, sit at meat in the idol's temple, shall not the conscience of him which is weak be emboldened to eat those things which are offered to idols, and through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish for whom Christ died? But when ye sin against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ. Wherefore, if meat make my brother to

offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." I say, is this the alleged warrant for making the pledge in question a term of communion? If it be, I am persuaded it will by no means sustain the weight which is attempted to be laid upon it.

The apostle is here making an appeal to christian principle and feeling in behalf of tender consciences. And after deciding that there is no sin in eating meat; nay, that, in itself considered, there is no sin in eating even the meat which has been exposed for sale in an idol's temple; yet he thinks and pronounces that it is very improper to run the risk of giving any offence by doing that, which though not in itself unlawful, will be very likely to be misconstrued, and to put a stumbling block in a brother's way. He, therefore, with that magnanimous and disinterested spirit for which he was remarkable, resolves, that, if eating meat should make his brother to offend, he would eat none as long as he lived, lest he should make his brother to offend. But does the apostle direct that giving a similar pledge on the part of every candidate for church membership at Corinth, shall be a term of admission? Nothing like it. The truth is, there are many christian duties, plain, undoubted and important, which, yet, can never be enforced as terms of communion. It is manifestly the duty of every one to contribute to the relief of the poor, and to the propagation of the Gospel throughout the world; and to do it "according to his ability," and "as God hath prospered him." But does one professing christian in a thousand really do this, in the spirit, and to the extent of the command? Probably not even this proportion. But does any reasonable man dream of making a rigid, or even a tolerably decent compliance with this law, a term of christian communion? No, the very suggestion would be considered as an extravagance to be at once rejected. In fact, such a law could not be enforced. Every such thing must necessarily be left to the conscience, and to the voluntary decision of each individual. And if a church member, or a candidate for membership, possess thousands, or even millions of silver and gold, and cannot be prevailed upon, at the same time, to give more than a trifling pittance to benevolent and religious objects; still, it is presumed, no one would think of excluding him from the church on this account alone. His friends may lament the fact, may mourn over it, and consider it as deserving of severe censure; yet the idea

of making it the ground of rejection or excommunication from the privileges of the church, probably never occurred to the mind of any reasonable man, as either practicable or safe; and he who should attempt the execution of such a plan, would be very soon taught, by the mischievous operation of his scheme, and by the frowns of all prudent men, that he had not been guided by that wisdom which is from above. The same principle may be applied to a thousand other things. The spirit, nay the express law, of our holy religion, requires all christians to be kind and tender hearted, forgiving and amiable in all their social and domestic relations. But it is only the grosser and more palpable violations of this law, that can possibly be made the subject of church discipline. If a man be guilty of lying, slander, fraud, or gross cruelty, in his social or domestic intercourse, he will not be received into any church that is pure and faithful; or if already in it, he will be immediately cast out. But is there not an undefinable range of churlishness, harshness, perverseness, and the total absence of every thing like a spirit of accommodation and benevolence, which though criminal in the sight of God, and hateful in the sight of all good men, can never be made the ground of formal rejection from the fellowship of Christ's family? In short, would not the visible church be involved in perpetual and destructive conflicts, if many things, which, though duties, and very important duties, were not left to the consciences and volitions of each individual, but were attempted to be enforced by ecclesiastical sanctions?

Another illustration of the great principle for which I contend, may be given. The use of tobacco, as a habit, is, as I believe, next to that of ardent spirits, one of the most pernicious of those that now curse society. It is pronounced by wise physicians, to be highly injurious to the nervous system and stomach in multitudes of melancholy cases; to be the means of gradually undermining the health, and ultimately destroying the lives of thousands. It is doubtless a powerful, and often fatal provocative to intemperate drinking; and is the parent of countless mischiefs in society. But what then? Besides exerting every fair and moral influence, by the circulation of suitable tracts, and by every method of private address, for the purpose of producing voluntary abstinence from this noxious weed; suppose, for a moment, that the use of tobacco, in any way, were made

the ground of church censure, and the total abandonment of it, in every form, were proposed as an absolute term of christian communion? Would any prudent ecclesiastical body be willing to demand the pledge? Yet why might it not be demanded, upon the same principle with that which is urged in the case before us? The truth is, when we once enter such a province as this, and undertake to form and enforce laws which Christ never made, we open a door to a thousand caprices of popular delusion, and cannot foretel where the mischief will end.

Perhaps it will be said that the pledge in question is not designed to be a term of communion in any cases excepting those of new churches about to be formed, and of new members, hereafter to be admitted into churches already organized. Now, in such cases, it is thought by some, that a voluntary agreement between the church session and those who may hereafter come in, may form a lawful compact; and that where it is acceded to, no injury is done. But is it doing no injury to an individual, who resides within the bounds of a particular church, loves it, and is earnestly desirous of being received into its bosom—to reject him on grounds which the Bible knows nothing of? Surely for so serious a decision we ought to be able to show a "thus saith the Lord." But besides this: who authorized us to institute one rule for those who are already, and have long been members of the church, and another for those who are to be newly introduced? It seems, in this case, that if the old members are detected in using ardent spirits, provided they be guilty of no intemperance, they will incur no censure. But if the new ones do the very same thing, they must be excommunicated. Why spare the former? I suppose it will be answered, because they violate no acknowledged law of Christ. The latter, then, are to be cast out of Christ's visible family, not for breaking any of his known laws; but for violating a voluntary pledge, or compact! Now who does not see that if voluntary compact may thus come in, and make a term of communion of whatever it pleases, total abstinence from tea and coffee, as enervating injurious liquors, or total abstinence from the use of imported sugar, or broad-cloths, as hurtful to some of the important interests of the country—may be agreed upon as a term of ecclesiastical communion, and the most guarded use of them made the ground of solemn excommunication!

The superstitious Romanists, we know, adopted in old

times from the Pagans, the plan of a double code of laws; one for perfect christians, and another for the imperfect. It is hardly necessary to say, that the operation of this plan made strange work, and led to many corruptions. Should we not be in danger of introducing a state of things somewhat similar, if the scheme against which I am contending were generally adopted? One thing is certain, that until the old members should all "die off," we should have two different rules in operation for the older and the younger ranks of professors.

It were well if such of the advocates of this proscribing system as belong to the presbyterian church, would calculate the consequences of the adoption of that system. Church members who are visited with censure under it, will have a right to appeal to their respective Presbyteries, and, ultimately, if they should see cause, to the general assembly. But is there the smallest probability that our higher judicatories would or could confirm such an unscriptural sentence? And if not, will not the pronouncing such sentences, in the first instance, have a tendency to discredit and weaken the cause of scriptural discipline? It is believed that, in at least one instance, a sentence of this kind has been already reversed by a higher judicatory. And this must ever be the case, especially in the last resort. A presbytery may perhaps be found, here and there, which, from local excitement, may fall in with such a scheme of discipline. But the time is, probably, far distant when a synod, or a general assembly will be disposed to take the same course.

If it be asked, what course professing christians, as such, shall take as far as possible to banish this destroyer from our land—I reply,

1. Let them go on with untiring and growing zeal to do what they have so laudably and efficiently begun to do. Let them fill every town, village, congregation, college, academy and private school in the United States with voluntary temperance societies, formed upon the total abstinence plan. Let these societies circulate, as numerously and widely as possible, well written, popular tracts, adapted to enlighten and impress the minds of all classes of people on this subject. Let ministers, elders and private christians co-operate with zeal in forming such societies, in circulating such publications, and in expressing suitable sentiments on the sub-

ject, on every proper occasion, in public and private. In short, let them endeavour to enlist the whole population of the land in voluntary associations, and in voluntary efforts, of all wise and lawful kinds, to put down so enormous an evil. But let them all be *voluntary*, entirely *voluntary;* and they will all be, unless I utterly mistake the character of the human mind, on that very account, the more acceptable and the more effectual.

2. Let all our churches be more careful than they have ever yet been to exercise vigilant and faithful discipline when any of their members subject themselves, in the least palpable degree, to the charge of intemperance. There have been by far too much indulgence and laxity on this subject in most of our churches. Aberrations of this kind have, in many cases, passed unnoticed, until they became habitual and gross. This ought no longer to be the case. Let the rulers of our churches be as watchful and decisive in calling to an account and censuring those who are visibly intemperate, as they usually are with respect to some other sins, not more destructive either to personal character, or to social order, than this, and the consequences will, undoubtedly, be happy. *A Friend to Temperance Societies.*

---

## REVIEW.

*Regeneration, and the Manner of its Occurrence. A Sermon from John* v. 24. *Preached at the Opening of the Synod of New York, in the Rutgers street Church, on Tuesday Evening, Oct.* 20, 1829. *By Samuel H. Cox, D.D. Pastor of the Laight Street Presbyterian Church. New York.* 1829. *Pp.* 42.

Voltaire, in one of his historical works, sneeringly inquires, "how were the priests employed while the Saracens were desolating the fairest portion of their church?" "Disputing," he answers, "whether Christ has one will or two!" It will be well, if the theologians of the nineteenth century do not furnish occasion to some future infidel historian for

a similar taunting remark. There is scarcely any subject in the history of the church which is more humiliating than that of theological discussions of this nature. The evil appears to have arisen early, for Paul, in his Epistles to Timothy, repeatedly and earnestly exhorts him, "not to strive about words to no profit," but to avoid "foolish questions, which gender strifes." Yet not a century has passed from that day to this, which has not been disturbed and disgraced by disputes fairly within the apostle's description. That there are serious evils attending controversies of this character, no one will deny. They bring discredit on religion; they alienate brethren who should live together in love; they call off the attention from the practical duties of benevolence and piety; and they are from their nature destructive of the spirit of true religion. These disputes, in nine cases out of ten, turn, not on the correct exposition of the Bible, but on the decision of some point in mental or moral science. Philosophy, instead of being the handmaid of religion, has become the mistress of theology. This is a fact deeply to be lamented. The subjects, we admit, are so nearly allied that they cannot be kept entirely distinct; still theology might have, and ought to have, much less of a philosophical, and more of an exegetical character than it has commonly assumed. The predominance of the former over the latter element in theology, has been unquestionably one of the most prolific sources of evil to the church. What is Pelagianism, Arminianism, or almost any other *ism* but a particular system of religious philosophy? And what are the questions which now alienate and divide christians in this country, but questions in mental or moral science? If a man tells you his theory of virtue, you need ask no questions about his theology. Hence it is that these diversities of opinion are in a great measure confined to professed theologians; clergymen or laymen. The views which ordinary christians, under the guidance of *common sense* and sanctified feeling, take of divine truth, are in all ages and countries very nearly the same. Nor does it seem to us correct to say, that common sense is nothing more than the popularized results of philosophical speculations, because we find it the same in countries where entirely different systems of philosophy have for ages prevailed. Look at Germany and England for an illustration. The philosophical theologians of these countries differ *toto cœlo* in their views. They

have hardly a single principle in common. But how is it with common christians? They are as much united in opinion as they are in feeling. And why? Because their opinions are formed from the Bible, under the guidance of the Spirit, and the influence of those essential and consequently universal principles of our nature, which it has been the grand result of philosophy to sophisticate and pervert. Is all philosophy then to be proscribed? By no means. The very statements we have made demonstrate its importance. If a man's speculative opinions do thus influence his views of religious truth and duty, it is a matter of unspeakable moment that these opinions should be correct. And in a multitude of cases, the only means of preventing the evils which flow from erroneous principles, is to show the fallacy of the principles themselves. Besides, all truth is harmonious, whether taught in the word of God or learned from the constitution of our own nature: and in itself there can be no subject more worthy of accurate knowledge, than that mysterious and immortal principle, which was created in the image of God. All this we cheerfully admit. At the same time the undeniable fact, that systems of philosophy have been as changeable as the wind; that each in its turn has been presented, urged and adopted with the utmost confidence; and each in its measure perverted the simple truths of the Bible, should teach us to be modest: it should teach us to separate the human from the divine element in our theology, and to be careful not to clothe the figments of our own minds with the awful authority of God, and denounce our brethren for not believing him when they do not agree with us. It should teach us too, not to ascribe to men opinions, which according to our notions may be inferred from the principles which they avow. This is an impropriety of very frequent occurrence, and of which we think we have great reason to complain in the sermon before us. To state what appear to us to be fair deductions from principles assumed, as arguments against them, is one thing; but to charge those who hold these principles with holding our deductions, is a very different affair.

With regard to the author of this sermon, we can truly say, that we entertain for him the highest respect. We love his honesty. We admire the frankness and decision with which he always avows his opinions. We rejoice to see that there is little of that evil spirit in the discourse which

so often converts investigations of truth into angry disputations. But while we give Dr Cox full credit for sincerity, and acquit him of entertaining any bad feelings towards his brethren, we still think that he is chargeable with grossly misrepresenting their opinions, and holding them up to a contempt and reprobation, due only to his acknowledged caricature. We refer specially to page 6, of the Introduction, where after stating that there are certain dogmas, "some of them not proved; or even suspected by those who employ them," which have a tendency "to solace the sinner in his distance from Christ," and "excuse his disobedience to the Gospel, and which ought to be rejected, as false and ruinous," he gives the following specifications:

"A man has no ability to do his duty.

"Where the means of grace are purely and abundantly vouchsafed, by the sovereign goodness of Providence, a man can do nothing for, but can only counteract, his own salvation; having no ability, even if he had the inclination, to believe the Gospel and be saved.

"The wickedness of men consists in physical defect or disorganization of the faculties of the soul, so that total depravity and physical depravity are nearly synonymous, and both equally true.

"Regeneration is the implantation of *a certain kind of* "principle of holiness," which is incapable of definition, or demonstration, and has no connexion with human consciousness; which precedes all active mental holiness, and is antecedent also to all "the fruit of the Spirit," as specified in the New Testament; in the susception and sustentation of which, the Creator is sole as well as sovereign agent; man no agent at all, but only a passive receiver, an unconscious subject, of the mysterious gratuity; and which is the happy contrary of a *principle of sin*, which is concreated with us, and is the permanent fund of all our depravity, in which also we are passive—though quite active in exercising all the wickedness which flows (full copiously) from such an inserted fountain, and which has its residence and location somewhere in the texture of the soul, which is itself a very wicked thing somehow physiologically, in the very nature of it, antecedent to any agency at all of ours.

"Regeneration consists in some secret physical motion on the soul, which restores its dislocated powers, and cures the connatural diseases of its texture; since the work of the Creator, as such, is not "good," but lays the foundation, in the very entity of the soul, for all its overt wickedness, and for the necessity of regeneration.

"The soul is passive, entirely passive, and God the sole agent, in regeneration.

"The means of grace, and the Gospel itself, are in no sense

moral causes of regeneration; since their important use is merely to illustrate the strength of an invincible depravity, to make the sinner worse and worse, till he is physically regenerated, and then to signalize the prodigious efforts and labours of Omnipotence, in this department of constant miracle-working:—as if there were no considerable difference between dividing the Red Sea symbolically by the rod of Moses, and conciliating the human mind by the revealed glories of the *everlasting* Gospel!

"It is wrong to require a sinner in the name of God to repent immediately, and believe the Gospel, and to urge him to this as the only way of salvation.

"The offer of salvation is not made to every hearer; or, if it be, to accept it is impracticable, and to require this of the sinner, wanton and absurd.

"If there is a universal offer in the Gospel, it is founded—not on the atonement of Jesus Christ at all, but only on the ministerial commission; or on human ignorance of who the elect are; or it has no moral foundation; or it is only man's offer, and not God's; or it is a matter of mere sovereignty, and so insoluble; or it is an offer in form, and in fact no offer or overture at all: and this, although there is no salvation known to the Gospel but that of our Lord Jesus Christ as an *atoning* Saviour. Prov. i. 20—33. Luke, xiv. 24. Acts, iv. 12; xiii. 26. 46."

The Doctor then says, "if I have caricatured these dogmas, I have done so intentionally: but only by representing them as they are, and making the reality govern the appearance." It is not probable that Dr Cox, in writing these paragraphs, had any one class of theologians exclusively in his eye; because some of "these dogmas" are inconsistent with each other. We have no doubt however that most of what is here stated, was intended as an exhibition of the doctrines of the old Calvinists (sit venia verbo). Our reason for thinking so is, that we are accustomed to see such, and even still more gross misrepresentations of these doctrines, though we acknowledge not often, from such men as Dr Cox. It is however notorious that this class of theologians are constantly represented as maintaining that "man has no ability, even if he had the inclination, to believe the Gospel and be saved,"—that man's depravity "is a physical defect"—that regeneration is "a physical change," &c. Representations have been made of these doctrines which we had supposed no man, who felt the obligation "of interpreting language in conformity with the known and declared nature of the thing described," could ever allow himself to make. Belonging as we do to the class, which for the sake of convenience and

distinction, we have called old Calvinists, we feel ourselves aggrieved by such representations, and called upon to show that no such doctrines can be fairly imputed to the elder Calvinists. It will not be expected that in a single article we should go over the formidable list presented by Dr Cox. We shall, for the present at least, confine ourselves to the doctrine of this sermon, and show that the old standard Calvinistic authors expressly disclaim the opinions here imputed to them, and that they are not fairly deducible from any of the principles which they avow. Should we entirely fail as to the second point, it would still be very unjust to charge men with holding doctrines, which they constantly disclaim, because we consider them as flowing from their principles.

The two main points of Dr Cox's sermon are, first, that regeneration is a moral, in distinction from a physical change; and secondly, that it occurs in a manner perfectly accordant with the active powers of the soul. We use the word physical, not as synonymous with natural, but in the sense in which it is used in this sermon, implying something referring to the substance or essence. By physical regeneration in this sense, is intended a change in the essence or essential properties of the soul, or, in the language of Dr Cox, an influence by which "the connatural diseases in the texture of the soul are healed." Our object is to show that Dr Cox has misrepresented the views of his brethren on this subject; that they hold to no change in the substance of the soul nor in any of its essential properties, but uniformly teach that the change is a moral one, and takes place in a manner perfectly congruous to the nature of a rational and active being. We appeal to the language and doctrines of all the old Calvinistic divines, in support of this assertion.

Charnock, in his discourse on regeneration, contained in Vol. II. of the folio edition of his works, proposes in the first place to state in reference to the nature of this change, what it is not. On page 72, he says, "It is not a removal or taking away of the old substance or faculties of the soul. Some thought that the substance of Adam's soul was corrupted when he sinned, therefore suppose the substance of his soul to be altered when he is renewed. Sin took not away the essence but the rectitude; the new creation therefore gives not a new faculty but a new quality." Who the "some" were, to whom Charnock refers, as holding that the substance of Adam's soul was corrupted by the fall, we know

not; all we know is that such is not the doctrine of any respectable body of Calvinists, nor of any standard writer on the subject. The only man of whom we have heard, who taught this doctrine, was Flaccius Illyricus, Professor at Jena, and a pupil of Luther; but we know too, that his opinions on this subject were condemned, almost without a dissenting voice, by the reformed theologians of Germany and England.

On the 73d page, Charnock says expressly, "the essence and faculties remain the same." "The passions and affections are the same as to the substance and nature of the acts; but the difference lies in the objects." "When a man loves God, or fears God, or loves man, or fears man, it is the same act of love and the same act of fear; there are the same motions of the soul, the same substantial acts simply considered," &c. "This new creation is not a destruction of the substance of the soul, but there is the same physical being, and the same faculties in all, and nothing is changed in its substance as it respects the nature of man." P. 85. We have here a most explicit disavowal of the doctrine of physical regeneration in the sense in which Dr Cox represents the old Calvinists as holding it.

As to the manner in which this work is effected, he remarks, in the first place, that "it is a secret work, and therefore difficult to explain." "Yet, secondly, this is evident, that it is rational, that is, congruous to the essential nature of man. God does not deal with us as beasts, or as creatures destitute of sense, but as creatures of an intelligent order. Who is there that believes in Christ, as heavy things fall to the earth, or as beasts run at the beck of their sensual appetites without rule or reason?" P. 217. "God that requires of us a reasonable service, would work upon us by a reasonable operation. God therefore works by the way of a spiritual illumination of the understanding, in propounding the creature's happiness by arguments and reasons; and in the way of a spiritual impression on the will, moving it sweetly to embrace that happiness, and the means to it which he doth propose; and indeed without this work preceding, the motion of the will could never be regular." P. 218.

In speaking more particularly of the direct operation of the Holy Spirit on the will, his first proposition is, that there is such an influence; second, that "this work, though immediate, is not compulsive. It is a contradiction for the will to be moved unwillingly: any force upon it destroys its nature.

It is not forced because it is according to reason, and the natural motion of the creature; the understanding proposing and the will embracing; the understanding going before with light, the will following after with love." "The will being a rational faculty cannot be wrought upon but rationally." P. 221.

The instrumentality of the truth in regeneration is strongly asserted by all old Calvinists. Charnock says, "that to make an alteration in us according to our nature of understanding, will and affections, it is necessary there should be some declaration of things under those considerations of true, good and delightful, in the highest manner, to make a choice change in every faculty of the soul; and without this a man cannot be changed as a rational creature," &c. P. 233. "The word operates, first, objectively, as it is a declaration of the will of God, and presenting the objects of all holy acts; and secondly, it has an active force. It is operative in the hand of God for sanctification." "The spirit doth so edge the word that it cuts to the quick, discerns the very thoughts, insinuates into the depths of the heart," &c. P. 235. "To conclude, the promise in the word breeds principles in the heart suitable to itself; it shows God a father and raises up principles of love and reverence; it shows Christ a Mediator, and raises up faith and desire. Christ in the word conceives Christ in the heart, Christ in the word the beginning of grace conceives Christ in the heart the hope of glory." P. 236. The use of the word in regeneration is surely according to this view something more than "the rod of Moses stretched out over the Red Sea." We presume, however, that the paragraph in which Dr Cox denounces the opinion that the means of grace have no tendency to produce holiness, was designed for a different quarter. Old Calvinists have generally been charged with laying too much stress on the use of means.

Charnock was by no means singular in the views here expressed. Living as he did in the days of the Puritan ascendancy in England, the companion of Owen, Goodwin, Burgess, Bates, and many others of the same class, he was united with them in opinion as well as in labours.

Owen, in his work on the Spirit, when speaking of regeneration, lays down the following proposition, (p. 270 of the folio edition). "In whom or towards whomsoever the Holy Spirit puts forth his power, or the acts of his grace for their

regeneration, it removes all obstacles, overcomes all opposition, and infallibly produces the effect intended." But how is this done? Is it by changing the substance of the soul or violating any of the laws of its being? The words which immediately follow, and which are intended to explain this general proposition contain the answer. "The power which the Holy Spirit puts forth in our regeneration, is such in its actings or exercise, as our minds, wills and affections are suited to be wrought upon, and to be affected by, according to their natures and natural operations. He doth neither act in them any otherwise than they themselves are meet to be moved and to move, to be acted and to act, according to their own nature, power and ability. He draws us with the cords of a man, and the work itself is expressed by a persuading; 'God persuade Japhet; I will allure her into the wilderness and speak comfortably:' for, as it is certainly effectual, so it carries no more repugnancy to our faculties than a prevalent persuasion doth." One can hardly imagine how men who use such language can be charged with holding a "physical regeneration," by which, "the connatural diseases of the texture of soul" are cured. Owen proceeds to say, secondly, that the Holy Spirit "doth not in our regeneration possess the mind with any enthusiastical impressions; but he works on the minds of men in and by their own natural actings, through an immediate influence and impression of his power. 'Create in me a clean heart, O God.' He worketh to will and to do. Thirdly, he therefore offers no violence or compulsion to the will. This that faculty is not naturally capable to give admission unto. If it be compelled it is destroyed." And again on the next page, "the Holy Spirit who in his power and operation is more intimate, as it were, unto the principles of our souls than they are to themselves, doth, with the preservation and in the exercise of the liberty of our wills, effectually work our regeneration and conversion unto God. This is the substance of what we have to plead for in this cause, and which declares the nature of this work of regeneration, as it is an inward spiritual work."

Bates's view of the manner in which this change is effected, is the same with that of Owen. In the fourth volume of his works (octavo edition) page 140, he says, "the effectual operation of grace does not violate the native freedom of the will, but is congruous to it. God's drawing is by teach-

ing: 'every one who hath heard and learned of the father cometh unto me.' When the author of the Gospel is a teacher of it, the most stupid and obstinate sinners shall be convinced and obedient." Again, "God draws sinners to himself 'with the cords of a man,' in a rational way without violence to their faculties, and fastens them by the bonds of love." In another place, Vol. II. p. 298, he says, "the Holy Spirit does not work grace in us, as the sun forms gold in the earth, without any sense in ourselves of his operations: but we feel them in all our faculties congruously to their nature, enlightening the mind, exciting the conscience, turning the will, and purifying the affections."

The opinions of the reformed, or Calvinistic divines of Germany and Holland were the same on these points, as those of the Calvinists of England. Turretin, Theol. Elenct. loc. 15, quæst. 4, § 15, says, "Gratiæ efficacis motio non est simpliciter physica, quia agitur de facultate morali, quæ congruenter naturæ suæ moveri debet; nec simpliciter ethica, quasi Deus objective solum ageret et leni suasione uteretur, quod pertendebant Pelagiani: sed supernaturalis est et divina, quæ transcendit omnia hæc genera." "Potens est, ne sit frustranea; suavis est, ne sit coacta. Vis est summa et inexpugnabilis ut vincatur naturæ corruptio et summa bene agendi impotentia ac male agendi necessitas: sed amica tamen et grata, qualis naturam intelligentem et rationalem decet."

The Synod of Dort, in order to prevent any misapprehension of their views of efficacious grace, as though it were inconsistent in its operation with the rational and moral powers of our nature, say in reference to the fourth article in dispute between them and the Remonstrants, "Sicuti vero per lapsum homo non desiit esse homo, intellectu et voluntate præditus, nec peccatum, quod universum genus humanum pervasit, naturam generis humani sustulit, sed depravavit et spiritualiter occidit: ita etiam hæc divina regenerationis gratia, non agit in hominibus tanquam truncis et stipitibus, nec voluntatem ejusque proprietates tollit, aut invitam violenter cogit, sed spiritualiter, sanat, corrigit, suaviter simul et potenter flectit: ut ubi antea plene dominabatur carnis rebellio et resistentia nunc regnare incipiat prompta ac sincera spiritus obedientia; in quo vera et spiritualis nostræ voluntatis libertas consistit.

Spanheim, in his Elench. Controv. cum August. Confess.

Theol. Oper. tom. iii. col. 909, after stating how nearly the views of the Lutheran divines coincided with those of Calvinists on this subject, says that the difference which did exist seemed to result from a misapprehension of the calvinistic doctrine. Supponunt precario, he says, 1. "Nos velle per gratiam insuperabilem, motionem coäctam, violentam, qualis trunci, lapidis, &c. 2. Negare nos resistibilitatem gratiæ respectu naturæ corruptæ, et carnis Deo inimicæ, qua sanè quantum in se est nimis resistit."

Stapfer, in his Institut. Theol. Polem. Cap. III. § 136, maintains in unison with the common mode of speaking among Calvinists of his day, that there was in regeneration a divine illumination of the understanding, and a divine influence on the will. What he intended by these expressions he carefully explains. "Per illuminationem autem intelligimus convictionem supernaturalem veritatum revelatarum, et nexus illarum distinctam repræsentationem." And this, he says, though certainly producing conviction, offers no more violence to the mind than the demonstration of a proposition in geometry. "Neque magis, (are his words) hominis libertati obesse potest, ac illi aliquid derogatur, si sole post tenebras redeunte objecta circumjacentia ipsi clare repræsentantur, aut si de veritate geometrica per illius demonstrationem convincitur." With regard to the influence which operates on the will, he says, "Pono ita agit, ut homo in determinatione sua liber maneat, neque obtorto quasi collo et invitus trahitur; facit ut homo volens agat. Veritatem tam clare mentibus ingerit, ut non possint non assentiri, et tanta motiva voluntati suggerit, ut non possit nolle, sed featur: Pellexisti me Jehova, et pellectus sum, fortior fuisti me, et prævaluisti. Jer. xx. 7."

This he asserts over and over, is the true calvinistic doctrine. This he does, not only in his chapters on Pelagianism and Arminianism, where he is answering precisely the same objection, which (and it is one of the wonders of the age) Calvinists are now urging against Calvinism, viz. that efficacious grace, as explained by them, is inconsistent with the nature of man as a rational and responsible creature; but also in his chapter De Consensu et Dissensu Protestantium, and in his preliminary statement of the general truths of theology.

We fear that we have already exhausted the patience of our readers, in proving a point concerning which every one

acquainted with Calvinistic writers must have been satisfied before we began. We hope however that our labour will not be regarded as altogether unnecessary; because when an imputation comes from a source in every way so respectable, and in fact so highly respected, the inference will be, that in sober truth old Calvinists do hold, that the texture of the soul is diseased; that its substance is changed in regeneration; that some unknown violence to its faculties is suffered under the Spirit's influence. It is proper, therefore, that it should be shown, that the direct reverse of all this is distinctly declared by them to be their opinion; that they profess to believe regeneration to be a moral and not a physical change; and that it takes place without any violence being done to the soul or any of its laws. Our readers too will be led, we trust, to think with us, that there should be something more than mere inferential reasoning, to justify ascribing to men a set of opinions which they constantly and earnestly disclaim.

We are perfectly willing to admit, that old Calvinists, when treating on the subject of regeneration, often speak of a direct and physical influence of the Spirit on the soul. But in what sense? In the sense in which Dr Cox represents them as holding physical regeneration? Far from it. He says that physical regeneration and physical depravity stand together. He thus uses the word as qualifying the effect produced. They use it to qualify the influence exerted in producing the effect. But what do they mean when they speak of a physical influence being exerted on the soul in regeneration? They mean precisely what we suppose Dr Cox means, when he speaks of "the agency of the Spirit, apart from the power of the truth, which is his instrument." P. 27. They mean to assert that regeneration is not effected by mere moral suasion; that there is something more than the simple presentation of truth and urging of motives. The idea of Calvinists uniformly was, that the truth, however clearly presented or forcibly urged, would never produce its full effect without a special influence of the Holy Spirit. This influence they maintained was supernatural, that is, above the mere moral power of the truth, and such as infallibly to secure the result, and yet, to use their own illustration, did the soul no more violence than demonstration does the intellect, or persuasion the heart. This opinion is not confined to any one class of Calvinists:

as far as we know it is common to them all. We understand Dr Cox as teaching the same doctrine. In fact we know no Calvinist who denies it. The author of the review, in the last number of the Christian Spectator, of the strictures of Dr Tyler on some previous articles in that work, says, "We have never called in question the doctrine of an immediate or direct agency of the Spirit, on the soul, in regeneration." This is all the old Calvinists intended by physical influence. That this assertion is correct is evident from the fact that they taught, as we have seen above, that this influence is perfectly "congruous" to the nature of the soul, doing it no more violence than, in the language of Owen, "an effectual persuasion doth;" and that it produces no physical change in the substance of the soul or any of its faculties. Unless therefore we mean to interpret their language, not according to their clear and often repeated statements of their meaning, but according to the sense which a particular expression has attained among ourselves, we must admit that no part of the proof of the charge which we are considering can be made to rest on the occurrence of the phrase "physical influence," in their writings. But there is still further evidence that our assertion on this subject is correct, which is derived from the fact, that it is in controversy with those who taught that there was no influence beyond "moral suasion" and "common grace" exerted in regeneration, that the older writers maintained what they sometimes called a physical influence of the Spirit*.

Turretin, in the passage quoted above, describing the nature of the influence exerted in regeneration, says, that it is not merely a moral influence, such as the Pelagians contend for, but supernatural and divine; and immediately adds, "aliquid de ethico et physico participat," where it is plain that it is in opposition to the Pelagian doctrine that he uses this expression; precisely as Dr Cox would do the words, direct and immediate. When the Remonstrants arose, they objected strongly to the modes of expressions which had become common among the Reformed theologians on the subject of efficacious grace. This led to a more precise state-

* This expression however is by no means so common as that of "direct and immediate influence," and is so carefully guarded as to prevent any justifiable mistake as to its meaning.

ment of what their real doctrines were on this subject, and they uniformly repelled the imputations of their opponents that they taught that this influence was inconsistent with the rational nature of the soul. They very unwillingly used even the word irresistible, which they said was no word of their selection, but was put upon them by the Jesuits and Remonstrants. It afterwards indeed became very common; but they tell us they intended by it, nothing more than, certainly efficacious. Stapfer, cap. 17, p. 540, says, in answer to such objections, that when the Reformed speak of irresistible grace, "hoc volunt, ita efficaciter divinam gratiam operari, ut hominis resistentiam infallibiliter superet, *ut sausio ipsius* tantæ sit efficaciæ ut homo non possit non velle summaque spontaneitate sequi." The necessity or certainty as to the result for which they contended, was none other than that for which president Edwards and all other Calvinists contend, and which is inconsistent with no other theory of liberty than that of indifference. If any man would candidly compare one passage with another in the writings of old Calvinists, and interpret their language agreeably to the fair rules of construction, there could be no doubt as to their meaning, by physical influence, what Dr Cox, we presume, means by "an influence apart from the truth." Charnock, in speaking on this subject, says, in the general, that the work is secret, yet "congruous to the essential nature of the soul." He then states more particularly, first, that there is "an immediate and supernatural work on the will:" as synonymous with this expression he on the next page uses the words "physical operation." His second proposition is, that "this work, though immediate, is not compulsive and by force." "The will being a rational faculty cannot be wrought upon but rationally," is one of his assertions, in explanation of his idea of this immediate influence. "God, who knows how to make a will with a principle of freedom, knows how to work upon the will, without intrenching upon or altering the essential privilege he bestowed upon it," is another. His third position is, that this immediate work, "is free and gentle." "A constraint not by force, *but love.*" "It is sweet and alluring: the Spirit of grace is called *the oil of gladness;* it is a ready and delightful motion which it causes in the will; it is a sweet efficacy, and an efficacious sweetness." Is this "to paralize the soul, or to strike it through with a moral panic?"

Surely Dr Cox will regret having made such a representation of the views of men whose opinions as to *the nature* of divine influence do not differ one tittle from his own. "At what time," Charnock goes on to say, "God doth savingly work upon the will, to draw the soul from sin and the world to himself, it doth with the greatest willingness, freedom and delight, follow after God, turn to him, close with him, and cleave to him, with all the heart, and with purpose never to depart from him. Cant. i. 4. *Draw me, and we will run after thee:* drawing signifies the efficacious power of grace; running signifies the delightful motion of grace: the will is drawn, as if it would not come; it comes, as if it were not drawn. His grace is so sweet and so strong, that he neither wrongs the liberty of his creature, nor doth prejudice his absolute power. As God moves necessary causes, necessarily; contingent causes, contingently; so he moves free agents freely, without offering violence to their natures. The Spirit glides into the heart by sweet illapses of grace, and victoriously allures the soul. Hos. ii. 14. *I will allure her, and speak to her heart;* not by crossing, but changing the inclination, by the all conquering and alluring charms of love," &c. 222. The fourth proposition is, that this influence is "insuperably victorious," or, in other words, irresistible. In what sense is it irresistible? Let the following explanation from Charnock in this immediate connexion answer, and prevent those brethren reproaching us for a word, who agree with us as to the thing intended. "As the demonstration of the Spirit is clear and undeniable, so the power of the Spirit is sweet and irresistible; both are joined, 1 Cor. ii. 4. An inexpressible sweetness allures the soul, and an unconquerable power draws the soul; there are clear demonstrations, charming persuasions, and invincible efficacy combined in the work. He leaves not the will in indifference. (This is what they were arguing against.) If God were the author of faith only by putting the will into indifference, though it be determined by its own proper liberty, why may not he also be said to be the author of unbelief, if by the same liberty of indifference it be determined to reject the Gospel?" "*This irresistibleness takes not away the liberty of the will.* Our Saviour's obedience was free and voluntary, yet necessary and irresistible." "Is God not freely and voluntarily good, yet necessarily so? He cannot be otherwise than good; he will not be otherwise than good. So the will

is irresistibly drawn, and yet doth freely come to its own happiness." It is perfectly evident therefore that nothing more was intended by this expression than what president Edwards and all other Calvinists contend for, viz. moral or philosophical necessity. Now when it is remembered that all the expressions which we have quoted, and much more of the same import, are used in explanation of the nature of that divine influence by which regeneration is effected, we think that our readers will feel, that the strongest possible evidence should be required, to sustain the charge against those who use them, of holding doctrines utterly inconsistent with their most clearly expressed opinions. We think that any candid man will acknowledge, who should take the trouble to read the writings of the older Calvinists, that they held no other doctrines on the subject of divine influence than such as are common among all classes of opposers of Arminianism. Their "supernatural" or "physical" influence meant nothing more than what is now intended by "a direct and immediate influence." Owen, whose language on this subject is as strong as that of any writer with whom we are acquainted, states clearly, as we have already seen, his belief that the influence for which he contended, is perfectly "congruous" to the nature of the soul. He tells us also, page 257, that it is against the Pelagian theory that he is arguing when he maintains that moral suasion alone does not effect our regeneration, but that there is a direct agency of the Spirit in the work, which is such "as our minds, wills and affections are suited to be wrought upon and affected by, according to their natures and natural operations."

But if old Calvinists held such opinions, (and they hold them still,) on "the nature of regeneration and the mode of its occurrence," where is the difference between them and Dr Cox? None in the world, as far as these general statements go. His general propositions, that regeneration is a moral, and not a physical change, and that it takes place in a manner accordant to the nature of the soul, are as orthodox as Owen or Charnock could wish them. We take it for granted, however, that Dr Cox would think we had treated him rather unhandsomely thus to convict him of *old* orthodoxy. We proceed therefore to state where the difference really lies. It is simply this. All the old Calvinists, and the great majority, we hope and believe, of the new school also, hold

that the *result* of the Holy Spirit's operation on the soul, is a holy principle or disposition; Dr Cox says, if we understand him, that the result is a holy act. This is the whole ground of debate, and to lookers on it may appear rather too narrow to be worth disputing about. Dr Cox however seems to think that this is a subject of vital importance, affecting deeply our views of the whole system of divine truth, and our manner of preaching; involving the high questions of the grounds of man's accountability, the nature of sin and holiness, and of human liberty. And here we are sorry to say we agree with him. We are afraid that this is a turning point. We do not see how it is possible to hold together the tattered shreds of Calvinism, if this ground be assumed. Is Calvinism then a mere metaphysical system? We think not. But there are some metaphysical opinions utterly inconsistent with it; that indifference is necessary to the freedom of the will is one, and that morality consists in acts only, we fear is another.

All the ground that we have for supposing that Dr Cox holds this latter opinion, is found in the pamphlet under review. And even here it is not distinctly asserted; but it seems to be constantly implied, and to be the foundation of all that is peculiar in the sermon or introduction. The principle assumed is, that there is nothing in the soul but its substance with its essential attributes, and its acts. Therefore, if regeneration be not a change in its acts, it must be a change in the substance. If sin be not an act, then it is substance, "an entity," "a disease of the texture of the soul." This, we take it, is the ground of the imputation, that Calvinists believe in physical depravity and physical regeneration; for if this principle be not assumed, there is not even the slender and insufficient ground of these doctrines being deducible, in the author's opinion, from Calvinistic principles, to justify the charge. Besides, every one knows that this is the ground on which this charge has been made before, in a manner far more offensive and unfair than Dr Cox is capable of making it. It is on this ground, also, we presume that Dr Cox maintains that the soul is as active in regeneration, as in repentance or the exercise of faith. And it is on this ground, we suppose, that he ridicules the idea of regeneration being the production of a holy principle in the soul, "the happy contrary," as he calls it, "of a principle of sin, which is concreated with us." This view of the doctrine

of regeneration, (that it is the production of a holy principle,) he says, can "command the confidence of no well disciplined mind," (rather a bold assertion by the way,) and then adds, "By holy principle *I* mean love to God, and not any thing antecedent to it; and by love to God, I mean loving him; and in that the subject is active."

Dr Cox, we believe, pins his faith to no man's sleeve, and is the follower of no party. His opinions are his own; but what they are we pretend not to know, further than they are developed in this discourse. He has here brought forward the charge against many of his brethren, whom he loves, and who love him, of believing in physical depravity and physical regeneration. On what grounds he rests the charge we have no means of ascertaining, but from the opinions advanced in this discourse. We are anxious to show, that, as far as old Calvinists are concerned, the imputation is unfounded. And we think that we have shown, to the satisfaction of every candid reader, that these doctrines are constantly and explicitly disclaimed by this class of theologians. When it is asserted, therefore, in the face of such positive declarations to the contrary, that they do entertain these opinions, it can only be on the ground that they are fair inferences from the principles which they avow. This, though a very improper ground for a direct imputation, is all, we are persuaded, that can exist. How Dr Cox would endeavour to make it appear that these are fair inferences, we do not know, and therefore do not wish to be considered, in our further remarks on this subject, as having reference to Dr Cox's theological opinions any further than they are distinctly avowed in this sermon. Our object is simply this; to endeavour to show that the Calvinistic doctrine, that regeneration consists in the production of a holy habit or principle in the soul, fitting and disposing it to holy acts, is not liable to the charge here advanced.

It will not be necessary to take up much time or space in proving that the doctrine of regeneration, as just stated, is that which is held by old Calvinists. Charnock, p. 85, Vol. II, says, "This new creation consists in gracious qualities and habits, which beautify and dispose the soul to act righteously and holily." Owen says the new creation is "an habitual holy principle wrought in us by God, and bearing his image," or, as in the next sentence, "a divine supernatural principle, of spiritual actions and operations."

We prefer however referring to the statements of a few of the theologians of our own country, some of whom do not belong to the class which, for the sake of convenience, we have called old Calvinists. *President Edwards* not only admits that moral principles or habits may and must exist in the soul prior (in the order of nature) to moral action, but his whole system of practical theology, as it seems to us, rests on this foundation. The great fundamental principle of his work on the Affections is this:—All gracious or spiritual affections presuppose and arise from spiritual views of divine truth. These views the natural man neither has, nor can have, while he remains such. Hence arises the necessity of such a change being wrought in the state of the soul, that it can perceive the real beauty and excellence of divine things. This change consists in imparting to the soul what he calls "a new sense," or a new taste, or relish, or principle, adapted to the perception and love of spiritual excellence. Were we to attempt to exhibit all the evidence which might be adduced, in proof of the fact that his views were such as we have represented, we should be obliged to quote a great part of the work just mentioned. We refer the reader especially to what he says on the first and fourth signs of gracious affections. With regard to the nature of regeneration, we quote only a single passage. After having stated that the exercises of the true Christian are specifically different from those of unsanctified men, he infers that if the exercises are different, the principle whence they proceed must be different, or there must be, "as it were, a new spiritual sense, or a principle of new kind of perception or spiritual sensation." And he hence explains why it is that "the work of the Spirit of God in regeneration is often, in Scripture, compared to giving a new sense, giving eyes to see, and ears to hear, unstopping the ears of the deaf, and opening the eyes of them that were born blind, and turning them from darkness unto light." The nature of this "new sense" he thus explains.

"This new sense, and the new dispositions that attend it, are no new *faculties*, but are new *principles* of nature. I use the word *principles*, for want of a word of a more determinate signification. By a *principle of nature*, in this place, I mean that foundation which is laid in nature, either old or new, for any particular kind or manner of exercise of the faculties of the soul; or a natural habit, or foundation for

action, giving a person ability and disposition to exert the faculties in exercises of such a certain kind; so that to exert the faculties in that kind of exercises, may be said to be his nature. So this new spiritual sense is not a new faculty of understanding, but it is a new foundation laid in the nature of the soul, for a new kind of exercises of the same faculty of understanding. So that new holy disposition of heart that attends this new sense, is not a new faculty of will, but a foundation laid in the nature of the soul, for a new kind of exercises of the same faculty of will. The Spirit of God, in all his operations on the minds of natural men, only moves, impresses, assists, improves, or some way acts upon natural principles; but gives no new spiritual principles."*

We have never met with a stronger, or more formal statement of the doctrine which we are endeavouring to support, than is found in this passage. And it should be considered that this is not a passing remark on the part of president Edwards, or the statement of an isolated opinion, but it is a fundamental principle of his whole theology, as we understand it. Take this away, and his whole theory of original righteousness, original sin, of the nature of holiness, and the nature of sin, and of the liberty of the will, go with it. Whether his views on these subjects are correct, although the main question, is one thing, but that he really entertained the opinion here so clearly expressed, we wonder that any man should ever have doubted. We trust that respect for the memory of president Edwards, and the obligation "to interpret language according to the known and declared nature of the thing described," will prevent any one saying, that he believed that "this new sense" is an entity, or "this foundation" for moral exercises is "something inserted in the soul," "an agent within an agent," &c. &c.

Dr Bellamy seems to teach the same doctrines as president Edwards with regard to spiritual blindness, the necessity of divine illumination prior to the exercise of any holy affections, and the nature of regeneration. In the second volume of his works, page 502, he says, "In regeneration, there is a new, divine, and holy taste begotten in the heart, by the immediate influences of the Holy Spirit." And on the opposite page, "The idea of a natural beauty supposes an internal

---

* Treatise concerning Religious Affections, p. 231, 232. Elizabethtown edition, 1787.

sense, implanted by our Creator, by which the mind is capacitated to discern such kind of beauty." "And that the idea of spiritual beauty supposes an internal spiritual sense, communicated to the soul by the Spirit of God, in the work of the new creation, is clearly illustrated and proved by a late divine, whose praise is in all the churches." He here refers his readers to Edwards on Religious Affections.

Dr Dwight taught the same doctrine, and that clearly and definitely. In his discourse on the nature of regeneration,* he says, "This change of heart consists in a relish for spiritual objects, communicated to it by the power of the Holy Ghost." That "this relish" was antecedent, according to his view, to all holy acts, there can be no doubt. Because he expressly asserts it, and because his arguments go to prove it. What he calls "a relish for spiritual objects" he elsewhere calls a holy disposition, and refers to the case of Adam for an illustration of its nature. "When God created Adam," he remarks, "there was a period of his existence after he began to be, antecedent to that in which he exercised the first volition. Every man who believes the mind to be something besides ideas and exercises, and does not admit the doctrine of casualty, will acknowledge, that in this period the mind of Adam was in such a state, that he was propense to the exercise of virtuous volitions rather than of sinful ones. This state of mind has been commonly styled disposition, temper, inclination, heart, &c. In the Scriptures it usually bears the last of these names. I shall take the liberty to call it disposition. This disposition in Adam, was the cause whence his virtuous volitions proceeded; the reason why they were virtuous, and not sinful. Of the metaphysical nature of this cause I am ignorant; but its existence is, in my view, certainly proved by its effects." Again, on the same page, "In regeneration, the very same thing is done by the Spirit of God for the soul, which was done for Adam by the same Divine Agent at his creation. The soul of Adam was created with a relish for spiritual objects. The soul of every man who becomes a christian, is renewed by the communication of the same relish. In Adam, this disposition produced virtuous volitions. In every child of Adam, who becomes the subject of virtue, it produces the same effects."

---

* Works, Vol. II. p. 418.

The same idea is expressed, if possible, even more formally in the same volume, p. 451, where, among other things equally explicit, he says that by this disposition he intends "the cause, which in the mind of man produces all virtuous affections and volitions." The same doctrine is repeatedly taught in other passages of his works, as in the sermons on the Probation of Man, Vol. I. 394, on the Fall, 410, 413, on Depravity as derived from Adam, &c.

From various passages which occur in the pamphlet of Dr Tyler, already mentioned, we infer that he holds the same doctrine. The same principle, (that moral disposition may exist antecedently to all moral acts), is also frequently and clearly asserted by Dr Woods of Andover, in his controversy with Dr Ware. We refer to the opinions of these distinguished men, to show how united Calvinists, old and new, are in their views on this point, and that if the charge of believing in physical depravity and physical regeneration be sustained, it lies on almost the whole Calvinistic world. Still the main question recurs—is the charge well founded?

The main principle, as before stated, which is assumed by those who make this charge is, that we can only regard the soul as to its substance on the one hand, and its actions on the other. If, therefore, there be any change wrought in the soul other than of its acts, it must be a physical change. And if any tendency, either to sin or holiness, exist prior to choice, it is a positive existence, a real entity. Thus the charge of physical depravity and physical regeneration is fairly made out. We are constrained to confess, that if the premises are correct, the conclusions, revolting as they are, and affecting, as they do, the fair names of so large a portion of the christian church, are valid. The principle itself, however, we believe to be a gratuitous assumption. It is inconsistent with the common, and as we believe, correct idea of habits, both connatural and acquired. The word habit (habitus) was used by the old writers precisely in the same sense as "principle" by president Edwards, as explained above, or disposition, as used and explained by president Dwight. That there are such habits or dispositions which can be resolved neither into "essential attributes," nor "acts," we maintain to be the common judgment of mankind. Let us take for illustration an instance of an acquired habit of the lowest kind, the skill of an artist. He has a soul with the same essential attributes as other men; his body is composed of the same materials; and the same law regulates the

obedience of his muscular actions to his mind. By constant practice he has acquired what is usually denominated skill; an ability to go through the processes of his art, with greater facility, exactness and success than ordinary men. Take this man while asleep or engaged in any indifferent occupation, you have a soul and body not differing in any of their essential attributes from those of other men. Still there is a difference. What is it? Must it be either "a real existence, an entity," an act, or nothing? It cannot be "an entity," for it is acquired, and it will hardly be maintained that a man can acquire a new essential attribute. Neither is it an act, for the man has his skill when it is not exercised. Yet there is certainly "something," which is the ground of certainty, that when called to go through the peculiar business of his art, he will do it with an ease and rapidity impossible for common men. It is as impossible not to admit that this ground or reason exists, in order to account for the effect, as it is not to admit the existence of the soul to account for its exercises. By constant practice, a state of mind and body has been produced adapted to secure these results, and which accounts for their character. But this is the definition of principle or habit as given above. A single circumstance is here wanting which is found in other "habits," and that is, there is not the tendency or proneness to those particular acts to which this state of mind is adapted. This difference, however, arises not from any difference in the "habits" themselves, but from the nature of the faculties in which, so to speak, they inhere. A principle in the will (in its largest sense, including all the active powers) is not only a state of mind adapted to certain acts, but prone to produce them. This is not the case, at least to the same degree, with intellectual habits. Both classes, however, come within the definition given by president Edwards and Dr Dwight,—"a state of mind," or "foundation, for any particular kind of exercise of the faculties of the soul." The same remarks may be made with regard to habits of a more purely intellectual character. A man, by devoting himself to any particular pursuit, gradually acquires a facility in putting forth the mental exercises which it requires. This implies no change of essence in the soul; and it is not merely an act, which is the result of this practice. The result, whatever it is, is an attribute of the man under all circumstances, and not merely when engaged in the exercises whence the habit was acquired.

But to come nearer to the case in hand. We say a man has a malignant disposition, or an amiable disposition. What is to be understood by these expressions? Is it merely that he often indulges malignant or amiable feelings? or is it not rather that there is an habitual proneness or tendency to their indulgence? Surely the latter. But, if so, the principle stated above, that we can regard the soul only as to its substance or its actions, cannot be correct. For the result of a repetition of acts of the same kind, is an abiding tendency, which is itself neither an act, (eminent or imminent,) nor an "entity." Here then is the soul with its essential attributes—an habitual tendency to certain exercises, and the exercises themselves. The tendency is not an act, nor an active state of the feelings in question; for it would be a contradiction to say, that a man whose heart was glowing with parental affection, or filled for the time with any other amiable feeling, had at the same moment the malignant feelings in an active state; although there might exist the greatest proneness to their exercise. We have seen no analysis of such dispositions, which satisfies us that they can be reduced to acts. For it is essential to the nature of an act, that it should be a matter of consciousness. This is true of those which are imminent acts of the will, or ultimate choices, (by which a fixed state of the affections is meant to be expressed,) as well as of all others. But a disposition, or principle, as explained above, is not a matter of consciousness. A man may be aware that he has a certain disposition, as he is aware of the existence of his soul, from the consciousness of its acts, but the disposition itself is not a subject of direct consciousness. It exists when the man is asleep, or in a swoon, and unconscious of any thing. Neither can these habits be with any propriety called a choice, or permanent affection. For in many cases they are a mere proneness to acts which have their foundation in a constitutional principle of the mind. Our object at present is merely to show, that we must admit that there are mental habits which cannot be resolved either into essential attributes of the soul, fixed preferences, or subordinate acts; and consequently, that those who believe in dispositions, prior to all acts, do not necessarily maintain that such dispositions are of the essence of the soul itself. If it be within the compass of the divine power to produce in us that, which by constant exercise we can produce in ourselves, then a holy principle or habit may be the result of the Spirit's influence

in regeneration, without any physical change having been wrought.

But it is not only objected, that regeneration is a physical change, if any thing beyond a change in the exercises of the soul is effected; but it is said, that the thing contended for is utterly unintelligible, incapable of definition or explanation. We are ready to acknowledge that it admits of no other explanation than that which is derived from stating its effects, and referring to cases of an analogous kind. There is in all men a social principle, as it is called, which is something else than a desire to live in society, because it is connatural, as may be inferred from its universality; there is a tendency in all men to love their children, which is something besides loving them; there is a tendency in man also to sympathise in the sufferings of others, &c. It may be said these are all constitutional tendencies implanted in our nature. This is very true; but does saying this enable us to understand their nature? May it not be objected to those who employ this language, You are using words without meaning; what do you know of a social principle, distinct from the actual desire to live in society, or prior to its exercise? What idea can you form of a principle of self-love excepting actually loving one's self? Are we then to deny that there are any such original propensities or tendencies as these implanted in our nature, because we cannot directly conceive of them? Yet Dr Cox says, in reference to this subject, "By holy principle, *I* mean love to God, and by love to God I mean actually loving him." On the same principle, he might deny the existence of any of the original dispositions or tendencies of the soul. For they are as incapable of being defined, as the holy principle which is produced in regeneration. The soul itself is in the same predicament. We know nothing of it, but from our consciousness of its acts. And if the objection, which we are now considering, be valid against the existence of principles prior to acts, then it is valid against the existence of the soul. We are conscious only of its exercises; and therefore some philosophers and theologians tell us, we are not authorized to go any further. The existence of a substance apart from the exercises is not necessary to account for their existence, and therefore is a gratuitous assumption. An assumption, too, of the being of something which we are incapable of defining, explaining, or even conceiving. The reply which Dr Cox would make to this reasoning, is proba-

bly the same that we should be disposed to make to his objection against the existence of holy principles prior to holy acts. For the mind as instinctively seeks a reason for the choice which the soul makes in loving God, as it does for the various ideas and exercises of which it is constantly conscious. And we should probably be as little satisfied with the reasons which Dr Cox could assign to account for this choice, as he would be with those of the defenders of the exercise-scheme to account for these exercises without resorting to a thinking substance. If he were to say, that the effect is produced by the Holy Spirit, we should answer that this can only be done in one of three ways, that we can conceive of. First, either by his direct agency producing the choice, in which case it would be no act of ours; or, secondly, by addressing such motives to our constitutional and natural principle of self-love as should induce us to make the choice, in which case there would be no morality in the act; or, thirdly, by producing such a relish for the divine character, that the soul as spontaneously and as immediately embraces God as its portion, as it rejoices in the perception of beauty. The thing contended for is not more unintelligible than a hundred things of like nature. Taste is the ready perception and quick feeling of natural beauty. That is, these are its effects. But no one can directly conceive of it, as it is an attribute of the mind, either original or acquired. It is absolutely certain, however, that the man who does thus readily perceive and feel the beauty of natural objects, has a quality of mind which a clown does not possess. And we should be astonished to hear any one maintain, that there was no such thing as taste, but the exercise. "By taste I mean the love of beauty, and by love of beauty I mean actually loving it, and that is an act, and not a principle." But why does one man see and feel a beauty in certain objects, when others do not? Is there no difference between the clown and the most refined votary in the arts, but in their acts? Is any man satisfied by being told that one loves them, and the other does not; that it is in vain to ask why; the fact is enough, and the fact is all; there is no difference in the state of their minds antecedent to their acts; there can be no such thing as a principle of taste, or sense of beauty, distinct from the actual love of beauty? We are disposed to think that no man can believe this: that the constitution of our nature forces us to admit, that if one man, under all cir-

cumstances, and at all times, manifest this quick sensibility to natural beauty, and another does not, there is some difference between the two, besides their acts; that there is some reason why, when standing before the same picture, one is filled with pleasure, and the other is utterly insensible. We cannot help believing, that one has taste, (a quality, principle, or "inward sense,") which the other does not possess. It matters not what it may be called. It is the ground or reason of the diversity of their exercises, which lies back of the exercises themselves, and must be assumed to account for the difference of their nature. Now, there is moral, as well as natural beauty, and it is no more unintelligible, that there should be a "sense," or taste, for the one, than for the other. The perfect character of God, when exhibited to different men, produces delight and desire in some, repugnance in others. We instinctively ask why? Why do some perceive and delight in his moral beauty, while others do not? The answer, some love, and others do not, is no answer at all. It is merely saying the same thing, in other words. There must be some reason, why one perceives this kind of beauty, to which others are blind; why one is filled with love the moment it is presented, and the other with repugnance. And this reason must lie back of the mere exercise of this affection, must be something besides the act itself, and such as shall account for its nature.

It may be said, however, that the cases are not analogous: that the emotion excited by beauty is involuntary, while moral objects address themselves to the voluntary affections; and that it is admitted, that there is not only "something" back of each exercise of love, but we are told distinctly what it is, viz. the soul with its essential attributes, its ultimate or supreme choice, or dominant affection, and the object in view of the mind. Accordingly, it is easily accounted for, that when the character of God is presented, one man is filled with love, another with repugnance. The reason of the difference in *these* acts, does indeed lie back of the acts themselves; for it is found in the ultimate or supreme choice of the different individuals. But how is this to be accounted for? If there is no necessity for accounting for the particular character of the first or ultimate choice, (if so it must needs be called,) there is no need of accounting for the others. The difficulty is not at all met by this statement. It is only pushed back, from the secondary and subordinate, to the pri-

mary and dominant preference. There it returns. The question still is, why does the soul of one man make this supreme choice of God, or, in other words, love him, while another sets his affections on the world? There is precisely the same necessity for assuming some ground or reason for the nature of the first choice, as for any acts subordinate and subsequent to it. Let us suppose two individuals called into existence, in the full maturity of their faculties; each has a soul with the same constitutional powers, or essential attributes; the one is filled with delight the moment the character of God is presented, and the other is not; or the one loves his Maker as soon as the idea of his excellence is presented, the other does not. According to this theory, there is no reason for this difference. There is nothing back of the first act of choice that is not common to both. If instead of two individuals, we suppose two millions, one portion having their affections spontaneously called forth on their first view of their Maker, the other unaffected; we have only a greater number of effects without a cause, but the case is the same. It will not do to answer, that the choice is made under the influence of the desire of happiness, for this being common to all, is no reason for the difference of the result, which is the very thing to be accounted for. To say that the choice is made under the influence of the desire of happiness, is only to say, that when the character of God is presented, it gives pleasure. But the same character is presented in both cases, the same desire exists in both, yet in one it gives pleasure, is an object of desire; in the other, not. This is the fact which is left entirely unaccounted for on the theory in question, and for which the mind as instinctively seeks a question, as it does for any other effect. To account for the difference from the nature of agency, is to assume the liberty of indifference. For if the choice be made prior to the rising of desire towards the object, then it is made in indifference, and is of no moral character. If the desire rise, it is love; which is the very thing to be accounted for. We are at a loss to see how this theory is to be reconciled with the Calvinist's doctrine on the will, which is not peculiar to Edwards, but constituted the great dividing line between Calvinists and Arminians from the beginning. We feel, therefore, a necessity for assuming, that there is "something" back of the first moral act, besides the soul and its essential attributes, which will account for the nature

of that act, which constitutes the reason, why, in the case supposed, the soul of the one individual rose immediately to God, and the other did not; and the "something" assumed in this case, is no more indefinite and undefinable, than the constitutional propensity to live in society, to love our children, or the mental quality called taste, all which are assumed from a necessity not more imperious than that which requires a holy principle to account for the delight experienced in view of the character of God. And if our Maker can endow us not only with the general susceptibility of love, but also with a specific disposition to love our children; if he can give us a discernment and susceptibility of natural beauty, he may give us a taste for spiritual loveliness. And if that taste, by reason of sin, is vitiated and perverted, he may restore it by the influences of his Spirit in regeneration. Neither, therefore, the objection, that what is not an act, must be an essential attribute; nor the unintelligible nature of a "principle of nature," is, in our view, any valid objection to the common doctrine on regeneration.

There is a third objection, however, to this doctrine, and that is, that it renders the sinner excusable, because it makes regeneration to consist in something else than the sinner's own act. This objection, as it seems to us, can only be valid on one or the other of two grounds: the first is, that the common doctrine supposes sin to be a physical defect, and regeneration a physical change; and the second is, that a man is responsible solely for his acts, or that there can be no moral principle anterior to moral action. With regard to the first, it is enough to say, that no physical change, according to the constant declaration of Calvinistic writers, is held to take place in regeneration, and that no such change is implied in the production of a holy principle, as we have already endeavoured to show.

The second ground is inconsistent with the common notions of men, on the nature of virtue, and if true, would render the commencement of holiness or regeneration impossible. It is according to the universal feeling and judgment of men, that the moral character of an act depends upon the motive with which it is done. This is so obviously true, that Reid and Stewart, and almost all other advocates of the liberty of indifference, readily admit it. And so do the advocates of the theory on which this objection is founded, with regard to all moral acts, excepting the first. All acts

of choice, to be holy, must proeeed from a holy motive, exeepting the first holy choice whieh constitutes regeneration; that may be made from the mere desire of happiness or self love. We confess that this strikes us as very much like a relinquishment of the whole system. For how is it conceivable, that any thing should be essential to the very nature of one aet as holy, that is not neeessary to another? Is not this saying that that on which the very nature of a thing depends may be absent, and yet the thing remain the same? Is it not saying that that which makes an aet what it is, and gives it its character, may be wanting or altered, and yet the character of the aet be unaffeeted? It is the motive which gives the moral eharaeter to the act. If the motive is good, the act is good; if the motive is bad, the act is bad; if the motive is indifferent, so is the act. The act has no character apart from the motive. This, it seems, is admitted with regard to all moral acts exeepting the first. But the first act of a holy kind is an act of obedience, as well as all subsequent acts of the same kind. How then is it coneeivable that the first act of obedience performed from the mere desire of happiness or self love can be holy, when no other aet of the same kind, and performed from the same motive, either is or ean be? How does its being first alter its very nature? It is still nothing more than an aet done for self-gratifieation, and cannot be a holy aet. It is said we must admit this from the necessity of the ease, or acknowledge that there ean be holiness before moral aetion. We prefer admitting the latter, and believing that "God ereated man upright," and not that he made himself so. That there was a disposition or relish, or taste for holiness, before there was any holy aet, whieh to us is far more reasonable than that an act is holy because the first of a series, whieh, if performed from the same motive at a different point of the line, would have a different eharacter. The grand objeetion, we know, that is made to all this is, that holy beings have fallen, whieh it is maintained would be impossible if the ground here assumed is eorreet. If the charaeter of an act depends on its motive, a sinful aet cannot be performed by a being in whom sin does not already exist; and, eonsequently, neither the fallen angels, nor Adam, could ever have apostatized. We think, however, that there is a broad difference between the commeneement of holiness, and the commeneement of sin, and that more is necessary for the former than for the lat-

ter. An act of obedience, if it is performed under the mere impulse of self-love, is virtually no act of obedience. It is not performed with any intention to obey, for that is holy, and cannot according to the theory precede the act. But an act of disobedience performed from the desire of happiness is rebellion. The cases are surely widely different. If to please myself I do what God commands, it is not holiness; but if to please myself I do what he forbids, it is sin. Besides, no creature is immutable. Though created holy, the taste for holy enjoyments may be overcome by a temptation sufficiently insidious and powerful, and a selfish motive or feeling excited in the mind. Neither is a sinful character immutable. By the power of the Holy Spirit the truth may be so clearly presented, and so effectually applied, as to produce that change which is called regeneration. That is, as to call into existence a taste for holiness, so that it is chosen for its own sake, and not merely as a means of happiness.

It is evident, therefore, that the theory which denies the possibility of moral distinctions being carried back of acts of choice, forces its advocates to adopt the opinion that the first holy act is specifically different from all others. That Adam was not created holy, but by choosing God made himself holy, and that this choice, though made with no holy motive or intention, but merely from a desire of happiness, has a moral character. This we think not only contradictory to the express declaration of Scripture, which says that man was created in the image of his Maker, (which includes his moral as well as his natural image, as we are taught in the New Testament), but is inconsistent with the very first principles of morals, as it teaches that an act performed without any good intention or motive is yet holy. It seems to us liable, also, to this further objection, that it represents man's obligation to love God, to rest upon the fact that it will promote his happiness. This is involved in the principle, that the choice made from this motive is a good choice; for it can only be good as it is in obedience to a moral obligation. If the obligation fulfilled is to God, then to fulfil it must be the motive. If the motive which prompts the choice have reference to himself, then the only obligation which he fulfils, is to himself. It is a wise decision, but it is no holy act. If it be said that the excellence of the choice lies in the nature of the object chosen, it is giving up the question. For if the excellence of the object be the

ground of the choice, it can act as a motive only by exciting a desire for it as excellent, which must needs be a holy desire, and if this determines the choice, then the man is holy before he chooses God as his portion, and the choice is the result, and not the cause of his holiness. Or if we call the desire itself the choice (which is an incorrect use of terms) still the case is the same. For the best definition that can be given of a holy being is, that holy objects excite in him desire, as soon as they are presented. If Adam therefore was filled with desire and pleasure, as soon as his mind rested on the character of God, then he was created holy. As we remarked above, this theory, that the first moral act is not performed from a holy motive, but from the constitutional desire of happiness, is not only inconsistent with the nature of a holy act, but affords no relief in the case. For the difficulty still remains, why the character of God should appear desirable to one being, and not to another, if both are called into existence in *puris naturalibus*.

That Adam was created holy, that is, with a holy disposition which existed prior to his first holy act, though necessarily destructive of the very first principle of the theory referred to, has been considered as a fixed point among Calvinists. We have already seen that Dr Dwight did not think it necessary to prove it. Because he says, "every man who believes the mind to be something more than ideas and exercises, and *does not admit the doctrine of casualty*, will acknowledge" it. President Edwards, in his work on original sin, has a whole chapter, in which he endeavours to prove that our first parents were created in righteousness, or, as he expresses it, "with holy principles and dispositions." The grand objection against this doctrine, he says, is this: "that it is utterly inconsistent with the nature of virtue, that it should be concreated with any person; because, if so, it must be by an act of God's absolute power, without our knowledge or concurrence; and that moral virtue, in its very nature, implieth the choice and consent of the moral agent, without which it cannot be virtue and holiness: that a necessary holiness, is no holiness," and he quotes from Dr Taylor of Norwich, the words, "Adam must exist, he must be created, yea he must exercise thought and reflection before he was righteous." To this he replies, "In the first place, I think it a contradiction to the nature of things, as judged of by the common sense of mankind. It is agreeable to the

sense of the minds of men in all ages, not only that the fruit or effect of a good choice is virtuous, but the good choice itself, from which that effect proceeds; yea, and not only so, but also the antecedent good disposition, temper, or affection of mind from whence proceeds that good choice is virtuous. This is the general notion, not that principles derive their goodness from actions, but that actions derive their goodness from the principles whence they proceed; and so that the act of choosing that which is good, is no further virtuous than it proceeds from a good principle, or virtuous disposition of mind; which supposes, that a virtuous disposition of mind may be before a virtuous act of choice; and that therefore *it is not necessary that there should first be thought, reflection and choice before there can be any virtuous disposition.* If the choice be first, before the existence of a good disposition of heart, what signifies that choice? There can, according to our natural notions, be no virtue in a choice which proceeds from no virtuous principle, but from mere self-love, ambition, or some animal appetite." P. 140. If there was a holy disposition, before there was "thought, reflexion or choice," Edwards most assuredly carried moral distinctions back of moral acts. That by so doing he carried them into the "essential attributes of the soul," is an assertion founded on the assumption, that what is not an act must be an essential attribute, which we believe few are prepared to admit. God has created man with various susceptibilities, dispositions or tendencies of mind towards objects without himself; these tendencies are not necessarily "real existences, entities," or essential attributes, for tendencies or habits may, as before remarked, be acquired, as the skill of an artist, or a proneness to any particular mental exercise. They may result from the relative state of all the essential attributes, and yet be no "part of the soul" themselves. Their nature, however, is confessedly as inconceivable as the nature of the soul, and no more so; and they are as necessarily assumed to account for the results which meet our view, as the soul or any of its attributes. If a million of intelligent beings, the first moment they think of the character God, are filled with desire and delight, it is as evident that they were created with a proneness or disposition to take pleasure in holiness, as it is that the hearts of mothers have an innate tendency to love their children, because they glow with delight the first moment

they are given to them. Nothing we think but the most determined adherence to a speculative opinion, can prevent any man acknowledging that it is as possible for the mind to be created with this "instinctive" love of holiness, as with a disposition for any other specific class of objects. And we think too, that the vast body of men will agree with president Edwards in thinking, that "such a disposition's being natural, or from a kind of instinct, implanted in the mind in its creation," is no objection to its being of a virtuous or moral character. Does the maternal instinct cease to be amiable, because it is natural? Does a disposition to kindness and gentleness lose its character by being innate? Are not the instinctive love of justice, abhorrence of cruelty, admiration of what is noble, which God has implanted in our nature, objects of approbation? If our feelings and the general sense of mankind answer these questions in the affirmative, they as certainly will decide that an innate disposition to love God, existing in the mind of Adam at the moment of his creation, does not lose its moral character by being innate. The common feelings and judgment of men, therefore, do carry moral distinctions back of acts of choice, and must do so unless we deny that virtue ever can commence, for "there can, according to our natural notions, be no virtue in a choice which proceeds from no virtuous principle, but from mere self-love."

If this be so, the very foundation of the objection that the common doctrine of regeneration destroys the responsibility of the sinner, is taken away. This responsibility rests upon the fact, that he stands in the relation of a rational and moral creature to God. He has all the attributes of a moral agent—understanding, conscience and will. He has unimpaired the liberty of acting according to his own inclinations. His mind is not subject to any law of causation, which determines his acts independently of himself. Motives, as external to the mind, have no influence, but as the mind itself, according to the laws of all rational creation, is affected by them and *voluntarily* admits their influence, and yields to it. The responsibility of man, therefore, resting on the immutable obligations which bind him to love and obey God, and on the possession of all the attributes of moral agency, is not destroyed by his moral depravity, of which the want of a disposition to holiness is an integral part. He does not love God, not because there is any physical defect

in his constitution, but because his moral taste is perverted by reason of sin. He is so corrupt, that even infinite loveliness appears hateful to him. There can, in the nature of things, be no reason why an intelligent and moral being, should be blind to moral excellence, excepting moral corruption. And if this be an excuse, then the more depraved, the less he is to blame. How he became thus depraved, is another question,—but it has nothing to do with the point before us, which is, the nature of the inability which it involves to love God. He may have been born so, or he may have made himself so. It makes no difference as to this point. So long as this depravity is his own, his own moral character, it can furnish no excuse or palliation for not complying with the great command of the law and gospel. An object worthy of all affection is presented to his view, viz: the divine character; he is capable of intellectually apprehending this object. If blind to its loveliness it is, in his own judgment, and that of all men, his sin; it is the very height of corruption to view as unlovely what is the perfection of moral beauty. That men do labour under this moral blindness, is one of the most frequently asserted doctrines of the Scriptures. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." "These things," says our Saviour, "will they do unto you, because they have not known the father nor me." "To know God, is eternal life." We are said to be saved through knowledge. The gospel is "hid to them that are lost." Their eyes are blinded. Light has shined into the hearts of those that believe. The saints of old prayed to have their minds illuminated; and Paul intercedes for his fellow Christians earnestly and frequently for this blessing, as the only possible means of their sanctification. This is so plain, that president Edwards, in speaking on this subject, says, "There is such a thing, *if the Scriptures are of any use to teach us any thing*, as a spiritual, supernatural understanding of divine things, that is peculiar to the saints, and which those who are not saints know nothing of." (P. 298, On the Affections.) The cause of this blindness is sin, and therefore it is inexcusable. But if it exists, there is an evident necessity for such a change in the soul, that it shall be brought to see this beauty of holiness, and from the constitution of our nature, this change must precede the exercise of love. For how can we love that

which we do not see. The affections must have an object, and that object must be apprehended in its true nature, in order to be truly loved. It is obvious, therefore, that regeneration, to be of a moral character at all, must consist in such a change as brings the soul into a state to see and love the beauty of holiness. It matters not what the change be called; a "spiritual sense," or "a taste," or "disposition," it is as necessary as that an object should be seen in order to be loved.

Now it is evident that all this must be denied by those who make regeneration to consist in the "act of loving God," who deny that there is any change prior in the order of nature, to the exercise of love. For if the sinner is blind to God's loveliness, it is absolutely impossible that he should love it, until he is brought to see it. It may be said, that this is to render the sinner's case absolutely hopeless. So it is. And they do but delude and mock him, who represent it otherwise. It is thus the Bible represents it. It tells him that the natural man cannot know the things of the Spirit of God. And it is moreover necessary, that the sinner should be brought to feel, that his case, as far as he himself is concerned, is absolutely hopeless; that he may be brought to fall, with his blind and wicked heart, at the feet of sovereign mercy, and cry, Lord, save me! or I perish. But does this make the sinner excusable? not unless his sin is his excuse. It is this, and this alone, which prevents his perception of the loveliness of God, and, therefore, the more complete his blindness, the greater his loathsomeness and guilt. The two sentiments of complete helplessness, and of entire blame-worthiness, are perfectly consistent, and are ever united in Christian experience. The believer feels them every day. He knows that it is his duty, at once, to love God as purely, and fervently, and constantly, as do the saints made perfect. Yet he feels that no mere efforts of his own, no use of means, no presentation of motives, no summoning of his powers, will ever enable him to raise his carnal heart to heaven. Does this free him from a sense of guilt? No. He covers his face with both his hands, and bows down in the dust, and cries, Behold, I am vile. Have mercy on me, O Lord, and create within me a clean heart.

That the denial of the sinner's blindness, to the holiness of God, is involved in the theory of regeneration, under consideration, is perfectly evident, and is not, we presume, de-

nied. If the mere choice of God, as the supreme portion of the soul, is regeneration, and the performance of this act constitutes the change, then of course no previous change is admitted to be necessary to enable him to make the choice; no opening of his eyes to see the moral excellence of the object he is to choose, no production of any sense of its loveliness; the choice itself is all that is demanded; and for this, every thing is present that the act requires. The object, the capacity of viewing it in its true moral excellence, and the motive whence the choice is to proceed. For he need not choose God from any holy motive or intention, (which would be to make holiness precede moral action), the simple desire of happiness is all that is required. The character of this first act does not depend on its motive. It is holy, though performed merely from the desire of self-gratification. This is a conclusion from which our minds instinctively revolt, and which Edwards says, is contrary to the natural notions of men. It is, however, a conclusion which is legitimate and acknowledged, and, being in our view, a complete reductio ad absurdum, the system is fairly, in our humble apprehension, *felo de se.*

Dr Cox asks whether it is not "intrinsically absurd," that a man should be regenerated before he does his duty? We think the absurdity is all the other way, that he should do his duty without being regenerated. That he should love God without having any proper perception of his character; or that an unholy soul should have this perception of the beauty of holiness. It appears to us a contradiction in terms to say, that a holy object can be viewed as excellent and desirable by a carnal mind; for a holy mind is best defined by saying, that it perceives and relishes the beauty of holiness. It is inconceivable to us, therefore, that any sinner should love God, without this previous change, except on one or the other of these two grounds; that all his acts are created in him, and he is really no agent at all, or that an act proceeding from mere self-love is holy. Both which contradict what to us are primary principles or intuitive truths. But how is it that regeneration precedes the exercise of love? As the opening of the eyes precedes sight; as a sense of the beautiful precedes the emotion of beauty; as the maternal instinct precedes maternal love. As it is impossible for a man to have his eyes open in the day time without seeing, so it is impossible for a man to be regenerated without delighting

in God. Yet opening the eyes is not seeing, nor is regeneration delighting in God. What the metaphysical nature of this change is, no one can tell. All the soul can say, is, whereas I was blind, now I see. What once appeared repulsive and "foolishness," now appears supremely desirable and excellent. What once excited enmity, now calls forth love. What once was irksome and difficult, is now easy and delightful. To say that these exercises themselves constitute the change, and the whole change, is to say, that a wicked man is suddenly transformed in all his views, feelings, and conduct, without any reason for it. And to refer all to the immediate operations of the Spirit, is to make man a machine, a mere instrument, on which a mysterious hand plays what tune it pleases, to the delight or torment of the conscious, but passive subject.

There is still another point. Dr Cox speaks of this "certain kind of principle," as "a mysterious gratuity," with which the receiver has nothing to do. A something inserted in the soul in some magic manner to influence his exercises, but which forms no part of his character. We are persuaded that a fundamental difference, as to the nature of agency, and human liberty, lies at the foundation of all such objections. We are as yet only fighting in the dark. The real turning point is yet in the back ground. We do not mean that it is intentionally kept there, but that these objections have not even the semblance of force, if (what is yet considered common ground) the Calvinistic theory of the will is retained. Was it a mere "mysterious gratuity," without moral character for him, that Adam was created in the image of God "with holy principles and dispositions?" Were these not voluntary principles? Was he not free in all his exercises of love determined by them? A disposition is not the less voluntary because it is innate. The affections are all voluntary, although concreated with us. Is a man less free in loving himself because self-love is a constitutional propensity? Does a mother love her child against her will, because she acts agreeably to her nature? Does not the disposition so to do enter into her character? If this be true with regard even to constitutional propensities, it is still more obviously true with respect to moral disposition, whether originally implanted or restored in regeneration. There is a continual play upon the double sense of the word voluntary. When the faculties of the

soul are reduced to understanding and will, it is evident that the latter includes all the affections. In this sense, all liking or disliking, desiring or being averse to, &c., are voluntary, or acts of the will. But when we speak of the understanding, will and affections, the word will includes much less. It is the power of the soul to come to a determination, to fix its choice on some object of desire. These two meanings are distinct, though they may relate only to different states of the same faculty. In the latter sense, will and desire are not always coincident. A man may desire money, and not will to take it, or to make it an object of pursuit; he may not fix his choice upon it. The will is here determined by some other desire of greater force; desire of doing right, for example. When we speak of a volition, of a choice, of a decision or determination of the will, the word will is used in the restricted sense. A man may have many objects of desire before his mind; the decision which the will makes among them, or its selection, is its choice. There are a thousand things capable of ministering to our happiness; riches, honour, sensual pleasure, the service of God; the selection which the soul makes, is made by the will in the narrower sense. This is a voluntary act, in one sense of the term. But in another, the desire itself which the soul has for these objects, and not merely its decision or choice, is a voluntary act. For, according to Edwards, "all choosing, refusing, approving, disapproving, *liking*, *disliking*, directing, commanding, *inclining*, or being averse, *a being pleased*, or *displeased with*;" are acts of the will. In this sense, all the affections, and all desires are voluntary exercises, whether constitutional or not, and not merely the decisions to which they lead. Hence self-love, the love of children, the love of society, the desire of esteem, are all voluntary, although all springing from native tendencies of the mind.

This distinction between these different senses of the word will, although frequently made, and formally stated, is yet, time after time, lost sight of in discussions of this nature; which gives rise to endless confusion. The word is often used in one sense in the premises of an argument, and in the other in the conclusion. How often is it said that a man can love God if he will? What does this mean? If will be here used, in its narrower sense, this is not true. The affections no more obey a determination of the mind,

than the emotions do. A man can no more will to love, to hate, to be pleased or displeased, than he can will to be joyful or sorrowful, gay or sad, or even hot or cold at any given moment. But if the word be taken in its larger sense, as including the affections, then the proposition is identical; it is saying, a man can love God, if he does love God. And when Dr Cox says, there are some men who teach, that a man has no ability to believe, even if he has the inclination; the very statement is absurd. For if the mind is inclined to embrace the truth in its real character, it does believe.

Although the advocates of the theory, that morality attaches only to acts of choice, lay down, as the foundation of their doctrine, Edwards' definition of the will as given above, yet it is plain, that in a multitude of cases, they confine acts of choice to acts of the will in the restricted sense. Thus the desire of money becomes avarice, they say, only when the will comes in and decides on money as the main object of pursuit. Self-esteem is not pride, until the will decides on preferring our own claims unduly. In all such cases, it is the will, as the faculty of decision between different objects of desire, that is intended. It is to acts of the will in this restricted sense, and to the states of mind thence resulting, and not to voluntary acts in the broad sense of president Edwards, that morality is made to attach. Hence in the case of Adam, the desire excited by a view of the divine perfections, has no moral character. That belongs only to the act of the will, which fixes on God as the chief good. And the first holy act of a new-born soul is not the desire which rises in view of the divine Being, but the act of the will by which he is chosen as a portion. Hence, in the distinction between constitutional and voluntary propensities, the social affections, the love of children, desire of esteem, &c. are referred to the former class, and are not considered as voluntary. Yet in the broad sense of the word will, assumed as the foundation of the theory, according to which, all "inclining or being averse," all "being pleased, or displeased with," are acts of the will, they are as truly voluntary as the others. Now, when it is asserted, that no disposition is of a moral character, except so far as it depends on choice or preference, and that all morality lies in the will, the whole mean-

ing turns on the sense in which the word will is taken. If taken in its broader sense, this would be admitted; if in the restricted sense, we should deny it altogether. Those who make the assertion, doubtless take it in the latter; for they say that all that precedes the decision of the soul, its fixing on some object of desire as its chief portion, is neither sinful nor holy; that holiness consists in the selection of God and sin in the choice of the world, and that there is nothing sinful or holy but these primary or ultimate choices, and the subordinate acts resulting from them. But it is clear that the term voluntary applies not only to such acts of choice, but to all exercises of the affections or desires preliminary thereto. No one would say that the disposition to love ourselves, or our children, depends on choice; and yet these dispositions are properly and truly voluntary. We cannot love otherwise than voluntarily. When, therefore, these gentlemen use the word voluntary, it is in reference to acts of the will in the restricted sense, excluding the spontaneous exercises of the native propensities of our nature. They of course deny that Adam was created holy. The spontaneous rising of desire in his mind to God, was neither holy nor unholy. His moral character commenced with the first act of choice, that is, with his selection of God from among the various sources of happiness as his chief good. Here lies one great point of difference between them and common Calvinists. President Edwards maintains clearly that Adam was holy before this act of choice, yea, before he exercised "thought or reflection." And he says, that it is according to our natural notions of things that there could be no virtue in this choice, unless it was determined by a virtuous disposition. The common judgment of men is, that moral character belongs to the desire of moral objects. The morality lies in its nature, independently of its origin. Its being from "a kind of instinct," does not destroy its moral character. The desire of holiness is holy, no matter how it rises in the mind. If this be so, a similar tendency of mind and a similar desire, if produced in our mind by the power of the spirit in regeneration, is not "something inserted in the soul" without influence on our character. It constitutes us holy, as truly as Adam was holy at his first creation, though much of sin may yet remain. It is indeed "a mysterious gratuity;" the Scriptures call it GRACE; but it is still ours, from its nature, voluntary and active. It is

an inclination of the heart, and, as Dr Bellamy remarks, an "involuntary inclination of the heart is a contradiction in terms." He uses the word voluntary in its larger sense, as Edwards does, and not merely in that which applies to a decision, or selection from among different objects of desire. With him all spontaneous exercises of the mind are voluntary; self-love, the love of children, and all other similar affections. A disposition therefore to these, or any other exercises, existing prior to the exercises, in his view, does not destroy their character as voluntary, nor their morality if they have reference to moral objects; this depends upon their nature, not their origin.

We have already remarked that the opposite system destroys the moral character of the first act (in reference to moral objects) in Adam, and in regeneration. We are ready to admit, that as the desire of a holy object is from its nature holy, so the choice of such an object as holy, is from its nature good. But it is inconceivable that holiness, as such, can be chosen without a previous apprehension of its real excellence and desire for it as such. For the choice is but the determination of the desire. If therefore moral character be denied to the antecedent desire, the choice loses its moral character also. It cannot be confined to the act of choice, for there can in fact be no choice of a holy object as such, but from a desire for it in its true character, and this is a holy desire, and precedes the choice. If self-love be only so far the motive to this choice, that it "prompts to the choice, but not determines it," what, we ask, does determine it? There are but two answers to this question. The one is that the will determines itself, *i. e.* the choice is made in indifference, and has clearly no moral character; or it is determined by a desire of the object as such, (not mere desire of happiness, for that only prompts to the choice, *not determines it*) and then the whole theory is relinquished, for here is the desire of a holy object, not merely as a means of happiness, but for the object as holy, which must needs be a holy desire, and being antecedent to the choice, would be, according to the theory, anterior to the commencement of holiness.

The truth is, that this whole system is a forced and unnatural union, between Arminian philosophy and Calvinistic facts. A union which can neither be peaceful nor lasting. Nor is this the first time that it has been attempted. The

favourite principle of the opposers of the doctrines, which are now called Calvinistic, in all ages, has been, that moral character can only belong to acts of choice; and of course, that no such thing as original righteousness or original sin is possible or conceivable; that any other influence in regeneration, than that of moral suasion, by which one man is led to make a good choice, which another man, under the same influence, might refuse to make, is inconsistent with moral agency; that the doctrines of election and perseverance of the saints, presupposing that of efficacious grace, must necessarily be untrue. The first departures from these doctrines have commenced by adopting the main principle, and endeavouring to reconcile it, as far as possible, with the facts involved in the doctrines themselves; viz. that all men do sin, with absolute certainty, the moment they become moral agents; that the influence of the Spirit is infallibly efficacious: and that all whom God has chosen certainly believe and attain eternal life. But less than a generation has commonly been sufficient to break the connexion, and leave the philosophical principle undisputed master of the field.

That this principle is inconsistent with the doctrine of original righteousness is formally admitted. That it involves the denial of original sin, as this doctrine has been commonly held among Calvinists, is equally clear. According to the prevalent doctrine on this subject, original sin consists, first, in the imputation of Adam's sin: this, it seems, has been long exploded: secondly, in the want of original righteousness, this is gone too, for there never was any such thing; and thirdly, in the corruption of nature, that is, a tendency to do what God has prohibited, existing prior to all acts of choice, and independently of them, and now this is gone. There is no such tendency to sin, as can be considered a moral disposition.

Although this article has already swollen far beyond our expectations, we cannot pass this subject without a single remark on the charge of physical depravity. The futility and unfairness of the same charge, as it regards the subject of regeneration, we have endeavoured to expose above. As this rests on precisely the same grounds, it must stand or fall with the other. If there may be moral principles prior to moral acts, (as we think must be assumed, in the case of Adam, or make the commencement of holiness impossible,)

then there is not a shadow of ground for this charge. Nor is it the Calvinistic doctrine, that there is a specific propensity to sin, (analogous to the holy disposition implanted in the heart of Adam), connatural with the soul of man. None such need be assumed, and none such is believed to exist. The mere absence of a native tendency to God leaves the soul in moral confusion and ruin. There is no positive infusion of wickedness. The essential attributes and constitutional propensities are there, and nothing more. But they are there without a principle of moral order and subordination. There is no presiding spirit to turn them to the service of God. The result of this absence is all manner of evil, and a tendency to all this evil lies in this very state of the soul, and exists prior to any of its moral acts. Does the withholding this predisposition to holiness, from a being to whom all the essential attributes of his nature are left unimpaired, make God the author of sin? then must he be accused of being the author of all sin that results from the abandonment of the reprobate, and of all that by the utmost exertion of his power he could prevent. Nor is it more difficult to reconcile this fact (that God should withhold from the fallen race of man those communications which resulted in the innate tendency to holiness, which filled the soul of Adam) with the divine justice and goodness, than it is the admitted fact that he has brought, and is still bringing, the countless millions of the human family into existence under circumstances so unfavourable, that all, without exception, incur the penalty of eternal death at the first moment of moral agency. And that moment arriving too at the first dawn of intellect, and when the first faint flushes of moral feeling rise in the soul. If this be no penalty, we know not what is. "To be placed under a law," says Coleridge, (Aids to Reflection, p. 168), "the difficulty of obeying, and the consequences of not obeying which, are both infinite, and to have momently to struggle with this difficulty, and to live in momently hazard of these consequences—if this be no punishment!—words have no correspondence with thoughts, and thoughts are but shadows of each other, shadows that own no substance for their anti-type. Of such an outrage on common sense Taylor (Bishop Jeremy) was incapable. He himself calls it a penalty; he admits that in effect it is a punishment." It is a penalty too, according to this theory, without transgression; a punishment without a crime. We

cannot see, therefore, that any thing is gained by the new theory over the old doctrine, which represents our race as having enjoyed a full and fair and favourable probation in their first parent, and as being regarded and treated as an apostate race on account of his rebellion: so that the withholding those divine communications which resulted in the first man, in the moral image of his maker, is a penal evil, from which, it is true, utter ruin results, but it is the ruin, not of innocent, but of fallen human beings. This doctrine involves no mysterious confusion of the identity of the race with that of Adam, and no transfer of moral character from him to us. His act was personally his own and only his; it is ours only on the representative principle, which is recognised not only by Dr Hopkins and his followers distinctly, but by Arminians and Pelagians*, and is so clearly taught by the fact, that the race fell when Adam fell, that it is admitted in reality even by those who formally deny it.

But to return to our subject. This theory not only overthrows the doctrines which we have just mentioned, but it throws the Spirit's influences almost entirely out of view. We are not speaking of the opinions of its advocates, but of the tendency of the theory. According to their views, regeneration consists in the choice of God as the supreme portion of the soul. This requires that the soul should view him as supremely desirable. This the sinner is, not only naturally, but morally, able to do; for his corruption does not blind him to the excellence of holiness, or its adaptedness to promote his happiness. To secure this happiness is the only impulse or motive necessary to make this choice, and he is urged to make it, assured that if he will summon all his powers to the effort, the result, by the grace of God, may follow. We think the grace of God acts a part scarcely more conspicuous in all this scheme, than it does in the enumeration of the titles of an European monarch. There is no blindness to the excellence of the object of choice to be removed, no holy motive is necessary for the grand decision; all that is required is a practical conviction that it will be for the sinner's interests. Firmly as these brethren may believe in the necessity of the Spirit's interference, it is evident that necessity is left out of view almost entirely in

---

* See Whitby on Romans, v. 12.

their theory. Accordingly, when they come to describe the process of this great change, the sinner is the only agent brought to view; he is to consider, ponder and decide, for all which he absolutely needs no assistance, though it may be graciously afforded. This mode of representation stands in strong contrast with the language of Scripture in those passages in which we are said "to be born of the Spirit," "to be created anew in Christ Jesus," to experience the workings "of the exceeding greatness of the power of God," and many others of a similar character.

As to the point which Dr Cox thinks so "intrinsically absurd," and about which he says so much, whether man is passive in regeneration, it will be seen that, for its own sake, it does not merit a moment's discussion. It depends entirely on the previous question. If regeneration be that act of the soul by which it chooses God for its portion, there is an end of all debate on the subject. For no one will maintain that the soul is passive in acting. But if there be any change in the moral state of the soul, prior to its turning unto God, then it is proper to say, that the soul is passive as to that particular point. That is, that the Holy Spirit is the author, and the soul the subject of the change. For all that is meant by the soul's being passive, is, that it is not the agent of the change in question. Its immediate and delightful turning unto God is its own act, the state of mind which leads to this act is produced directly by the Spirit of God. The whole question is, whether any such anterior change is necessary. Whether a soul polluted and degraded by sin, or in Scripture language, carnal, needs any change in its moral taste before it can behold the loveliness of the divine character. For that this view must precede the exercise of affection, we presume will not be denied. If this point be decided, the propriety of using the word passive to denote that the soul is the subject and not the agent of the change in question, need not give us much trouble. Sure it is that this change is in Scripture always referred to the Holy Spirit. It is the soul that repents, believes, hopes and fears, but it is the Holy Spirit that regenerates. He is the author of our faith and repentance by inducing us to act, but no man regenerates himself. The soul, although essentially active, is still capable of being acted upon. It receives impressions from sensible objects, from other spirits and from the Holy Ghost. In every sensation, there is an impression made by

some external object, and the immediate knowledge which the mind takes of the impression. As to the first point, it is passive, or the subject; as to the second, it is active, or the agent. These two are indeed inseparably connected, and so are regeneration and conversion. It is even allowable to say that the mind is passive considered as the recipient of any impression, no matter how communicated. Coleridge says, "In ATTENTION, we keep the mind *passive:* in THOUGHT, we rouse it into activity. In the former, we submit to an impression, we keep the mind steady in order to receive the stamp." P. 252. Whether this is "technically wretched, philosophically wrong, and theologically false," or not, we do not pretend to say. All that we say is, that it is perfectly intelligible and perfectly according to established usage, to speak of the mind as passive, when considered as the subject of an impression. And if the Holy Spirit does make such an impression on the mind, or exert such an influence as induces it immediately to turn to God, then it is correct to say that it is passive in regeneration, though active in conversion. However, this is a very subordinate point; the main question is, whether there is not a holy "relish," taste, or principle produced in the soul prior, in the order of nature, to any holy act of the soul itself. If Dr Cox can show this to be "intrinsically absurd," we shall give up the question of "passivity," without a moment's demur. To relinquish the other point, however, will cost us a painful struggle. It will be the giving up the main point in debate between the friends and opposers of the doctrines of grace from Augustine to the present day. It will be the renunciation, not only of a favourite principle of old Calvinists, but of one of the fundamental principles of the theology of Edwards, Bellamy, Dwight, and, as we believe, of the great body of the New England clergy. It will be the renunciation of what Calvinists, old and new, have believed to be the Scriptural doctrine of original righteousness, original sin and efficacious grace. It will be the rejection of that whole system of mingled sovereignty and love which has been the foundation, for ages, of so many hopes and of so much blessedness to the people of God. And all for what? Because it has been discovered, that what is not an act is an entity; that to suppose the existence of moral disposition prior to moral action, is making morality a substance. As we are incapable of seeing the truth of these axioms, and

believe their assumption to be encumbered with all the difficulties above referred to, we are not disposed to renounce, on their behalf, doctrines which have for ages been held dear by the best portion of the Christian church.

Dr Cox demands what has been the moral history of these doctrines? It would require more time and space than we can now command fully to answer this question. Not to enter on questionable ground, however, we would refer him for an answer to the history of the reformation. These doctrines were held sacred by all those men who were God's great instruments in that blessed work, and are incorporated in the confessions of all the reformed churches. We would point him to the history of the English Puritans and Nonconformists; to the Puritans of New England, from the time of their landing down to a late period in their history, and to the present opinions of the great body of their descendants. We would refer him to any age or any church, peculiarly distinguished for genuine piety. For there is scarcely one of the doctrines which he has empaled in his introduction, (with the exception of the mere extent of the atonement, a point of very subordinate importance to that of its nature), which does not enter in the faith of the great body of evangelical Christians. We have no doubt that Dr Cox believes these doctrines. What we lament is, that he should have "caricatured" the manner in which the vast majority of those who hold them have been accustomed to represent them, and that he should even seem to advocate a principle which we fear is subversive of them all.

---

## REVIEW.

*Lectures on the Shorter Catechism of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, addressed to Youth. By Ashbel Green, D.D. Philadelphia. A. Finley, and Towar and Hogan. One Volume.*

With pleasure we hail the appearance of these Lectures on the Shorter Catechism, and we are gratified to see them

comprised in so handsome a volume; for we are more and more persuaded, that nothing is gained to any body by coarse paper and a bad type. A perspicuous and orthodox commentary on this concise but rich system of gospel truth, cannot but be a valuable present to the christian public, and especially to the members of the Presbyterian church. Such a work we have now before us, which, in our opinion, supplies an important desideratum in our theological literature. For although we have several expositions of the Westminster Shorter Catechism which are sound and pious, yet, having been written a long time since, their language is now uncouth, and the whole style of composition antiquated; so that they are little read, and indeed are for the most part out of print. The whole body of Presbyterians, therefore, of every sect, who use this catechism, will feel themselves under special obligations to the venerable author for producing what, we hope, will become a sort of standard work for the instruction and edification of their youth; and certainly it is matter of congratulation with the friends of orthodoxy, that the execution of such a work has fallen into hands so competent to do it justice. The reader, it is true, will not, in these lectures, find much discussion of abstruse and difficult points in theology, nor any great parade of critical learning: both of which would have been entirely out of place in a work addressed to youth, and intended for the edification of persons of all classes in society. But we are far from intimating that the young theologian may not study these lectures with profit. We do believe, that often the student of theology spends his time and wastes his strength in reading authors which have no other recommendation but that they are abstruse, obscure and learned; while he neglects and perhaps despises works which are rich in truth and strong in argument, merely because they are plain and unpretending. We do not hesitate, therefore, to recommend this volume to the careful and repeated perusal of our candidates for the holy ministry. In fact, it comprehends all the truths which they will ever have occasion to teach.

It is no part of our object, in this review, to enter into a critical examination of the style and composition of these lectures. This is altogether unnecessary at this time; for although they now appear for the first time collected into a volume, the whole of them have been twice before the

public; first, when they were orally delivered by the author to his own catechumens, and secondly, when published in numbers in *The Christian Advocate*, of which valuable miscellany the author of this volume is the well known editor. It will be sufficient to remark, in general, that the style of these lectures is remarkable for correctness, perspicuity and force; the language is well adapted to the subjects treated, and while it furnishes a good example of purity and neatness, it is every where intelligible to the humblest capacity.

But if we do not entirely misinterpret the temper and taste of the times in which we live, doctrinal catechisms, and lectures explanatory of such catechisms, are not the books which will be sought after and read with avidity. The religious taste of most readers is, we fear, greatly vitiated by works of fiction and other kinds of light reading. Nothing will now please, unless it be characterized by novelty and variety; and while many new means of instruction have been afforded to our youth, in which we sincerely rejoice, we are so old fashioned in our notions, as to feel regret that in our own church those excellent little summaries of Christian doctrine, the Westminster Catechisms, are falling with many into disuse. Our numerous periodicals, coming out weekly, monthly, and quarterly, and often presenting much that is interesting, so occupy our leisure, that works of solid instruction are now read by few. Even the theologian, who is devoted to sacred pursuits, unless he is very economical in the distribution of his time, will find, that after perusing all the pamphlets which fall from the press in such abundance, he will have a small portion left for the more deep and solid works of theology; it is well indeed if by this means the Bible itself is not neglected. There is, doubtless, a great increase of reading among the population of this country within a few years; yet we cannot but fear that didactic and practical works of sound theology have, in too many instances, been excluded by the religious novel and the religious newspaper. And here, again, we must enter a caution against being misunderstood; as though we wished to proscribe all attempts at promoting a taste for reading by well composed fictitious narratives; or, that we would, if we could, diminish the facilities which now exist, of conveying religious intelligence to every corner of our country. We assuredly entertain no such feelings: but what we regret is, that while on the one hand we are gain-

ing many advantages which our fathers did not enjoy, on the other we are losing benefits which they did possess, and which they highly prized. For we see no good reason why the acquisition of new privileges should lead us to relinquish the old. There is certainly no necessary repugnance between different approved methods of religious instruction. In the circumstances in which the rising generation are placed, there may be abundance of shallow, showy, bustling, active piety; but the ripe fruits of profound spiritual knowledge, and of deep practical experience, will be rare. In process of time, we apprehend, the strong lines of demarkation between truth and error, on many important points, will become more and more indistinct: and not only so, but many precious evangelical doctrines will be held in low estimation; because, perchance, they are not embraced by every denomination of Christians. Creeds and catechisms, so highly appreciated by our ancestors, are in danger of being cast aside like old-fashioned furniture, which is too cumbersome for modern use. Many are not at all aware that there is an increasing tendency to these consequences; while others foresee them, and rejoice in what they consider the extinction of a sectarian spirit; and fancy they see, in the course of things, an approximation to that happy state of the church, predicted in Scripture, when all sects shall be melted down into one harmonious, united society. Now, although we respect the motives by which such persons are actuated, and would as truly rejoice in the universal peace and unity of Christ's body on earth as any others; yet, we are persuaded, that union which has not gospel truth as its foundation, is worthless, and in the nature of things cannot be lasting. When that happy period of the church shall arrive, which has been alluded to, Christians will be better acquainted with all the doctrines of the Bible than at any former time, and will be more attached to them. As long as error exists in the world there must be a collision between it and truth: for light and darkness cannot dwell together; and no church will really be promoting unity and peace by relinquishing or neglecting what she believes to be truth, because some sections of the church do not view these points in the same light. If these doctrines are true, all will eventually embrace them; and the sooner, if they are clearly and faithfully exhibited. We think, then, that the true policy for every Christian denomination to pursue, is to

maintain firmly and faithfully the doctrines which are believed to be scriptural; and at the same time, to treat other denominations who do not differ from it in fundamental points, with a kind, paternal, and liberal spirit; but while real differences exist, not to attempt an amalgamation, or even too close an union; for bodies which continue very peaceable towards each other when at a proper distance, may, when placed in too close contact, be thrown into a state of violent collision.

Catechetical instruction must have been coeval with the human family. At first all knowledge was communicated orally, and handed down by tradition. The first man delivered a stock of important ideas to his children; and they again to theirs, with different degrees of ability and fidelity. The most usual place of instruction was, doubtless, for a long time, the domestic circle. Here the pious patriarch would spend much time in dealing out to his listening children the lessons which he had learned in his youth from his predecessors, and those which he had been taught by his own experience. These instructions were properly of the nature of *catechising*, which may be defined to be "the familiar communication of knowledge, orally." As long as this duty was faithfully performed by parents, the darkness of ignorance and idolatry was prevented, but as soon as it fell into neglect, error and vice must have been the consequence. Of Abraham, God certifies, "I know that he will command his children, and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment." Gen. xviii. 19. And God, by Moses, insisted moré upon no duty than this, of domestic instruction in the truths of religion. "And the words which I command thee shall be in thy heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently to 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." Again "Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes have seen, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life; but teach them, thy sons, and thy son's sons." Deut. iv. 9, 10. vi. 7. To these precepts the Psalmist refers, when he says, "He established a testimony in Jacob, and appointed a law in Israel, which he commanded our fathers, that they should make them known to their children: that the generation to come might know them, even the children

which should be born, who should arise and declare them to their children." Psal. lxxviii. 5, 6. The word *catechise*, is properly Greek, derived from the verb κατηχέω, "to instruct with the voice," which is found, in some of its parts, six or seven times in the New Testament, but is commonly translated "to instruct:" because in English, the word *catechise* has somehow acquired a narrower signification than the original term, and conveys the idea of *instruction by question and answer;* whereas, the word in Greek includes all manner of elementary, oral instruction: and it would be desirable to bring back the word to its original meaning. This, however, is of small moment. The passages in which the original word is found, are the following: Luke i. 4. Acts xviii. 25. xxi. 22, 24. Rom. ii. 18. 1 Cor. xiv. 19. Gal. iv. 6.

It appears, therefore, that this mode of instruction is fully recognised in the sacred Scriptures. Indeed, if no other methods of inculcating divine truth were resorted to, than delivering elaborate and continued discourses from the pulpit, very little information would be gained by the young and the ignorant. Preaching supposes and requires some preparatory knowledge in the hearers, to render it useful in communicating religious knowledge. Elementary principles must be acquired in some other way; and this was more especially the case before the invention of printing, when books were very scarce, and few persons were able to read. It seems that the apostles and first teachers of the Christian religion were much occupied in giving religious instruction, from house to house; and we know, from undoubted authorities, that in the earliest times of the primitive church, all who applied for admission into the church, from among the heathen, and all the children of Christians, were carefully instructed by catechising; that is, by a course of familiar teaching, *viva voce.* To every church a class of catechumens was attached, and formed a kind of school, in which the first principles of religion were inculcated, and certain formulas of Christian doctrine, such as the early creeds, carefully committed to memory, together with portions of the sacred Scriptures. In some places these schools for catechumens became very famous, and were supplied with teachers of the highest character for learning and piety; so that they were frequented by the lovers of sacred literature from other countries. A celebrated institution of this sort flourished for several ages at Alexandria, in Egypt, in which

Origen was educated, and of which he became the most distinguished teacher. A large number of the treatises written by the fathers, in different countries, and in different centuries, were composed expressly for the instruction of the catechumens. And until darkness overspread the church, and her unnatural pastors deprived the people of the Scriptures, the church was, as it ever should be, like a great school, where holy men of God devoted their time to the instruction of the rising generation, and of converts from paganism.

In catechetical, or elementary instruction, the grand secret is, "little at a time, and often repeated." Whoever would successfully instruct children and very ignorant adults, should avoid the error of crowding too many things into their minds at once. It is as preposterous a practice as it would be to attempt to increase the activity, vigour and size of the body, by cramming the stomach with as much food as it could hold. Moreover, the truths first communicated should be as simple as possible. Tender minds must not be fed with strong meat, but with pure milk. To accommodate instruction to the state of advancement in knowledge, and to the degree of development of the mental faculties, is certainly that part of education which is most difficult, and at the same time most important. That historical facts should form the commencement of a course of religious instruction, is indicated, first, by the method pursued in the Bible; and secondly, by the predilection of all children for this species of knowledge. But, at a very early period, moral and doctrinal instruction of the most important kind may be connected with the scriptural facts inculcated, and may always be most advantageously engrafted on them. Doctrinal catechisms are, it is admitted, not commonly understood well by children; but it can do them no harm to exercise themselves in committing the words to memory; for it is universally admitted, that to strengthen the memory, it must be frequently and vigorously exercised: and will it not be much better to have it stored with words, which contain the most salutary truths, rather than those which may, by some association, prove injurious on the recollection? Sometimes the having committed to memory such a system as the Shorter Catechism, is of the utmost importance to an individual when his lot is cast where he has no means of correct information; or in case the person should lose his sight or hearing. We once noticed an exemplification of this in the case of a man of

strong mind, who had led a busy life, without much concern with books, and who in his latter years was entirely blind. In conversation on the most important topics of religion, in which he took a deep interest, he would continually recur to the answers in the Shorter Catechism, which he had learned when young; and which now seemed to serve as a guide to his thoughts in all his meditations. But the true reason why so many children learn the catechism without understanding its meaning, is, that no pains are taken to explain its doctrines, and to illustrate them, in a way adapted to their capacity. Parents are, for the most part, either incapable of giving such instruction, or negligent in the performance of this important duty. Most parents then need just such a help, for the discharge of this duty, as is here provided for them. Why then should not every Presbyterian family possess itself at least of one copy of these Lectures, which are handsomely printed, and sold at a very reasonable rate? And why may not this become an important aid to the teachers in Sunday schools, where these schools consist of the children of Presbyterian parents? We do earnestly hope that attention to doctrinal instruction will not be relinquished, nor diminished, in our church. Hitherto Presbyterians have been distinguished above all people in the world, for a correct and thorough knowledge of the tenets of their own church. No people on earth are so well indoctrinated in the principles of religion, and in the proof of the doctrines believed, as the Scotch, and their descendants in Ireland and America. Other people far exceed them in metaphysical speculations, and in the knowledge of other matters: but for sound religious knowledge, commend us to Scotch Presbyterians of every sect.

The benefits of thorough instruction in the doctrines of religion cannot be calculated. The truths thus received into the mind may prove ineffectual, in some cases, to restrain from open sin; but even in these, the force of the truth is often felt, and the person thus situated, is much more likely to be convinced of the error of his ways than those transgressors whose minds are almost totally destitute of the knowledge of the doctrines of religion. There is, moreover, an unspeakable benefit from the possession of correct doctrinal information, when the mind falls under serious impressions of religion; for, then, truths which had been early inculcated, and long forgotten, will revive in the memory, and serve to guard the

anxious mind from those enthusiastic errors into which ignorant persons are so prone to fall when they are deeply exercised on the subject of their salvation. Let not the members of the Presbyterian church, therefore, become remiss in that which has ever been her most honourable distinction; the careful initiation of children into the doctrines of religion, contained in her catechisms; than which, we believe, a sounder system of theoretical and practical theology, cannot be found in any language. It may appear rather extraordinary, that the assembly of divines at Westminster, should have prepared two catechisms, as this seems rather calculated to distract than edify the church. But the history of this matter is simply this. The Larger Catechism was first composed by a committee of three members; Dr Tuckney, Dr Arrowsmith, and the Rev. Mr Newcomen; though there is good reason to believe that the first named had the chief hand in the composition. The work was highly approved, but was thought to be too long to be generally committed to memory by children; the committee was therefore directed to prepare a catechism containing the same truths, in a more condensed form. The Shorter Catechism is therefore an abridgment of the Larger, and by comparison it will be found to contain the substance of the Larger, expressed with more brevity, but containing, for the most part, the very language of the original. It was formerly a frequent thing for young persons of both sexes, in our church, to commit to memory, accurately, the whole of the Larger Catechism. Whether this practice is continued in many of the Presbyterian congregations, under the care of the General Assembly, our information is not sufficient to enable us to declare; but we cannot but believe that young persons who have accomplished this object, have acquired a treasure which may be to them of more value than thousands of silver and gold. One thus armed with the panoply of divine truth, will not be liable to be "carried about with every wind of doctrine," and every wild spirit of enthusiasm which may be abroad in the world; and when he reads religious books, or hears discourses from the pulpit, he will be not only capable of understanding them better than others, but will carry about with him a test, by which he can make trial of the correctness of what he hears or reads, and thus be in a situation to obey the apostle's exhortation, "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." We cannot be contented to let the opportunity pass

of bestowing merited commendation on those denominations of Scotch Presbyterians who are not in communion with the General Assembly, for their indefatigable industry and care in giving doctrinal instruction to their children. In this respect, it must be acknowledged, they greatly excel all other denominations of Christians in our country. Among them, we have reason to believe, there has been no falling off in attention to the Catechisms; and few instances ever occur of the members of these churches being seduced by the insidious arts of the propagators of error and infidelity.

The question may occur to some, To whom does it belong to give catechetical instruction? We answer, to all who are capable of teaching any thing of divine truth correctly. But, especially, it is the duty of parents, guardians, masters, schoolmasters, elders, and ministers. All who can be enlisted in the service should be engaged to teach those more ignorant than themselves. And we feel constrained to give our testimony strongly in favour of Sunday schools, in which so many persons are employed, so beneficially to themselves and others, in giving instruction out of the Bible. When this is called a new institution, it surely is not meant that any new instruction is given; or that there is any thing new in the manner of communicating religious knowledge. The whole novelty of the thing consists in the success of the attempt to engage such a multitude of teachers in giving lessons, and such a multitude of scholars in learning them. But we would respectfully ask, whether parents, and ministers, and elders, have not become more remiss in catechising since the introduction of Sunday schools?

In order to render the public catechising of children profitable, the pastor of the flock must manifest a deep and lively interest in the exercise. If he should appear indifferent, and attend on catechetical exercises in a formal, or careless manner, no great good can be expected to arise from such meetings: but if he will take pains to arrange all the circumstances of such exercises, so as to render them interesting to old and young;—if he will propose special subjects of inquiry, refer to proper books, and converse freely with his people on this topic, a spirit of investigation will be excited, religious knowledge will be pursued with diligence and alacrity, and catechising will be found to be the most effectual means of diffusing correct information on the doctrines of religion.

If common schools were what they ought to be, semina-

ries in which Christian doctrine was carefully taught, then our schoolmasters would all be catechists, and the children would be trained in the knowledge of God, and their duty. The business of catechising youth seems also to be one of the appropriate duties of the eldership: for surely these officers ought not to be restricted to mere matters of order and government. As leaders of the people, they should go before them in religious instruction; and it would be an expedient, as it is a common arrangement, to have each parish so divided into districts, that every elder would have a little charge of his own to look after, the families within which he might frequently visit, and where he might frequently collect and catechise the youth. If ruling elders are commonly incompetent to perform such a work as this, they are unfit for the office which they hold, and can be of little service in the church in other respects. It is now becoming matter of common complaint, that our ruling elders are not generally sensible of the important duties which belong to their office, and are not well qualified to perform them. But how can this evil be remedied? We answer, that the effectual remedy will be found in an increased attention to instruction in the doctrines of the church, by which means many will acquire a taste and thirst for religious knowledge; and whenever this occurs, there will be rapid progress in the acquisition of such a fund of sound theology, as will qualify them to communicate instruction to the young and ignorant. In the mean time, let every pastor meet with the elders of his church, once in the week, for the express purpose of discussing questions which relate to the duties belonging to their office; and thus those who are really desirous of executing their office in a faithful and intelligent manner, will become better and better prepared for their important work every year.

The question has often been agitated, whether it would not be expedient to have an order of catechists, whose duty it should be to attend to this whole concern; and the idea has been favourably entertained by some in the Presbyterian church. But to us it appears, that such an office would be worse than useless: for, if the catechist be taken from among the members of the church, where he is expected to officiate, and this must be the case if every church is supplied with one or more, then why not constitute him at once a ruling elder? Surely the mere name of *catechist* would not qualify him to give instruction; and if he is qualified, would he not

be as able to teach, if called by the name elder as catechist? And if the office is judged to be expedient, because we cannot obtain well qualified elders, how can it be supposed that competent catechists could be found? The idea of some, however, is, that to perform the duties of catechising well, requires much more time than men can commonly afford from their own business; and, therefore, proper persons should be employed, at a reasonable salary, to devote their whole time to this important branch of instruction. Now all this is very reasonable, and brings us to the very point mentioned before, viz. that schools, among Christians, should have it as their chief object, to bring up children in the knowledge of divine things; and the proper catechists of the church would be the teachers of these schools. If it be said, that school-masters are often incompetent to perform this part of their duty; we reply, that the same thing would be true, if they were called catechists; or if other persons were sought for, in the present state of the church, there would exist the same difficulty in obtaining them as there is now in finding well qualified schoolmasters. The truth is, the church should take pains to train men for this very office; and parents should set a much higher value on it, than they have been accustomed to do; and the office ought to be rendered more respectable, and more desirable than it is at present.

It may, perhaps, be thought by some, that the prevalence of Sunday schools renders it unnecessary for church officers to concern themselves with the instruction of the youth under their charge. If, indeed, the schools of this description within the parish are under the special superintendence and tuition of the pastor and elders, there is no good reason why catechetical instruction should not be given in a Sunday school as well as any where else. Catechising is an exercise peculiarly suited to the Sabbath, and if the officers of any church should agree to conduct this part of instruction in their valuable institutions, it would certainly be an improvement on the plan on which they are commonly conducted. But when, as is commonly the case, these schools are made up of children of different denominations, and are under the direction of persons not connected with any one church, their existence and prosperity, while it will greatly facilitate pastoral labours, ought not to be considered as a substitute for catechising. We are afraid, however, that some pastors, as well as many parents, have become remiss in this

part of their duty, from the mistaken idea, that their labours in this field are now superseded. This mistake should be carefully counteracted; and while the benefits of Sunday schools are gratefully acknowledged, the instruction of our youth in the catechisms of our own church should be pursued with increasing diligence.

The old Presbyterian plan of conducting catechising did not confine this method of instruction to children and youth, but extended it to all persons except the officers of the church. And certainly one of the chief hinderances to the success of catechetical instruction has been that it commonly terminates too soon. When children have arrived at the age of twelve or fourteen years, they take up the opinion that they are too big and too old to repeat the catechism; in consequence of which, until the institution of Bible classes, our youth received no appropriate instruction, in many congregations, in that period of their lives which of all others is most important for improvement in knowledge. While we are strong advocates for catechetical instruction, we are at the same time warm friends to the method of instruction pursued in Bible classes; and we should be pleased to see both these methods of instruction extended to all ages and conditions of men; for who is there that has not something yet to learn? And what upon earth is so worthy of time and pains as the knowledge of God's word, and the doctrines of his wonderful love and grace? Every man who contributes to the increase of this kind of learning by his writings, should be deemed more a public benefactor than he who invents the most useful machine. Let all, then, whom God has entrusted with so excellent a talent as that of writing well on theology, take heed that they do not hide it in a napkin or bury it in the earth; for never was there a time when there was greater need of good books and tracts to counteract the floods of error which are issuing from a thousand sources; and never was there a period when the effect of good writing was so extensive. By means of the improvements in printing, and the facilities of conveyance in our day, opportunity is afforded of circulating opinions throughout the land; and if religious men sleep, there is no doubt that the enemy will sow his tares plentifully. Let the friends of truth, therefore, be watchful and wise, and ever on the alert, in seizing opportunities of enlightening the world with the pure doctrines of the word of God.

## LETTER OF DR COOKE, AND REPLY OF THE EDITORS.

*Lexington, Feb.* 20, 1830.

MESSRS. JAMES KAY, JUN. & Co. PHILADELPHIA.

Gentlemen,

I have received, by favour of Dr Blythe, the Biblical Repertory for January 1830, which came to hand, the Dr informs me, a day or two ago. In it I see a review of my Essay on Ordination. I am there openly charged with "palming" certain things on the public, &c. &c. I write to inform you that I shall immediately set about an answer to it, and wish to know whether you will insert it in your next number. This is a piece of justice which I am not willing to believe you will deny me. There is an obvious difference between a reply to a published work, by another, offered for sale in the same way, and by a publication in a periodical. The latter compels the notice of numbers who would not, perhaps, choose to purchase the former. There will, therefore, be many who will read the review, who will never read the work reviewed, nor the answer to the review, if not published in the same periodical. You will please let me have your answer without delay through my friend, who will hand you this.

Yours, &c.
JOHN E. COOKE.

P.S. I should have written to the Editors, had I known where to address them, or whom to address. There are no instructions that I perceive, on this subject, on the cover. If you determine to insert my answer, send me the work for the year, and you shall be paid immediately after hearing from you.

It was with no little surprise that we received the foregoing letter. That Dr Cooke should expect and demand that the pages of the Repertory should be open, without limit, to all he might choose to write in answer to our review of his book, does, indeed, appear to us truly wonderful. Had he, instead of the above communication, sent us a letter, adapted to fill two or three, or even half a dozen pages, showing, or attempting to show, wherein we had misrepresented him, or done him, in any way, the least injustice, we should have inserted it promptly and with pleasure. And this, if he is as familiar with the periodical works of the day as we suppose him to be, he must know is all that is usually admitted in similar cases. But to have it intimated to us, that he had in view an answer entirely too long to be completed in a few hours; and that, if we would promise it a place, he would "immediately set about" the preparation of it, was, indeed, a prelude of most portentous aspect. We appeal to Dr Cooke's candour. If he were allowed to answer at as much length as he might think fit, our review of his book, the same privilege might be, with equal propriety, claimed by all persons whose writings or opinions we might happen to oppose; and thus every heretic and infidel in the land, whose works or sentiments we had assailed, would feel himself entitled to speak at full length in our pages. Would this be reasonable? Besides, we do not choose to permit the Repertory to be filled, or to any disproportioned extent occupied, with pieces on the Episcopal controversy. There are many subjects, the discussion of which we consider as far more likely to be useful, as well as more acceptable to the great mass of the religious public; but for which we have not room in our pages. If Dr Cooke thinks proper further to waste his time and strength on this controversy, we have no right to object; but he must excuse us for declining to become partners in the concern. Whatever he may write, we reserve to ourselves the privilege of noticing or not, as we may think proper. If we should choose to animadvert on any of his future lucubrations, we will certainly try to do him justice. More we cannot promise.

THE EDITORS.

# Select List of Recent Publications.

## BIBLICAL.

A Complete Concordance to the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, or a Dictionary and Alphabetical Index to the Bible; very useful to all Christians who seriously read and study the Inspired Writings. In two parts. To which is added, A Concordance to the books called Apocrypha. By Alexander Cruden, M.A. From the tenth London edition, carefully revised and corrected by the Holy Scriptures. To which is added, an original Life of the Author. Philadelphia, published by Thomas Wardle, Minor street. Pp. 872. Imperial 8vo. Stereotype, 1830.

We take great pleasure in placing at the head of our list this American reprint of a work so truly valuable to biblical students. There is little difference of opinion as to the worth of this elaborate concordance. Since its first appearance in 1737, it has stood above all competition, and no christian library can be considered complete without it. The English editions, however, have been both expensive and inaccurate, and we cannot but commend the enterprise of the publisher in Philadelphia, who has spared no pains in order to present a fair and correct impression. The typography is singularly beautiful, and some idea may be formed of the care which has been expended upon the work, when we are told that more than *ten thousand* references have been corrected, which had escaped the revision of the London publishers. It would be superfluous to add any further commendation of a book so advantageously known. For thus affording it at a very reduced price, Mr Wardle is justly entitled to the thanks of every reader of the Holy Scriptures.

A Summary of Biblical Antiquities, compiled for the use of Sunday School Teachers, and for the benefit of Families. By John W. Nevin, late Assistant teacher in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, (N. J.) In two Volumes. Revised and corrected by the author, for the American Sunday School Union. 1830.

A Pocket Dictionary of the Holy Bible. Containing a Historical and Geographical Account of the Persons and Places mentioned in the Old and New Testaments: and also a Description of other objects, Natural, Artificial, Civil, Religious, and Military; together with a copious reference to Texts of Scripture under each important word. Prepared for the American Sunday School Union, and adapted to general use. By Archibald Alexander, D.D. Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. 18mo, pp. 546. Philadelphia, 1830.

Analecta Theologica, a digested and arranged Compendium of the most approved Commentaries of the New Testament. By the Rev. William Trollope, M.A. of Pembroke College, Cambridge, and one of the Masters of Christ Church Hospital. 2 vols, 8vo. London, 1830.

The Book of Psalms; newly translated from the Hebrew, and with Explanatory Notes. By W. French, D.D. Master of Jesus College, Cambridge; and G. Skinner, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. 8vo. John Murray, London, 1830.

Annotations on the Gospels. Parts I. and II. Designed for the use of Students at the University, and for candidates for Holy Orders. By the Rev. M. Bland, D.D. F.R.S. and F.A.S., Rectory of Lilly, Herts: Prebendary of Wells, and late Fellow and Tutor of St John's College, Cambridge. 8vo. London, 1830.

Two Lectures on the History of Biblical Interpretation, with an Appendix. By Herbert Marsh, D.D. F.R.S. and F.A.S. Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and Bishop of Peterborough. 8vo. London, 1830.

The Veracity of the Five Books of Moses, argued from undesigned coincidences to be found in them, when compared in their several parts. By the Rev. J. J. Blunt, Fellow of St John's College, Cambridge. Small 8vo. London, 1830.

The Veracity of the Gospels and Acts, argued from the undesigned coincidences to be found in them, when compared, first, with one another; secondly, with Josephus. By the Rev. John James Blunt. 8vo. London, 1830.

Conversations on the Bible. By Erodore. Boston, 12mo, pp. 112.

Biblical Emendations, or a View of the Various Readings of the most important passages of Scripture. Boston. Carter and Hendee. 12mo.

## THEOLOGY.

The Orthodox and Catholic Doctrine of our Lord's Human Nature, set forth in four parts. 1. Statement of the Doctrine from Scripture. 2. Confirmation of it from the Creeds of the Primitive Churches, and of the Church of Scotland. 3. Objections to the True Doctrine considered. 4 The Doctrines of the Faith which stand or fall with it. By the Rev. Edward Irving, A.M. 12mo. London, 1830.

Natural Theology, or Essays on the Existence of Deity and of Providence, on the Immateriality of the Soul, and a Future State. By the Rev. Alexander Crombie, L.L.D. F.R.S. and M.R.S.L. 8vo. London, 1830.

Sermons, Explanatory and Practical, on the Thirty-nine Articles. By the Rev. T. Waite, D.C.L. Chaplain to H. R. H. the Duke of Gloucester, and to the Hon. and Right Rev. the Bishop of Oxford; and Master of the Grammar School, Lewisham Hill. 8vo. London, 1830.

A Treatise on the Evidence of the Scripture Miracles. By John Penrose, M.A. formerly of C. C. College, Oxford. 8vo. London, 1830.

True Christian Religion; containing the Universal Theology of the New Church, which was foretold by the Lord in Dan. vii. 13, 14, and in the Apocalypse, xxi. 1, 2. Translated from the Latin of E. Swedenborg. 2 vols, 8vo. London, 1830.

A plain and Serious Address on the subject of the Christian Religion; urging the practice of it in a candid and charitable spirit. Boston. Gray and Bowen.

Friendly Letters to a Lady, on Doctrinal Subjects. By John Butler, A.M. Boston. James Loring.

Strictures on the Review of Dr Spring's Dissertation on the Means of Regeneration, in the Christian Spectator for 1829. By Bennet Tyler, D.D. Portland. Shirley and Hyde. 8vo, pp. 64.

Letters to a Friend on the Evidences, Doctrines, and Duties of the Christian Religion. By Olinthus Gregory, L.L.D. Honorary member of the Literary and Philosophical Society of New York, Associate member of the Academy of Sciences and Belles Lettres at Dijon, Member of the Astronomical Society of London, and Professor of Mathematics in the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich. Two volumes 8vo.

First American, from the fourth London edition. New York, G. and C. Carvill. 1826.

There are some books which we dismiss with a single perusal. Important, perhaps, only as communicative of facts, and characterized by no peculiar felicity of execution, they contribute little to mental improvement, and hence should not long detain us from more interesting works. There are others, which, from the nature of the subjects they discuss, and the quickening manner in which they are written, deserve our frequent attention and study. They do not merely afford instruction ; they impart the spirit of the author, cherish and strengthen the desire of knowledge, awaken the mind to a consciousness of its energies, and lead to the perception of higher truths than they unfold. To this class belong the "Letters" of Dr Gregory. They first appeared in England in 1812, and soon passed through a number of editions. But one edition has as yet, we believe, been published in this country. This we regret, as we know of no work better adapted to give just views of the evidences, nature and importance of revealed religion. The first volume treats of the absurdity of deism, and of the necessity and evidences of revelation. The various topics are discussed in a manner at once brief, clear and convincing. The second volume treats of the most important Christian doctrines, and closes with a summary of the Christian duties. The views of the author on these subjects are orthodox, and his mode of treating them worthy of his powers and acquirements. He evinces not only a clearness of conception and an accuracy in reasoning which few attain, but a liveliness of emotion which is not usually deemed compatible with scientific pursuits, and a warmth and elevation of piety which is truly refreshing. Should our Journal meet the eye of any who have not read the letters, we hope they will avail themselves of the pleasure and profit of so doing, and increase the usefulness of the work by promoting its circulation.

---

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

The History of the Church of England. By J. B. S. Carwithen, B.D. of St Mary's Hall, Oxford, Bampton Lecturer for 1809, and Vicar of Sandhurst, Berks. Part I., to the Restoration of the Church and Monarchy in 1660. 2 vols, 8vo. London.

The History of the Rise and Early Progress of Christianity; comprising an Inquiry into its true character and design. By the Rev. Samuel Hinds, M.A., of Queen's College, and

Vice Principal of St Alban's Hall, Oxford. 2 vols. 8vo. London.

A Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World. By John Evans, L.L.D. Fifteenth edition, with the Author's last improvements. 12mo. London.

Dr Edward Calamy's Historical Account of his own Life and Times; now first printed from the original MS., including interesting particulars relative to Lord Shaftesbury, Dr Tillotson, Mr Baxter, Dr Burnet, Dr Sherlock, Hobbes, &c. 2 vols, 8vo. London, 1830.

The Last Hours of Eminent Christians; from the commencement of the Christian Æra to the death of George III. Compiled from the best authorities, and chronologically arranged. By the Rev. Henry Clissold, M.A., Minister of Stockwell Chapel, Lambeth. 8vo. London, 1830.

The Life of Bishop Heber, with selections from his correspondence, and from his unpublished works. By his Widow. 4to, with a portrait. London, 1830.

Memoirs of the Rev. Edward Payson, D.D., late Pastor of the Second Church in Portland, Maine. 12mo, with a likeness. Boston, 1830.

Anecdotes Curieuses et Authentiques sur les celèbres réformateurs Calvin, Théodore de Bèze, Farel et Viret, suivies de Notices Biographiques sur ces deux derniers. Paris, 1829.

Successful Missions; or a History of the Missions conducted by the London Missionary Society, in the Society and Georgian Islands; with an account of the unsuccessful attempt at the Friendly Islands. By Asa S. Colton. 18mo, pp. 174. Philadelphia, 1830.

---

## PROPHECY.

Lectures on the Apocalypse. By William Jones, M.A., Author of the "History of the Waldenses," &c. &c. 8vo, pp. 632. London, 1830.

Lectures on the Book of the Revelation. By the Rev. Edward Irving, M.A., &c. &c.

These are, in substance, the discourses delivered by the erratic author during the sittings of the Scottish General Assembly in 1829. They are now in the course of publication by numbers, and are upon the following subjects. 1. Name, Authority, Substance and

Sanctions of the Book. 2. The Revelation of Jesus Christ by Names and Titles. 3. Jesus Christ as the Universal Bishop and Head of the Churches. 4. Jesus Christ as the Lamb slain, revived, received in Heaven, and put into possession of the seven-sealed Book. 5. The seven-sealed Book. 6. Jesus Christ the High Priest and Intercessor in Heaven, sending forth the seven Angels with the trumpets of judgment.

Annotations on the Apocalypse; intended as a sequel to those of Mr Elsley on the Gospels, and of Mr Prebendary Slade on the Epistles; and thus to complete a set of comments on the whole of the New Testament. For the use of Students in Prophetical Scripture. By John Chappel Woodhouse, D.D. Dean of Litchfield. 8vo. London. 1830.

The Apocalypse, or Revelation of St John, translated: with notes Critical and Explanatory. By J. C. Woodhouse, D.D. 8vo. London.

A Key to the Revelation of St John the Divine; being an Analysis of those parts of that wonderful Book which relate to the General State of the Christian Church through all the times since it was written, and to the peculiar signs of those times. By the Rev. Philip Allwood, B.D. Fellow of Magdalene College, Cambridge. 8vo. London, 1830.

The Scheme and Completion of Prophecy, wherein its design and use, together with its sense and application as the grand fundamental proof of Religion, specially adapted to all periods of the world, and all stages of the Church, are considered and explained; together with an inquiry into the Shekinah and the Cherubim in the Holy of Holies, and the Visions of the Prophets. By the Rev. John Willey, D.D. T.C.D. Master of the School of Galway. 8vo. Wakeman. Dublin, 1830.

---

## SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

Sermons, Plain, Brief and Explanatory, on the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. By John Nance, D.D. 12mo. London, 1830.

Sermons, Preached in the Parish Church of St Botolph, Bishopsgate. By C. J. Bloomfield, D.D. Rector, now Bishop of London. 8vo. London, 1830. Twelve Lectures on the Acts of the Apostles; to which is added a new edition of Five Lectures on the Gospel of St John. Second Edition. By the Bishop of London. 8vo. 1830.

Sermons, by Samuel Horsley, L.L.D. F.R.S. & F.A.S. late Lord Bishop of St Asaph. Only complete edition. 2 vols, 8vo. London, 1830.

Sermons on the principal festivals of the Christian Church. By the Rev. John Bird, Lord Bishop of Chester.

Practical Discourses; a selection from the unpublished MSS of the late venerable Archdeacon Townson. Edited by John, Bishop of Limerick. 8vo. London, 1830.

A Discourse on the Duties of Church Members. By Thomas H. Skinner, Pastor of the Fifth Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia. 12mo. Philadelphia.

A Discourse delivered in the Meeting House of the First Baptist Church and Society in Boston, on the day of Public Thanksgiving, Nov. 26, 1829. By Cyrus P. H. Grosvenor. 8vo. Boston. True and Greene. 1830.

A Discourse delivered in the Meeting House of the First Baptist Church and Society in Boston, Dec. 6, 1829. By Cyrus P. H. Grosvenor. Boston, 1830.

A Sermon preached at the Dedication of the Second Congregational Church in Milton, Oct. 21, 1829. By Charles Lowell. 8vo, pp. 24. Boston.

A Sermon preached on the day of the Annual Thanksgiving, November 26, 1829. By Daniel S. Southmayd. 8vo, pp. 24. Boston.

Holiness Preferable to Sin. A Sermon by Edward R. Tyler, Pastor of the South Church, Middletown, Connecticut. New Haven, 1829.

Thoughts on Unitarian Christianity; a Sermon preached September 27, 1829, before the First Unitarian Society in Milton. By Daniel Kimball. Dedham.

Christianity a Universal Religion. A Discourse at the Ordination of the Rev. James W. Thompson in Natick.

Address on Temperance, delivered Jan. 14, 1830. By A. L. Peirson, M.D. 12mo. Boston.

Extracts from an Address delivered by the Hon. Samuel M. Hopkins of Albany, before the Saratoga County Temperance Society in September 1829.

An Address delivered before the Temperance Society of Plymouth, N. H. July 4, 1829. By Jonathan Kittredge. Boston.

An Address delivered in Pomfret, Conn. Oct. 28, 1829, before the Windham County Temperance Society. By the Rev. John Marsh. Hartford.

*H. & F. J. Huntington, Hartford, Conn.*

AND

*Towar, J. & D. M. Hogan, Philadelphia,*

HAVE FOR SALE,

1. *Familiar Lectures on Botany*, including Practical and Elementary Botany, with Generic and Specific descriptions of the most Common Native and Foreign Plants, and a Vocabulary of Botanical Terms, for the use of High Schools and Academies. By Mrs. Almira H. Lincoln, Vice Principal of the Troy Female Seminary. Containing Thirteen Beautiful Engravings on Copper. 1 Vol. Imperial 12mo.—$1,50, bound.

2. *Outlines of Ecclesiastical History*, on a new plan, designed for Academies and Schools, by the Rev. Charles A. Goodrich. Illustrated by Engravings. 1 Vol. 12mo.—Price $1,25, bound.

*From the Spirit of the Pilgrims.*

"The incidents in this work are well selected and arranged; the style is sufficiently elevated and always perspicuous; and the volume will be found interesting and useful, not only in academies and common schools, but in private families. The plan of making Ecclesiastical History the subject of attention and recitation in the higher schools, is obviously important, and we know of no work more suitable to be adopted as a text book, than the one before us."

*From the Rev. R. Emerson, Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the Andover Institution.*

"It appears well adapted to its object—the use of schools. Ecclesiastical History, always important, appears doubly so at the present time, for the rising generation in this country. Its bearing on the question of Popery, and on the cause of missions and the spread of the Bible, is as important as it is obvious. Next to the Gospel itself as read and preached, we must ever regard the history of the Church as the best antidote to the corruptions and the strongest excitement to the virtues that have been found in its bosom. To introduce such works into our schools is an important step towards rendering them truly Christian and 'practical.'"

*From the Rev. Joseph Emerson, Principal of the Female Seminary at Wethersfield.*

"During the last two years, I have devoted a considerable portion of my time to studying and teaching Ecclesiastical History, while my estimation of this most noble branch of literature has been continually rising. I am therefore prepared most cordially to repeat my brother's recommendation, and could add much more.

"The sweet simplicity, the classical neatness, the luminous perspicuity, the able arrangement, the distinct numerical statement of causes, in connection with the importance of the matter, can hardly fail to render your work both interesting and profitable to all who may study it. But probably the *Questions* are its most distinguishing excellence. May you long continue to be more and more useful, in your most difficult and momentous employment of composing books for the rising generation."

The above work has been introduced into several seminaries during the short period since its publication, and has in every instance afforded the utmost satisfaction in both teachers and pupils. Very flattering notices have been received by the Author from a large number of clergymen, and reviews commending the book have appeared in the Spirit of the Pilgrims, Journal of Education, and most of the Religious weekly periodicals in this country.

*From Professors Taylor and Fitch, of New-Haven.*

This work presents the outlines of Ecclesiastical History in a faithful and perspicuous manner. By arranging the principal events into distinct propositions, with comments and additional facts subjoined, in small letter, and by inserting questions upon the text at the foot of each page, the author has happily adapted the book to the capacities of the young and to exercises in our schools. And the impartiality of the narative renders it a useful class book to children universally, to whatever religious denomination they may belong.

3. *Remains of the Rev. Charles Wolfe,* A.B. Curate of Donoughmore, Diocese of Armagh, with a brief memoir of his life, by the Rev. John A. Russel, M.A. with a fine Engraving of Mr Wolfe. In 1 Vol. 12mo.—Price $1,50.

4. *Journal of a Residence during several months in London,* together with Excursions through various parts of England; and a short tour in France and Scotland, in the Years 1823 and 1824. By Nathaniel S. Wheaton, A.M Rector of Christ Church, Hartford.

THE

# BIBLICAL REPERTORY

AND

# THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Is published quarterly by JAMES KAY, JUN. & CO. Library street, Philadelphia, on the 15th day of January, April, July and October.

This Periodical is a continuation of the *Biblical Repertory;* is more adapted to the taste and the wants of the Christian public generally than that work was; and is conducted by an *Association of Gentlemen in Princeton, N. J. and its vicinity; aided by Distinguished Writers in various parts of the Union.* It is designed not only to promote the proper interpretation and illustration of the Bible, but also to review such works on Philosophy and Literature as have a bearing on religious sentiment and doctrine, as well as those touching religious opinion, ecclesiastical polity, and those events which promote or retard the diffusion of piety. The various enterprises of Christian benevolence will be reviewed with deep attention, and cordially sustained.

## AGENTS FOR THIS WORK.

Concord, N. H. *Marsh, Capen & Lyon.*
Burlington, Vt. *Chauncey Goodrich.*
Windsor, Vt. *John C. Allen.*
Boston, Mass. *Crocker and Brewster.*
Newburyport, Mass. *Charles Whipple.*
Andover, Mass. *Mark Newman.*
Providence, Rh. Island, *A. S. Beckwith.*
New Haven, Conn. *A. H. Maltby.*
Hartford, Conn. *H. & F. J. Huntington.*
New York, *J. Leavitt.*
Albany, N. Y. *Weare C. Little.*
Princeton, N. Jersey, *P. F. Phelps.*
Lancaster, Pa. *Mrs Mary Dickson.*
Lewistown, Pa. *Charles Bell.*
Pittsburg, Pa. *Rev. A. Hamilton.*
Baltimore, *W. & J. Neal.*
Hagerstown, Md. *Parker Blood.*
Union Semin. Prince Edward Co. Va. *Rev. Hiram P. Goodrich.*
Madison, Indiana, *T. J. Langdon.*

Subscription—*Three dollars per annum, payable in advance.*

Gentlemen disposed to subscribe for this work, are respectfully requested to address a letter, ordering the work, and enclosing the amount of one year's subscription, to the Publishers at Philadelphia, or to any of the foregoing gentlemen, who are Agents for the work:

All subscribers who receive their numbers from the Publishers, in Philadelphia, are requested to make their payments to them. Those who take the work from any of the above agents, will, of course, transmit the amount to the same.

To any minister, who, after this date, shall obtain three subscribers and be responsible for their subscriptions, a copy of the work will be transmitted gratis; and this arrangement will be continued from year to year, so long as the responsibility for the payment of three subscriptions is retained by the clergyman.