

THE

# SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. IV.

JANUARY, 1831.

NO. 1.

---

---

## INTRODUCTION.

SPARED to begin another year, and to commence a new volume of the Spirit of the Pilgrims, propriety may suggest, if it does not require, the formality of a direct communication to our readers. We need not recur again to the object for which this work was instituted, or to the principles on which it has been hitherto conducted. Our views of doctrine were fully exhibited at the commencement of our labors, and as we have proceeded, we have found no occasion for change. The great principles of the Orthodox faith, as contained in the Scriptures, as explained by Edwards and his coadjutors and followers, and as embraced by the Evangelical churches of New England, are too firmly established—on their own proper evidence, and in the hearts of thousands—to be easily subverted or abandoned. Constituting, as we doubt not they do, the *theology of the Bible*, and the hope of the world, to explain, defend, and enforce them, for the edification of believers and for the conviction of misbelievers and unbelievers of every description, will continue to claim our chief attention. In this important work, we need, and we solicit, a general co-operation of the friends of truth. We need the assistance of their ablest pens, in discussing, as we hope to do more at large in our future numbers, the great doctrines and precepts of the Gospel.

That so many of our pages have hitherto been occupied in exposing and refuting a particular system of false religion, which has crept in and spread desolation around us, was not because the refutation of this system constituted the only or the principal end of our labors, but because, for the time, this seemed to be the threatening evil of the church, affecting (as it does) the principal articles of the Evangelical faith, and aiming, confessedly, to overthrow them all. Should innovations equally great and alarming make their appearance from any other quarter, they will be met in the same spirit, and with a resistance equally determined.

The progress of the heresy to which we have alluded has not been such, during the last year, as to excite any fearful apprehensions. Notwithstanding the frequent boasts of its friends—whose vauntings would seem to be in the inverse ratio of their successes

—the error has evidently received a check. It has been drawn from its hiding places, and been to some extent exposed. The history of its introduction and progress has been, in great measure, written. The eyes of the community are opening, and a correct public sentiment is forming, in respect to it. Its moral features have been compared with those of the Bible, and the contrast is too striking to escape the notice even of the indifferent observer. Indeed, the disposition which has been manifested, by some of its leading supporters and advocates, to *shake the foundations of the Bible itself*, betrays a strong consciousness, on their part, that the testimony of Scripture is not with them.

In the political world, the last year has been one of prodigious interest, in which God has been pulling down old establishments, and subverting the deep laid foundations of spiritual tyranny,—has been overturning and overturning among the nations, to make way for Him whose right it is to reign. The revolutions in Greece and Algiers (the former consummated and the latter accomplished within the year) have opened wide and effectual doors for the spread of the Gospel in regions where Christ before was scarcely named; while the revolution in France, the work almost of a day, by which a great and mighty nation cast off the chains attempted to be fastened on it, presents the most interesting anticipations to the view of the Christian. The Papal harlot has now lost her supremacy in that “land of science and of sin,” and the way is prepared for the Gospel to “have free course and be glorified.”

In these mighty changes, the God of nations should be regarded as *presenting opportunities* for the efforts of his people; and he is now waiting to see how they will improve them. If vigorously seized, they may be turned to good account; but if suffered to pass unimproved, when are we to look for their return? And what, in this case, is to be expected, but that God should bind again the burthens of his people, or at best, that the church should sink down into the torpor of ages, while the spirit of infidelity stalks through the world, breathing out its pestilence and inflicting its plagues, tenfold more terrible than those of Egypt? Never did a more fearful responsibility rest upon the people of God than, as it seems to us, there does now. And never did they more need an increase of wisdom, and energy, and true piety, in order to meet it. They need to be, and must be, more closely united among themselves. They need a spirit of love and zeal, which shall wither and consume sectarian prejudices—allay unreasonable suspicions—and prompt them, with united hearts, to give themselves to the work of the Lord. They need to be excited to greater sacrifices and efforts than have ever yet been made, to promote the kingdom of Christ, and save the perishing souls of men.

If the people of God will not awake to their duty and interest in

this respect, under the influence of ordinary motives, the day is not distant, probably, when recourse will be had in providence to means of a very different character. Those greatly mistake, not only the language of prophecy, but the signs of the times, who do not anticipate approaching trial and conflict for the church. The way is evidently preparing, and in no small measure prepared even now, for a tremendous struggle, between those who love, and those who oppose, the kingdom of Christ. Satan is 'coming out in great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time;' and those who act under his influence are uniting and concentrating their forces, to stay the triumphs of the Son of God. They will be able to make, and doubtless will make, a *strong resistance* to the prevalence of truth. And in overcoming this resistance, there may 'be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be.' The people of God may be brought into straits, where their earthly resources will be cut off, and they will have nothing on which to rely but the naked promise and protection of Jehovah.

But these scenes of tribulation, like all other things, will be overruled by God for the greater good of his people. The heated furnace of providence will serve to melt down their party distinctions. The band of fire, thrown around them, will draw them nearer together, and make them more entirely one body. A sense of personal weakness and dependance will be more deeply felt. There will be a great increase, also, of the spirit of prayer, of humility, and of self-sacrificing zeal. The tone of religious feeling will be elevated and purified, and the number of disciples will be multiplied.

Thus—whatever is before them in the providence of God—his true friends may begin and end their years under very different impressions from those of any other people. For they are sure that the way is constantly preparing, though they cannot tell by what means, for the establishment and universal prevalence of that kingdom which they most love. Time, in its resistless course, is bringing all other kingdoms to their final close. It has swept away already the ancient and most renowned empires of the world, and those which remain are destined to follow in the same manner. But, under all circumstances, the kingdom of the blessed Redeemer is safe.

"Time, which doth all things else impair,  
Still makes this flourish, strong and fair."

The seat of this holy kingdom is in heaven. There is the royal city. There are the throne and palace of the King. There his happy subjects are assembled and assembling, as they are trained and fitted in different parts of the universe, to take possession of the mansions prepared for them from the foundation of the

world. And as years roll away, that *branch* of the general kingdom of Christ which is planted in this lower world, is casting deeper its root, and spreading abroad its shade, and is destined ere long to fill the earth.—Who would not be a member of this holy kingdom! Who would not flee from the ranks of the wicked, and take his lot and portion with the people of God!

The commencement of the year has always been regarded as an appropriate season for reflection. The occasion requires us to look back upon the way in which we have been led, that we may rejoice in the goodness and faithfulness of God, while we cheerfully submit to the needed corrections of his hand. It requires us to look into the secrets of our own characters, to mourn over opportunities lost, duties neglected, evil affections indulged, sins committed, and see how our account stands with God, and what is our preparation for his judgement bar. It prompts us also to look forward into the untried future; and, while past blighted hopes and withered expectations may teach us how little we can depend on the world, we should resolve to stand in our lot, whatever it may be; seize opportunities of usefulness as they are presented; and do with our might what our hands find to do. ‘The night cometh when no man can work.’ We shall rest from our labors—when we arrive at heaven.

The departure of days and years, and the consequent approach of death, are to most people subjects of painful reflection. They see the current rolling on with a rapidity which nothing can resist or arrest, and themselves borne downwards in the midst of the stream towards that eternity into which myriads are ever pouring;—and the prospect terrifies them. They shudder and shrink back. But why should the flight of time or the approach of death be unwelcome to the Christian, who is diligently engaged in his appointed work, and waiting the expected hour of release? What has such an one to fear from death, or from anything which lies beyond it? True, he is going to the judgement; but the Judge is his adored Redeemer, and his best friend. He is going into the eternal world; but in that world are treasured all his hopes. There is heaven—the end of his pilgrimage, and the home of his heart. There is the eternal resting place, which Jesus has gone to prepare for his people. There are ‘the innumerable company of angels, and the general assembly and church of the first born, and God the Judge of all, and the spirits of just men made perfect.’

“There his best friends, his kindred, dwell;  
There God his Saviour reigns.”

Why then does the Christian mourn over his departing years, and the consequent approach of eternal realities? How much rather does it become him—as he looks backward upon scenes which never can return, and forward to those towards which he is hasting—to say,

and to sing, 'Welcome, flying time ! Welcome, departing hours and years ! I am now ready to be offered ! I desire to depart and be with Christ !

Ye wheels of nature, speed your course ;  
Ye mortal powers, decay ;  
Fast as ye bring the night of death,  
Ye bring ETERNAL DAY.'

How inestimable is that religion, which inspires hopes and presents prospects such as these ! which gives its possessor the victory over time and death, and prompts him to ' sing himself away to everlasting bliss.'

Reader, is this religion, with all its hopes and its consolations, yours ? Are you an enlisted soldier and follower of Christ, an enrolled member of his holy family and kingdom ? Forget not, then, your high obligations. Forget not your solemn responsibilities. The work before you is indeed great ; but the cause in which you labor is glorious. Our divine Master expects every servant to do his duty ; and, for our encouragement, he is addressing us individually from the skies, ' Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life. He that overcometh shall sit with me on my throne, as I have overcome and am seated on my Father's throne.'

But does the eye which falls on this page beam with no such heavenly illumination ? Does the conscience of the reader admonish him, in terms too significant to be mistaken, that he has neither part nor lot in the matter, because his heart is not right in the sight of God ? Let him resolve, then, in the strength of heaven, before he closes this book, or rises from the seat on which he sits, that this year shall not be spent as the last—that this shall be a *new year* to his soul. Fear to delay such a resolution ;—and having made it, fear to trifle with it. Begin the year with God, and spend it in his service. Spend it in such a manner, that should you be summoned away before its close, your end may be happy, and your immortality glorious.

---

## COMMUNICATIONS.

### MINISTERIAL SOBRIETY.

A MAN may possess valuable and even exalted traits of character, and yet be destitute of those which qualify him for a particular office. This is too obvious to need illustration. To no office, however, is the remark so strictly applicable as to that of a minis-

ter of Christ. That those who sustain this office should be perfect, is not to be expected. But so many, often, are their imperfections, so difficult the duties devolving on them, and so narrowly is their conduct watched, that we need not wonder, if some, even of those whose piety is unquestionable, do little or no good in the ministry. I have seen such toil through life, abundant in labors, and yet accomplish comparatively little. The reason was, that some foible or frailty peculiar to themselves, and which would not have disqualified them for any other office, was observable in their characters, and furnished matter of continual reproach.

In writing a letter of advice to a young minister, Paul was careful to enumerate the qualifications necessary in order to success in his important work. Among these, he insists, that a Bishop should be *sober*,—meaning, undoubtedly, that he should have his mind and feelings so balanced by considerations of eternity, as to be in a state of habitual seriousness.—I propose, in this paper, to consider some of the *causes* which tend to prevent sobriety of character in the minister of the Gospel.

1. Habits of education may have this effect. Students, in the preparatory school, and on arriving at college, all meet on a level, and mingle familiarly together. They are young, and have the vivacity and buoyancy of youth; consequently, are social and talkative, exhibit original and amusing traits of character, and see multitudes of things which are entertaining and ludicrous. They easily learn to tell stories, use satire, give and return the idle jest, and to lay up a fund of anecdote, from which to draw in future life. Add to this, they are a society by themselves, and can indulge in what is amusing to an extent seldom equalled in subsequent years. Free from cares, as to what they shall eat and what they shall drink, if the monitor does not find them absent, or the Professor puzzle them at the hour of recitation, all anxiety is gone. Now take young men by hundreds, and bring them together in these circumstances from different parts of the country, and it seems impossible almost that habits of sobriety should be cultivated. I wish I could say that these remarks do not hold good even in regard to our Theological schools, so that, during the four, seven, or ten years, in which young men are secluded from the world, if there be not one or more powerful revivals of religion, by which the soul is quickened and advanced in piety, the habit of light feeling and light conversation becomes very strong.

I know it will be said that, to some extent, these feelings are not improper for young men in this situation. And if this were granted, still the fact would remain, that years thus spent, go to form habits for life. Multitudes in this way have picked up stories and anecdotes, which they have afterwards retailed, and have heard them laughed at, perhaps to the thousandth time. Nor is this all.

They have formed associations of ideas, embracing the ludicrous, which follow them to the end of their days. Like the ghost of Banquo, they rise up and beset them most fearfully when in company. Besides, not a few of those who go into the ministry were not pious while in college. Of course, they had still fewer restraints than others who were professors of religion. Many of this character have to lament, while they live, that their associations of ideas were depraved by the society of their youth. I do not feel called upon to say how far habits of education may be an excuse for a want of sobriety in after life. That they greatly influence the whole life, there can be no doubt; and I could not rationally account for that deficiency in ministers of which I am speaking, without going back to the circumstances of their early years. If others have had a different experience, I can only say they have been uncommonly favored.

2. The peculiar habits of the ministry are another cause of this deficiency.—The period intervening between the commencement of preparatory studies, and ordination, cannot usually be less than eleven years. During all this while, as things have been, but little bodily exercise, commonly is taken; so that by the time we have completed our education, the stomach begins to complain of weakness and indigestion. The whole system responds to these complaints. “*Propter stamachum, homo est quod est,*” is not so far from literal truth. By the new duties of our office, we are driven again into the study. We must write new sermons—must think—must preach, and do it all, time or no time at our disposal. Some may think it a small matter to write a sermon,—very easy,—‘he walks across the study—scribbles a little on a bit of paper—throws it into the fire, and begins another;’—but all this while, there is an anxiety and an agony of feeling, which suspends digestion, prostrates the spirits, and deranges the whole nervous system. The same process is acted over weekly, perhaps daily. The result is, that ministers become, in many instances, nervousmen, dyspeptic, hypochondriacal, &c. This is a very natural result, (as well as a very common one,) of their situation. Let the minister, besides, have a small salary, a growing family, little economy, and an increasing debt. Then let him be in constant expectation of difficulties between himself and his people, and you have a nervous man—easily moved.

He then is full of frights and fears,  
As one at point to die;  
And long before the day appears,  
He heaves up many a sigh!

He, who in his strength would laugh at the rattling of the spear,  
now trembles at the shaking of a leaf. There is more rigidity of nerve in one laboring man, than in an army of such.

*Ministerial Sobriety.*

Oh! why are farmers made so coarse,  
 Or clergy made so fine?  
 A kick, that scarce would move a horse,  
 May kill a sound divine!

Now the point at which I would come is this: the same set of nerves which may be easily depressed, is as easily excited. And he who, in his study, feels bowed down under depression of spirits may, when out of his study, be easily exhilarated by society and conversation. The pendulum oscillates to either extreme with great rapidity. The result is, that men thus situated exhibit extremes of character—a *depression* which is not becoming a Christian minister, and a *hilarity* which is thought to be still more unseemly. In these moments of pleasure, the tongue is prompt in conversation, the ideas flow rapidly, memory is vivid, and the feelings are hurried into a state of delicious excitement. In these moments, too, many a light, or injudicious, or severe remark is dropped, and the effect of many a good sermon is destroyed. Nor is this always because the heart is so wicked; for if the same man, at the same hour, were unexpectedly called to a scene of sorrow, he would be as ready to weep as he now is to laugh. I am not undertaking to palliate the light-mindedness of a minister, because his nerves are shattered, or his bodily system is out of order, and therefore the strings of the harp will readily pour out music too melancholy or too gleesome. But I am aiming to develop the true cause of the want of ministerial sobriety. I am confident that much depends upon the state of health. If ministers cannot, by exercise or otherwise, have what Juvenal calls *mens sana in sano corpore*, we may look in vain for symmetry or unvaried consistency of character.

I may here add, that this nervous susceptibility has been greatly heightened in years past by the moderate use of alcoholic stimulants. No man can feel any degree of excitement from this source, and at the same time either feel or exhibit due ministerial gravity. A minister who uses these liquors not only has the consciousness of letting himself down in his own opinion, but he has something worse. He has a serpent within him; and it rages like that which was pulled from the head of Alecto, as she came up from Tartarus,

Vipeream inspirans animam,  
 Pertentat sensus, atque ossibus implicat ignem.

He who drinks with others must talk with them; and he must let himself down to their scale, however low they descend. We should not be too severe, however, upon ministers of the last generation. Most, undoubtedly, sinned in ignorance, and we may hope that God winked at their sin. But I can well remember what were my impressions when a child at the annual festivals, when I saw my good minister at the public tables, eating and drinking as



others did, and from his usual temperate habits, perhaps even more excited than the rest of the company. Such sights were never frequent, and yet the impressions left upon the mind of childhood were not easily effaced. If I may be allowed to borrow an allusion from the talented but guilty Sterne, these are sins over which the witnessing angel would drop tears of regret, as he gave them into the chancery of heaven. Unceasing thanks to God, that we are delivered from this snare—the only one which could be set in sight of the victim, with perfect success.

Among the habits of the ministry, I should also mention its continually recurring and most responsible services. In order to perform these services properly and profitably, the feelings must be solemn and elevated. Let a man, during the same week, preach and pray repeatedly in public, go to the sick bed, console the mourner by sympathy and instruction, meet his church at the communion table, attend inquiry and other meetings:—and who can do all this, without feeling a severe and unnatural draft upon both soul and body? The consequence is, that when he has a short respite from these responsibilities and anxieties there is a reaction in the soul, which throws it to the other extreme. Woful are the instances, both in number and aggravation, in which a minister has more than destroyed all the impressions of his preaching and exhortations by a want of sobriety immediately afterwards.

3. The love of immediate applause, is another cause of the want of ministerial sobriety.

Goldsmith says, that oratory is the most glorious of all arts, because it brings its triumphs and applauses with it. The orator enjoys it, even while addressing his audience. But most men are too indolent to seek to shine in this way. The road is too long and too hard to travel. To shine in conversation, and to command the admiration of the social circle, is a much easier business. Thousands may excel here, who have not the patience to study in order to thrill an audience by genuine eloquence. The consequence is, that multitudes are tempted to split on this rock. In our reading we meet with anecdotes, and ludicrous facts, both on the pages of history, and in the publications of the day. In our intercourse with men, too, we of necessity learn many more which have never appeared in print. In this way, a man may, if he pleases, soon become a walking jest-book. He who has great opportunities to learn these things, will have as great to communicate them. It is thus easy to draw the eyes of a circle, to cause them to stare and admire, and go home and repeat the strange stories they have heard. Pride is thus flattered by attention, and by the laugh or the looks of surprise, and we are led on to tell stories and amuse others, at the expense of that respect which is due to the ministerial character, and to ourselves. How often have we seen a circle

silent—*couticuere omnes, intentique ora tenebant*,—while the minister was indulging his wit, and telling smart stories!—It is the same spirit of pride, which sometimes, though less frequently, causes clergymen to dress with great particularity, thus drawing upon themselves the incongruous appellation of “*holy dandies*,” which the poet rebukes with such just indignation:—indulging

“A silly fond conceit, of his fair form,  
And just proportion, and fashionable mein,  
And pretty face, in the presence of his God!”

4. The low state of the moral feelings is another, and perhaps the greatest cause of the deficiency in question.

As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God; and few things are more unlike the leadings of the divine Spirit, than that state of feeling which may be denominated *light* or *trifling*. In the Evangelical biographies of Jesus Christ, we never read of his jesting, or even smiling. The weight of eternal things lay heavy upon him, and he never exhibited, (so far as we know,) a feeling of levity. The man who has any weighty concern upon his mind, does not readily admit the lighter feelings. The reformers were uniformly grave. Even Luther, though others smiled in astonishment at his intrepidity, seldom smiled himself. Oliver Cromwell is said to have taken up an anonymous pamphlet one day, the design of which was to rouse the nation to shake him off. He felt that it was a case of life and death. His eye glanced hastily round, as if he was expecting to see the dagger of a Brutus, and he was never known to smile afterwards. In leading our armies amid the dangers of the revolutionary war, Washington is said to have been always sober. It would seem from these examples, that if the mind of the minister were deeply impressed with eternal things, there would be little room for levity. The serpent could not find access to the heart, if that heart were full of deep concern for the everlasting salvation of men.

The serpent of the field, by art  
And spells, is won from harming;  
But that which coils around the heart,  
Oh! who hath power of charming.

It will not list to wisdom's lore,  
No music's voice can lure it,—  
But there it stings forever more,  
The soul that must endure it!

I might prolong the remarks under this head, but I trust it is needless. I will only add, that if the ministers of Christ had that faith in eternal things which so eminently distinguished the Prophets and Apostles; if they would habitually look upon their unsanctified hearers, as if they saw the anguish of the great day; when

—starless, hopeless gloom  
Falls on their souls, never to know an end;

there would be fewer seasons of deep mourning over the improprieties of their lighter hours.

O. ERATOI.

---

ON THE FIGURATIVE CHARACTER OF THE SACRED WRITINGS.

OUR blessed Lord, in communicating his instructions, had occasion frequently to use figurative language. "He spake many things unto" his disciples and followers "in parables." With little qualification, the same remark may be made respecting most of the inspired writers; so that the Bible is, to a great extent, a figurative composition—a book abounding with the loftiest and noblest of figures of speech. What conclusion is to be drawn from this fact? That the Bible does not mean anything? Or that men may safely put upon it just what meaning they please? With inferences such as these, many are endeavoring to quiet themselves in unbelief and sin, in view of the figurative character of the Sacred Writings. When met with a passage which contravenes their views or wishes—which administers a reproof to their errors or corruptions—which enjoins a duty which they are unwilling to perform, or points them to future scenes which they choose to disregard; they are ready to say at once, 'Why this is *figurative*! This is all *figurative*!' As though a figurative expression could not mean anything; or as though they were authorized to put that meaning upon it which best comported with their convenience or their inclinations. But is this a just conclusion, derived from the figurative character of the Sacred Writings? By no means:—the farthest from it imaginable. It is a conclusion so replete with impropriety and absurdity, that it would not be tolerated in regard to any other writing or composition whatever.

What, allow me to ask, are the nature and character, and what the uses of figurative language? Consult any of your standard authors on Rhetoric, and they will tell you, that figures of speech serve to give new scope and power to language, rendering it capable of expressing "the nicest shades and colors of thought, which no language could possibly do" without them. They will tell you, that figures "give us frequently a much clearer and more striking view of a subject, than we could have of it, were it expressed in simple terms." "They render an abstract conception in some degree an object of sense. They surround it with such circumstances, as enable the mind to lay hold of it steadily, and contemplate it fully." On this account, figures "are very properly said to *illustrate* a subject, or to *throw light* upon it."

That there may be no mistake, I have here quoted the language of a distinguished rhetorician, relative to the uses and benefits of

figures of speech. You will find all the rhetoricians, ancient and modern, expressing the same sentiment. Indeed, they could express no other sentiment, consistently with truth, and with the common apprehensions and practice of men. We all know, how difficult subjects may be illustrated and explained, by means of comparisons, and other figures of speech. We know, too, how any important subject may be enforced and impressed, by the same means. Figurative language is so easy and natural to us, that it may not improperly be called the language of nature. Earnest, animated conversation is always figurative; and the child, the peasant, or the mere man of business, who never attended to the subject scientifically for a moment, when endeavoring to open, explain, or enforce any subject in which he feels interested, will resort, of necessity, and without once thinking of it, to the use of figures.

I have made these remarks on the nature and uses of figurative language for the purpose of applying them to the important subject now under consideration.

There is undoubtedly much figurative language in the Bible. This is, on all hands, admitted. But is the Bible on this account the less plain, the less interesting, the less impressive, the less important? Not at all, but the more so; and vastly the more. The Bible was written in this language, because it was the most proper language in which it could be written—because, indeed, (from the very nature of the subjects revealed and illustrated) it was, in many parts, the only language in which it would be possible to write it.

I will not say that some of the *prophetic* language of the Scriptures is the more plain, on account of its highly figurative character. For it was designed, and with good reason, that the prophecies should not be minutely understood, until after their accomplishment. As they were intended, not so much to make prognosticators of us, as to confirm our faith after their fulfilment, they are designedly and *wisely* hung around with shadows, which nothing but a fulfilling providence can remove.—But, in regard to the inspired writings generally, I do say, that they are more plain, more interesting, and more impressive, than though they had been given us in more literal terms. And if any one doubts this, let him take, for instance, one of the parables of our Saviour, and strip it of its figurative dress, and put it into the simplest language he can use, and see if it has lost nothing of its interest, and energy, and force. Let him take some of the figurative representations of the future world, and strip them of the awful garb in which the Holy Spirit has seen proper to invest them, and see if he can exhibit the idea more forcibly, if indeed he can exhibit it at all, by a more literal expression.

My readers cannot be ignorant of the continual efforts which are made—in conversation, in sermons, and in books, to get away

from the solemn annunciations of the Bible, on the ground that they are figurative. When, for example, we refer to the scriptural account of the fall of our first parents, and the consequent sin and ruin of their posterity; we are not unfrequently met with a smile of mingled incredulity and contempt, and from those, too, who profess to believe the Bible, on the ground that the representations on this subject are all figurative.—So when we refer to the numerous passages which set forth the entire depravity of the human heart, as being destitute of holiness, and dead in sin; the reply most commonly returned is, that this is hyperbole, oriental imagery, a figure, and of course a fiction.—When we warn sinners of the necessity of regeneration, and say to them in the language of Christ, “Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God,” the objector has an answer ready, ‘To be sure the Saviour used this language; but then, it cannot be literally understood—it must be figurative—and who can tell what interpretation shall be put upon it? The new birth may mean nothing more than baptism—or a profession of religion—or a gradual, external reformation. Various significations have been given to the words; and who can tell without a new revelation, what their meaning is?’

The numerous passages which speak of the atonement, are often treated in the same manner. Christ is said in the Scriptures, to have “borne our sins,” to have “suffered for our sins,” to have “died for our sins,” to have made “propitiation for our sins, and to have shed his blood for the remission of sins.” These passages seem plain to most minds, and the sentiment conveyed by them interesting and glorious. But there are some who cannot understand them. They are symbolical, figurative, shadowy, referring to “the perished peculiarities of a former age.” Of course, they can be, and ought to be, explained away.

A similar account is given of passages which speak of the outpouring and special operations of the Holy Spirit. “I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh.” “I will pour my Spirit on thy seed, and my blessing on thine offspring.” “According to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.” These and similar expressions, on which so much stress is laid in the Scriptures, are thought by many to be so highly figurative, that nothing can be known or established by them. ‘They cannot mean what they seem to say, and every one is entitled to put that construction upon them, which best comports with his own views and wishes.’—

There was a sect in the primitive church, who denied that Jesus Christ had come in *the flesh*—insisting that he lived and died only in *appearance*, being a sort of figurative Saviour. As it was said to them by the ancients, so may it be said to triflers of the same description now, “Beware, lest, in the day of your extremity, you find only a *figurative salvation!*”

There are numerous passages in the Bible which speak most expressly of the existence and agency of fallen spirits. Indeed, we have as direct evidence, from the language of the Bible, of the existence of fallen angels, as of holy angels, or as we have of the existence of wicked men. But there are many to whom this doctrine is altogether incredible, and the passages which speak of it stand for nothing, because (it is pretended) they are *figurative*. Satan is but "the personified principle of evil," and his angels are the evil dispositions which prevail, more or less, in the hearts of men.\*

Some of the most striking and awful representations of the Bible are those which describe the great and last day, the day of Judgement. I need not repeat them, as they are, I trust, familiar to every reader. But it has been recently discovered that the day of Judgement is an absurdity; and the passages which speak of it are explained away, on the ground that they, too, are figurative. They can only refer to what is called a "judgement of souls"—the spiritual judgement which every person, sooner or later, in this world or the next, will be led to form respecting his own character.†

But no passages have been more sadly perverted, on the ground of their being figurative, than those which relate to the future and endless punishment of the wicked. These are numerous,—and they are fearfully plain. But, in the estimation of many, they are not plain. The doctrine of eternal punishment is a horrible doctrine, and they cannot believe that God has revealed it. "The passages which speak of it, are clearly figurative; they may mean something else; and we may lawfully exercise our ingenuity upon them to explain them away."

I have here referred to several important doctrines, for the purpose of showing, in one view, the *extent* of the evil of which we complain—the evil which it is hoped these remarks may have a tendency to correct. Advantage is taken of the figurative character of the Bible to *get rid of it*, and to make it speak anything, or nothing, just as ingenious but unsanctified men prefer. The moment any unwelcome, unpopular truth is attempted to be proved, by a direct reference to the declarations of Scripture, the pretence is set up that they are figurative, and if figurative, nothing can be known or established by them.

But (as has been already shown) those to whom we here refer mistake entirely the nature and use of figurative language. Rhetoricians do not describe figurative language as designed to cover up the sentiment of a discourse, and render it ambiguous and doubtful; but rather to illustrate the sentiment, and bring it out,

\* See Ware's Discourses on the Offices and Character of Christ. p. 185. Christian Examiner, Vol. ii. p. 74.

† "I do not believe there ever will be any general judgement." "All judgement of souls is of a spiritual, inward nature. This inward judgement takes place in the individual person, whenever God is revealed to that soul in his true character; as truly, though not to the same extent, in this world, as in the world to come." Christian Examiner, Vol. V. p. 443.

and make it more prominent, forcible and impressive. Figurative expressions, in general, are not less plain than literal ones; often they are more so. They are often used to set forth an idea, which literal language could not so clearly or forcibly express. The laws too, by which figurative language is to be interpreted, are in general as well understood, and are as easy of application, as those for the interpretation of literal language.

We need not, then, go over again with the several doctrines which have been mentioned, examine the passages by which they are supported, and decide whether they are to be understood literally or figuratively. It is not material, in respect to the present discussion, whether they are understood the one way or the other. If literal, they mean just what they say, according to the literal acception of the terms; and they actually prove all that they are properly quoted and applied to prove. Or if we suppose these passages to be figurative, still they have a meaning; and a meaning, for the most part, more plainly, and strongly, and forcibly expressed, than it could be in any other manner. Indeed, it is for the purpose of bringing out their meaning with greater prominence and effect, that the literal dress is dropped, and the figurative garb and drapery are assumed.

In order to give individuality and point to these remarks, let us apply them to a single case. We may apply them to the passages commonly relied on to prove the doctrine of eternal punishment. I need not repeat these proof texts. You know their frequency; you know, too, their awful plainness, and their tremendous import. Now if these passages are to be understood literally, it will not be questioned that they establish the point for which they are quoted and applied. And if they are figurative; *why*, allow me very seriously to ask, *are they made figurative?* Why are these awful figures—such as the undying worm—the devouring fire—the everlasting burnings—the blackness of darkness—the lake burning with fire, from which a smoke ascendeth up forever and ever—why are these awful figures used? Why is figure crowded upon figure, and all the appalling and terrible imagery of nature drawn together, in describing the future destiny of the wicked? Is it to show that there will be no future punishment? Or is it to envelope the whole subject in such horrible clouds and darkness that nothing can be known respecting it? Or is it not rather to enforce the subject, make it more plain and striking, and place it before unthinking mortals in a way to arrest their attention, and impress their hearts? Were not these awful figures used, because literal language fell entirely below the subject, and was *too poor* to make an adequate representation of the dread reality? If such is indeed the purpose and meaning of the figurative representations of the Bible in regard to the subject of future punishment, then, what an infatuate perversion of language must it be, to conclude, as many do, from the fact that

these representations *are some of them figurative*, that they mean nothing; or if anything, that nobody can pretend to determine what their meaning is! Alas! God will soon teach such triflers that the figurative language of his word has a meaning, and that had they not been blinded by the stupifying power of sin, they must have seen it. He will soon teach them that all the terrible representations of the Bible are true, and ought to have been believed and practically heeded by them, in season. When they come to open their eyes upon the other world, and see what is to be the portion of their cup; instead of complaining of the hyperboles and exaggerations of the sacred record, they will rather be disposed to say, 'The half was not told us. No, the half *could not be told us*, in the language of mortals.'

Various are the artifices which are practiced by those who do not love the truth, to take from us the Holy Bible. Some would reject it altogether, as an imposition; but more would prefer to have the name and the credit of receiving it, while they root out of it almost everything which renders it valuable. 'There is so much that is dark, and figurative, and oriental—so much that is adapted to the peculiar circumstances of a distant country and age, that nobody can pretend that he understands it; and he who doubts the most, and believes the least, may probably be the wisest man.' But let us not consent to part with the Bible in this way. It is 'that *sure word of prophecy*, to which we do well to take heed, as to a light shining in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in our hearts. It is in general a plain book. It may be easily understood, at least, as to all the essential purposes of religion. And certainly it discloses to us the most interesting and important things. It shows us what we are, and what we must be—what God has done for us, and what we must do for ourselves—what is the nature of the Gospel provision, and on what conditions we may become interested in this glorious provision, for time and eternity. It goes with us—beyond where the eye of sense can penetrate, or the lamp of reason shine. It dispels the darkness of the tomb, and spreads its cheering light over the regions of futurity. In his word, God draws aside the impenetrable curtain, which separates this from the other world, and shows us plainly what is before us. He shows us the bursting tombs, the enthroned Judge, the melting elements, and burning worlds. He shows us heaven, and he shows us hell; and he shows us what we must be and do, in order to escape the one, and enjoy the other. And he not only shows us these things, he condescends to invite, and intreat, and to use the most powerful motives with us, to induce us to be wise. He allures us upward by the most precious promises; while he dissuades us from the way which leads down to death, by the most alarming threats. And he graciously provides an *influence* to accompany these motives and



means, which render them, in many instances, effectual to the recovery of the lost soul. What then could we do—situated as we are here on probation, with death, judgement and eternity, but a little way before us—what could we *do* without the Bible? What could we do, without its sacred light and influence, to guide us through time and death, and show us the way upward from these apostate regions, to the paradise of God above? Without it, this world would indeed be a *dark place*. Spiritual darkness would literally cover the earth, and gross darkness the people. Spiritual darkness does, in fact, cover those portions of the earth where the Bible is not known; and the same horrible night would brood over us, were this “light shining in a dark place” to be withdrawn from us. But this heavenly light *may be* withdrawn. It has been withdrawn from many regions which it once illumined; and it may be withdrawn from us. And it may be withdrawn, we should well remember, not only by the rude hand of the avowed infidel, but by the *insidious glosses of the false interpreter*. It may be withdrawn by him who would persuade us, because the language of Scripture is to some extent figurative, that therefore it has no definite meaning, but every one is entitled to put that sense upon it which to him appears the most convenient and agreeable. But let us not be deluded to destruction in this way. The figurative character of the Bible is no disparagement to it, but rather its glory. Without detracting at all from its plainness, it gives it an interest and impression which it could not otherwise possess. Let us then cling to this sacred book, as the anchor of our safety, and the charter of our inheritance. Let us believe it—study it—love it—obey it—and thus receive its benefits—and partake its consolations.—And let us be engaged to diffuse the knowledge of it, to the full extent of our means and influence. Let us unite in the effort for which our age is distinguished, to translate it into every tongue—carry it to every land—place it in every house—lay it at the door of every human being.—In this way, we shall best fulfil the great purpose of life—which is to prepare ourselves, and, so far as we are able, to prepare others, for a glorious immortality.

---

## REVIEWS.

A MEMOIR OF THE REV. EDWARD PAYSON, D. D., *late Pastor of the Second Church in Portland*. By ASA CUMMINGS, *Editor of the Christian Mirror*. Second Edition. Boston: Crocker and Brewster, 1830. 12mo. pp. 400.

It is refreshing to turn from the lives of the illustrious wicked, who fill the world's eye, to read a faithful memoir of one, who

combined the most ardent piety and disinterested benevolence, with an ever active energy of mind. Mr. Cummings has done an important service to the cause of religion, by compiling this memoir, of which, besides the present, stereotype edition, an edition has been published in England, and other editions are at this moment in progress. Thousands have read this work, and other thousands will yet read it, and profit by the perusal.

"*Religious Biography*," as is well remarked by the compiler, "is the means, under God, of attaching to the cause of Zion, men of great energy and moral worth,—magnanimous in purpose, wise in counsel, vigorous and persevering in action. In how many, who have done valiantly for the truth, has the flame of holy zeal and enterprise been first kindled at the pages which record the religious experience and evangelical labors of Baxter, Brainerd, Edwards, Martyn, and others of a kindred spirit,—who, but for these memorials, would have been lost to the Church of Christ, and perhaps have become her most determined foes! The 'children of this world' understand the influence of such writings, and wisely preserve everything that is memorable in their heroes, philosophers, poets, and artists, that youth may emulate their enthusiasm, and act over their achievements. And though it may be true, that "modern biography has been too busily and curiously employed in enrolling and blazoning names, which will scarcely outlive the records of the grave-stone," still "it is not easy to estimate the loss, which is sustained by the Christian community, when an example of eminent sanctity and heroic zeal is defrauded of its just honors; when a living epistle of apostolic piety is suffered to perish; or, to change the figure, when the lamp kindled by a holy life, which might have shone to posterity, is suffered to go out."

EDWARD PAYSON was born at Rindge, New Hampshire, July 25, 1783. His father was the Rev. Seth Payson, D. D. To the Christian instructions, examples, and prayers of his father, and more especially of his mother, he was accustomed to ascribe, under the blessing of God, his religious hopes, and all his usefulness in life. His first religious impressions occurred in childhood. His moral character in youth was without a blemish. From an early period, his thirst for knowledge was intense; and was probably increased by the obstacles to its gratification. The circumstances of his father, dependent in part for his support upon the cultivation of a farm, occasioned some delay in his literary pursuits. However, he "worked hard," with mind, as well as with hand. In 1800, he became a member of the Sophomore class at Harvard college, where he was graduated in 1803. While at college, he read more, perhaps, than any other young man in his class; and his extraordinary memory held fast what he read. From 1803, to 1806, he was the teacher of an academy at Portland. During this period, the death of a beloved brother had a most favorable influence on his religious character. He wrote to his mother:—

"Infatuated by the pleasures and amusements which this place affords, and which took the more powerful hold on my senses from being adorned with a refinement to which I had before been a stranger, I gradually grew cold and indifferent to religion; and, though I still made attempts to reform, they were too transient to be effectual.

"From this careless frame, nothing but a shock like that I have received, could have roused me; and though my deceitful heart will, I fear, draw me back again into the snare, as soon as the first impression is worn off, yet I hope

by the assistance of divine grace, that this dispensation will prove of eternal benefit. This is my most earnest prayer, and I know it will be yours.

"In reflecting on the ends of divine Providence in this event, I am greatly distressed. To you, my dear parents, it could not be necessary. My sister, as you sometime since informed me, has turned her attention to religion; the other children are too young to receive benefit from it. It remains then, that I am the Achan, who has drawn down this punishment, and occasioned this distress to my friends. My careless obdurate heart rendered it necessary to punish and humble it: and O that the punishment had fallen where it was due! But I can pursue the subject no further."

He made a public profession of religion Sept. 1, 1805; from which time his zeal in the cause of Jesus Christ seems to have been unabated, and his religious course was like that of the rising light "which shineth more and more unto the perfect day." In 1806, he devoted himself to the study of theology, under the care of his father, giving his chief attention, however, to the Bible. In a little more than six months he was licensed to preach, and, after about the same period, was settled in the ministry as colleague with the Rev. Mr. Kellogg at Portland, Dec. 16, 1807. He was married in May 1811, to Miss Shipman of New Haven; and died at Portland, Oct. 22, 1827, in the 45th year of his age, and the 20th of his ministry.

Such is the brief story of a man, in whose life there were no wondrous incidents, and whose name is associated, as the inventor or chief agent, with no new and applauded project of charity; yet whose memoirs are extremely interesting, and who exerted a most powerful influence in the general cause of religion. No mighty warrior, amidst the toils of an arduous campaign, ever exhibited greater watchfulness, devotedness, zeal and energy, than were manifested by Dr. Payson during his whole ministerial career, in fighting the battles of the Lord.

Mr. Cummings, we think, has executed his task with great skill and characteristic judgement. He exhibits with historical verity, the real character of Dr. Payson. We behold occasionally, and particularly in early life, a deep melancholy; and we perceive, in the extracts from the private diary, strong expressions of self-aborrence, and self-condemnation. All this, it was in the power of the compiler to have kept out of sight; and in doing it, he would have deprived the enemies of piety of the opportunity,—which they now have, and which indeed has not been wholly neglected, of scoffing at the emotions of an awakened conscience and a contrite heart. But, with the exclusion of these extracts, we should not have known the conflicts to which even an eminent Christian may be momentarily subjected; we should not have seen all the vigor and triumph of faith;—we should not have reviewed those invaluable lessons of trust in God, and of fervency in prayer, which are now brought to our minds. Besides, the chief interest of biography depends on minuteness of detail. It is the secret heart of a fellow being, which attracts us more powerfully than all

the delightful and sublime objects of the natural world. We *admire* what is beautiful and grand; we *sympathise* with a fellow being. Mr. Cummings justifies himself for the details which he has inserted, as follows:—

“The preceding pages contain a tolerably complete—perhaps too complete—exhibition of Dr. Payson’s religious character. It has been found a very serious and difficult question, how far it is justifiable to submit to the inspection of good and bad, indiscriminately, the records of one’s private exercises, which were not intended to be seen out of the closet. As religion is so much the business of the closet, it is obvious, that no man’s religious character can be fully developed without exhibiting the transactions of that sacred retreat. Disclosures of this class have been highly prized by the Christian community generally; and God himself seems to have set the seal of his approbation upon them, by rendering them the frequent occasion of exciting and cherishing religious affections. These considerations have done much to quiet the misgivings, which were occasionally felt, on exposing, as it were to the public gaze, the recesses of a heart so deeply and variously affected as was that of the subject of this Memoir. It is hoped, however, that there is no wanton exposure. The author’s first care has been to give an honest, faithful history; and he is not aware that any deductions or abatements from the commendatory part need to be made on the ground of personal friendship or partiality, or that any lack of censure needs to be supplied for similar reasons. Rather has he feared that his anxiety to copy scriptural models, which describe the faults of good men with the same unshrinking fidelity that they embalm their virtues, may have led him to throw too much of shade into the picture, to dwell at disproportionate length on those points which cannot be contemplated without sadness. The several parts of the work, however, will be found, notwithstanding their apparently miscellaneous character, to have an intimate relation to the whole, and to, reciprocally, modify and explain each other.”

We do not propose to give a formal analysis of the character of Dr. Payson. For this we refer the reader to the latter part of the memoirs. There are, however, a few remarks, which we propose to make in regard to him.

Dr. Payson was not a “*self-made*” man; for every man is made by the original powers given him, by the circumstances in which Providence places him, and by the various influences which God brings to bear upon his mind. But he was, in an eminent sense, as a theologian, and so far as earthly aid is concerned, an *αυτοδιδασκος*, a *self taught* man. He had no earthly teacher to mould his sentiments. His only master was in heaven. He never passed through the discipline of a school of the prophets. Doubtless, he experienced from this course disadvantages; but he found also great advantages. He was in less danger of being prejudiced in favor of a particular system. He was free from the force of the tide, bearing him onward in a particular direction. His sentiments were founded, not on the traditions of men, but emphatically on his unbiassed views of the import of scripture. He studied theology in solitude, seeking guidance from above. He studied it all his life. That he fell into no errors will not be pretended; but he was in a remarkable degree exempt from the influence of some of the causes of error.

“A precious mark of the genuineness of his religion was his bowing with entire reverence to the supreme authority of divine revelation. This was strikingly apparent from the time when he first knew its value by experience, by his

making it his almost exclusive study, as a preparation for preaching, and by his daily devotion to it till his death. He had no favorite dogma, no figment of the imagination, no theoretical speculation, or practical views, which he was not ready to discard at once, if they were seen to clash in the least with the Scriptures of truth. These were his chart, his pole-star, his 'light shining in a dark place, to which he did well to take heed.' He opened them with the docility of a child, and 'drank in the sincere milk of the word' with exquisite relish. To him they were 'more precious than gold, sweeter than honey, and more highly prized than his necessary food.' And in this love and reverence for the Scriptures may be seen the reason, why, constituted as he was, he was never led astray by the pride of opinion, never drawn into ensnaring errors by his salient imagination. Every thought, sentiment, fancy, and opinion was *daily* corrected by the word of God. It was this steadfast adherence to his Rule, that kept him in "the good and right way."

It pleased God to endue him with uncommon intellectual powers, without which he could not have gained the influence he possessed. He had a keen discernment, great rapidity in his mental operations, a very retentive memory, and especially a fancy of almost unequalled richness, enabling him to illustrate subjects, which otherwise would have been dark, and to adorn what otherwise might have been repulsive or unwelcome. We think it not a little wonderful, that with a fancy teeming with imagery, not a single line of poetic composition is found in his memoirs. Even the stern mind of Andrew Fuller was sometimes relaxed amidst the measures of poetry. We suspect that Dr. Payson never, in early life, thought it worth while to bestow a little toil in acquiring a knowledge of the mechanical part of poetical composition, and that to this cause we may ascribe the circumstance, that he never embodied his sublime conceptions in the imperishable language of poetry. The soul of the poet was his; and his also was the nice and polished taste, the skill of words, which would have secured that kind of perfection, without which poetry is good for nothing. There is much grace and beauty of language in his more labored productions, particularly in his discourses on the worth of the Bible, and on music. The following extracts from the latter will prove that he drew from "the well of English undefiled," and will show also of what he was capable, had he chosen to devote much time to the business of fine writing:—

"Of this universal concert, man was appointed the terrestrial leader, and was furnished with natural and moral powers, admirably fitted for this blessed and glorious employment. His body, exempt from dissolution, disease, and decay, was like a perfect and well-strung instrument, which never gave forth a false or uncertain sound, but always answered, with exact precision, the wishes of his nobler part, the soul. His heart did not then belie his tongue, when he sung the praises of his Creator; but all the emotions felt by the one were expressed by the other, from the high notes of extatic admiration, thankfulness, and joy, down to the deep tones of the most profound veneration and humility. In a word, his heart was the throne of celestial love and harmony, and his tongue at once the organ of their will, and the sceptre of their power.

"We are told, in ancient story, of a statue, formed with such wonderful art, that, whenever it was visited by the rays of the rising sun, it gave forth, in honor of that luminary, the most melodious and ravishing sounds. In like manner, man was originally so constituted, by skill divine, that, whenever he

contemplated the rays of wisdom, power and goodness, emanating from the great Sun of the moral system, the ardent emotions of his soul spontaneously burst forth in the most pure and exalted strains of adoration and praise. Such was the world, such was man, at the creation. Even in the eye of the Creator, all was good; for, wherever he turned, he saw only his own image, and heard nothing but his own praises. Love beamed from every countenance; harmony reigned in every breast, and flowed mellifluous from every tongue; and the grand chorus of praise, begun by raptured seraphs round the throne, and heard from heaven to earth, was re-echoed back from earth to heaven; and this blissful sound, loud as the archangel's trump, and sweet as the melody of his golden harp, rapidly spread, and was received from world to world, and floated, in gently-undulating waves, even to the farthest bounds of creation."

To this primeval harmony, he exhibits the lamentable contrast which followed, when sin "untuned the tongues of angels, and changed their blissful songs of praise into the groans of wretchedness, the execrations of malignity, the blasphemies of impiety, and the ravings of despair. Storms and tempests, earthquakes and convulsions, fire from above, and deluges from beneath, which destroyed the order of the natural world, proved that its baleful influence had reached our earth, and afforded a faint emblem of the jars and disorders which sin had introduced into the moral system. Man's corporeal part, that lyre of a thousand strings, tuned by the finger of God himself, destined to last as long as the soul, and to be her instrument in offering up eternal praise, was, at one blow, shattered, unstrung, and almost irreparably ruined. His soul, all whose powers and faculties, like the cords of an *Æolian* harp, once harmoniously vibrated to every breath of the divine Spirit, and ever returned a sympathizing sound to the tones of kindness and love from a fellow being, now became silent, and insensible to melody, or produced only the jarring and discordant notes of envy, malice, hatred and revenge. The mouth, filled with cursing and bitterness, was set against the heavens, the tongue was inflamed with the fire of hell. Every voice, instead of uniting in the song of 'Glory to God in the highest,' was now at variance with the voices around it, and, in barbarous and dissonant strains, sung praise to itself, or was employed in muttering sullen murmurs against the Most High—in venting slanders against fellow creatures—in celebrating and deifying some worthless idol, or in singing the triumphs of intemperance, dissipation, and excess. The noise of violence and cruelty was heard mingled with the boasting of the oppressor, and the cry of the oppressed, and the complaints of the wretched; while the shouts of embattled hosts, the crash of arms, the brazen clangor of trumpets, the shrieks of the wounded, the groans of the dying, and all the horrid din of war, together with the wailings of those whom it had rendered widows and orphans, overwhelmed and drowned every sound of benevolence, praise, and love. Such is the jargon which sin has introduced—such the discord which, from every quarter of our globe, has long ascended up into the ears of the Lord of hosts."

Dr. Payson devoted himself exclusively and entirely to the duties of his holy profession,—to the preaching of the Gospel, and the winning of souls unto Jesus Christ. His great object was to persuade his fellow men to be truly religious. This was his ambition, his passion. To this purpose, he cleaved with a tenacity which was never loosened. For this, he relinquished the delights of literature and science, for which he had a keen relish. For this, he prayed with a constancy and fervency, almost unequalled. The great truths of religion were ever present to his heart. The scenes of eternity were ever before his eye. He eminently walked with God. Of the sincerity and depth of his piety, no one could doubt. It was this which carried him through his immense labors. It was this, which made him cheerful, and at times even rapturous, amidst the tortures of his last sickness. With all the energy of Baxter,

his zeal was also kindled from the same altar. Nor were his labors in vain. Few ministers, even in a long life, have accomplished so much as was done by Dr. Payson in the short period of twenty years. The extent of good which he produced cannot be measured. Having turned many unto righteousness, we doubt not, that he will shine as a bright star in heaven forever.

With all his eminence and power as a preacher, Dr. Payson cultivated none of the higher graces of the orator. This is to be accounted for from his private theological education. Nor is it certain, that if he had been subject to the discipline of a school of the prophets, his manner would have been improved; for in none of our theological schools, is sufficient importance attached to this subject. We may find, indeed, that some instruction is given, and sometimes an itinerant orator is called in for a few weeks;—but the only competent teacher of the art, we think, is a resident, established Professor of Oratory, who is at once a model of Christian goodness, and of Christian eloquence,—who has not only the soul, but the *real manner* of an orator, and whose incessant toils are devoted to the work of cultivating in his pupils the powers of persuasion. We are aware, that there are men who affect to decry the value of oratory; and there is doubtless much attempt at oratory, which is ridiculous. Half taught, it may only embarrass; but fully taught, so as to become a second nature, its value, in giving ease, point, and force to public instruction, is too palpable to need illustration. We have heard public speakers, whom we could not but pity, in perceiving such vigor of natural powers so unguided and extravagant. When the style of composition is deemed worthy of great attention in our schools;—why should the voice and the gesture, which produce more effect on the hearer,—be so much neglected? Nor can any one teach an art effectually, in which he is not himself skilled and eminent. The *soul* of an orator is not enough for the teacher. He must wear the orator's panoply,—looks, voice, gesture;—he must have himself the three requisites, *action, action, action!* Our youth are indeed digging in the deep mines of science, and they find many a precious gem of truth:—but the lapidary's skill fails to teach them how to reflect most copiously and delightfully the dazzling radiance upon the eyes of the observers.—We have heard at times Dr. Payson preach, when we could not but lament that deficiency of manner to which we have alluded, principally, because he failed to produce that effect on men averse to the truth, which he might have produced, had he been more oratorical. The friends of truth and of holiness asked only to hear from his lips his glowing conceptions; but the mass of men are not of this character. There were those, who turned away from his preaching, but who might have been attracted to it to their everlasting good, had his manner been more truly oratorical.

Of the art of eloquence, Dr. Payson had a very perfect conception. It was with him an established principle, that a discourse should conclude with something very striking and deeply impressive. He could not endure it in another preacher, when a powerful blow was struck towards the close of a sermon, to observe, that the strong excitement was quieted, and the whole effect counteracted, by a protracted discussion and a feeble and wearisome conclusion. Of his printed sermons, the 12th, 15th, and 24th, furnish examples of an energetic close, in accordance with his views of what was requisite to the perfection of a discourse from the pulpit. The following is the close of the last of the above mentioned sermons.

"Is it true, that, before a century shall have passed away, all the souls, who now fill this house, will be angels or demons, and fixed forever in heaven or hell? Yes, my hearers, it is true. It is as certain, as that there is a God; as certain, as that we are here. O, then, in what language can we describe, how can we adequately conceive of, the folly, the madness, of sinners, of those who neglect the great salvation. In less than a century, and, with respect to most of them, in much less than half that time, the question, which of the two opposite states shall be theirs, is to be decided. Yes, my immortal hearers, in a few years, will be forever decided the question, whether your vast and almost boundless capacities, shall be filled with happiness, or with misery; whether the noble faculties, which God has given you, shall blossom and expand in heaven, or be scorched and withered in hell; in a word, whether you shall brighten into angels, or blacken into fiends. And while this question is in suspense; a question which might convulse the thrones of heaven, and throw the universe into agonies of anxiety, how are you, who are most nearly concerned in it, employed? In some childish, worldly scheme of temporal aggrandizement; or in laboring to amass wealth, which you can possess but for an hour, or, perhaps, in a round of frivolous amusements and dissipation. Yes, let earth blush, let heaven weep to hear it,—these, these, are the employments, in which immortal beings choose to spend their hours of salvation, to pass away the time, till the great question is decided. Well may inspiration declare, as it does, that the heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and that madness is in their hearts while they live. And well may we exclaim, in the language of inspiration, O, that they were wise, that they understood their latter end. My dying, yet immortal hearers! will none of you be wise? Will none of you suffer me, or rather suffer the guiding Spirit of God, to take you by the hand, and lead you to that mount, on the summit of which an angel's crown, and a Saviour's throne, awaits all who overcome the difficulties of the ascent? O, look once more, before you turn away and renounce them forever,—look once more at these inestimable rewards. Look, too, at Him, who dispenses them. Hear him offering you the aid of his own wisdom to guide you, and of his own power to strengthen you, while contending for the prize. Hear him repeating all the gracious melting invitations, which he addresses to sinners in the volume of his word. Hear him saying, Sinner, trust in me, and I will raise thee to an equality with angels; but neglect me, and thou wilt plunge thyself down to a level with despairing fiends."

If there have been preachers, who, in respect merely to their discourses, have been more admired than Dr. Payson; yet we know not that he has ever been equalled in respect to the solemnity, the fulness, the richness, the originality, the variety, the pathos, and the sublimity of his public prayers. In hearing his extemporaneous effusions, for he never wrote his prayers, we think the greatest bigot to establish forms, would have felt his prejudices



melting away ; or at least, would have wished, that those effusions were the forms to be recited.

On the whole, we would remark, that as the Memoirs of Brainerd, Martyr, and other devoted missionaries to the heathen have awakened a spirit of benevolence and piety in many a breast ; so, we are inclined to think, the memoirs of Payson will produce still greater good, in as much as his sphere of toil was that of a common minister of the Gospel, and as his example may be a guide and a powerful stimulus to thousands, engaged in the same holy vocation. It should also impress all classes of readers with the beauty and glory of the Christian character, and with the faithfulness and mercy of Jesus Christ to his devoted disciples, giving them in sharp distresses, ineffable joys, and sublime triumph over death.

APPENDED REMARKS ON DR. PAYSON.

IT is my purpose to indicate, in few words, what appear to me, the *original elements* of Dr. Payson's character, the inborn qualities from which his peculiarities, as an individual, originated.

His mind was so constituted, that it was necessarily always hard at work. It could never rest satisfied with the passive reception of ideas that floated in upon it from without, (which make up almost the whole current of thought in ordinary men,) but was continually laboring in the formation of new combinations of thought for its own contemplation. Hence, though an acute and accurate observer of all that was passing about him, and possessing, in an unusual degree, the sensibilities and sympathies which bind man to his fellow man—he often appeared abstracted and absent, because he was busied in working up the materials which lay before him ; and sometimes seemed cold and reserved, because his sympathies were of too fine a texture to be interwoven with those of others without rending. From the same source, arose the deep melancholy which sometimes settled upon him. With a mind too inventive to be contented with common objects of thought, and with sensibilities too acute to cling to the world around him ; his soul, unless engrossed by some great object of pursuit, turned in and preyed upon itself. This was the case in childhood and early youth, before his mind was occupied by any one prominent object ; and it was always the case in after life, when exhausted by labor, and during the transition from one intellectual effort to another. Then he knew all the awful miseries of utter loneliness, of a consciousness of existence without one ray of sympathy with any other being whatever, or even with himself ; then, to himself

—“ he as some atom seemed, which God  
Had made superfluons, and needed not  
To build creation with, but back again  
To nothing threw, and left it in the void,  
With overlasting sense that once it was.”

The same characteristic explains the rapidity with which he made acquisitions, the avidity with which he devoured books, and the thorough knowledge which he seemed to possess, after a short observation, of every person's character and intentions.

Another original element of his character, was a *tremendous energy of feeling*, which impelled him through every obstacle to the accomplishment of a favorite design. So strong were his feelings that, for the time, they would give the vigor of a giant to a body that was prostrated by disease and lassitude; however great the difficulties that lay in his way, he would scarcely seem conscious of their existence, till he had reached the desired object; and it was never, till after the victory was gained, that he felt the wounds which he had received in the conflict. When this energy of feeling was entirely under the control of cheerful piety, (as it generally was) he would seem to possess an angel's might; but when it exhibited itself in a season of melancholy and spiritual desertion, there was something in it that was dreadful, and almost terrific. It was not anger nor impatience; it was a feeling which one could not help respecting while he trembled at it; and from which he could not persuade himself to escape, however severely he might be suffering from its influence. Often, when in his company at such times, I have been reluctant to leave him, because it seemed as if there was more happiness in *being afraid* of him, than there could be in *being delighted* with other men. It was this energy of feeling which carried him through such astonishing efforts on the Sabbath, immediately after a week of severe illness and total prostration; and it was this which impelled him to those constant exertions, that at length deranged the physical organization, and exposed him to such terrible sufferings during the last years of his life.

The last trait which I shall mention, as an original element of Dr. Payson's character, was the *liveliness and exhaustless exuberance of his fancy*. There was no end to the illustrations and images which he poured forth in the domestic circle and in the pulpit; yet they were always appropriate and in good taste, and though in general strikingly original, they seldom had the appearance of oddity or grotesqueness. His powers of conversation were unrivalled: his thoughts flew from him, in every possible variety of beauty and harmony, like birds from a South American forest. We may truly say of him, as Ben Jonson said of Shakspeare: "He had an excellent fancy, brave notions, and gentle expressions; wherein he flowed with that facility, that sometimes it was necessary he should be stopped. His wit was in his own power, \_\_\_\_\_ and there was ever more in him to be praised than pardoned."

These appear to me to be the principal original elements, which, in various combinations and developements, formed a character of

such distinguished merit and usefulness. The chief cause of the defects which existed in Dr. Payson, appeared to be the want of a systematic and philosophical study of his own nature and powers. He never thought of analyzing his own mind, of examining it part by part, and ascertaining how he could avail himself of his peculiar powers in the best possible manner. Whatever he did, he did by a *dead list*. He adopted no expedient to facilitate his intellectual efforts, excepting those which casually fell in his way in the course of practice. Owing to the same cause, he mingled many feelings with his religious experience, particularly in early life, (and suffered them to disquiet and distress him,) which, he ought to have known, arose from the peculiarities of his constitutional structure. Had he not possessed an unusual share of good sense, his neglect of *philosophical* self-scrutiny would have made him a fanatic: as it was, it disturbed his peace and shortened his life.

It will be understood, that I have not attempted to draw a character of Dr. Payson. My only endeavor has been to exhibit a few leading facts respecting the original structure of his mind, which, if well considered, may enable the reader to account for the peculiar excellencies and defects, which appear in his Memoirs and writings.

SIGMA.

- 
1. THE MANCHESTER SOCINIAN CONTROVERSY, *with Introductory Remarks, and an Appendix*. London. 1825. pp. 220.
  2. THE REPORT OF HIS MAJESTY'S COMMISSIONERS, CONCERNING DAME SARAH HEWLEY'S CHARITY. Manchester. 1829. pp. 63.
  3. STATE OF UNITARIANISM IN ENGLAND. *An Article in the Eclectic Review for October, 1830.*

SOME of the most important works on the Unitarian controversy, published in Great Britain, are well known in this country. But the developement of Unitarian sentiments in actual life, and their influence upon the moral character of the denomination abroad, are not so well known among us. We see, now and then, a biographical notice of some individual of superior mind, whose habits were studious and contemplative, and who had cultivated some of the kindlier sympathies of our nature; and he is presented to us as a pure and lovely type of the moral character formed under the influence of Unitarianism. We have looked to England to witness the full efflorescence of that plant which has been so vigorously shooting up its head in the midst of us, and have been assured that it combined most of the beauty and much of the strength of the

English character, as exhibited in former and in present times. The daughter here has told us much of the elegant and matronly dignity of her parent; how that she was of the ancestry of Milton and Locke, and how, in the progress of years, she drew at the call of her noble charms most of the suitors of enlarged and liberal minds; how she attracted to herself the pure, and elevated, and chivalrous spirit of the English people; and how, under her guidance and instruction, they were to be, not merely the heralds of a glorious day, when intellect, religion, and moral sentiment should be combined in a literature instinct with elevated and spirit-stirring thoughts, but were actually fast becoming the first fruits of that golden period.

We are sorry to cast a shade over such brilliant visions and anticipations; still, it is better for all parties to know the truth. And we are constrained to believe, from the documents before us, that there has been and is, much misapprehension, respecting the actual state of Unitarianism in England. It is not found there among the thinking, intellectual portion of the community. By this we do not mean, that there are not men of various learning, and extensive acquisitions, who have been, or now are, Unitarians; but that these are exceptions, and are so regarded abroad. The fact that Unitarianism has flourished, and does flourish, almost exclusively in the commercial or manufacturing towns and districts is proof of the truth of this assertion. In Liverpool, Leeds, Bristol, Birmingham, Manchester, and the region round about the latter place, with a few places of worship in London, that *omnium gatherum* of the world, may be found most of the Unitarians of Great Britain. In places where men have to do mainly with things, and not with accountable beings, with goods and chattels, and not with truths and principles, with canals and rail roads, with engines and machinery, with looms and factories, and not with moral and intellectual cultivation, there is the soil where Unitarianism has struck its roots the deepest. A mass of mind under such influences very readily, if it turns towards religion at all, turns towards Unitarianism—a religion which teaches morals, without the necessity of spiritual faith;—which teaches morals, as some young ladies would study botany, by noticing leaves, and flowers, and fruits, to the neglect of examining such repulsive things as roots.\*

To find the works of Dr. Channing spoken of with censure and severity in the Edinburgh Review, was not at all anticipated in certain quarters in this country. So long had we been told that the intellect of Great Britain was almost under the control of Unitarian principles, if not dressed out with Unitarian names and forms, that many were greatly surprized at the appearance of such

\* These remarks would not apply to many of the manufacturing villages in this country, the inhabitants of which are not a whit behind their fellow citizens generally, in point of intelligence, and of correct moral and religious sentiment.

an article, issuing, as it did, from the very fountain of liberal and original thought. And, lest we should draw false inferences from the fact, we have been told that the review was written by a worthless young man—that it was got up by booksellers to decry the publication of Dr. Channing's works—that the ministers, or the aristocracy, or other vile haters of the light and blessings of free institutions engaged some hireling to pour out their venom upon the work, as a representative of our country's literature. Had the review appeared in the Quarterly, there would have been more plausibility in some of these suppositions; but the '*Judex damnatur, qui nocens absolvitur*' of the Edinburgh, and the general adherence to the motto, so far, at least, as independent discussion is concerned, makes the suppositions that are put into our ears very difficult of belief. Be this as it may, Scotland of all countries, and Edinburgh of all places in Scotland, is least fitted for the growth of Unitarianism. The spirit of the Scotch people is not enough covered up by sensible, tangible, material things, to be in want of a system of religion, that teaches morality, by neglecting those principles, on which all morality, which is anything better than the outward form, must ultimately rest. But as some minds are impatient of searching into the reason and nature of things, we will appeal to what they will more readily understand—to *facts*.

"The extent of chapel accommodation, belonging to the Unitarians in all Scotland, does not exceed 1500 sitters; and to fill up that accommodation there are not more than 300 persons, if indeed even this number does not include a considerable surplus"!!!

Edinburgh, sometimes called "the modern Athens," contains at least 130,000 inhabitants; and among so intellectual a people, we should certainly expect a religion professing to be rational beyond all others, and adapted to the necessities of literary men, would be unusually popular. How has it fared with Unitarianism here?

"A good many people attended Mr. Fox's (of London) Lectures on the tenets of the party, when the chapel was opened;—but since that time, the attendance has been a mere handful. There are a few occasional hearers, and even these few consist chiefly, it is thought, of commercial gentlemen from the south, of Unitarian principles."

This was written after the chapel had been open a twelvemonth. Four years after this, on inquiry whether there were many Unitarians in Edinburgh, an intelligent lawyer made answer, "No: There may be a few, that occasionally meet in a hall; but I believe they have no regular preaching."

In Glasgow, a Unitarian chapel was opened in 1812; and out of a population of 150,000 "the average number of hearers may be reckoned at from 50 to 100; but generally nearer the former than the latter, and sometimes below it." At Port-Glasgow, "The

average attendance is about twelve, and the heads of families avowedly of Unitarian principles, six or seven."

At Paisley, out of a population of 50,000, "the average attendance is between seventy and eighty."

Some of these are manufacturing places; but they are in Scotland, where the spirit of trade has not yet triumphed over the intellectual character of the people, and where the operatives as well as the merchants retain, to an unusual degree, their habits of reading.

It will perhaps be answered to all this, that Unitarianism has not yet penetrated into the more intellectual portions of England, because it is comparatively of recent origin, and the habits of all classes are firmly established. Whoever should thus reply, I hope, will remember, that Milton, and Locke, and Newton, and Watts, and several English Bishops are claimed as having been Unitarians; and if they were such, no sect in the world has enjoyed such advantages as the Unitarians, to lead captive the English mind. But every reading or thinking man knows that they were neither the fathers nor the abettors of Unitarianism, as a *system of belief*, or as a *baseless fabric of unbelief*.

The English Reviews, how much so ever we may have been told that the best writers in them were leaning to liberal and enlightened opinions of the Unitarians, have been decidedly hostile to them,—not on the ground of pledged opposition, but from a perception of the inanity and falsity of their system. The Westminster Review commenced under infidel auspices. It could not succeed. It has passed into Unitarian hands now, and that not on the principle that extremes meet. Some of its *present* contributors are sceptics and materialists. Nor is this surprising, when we read in the Rev. Mr. Taylor's\* sermon "on Communion with Unbelievers," "I know of no one whose society is more improving, or more calculated to make us think closely and earnestly on the subject of religion, than a serious, candid, and moral deist." Many of the English infidels and infidel publications have found it convenient, at times, to speak well of Unitarianism, as a system leading into their own opinions, and therefore to be petted, or at least tolerated with forbearance. And this has been the reason, why so large a number of writers, and so large a portion of the English public have been thought to be Unitarian, or tending to Unitarianism.

But it is time, that we give our readers some account of the work, the title of which stands first at the head of this article, and which has now called our attention to this subject. It appears, that upwards of an hundred Unitarian gentleman held a convivial meeting at the Spread Eagle Tavern in Manchester, for the pur-

\* A Unitarian clergyman of Manchester.

pose of presenting a *silver tea service*, to the Rev. John Grundy, as a token of respect, on the occasion of his removal from Manchester to Liverpool. It was a good substantial English dinner. The company sat down at four o'clock, P. M. and rose to depart at eleven—seven hours!! It must not be supposed that they ate all this while. No: they drank; they presented the “silver tea service;” they gave toasts, made speeches, and did all necessary acts and things, to show their love to Mr. Grundy, and their attachment to “the cause of UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY.” The room, and indeed the neighborhood rang with their plaudits, and according to their own description of the effects of their eloquence, “*applause!*” “*unbounded applause!*” “*great applause throughout!*” “*immense applause!*” “*rapturous and long continued applause!*” successively attended their speeches, until an alarm of “*fire*” was excited among the populace without, who expected shortly to see the “*Spread Eagle*” in flames.

Amid this merriment, the health of the Rev. GEORGE HARRIS was given, who of course arose, and returned his thanks, and made a speech. It was during, and at the conclusion of this speech, that such tumultuous plaudits were given, as to occasion the alarm of “*fire*.” In this speech, which was published the next day in an account of the dinner, the Rev. gentleman contrasts the spirit of Orthodoxy, and that of Unitarianism, in the following animated language.

“For what is the spirit of *Orthodoxy*? Is it not a *slavish* spirit? but the spirit of Unitarianism is one of rational and enlightened liberty. The spirit of Orthodoxy is a *mean* spirit, for it bends before the dictation of a worm of the earth, and its essence consists, as its own advocates aver, in the “prostration of the human understanding;” but the spirit of Unitarianism is open, generous, liberal. The one is *partial and capricious*, viewing the favorites of Heaven only in a selected few, whilst Unitarianism sees in every man, a brother training up for the glorious inheritance which awaits all the family of the Eternal. The spirit of Orthodoxy is a *cruel and vindictive* spirit; witness its excommunications and its inquisitions;—the spirit of Unitarianism is merciful and benevolent, *anxious for man's rights*,\* and detesting revenge. The spirit of Orthodoxy is *one of persecution*;—look at the Athanasian Creeds, and Test and Corporation Acts; see the unbeliever—oh! shame and scandal!—even in the nineteenth century, dragged before the tribunal of man, to answer for his supposed want of faith; and behold Judges acting under the abused name of that Christianity, which, they say, is part and parcel of the law of the land, inflicting sentences, which even the worst of crimes would scarcely sanction; but Unitarianism is free as the winds of Heaven, and desires that every human creature may be so too. Orthodoxy says it encourages inquiry; it may do so to a certain point; but when a human being arrives at that, it is the language of its *deeds*, hitherto shalt thou go, but no further. Unitarianism, however, has no land-marks on the shores of knowledge;—like the swelling waves of the ocean, it is spirit and it is life. Orthodoxy would strip a man of the name of Christian, and would shut him out from all the rewards of Heaven, unless he can pronounce the shibboleth of an intolerant party; whilst Unitarianism affirms, that in every nation, aye, and in every sect, he who feareth God, and worketh righteousness shall be accepted of him. Orthodoxy is bound up in *creeds and confessions, and articles*

\* It is gratifying to be assured on such authority, that the Unitarians are “*anxious for man's rights*,” as that anxiety will necessarily impel them to restore all the perverted endowments and funds, to their legitimate and orthodox purposes. Editors.

*of faith, with inky blots, and rotten parchment bonds;—but Unitarianism, like the word of the everliving Jehovah, is not, and cannot be bound. Orthodoxy is gloom, and darkness, and desolation. Unitarianism is light, and liberty, and joy. The influence of the former system on human civilization, human liberty, and human happiness, has already been tried; it has been tried for ages; and its direful and demoralizing effects may be read in the history of every nation under the sun. It has been weighed, Sir, and has it not been found most miserably wanting? Let the state-craft, and the priest-craft, the war and the slavery, by which mankind have been cursed for ages, answer the question. What then remains, but that every friend of his species should unite, in trying the effects of the other system."*

The good people of Manchester, being for the most part Orthodox, were not disposed to sit quietly down under this tirade. One of them commented upon it in the paper containing the speech, and after remarking, that the manner in which the sentiments were received by the company, makes the whole company responsible for them, he says,

"And is this the spirit, and are these the terms, with which Manchester Unitarians regard and describe their Orthodox neighbors? Will no language adequately convey their feelings concerning us, but that of abhorrence and contempt? To meet these virulent and sweeping charges, which include the majority of professing Christians in this country, both in and out of the Establishment, it would suffice to say, that they are as unfounded as they were unprovoked, and that they betray on the part of those who make them, but little information, or but little reflection; we refer, however, to the history of generations of Orthodox believers as a triumphant refutation of them all.

"Will it be said of the Martyrs of Queen Mary's reign, that they were of a mean and slavish spirit, that they bent before the dictation of a worm of the earth? Yet they were full of the spirit of Orthodoxy. Were the Puritans servile adherents of power; did they bend before human authority, and did the essence of their religion consist in "the prostration of the under-standing?" Yet who more Orthodox than they? Were the two thousand Confessors, who on Bartholomew's Day, relinquished their Livings for conscience sake, men whose spirit was "slavish, mean, vindictive, cruel, and persecuting?" In a word, are we to ascribe to the persecuted Covenanters of Scotland, and Non-conformists of England, all that "darkness, gloom and desolation," and all those "direful and demoralizing effects," on which the Rev. Mr. Harris delights to declaim? These were the champions of Orthodoxy,—and these were the very men whose "faithfulness unto death," prepared the way for the glorious Revolution, and the chartered recognition of the rights of conscience.

"These accusations come with a peculiar ill-grace from Unitarians. As a body, they are of recent origin, in this country at least. During the period of the great struggles for liberty they were unknown; and they did not arise until the object was achieved—until the battle was fought, and the victory won. The Orthodox labored, and the Unitarians have entered into their labors."

This was the opening of a subject, in which Mr. Harris, and his speech, and the dinner party, were all forgotten. One writer after another, made allusions, and insinuations, and finally accusations against the whole Unitarian body in that vicinity, for basely and unjustly occupying chapels not their own; appropriating to their own and other purposes endowments of great value not theirs, either by civil or moral right; violating trusts of the most sacred kind, and showing, or attempting to show, that almost the whole superstructure of Unitarianism, as it existed in the forms of chapels, academies, alms houses, aids and assistances to poor clergymen and students in divinity, was founded in dishonesty, injustice and fraud.



We confess ourselves utterly astounded at the array of evidence brought forward in support of these various charges. We doubt whether the whole civilized world affords such another instance of open and unblushing abuse of public charity, as is exhibited in this "Manchester Controversy." The whole of Mr. Brougham's celebrated exposure of the abuse of public charities, is said to afford nothing, which, in any measure equals that, of which the Unitarians are continually availing themselves, in many places in England.

It appears, that the whole number of Unitarian chapels on the Island is as follows :

In England	- - - -	206	
Wales	- - - -	14	
Scotland	- - - -	3	Total, 223.

Of these, *two hundred and twenty-three* places of worship, *one hundred and seventy-eight*, *four fifths of the whole*, were ORIGINALLY ORTHODOX. Of the *two hundred and six* in England, only *thirty-six* were built by the Unitarians.

The inference, which Unitarian apologists would have us make is, that the congregations in these places had, from the superior light flowing in upon them, become Unitarian; and then, in virtue of a majority, had established a Unitarian ministry. But it was not so.\* "*In a majority of instances*, the death blow was given to the congregation, when the TRUSTEES first *obtruded* a Socinian ministry; and in many cases, it can now scarcely be said, that there are congregations in their Chapels." It is stated that one tenth of their places of worship would contain all the attendants. A gentleman, who has information on this subject, says, "that in Lancashire, Cheshire and Derbyshire, there are *forty* places of worship possessed by the Unitarians, and several of these well endowed, in each of which the average number of hearers will not amount to *twenty-five*."

The appendix to the "Manchester Socinian controversy" contains a list of the above two hundred and twenty-three chapels, with remarks upon the endowments and the present condition of many of them. We will select a few.

"ALLOSTOCK, near Knutsford.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Built about the year 1700. There is an estate of twenty-seven acres at Rainow, near Macclesfield, belonging to it, which was purchased with property left for that purpose by the Rev. S. Garside, the second minister, who was unquestionably of Orthodox

\* At the Wolverhampton Chapel, which was originally Orthodox, on the resignation of the minister, the majority of the congregation, in the year 1781, chose Mr. Jameson, a decided Calvinist, to succeed him, and he removed to Wolverhampton with his family and furniture; but the minority, consisting of a few Socinians, locked and guarded the doors of the Meeting-house against him, without any notice having been given to him; and no admittance could be gained without having recourse either to violence or to legal measures. Mr. Jameson, being a man of a peaceable disposition, would not suffer the former to be resorted to; and the want of means, and the heavy expenses thrown upon his friends, prevented their having recourse to the latter; they therefore fitted up a barn for a temporary accommodation; and in this way Socinianism triumphed in the Chapel at that time.

sentiments." "It is now held by the Unitarian minister at Knutsford, but there is, in fact, no Unitarian congregation whatever at this place."

"CROSS-STREET, near Altrincham.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Endowment forty pounds, *per annum*. Usual number of hearers eight.

"MACCLESFIELD.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Built in 1692." "The congregation is almost extinct."

"MIDDLEWICH. The chapel here was *originally Orthodox*, and was endowed; but it passed into the hands of the Unitarians, and in order to entitle the late Rev. John Philips, then the minister of a chapel at Kingsley, to the endowment or funds for preaching at Middlewich, it became necessary to hire a congregation of a few persons to attend, at the rate of eight pence *per diem*!!! Since his death, the chapel has been converted into cottages."

"BUXTON.—*Originally Orthodox*.—As there are no persons of Unitarian sentiments in Buxton, or the neighborhood, the chapel is shut up, except occasionally in the bathing season."

"CREDITON.—*Originally Orthodox*.—At present scarcely any hearers remain. The endowments are large."

"DORCHESTER.—*Originally Orthodox*.—On the withdrawal of the Evangelical doctrine, many of the hearers went off to Lady Huntingdon's chapel, and the congregation is now very small."

"SAFFRON WALDON.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Endowment about £200 *per annum*. The congregation a mere handful."

"GLOUCESTER.—The meeting in Barton street, Gloucester, was built in 1699 for the Rev. James Forbes.

"He was succeeded by Mr. Denham, who was also sound in the faith.

"Next came Mr. Hodge, reputed an Arian, who was succeeded by Mr. Dickinson, from Yorkshire, a Baxterian. Messrs. Tremlet, Aubrey, and Brown, all of whom were considered Socinians, followed Mr. Dickinson in succession, and the congregation sunk from 200 or 300, to 20 or 30. Between one and two years it has been shut up."

"COCKEY-MOOR.—The chapel now occupied by the Unitarians was erected in 1718. The trust deed specially states that "the ministers of the said congregation who, for the time being, shall officiate there, must be sound in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, and such as hold and profess the *Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England*, required to be subscribed by the pastor or teacher of such congregation. Mr. Bealy, one of the ministers, died in 1813. In the latter part of his life he acknowledged himself to be a decided Unitarian, but still continued to retain possession of the pulpit. Before his death, the congregation very much declined; many of his former hearers disapproving of his new sentiments, sought their spiritual instruction elsewhere. Mr. Brettel, educated at York Academy, was minister here a short time, and then removed to Rotherham. Mr. Whitehead is the present minister, and preaches to a small congregation. The amount of the endowments received by the Trustees is about £120 *per annum*.

"GATEACRE, near Liverpool.—This chapel was built by the friends of Orthodoxy, and is very liberally endowed. The present minister is Mr. Shepherd, a Unitarian, who publicly advocated Mr. Brougham's education bill. His congregation is very small, about twenty."

"LANCASTER.—The descendants of some of those who left the place when Unitarianism was introduced, are yet living in Lancaster. The persons now holding possession of the chapel say, that the trust deed cannot be found. The endowment is about £100 *per annum* arising from two estates in the neighborhood, and part, if not the whole was given when the people were Orthodox. The congregation seldom amounts to twenty persons."

LIVERPOOL, Renshaw-street.—With the sum of £2000, for which the old Orthodox chapel was sold, and other means, the congregation formerly assembling in Benn's Gardens built the present Unitarian chapel in Renshaw-street, in 1811. But the congregation dwindled to nothing, and the chapel has been pulled down."

"OLDHAM.—The Unitarian chapel in this place was built a few years since, by the subscriptions of those who approve of the system of doctrines denominated Unitarianism. It is one of the few places of worship to which they have a legitimate claim. No minister has been settled here, but occasional supplies

come to preach to a very small number of people. The preacher and the whole of his congregation have been seen conducting their worship all in one pew."

"ORMSKIRK.—*Originally Orthodox.*—The chapel is endowed, and, it is said, there are now about a dozen hearers."

"PLATT, near Manchester. The present chapel is built on the site of an old one which was erected about the year 1700 for Mr. Finch, an eminent Orthodox divine. The old trust deed says, that the doctrines preached here shall be according to the *Assembly's Catechism, and the Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England*. During the pious labors of the first ministers of this chapel, the congregation was numerous; at present it often does not exceed twenty persons."

"PRESTON.—*Originally Orthodox.*—The Unitarian minister at Preston is partly supported by the bounty of Lady Hewley's Trustees, partly by the rents of Walton chapel let as cottages, and partly by a congregation of about forty persons."

"ROCHDALE.—*Blackwater-street Chapel.*—*Originally Orthodox.*—About fifty years since, if a family coming to reside at Rochdale wished to attend at Blackwater-street chapel, they often had to wait a considerable time before they could obtain a pew; but now the congregation in winter is frequently under twenty individuals."

"TOXTETH PARK, near Liverpool.—The ministers preceding Mr. Anderson, who now occupies the pulpit of the Dissenting chapel here, and who has been nearly fifty years at this place, have all been reputed as Orthodox. When he came, it was on the supposition that he was of the same Evangelical sentiments as his predecessors. Soon after Mr. Anderson's settlement at Toxteth Park, a great part of the congregation withdrew, and assisted in building the Independent chapel in Renshaw-street, Liverpool in 1777. The chapel at Toxteth Park has endowments belonging to it, some of which are expressly directed to be paid to a minister "holding and teaching sentiments conformable to the *Doctrinal Articles of the Church of England*." A correspondent says: "The congregation is literally gone to nothing, consisting often entirely of official persons, viz: the door keeper, the grave digger, the singers, and the preacher. I have been there when there were only a dozen persons present." When Mr. Gellibrand was minister here, about a century since, the place was crowded to excess, and it was accounted a privilege to obtain standing room."

"WALTON, near Preston.—*Originally Orthodox.*—It is now converted into cottages, and the rents are paid to the minister at Preston."

"HINCKLEY.—*Originally Orthodox.*—The number of the congregation is almost reduced to nothing."

"KIRKSTEAD.—*Originally Orthodox.*—At present neither minister nor congregation. The property has been for some years under litigation. The endowment large."

"HAPTON.—*Originally Orthodox.*—Endowment very large. Congregation almost extinct."

"STAFFORD.—*Originally Orthodox.*—Vacant and going to ruins. The trustees possess the endowment, but the deeds of the chapel provide that if the worship should be discontinued, the funds should be paid to the nearest congregation of the same denomination."

"BROMSGROVE.—This place being upwards of a century old, there can be no doubt that it was originally Orthodox. It is now occupied by the Methodists, by permission of the Socinians, who, in order to retain possession of the chapel and funds, have a sermon there once a fortnight.

"Our correspondent laconically adds to the above statement, 'scarcely any- body attends.'"

"SELBY.—*Originally Orthodox.*—Endowed.—The present state of this place appears, from the account of Richard Wright, the Socinian itinerant, who says, 'the present minister has very few hearers.'"

"STANNINGTON.—*Originally Orthodox.*—An attempt was made in 1780 by the trustees to introduce an Unitarian minister, but the inhabitants were so opposed to it, that they consented to the appointment of Mr. Rhodes, a Calvinistic divine, who officiated to a numerous congregation until 1785, when he removed to Sutton. The trustees thereupon, contrary to the wishes and remonstrances of the inhabitants, appointed Mr. Gibson, an Unitarian minister;

in consequence of which most of the hearers left the chapel. Mr Meanley succeeded to Mr. Gibson; and the present minister is the Rev. Peter Wright, an Unitarian minister. The congregation consists of about thirty or forty persons, though the chapel will contain four or five hundred."

YORK.—*Originally Orthodox*.—Liberal y endowed. The present average congregation in this place is said to be not more than forty or fifty."

In some cases, the trust-deeds of these chapels and endowments are said to be *lost*; in others, they are forcibly *concealed*, so that the means of detection may not be furnished; and in others, they specify in express terms, as has been seen, that the preachers shall be required to preach the doctrines of the Assembly's Catechism, and of the thirty nine articles. But what do Orthodox endowments, trust-deeds, or creeds and confessions of faith avail, before a denomination, who hold such notions of civil liberty, and of their own rights, as do these English Unitarians? In the language of Mr. Harris, They are partakers of a spirit that "*is not, and cannot be bound,*"—no, not by solemn oaths—to execute trust deeds according to the intention of the donors!!

It has been openly contended by Unitarians in this controversy, "that trustees are not bound by the will of the testator, but must be left to act according to their own discretion, in the application of trust funds." But in reply to this corrupt and abominable principle, it is conclusively urged, that "trust property is not left to persons to do what they please with it, but for specific purposes to be promoted by it; and when those to whom it is left cannot or will not, devote it to those purposes, they ought, in all honesty, to relinquish the trust."

"In what confusion the world would be involved, if the practice of Unitarians, in this matter, were introduced into all the other concerns of society? Suppose trustees were to proceed upon the same plan in other charities besides those immediately connected with religion, and in the private concerns of life; what would be the consequence? All confidence among men must cease, and universal confusion ensue. Or is it in religious concerns alone, that no regard is to be paid to the views and wishes of the pious dead?"

The principles advocated by the Orthodox Dissenters of England in regard to this subject, are consistently exemplified by them in practice.

"At Stainland, a populous village in the parish of Halifax, a chapel was built in 1754, by the inhabitants, at their own expense, and for their own accommodation, and it was unconnected with any religious denomination. In 1813, part of the congregation wanted an Independent minister to be chosen, and that part were the majority of the seat-holders. But the minority appealed to the trust-deed, which requires that the prayers of the Church of England shall be read. That appeal settled the question. The majority peaceably, and at once, gave up to the minority the chapel, the burying ground, and all appurtenances; and incurred the expenses of £1700 in building a new chapel."

We cannot forbear to quote one more "example of Unitarian usefulness, in a place which was once in most flourishing circumstances, and will do it in the words of its late minister, himself a Unitarian.

"The funds belonging to this place, which have arisen out of the donations of the wealthy members of the society from time to time for the use of the minister and the support of the poor, are very considerable, and are managed by trustees chosen in succession out of the congregation. They have 8 alms houses, which are liberally endowed, and in which poor widows reside; funds for the education of young men for the ministry, for the instruction of the children of the poor, and other very important charities. *The congregation, though respectable, is not large, the opinions of the Unitarians being by no means popular in this part of the kingdom.*" Will the reader believe that this refers to the chapel where Matthew Henry once dispensed the word of life to crowds, who hung upon his lips, from which flowed religious knowledge and instruction to refresh and gladden the church? And what has it now become, under the enlightening system of Unitarianism? The place is beautiful and lovely even in its ruins and ashes! The impress of Matthew Henry's image, in faint but fairest lines, is still upon it, although its glory is gone."

We are not surprised, nor are we pained, to learn that of many, very many of these stolen chapels it is said, "the congregation is almost extinct." The preacher reads to "empty pews." There are but "twenty," or "thirty," or "forty hearers;" that on the forcible introduction of Socinian preachers, by the trustees, many of the families, sometimes a majority, sometimes all, left the congregation, and sought religious accommodation in other places. It is worth while to notice, also, that in many cases the departure from Orthodoxy commenced in the minister's becoming high Arian, and *concealing his sentiments* for years, silently sapping the foundation of the faith of the people, while he used the common Orthodox forms of expression in his preaching. It is worthy of special remembrance, too, that these congregations, with very few exceptions, are not composed of individuals, who have become, or who now are Unitarians, from a conviction of the truth of Unitarianism as a system; but of all classes of errorists, who wish to be rid of the restraints of spiritual and practical religion, and yet have a place of public deposit for their consciences.

We would gladly pause here; for we are sick of contemplating such exhibitions of human nature, under the form of Christianity. But the half is scarcely told, and to many it will appear not the most important half. The "Manchester College," the only public Unitarian Theological Seminary in England, is maintained partly by voluntary contributions, and partly by exhibitions from charitable funds. The Theological tutor is Mr. Charles Wellbeloved, successor to Rev. Newcome Cappe. Mr. Cappe received, as minister from the Chapel, 180 pounds *per annum*. The endowments, from which this is collected, were given by "the Orthodox Lady Hewley," to support Orthodox preaching. This Mr. Wellbeloved now receives. Besides this, there are *five* other Orthodox charitable endowments, the income of which is applied to the aid of these students.

"One expressly designed for the *apprenticing of poor boys to trades* is, by an indescribable device, made applicable to the *educating of young gentlemen for the ministry.*"

"No less than *one hundred and twenty pounds* are annually appropriated,

from Lady Hewley's funds, to the education of young men, for the very purpose of denying and endeavoring to extinguish a belief in those doctrines, in the faith of which Lady Hewley died, and to the dissemination of which she designed her property should be devoted, when she was no more!"

The Rev. Dr. Williams,\* "a man of tried and established Orthodoxy," whose "intimate companions and friends, were the famous Richard Baxter, Dr. Bates, Mr. Howe, and Mr. Alsop," bequeathed at his death, to pious purposes, about 50,000*l.*, or 222,000 dollars. A little of this has passed out of the control of the Trustees; but most of it is now applied, under the direction of Unitarians, for their purposes, and this, while the Doctor in his last testament says,—

"I beseech the blessed God, for Jesus Christ's sake, the Head of his church, whose I am, and whom I desire to serve, that this my will may, by his blessing and power, *reach its end, and be faithfully executed.* Obtesting, in the name of the great and righteous God, all that are or shall be concerned, that what I design for his glory to the good of mankind, may be *HONESTLY, prudently and diligently employed to those ends*; as I have, to the best of my judgement, directed."

The most important charity is that of Lady Hewley, already alluded to. The income is about 4000*l.* per annum; all which is now so misapplied, as to form a bounty or premium for Socinianism. By the deeds, it is to be applied,

1. "To certain Alms-houses, where prayers were to be said, and religious instruction given.
2. To the relief of *poor godly preachers* of Christ's holy Gospel.
3. To the relief of poor widows of poor and godly preachers of the Gospel.
4. For encouraging the *preaching of the Gospel in poor places.*
5. Exhibitions for *educating young men for the ministry*, or preaching of the Gospel, not exceeding five such young men.
6. In relieving godly persons in distress."

Complaints are made of the abuse of this charity in all respects:

1. That the alms-houses are filled with the superannuated servants of the Trustees, or their favorites; and that the catechism, required by deed to be taught, being Orthodox, has long since been excluded.
2. That the *poor preachers* relieved are Unitarians, which is contrary to Lady Hewley's intention, and that they are often rich men. It appears that Rev. Newcome Cappe, and Mr. Wellbeloved, have been men whom the Trustees have delighted to honor in this way, though Mr. Wellbeloved's income, from the endowment of the chapel by Lady Hewley, and from the college, is greater than that of any other dissenting minister in the "northern counties." On the ground of relieving "*poor ministers*," and supplying "*poor places*" with the Gospel, Mr. Newcome Cappe was introduced, and with him Unitarianism, into Ycrk. This was not done how-

\* Dr. Williams gave a large sum of money to establish "a public Library for Dissenters." The legacy not being sufficient "to furnish the building, (in Red cross Street London) it was completed by the joint contributions of Independents, Baptists, and Presbyterians."

"So great a change has taken place in the management of this Library, that Orthodox ministers are now obliged to solicit the permission of a Unitarian Trustee, before they can enter its precincts; and complaints have been made repeatedly, and without contradiction, that the MSS., which are freely conceded to the inspection of Unitarians, are prohibited to the Orthodox."

ever, without the protest of one of the trustees. Mr. Cappe received 60*l.* per annum, from 1756 to 1800; and Mr. Wellbeloved has received 80*l.* per annum, since. So that these two ministers of St. Saviorgate chapel, have received 5040*l.*, *twenty-three thousand four hundred and eighty seven dollars*, from this charity!! The congregation varies from fifty to eighty persons!!! See Report of Commissioners, p. 23.

There happens to be a manuscript account in existence, by one of the former trustees, of the manner in which the funds passed into hands such as now hold them. From this account, we extract the following. "It was proposed to give Mr. Cappe 60*l.* by one of the Trustees. No, says Mr. Moody, in his account, I object, because he is not an object of charity, and it will be contrary to our trust to do it;—and besides, as our expenditures are 58*l.* more than our income last year, we cannot do it. Here was a difficulty. They, however, resolved 'to take off from all the minister's widows *half their allowance*, to make room for Mr. Cappe. I refused signing the distribution, and told them I could not consent to rob so many necessitous families, in order to gratify an aspiring boy to keep a footman at the expense of charity.'"

"A list of these poor widows is with the papers; and by means like these, the Rev. Newcome Cappe introduced Unitarianism into York, and was supplied with a footman "at the expense of Lady Hewley's charity," designed for the "poor widows of poor and godly ministers!!" We do not profess to comment on deeds like these; it is an unpleasant subject,—let us pass on!"

Yes, let us pass on. A *little* of this charity is received by ministers of Orthodox sentiments. One writes, "I imagine they give one or two hundred pounds per annum to Orthodoxy, by way of a blind, but latterly I have heard of their giving us little but refusals." There are several "well authenticated instances," where, on change of sentiments to Orthodoxy, the stipend has been taken away; and where, on change to Unitarianism, it has been given.

Under the fourth specification of the trust-deed, funds are applied in such abundance to the support of Unitarianism, as to be its principal source of income in the "northern counties." It would scarcely have had existence there, had it not been for the mal-administration of this charity.

But we have already trespassed upon the patience of our readers by a notice of facts which might be greatly extended. The controversy led to the appointment of commissioners from his Majesty to see how this charity had been disbursed; who, after examination, recommended that the "case be submitted to a court of equity—that a judicial declaration may be pronounced, as to the proper mode of administering, &c., and such directions given as the case may require, for securing its proper administration in future."

Of the result of this measure, we have not been informed; though one could hardly doubt what it would be, after reading the

following opinions of lord chancellor Eldon, which we commend to the consideration of certain jurists in this country.

In the case of the Attorney General against Pearson & Merivale 353 the following *principles* are laid down.

"Where a trust is created for religious worship, and it cannot be discovered from the deed creating the trust, what was the nature of the religious worship intended by it, it must be implied from the *usage of the congregation*. But if it appears to have been the founder's intention, *although not expressed*, that a particular doctrine should be preached, it is not in the power of the trustees of the congregation to alter the designed objects of the institution."

"If land or money be properly given for maintaining 'the worship of God,' *without more*, the court will execute the trust in favor of the established religion." But, "as in that case, the intention *clearly appears, aliunde*, though *not expressed in the instrument creating the trust*, the court will also carry the manifest design of the founder into execution, so far as consistent with the law." The same opinion, as to the maintenance of the original doctrines, is given in the case of *Foley vs. Wontner*, 2 Jacob and Walker 247; and his Lordship in this case added, "I take it to be now settled, by a case in the House of Lords, on appeal from Scotland, that the chapel must remain devoted to the doctrines originally agreed on." And in the case of the Albion Chapel, he said, "The court *would not permit even a majority of the individuals to depart* from the purposes to which the property was in the first place made applicable."

We have dwelt longer upon this matter than we intended; and still must pass over some things of great interest, that are incidentally introduced in this controversy; such as the vain boasting of some Unitarians, as though they were the peculiar, unflinching advocates of civil and religious liberty, and of the rights of conscience. The history of the sect in England furnishes several occasions in which the spirit of its professors has been tried on this subject, and found wanting.

"The first of these examples occurred in the year 1772, when many clergymen of the Church of England, who held Unitarian sentiments, petitioned the Legislature for relief from the necessity of subscribing the articles of that church, because that subscription was opposed to their conscientious belief. This petition was signed by about two hundred and fifty, among whom were the celebrated Law, Bishop of Carlisle, and Archdeacon Blackburne; but its prayer was rejected by the House of Commons, and the subscription was enforced. Notwithstanding this, the petitioners, with the exception of Mr. Lindsey, clung to the emoluments of a church, the doctrines of which they had publicly declared they no longer believed; and Mr. Lindsey had to complain with indignation, that, of the multitudes who concurred in his sentiments, only one member of the Establishment was found to contribute towards the expense of erecting his chapel. What a contrast this, to the self-denying conduct of the two thousand *Orthodox* clergymen, who, on the passing of the act of Uniformity, rather than compromise with their consciences, unhesitatingly exposed themselves to poverty, to bonds, to imprisonment and death!"\*

\* The following testimony to these men is from the pen of the celebrated Dr. Taylor of Norwich. "The ministers ejected in the year 1662, were men prepared to lose all and to suffer martyrdom, rather than desert the cause of civil and religious liberty. They were excellent men, because excellent, instant, and fervent in prayer. Those who knew them not might despise them, but your forefathers, wiser and less prejudiced, esteemed them highly in love for their work's sake. You were once happy in your Heywoods, your *Newcomes*, your *Jollies*, &c. &c., who left all to follow



Other cases have occurred more recently. "One of them was Lord Sidmouth's attempt virtually to repeal the toleration act." On the subject of this bill, Mr. Belsham addressed a public letter to Lord Sidmouth.

"In that letter, the preacher fawns, and crouches, and licks the feet of the peer,—he ridicules that animated opposition by which the Dissenters strangled the monster in its birth—he pours contempt on a laborious and useful class of ministers of the Gospel, whom he styles "illiterate fanatics"—he actually instructs his patron how he may frame another Bill, so artfully as to beguile the Dissenters and carry his point—and to crown the whole, with an insolence which could find a place only in a breast so devoted to servility and sycophancy as his, as if he had a right to represent the Dissenting body, he humbles himself before Lord Sidmouth on account of their opposition to his Bill, and in their name, and in the most cringing and obsequious manner, deprecates his anger and implores his forgiveness. The same writer, in a series of sermons which he entitles "Christianity pleading for the patronage of the Civil Power, &c. &c.," renounces the essential principles of Nonconformity—he declares that he sees no good reason why Christianity may not occasionally "lift her mitred front in Courts and Parliaments"—he endeavors at great length to refute the opinions of those who hold that Christianity neither needs nor requires the patronage of the Civil Power—to which patronage he even ascribes the continued existence of Christianity—and thus the living patriarch of English Unitarianism adopts and advocates the principle of the alliance between Church and State, to which he avers, that our Lord's declaration, "My kingdom is not of this world," furnishes no objection."

The question will arise, and it deserves consideration, How has Unitarianism obtained the ascendancy, in so many congregations, which once were Orthodox?

This question stands associated in our minds very closely with the subject of church government; not church government as a system of rules and authority, but as a form of embodying principles—*living truths*.—It has been asserted often, in America, that the spread of Unitarianism in England was owing to the looseness of Independency as a form of church government; and to the same cause has been attributed its extension in this country. It is not long, since we met with the following in a respectable Episcopal publication: "That out of about 220 Socinian societies in England, 170 are ultra Calvinistic *Congregational* churches revolutionized." This was made the foundation of a warning to beware of the heretical tendencies of Congregationalism.

And other denominations have used not always the most charitable language, when the topic of Congregationalism has been in discussion. In regard to the Unitarianism of England, we wish our words to be distinctly noted when we say, that *none of it originated in Congregational or Independent churches and societies.*

Christ. But Providence cared for them, and they had great comfort in their ministerial services. The presence and blessing of God appeared in their assemblies, and attended their labors. How many were converted, and built up in godliness and sobriety, by their prayers, pains, doctrines and conversations! Let my soul forever be with the souls of these men."

We would not be understood to affirm, that not a single Congregational church has become Unitarian. Out of the *one hundred and seventy-eight* that were originally Orthodox, from *six to ten* were probably Congregational—several were Episcopal chapels—of late some Methodist congregations have joined in the heresy—but the most were *Presbyterians*. And to this hour do the Unitarians call themselves Presbyterians, in the northern counties of England, whenever their right to the funds they control is called in question. Presbyterianism is their *nom de guerre*, when the trust deeds are appealed to; and yet they now have not a single feature of Presbyterianism about them.\* Rev. O. Heywood, himself a Presbyterian minister, when describing the government of the Presbyterian churches in Lancashire, in which county is found about one fourth of all the Unitarianism in England, says,

“They had their eldership in every congregation,—several congregations had their classis; and these maintained intercourse by a provincial assembly which, for the county of Lancaster, was usually held at Preston. The elders, who sat with the ministers, carried the votes, inquired into the conversation of their neighbors, and usually sat with the ministers when they examined the communicants, and (though the ministers only examined) yet the elders approved or disapproved.’ When a person desired admission to these Presbyterian churches, he signified his intention to the minister, or one of the elders; and if, on examination, his religious knowledge and practice were approved he was admitted. If any member of these churches was guilty of immoral conduct, or acted contrary to their prescribed rules, he was suspended from communion for a time, or excluded, as the case required. On these principles, the early “English Presbyterian” churches were formed, and according to them they were governed. I have been informed, from a very respectable source, that one of the last public acts of the Assembly, of which the pious Matthew Henry was a member, was the suspension of a minister from the exercise of his ministry, in a chapel in this county, for *Arianism*.”

It is a truth well understood in England, that Unitarianism has never been indebted to the spirit of Independency, or Congregationalism, for its increase. Nay more, it is understood that no sect of Christians has been so long free from a bias to Arminianism, and from Arianism running into Unitarianism, as the Independents or Congregationalists. We quote the following from a critical journal, whose predilections, at least, are not in favor of Orthodoxy.

“It is curious indeed, to observe, how the subsequent history and fortune of each of these bodies (the Presbyterians and Independents,) have been determined by the characteristic difference of their original constitution. The moderate aristocracy of Presbyterianism, as long as Presbyterianism could be said to have any form of government, enabled its ministers to follow their own inclination with regard to the manner of conducting public worship and the strain of preaching, while the jealous democracy of Independency kept the minister under the eye and control of his people, and punished the first appearance of

\* Mr. Grundy, a Unitarian minister, formerly of Manchester, in a published sermon, uses the following language: “*Arian* and *Socinian* are the terms generally assigned to us; and these, till lately, were frequently considered as synonymous with deist or infidel. The term *Presbyterian* is now commonly used; but, I confess, some difficulty appears to me to attend the use of it; because, it either has no definite meaning as to opinions or discipline, or, if it have any meaning, it signifies something which we are not.”

deviation, though merely negative, from the standard of Orthodoxy. The Presbyterian ministers became men of polished manners—partook largely of the biblical knowledge, and the elegant and scientific literature of the age, *dropped in every generation something of the Orthodoxy of their forefathers, and while their flocks gradually diminished, contented themselves with being the rational instructors of a few, rather than the idols of the multitude.* Of late, they seem to have discovered, that, as a religious community, they must speedily become extinct by adhering to this plan; new controversies have sprung up among them, and though, with a new principle of cohesion and repulsion, they may still maintain themselves, as a distinct body, *the history of Presbyterianism, as a sect deducing itself from the time of the great separation from the Establishment, in 1662, must be considered as very nearly closed.* Monthly Review, New Series, vol. lxxxi., p. 411."

Individuals may examine for themselves whether the suggestion that the "aristocracy of Presbyterianism" has had anything to do with the question of the extension of Unitarianism is true or not. And if any one should spend a thought upon it, we hope he will not say, 'I always thought Presbyterianism was a bad system of church government,' and thus jump at the above conclusion;—or that he always thought it a good system, and therefore the above suggestion is false.

But to return to the question, How has it happened that the Unitarians have obtained the ascendancy, in so many congregations, that once were Orthodox? We account for this, in the first place, from the fact, that so much property was put in trust for religious purposes. It took from Congregations the necessity of supporting their own religious institutions; and thus deprived them of the best opportunity of cultivating the spirit of self-denial and of benevolence, which is essential to the continuance and growth of active piety. In this way, religion itself was put in jeopardy. What costs little is little prized. Indifference to the interests of the congregation, would be the natural consequence.

2. The placing of the property in the hands of trustees, without making provision that they should be *pious men*. It was thought, as the object was specified, it was enough. None but good men would interest themselves in such an object. To be sure, none but good men would care for the object, but many others would care for the money.

3. The want of a system of responsibility to true piety, in the places where funds were to be expended. This would have been the safeguard which Independency might have supplied. And so long as Independency held fast to the *vital principle*, that none could gain admission to the church but those who, in the view of even-minded charity, were truly pious, a misapplication of the funds could not have taken place. It is because Independency is constantly driven back upon vital piety, as the only sustaining power for her *formal* existence, that she has not long since been crushed by error abroad. It is because she stands on this, and *on this alone* in Scotland, that Dr. Chalmers said of "the Congregational Union," "it is the purest body of Christians in the United King-

dom." And it is because she departed from this, *her life*, and began to talk of "*half way covenants*," and to admit to her bosom those that had no piety, that the door was opened for error to enter into our own New England churches. It is forgotten by Congregationalists, that their form of church government is only an embodying of the principle of true piety, and making it publicly visible, and that just in proportion to the want of piety, there is derangement in their outward forms, which should drive them back to the means of increasing piety as their only safeguard. And what else ought to be done? If there is not piety enough to place us above the reach of overwhelming difficulties, why have any church government at all? To be domineered over by Ecclesiastical authority in any form, because it is authority, is as subversive of the end and purpose of Christ's kingdom, the production of holiness in the heart, as to be crushed by a power called civil.

(To be continued.)

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### OBITUARY NOTICE.

DIED, near this City, on Tuesday, the 27th of April last, Mrs. Martha Ropes, wife of William Ropes, Esq. Merchant.

This notice is written, not for the purpose of eulogy, but to express the feelings of a large circle of Christian friends, who would be disappointed, if they were not to see some expression of a regret and affection, which is felt by all of them; and who desire that the example of her whom they loved should live.

Mrs. R. was an active Christian:—She felt that there was something more required of her, as a follower of Christ, than a bare abstinence from what was inconsistent in the conduct of his disciples; and she took pleasure in endeavoring, by personal exertions, to enlarge the sphere of Christian influence, and of human happiness around her. In doing this, she was among the number of that (shall we say?) *small* class of disciples, who, after having decided on what is right, freely share responsibility with others, without waiting until success has rendered assistance less needed, or failure has excused them from action, and perhaps encouraged them to blame. Many, who have been associated with her in doing good, can bear witness to the justice of this remark.

The deceased was an intelligent Christian:—Though few, in similar situations, feel more deeply on the subject of religion, than she felt;—few, also, are more anxious that Christian feeling should be regulated and rendered permanent by growth in knowledge. She apparently neglected no good opportunity of acquiring such clear ideas of the doctrines on which her faith was founded, as

might enable her to give an answer to every one that asked a reason of the hope that was in her. The path of her Christian experience naturally led to this. An advocate once for a religious system, one of the darkest features of which we believe to consist in a reliance upon human wisdom, which renders the preaching of the Cross foolishness, and therefore knows not God; it appears to have been her anxious endeavor, after this change of sentiment, to manifest by her own advancement in the knowledge of divine truth, that while the heart must first be humbled lest it lead the understanding astray, the latter need never shrink from the investigation of truth afterwards.

Mrs. R. was a Christian friend:—It was a characteristic of her friendship, to which there are witnesses, that she endeavored to increase mutual confidence and affection, by being quick to observe and frank, though prudent, in endeavoring to correct those faults in Christian friends, which might lessen their influence, and injure the cause of Christ,—mentioning them, in the spirit of the Redeemer, between the offenders and herself alone.

There is a circle of mourners, whose every feeling will go along with the writer of this notice, as he records the worth of the deceased as an affectionate and Christian mother. They can tell what anxiety she ever felt for the moral as well as intellectual improvement of her children,—for they have been the subjects of her anxiety. And they know, that in the acquaintances which she cultivated, and the conversation in which she engaged amid the domestic circle, and in the actions which she performed in the presence of her children, there was ever manifested an affectionate, and deep, and religious regard to the impressions which might be stamped upon their future characters.

There is another,—the father of these children, who can feel, better than we can express, that she was an affectionate and Christian companion, in the nearest of all earthly relations.

It is a sublime, as well as permanent consolation for him, and for us, and for every disciple of Christ, that everything so works together for good to those who love God, that all things are theirs;—whether life, or death, or things present, or things to come;—all are theirs; and they are Christ's; and Christ is God's. Though sorrowful, they may be always rejoicing; though cast down they are not destroyed.

---

REMARKS ON ROMANS IX. 5.

Extracted chiefly from Dr. Smith's Scripture Testimony to the Messiah, vol. iii.

*"Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen."*

In the reading of this passage, there is an unusually full consent of manuscripts, versions and fathers. The ancient manuscripts agree

*perfectly* in recording the apostles' testimony to the supreme divinity of Christ.

The old Syriac version is peculiarly strong and clear, and incapable of being turned aside by any device of punctuation or construction. "From them (the fathers) was manifested Messiah in the flesh, WHO IS GOD THAT IS OVER ALL, *whose are praises and blessings to the age of ages. Amen.*" There is no various reading of the Peshito in this place, and the Philoxenian is equally determinate.

The ancient Vulgate reads as follows: "From whom is Christ, according to the flesh, *who is over all things, God blessed forever. Amen.*"\*

The words being impregnable, most Unitarians have recourse to a change in the punctuation. Some put a period after *flesh*; others, after *all*. Thus the former read, "And of whom is the Christ according to the flesh. God, who is over all, be blessed forever"! The others, "And of whom is the Christ, according to the flesh, who is over all. Blessed be God forever"! But both of these are evasions, contrived to serve a purpose; for every Greek scholar must admit that the fair and just construction of the sentence is that which is generally received. Each of these schemes is also contrary to grammatical propriety. In proof of this, the following authorities are sufficient.

ROSENMULLER.—"The interpretation of some ancient and modern writers, which applies these words to the Father, is incompatible both *with the context, and with the rules of grammar.*"

MORUS largely vindicates the common punctuation and interpretation of the passage, in his *Prælectiones*, pp. 128—131. "Any person," says he, "reading this passage, supposing him to have no bias upon his mind and to be unacquainted with the controversy relative to it, *would, without doubt, apply it to Christ.*"

KOPPE, after showing the futility of the methods resorted to by some, for evading the grammatical sense of the passage, intimates that "those methods cannot be adopted, *without destroying all the truth and certainty of interpretation.*"

MICHAELIS.—"I, for my part, sincerely believe, that Paul here delivers precisely the same doctrine of the DEITY OF CHRIST, which certainly stands elsewhere in the New Testament."

NÖSSELT has powerfully evinced the unshaken solidity of the Orthodox interpretation, both by direct arguments, and by a detailed refutation of Wetstein's and Abauzit's objections.

To the above considerations and authorities it should be added, that many of the ancient fathers quoted and applied the passage in question, in the commonly received sense, as establishing the proper Divinity of the Saviour.

IRENÆUS.—"Writing to the Romans, he (Paul) saith concerning Israel, 'Whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ according to the flesh, *who is God (super omnes) over all persons, blessed forever.*'"

TERTULLAN.—"When I am speaking of Christ alone, I may call

\* Qui est super omnia, Deus benedictus in secula.

him God, as the apostle says, 'Of whom is Christ, *who is God, (super omnia) over all things blessed forever.*'"

CYPRIAN.—"Whose are the fathers; from whom is Christ, according to the flesh, *who is over all things, God blessed forever.*"

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA, in his Reply to Julian, introduces this passage in such a way as leaves no room to suppose that any variation in the reading then existed.

ATHANASIUS cites the passage many times, and in the most definite manner, *according to the usual acceptation.*

GREGORY NYSSA.—"Who (Paul) not only called our Lord God, but 'the great God,' and 'God over all.'" He immediately subjoins the three passages, Rom. ix. 5, Tit. ii. 13, 1 Tim. iii. 16.

CHRYSOSTOM.—"And Paul testifies, 'Of whom is the Christ, according to the flesh, *who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen.*'"

---

LETTER TO A YOUNG CHRISTIAN.

THE following Letter, addressed by President Edwards to a young lady at S—, Conn., at the time of the general revival in New England in 1741, is extracted from the Memoir of Edwards, lately published by Mr. Dwight. We hardly need say, that it is worthy the attention of all professing Christians—especially those in early life.

"MY DEAR YOUNG FRIEND,

As you desired me to send you, in writing, some directions how to conduct yourself in your Christian course, I would now answer your request. The sweet remembrance of the great things I have lately seen at S—, inclines me to do anything in my power, to contribute to the spiritual joy and prosperity of God's people there.

1. I would advise you to keep up as great a strife and earnestness in religion, as if you knew yourself to be in a state of nature, and were seeking conversion. We advise persons under conviction, to be earnest and violent for the kingdom of heaven; but when they have attained to conversion, they ought not to be the less watchful, laborious, and earnest in the whole work of religion, but the more so; for they are under infinitely greater obligations. For want of this, many persons, in a few months after their conversion, have begun to lose their sweet and lively sense of spiritual things, and to grow cold and dark, and have "pierced themselves through with many sorrows;" whereas, if they had done as the apostle did, (Phil. iii. 12—14,) their path would have been "as the shining light, that shines more and more unto the perfect day."

2. Do not leave off seeking, striving, and praying for the very same things that we exhort unconverted persons to strive for, and a degree of which you have had already in conversion. Pray that

your eyes may be opened, that you may receive sight, that you may know yourself, and be brought to God's footstool, and that you may see the glory of God and Christ, and may be raised from the dead, and have the love of Christ shed abroad in your heart. Those who have most of these things, have need still to pray for them; for there is so much blindness and hardness, pride and death remaining, that they still need to have that work of God wrought upon them, further to enlighten and enliven them, that shall be bringing them out of darkness into God's marvellous light, and be a kind of new conversion and resurrection from the dead. There are very few requests that are proper for an impenitent man, that are not also, in some sense, proper for the godly.

3. When you hear a sermon, hear for yourself. Though what is spoken may be more especially directed to the unconverted, or to those that, in other respects, are in different circumstances from yourself; yet, let the chief intent of your mind be to consider, "In what respect is this applicable to me? and what improvement ought I to make of this, for my own soul's good?"

4. Though God has forgiven and forgotten your past sins, yet do not forget them yourself: often remember, what a wretched bond-slave you were in the land of Egypt. Often bring to mind your particular acts of sin before conversion; as the blessed apostle Paul is often mentioning his old blaspheming, persecuting spirit, and his injuriousness to the renewed; humbling his heart, and acknowledging that he was "the least of the apostles," and not worthy "to be called an apostle," and the "least of all saints," and the "chief of sinners;" and be often confessing your old sins to God, and let that text be often in your mind, (Ezek. xvi. 63,) "that thou mayest remember and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more, because of thy shame, when I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done, saith the Lord God."

5. Remember, that you have more cause, on some accounts, a thousand times, to lament and humble yourself for sins that have been committed since conversion, than before, because of the infinitely greater obligations that are upon you to live to God, and to look upon the faithfulness of Christ, in unchangeably continuing his loving-kindness, notwithstanding all your great unworthiness since your conversion.

6. Be always greatly abased for your remaining sin, and never think that you lie low enough for it; but yet be not discouraged or disheartened by it; for, though we are exceeding sinful, yet we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; the preciousness of whose blood, the merit of whose righteousness, and the greatness of whose love and faithfulness, infinitely overtop the highest mountain of our sins."

7. When you engage in the duty of prayer, or come to the Lord's Supper, or attend any other duty of divine worship, come to Christ as Mary Magdalen\* did; (Luke vii. 37, 38;) come, and cast yourself at his feet, and kiss them, and pour forth upon him the

\* This is a very common mistake. The woman here mentioned was not Mary Magdalen.



sweet perfumed ointment of divine love, out of a pure and broken heart, as she poured the precious ointment out of her pure broken alabaster box.

8. Remember, that pride is the worst viper that is in the heart, the greatest disturber of the soul's peace, and of sweet communion with Christ; it was the first sin committed, and lies lowest in the foundation of Satan's whole building, and is with the greatest difficulty rooted out, and is the most hidden, secret, and deceitful of all lusts, and often creeps insensibly into the midst of religion, even, sometimes, under the disguise of humility itself.

9. That you pass a correct judgment concerning yourself, always look upon those as the best discoveries, and the best comforts, that have most of these two effects: those that make you least and lowest, and most like a child; and those that most engage and fix your heart, in a full and firm disposition to deny yourself for God, and to spend and be spent for him.

10. If at any time you fall into doubts about the state of your soul, in dark and dull frames of mind, it is proper to review your past experience; but do not consume too much time and strength in this way: rather apply yourself, with all your might, to an earnest pursuit after renewed experience, new light, and new lively acts of faith and love. One new discovery of the glory of Christ's face, will do more toward scattering clouds of darkness in one minute, than examining old experience, by the best marks that can be given, through a whole year.

11. When the exercise of grace is low, and corruption prevails, and by that means fear prevails; do not desire to have fear cast out any other way, than by the reviving and prevailing of love in the heart: by this, fear will be effectually expelled, as darkness in a room vanishes away, when the pleasant beams of the sun are let into it.

12. When you counsel and warn others, do it earnestly, and affectionately, and thoroughly; and when you are speaking to your equals, let your warnings be intermixed with expressions of your sense of your own unworthiness, and of the sovereign grace that makes you differ.

13. If you would set up religious meetings of young women by yourselves, to be attended once in a while, besides the other meetings that you attend, I should think it would be very proper and profitable.

14. Under special difficulties, or when in great need of, or great longings after, any particular mercy for yourself or others, set apart a day for secret prayer and fasting by yourself alone; and let the day be spent, not only in petitions for the mercies you desire, but in searching your heart, and in looking over your past life, and confessing your sins before God, not as is wont to be done in public prayer, but by a very particular rehearsal, before God, of the sins of your past life, from your childhood hitherto, before and after conversion, with the circumstances and aggravations attending them, spreading all the abominations of your heart, very particularly, and as fully as possible before him.

15. Do not let the adversaries of the cross have occasion to reproach religion on your account. How holily should the children of God, the redeemed and the beloved of the Son of God, behave themselves. Therefore, "walk as children of the light, and of the day," and "adorn the doctrine of God your Saviour;" and especially, abound in what are called the Christian virtues, and make you like the Lamb of God: be meek and lowly of heart, and full of pure, heavenly and humble love to all; abound in deeds of love to others, and self-denial for others; and let there be in you a disposition to account others better than yourself.

16. In all your course, walk with God, and follow Christ, as a little, poor, helpless child, taking hold of Christ's hand, keeping your eye on the marks of the wounds in his hand and side, whence came the blood that cleanses you from sin, and hiding your nakedness under the skirt of the white shining robes of his righteousness.

17. Pray much for the ministers and the church of God; especially, that he would carry on his glorious work which he has now begun, till the world shall be full of his glory."

---

*To the Editor of the Spirit of the Pilgrims.*

SIR,

I am much gratified to see, at length, the character of JOHN CALVIN presented fairly to view in the two last numbers of your estimable publication. Whoever had attentively read the entire history of the Protestant Reformation might have known the truth of the statements in that biographical sketch; but, after the lapse of nearly three centuries, many persons, calling themselves Protestants, but abhorring Calvinistic Protestantism, have taken up the unfounded allegations of the Catholics and others respecting this eminent Reformer, regardless of the authentic accounts of him, written and published in or near his own age. It was high time that we, liberal Protestants, should have a lecture upon this subject; and we accept this sketch as a substitute. It is worthy of a Lyceum.

Within my own remembrance, a Protestant Lecturer gave so very Catholic an account of Calvin's character and principles, *ex cathedra*, as could hardly fail to excite in his juvenile auditors emotions of horror. To say nothing here concerning the deleterious quality of this part of his Lecture—it was mortifying to find a professed Lecturer, *on any foundation*, so grossly deficient, either in learning, or in liberality. Plain facts are the best refutation of such subtil errors: and by them you have "taken the foxes, the little foxes that spoil the vines."

In defect of positive testimony from contemporary writers, I cannot but regard their very *silence*, upon any great and interesting subject of their times, especially if controversial—as conclusive against subsequent writers. "It is," indeed, as observed in the sketch, "worthy of particular observation, that for more than fifty

years after the death of Calvin, no respectable writer of any sect can be found, who censures him for the part he took against Servetus." When, in near connexion with this remark, the writer of the biographical sketch quoted "the learned and pious Turretine," as "defending the justice of his sentence," I was glad to see his name, and expected to see a fuller and still more direct attestation of his to Calvin in this affair. Francis Turretine was pastor in the church, and pastor and Professor of Divinity in the Academy, in Geneva. How much more deference is due to such a man—within such a period after the occurrence, and in the very city in which Calvin lived, and successor to him in the same professorship—than to a young Lecturer, at the distance of nearly three hundred years from the time, and of three thousand miles from the place of the transaction. Had not the attestation of Professor Turretine been known to be true, it would have been contradicted on the spot. It was in these words:

"Quod vero Grotius supplicii istius invidiam totam in *Calvinum* derivare conatur, *Serveti exustorem* eum, facto ad contumelian nomine, maledice vocando, strenue calumniatur contra totius historię fidem et omnium Scriptorum testimonium, qui *Calvinum* quod sui erat muneris egisse asserunt, ut convinceretur prodigalis et immanis hæreseos, et ab errore pestifero ad meliorem frugem redisset. Sed ut Magistratui autor fuerit ut exuretur; nec uspiam dicunt, nec ullo argumento liquet. Imo constat dissuasisse hoc supplicii genus cum Pastorum collegio. Sed Magistratum ad tot blasphemias exhorruisse, nec voluisse cum eo comitius agere."

Since Grotius endeavors to bring the whole envy of that punishment upon Calvin, as though he was the *burner of Servetus*, and his name is brought into reproach by being used maliciously; he is in this respect grievously calumniated, against the credit of all history, and the testimony of all writers, who assert that Calvin only did what belonged to his office, that he (*Servetus*) might be convinced of his profligate and cruel heresy, and be restored from his pestiferous errors to a better course. But that he was the instigator of the magistrates that he (*Servetus*) might be burned, they neither anywhere affirm, nor does it appear from any consideration. Nay it is certain that he, with the college of Pastors, dissuaded from that kind of punishment. But the magistrates, being shocked at his blasphemies, would not consent that he should be dealt with in a more gentle manner.\*

#### RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Essay on the Prize Question, Whether the use of Distilled Liquors, or Traffic in them, is compatible, at the present time, with making a Profession of Christianity?* By Moses Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Andover: Flagg & Gould. 1830. pp. 70.

In this Essay, Mr. Stuart discusses the four following questions: I. "In

\* *Institutio Theologiæ Elenct. Authore Francisco Turretino in Ecclesia et Academia Genevensi Pastore, et S. S. Theologiæ Professore III. 374.*

what light is the use of intoxicating liquors to be viewed?" II. "Are those persons who consume intoxicating liquors, or who traffic in them, to be regarded as deserving Christian animadversion and discipline?" III. "Have the churches of Christ power to debar persons from their communion, who are guilty of the offence under consideration?" IV. "Is it a matter of expediency or duty to exercise the power in question?" To these questions, the following answers—after much laborious, *Scriptural* investigation and discussion—are given: "The use of intoxicating liquors is evidently forbidden by God, in his arrangement of our natures, and in the volume of his Revelation." "The use of intoxicating liquors in any way, as a common drink, or matter of luxury, and all traffic in them for the sake of promoting or accommodating this purpose, is a just subject of Christian animadversion and discipline; for it is against the plain and obvious principles of our holy religion, an offence against the great Head of the church, and against the best interests of our country." "The churches of Christ have the power to debar from their communion, not only the intemperate themselves, but the aids and abettors of intemperance." In reply to the fourth question, as above stated, Mr. Stuart makes the following distinction and observations:

"It is one question, then, whether those who joined our churches under the former state of things, are to be excluded from them, because they may use intoxicating drinks, or traffic in them; and another question, whether *future* members should renounce this use and traffic. The former question turns on the inquiry, whether an attempt to *exclude* such persons will not be productive, on the whole, of more harm than good? And in regard to this, I see no way to decide it, but for each church to judge for itself. Where there is a great majority of any church in favor of entirely prohibiting the use and traffic under consideration, this may, for the most part, be safely done, provided it be done with moderation, and forbearance, and gentleness, and in a truly Christian spirit. Where there is not such a majority, it is better to wait patiently for more light, and for more unanimity, than to disturb the peace of the church by strenuously urging rigid measures.

"I leave this question, however, as I am not called to discuss it; and turn to the other, which respects the *future* admission of members. *Shall those be denied admittance, who will not engage, neither to use nor to traffic in spirituous liquors?*"

In answer to this question, the writer comes "fully to the conclusion, that *it is a matter of expediency and duty, for our churches not to admit members in future, except on the ground of total abstinence from the use of intoxicating liquors, and from all traffic in them.*"

We hardly need say that we wish this Essay an extensive circulation. It will have such a circulation, whether we wish it or not. And whatever difference of opinion there may be respecting some of the positions here established, all competent judges will agree, that the discussion is able and *Scriptural*, calculated to excite to thought and action, and fitted to hasten the happy day, when our churches shall no longer be polluted with the contamination of intoxicating liquors.

2. MEMOIR OF NATHAN W. DICKERMAN, *who died at Boston, Mass., Jan. 2, 1830, in the eighth year of his age.* Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1831. pp. 184.

Many circumstances conspire to draw unusual attention to this little volume. In the first place, the account contained in it is entirely *authentic*. Of this we might be satisfied, even if it related to a stranger; as the marks of au-

thenticity on almost every page are inimitable and indelible. But the subject of the Memoir lived and died in the midst of us, and was visited by many in the course of his sickness, who unitedly testify that, so far as they can judge, a true and faithful account has been given.—The great numbers, too, who are now connected in one way or another with Sabbath Schools, will wish to ponder perhaps the most remarkable instance of the success of Sabbath School instruction which has occurred in this part of our country.—But aside from these circumstances, the Memoir is one of great interest in itself. The subject of it was a very extraordinary child. His mental endowments might not have been superior originally to those of some other children; but a worm at the heart often causes that fruit to ripen early which must early fall. His disposition was naturally sweet; his appearance and manners engaging; his power of perception quick; his memory tenacious; and his understanding, particularly of religious subjects, as evinced by his questions, answers, warnings, and observations generally, remarkable. His love to God, to Christ, and the souls of men; his penitence, faith, hope, joy and (what is chiefly noticeable, considering the attention which was paid to him) his *humility*, all appear in due proportion, and present him as a bright and lovely example of intelligent and well balanced piety, shining forth in literal childhood.

The book, of course, will go into all the Sabbath School libraries, and into many religious families, both in city and country; and may the Spirit of God accompany it, wherever it goes, and make it a blessing to parents, to teachers, and especially to children. The eyes of thousands of little immortals will wander with admiring interest over these pages; and may their eyes affect their hearts. May they learn from "little Nathan," as he was sometimes called, "to love the Saviour, and pray to him, and read the Bible, and NOT PUT IT OFF."

3. *Religion; and the Triumphs of Faith; Poems*, by the Rev. Daniel Huntington. Delivered before Literary Societies. Boston: Perkins & Marvin. 1830. pp. 40.

The first of these Poems, entitled "Religion," was delivered before the "United Brothers' Society" in Brown University, Aug. 31, 1819, was soon after published, and is now re-published. The second, entitled "The Triumphs of Faith," was delivered before the "Porter Rhetorical Society" in the Theological Seminary, Andover, Sept. 21, 1830. As a specimen of the author's talents and manner, we give the following lines on Faith.

"Is Faith at war with Reason?—Surely no.—  
Else all mankind are crazed;—for all rely  
On proof of what the senses cannot show  
From documents which other hands supply.  
How oft we see as with another's eye,  
Or use the audience of another's ear;—  
View scenes that spread beneath a foreign sky,—  
The past recall,—bring distant objects near,—  
And thus through time and space, extend our being's sphere.

"Shall man in *man* such needful trust repose,  
And yet his humble confidence deny  
To Him, whose light supernal glows,—  
To Truth itself—to God who cannot lie?  
Still shall he view with cold, suspicious eye,  
Th' epistle, which so many tokens prove  
Sign'd, seal'd, deliver'd, at the Court on high,

Calling the wand'rer to his home above,  
To meet a Father's smile, and taste a Father's love!

"Away such skeptic pride! dark doubts away!  
The well known traces of His hand I see:—  
Who else such boundless wisdom could display,  
Or grace so rich, so sov'reign and so free?  
'Tis His epistle, and 'tis sent to me."

4. *Two Letters to the Rev. Moses Stuart, on the subject of Religious Liberty.* By Bernard Whitman. Boston: Gray & Bowen. 1830.

As our last sheet is just passing from our hands, we have looked into these forth coming Letters; and for the satisfaction of some who may desire information, shall take the opportunity to drop a few words respecting them. Our readers are not altogether unacquainted with the literary and theological character of Mr. Whitman. They have heard of a certain sermon, in which he charges Trinitarians with denying the Lord Jesus; of another, on Regeneration, reviewed in our first volume, p. 409; and of a more recent effort before the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company, June 1, 1829, noticed in our second volume, p. 464. Were we to express our opinion, in few words, concerning these Letters, we should say that they are in good keeping with the former publications of the author,—plain, direct, fearless, impudent, dashing forth what at the moment seems convenient, without much regard to consequences, to consistency, or truth.

The book is made up, to a considerable extent, of stories, new and old, original, selected, and invented;\* of a nature, so far as believed, to injure the reputation and the usefulness of a numerous body of professing Christians. These stories are variously founded as to proof;—sometimes on the misrepresentations of a few jealous, discontented men, whom Mr. W. calls Orthodox, who have sought to relieve their spleen by pouring out abuse upon their brethren, and who, for their consolation, may expect always to be eulogized, if not canonized, by such men as Mr. Whitman;—sometimes on ex parte evidence derived from letters received, or pretended to have been received, from different parts of the country, but without name or date by means of which their statements may be substantiated or refuted;—and sometimes on the assertions of Mr. W. himself—round assertions too—as to what he has seen, heard, or surmised, in the course of his life, and especially in his late travels. Of these stories, we have no hesitation in saying that a great proportion are thoroughly false; and the remainder, if founded originally on fact, are so colored and exaggerated, that, as they stand, they can no longer be said to be true.

Mr. W. will have it, that the leading Orthodox clergy are among the worst of men, chargeable, besides other heinous sins, with asserting that Unitarians have concealed their sentiments; that they are Universalists and heretics; and that their cause is on the decline in this region. They have even gone so far as to pray for Unitarians. Yet, bad as they are, he wishes an exchange of pulpits with them, and is vexed because their consciences compel them to decline such exchanges. He finds fault with our creeds, our seminaries, our churches our Ministerial Associations, our Councils, our Education Societies, our measures generally. All are pronounced corrupt and wrong; and all inconsistent,

\* We say not by whom invented, but that some of them are sheer fabrications is certain.

demonstrably so, with "free inquiry, religious liberiy, and the principles of Congregationalism." The ground of most of his objections evidently is, that we believe our own sentiments, and endeavor to act according to them; and if our conduct was still more consistent with our principles, we should be proportionably worse, in his estimation, than we are now.

Mr. W. has not forgotten his old trick of waging war upon himself, but frequently falls into the most palpable, belligerent self-contradictions. He commonly speaks of the Orthodox of the United States as a single denomination, so closely and harmoniously linked together, as to be fairly answerable for one another's language and measures. Accordingly Mr. Stuart is told of things which have been said and done at New York, at Princeton, at Baltimore, in Tennessee, Ohio, and various other places, in much the same manner as though they had been said and done by himself. But before he gets through, Mr. W. finds it convenient to represent this one and indivisible denomination as most sadly at variance among themselves. "You are divided into various parties, and distinguished by several sectarian names. There are the old, the new, the moderate, and the rigid Calvinists. There are the Hopkinsians, the Presbyterians, and the Congregationalists. There are among you great envyings, and jealousies, and enmities."

On one page, our author speaks of the measures of the Orthodox, in regard to ministerial exchanges, as "measures of persecution;" an "unholy combination;" as "oppressive, tyrannical, and unchristian;" and he calls upon "the community" to "utter their opinion on this subject with distinctness and authority, and loud as seven thunders." But speaking of this alleged "combination" of the Orthodox (which, by the way, is a mere fiction of his own imagining) in another place, he asks, "And what has been the conduct of their liberal brethren? Have they resented such a measure with *unchristian reproaches, and endeavored to ruin their peace, prosperity, and enjoyment?* No; **NOTHING OF THIS KIND**!! No reproach, to accuse them of having formed an 'unchristian, unholy, combination,' and to denounce them as persecutors, oppressors, and tyrants!!

It is amusing to hear Mr. W. throw out the "surmise," that "a very deep plot is laid for obtaining possession of our Unitarian churches and funds," by Orthodox persons crowding into such churches; when, in fact, it is no small part of the offence of our brethren, and is so considered in these pages, that they are fleeing out of the Unitarian churches, and separating from them.

Mr. W. talks of our "Domestic Missionary Society," a society which has no existence; and insists "that a large fund has been raised for the *express purpose* of establishing and maintaining Orthodox societies within the borders of Unitarian parishes." Those who should search in earnest for such a fund would soon ascertain that it could not be found—except in the brain of Mr. Whitman. He asserts, that "were Unitarians to imitate the example of the Orthodox, they might form more than a thousand societies forthwith." We were told in a late Review of Professor Stuart's Letter in the Unitarian Advocate, that "there are thousands of such" societies already in existence. vol. ii. N. S. p. 129. One of these assertions, we suppose, is worth about as much as the other.

We intend not, however, to go into an examination of the various unfounded and self-contradictory statements which occur in these Letters. To do this, we should be obliged to make a book as large as that which lies before us. We are glad, by the way, that this book is so large;—we wonder why it was not

made even larger, as Mr. W. is complaining all along for want of room. If it were a small production, decent men might read it through, without being wickened and disgusted with it; but we defy any such man to undertake it now, without finding it too strong for his stomach, and without feeling a strong inclination before he sees the end of it, to throw it aside. We hope, however, that respectable Unitarians will try to read it. We recommend it to those, especially, who have accused us of dealing in personalities, and of assailing the characters of our opponents, instead of answering their arguments. And if a few of our good Orthodox brethren can borrow it and look into it (it will be hardly worth their buying) it may satisfy them that we have not altogether mistaken the *spirit* of some men with whom we have had to do, and that of a certain class it is as true now as it was in the days of David, that though 'their words are smoother than butter, and softer than oil,' yet '*war is in their hearts.*'

5. *Observations upon the Peloponnesus and Greek Islands, made in 1829.* By Rufus Anderson, one of the Secretaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1830. pp. 334.

Of this interesting volume, a Review may be expected in a future number.

6. *The Library of Education.* Some thoughts concerning Education, by John Locke: and a Treatise on Education, by John Milton. With an Appendix containing Locke's Memoranda on Study. Vol. I. Boston: Gray & Bowen. 1830.

The Library of Education "is intended to embrace, in a series of volumes, issued at intervals of a few months, the principal treatises on Education, which are to be found in the works of eminent English writers." The whole is to be edited by Mr. Russell, late Editor of the Journal of Education.

7. *Exercises for the Closet; for every day in the year.* By William Jay, Author of 'Christian Contemplated,' 'Family Sermons,' 'Prayers,' &c. &c. In two Volumes. Boston: Crocker & Brewster, and Peirce & Parker. 1830.

We announced this work in our number for December, 1829, and published several pages of extracts. We repeat, what we then said, that it "is one of the most interesting devotional performances we have ever seen."

8. *A Full and Accurate Account of the New Method of curing Dyspepsia,* discovered and practised by O. Halsted. With some observations on Diseases of the Digestive Organs. New York: O. Halsted. 1830. pp. 156.



THE

# SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

VOL. IV.

FEBRUARY, 1831.

NO. 2.

---

## COMMUNICATIONS.

LETTERS ON THE INTRODUCTION AND PROGRESS OF UNITARIANISM IN NEW ENGLAND.—NO. IX.

Dear Sir,

I MUST be permitted to trouble you with one more communication on the general subject of these Letters, though from my long silence you may have been led to anticipate that you should hear from me no more. I might enlarge on the *means* to which some Unitarians have resorted, in order to retain those who were still nominally with them; or to punish those who had strayed from them; or to bring others under their influence. I might tell of favors bestowed or withheld; of the kind offices of neighborhood and friendship continued or interrupted; of liberty of conscience permitted or refused, according as individuals adhered or not to the favorite doctrine. I might tell of physicians and mechanics who, on their becoming Orthodox, have lost their patronage, and with it, in a measure, their means of living;—of school-teachers harassed and dismissed by Unitarian Committees, for no assignable reason but that their religious profession was disapproved;—of publications on general subjects condemned, and of incivilities and neglects openly inflicted, apparently from the same cause. I might tell of wives and children in great numbers, who have been prohibited from attending on that religious instruction which they preferred; and of dependent relatives in sickness—not excepting even aged and helpless parents—who, after repeated and earnest solicitation, have not been permitted to receive the visits of an Orthodox clergyman, or a pious friend. I might tell of instances, in which the public worship of the Orthodox has been interrupted, and their ministers threatened, and in which the most injurious misrepresentations have been put in circulation respecting them, with a view to destroy their reputation and influence. I might tell of measures adopted, to an extent which shows evidence of plan and system, to fill all important civil offices with Unitarians, and thus exclude the Orthodox; and of the efforts which are made in many places to render Evangelical religion so exceedingly odious,

that no person, who values his reputation above his conscience, would think of embracing it. I might enlarge on topics such as these, referring to particulars, names and dates, and substantiating every point in the most unequivocal manner;—but an exposure of this nature should not be resorted to, except in case of extreme oppression and injury, and I prefer to waive it, at least for the present. The time may come when it will be necessary; but I choose it should be made, if made at all, in some other connexion rather than here.

It is evident from the facts exhibited in these Letters, that the causes of the Introduction of Unitarianism into New England have been not unfrequently mistaken. Some have attributed its existence here to our peculiar mode of church government, as though there were obvious and strong affinities between lax religious principles and Congregationalism. But this supposition is contradicted by facts. The first church corrupted among us, and for many years the only one openly Unitarian, was not Congregational, but Episcopal. The liturgy and articles presented no obstacle; and the assistance of a Bishop was easily dispensed with, the wardens taking the work of ordination into their own hands. See Letter iv. Vol. ii. p. 291. I may refer also to the recorded experience of the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches in England. The Presbyterian establishments, with scarcely an exception, have fallen into the hands of Unitarians, and there virtually died; while the Congregational churches, with scarcely an exception, have retained their Orthodoxy, and are now in a state of high and increasing prosperity.

I readily admit, that against the *open* assaults of error, public formularies of faith and an extended organization, like those of the Episcopalians and Presbyterians, may be a defence; but what security are they against its secret, insidious, disguised intrusion? When Dr. Priestley arrived at Philadelphia in the known and acknowledged character of a Humanitarian, Materialist and Universalist, doubtless the Presbyterian organization afforded some protection to the churches against his influence. But suppose he had come in the character of a good Presbyterian brother; had been received and established as such; and, to avoid suspicion and enable him the better to carry on the deception, had adopted the customary phraseology, while he was secretly infusing his poison into the mind of this and that confiding, influential individual; suppose he had taken this course, and persisted in it, till a strong interest was excited in his favor, and he could with safety throw off the mask;—against an attack of this sort, what security would have been afforded by the Presbyterian forms? Obviously, they not only would have been powerless, but when the evil had proceeded beyond a certain limit, they would literally have aided to

protect and foster it. Yet this is the way, almost precisely, in which Unitarianism obtruded itself upon the unsuspecting churches of Massachusetts. It did not come here with open front, under the now boasted name of "Unitarian Christianity," and urge its pretensions and its claims. Appearing in this way, our fathers would have known very well how to have met the daring intruder. But it came upon us in disguise, denying its real name and character, and claiming to be a very different thing from what it is. As stated in Letter vi, Vol. iii. p. 123, the Unitarians of Massachusetts formerly denied that they were Unitarians, and counted themselves slandered when this name was charged upon them. Previous to 1815, Unitarian candidates for the ministry never went to the churches, under the name and in the avowed character of Unitarians. They did not preach Unitarianism previous to settlement, and if they had preached it, in a great majority of cases they would not have been settled. Against the assaults of error, conducted on such principles and by such means, no form of church government on earth can furnish a security. It may creep into one spiritual enclosure as well as another, and nothing but a return of inspiration and miracles would be able to exclude it.

Some have attributed the introduction of Unitarianism among us to the prevalence of what has been called the New England divinity.—This New England divinity is a modification or peculiar explanation of some of the doctrines of Calvinism. For more than half a century, the greater part of the Orthodox clergy of New England, following, in general, the Edwardses, the Hopkinses, Bellamy, Smalley, Spring, Dwight, and some living authors, have adopted and inculcated these explanations. But that these have not terminated in Unitarianism, as some have pretended, is evident from facts.—The ground of the general division among the Congregational clergy of Massachusetts, as shown in Letter ii. Vol. ii. p. 126, was laid at the close of the great Revival of religion, between the years 1740, and 1750. The successors, admirers, and followers of the principal Revivalists of that period are now the Orthodox of New England. While the successors, admirers and followers of the Anti-revivalists are, in many instances, Unitarians. Who, then, were the principal Revivalists of 1740? The very men who gave the new explanations to some Calvinistic doctrines, and led the way to the New England divinity. And who were the Anti-revivalists? In general, they professed to be Calvinists, holding, in oppositon to their brethren, the doctrines of physical depravity, and the natural inability of sinners to repent and turn to God. In accordance with these doctrines, sinners were exhorted to do such things as they could do—to pray, and use means, and profess religion, and come to the sacrament with such a heart as they had, and wait till God was pleased to give them a better heart. It was under the influence of preaching

such as this, that many churches were filled with unconverted members, and many pulpits with unconverted ministers, who were prepared to relax the strict discipline of their fathers, and listen to the syren whispers of Unitarianism without alarm. This account of the matter is not theory, but fact,—of which any person, by looking into our Ecclesiastical history, may soon be satisfied. I do not now recollect a church, where the views of Edwards were preached, and where they prevailed, from thirty to forty years ago, which has become Unitarian; but I could refer you to scores of churches, where the opposite views were inculcated half a century ago, in which Unitarian ministers are now established. The followers of Edwards have ever been among the most strenuous opposers and discomfitters of Unitarianism in this country;—while, on the other hand, they have been the most strenuously opposed by the abettors of this heresy. It is hard to see, therefore, what affinity there can be between the two systems, or how the one naturally leads to the other.

The view taken in these Letters of the Introduction and Progress of Unitarianism in New England, presents lessons of caution to the churches, which they cannot innocently or safely disregard.

In the first place, let them not be deluded by that sweet word *charity*—which, as commonly used, imports no charity at all. The charity (*ἀγάπη*) spoken of by the Apostle (1 Cor. xiii.) is indeed the first and greatest of the Christian virtues. It is a supreme love to God, which cannot bear to see him dishonored; and a strong impartial love to men, which cannot see them wandering in darkness and error, without an effort to reclaim them. The apostle exemplified this charity, when he affirmed, ‘Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed;’ and the heart of the Saviour overflowed with it, when he said to the false pretenders to religion by whom he was surrounded, ‘Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?’ The charity now so much extolled would never have led to a declaration like this, as the very essence of it consists in believing, with or without evidence, or even against evidence, as the case may be, that people are as good as they pretend, and that the Christian name and privileges are to be extended to all alike, who think they deserve them. The praises of this spurious charity have been sounded among us, for the last fifty years, on every note of the octave, and the strain has contributed not a little to usher in that lamented defection, over which our churches have been called to mourn. We ought not to be again deluded by the same idle song. We ought to look beyond the mere sound of words, and while we cultivate the charity recommended in the gospel, should renounce all fellowship with this false pretender.

Let not the churches be cheated or frightened out of their *confessions of faith*. It was a stale artifice of those who prepared the way for another gospel among us, to deny and denounce confessions of faith. Creeds have long been a subject of popular declamation, as being useless, and of bad influence; as inconsistent with the first principles of Protestantism—the *sufficiency of Scripture*. But all who understand the subject know, that this is mere declamation. Our creeds are not regarded as the *foundation* of our faith, but only the *expression* of it. Our churches have never substituted their creeds in place of the Scriptures, but have used them to set forth what they considered the *sense* of Scripture. The sufficiency of Scripture, in distinction from the decretals of an alleged infallible church, is indeed a first principle of Protestantism, and was so understood by the early Protestants; but did not these same Protestants have their confessions of faith? The famous confession of Augsburg, prepared by the joint labors of Luther and Melancthon, was drawn up the very same year (1529) in which the memorable protest was entered, which gave to the united dissenters from Rome the appellation of Protestants. What absurdity to pretend, that Christians may not study the Scriptures for themselves, gather their opinions from them, express them one to another, reduce them to writing, and thus form a creed, and associate on the basis of it, without incurring the charge of undervaluing and superseding the use of Scripture.

Our churches should feel the importance of a faithful examination of those who are to be received as members. It was a departure from the rule of Scripture, and from the original usage of the New England churches in regard to this point, which led the way to most of the evils we have suffered. We hear much, in these days, of the sin of hedging up the door of the church, and preventing worthy persons from approaching the sacramental table. But two things relating to this subject all experience has shown to be true: The first is, that the wider you open the door of the church, the fewer persons will be disposed to enter. The more you attempt to lower the claims of religion to meet the views and wishes of the ungodly, the more you expose it to their contempt. And the second is, that the admission of unregenerate persons to the churches (and we would exclude no others) is not only an injury to themselves, and to the particular churches with which they are connected, but exposes the cause of religion generally to almost inevitable contamination.

Let those, who have the charge of introducing young men into the holy ministry, be strict and faithful in the examination of persons who are looking forward to this responsible work. No greater evil can light upon any church, than the curse of an unconverted, unfaithful ministry. Ministers of this description may be moral men, and they may retain a nominal Orthodoxy, so long as

Orthodoxy is popular and prevails. They may be men of study, of science, of learning, of enterprise, and may be useful in a variety of ways. But it is certain they will have no heart for their appropriate work. Their prayers cannot be fervent and prevalent. They will not know how to enlighten those who sit in darkness, or to awaken the stupid, or direct inquiring souls, or edify and comfort the people of God. And their hearts not being established by grace, they will be easily blown about by every wind of doctrine. They will be ready to listen to every 'lying spirit,' every seducing error, which is calculated to flatter the pride of man, and represent the way of salvation easy. They will be forward to abandon those principles and usages, intended for the security and advancement of true piety in the church. I would be far from sitting in judgment on individuals of a former generation; and yet it cannot be doubted, that it was chiefly through the influence of lukewarm and unconverted ministers, that Unitarianism was introduced and planted among us.

The churches should be on their guard against *indifference* to religious truth, and against even small departures from the essential principles of the gospel. Indifference to truth was strongly inculcated in Massachusetts, long before there were any professed departures from the great truths of the gospel. Thousands of times the false maxim was repeated, 'It is of little consequence what one believes, if his life is but good,' before any would acknowledge that their belief was different from that of their fathers. I would by no means inculcate a prying, vexatious jealousy among Christians, as to the religious sentiments of their brethren. Difference of opinion in circumstantial points, and difference of explanation in matters more essential, should not be suffered to sunder the bonds of fellowship among those who agree in holding the head. Still it should be remembered, that the church has usually been corrupted by seemingly small departures at first. The abettors of incipient heresy have always insisted, that the difference between them and their brethren was small, that their points of agreement were numerous, and that mutual forbearance ought to be exercised. In this way, the promoters of Unitarianism long declaimed, and it was by such means, in part, that they succeeded. The churches should learn wisdom by what they have suffered, and be watchful in future. 'Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird.'

I only add, what the whole discussion is intended to impress, the great importance of an increase of enlightened and fervent *piety* in the churches. This, it should be kept in mind, is the principal end for which churches were established, and means ordained. Truth is of little importance, except as it tends to promote godliness; and error should be feared and shunned, chiefly, as it corrupts the heart, and destroys the soul. And as truth is

the proper nutriment of piety, so intelligent and ardent piety is the grand safeguard of truth. Let the churches become and continue fervent in love, instant in prayer, faithful in discipline, and diligent in every good word and work; and their faith will never be corrupted. The great Head of the church will walk among them to protect and bless them, and their candlestick will never be removed out of its place.

INVESTIGATOR.

ON THE IMPORTANCE OF A CORRECT INTERPRETATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

"The creed of the Christian," says the author of the Natural History of Enthusiasm, "is the fruit of *exposition*. To ascertain the true meaning of the words and phrases used by those who 'spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,' is the *single aim* of the studies of the theologian. *Interpretation is his sole junction.*" These axioms, if limited to *revealed* or *Christian* theology, are obviously true; and they represent the science of interpretation, particularly in its application to the sacred writings, as one of paramount importance. That this science is liable to abuse, and has in some instances been greatly abused, is certain. Still, this furnishes no argument against its existence as a science, or against its importance when honestly and legitimately applied. All Protestants profess to receive the Bible, as capable of being understood, and as their sole and sufficient rule of faith and duty. Hence all Protestants are interested alike to *understand* the Bible—to apply to it correct principles of interpretation, as they would to any other book, and ascertain what is *really* 'the mind of the Spirit.'

In discussing the subject here presented, I shall endeavor to show,

I. That there are established principles of interpreting language, which all apply, and by which they abide, on ordinary subjects.

II. These principles are strangely departed from by many in interpreting the Bible. And,

III. The importance of adhering to them in their application to the Bible, as well as to other books.

I design not here to go into a scientific statement and illustration of the established principles of interpretation. Nor is this at all necessary. A moment's reflection will satisfy every reader that there are such principles, and that, whether conscious of it or not, men continually apply them, and abide by the application.—Your neighbor comes to you with some interesting article of intelligence. He tells his story—you understand him;—you make reply—and he understands you. But how is this done, unless you and he

have some common principles of interpreting language, which both (perhaps unconsciously) apply, and by the application of which you both abide?—Again; you receive a letter from an absent friend—you read and understand it; and you return an answer, which he reads and understands. Here again is an instance, in which you both apply some known and established principles of interpretation, and in which you abide by the application. But if your friend should write you that he was dangerously sick, and you should insist that this meant that he was very poor in point of property, or in a very melancholy state of mind, and should return answer accordingly; you and he would in this case fail of applying common principles of interpreting language, and you can easily conceive of the surprise which would follow.—Again; your neighbor, for a satisfactory consideration, gives you a deed of a valuable piece of land. You understand it perfectly, and so does he, and both are satisfied; but this is only because you both interpret the instrument according to some common and established principles. Should your neighbor depart from these principles, and insist that the deed to you and your heirs forever, meant a *lease for a limited period*, contention and confusion would be the inevitable consequence.—Take another instance: A number of you agree to form a society, for the promotion of some favorite object. You adopt a constitution, the stipulations of which you all understand, and by which all consent to be governed. Here again you have applied common principles of interpretation, and expect to abide by the application. But suppose, on experiment, that one of the members understands the most important article in the constitution in a manner very different from the rest of you. He has assented to the article, and is willing to assent; but then he insists that he has a right to put his own meaning upon the terms, and his meaning is just the opposite of yours. Here, again, you have no common principles of interpretation, and the result, as before, is contention and confusion.

These familiar illustrations, the number of which might be increased indefinitely, may serve to show, that *there are established principles of interpreting language*, which are sufficiently understood, and in common concerns, are continually applied. Without them, we could not hold conversation with our families; or correspond with absent friends; or transact the most necessary affairs of life. Without them, society could not be formed; or if formed, the frame of it could not be held together. Indeed, without established principles of interpreting language, we might as well have no language; as the power of holding intercourse by means of it would be utterly useless.

These principles are essentially the same in all languages. Their object is to determine *the meaning* of the words and phrases which go to constitute a discourse. They require us to take into consideration the nature of the subject discussed; the connexion in which



the questionable words occur, "the purposes, feelings, circumstances, and principles of the writer" or speaker; and "the genius and idioms of the language which he uses;"\* and by all these means to judge impartially and truly as to *the sense intended to be conveyed*;—not what we wish the sense was, or think it ought to be, but what *it is*.

I proceed to show that from these established principles of interpreting language, which all sufficiently understand, which all apply in common life, and which constitute the very basis of social intercourse, numbers strangely depart, in interpreting the language of the Bible. Some do this, in accommodation to their wishes. They wish to polish and improve what appear to them the rough features of the Bible;—to round off its sharp points—to soften down the strictness of its requisitions and the harshness of its threatenings—to remove in a measure its severe restraints. They wish it to speak a somewhat different language from that which appears on the open face of it; and they flatter themselves, at length, that it does speak a different language—that a softer and more palatable meaning may be put upon the terms.

Some depart from established principles in interpreting the Bible, in accommodation to their *delinquencies*. If the Bible means what it seems to mean, they fall greatly and fearfully short of it, and have reason to feel themselves reprov'd and alarmed. But such feelings are uncomfortable; they wish to be rid of them; and what shall be done? To bring their characters up to the strict demands of the Bible, they are not willing; and consequently an effort must be made to bring the Bible down to them. And after much ingenious labor, perhaps they think they have succeeded. 'The Bible does not require so much as it seems to require. It does not threaten so severely as it seems to threaten. The standard is not so high as at first view it appears. What would be discouraging and terrifying if interpreted strictly, may, by a little necessary qualification, be made a very comfortable rule of life.'

Persons sometimes depart from established principles in interpreting the Bible, in accommodation to their *systems*. Their system of religion is already established. It is in their view complete and perfect. Nothing can be added to it, and nothing taken from it. And they go to the Bible, not so much to ascertain what it really means, as to bring it to an accordance with their preconceived views. And with this object before them, the declarations of Scripture are of little force. If too long, they can be easily shortened; or if too short, they can be prolonged. The Bible must be made to conform to their systems, and not their systems to conform to the Bible.

Others depart from established principles in interpreting the Bible, from a disposition to *lean to their own understandings*. They

\* Channing's Works, p. 291.

think themselves capable of determining, not only what the Bible means, but what it ought to mean. And if it does not seem to mean what, in their judgement, it ought to mean, then it must be made to conform to their judgement. It must be narrowed or widened, prolonged or curtailed, till it comes to speak a language which seems to them reasonable.

In the respects here alluded to, persons do not treat any other book or writing, as they treat the Bible. If they did, they might wrest it as easily as the Bible; and they would have no more reason to find fault with it, than they think they now have to find fault with the Bible. For instance, the Bible ascribes to Christ the names, the attributes, the works, and the worship of the Supreme Being. He is repeatedly called God and Jehovah; He is said to know all things, to have made all things, to uphold all things, and to be an object of worship to saints on earth and to angels in heaven. But some apply principles of interpretation to the Bible by which they satisfy themselves that this does not prove, or mean, that Christ is a divine person—that it is all very consistent with his being no more than a mortal man. Now let these persons take the same principles of interpretation which they apply to the Bible, and by which they bring out this result, and apply them to the Athanasian Creed, or the Assembly's Catechism, and they might prove just as well that neither of these formularies teach the proper divinity of Christ. The same glosses and interpretations which would take the divinity of Christ out of the Bible, would take it out of any Trinitarian creed or publication in the world.

Again; the inspired writers have much to say respecting the devil and his angels. They speak of fallen spirits as *real beings*, from whom we have much to fear, and against whom we ought to watch and strive. But some apply principles of interpretation to the Bible by which they satisfy themselves that there is no devil, and that the Bible does not teach the existence of any such being. Now I fearlessly aver, if the Bible does not teach the doctrine of fallen spirits, no other book (interpreted after the same manner) does teach it, or can teach it. The same principles of interpretation which would take this doctrine out of the Bible, would take it out of any other book or writing whatever.

Take another instance: The Bible teaches the endless punishment of the wicked;—that they “shall go away into everlasting punishment;—that they shall ‘depart accursed into everlasting fire,’ ‘where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched,’ and where ‘the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever.’ But some apply principles of interpretation to the Bible, by which they satisfy themselves that this language does not mean that the wicked shall be punished forever, or that they shall be punished at all, in the future world. Everlasting signifies a limited duration; the worm, the fire, the punishment, are the afflictions of this life; and hell

means only the valley of Hinnom, a polluted valley near Jerusalem. But these principles of interpretation which, when applied to the Bible, make it teach Universal Salvation, if applied to any other work in favor of future punishment, would cause it to teach the same doctrine. Take, for instance, President Edward's Sermon on 'the Eternity of Hell torments:' The same interpretation which would make the Bible a Universalist book, would make this a Universalist Sermon. *The Eternity of Hell torments*: what does this mean? Why, *eternity* means a limited duration; and *Hell torments* signify certain pains which were once endured in the valley of Hinnom. There is nothing, therefore, in the *title* of this sermon, or in the sermon itself, which need offend the ear of the most sensitive Universalist.

Those who believe the doctrine of Universal Salvation are sometimes displeased, when they hear eternal punishment insisted on from the pulpit. But why displeased? What is eternal punishment, according to their interpretation of these scripture terms? It means nothing more than temporal sufferings—the afflictions of this life; and surely they ought to be willing to hear of the afflictions of the present life.

It will be said, perhaps, that this representation is unfair, because, when the living preacher speaks of eternal punishment, *we know what he means*; whereas the whole question in regard to the Bible *relates to the meaning*. In the one case, the sense is questionable, but not in the other.—But how do we know what the living preacher means by eternal punishment, except from what he says? except from the *terms* he uses, the *language* he employs? Yet this same language, in the Bible, means nothing more, we are told, than temporal afflictions. This, we are assured, is its proper, *natural* meaning. But if such is its natural meaning, in the one case, why not in the other? And why should not the language of the living preacher and of ordinary sermons be interpreted as correctly, and as liberally too, as that of the Bible?

I have made these remarks, not to throw lightness over a serious awful subject, but to expose the miserable, trifling manner in which many persons allow themselves to treat the Bible; and to show how differently they interpret the Bible, from any other book or language. Let any other book be tortured, as the Bible is, to bring it into conformity to the interests, the inclinations, and the prejudices of men, and it may be tortured as easily as the Bible. Let the language of common life be submitted to the same ordeal, and it would cease to be intelligible language; and all intercourse, through the medium of it, would be destroyed.

The way is now prepared to urge, in the third place, the *importance* of adopting and adhering to the same principles of interpretation in regard to the Bible, which we apply to ordinary language, and to other books. The Bible was written not for the benefit of

the learned and critical only, but for the plain and common reader. It was made, therefore, a plain book; and was designed to be interpreted in a plain, common-sense way, according to the ordinary use of language. Such being the case, unless the Bible is interpreted in this way, it is virtually *altered*. There are two ways in which the Bible may be altered: The one is, by literally adding to it, or taking from it; the other, by suffering its contents to remain, and misinterpreting them; and there are many persons who would not dare attempt the former, who very readily perpetrate the latter. Here is a passage which, in its plain meaning, teaches a particular doctrine. If now, instead of receiving this doctrine, I misinterpret the passage, and put quite another construction upon it; what do I better, than though I had first blotted out the passage, and then written down another according to my own views? The mere letters and words of a verse in the Bible are of no importance, separate from the meaning; if then, by false interpretation, I alter the meaning, I am chargeable with altering the Bible, although the letters and words may remain the same. Our great danger, at the present day in regard to the Bible, is not of having its chapters and verses removed in form; but of having its *sense*, its *true meaning*, taken away, and a false one substituted. Give the enemies of the Bible all the latitude of interpretation which they desire, and not the most virulent among them ever need be an avowed Infidel. Not one among them ever would take *the name* of an Infidel, so long as it was for his credit and interest to avoid it. The work of interpreting the holy Scriptures is vastly responsible; while the sin of misinterpreting and so altering them is fearfully heinous. Our only safety, in this respect, is to be honest; take the Bible as it is; apply to it the plain principles of interpretation, as we would to any other book; and abide the result. Yes, whether it accords with our systems, our prejudices, our wishes, or not, we must *abide the result*.

The importance of so treating the Bible, will further appear, if we consider that this is the only way in which Christians can ever be brought to anything like an uniformity of religious sentiment.—Why is it that persons do not differ as widely respecting the doctrines of Pelagius, or Augustine, or Calvin, or Socinus, as respecting the doctrines of the Bible? Not because these authors wrote more plainly and explicitly than the inspired penmen. But human authors are not regarded as of binding authority; so that if persons do not like them, they may reject them, and forfeit nothing. They have no temptations, therefore, to misinterpret them. And the consequence is that nearly all readers, whether they approve them or not, interpret and understand them alike.\* Now let per-

\* Two classes of facts may be adduced, showing that the *true reason* for the differences of opinion which are entertained respecting the import of the Bible has been here assigned. The first is, that those persons who have cast off the Bible, so as no longer to con-

sons go to the Bible in the same way, with no end in view but simply to understand it; let all apply to it the same general principles of interpretation, as they would to any other book; and in nearly every case, they would come to the same conclusions respecting its import. They might differ in regard to some small matters, which distance of time and place had rendered obscure; but in all essential points, the generality of Christians would be agreed, and uniformity of sentiment would be restored.

And this, it is believed, is the only way in which it ever will, or can be restored. While persons go to the Bible, encumbered with their prejudices, and determined to make it speak according to their views, it is impossible they should ever understand it, or be agreed respecting it. For going to the Bible in this way, the reader directly encounters passages which, in their plain meaning, are offensive to him. 'If this verse means what it seems to say; what will become of my favorite system? I must change my sentiments, change my meeting, and incur the reproach of joining some other denomination; or I must put another meaning upon this strange sentence of the Bible.' As he reads on, he finds perhaps another passage, which censures and condemns his course of conduct. 'This sentence, as it reads, is too strict for me. I cannot live up to it. It would seem to make me a great sinner,—which surely I am not,—and, therefore, some other meaning must be given to it.' As he reads further, he meets, it may be, with still greater difficulties. He meets with passages which represent him as not in a safe condition. He is in absolute danger of losing his soul. 'But this cannot be true,—the Bible does not mean so,—and, hence some other interpretation must be put upon the words.'

This is but a specimen of the manner in which many persons allow themselves to treat the Holy Bible; and treating it in this way, there is no difficulty in seeing why they do not understand it alike. They manifestly could not understand it alike, unless all agreed to misinterpret it, and to do it after the same manner. The Bible is sufficiently plain in its annunciations—as plain as any religious book; and if all who read it would go to it with simplicity of purpose, to ascertain its meaning, and would apply to it the ordinary principles of interpretation, as they do to other books, they could not essentially misunderstand it, and would soon be agreed respecting it.

sider it of binding authority (as, for instance, the old English Deists and the German Rationalists) have usually understood it much in the same manner. They all would say with Professor Gabler, that "an impartial view of Biblical theology, as a history of the doctrines of the New Testament, must, in its nature, be *pretty much Orthodox*." The second reason is, that other writings, when they come to be held as of binding authority, are as variously interpreted as the Bible. Witness the articles of the church of England, respecting which the members of that church are quite as far from being agreed, as they are respecting the Book of God.

It may be observed again, that this is the only *safe* mode of treating the Bible. The Bible is a revelation from God; and, however it may be regarded by us, *it will stand*. 'The unbelief of men cannot make the word of God of none effect;' and neither can the false interpretations of men make the word of God of none effect. We may think that we have set aside a passage, in accommodation to our views and wishes; but we deceive ourselves in this respect. The passage stands just as before, and we must abide by it, whether we will or no. We may think the requisitions of the Bible too strict, or its denunciations too terrible; and may endeavor to soften them, in accommodation to our feelings. But the requisitions of the Bible must stand, and by them we must be tried and judged, whether we live up to them or not; and the denunciations of the Bible must stand, and impenitent triflers feel all their dreadful import, whether they believe them or not.—It is then our wisdom, our duty, our safety to be honest,—take the Bible as it is—receive it in its plain meaning, however severely it may reprove or condemn us,—and make it our study, not to conform the Bible to our wishes, but to conform our wishes, hearts and characters to the holy precepts of the word of God.

Unless we will receive and treat the Bible in this way, it might be as well for us if we had no Bible, and perhaps better. For what good can the Bible do us, if we only trifle with it? What good can the Bible do us, if, instead of making it the standard and conforming our opinions and characters to it, we set up something else as the standard, and only go to the Bible that we may bend it to our wishes? What good can an *altered* Bible do us? And we have seen that the Bible *is* altered, just so far as it is misinterpreted. What good can false instructions, false precepts, false promises and encouragements do us? And yet the Bible is falsified, if it is falsely interpreted? No, reader, if we need any Bible, we need the *true* Bible. We need it, as God made it; and we need to interpret it in a plain, honest, common-sense way, as we would any other book or writing in which we felt greatly interested, and of which we were sincerely desirous to ascertain the sense.

The unlearned reader, after hearing so much in these days about exegesis and criticism, may feel that the Bible is a sealed book to him. It is above his learning, above his comprehension, and he may well be excused in neglecting it. But from what has been said it follows, that this impression is as unfounded, as it is dangerous. The Bible is a plain book, was intended for common use, and is to be interpreted on the same principles as other books intended for common use. The obvious meaning, in all ordinary cases, is the true meaning, and can be apprehended by the common reader. You can understand your neighbor, when he comes to you on an errand; you can understand your correspon-

dent when he writes to you on business ;—you can understand your minister when he preaches to you a plain discourse ;—and (if properly disposed to receive the truth) you can just as well understand the plain preaching of Christ, and the plain writings of the Apostles and evangelists. These writings—as to all essential, practical purposes—are within the comprehension of a child, and are important to be studied and pondered by us—in *the temper of children*. This is the very spirit in which the Bible can be best understood, and it is from a want of this spirit, more than from any other cause, that such various and contradictory interpretations have been given to it. I will even go further and say, that the Bible should be studied, and pondered, by those who are in *literal childhood*. The youth in the Bible class, the child of ordinary capacity in the Sabbath school, can understand his Saviour when he says, ‘If any man love me, he will keep my commandments’ ;—‘Except ye repent, ye shall all perish’ ;—‘For every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account in the day of Judgement’ ;—‘He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved ; but he that believeth not shall be damned.’ Surely this is sufficiently plain. What is the difficulty in understanding such plain teaching as this ?

Let all remember, in conclusion, that this Bible, about which so much has been said, is a solemn, awful book. It is solemn to have it in our hands and houses. It is solemn to read or hear its important messages. Who would not be solemnly affected, should he hear the Almighty speaking to him in an audible voice from the skies ? Yet, reader, the Almighty is speaking to you as really and as solemnly in the Bible, as though he addressed you directly from the heavens. Beware then, how you trifle with his words ! “The word that I have spoken,” saith Christ, “*the same shall judge you at the last day.*” Among the books then opened, as the rule of final judgement, will be that holy book of which you have now been reading. Shall it be opened to testify in your favour, or against you ? Shall it be opened to your confusion and condemnation,—or to your unspeakable and eternal joy ? These, reader, are questions in which you are immensely interested. Decide them for yourself. Decide them now.

---

A COMMON EXCUSE FOR FORSAKING THE LORD’S TABLE,  
considered in a Letter from a Pastor to an influential Member of  
his Church.

Dear Brother,  
In our conversation last evening, you expressed your dissatisfaction with the conduct of Brother B——, and observed that you

felt as though you could not longer commune with him, but must withdraw from the sacramental table, unless he made satisfactory concessions. You will recollect that I did not reply at the time; for your remark surprised and grieved me. I dared not trust myself to express to you my thoughts verbally, but improve this earliest opportunity to do it in writing. Allow me then to say, in the outset, that I hope your determination to withdraw from the Lord's table is not yet formed; or if formed, most sincerely do I hope that it never will be executed. That brother B—— has given just cause of offence to the members of the church, and that the offence is of such a nature as to require discipline, according to the rules of the gospel, I shall not at present either affirm or deny. If the matter comes regularly before the church, as perhaps it ought to, we will endeavor to consider and judge of it impartially. But for you, or for any other member in this stage of the business, before having taken measures to convince and reclaim your brother, to forsake the Lord's table on this account, I hope to be able to satisfy you, would be disorderly and sinful.

It is obvious, in the first place, that such a course must tend necessarily to the subversion of all regular discipline. The rules of the gospel require that offenders in the church be admonished, first privately; then in the presence of two or three witnesses; and, finally, that the charges against them be substantiated before the church, to which body they must make satisfactory concessions, or be excluded. But on the plan you propose, these divinely appointed rules are superseded and disregarded. The offender, instead of being kindly admonished, is at once abandoned. Those whose duty it is to watch over him, instead of telling him his faults privately in a spirit of meekness, turn from him, and leave him to wander in his sins. And the church, as a body, perhaps never becomes acquainted with his case, till it is compelled to notice the cases of those who have left the Lord's table on his account. In other words, the church is never in a situation to heal or remove one evil, until she is beset by a host of evils which have risen out of it.

But there are other consequences of the course you propose more strange and inexplicable even than this. If it is right for you to leave the sacramental table, it is right for others to do the same. Suppose, then, that the other members follow your example, and because they are dissatisfied with brother B——, or with some other brother or sister, withdraw from the supper of the Lord. The table is spread at the appointed season, but, on the supposition now made, it is abandoned by the church, and left in complete and exclusive possession of the offending member. Instead of the church dealing with him, and, if necessary, excluding him, they have excluded themselves, and left him in the quiet enjoyment of all church privileges.



The course which you propose to adopt should be tested also by the *command* of the Saviour. The Lord's supper is not a mere ceremony of human invention. It was enjoined and instituted by the express command of Christ. "*This do* in remembrance of me," is as really a command of God, as either of those which were delivered on the flaming mount. And you will observe, that the followers of Christ are here required to come to his table, not while they find it convenient so to do, or while they continue satisfied with the conduct of their brethren; but they are required to come *absolutely*, without exception or reserve, so that nothing can excuse their absence so long as they have ability and opportunity to attend. And Christians, in successive generations, will never be released from this command, while the ordinance of the supper is continued in the church; and this will be till the end of the world. As often as they eat this bread and drink this cup, they will continue to show forth their Lord's death—*till he come*.

The will of Christ on this important subject may also be gathered from his *example*. And here I shall not attempt to settle the long agitated question, whether Judas Iscariot came to the sacramental supper at the time of its institution. It is admitted on all hands that he came to the last Passover; and who does not know, that the Passover gave place to the supper—that it was to the church under the former dispensation, in most important particulars, what the supper is to Christians now. But at this sacred festival—after he had set a price upon the head of his Master, and entered into covenant to betray him—Judas and Jesus sat down together. And why was this? Not surely because our Saviour was ignorant of what Judas had done; or because he was unable to exclude him. He knew perfectly the heart of the traitor, and there were thousands of ways in which he might have debarred him from this last solemn festival occasion, had he preferred, on the whole, that he should not be there. Or if he could not have excluded Judas, he might have done what you propose to do, and absented himself. Nor was Judas admitted to the Paschal supper, to show that none in after ages, let their characters be what they might, who had an inclination to come to the Lord's table, ought to be excluded. An inference of this sort has sometimes been drawn from the fact under consideration, but altogether without reason. Judas, at this time had committed no public, overt act of wickedness. Not one of the disciples knew or suspected that he had entered into an agreement to betray his Master; and if our Saviour had asserted such a thing, he could not have proved it, except on the authority of his own omniscient word.—In going to the supper with Judas, our Saviour intended, doubtless, to leave an example to his followers. He foresaw that they would sometimes be tempted to leave his table on improper grounds—on the ground

of offences, which either did not admit of a remedy, or which ought to be remedied in some regular way; and he intended they should have it to reflect, '*So did not the Lord Jesus Christ.* He sat down at the table with Judas, when he knew that he had treason and murder in his heart.'

It deserves consideration, my dear Sir, whether you can reconcile the course you contemplate with your solemn *covenant engagements*? When you made a profession of religion, and entered into covenant with God and his people, you were understood to promise, that you would walk in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless,—not for any definite period, or during the good behavior of your brethren and sisters,—but *so long as you lived*. You were understood to promise, that you would not absent yourself from the table of the Lord, or from any part of his instituted worship. Now these, you are sensible, were solemn promises, made in a solemn place and manner, and heard and ratified in heaven; and how you will reconcile them with a neglect of the Lord's table, on account of supposed offence on the part of one of your brethren, I confess, I know not.

You will not understand me, Sir, in anything I have said, as charging you, or those who think and act with you, with wrong intentions. I doubt not you desire the purity of the church, and think you are taking the easiest and safest way to promote it. But I hope to satisfy you that in this particular you are mistaken. It may be easier, in the first instance, to neglect a painful duty, than to perform it. It may seem easier to withdraw silently from the Lord's table, than to go to your offending brother, and tell him his fault, and endeavor to bring him to repentance. But will not your neglect of duty in this respect, like sin of every other description, be bitterness in the latter end? Suppose you enter on the course you contemplate, and absent yourself from the table of the Lord. How long can you persist in such a course, before you render *yourself* publicly censurable; are complained of to the church for breach of covenant; and are obliged, either to make a public confession, or be excommunicated? And if you make a confession and are restored, in what better situation will you then be to reprove your offending brother, and do your duty towards him, than you are now? How much easier to do your duty in the first instance;—or rather not to neglect your duty?

Your plan has been formed, probably, in view of certain passages of Scripture, which you flatter yourself amount to a justification. The following, I presume, are among the strongest which have occurred to you. "If any man that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one, *no not to eat.*" "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye *withdraw yourselves from every brother that*

*walketh disorderly.*" In order to understand these passages, it must be remembered that they were addressed to *churches*—the former to the church at Corinth, and the latter to the church at Thessalonica. The whole church at Corinth are here exhorted "not to eat" the Lord's supper with the guilty, offending brother. Now in complying with this exhortation, the members of that church could not have understood that they were all to retire from the Lord's table, and leave the offender to sit there alone; but rather, as the Apostle expresses it in a following verse, that they were to 'put away from among them that wicked person.' So the church at Thessalonica are commanded to 'withdraw from every brother that walks disorderly.' But how withdraw? Not in such manner as to leave the disorderly walkers in possession of the name and privileges of the church; but rather to purge the church from these disorderly persons, by separating them from the communion of the faithful. These directions of the Apostle are precisely equivalent to that of our Saviour, 'Let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican;' and require, not that the whole church, or that unoffending individuals, should abandon their privileges to the corrupt and disorderly, but that they should, in a regular way according to the principles of the gospel, exclude such persons from their society and fellowship.

In short, my dear Sir, it is plain, that you ought not to leave the sacramental table in any case, on account of offences existing in the church, until you have used all lawful means to reclaim or exclude the offending members; and when these means have been faithfully used, and have failed (unless the evil is of such a nature as to affect and corrupt the whole church) *you need not leave the table.* You have done your duty, have discharged your conscience, and you may now come and commune with your Saviour at his table, with equal propriety and profit as before. The table, you will remember, is not the offender's table, nor the church's table; nor is it necessary, in order to approach it worthily and happily, that we be perfectly satisfied and pleased with the conduct of every member. The table is THE LORD'S; and if we have evidence that we are friends to him—have done our duty to him—and are prepared, by an approving conscience and a humble heart, to enjoy communion with him, we may sit down under his shadow with great delight, and his fruit will be sweet to our taste,—though we may not be able to regard with entire complacency the character of every individual around us. The propriety of our coming to the Lord's table depends on our own characters, not on the characters of others; and if our hearts are in the most proper state to approach this ordinance, we shall have objects of interest enough to occupy us, without thinking of the faults of our brethren. I do not mean by this, that the faults of our brethren are to pass unnoticed, or that mutual watchfulness and discipline are to

be neglected. Everything should be done by such means which can be done, consistently with the best interests of the church and the rules of the gospel. But there are evils occasionally occurring in the church, which no measures of this sort can cure. There are suspected and troublesome members, and always were, and always will be, which no regular discipline can remove. They are tares among the wheat, which cannot be rooted up without injury to the precious grain; and they must stand till the great harvest day. They may be a grief to us, and doubtless will be; but we must not suffer ourselves to be restrained or hindered by them in the performance of duty. The day of decision is at hand, when 'the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is.' May you, and I, and all our dear brethren, know our duty, and do it, and thus be prepared for the trial that awaits us. So prays your affectionate Pastor.

---

## REVIEWS.

1. THE MANCHESTER SOCINIAN CONTROVERSY, with *Introductory Remarks, and an Appendix*. London. 1825. pp. 220.
2. THE REPORT OF HIS MAJESTY'S COMMISSIONERS, CONCERNING DAME SARAH HEWLEY'S CHARITY. Manchester. 1829. pp. 63.
3. STATE OF UNITARIANISM IN ENGLAND. *An Article in the Eclectic Review for October, 1830.*

(Continued from page 48.)

MOST of the general facts published in our last relative to the state, character, and prospects of Unitarianism in England, are confirmed in an article on the same subject in the *Eclectic Review* for Oct. 1830. As this testimony is recent and unexceptionable, and as but few of our readers, probably, will see the original, we shall be justified in making copious extracts.

Describing the situation and feelings of the Unitarian minister, who receives the greater part of his salary from the perverted Orthodox endowments of which we have spoken, the Reviewer observes,

"But the pittance on which the children of the Unitarian minister starve, has been filched for him; his income, or three-fourths of it, is the fruit of a fraud,—the shameless perversion of a testamentary grant. Every shilling, if he be a man of sensibility, must burn his palm as he takes it. The thirty, sixty, hundred pounds *per annum*, which, if it be not the whole of his salary, is that on which his

continuance in his place absolutely depends, was destined by the donor for the maintenance of a doctrine which the man who receives it is always laboring to impugn! Odious position! Hard service! The minister who stands in a pulpit under such conditions, might well, as he glances at the tablet dedicated to the memory of the abused dead, imagine that he hears the "stone out of the wall," uttering the reproachful taunt—"He who eateth of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me"!

The fact that Unitarianism in Great Britain is in a declining, dying condition is abundantly confirmed in the article before us. In order to show this in the most satisfactory manner, the Reviewer divides the entire number of the places of worship in England, belonging to all denominations, into four classes, according to the degree in which they are ordinarily filled.

"The *first* comprehends the crowded: the *second*, the fairly filled; the *third*, the moderately filled; and the *fourth*, those that from Sunday to Sunday round the year, challenge to themselves, in a pre-eminent degree, the imposing solemnity of desolation; or, in other words, such as are occupied by—the parson, the clerk, the pew-owner, and five, seven, or fourteen resolute good folks, who have vowed that nothing, while life and limb are spared, shall drive them from the venerable walls. As to places of the first class, or the crowded, we might exclude them from consideration on the present occasion, as anomalous instances; it being fairly presumable, that such cases of extraordinary repletion result from special causes;—generally, the peculiar attractions of a preacher,—his genius, his fervor, or his extravagance."

"The second class, or the permanently well filled, may (with a few exceptions easily accounted for) be considered as so distinguished, because the religious instruction obtained in them is of a sort that approves itself to the consciences of men as sound, efficient and salutary. To this order belong most of those churches of the Establishment, wherein the doctrines of its founders are preached in an able and acceptable manner. It includes also a fair proportion (perhaps a majority) of all Dissenting meeting-houses and chapels in populous neighborhoods, in which the same doctrines (the doctrines of the Reformation) are maintained by men of good education and respectable pulpit talents. We come to the third, and perhaps the most numerous class; namely, the moderately, or half filled,—neither desolated nor flourishing. Seats are *claimed* or *let*, more than occupied. Of this sort, are, first, a *large* proportion of all the parish churches throughout the land, both rural and municipal, whereunto resort, every Sunday, (bad weather always excepted,) the good sober folk of the parish, who would do as they do, though the parson were to preach Islamism; and perhaps be neither the wiser nor the worse! Secondly, under this *general*, (we must use as much subdivision almost as belonged to an old non-conformist discourse) are to be reckoned some number (we fear,) of regular and Orthodox dissenting places, in towns and out of them; and which contain a very similar *genus* of 'good sort of folks,' better taught,

perhaps, in Christianity, than their neighbors of the Establishment, and decided foes of all 'rites and forms of man's 'devising,' but not much more vivacious in either their intellectual or moral life than other people."

"Last come the empty.—It is no *bull* to call a thing *empty*, whether box, vase, house, or purse, which is not found to contain what one expects to see within it; even though there be no absolute vacuum. In this sense, an *empty* place of worship is one in which, though there is some dozen of men, women, and children, there is *no congregation*. Instances of very dissimilar sorts come under this head: as first, not a few parish churches, the officiating ministers in which, by their bad reputation, or utter inefficiency as teachers, secure for their own voices and their clerks', all the advantages of solemn echo. But to whom, among the *sectarists*, belong the deserted chapels? We are prepared to affirm confidently, that an exceedingly small number can be claimed by the Orthodox dissenters of any denomination. Who then claims the remainder?—UNITARIANISM. And in what proportion? *In the proportion of ninety-eight in every hundred of all its places.*"

"We must dilate awhile upon this fact; and first recur to our classification. If we err in particulars, we shall be glad to receive correction, and yet, need acknowledge no detriment to our argument. We believe, then, that English Socinianism has not to boast a single place that is *ordinarily* crowded, or over-filled. Assuredly, it has not three such places; and we do not hesitate to say, that nothing can be more improbable, than that a preacher of this class should excite that sort of intense interest which could attract a throng."

"Three or four (we doubt if there be five) Unitarian chapels in England, are well filled; though not crowded. But, in these few instances, *all the Unitarianism* of one side of the metropolis, or of a populous city or manufacturing town, is brought together, and makes indeed a fair show, if thought of apart from the space whence it has been gleaned. Thus, if all the men in London who had the misfortune to be christened Zachary or Jonas, were convened under one roof, one might, in looking at the goodly assembly, be tempted to say,—How favorite a name among the English is Zachary or Jonas! But the fact is far otherwise. And much the same account must be given of the few Unitarian chapels that are ordinarily well filled."

"It is a remarkable fact, that the system of doctrine of which we are speaking, seems not to be susceptible of a middle state of prosperity. Unitarian places of worship are either the three or four, or it may be five, well-filled chapels in London, Birmingham, Manchester; or, the three or four hundred dungeons of desolation found elsewhere. Where, we ask, in towns of the second and third rate, are the edifices that bring together, on a Sunday, a fair proportion of the several orders,—the opulent, the mercantile, and the poor, to listen to Socinian doctrine? Hardly will such instances be met with. Unitarianism exists, either by collecting scattered individuals from large

circles, or purely by aid of endowments, where a congregation has long ceased to be thought of. So much for our third class."

"Nothing can be more significant than the facts that present themselves in turning to the fourth class,—or the empty. No sect at all approximates to the proportion which the empty chapels of the Unitarians bear to the entire number. To say that, of a thousand parish churches, taken indiscriminately in town and country, one hundred and twenty-five, or one-eighth, are graced with the awful grandeur of vacuity, is, we think, allowing a too large number. We doubt if the Methodists, Wesleyan and Calvinistic, have three empty chapels in a hundred. The Baptists may claim perhaps five or ten in the same number. The Independents, three or four. The Quakers twenty, or more. But the Unitarians have ninety-eight chapels in every hundred that are desolate. Yet, as our argument is of a general kind, and quite independent of nice calculations, we are willing to suppose that ten in a hundred own a congregation;—nay, let it be twenty; let it be said that not more than four-fifths of the Unitarian pew ground is a desert. Now, here we might stop. We should be content to leave the inference to every man's common sense. Most assuredly, were we Unitarians, we should accept the fact, *under the circumstances which belong to it*, as a sufficient proof of the badness, or at least the hopelessness of the cause. Unitarian chapels are empty, not because it is an age of darkness and fanaticism,—not because Unitarians are liable to imprisonments, confiscations, fines;—but for the simple, satisfactory reason, that, with the Bible in its hand, it fails to make good its pretensions,—the mass of the people being judges."

The article before us commences with a somewhat fanciful though we presume accurate description of one of the ancient, desolate meeting-houses now occupied by Unitarians during the time of service, and contrasting it with the crowded attendance on the public worship of some other denominations. After having sailed, in imagination, up the stream of time 'into the midst of the dark ages,' and heard the complaints of the 'luckless Albertus Magnus,' that he was 'born a thousand years too late, or a thousand years too soon,' the writer returns to his own England in the nineteenth century on a Sabbath morning, and enters the first place of worship which he meets.

"The sombre-visaged structure seemed to ally itself to the glooms of the scenery from which we had just returned. Nor did the interior belie the face of the edifice. Awful galleries protruded their descending and portentous bulk far upon the central space; as if the edifice had been constructed for the purpose of convening under the same roof terrestrials and cœlicoles, who, though interested in the same ceremonials, might by no means be suffered to catch glimpses of each other! The lower area was penfolded by pews not less secretive, and, to our minds, seemed intended to typify that felicitous sectarianism of the Christian community, which has so long made the Church universal (to take a bird's eye view of it) look

more like a Penitentiary of classified convicts, than a royal banquetting house,"

"Already, when we entered, the congregation was assembled; but the service had not commenced. Dimness, silence, and comfortless solemnity reigned within the sacred precincts, and we began to chill with the fear that we had not in verity returned from the twelfth century. We say, the congregation was assembled! We looked from side to side of the desolation, and descried here, and there again, a powdered poll, or trembling tuft of feathers and ribbons, peeping over the dead level of the pews! Such was the holy convocation! Yet we should not forget to mention a half dozen of rheumatic eleemosynaries, and a score of liveried urchins, who claimed the ample spaces of the galleries as their undisputed domain."

"The minister ascended to his place—a spare, pinched, keen-eyed, bald-headed man; sedate, sarcastic, and yet manifestly sad at heart;—sad as a man of sense must be, whose lot it is to stand still, year after year, in front of the perpetual sleet and frost of ill success. He gazed for a moment upon the unvaried scene,—for each of his patrons was in his place,—and looked as if in disgust of himself, of his vocation, of his congregation, of his times, and of all the world, and then announced the psalm. A dismal personification of perfunctory heartlessness in the desk, aided by a single voice from the furthest corner of the place, performed the joyous anthem! Again the leader of worship rose, and read, and prayed; while his hearers, like so many single columns erect amid the ruins of Tadmor in the desert, indicated by their position that they were not altogether unmindful of the specific service in which their minister was engaged. Ah, how did we sigh for the unaffected fervor of a Turkish mosque!

"The preacher took his text, which, as it was not referred to in the body of the discourse, has slipped from our memory. The querulous, sardonic, discouraging harrangue of half an hour, inspired us strongly with the belief, that the minister was preparing his hearers for the announcement, that the chapel doors would, from that day forward, be closed, nor any more fruitless attempts be made to dissipate the obstinate darkness of the age. Not so. But, instead of any such seemingly discreet resolution, the sanguine man, hoping against hope, concluded his discourse by declaring his conviction, that, some thousand years hence—perhaps fifteen hundred—mankind, at length escaping from the influence of enthusiasm and fanaticism, would yield to the sway of right reason, and acknowledge the excellence of primitive Christianity; that is to say, on the supposition that Christianity, which, perhaps, ought to be regarded only as a temporary dispensation, should, at that remote date, be deemed in any way a necessary medium of eternal truth!"

"But before he attained this heart-warming climax, the preacher complained heavily, and with a noble, indignant eloquence, (having in it little or nothing of the tone of wounded pride or preposterous arrogance,) of the inveteracy of vulgar prejudices—the obdurate impenetrability of notions once deemed sacred—the crushing despotism of religious endowments, which, as he affirmed, left no chance of success to truth and reason among the great body of the people;



while the sects that disclaimed such secular influence, were maddened by a fanaticism of the most malignant sort. Things being in this woful plight, what wonder that the few places in which the light of pure and primitive Christianity shone, were scarcely at all frequented!"

"We caught from the tones of his comfortless harangue an infection of despondency. The gloom of the building, its desolation echoing the plaints of the preacher oppressed our imagination; and we actually expected that, on issuing from this dungeon of despair, we should behold the heavens overcast with a triple blackness; that the midsummer's noon would be stained, as by sympathy, with the moral and intellectual 'darkness of the age.' We expected to meet, at the first turning, some procession of monks, or a band of heretics on their way to the fire. In a word, we thought of nothing, as we passed the untrod threshold of this Unitarian, Apostolic meeting-house, but to see the blood-stained banner of superstition, floating far and wide upon the murky sky!"

"How cheering was the reality that wakened us from this dismal dream as we gained the street! At the very moment, twenty churches and chapels of the neighborhood were disgorging their crowds. Sunday dresses, and Sunday faces, illuminated by a Sunday's summer sky, gave to the scene the liveliness and grace that so well befit Christianity where Christianity is free, intelligent and sincere. Most of the faces we encountered bore that expression of serene independence which is peculiarly *English*. Very few displayed that sort of timid, crabbed, cruel dejection that characterizes fanaticism or superstition. And as the crowd was thinning, we met several of the ministers of the congregations that had just dispersed; men whom we recognized as standing in the front of whatever is free, beneficent, dauntless: men, some of them erudite, most of them laborious in their circles; and scarcely too highly paid for their services."

It seems the Unitarian Clergy of England attribute their failure to the disadvantages of the times, by which the spirit of free inquiry is crushed, and truth is deprived of a fair hearing. But to this the Reviewer replies,

"Such things must not be said: they are contrary to plain and conspicuous facts. There never was a fifty years in which—there never was a people among whom a *sound argument* had a better chance of making head against old errors, than during the last fifty years, and among the people of England within that time. Nay; during the last fifty years, at several moments, the popular feeling in England has broken with so stormy a force upon all ancient and prescriptive opinions, that whoever came forward to impugn them, found, in every market-place, a people prepared to applaud and devour his most impudent sophistries. It is indeed true, that earthly passions and worldly interests now, as ever, indispose the mass of mankind to entertain religious motives, and render the religious, as compared with the irreligious, a small minority. But it is *not true*, that the temper of the times specifically, or any political institutions,

stand in the way of a particular theological system, as compared with others. Piety is, indeed, overpowered by worldliness of spirit and sensuality; but neither Unitarianism nor any other peculiar doctrine is disadvantaged in its struggle to hold a place among the crowd of religious opinions."

"On the contrary, Unitarianism has had its auspicious moments. Once and again, it has seemed to be just spreading its canvass to the gale upon a flood-tide of opportunity. If Unitarianism had in it at all the vigor of prosperous life, it might—it *must* have lived and prospered at some times during the last half century. And if ever and again it is lapsed and slunk away from the high road of success, no other intelligible account of the fact can be given, than this,—that it is intrinsically a doctrine of desolation and decay."

The Reviewers proceeds, in very good humor, to examine the pretence so often heard, that Unitarianism is 'pure, primitive, Apostolic Christianity'—the religion which prevailed and triumphed in the early days of the church.

"What then must be confessed concerning the 'primitive apostolic Christianity,' that is preached in Unitarian meeting-houses? Alas! this doctrine, which, if indeed it be the Christianity of the Apostles, *once* conquered all the gods, and set foot upon the throne of universal empire, *now*, when learnedly and zealously propounded to the most intelligent, the most free, and the most religious people in the world, proves itself to be a thing that none will listen to!—a thing the poor turn from in contempt!—a thing that inspires its converts with no zeal!—a thing that can neither walk, nor run, nor stand among competitors!—a thing that scatters, not gathers:—that desolates, not blesses!—a thing of silence, gloom, emptiness, coldness, despondency!—This is the primitive, apostolic Christianity of Unitarianism!"

"Christianity has, indeed, often been crushed or beaten out of a country by force of arms, or it has expired amid the general decay of learning, in the absence of political security, or the decline of national life. We mourn in such cases the extinction, yet cannot marvel. But what are we to think, what appalling surmises would come in upon the heart, if it should appear that Christianity, in its pure and primitive form, Christianity, which was announced as a blessing to the multitude, when proclaimed among an enlightened people, in an age of freedom and intellectual activity, can gain no hearing? What if we see that this pure Apostolic doctrine, entering upon a congregation (fairly taken from all ranks) presently scatters it, retaining nothing of the good things upon which it laid its hand but the endowments and the desolated walls. And what if these things take place again, and again, and yet again? Is there no significance in facts such as these?"

The fact, admitted by Unitarians themselves,\* and proved from

\* "Throughout the kingdom," says a learned Unitarian, "the result of the Missionary labors undertaken by Unitarians of late, has been a disappointing one. How happens this? (inquires the simple-hearted writer, whose ingenuousness is as admirable as his perseverance in a desperate cause.) 'Chiefly, we doubt not, because the spirit of Unitari-

their history, not only in England, but the world over, that their religion breathes not a missionary spirit, is also urged to show that it cannot be the religion of the Apostles.

“ ‘There never was a system,’ says a Unitarian writer, ‘which was so general in its regards, which bore so invasive a character, as Christianity in its earliest days. . . . Every preacher was a missionary, going about doing good, sent, and glorying in his office, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord. We are sure, therefore, that the spirit of missions is the spirit of Christ, and of Christianity.’ ”

“What part, then, has Unitarianism in the blessedness of the Missionary work? By the missionary work, we mean, not the proselyting at home from other persuasions; but the evangelizing of heathen or Mohammedan nations. A work eminently becoming to a great and Christian country; a work from which no *Christian*, now that it is in progress, can be content to stand either excused or excluded.”

“We turn to an account of the last annual meeting of the ‘British and *Foreign* Unitarian Association,’ the object of which is the diffusion, at home and abroad, of the unsullied light of rational, liberal, primitive and apostolic Christianity. From the statement of the treasurer, it appears, that (notwithstanding ‘a falling off of donations and collections’) the ‘most opulent body of Christians in England’ raised during the year, the sum of ‘*one thousand and odd pounds*,’ for the furtherance of their pious intentions! The expenditure has consisted of,—1. the charge of purchasing and printing books, namely, 45*l.* 15*s.* 11*d.*; 2. upwards of 300*l.* expended on congregational and *missionary* objects *at home*; and 3. (let Christendom hear it!)—*two hundred and fifty pounds* on account of the *Foreign Fund*!!!”

“Yet, even this adventure for converting the people of India (rather for diffusing Unitarianism among the *English* of Calcutta, such is the fact,) did not escape animadversion, as an improper diversion of the funds of the Association from the field where they were most needed. And though the objector allowed, that, the Calcutta mission having commenced, they were ‘*bound to endeavor to make the best of it*,’ he was far from admitting, (and none of the speakers affirmed,) that Unitarians should think of entering boldly as competitors with the Orthodox on the high course of foreign evangelization. And yet, why should they not do so? What obstacle stands between Unitarians and the Pagan world? What, but Unitarian indifference? Why would it be imprudent to originate some eight or

ans in this kingdom IS NOT THE MISSIONARY SPIRIT. Very many are hostile to missionary exertions, and especially the more rich and influential. The societies that have been, and are, have struggled into being, and struggle to exist. They have in some cases been formed by a few, in opposition to the will of the many; while the many looked on either in *apathy* or *scorn*. The propriety of their existence has been gravely questioned; the overture for aid to maintain them, met with a *smile of astonishment*; while almost in every instance, those who affect to give the tone to others, and who unfortunately have had but too much influence, have not only kept aloof from, but spoken warmly against them. In a word, the current of fashion, has been, and still is, of an anti-missionary hue. Missionary exertions have been denounced as *vulgar*: as interfering with the harmony and polish of refined and miscellaneous society.” Monthly Rep. N. S. vol. iii. p. 703.

ten Missions to Africa, India, and the Islands of the Southern Sea, but because it is too absurd to suppose that any such act of religious charity would be supported or approved by the Unitarian body? It is a missionary age, and the missionary spirit is allowed by Unitarians to be eminently proper to Christianity; and yet, Unitarians neither go forth to preach the Gospel, nor send others!"

"Such are the facts. Let them for a moment be viewed in that light in which they will appear to posterity, supposing Unitarianism to be Christianity. In that case, it will stand on the page of Church history, for the astonishment and scandal of all thoughtful minds,—first, that the fanatical and deluded professors of a corrupt and idolatrous creed were the men to originate and carry on perseveringly the truly Christian enterprise of turning the nations from their superstitions; and that in this enterprise they were conspicuously recognized and prospered by heaven. And secondly, that the only true Christians of the missionary age, were the *only men* who took no part in the work;—that, of these true Christians, the majority openly opposed the undertaking, 'looked upon it with apathy or scorn, and 'met an application for aid with a smile of astonishment,'—in such sort that the confession was wrung from the chiefs of the party, that 'the spirit of Unitarians,' (the only Christians) 'is *not a missionary spirit*,' and that they are "sufficiently indifferent whether other men and nations partake of the blessings of the Gospel, or not!" These are the facts which are even now going down to the ears of posterity. Upon the unalterable page of history it is even now being written, that the attempt to propagate Christianity, is scorned and denounced by the only men of the times, according to their own account, who possess the doctrine of Him that said, 'Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel!' " \*

The writer of the article from which we have made so large extracts, concludes by adverting to the pitiable, melancholy condition of most of the Unitarian clergy of England.

"That his (the Unitarian Clergyman's) income is small, and incapable of much augmentation, he does not complain of; for this is a disadvantage which he saw distinctly before him when he devoted himself to the ministerial calling, and which he shares with the great majority of the clergy of all denominations, of whom nine out of ten are inadequately recompensed for their services." "But amid his pecuniary humiliations, can he solace himself in contemplating the success of his spiritual labors? Can he derive from the manifest *efficiency* of his ministrations, a consolation which reconciles him to this degrading lot? He, and, upon the supposition of the Unitarian, he alone, holds in his hand that potent engine which, awhile ago, overthrew temples and thrones, and vanquished the na-

\* "Let the labors of William Roberts at Madras, or elsewhere, and the defunct efforts of Mr. Adam at Calcutta, carry all the importance that can possibly attach to them, and be held available for the desirable purpose of convicting any man of misrepresentation, who shall be so hasty as to affirm, that Unitarians have attempted, or are attempting, *nothing* for the diffusion of Christianity among the heathen. Far be it from us to advance any such absolute and calumnious predication! By no means: the Unitarians have William Roberts at Madras, and they had Mr. Adam at Calcutta!"

tions. What does it achieve in his hands? We put the question to his candor. These are not the days of mystification;—not the days in which a man may hide simple facts from himself and others by vague, unmeaning declamations. We ask, then, the Unitarian minister to tell us, to tell us as if in a court of justice, and before a dozen plain men, what does he see, within his particular sphere, of the **POWER OF THE GOSPEL**? Let him answer in reference either to the numbers whom he stately addresses, or the apparent benefit derived from his instructions by those who hear him."

"Or, if an inference from single instances be disliked, let us look at Unitarianism (this supposed only genuine Christianity) as it stands in the country at large, and viewed as an instrument of national virtue. We ask aloud, is Unitarianism, with all its chapels, worth to the people of England, as an actual means of purity and reformation of manners,—is it worth the revenues of the poorest of our bishopricks? Is it worth the salaries of a score of excisemen? Nay, is it worth a rush? If all the Unitarian chapels in England were let tomorrow for penitentiaries, or ware-houses, would the aggregate virtue of the English people exhibit in the following year the minutest deterioration? Verily, we think not."

"How cheerless, then, how utterly comfortless are the endeavors of each single laborer, when the worth of the aggregate labor of all is too diminutive a thing to be measured or reckoned! How deplorable the lot of a man who not only is unsuccessful in his particular sphere, but who, on looking round among his colleagues, far and near, sees ninety of them out of every hundred in the same dismal predicament,—hopelessly unsuccessful! How shall he defend his bosom against the inroad of the most heart-sickening of all convictions that can smite the human breast,—the conviction of toiling through life—fruitlessly?"

"The gainless man meets in society those with whom he set out on the course of life; each quick and alert (if not all successful) in the pursuit of interests the promotion of which, though private, is the promotion of the common wealth and general prosperity. But he, though not less well educated than they, not less intelligent, not less capable, constitutionally, of achieving success by energy and talent; he, though perhaps possessing the advantage over his fellows in these respects, navigates perpetually a stagnant pool, in the deadly waters of which not a fish will swim, over the pestiferous surface of which not a living thing will flit! *They* are ploughing, sowing and reaping: *he*, sowing, and sowing sterile sands, watered only with briny tears of despair! Once in the round of seven days he bends his steps, heart-fallen and sick of the profitless usages of devotion, to his chapel. No glistening eyes of the poor and afflicted whom he is to comfort, watch his approach. No joyous sounds of cordial, universal worship greet his ears. The few are in their places;—would he were left to indulge his melancholy in solitude! He delivers the appointed couplets of chilly adoration. Of the few worshippers, a few only respond. He reads the Scripture;—one verse in every five shocks his fastidious taste, or asks a crooked criticism to turn the edge of its obvious meaning. He prays. Yes, *he* prays; but who joins him? Do not all inwardly loathe the solemn imperti-

nence, in the efficacy of which none have a hearty faith? He preaches—he utters (so he says) the soul-wakening doctrine of immortality, stripped of every corruption, and therefore, by necessary consequence, potent to reform the profligate, and to spiritualize the convert! Preacher! shew to the world the roll of your actual triumphs!—The week's work is done; the congregation dismissed; and the functionary returns to his home; and, as a *public person*, feels himself an insulated being, a *sinecurist*,—unconnected with the multitude of men, either by relationship of secular utility, or by bond of spiritual sympathy, or by efficient labors of Christian beneficence."

"The Unitarian minister is either himself indifferent to the propagation of the Gospel, or being zealous for it, he finds himself in a party that can by none of his eloquence be roused to give him efficient aid. For the first case:—it is true, that a layman, who has nothing to do with religion but to sit his hour once a week in his pew, may be very tranquil and very well satisfied with himself, even in the consciousness of an utter indifference,—an absolute destitution of Christian zeal. But it can never be so with a public functionary. Nothing can render the constant performance of religious services before a small and lifeless congregation, by one who is himself devoid of zeal, otherwise than insufferably burdensome;—nothing, we say, but large or *secure* secular advantages. For the sake, or, to use a phrase proper to a mercantile transaction, for the *consideration* of a thousand per annum, or of even two hundred absolutely unalienable, a man may courageously bear himself through the irksome formalities of public devotion. Not so the starveling, who, if he displease his employers, may be discharged from his pulpit, and lose his morsel of bread. To such a one, disheartened and anxious, the conscious want of religious zeal, and the conspicuous inefficiency of all his performances, will be enough to afflict him with an unutterable disgust."

"But let us look at the other supposition,—the case of a Unitarian minister, who feels in all its force the unquestionable truth, that Christianity is essentially an invasive, expansive doctrine;—he confesses that something, nay, much must be wrong in its professors, if their spirit be not a missionary spirit;—he admits, that those (whatever errors they may fall into) who are actually going forth to preach the Gospel to the heathen, are most happily, most consistently, most nobly employed;—he cannot but grant that, though scoffed at by the scoffers of their times, posterity will do them justice, and call them the most heroic of philanthropists;—nay, that heaven will confess them as its servants; he would fain, spite of the corruptions to which they adhere, take part with them in their labors;—he steps forward:—but his companionship is avoided. (May it ever be so!) Those who are zealously propagating the Gospel of God their Saviour, shrink with fear from contact with the impugner of its capital doctrines. (May they ever, and on all occasions, so draw back!) Rejected, he turns towards the men of his party. He sees them affluent and well-informed, but, alas! utterly destitute of any motive powerful enough to command labors, sufferings, or contributions in the cause of the Gospel; or worse,—they are sarcastically hostile to

the 'visionary and useless crusade of the times.' Scarcely one lay Unitarian in a hundred confesses a zeal like his own; and nothing could be more preposterous than to hope, that the party at large should be moved to bring forward their twenty or fifty thousand pounds per annum, for the support of a religious undertaking. What but an utter despondency, what but an anguish of sorrow, belongs then, in this age of religious zeal, to the zealous Unitarian minister? What can be added to the discomfort of his lot,—unless it be the dark surmises which naturally spring from the perplexity of his position, and the faintness which that perplexity forces on his heart? 'After all,' must he be tempted to say, 'is this Christianity, which proves itself to be potent only when corrupted, and becomes utterly effete when pure, worth the spending of life, fortune family, welfare, talents, reputation, in its service? Why occupy a life in attempting to purge the feculence of a system which, when thoroughly purged, lies motionless as a corpse? Does Heaven indeed demand so large a sacrifice to so little purpose?—Racking and interminable questions! Wretched condition of inextricable doubt! Better than endure it, to plunge into the oblivious flood of absolute and universal skepticism."

At the close of these long and interesting extracts, we need only add, that the writer confirms most of his statements by quotations from Unitarians themselves, particularly from articles in the Monthly Repository—the same to which we referred in our number for May last, in giving an account of the "state of Unitarianism in England." To the quotations we then made from the Repository, we now add another, showing that some of the Unitarian clergy of England *feel* the miseries of their situation, much as they have been described in the foregoing extracts.

"Few beings are more to be pitied than a Unitarian minister, placed in one of these old societies. A man of education, with the miserable pittance of some seventy pounds per year, which, with much toil and solicitude, he *may* perhaps, but not in all cases, raise to a bare hundred! With this, he has a wife and children to support, and a decent appearance to maintain. Nor is this insignificant sum to be obtained without sundry and constant vexations from trustee influence and trustee domination. If animated by a laudable wish to extend the boundaries of his pasture, the minister is encountered by coldness and opposition. The poor, who attend his services, would gladly lend their countenance and aid. But the great man, who is also the keeper of the purse, frowns the intention down. On other occasions, the minister is checked in his purposes for want of pecuniary assistance; or by the engagements and vexations of a school. There are many, very many of our ministers in this condition."

Again; "The Unitarian is an insulated being. He stands apart from the rest of his fellow Christians. If he has society out of his own connection, he must seek it with those who believe less, not more than himself: if he wishes to be friendly with the Orthodox, he

is looked at with distance : if to join in their benevolent plans, with avoidance : if to rectify their errors, with horror. He can find his way neither to their head nor their heart. The public services of his temple, they avoid as they would a lazaret-house. He is cabined, cribbed, and confined on all sides ; his days are spent in inaction, and his charities are narrowed by reason of restraint. He is a stranger in a strange land ; having a peculiar language, a peculiar spirit, a peculiar creed."\*

In view of the facts which have been exhibited, more particularly in our last number, it appears that Unitarianism has spread itself in this country and in England, by much the same means. In neither, has it sprung up like other sects, and made provision for itself, and flourished on its own resources ; but has crowded itself into the labors of others, and clandestinely taken possession of endowments intended by their original proprietors for the promotion of a very different system of faith. Of the two hundred and six Unitarian chapels in England, only thirty-six were built by Unitarians of their own bounty ;—and of the places of worship which they claim in New England, only a small proportion were provided and intended for teaching and worship such as theirs. Nearly all their larger and more respectable establishments were originally Orthodox, and are the fruits of Orthodox liberality and zeal.

In old England, the friends of truth were driven from their altars, and deprived of the means of supporting religious institutions left them by their pious fathers, in most instances, through the mismanagement of corrupt and unfaithful trustees. "The Trustees *obtruded* a Socinian ministry," and the defrauded and famishing congregations withdrew, and sought the bread of life in other places. In this country, too, the churches of the Pilgrims have, in several instances, been judicially annihilated, declared incapable of independent action or existence, and been stripped of their property, to the last farthing, to satisfy the cravings of a Unitarian parish.

The reader may wish to be informed more particularly than he has been, by what means the trustees of the English Presbyterian endowments, who in the first instance were faithful men, became so generally corrupted with Unitarian errors. The following extract will satisfy him on this point, while at the same time it describes, with almost literal accuracy, the manner in which the heresy obtained footing in this country.

"When the Dissenting Ministers were no longer liable to fines, imprisonment, and death, for preaching the Gospel, there were many persons, who from the most unsuitable motives, solicited and obtained the ministerial office, and who feeling no attachment to the doctrines of Christianity, refrained always from enforcing, and often from introducing them in their sermons ; and thus, being at first in-

\* Monthly Repository, N. S. Vol. iii. pp. 764, 696.



different, they soon became latitudinarian, and then altogether erroneous. The unsuspecting indulgence of some who were truly Orthodox, gave an unhappy facility to this introduction of error, while many of the children of the old Dissenters began to sympathize with their contemporary preachers, and thus the Churches gradually assumed a mixed character, without either party acknowledging a necessity of separation. Young men who had been destined to the ministry in early life, and had actually entered upon that office without experiencing a change of heart, fostered the growing evil; and the Orthodox and Heterodox continued to preach in one pulpit, and to commune at one Table. Thus did unconverted Ministers, introduce those anti-christian doctrines, which were not resisted with sufficient zeal even by the truly pious of those days, and *which proved so palatable to unconverted Trustees, as to induce them to embrace every opportunity of appointing such ministers to the vacant pulpits of the Orthodox.* It was in the form of Arianism, however, that error first crept in. Socinianism broadly and distinctly avowed, could not then have gained admission: but Arianism, by preserving many of the modes of Orthodox expression and behaviour, was less shocking to the minds of the pious, and more seductive to the hearts of the unstable; and thus Orthodox ministers were willing to accept of colleagues who held the Arian scheme, and Orthodox church members regarded their Arian fellow communicants as Christian brethren."

Thus Unitarianism crept in and desolated many of the churches in our father land; and thus also it gained admission here. It came among us, not honestly and boldly, but by deception and stealth. Ministers were settled, perhaps, under a profession of strict Orthodoxy, when they were in fact Arminians; or under a profession of Arminianism, when they were secretly Arians, Socinians, or Universalists. In some instances, ministers after settlement changed their sentiments; but still continued to preach much in the same terms and manner as before. The old phraseology was accommodated to the new divinity, so that while they meant one thing by what they said, their hearers understood them to mean another. The discussion of important doctrines was discontinued, under the pretence that doctrines were of no importance, until they were so far undervalued or forgotten, that they could with safety be assailed and ridiculed.

As in England, so in this country, a separation of the Orthodox from the heterodox was not suddenly effected. Indeed, from the manner in which the error was introduced, this could hardly be expected. Many Orthodox ministers were slow to believe that their brethren around them had departed from the faith, and were unwilling to renounce fellowship but upon the clearest evidence.

And as in England, so here, it was while this unhalloved connexion continued, that the error made the greatest progress.

"Had this treacherous calm remained undisturbed,—could it

have been contrived, by continuing to lull the suspicions of the Orthodox, to perpetuate this incongruous association, this connexion of the living with the dead,—there is reason to fear that the whole body would have been paralysed beyond recovery : but the premature explosion of Arianism at Exeter, was overruled to prevent what otherwise might have been the silent, unsuspected and total extinction of piety in these churches. Then the Orthodox were roused to a salutary alarm, and began to perceive the folly of their previous indulgence of false doctrine. For a season the progress of error was suspended : but it had gone too far to be repressed by that discountenance which it received too late. The Churches which the Orthodox were constrained to abandon, being thus free from all constraint, soon passed from Arianism to Socinianism, and became, what we now behold them, the sepulchres of evangelical truth.

The days which preceded this separation were the best days of those who have thus departed from the right way. While the Orthodox, either from ignorance of their true character, or from too great indulgence for their erroneous sentiments, continued them in their fellowship, they derived from that association respectability and weight ; until at length they found themselves strong enough to reject the patronage which they had courted, and even to expel those who had cherished them in their weakness. But when they were detected, disowned, and abandoned by the Orthodox, their system began to wither and decay—it has continually declined, and had long ago been extinct, but for their usurpation of Orthodox funds.”

How exactly this describes the course of things among ourselves must be obvious to every intelligent reader,—except that the separation here is not of sufficient standing for that consequent decline to be fully manifested, which is so visible in the land of our fathers. But let our ministers and churches do their duty, and the experiment will show sooner here than there, that Unitarianism lacks the vital principle, and that when left to its own resources, it is sure to fall.

Something was said in our last of the “ Manchester College,” the only public Unitarian theological Seminary in England, and of the manner in which it is sustained. Mr. Wellbeloved, the theological tutor, is supported chiefly, if not entirely, out of the funds of the Orthodox Lady Hewley, and there are five other Orthodox charitable endowments, one of them producing 120 pounds annually, the income of which is applied to the support of students. Like criminal perversions on this side of the water will instantly suggest themselves to the mind of the reader. We have here a Unitarian theological Professor receiving year after year the income of funds, a part of which was given by the Orthodox Hollis for the support of a man “ of sound or Orthodox principles,” and another part by the Orthodox Henschman, for the support of

one who should "profess and teach the principles of the Christian religion, according to the well known [Orthodox] Confession of Faith, drawn up by the Synod of the churches in New England." There are also funds to a large amount, given by men of Orthodox sentiments, such as Hopkins and Hollis, for the assistance of pious and indigent young men in preparing for the gospel ministry, all which (if they were not lost in the general dilapidation of funds supposed to have taken place at Harvard under a former administration) are now applied to the support of Unitarian theologues—men who are qualifying themselves to assail with greater effect the faith of those on whose bounty they are fed.

We need not trace the comparison further between the history and character of Unitarianism in this country and in England. It is manifestly the same in both hemispheres, exhibiting the same features, adopting the same general measures, and leading to the same results. It has shown itself, here and there, to be a thievish, underhand system, not gifted in building temples, creating endowments, and making provision for itself, but disposed rather to crowd into the labors of others, take possession of their temples, seize and pervert their funds, and turn them to its own account. As shown by the Eclectic Reviewers, and as acknowledged by some of its own advocates, Unitarianism has never exhibited a Missionary spirit. It has little or nothing to tell of the labors, sufferings and successes of its representatives in heathen lands. Its boasts are of a very different character. Unlike the great primitive Missionary, who would not 'preach the gospel where Christ was named, lest he should build on another man's foundation,' the professors of this doctrine have ever been creeping in and corrupting established churches, pillaging their accommodations, and fattening on the fruits of their liberality and zeal. So did the Arians in the fourth century; and Unitarians of modern times,—in Germany, Switzerland, France, Great Britain, and the United States—have done the same. We say not these things because we are glad of an opportunity to say them, but because they are the truth, the painful truth, which the pen of history has recorded, and will record.

No other argument surely is needed, to show that Unitarianism cannot be the gospel of Jesus. To say nothing of theological opinions, who can for a moment believe that the gospel of our blessed Lord inculcates a *morality* such as this—such as is now exhibited before the world in the public acts of the Unitarians of England?

"If Trustees are not amenable to Trust Deeds, but Trust Deeds are to be subservient to Trustees, why incur the expense, why practise the imposture of preparing Trust Deeds at all? Is the public mind prepared to admit, that it is in vain for persons who bequeath property to religious or charitable uses, to specify the purposes and

design of their endowment?—that the sanction of the Law is insufficient to secure the validity of a legal instrument?"

"But if it be legal, honest, and righteous to *make* a Trust Deed, it cannot be legal, honest, and righteous to *break* a Trust Deed; nor will any pretence whatever, short of legal or physical impossibility, justify a departure either from its spirit or letter."

"To say, as the Unitarians do,\* that when it is "INEXPEDIENT" to fulfil exactly the intentions of the founders, the Trustees have a right "to consider what might *probably* have been the views of the founders under the *new circumstances* which may have arisen, and what *upon the whole* is best to be done," is to teach a doctrine, which, if it prevailed, would reduce mankind to a state of lawless barbarism, without recorded rights, and without a standard of justice. It would destroy all social confidence, and render our tribunals and judicial proceedings a solemn mockery."

Near the close of our remarks in the last number, we touched upon forms of *church government*, as connected with the continued purity of churches. The subject is one of so great importance, that we are unwilling to conclude without recurring to it.

The only security for any church, that they will continue in the main pure, rests on their assuming such a form, that they cannot operate and accomplish their purposes without a perpetual resort to the principle of piety, as lying at the foundation of their organization. This must be the spirit pervading their form, and if their form will, for a long season, permit them to go on without self-destruction, disregarding the spirit, and without the spirit, then it is demonstrative from Scripture, from philosophy and from fact, that error will come in like a flood, and destroy everything but the form of godliness. We have often wondered that pious thinking men have not studied this subject in the sad history of some of the branches of the protestant church. The reason probably is, they have been so pressed in spirit, as they looked abroad upon the world, and beheld the awful ravages of sin, that they have been constrained to put forth every energy to stay the overwhelming flood, even though it were only by a temporary expedient. And while thus engaged, they have forgotten that the only sure hope is the energy of vital piety pervading and shooting up through the public form of religion, and varying that form in any way that can give new egress to the principle. Christianity comes to us without form, that it may be omniform;—that it may be seen and known anywhere and everywhere as a collection of vital principles. This the protestant church have to a great extent forgotten, while they have been compassing themselves about by bulwarks of their own construction. They have their systems, their forms, their courts, their canons, their liturgies, their rituals, and all the *et cetera* of establishments and authorities;—and what has

\* Monthly Repository, March 1825, p. 158.

been the result? Look at Geneva. Her churches deserted, except by a few women! Her pastors Socinians and Rationalists! Look at France. Her churches, too, in many instances deserted, and her Pastors little better than those of Geneva! Look at Germany, and the protestant church in the north of Europe. And what is it, but a mighty temple in ruins, with only here and there a stone in its place! Look at England! The party, which *par excellence* call themselves "the church," and are the majority, including the dignitaries, are Arminian or Grotian in their religious sentiments, breathing much of the spirit, though they *scorn* the name of Unitarianism. Look at Scotland! And how long is it since Robertson, the historian, was among her most influential ministers!! And with such mighty men as Gordon, and Thomson, and Chalmers in the Evangelical party, they are still out numbered by the opposers of the truth. And it has not fared much better with Presbyterianism in Ireland. It is but the last year, that sixteen or twenty clergymen in the Synod of Ulster, who all along had agreed to the Assembly's Catechism, on being required explicitly to state whether they believed the doctrine of the Trinity, withdrew and cried "*persecution!*" And this, while not a single Independent congregation in Ireland has become Arian or Unitarian!! We wish thinking men, who love religion and men's souls more than any *ism* or any *doxy*, would ask how all this has come to pass, and how its recurrence may be prevented? And in connexion with this topic, we wish them to note one or two facts;—that of all the hopeful appearances on the continent of Europe of a revival of religion in the protestant churches, none of it has originated from, or in connection with, their forms of church government, but in spite of them; and, in some cases, in actual opposition to them;—and that of all the benevolent operations originated in Great Britain, within the last thirty-five years, scarcely one has arisen from, or in agreement with, the existing forms of church government, if we except those of the Independents, who had almost no ecclesiastical forms to consult, but were left to follow the living principle within.

It should be further inquired, in connexion with the same subject, whether nearly all the Evangelical piety, which is beginning to pervade the Protestant churches abroad, is not coming in *ab extra*, in distinction from growing up out of their various forms where they exist; and whether, indeed, a long and tedious warfare is not to be maintained with the mere forms which have been superinduced upon the church, before the spirit of religion shall be the pervading principle of all church organization. Nor do we think it necessary that the examination should be confined to the churches across the water. Could we suppose even-handed charity, the charity inculcated by the apostle, (1 Cor. xiii.) coming into *our*

land to take inquisition of the various denominations, how they are, or have been fulfilling their high commission, as churches of our Lord Jesus Christ, we should rejoice to hear her ask, 'Where did the Missionary spirit arise? Among whom is it most extensively prevalent? Who have taken into their hands most of those weapons which are not carnal, and are most active in using them for *truth's sake*, and not for *name's sake*? Who have most of the energy and determination of faith requisite for the conversion of the world? Among whom are there the most frequent disputes about modes of doing, and modes of acting? Among whom is the fire of zeal most idly wasted in agitating questions of names and forms? We should rejoice to hear her command justice to bring the scales, that it might be known who is most wanting;—to hear her command fire from Heaven, to see who would suffer most loss, when the wood, and the hay, and the stubble should be consumed; and then to hear her say, 'Follow me,' that it might be seen what companies would obey, and receive her spirit, and become incorporate *with her form*; and what would cry out, "Stop, stop," you are violating *our* book of discipline, or *our* canons, or *our* modes. We should rejoice to see this, for we have no fear that *any* would suffer *materially*; and if *we* should be among the denuded, we would endeavor to feel and to say, "Let the righteous smite me, it shall be a kindness; let him reprove me, it shall be an excellent oil, which shall not break my head."

ESSAY ON THE HIEROGLYPHIC SYSTEM OF M. CHAMPOLLION, JR. and on the advantages which it offers to Sacred Criticism. By J. G. H. Greppo, vicar General of Belley. Translated from the French by ISAAC STUART, with notes and illustrations. Boston: Perkins and Marvin, 1830. pp. 276.

The Euphrates and the Nile stand associated with the origin of civil society, and with the primeval fountains of human knowledge. The records of the ages immediately succeeding the deluge, save what is found in the brief epitome of Moses, are not only scanty, but uncertain. Whatever facts, therefore, critical research may glean from the sparse materials, recovered from the archives of bygone ages, will not only be valuable in the estimation of the scholar, but interesting to the intelligent Christian. More especially will this be the case, as it respects the history of ancient Egypt. This nation, though founded subsequently to Nimrod's Babylon, and to Nineveh, is the first that assumes a permanent existence; the first that figures conspicuously in sacred or profane

history. Its antiquities, which belong to the earliest remaining achievements of human knowledge and enterprise, and which have survived the ravages of thirty-five centuries, are not undeserving the attention, which, for a long time, they have awakened, and which is greatly increased by the recent and curious discoveries of science.

The literary itinerant, who surveys the ivy-mantled walls of feudal castles, or who walks among the ruins of Pompeium and Herculaneum, cannot restrain the emotions of solemn awe, which the surrounding scenery will awaken. A still deeper feeling will be excited, as he gazes upon the mouldering monuments of Grecian architecture, or explores the sepulchral vaults which contain the ashes of the prophets, and visits places memorable in sacred history. But when he comes to traverse the banks of the Nile, he finds himself on ground, where civilization had smoothed the rugged features of society, where intellect had developed its treasures of wisdom, and where art had reared stupendous fabrics, and decorated them with sculpture and painting, before Greece had emerged from a barbarous age, or Palestine had been honored with the residence of a prophet. He will find himself in the midst of monuments and records, regarded as antiquities, centuries before the Christian era commenced. Here, indeed, must he surrender himself to the strong excitement of a profound veneration, nor can he suppress the curiosity that will be awakened, to acquire more knowledge of a people who were the ancient and original pioneers in the work of human improvement.

The absence of authentic documents, relating to the history of ancient Egypt, has been a matter of deep regret, both to the lover of general literature, and the biblical scholar. The memorials which have come down to us from that people, naturally excite a strong desire to possess a more definite knowledge of their character and history, than is furnished by the means hitherto enjoyed. Probably their archives would have proved sufficiently explicit and ample, had they escaped the hands of those ruthless invaders, by whom the country, at different times, was overrun. When the savage and reckless Omar, in a freak of Mahomedan fanaticism, doomed to the flames the renowned library of the Ptolemies, history lost a depository of boundless riches, which might have revealed in ample details the story of those vanished ages, concerning which so little is known. The little that is known, however, tells of a people great and powerful—a people far advanced in civilization and the arts, at a time when most of the human family existed as semi-barbarous clans, or Nomadic tribes, rather than as settled states, under an established form of government. “Their temples, their pyramids, their obelisks, their colossal statues, their magnificent cemeteries, their paintings, whose colors and freshness time seems to have respected, all their monuments, in a word, from the amulet to the most gigantic edifices,

from the dwellings of the gods or kings, down to the most common object employed in the domestic occupations of the poor, all serve strongly to impress our imaginations with their grandeur, or to astonish us with the fineness and delicacy of their details."

Where written documents are wanting, recourse is had to fragments, and the legends of monumental history, as a substitute. Egypt, proverbially a land of monuments, has long been supposed to be rich in such materials, if some master spirit might arise, who should be competent to rescue them from the dust of ages, and reveal their true meaning. Many an accomplished connoisseur has tasked his ingenuity, in order to decypher the mysterious characters, with which the monuments of Egypt were covered; but all such attempts have, till recently, proved abortive, except in conjecture and hypothesis. As little advance seemed to be made towards a solution of the Hieroglyphic system, the hope of rescuing the information concealed beneath the unknown characters of this system was about being abandoned. The key was supposed to be irrecoverably lost. At this crisis, the bold, acute, and enterprising spirit of M. Champollion renewed the investigation, which many learned predecessors had abandoned in despair. His indefatigable researches and keen discernment, led to the discovery of the long sought key, by which "the great problem of Hieroglyphics" has been solved, and the mysteries revealed, which had for ages been hidden beneath them. It admits of a doubt, whether the materials furnished by the vast store-house of antiquities now laid open, will fully meet the extravagant expectations which have been excited. Yet no small benefit will be realized, in the satisfaction of that literary curiosity, which has been so exceedingly anxious to open the book of Egypt's monumental records, and loose the seals thereof.

The chronicles of Egypt, like those of Hindoostan and Chaldea, carry the nation back to an epoch of incredible antiquity; and they commence its existence in a mystic age, when gods and demi-gods swayed the destinies of empire. This fabulous period is represented as having continued about thirty-four thousand years, when the celestial Hierarchy resigned the kingdom to a succession of mortal dynasties.

Five chronological periods have been assigned to Egyptian history. "The first," says Spineto, "begins with the establishment of their government, and comprehends the time during which all religious and political authority was in the hands of the priesthood, who laid the first foundation of the future power of Egypt, founding and embellishing the great city of *Thebes*, building magnificent temples, and instituting the mysteries of *Isis*,"—from Misraim to

\* *Isis*, according to Jabloniski, represented the moon, which the Egyptians worshipped. She was recognized in a variety of capacities, as the inventress of agriculture, the divinity who contained within herself the seeds of productive nature, as the inventress of navigation, &c. [See Appendix, Note M.]



Menes." This whole period lies beyond the limits of authentic history, nor have any legendary inscriptions or fragments been discovered which recognize those primitive times. Whatever traditions exist relating to that age, wear too much the aspect of fable to inspire confidence. Not even its duration can be ascertained with any tolerable degree of certainty. The probability is, that it commenced soon after the dispersion of Noah's posterity, from their settlement in the plains of Shinar, and continued till the reign of Menes, the monarch who stands at the head of the long chain of Egyptian dynasties, according to the list of Manetho.

The second period, according to the author quoted above, begins at the abolition of the primitive government, and the first establishment of monarchy by the king just named. From this epoch commences the Pharaonic age, which continued till the invasion of the Persian conqueror Cambyses, when the sceptre departed from the illustrious line of the Pharaohs, and came into the hands of the Ptolemies. The reign of Menes commenced, as chronologists have reckoned, about the middle of the second century after the flood. Silberschlag dates it near the beginning of the third century, which probably is the more accurate calculation.\* The site of his kingdom was in Upper Egypt, in the neighborhood of Thebes. It does not admit of a doubt, that civilization first dawned in the Thebain District, and thence descended the Nile. Thebes, Memphis, and Tanis, appear to have been successively the places of royal residence, and at certain periods the capitals of separate and contemporary kingdoms.

When Abraham went down to Egypt, which according to Dr. Jahn was in the latter part of the fourth century from the flood, he found a flourishing agriculture, an established form of government, and a Pharaoh on the throne, who had a regular ministry around him, and courtiers and princes, who seem to have been devoted to the pleasure of their master. (Gen. xii: 15.) It was not far from this time that a part of the country was brought under the domination of a ferocious race of ancient Vandals, headed by a horde of chieftains, denominated *Hykshos*, or shepherd-kings. The site of their dynasty was Memphis, where they reigned not far from two hundred and sixty years, (longer according to some chronologists) and spread devastation over a large part of Egypt. Few of the monuments, existing antecedent to this period, escaped the destruction in which a savage ambition gloried. Who they were, and whence they came, and what is their history, are questions beyond the pale of historic solution. In the mean time, the native sovereigns of the Nile so far resisted the encroachments of

\* The period of two centuries does not give too long a time for such an increase of the posterity of Noah, as seems to be implied in the fact, that there were several remote and independent states, when Egypt was erected into a monarchy; though the rate of increase exceeded that of later ages.

these foreign invaders, as to retain a part of their dominions. The table of Abydas, discovered among the ruins of a temple by M. Calliaud, and interpreted by Champollion, contains a catalogue of the kings who reigned contemporary with the Hykshos sovereigns. It was one of the kings of this dynasty, (the seventeenth of Manetho,) who reigned at the epoch of Abraham's migration.

Beyond the period of which we have just spoken, Egypt is for the most part covered with the mist and shadow of a fabulous age. Nor is there much probability, that any authentic data will be recovered, that shall be competent to clear up this darkness, and rescue from oblivion the memory of perished generations. And indeed there is so much confusion, discrepancy, allegory, and fable, blended with subsequent history, that it is no easy task to discriminate satisfactorily between truth and falsehood, fact and fiction. This difficulty may, perhaps, be removed in part by the disclosures of Champollion. So far as his labors shall lead to such a result, the annals of "the olden time," will be rendered less dubious, and consequently much more valuable.

It is in the province of *sacred criticism*, however, that we are most concerned to be put in possession of new light respecting Egypt, subsequent to the time of Joseph. Whatever information may be retrieved from "dumb forgetfulness," touching the state of Egypt from the eighteenth Diospolite dynasty to the Ptolemaic dominion, will not only enrich secular history, but add some precious materials to the stores of sacred criticism. It is in view of the elucidation of the latter subject, that we have watched with great interest the progress of the learned Champollion in his researches.

But it is time that we introduce to the attention of our readers, the work of M. Greppo, noticed in the heading of this article. The special design of this work is to apply the discoveries of this great Egyptian scholar to the purposes of sacred criticism. We have for some time wished to meet something of the kind, and acknowledge ourselves obliged, not only to the Vicar of Belley for his very acceptable book, but to his judicious and faithful translator. In respect to the merits of the translation, we add our cheerful testimony to the perspicuity and purity of the style; and, considering the nature of the work, we can well conceive, that it must have cost no small labor to give it an English dress so neatly finished. Its value is greatly enhanced by the original and learned notes included in the appendix. The mechanical execution is of the first order, and the whole work, as to matter and form, is not unworthy the interesting subject of which it treats. We recommend to every person who may read this article, if he has aught of the enthusiasm of the biblical antiquary, to procure the book, and give it a thorough perusal.

In commenting on such of the results of Champollion's discoveries, as stand connected with certain portions of the sacred annals,

we shall avail ourselves of the observations found in the work under review, as well as other sources at our command. This work consists of two parts; the first gives an exposé of the Hieroglyphic system. Of this part, neither our limits nor object will admit of more than a very brief notice.

From the sixteenth century, unwearied efforts have been made to lift the mysterious covering, which concealed beneath it the meaning of numerous inscriptions, found upon the Pharaonic monuments, as well as the treasures of papyrus records, which were deposited in temples and cemeteries. It was not till after ages of abortive research, that the key was discovered, which has solved the hieroglyphic problem. The circumstance which aided the discovery may be related in the language of the author.

"The monument which finally led to the knowledge of the ancient writings of Egypt, was discovered at the close of the last century. While the French troops were carrying on the war in Egypt, and a commission of learned men, associated with the expedition, were exploring this ancient country with a view to advance the arts and sciences, one division of the army occupied the village of *Raschid*, which we call *Rosetta*, and were employed in laboring upon some military works. While digging the foundations of the fort St. Julien, they found a large mutilated block of black basalt, which was covered with a considerable portion of *three inscriptions in different characters*. One of the inscriptions, written in Greek, contained a decree in honor of Ptolemy Epiphanes, and suggested the idea that the same decree was the subject of the two other inscriptions, which were written in two distinct kinds of Egyptian characters, the *sacred* or hieroglyphic, and the *enchorial*, or common character of the country."

This *polyglot* monument, by contrasting the Egyptian texts with a Greek inscription containing a translation of them, shed a gleam of new light over the writings of ancient Egypt. It had been the general belief until now, M. Greppo observes, that the hieroglyphic writing was exclusively *ideographic*, i. e. figurative or symbolical, and that each sign employed expressed of itself an idea. Those ancient writers, who have alluded to this subject, have been entirely silent respecting any other method, except the ideographic part of Egypt's monumental writing. From nothing which they have said could the use of an *alphabetic* writing be conjectured. We must except Clement of Alexandria, the author of the only document from antiquity, which furnishes an exact account of the various kinds of Egyptian writing. And this account is so concise, that it has not been understood; though it is matter of surprise, that it has never suggested to any of its learned commentators the simple idea, which was at last originated in the mind of Champollion, as the clue to his discoveries. He had the sagacity to perceive, that the ideographic system must necessarily admit of exceptions; since it could not express *proper names*, which are not always significant, especially such names as should be introduced from foreign countries. To supply this insufficiency in the supposed hieroglyphic method, it was necessary to recur to a system of writing analogous to that of other nations. It was conjectured,

that there must exist among the Egyptians *phonetic* signs, i. e. signs which should in some way express the sounds of the spoken language.

Having hit upon this very rational hypothesis, Champollion undertook to test its truth, by applying it to the hieroglyphic and Greek inscriptions on the Rosetta monument. In the Greek text of the decree there inscribed, the name of *Ptolemy* often occurred. Likewise in the hieroglyphic inscription a group of signs was observed to be frequently repeated, contained in *cartouches* or rings. By this last mark of distinction, as well as by its relative position in the text, the hieroglyphic group appeared to correspond with the name of Ptolemy in the Greek inscription. It might then be supposed with good reason, that the group of signs clustered in the ring expressed *phonetically* the name of this king;—and this conjecture produced the expectation, that by decomposing the group of characters, to which such a signification was attributed, some of the first elements of alphabetic writing might be found. By proceeding to analyze the group selected for the experiment, and noting each of the signs which composed it, he recognized their correspondence, as he thought, with the letters, Π.Τ.Ο.Α.Μ.Η.Σ (Ptolemês.) The success of this analysis induced him to search for other bilingual inscriptions, to which he applied the same principle of interpretation, and with like success. Fired by the ardor which his discovery kindled, he prosecuted the business of examining and comparing the hieroglyphic texts, with an iron diligence and a quenchless zeal. The inscriptions of temples, obelisks, mummy-coffins, tombstones, scarabees, figurines, papyri, in a word Egyptian monuments of every kind, and of all ages, have furnished new facts in support of the discovery.

Such is the substance of M. Greppo's account of the method, which has resulted in the solution of a mystery, that had hung for centuries over the monumental writings of the Pharaonic age. It has been ascertained likewise, that Egypt possessed three entirely distinct kinds of writing, which were appropriated to different uses. First, the common writing, denominated *demotic* by Herodotus and others; secondly, the *hieratic*; thirdly, the *hieroglyphic*. Again, the hieroglyphic method of writing comprises three modes, viz., the *phonetic*, in which the signs correspond with the primitive letters of the alphabet,—the *ideographic*, in which the signs are proper imitations of the things expressed,—and the *symbolic*, which express ideas by tropes and enigmas, and by means of analogies. The last two methods are included by Champollion in one division, viz., *ideographic*, which employs one set of signs, that are imitations of the figure, shape, or form of some sensible object, or of one supposed to be so; and uses another set of signs to express abstract ideas, such signs as had relations to these ideas more or less distinct, real or supposed.\*

\* See Appendix, Note F. p. 199.

It would be foreign from our purpose to illustrate in detail these different kinds of hieroglyphics. The reader is referred to the work of M. Greppo for further information on the subject; and for still more copious illustrations, he may consult Champollion's *Précis du Système Hiéroglyphique*. Nor have we time to consider the results of these discoveries, as they stand related to the province of the philosopher, the antiquary, and the secular historian. As it respects the chronology of the arts, it has been ascertained, that the most beautiful of those monuments which still remain on Egyptian territory, or of those which have been transported to Europe;—those which excite the highest admiration among well informed men, relate to the first epoch of Egyptian style, and belong to the kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, whose names or surnames are inscribed upon them. It was under these illustrious dynasties, that the Hebrews commenced and continued their residence on the banks of the Nile, and were finally delivered from their oppressive condition by the hand of Moses. And were those monuments but to tell the story of their origin, some of them would doubtless inform, that the herculean labor of their structure constituted no small part of the task, under whose oppressive severity the sons of Israel groaned.

The relation which the Hebrews sustained to the Egyptians, and the frequent allusions of sacred history to the latter people, renders their ancient records more interesting and valuable, especially to the believer in revealed religion. An intercourse was kept up between these two nations from the time of Jacob, till the Babylonian captivity. During the centuries which the Hebrews spent under the dominion of the Pharaohs, there must have been an interchange of customs, language, and manners, that would modify more or less the moral physiognomy of each people. With reference to this point M. Greppo has the following pertinent remarks:—

“It is then indisputable, and it has long been understood, that the Hebrews and Egyptians should be studied together and in their relations; that the customs and history of Egypt, if better studied and better understood, would throw great light upon the history and customs of the people of God; in a word that the Pharaonic antiquities, if it were possible to lift up the veil, would form the best historic commentary upon a portion of the holy books, and especially upon the *Pentateuch*. But we were, not long since, still far from this result. To know Egypt, its history and customs, to facilitate the comparative study of the two nations, the banks of the Nile must needs be explored with the most untiring perseverance; their monuments, sketched with care, must be compared and commented upon with judgement; and especially, which we hardly dared to expect, they must cease to be unintelligible to us. Such is now the case; the land of the Pharaohs has been visited by numerous and learned travellers, and, for the first time, an army has been seen extending its protection to the peaceable researches of science. Egypt has been described in a work where all the arts are displayed with a magnificence truly regal. Finally, Providence, which has directed in our age the discovery of hieroglyphics, has given a mouth to the monuments, which for so many centuries have been wrapped in silence. Should not this happy concurrence of circumstances lead us to hope for many most important aids to sacred criticism? In proportion as the science which owes its origin to Champollion, shall successively reach the developements it promises,

we must see those narratives of the sacred books in which Egypt is so conspicuous, more and more confirmed and illustrated; and already, though the study of hieroglyphics is in its infancy, many precious documents have aided in the understanding and defence of the Scriptures."

The plan, which our author has pursued is to consider the *philological*, *historical*, and *geographical* results, which grow out of the application of hieroglyphics to the sacred books, and the means which they afford for a satisfactory solution of certain weighty difficulties.

It has been supposed, that there were some resemblances between the ancient Egyptian and Hebrew languages. The truth of this conjecture has been confirmed by the recent discoveries, as will appear from a careful collection of the alphabetic characters of the two languages. The similarity of the Coptic and Hebrew alphabetic sounds is very great. The analogies and resemblances between these two ancient languages furnish a topic of interesting discussion for the Hebrew critic; and when Champollion shall have completed his researches in regard to the language of Egypt, new and important light may be thrown on this interesting article of philology.

There is a striking analogy in the style and idiom of certain Egyptian compositions and those of the Hebrews. A great similarity has been observed in the manner of spelling proper names. On a funeral manuscript has been discovered the name of *Potiphar*, the official designation of the ruler to whom Joseph was sold. The hieroglyphic characters which compose this name, when rendered by equivalent alphabetic signs, give the reading Pëtèphree, the same as found in the Coptic version of Genesis; and its correspondence with the Hebrew name, shows the historic exactness of the Scriptures in the minutest details. Though the philological analogies and resemblances between these venerable languages, which have perpetuated the earliest records of human knowledge, have been but partially developed, yet conclusions are already warranted of a highly interesting nature, which we hail as an earnest of what may be anticipated, when the hidden treasures of Egyptian wisdom shall have been more fully explored. The abstract nature of this subject, interesting only to the biblical critic, compels us to forego further remarks, and to pass on to a consideration of what will be regarded as the more important division of the work before us.

(To be Concluded.)

---

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THE BIBLICAL REPOSITORY. NO. 1. JANUARY, 1831. CONDUCTED BY EDWARD ROBINSON, *Professor Extraordinary in the Theological Seminary at Andover*. Andover: Flagg and Gould. pp. 198.

This first number of the Biblical Repository bears unequivocal testimony to the ability and diligence of the Editor, and is particularly valuable as detailing, in part, the results of his researches and observations, during his long residence in France and Germany. It contains the following articles: I. Theological Education in Germany, by the Editor. II. Interpretation of Psalm xvi, by Professor Stuart. III. Grammatico-Historical Interpretation of the Scriptures, by Professor Hahn of Leipsic; translated by the Editor. IV. Remarks on Hahn's Definition of Interpretation, and some Topics connected with it, by Professor Stuart. V. Grammatical Accuracy of the Writers of the New Testament, by Professor Tittman of Leipsic; translated by the Editor. VI. Theological Literature and Education in Italy, by Professor Tholuck of Halle; Translated by the Editor. VII. Literary Notices, by the Editor. Of the relative merits of these articles, different opinions will doubtless be entertained. We were particularly interested with the first, third, and fourth. Professor Stuart's Interpretation of Psalm xvith, in the second article, is learned and able, containing an examination of the several views which have been taken of this Psalm, and a discussion of some important general principles. The writer applies this portion of Scripture exclusively to the Messiah. His principal reason for such an application is, that a portion of it is expressly so applied by the Apostles Peter and Paul (Acts ii. 25—28, and xiii. 35); and if a part of the Psalm applies to Christ, the remainder, it is insisted, must be similarly applied, since the same person is represented as speaking through the whole of it. We cannot say that we are entirely satisfied as to the correctness of this principle; in other words, we are not satisfied that certain portions of the same Psalm, or Chapter may not refer to the literal David, or to some other man, as a type of Christ, and other portions to Christ, the antitype, without any apparent change of person. For instance; when God forbade David to build him an house, he promised that he would raise up one of his sons (Solomon) to do this great work; that he would 'settle him in his house and in his kingdom forever; and that his throne should be established forevermore.' See I Chron. xvii. 14. A part of this promise certainly applies to Solomon; and is it not equally certain that another part cannot apply to the literal Solomon, but rather to Him of whom Solomon was a type?—We know that the seventh verse of the xlth Psalm is an address of the Father to the Son, because it is so interpreted by the Apostle, Heb. i. 8. "But unto the Son, he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever," &c. But is there no difficulty in supposing the eternal Father as addressing the Son, or as speaking of him, through the whole of this Psalm? Is it not much more natural to regard the literal son of David (Solomon) as the subject of some part of it?—So in the xvith Psalm, of which an interpretation is given in the article before us;—if it relate exclusively to the Messiah, the Messiah must be understood as the person speaking, through the whole of it. And yet the Apostle Peter, in the very passage in which he applies a portion of the Psalm to Christ, represents the literal David as the Person speaking. "For David speaketh concerning him (Christ) &c. Acts ii. 25.

We are glad this subject is under discussion, and would not be understood as being very sanguine in the objections here urged. Still, we are not willing, either on our own account or that of our brethren, to depart from the ancient interpretation of this Psalm, and other similar portions of Scripture,—that given by Calvin and acquiesced in by our fathers—until we are sure that the ground on which we are invited to step is sufficient to sustain us.

In commenting on the last verse of this Psalm, 'Thou wilt show me the path of life; in thy presence is fulness of joy, and at thy right hand are pleasures forever more,' Professor Stuart has the following eloquent remarks on the preferences of Unitarians and Rationalists that the Jews had no knowledge of a future existence until after their return from Babylon.

"Fortunate people, we may exclaim then, fortunate indeed that you were carried away to a distant heathen land, and a seventy years exile! For there, among the gross idolaters of the Euphrates and Tigris' plains, you learned what all the patriarchs and prophets of the living God had never taught you—you learned that you were made in the image of God and destined to live forever! Happy people, who came to such instruction by exile—instruction more important than all which they had ever before received! But seriously; are we then to believe, that when Paul says, (or if not he, at least a writer of his age, and one of high authority in the church,) that 'Abraham looked for a city whose builder and maker is God;' that when he asserts that the ancient patriarchs 'all died in faith, having seen the promises afar off, and embraced them, and desired a better country *even a heavenly*' (Heb. 11: 10, 13—16); are we to believe that such men had no hope of immortality? Who does not know, moreover, that the Egyptians of the most ancient times, had, of all the heathen world, the most distinct and palpable hopes of immortality and belief in it? So the immortal monuments erected in the times of the patriarchs and of Moses, do testify abundantly at the present moment; as Champollion has shewn in the most convincing manner. Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus help to confirm all this, in their account of the ancient Egyptians. Now was not Moses, the great leader and lawgiver of the Hebrew nation, "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Acts 7: 22); and was he not therefore acquainted with the doctrine of immortality which lay on the very face of their religion? And if the patriarchs and Moses knew all this, (to speak of no more,) was this knowledge all lost before the time of David? Was the king of Israel, the man after God's own heart, the anointed of the Lord, more ignorant than the tyrants of a heathen throne, the worshippers of oxen and blocks of wood and stone? Believe this who will;—but when the opposers of *credulity*, the rationalists of our times, lay such a tax as this upon our understandings, for one I must decline to pay it. I revolt, if it be at the expense of being regarded as superstitious. I am yet, and for aught that I can find, am still likely to be, a great way off from believing that the people of God were so much inferior to their idolatrous and heathen neighbors, that they did not even indulge the expectation of immortality."

The first article in the Repository, on "Theological Education in Germany," is left unfinished. The part published consists of an "Introduction," and an interesting account of the "German Universities." From the "Introduction," we extract the following, relating to persons and events connected with the reformation.

"We as a nation have no antiquity, and no history, except of recent date; and our very spirit of change and improvement prevents us from preserving that which is old, merely for the sake of its antiquity. But in Germany, all is different. There a love of antiquity predominates in external things, although discarded in regard to intellectual matters; and centuries seem there to be less remote from one another, than we have here been accustomed to conceive them. The period of the Reformation seems hardly separated from the present time. The names of Luther and Melancthon are as familiar in the mouths of the people, as with us those of Washington and Franklin; and the great Reformer is regarded with the same sort of filial veneration, as is our great champion of civil liberty.



You pass through the small city of Eisleben, and visit his father's house. An inscription above the door announces that this was the birth place of Luther. A school for poor children is now kept in the house, the master of which shews you around, and explains to you the relics they have collected in the room where the Reformer was born. At Wittenberg you visit his cell in the old convent, now the location of a theological seminary; you see there the table, the huge stove, the seat in the window, just as when occupied by Luther in the beginning of his career; and it requires no great stretch of imagination to behold him and Melancthon, engaged in discussions which they little expected were to agitate the world. You enter the ancient church by the door on which Luther posted up his celebrated theses; within, the two friends lie entombed over against each other in front of the pulpit, and their portraits hang upon the walls. You go to the spot where Luther publicly burned the pope's bull, and thus cut off all hope of reconciliation; you walk the streets of the city; and all now remains as it was then. The persons and the generation are gone; but their place, and their houses, and their streets, and all the objects by which they were surrounded, are still before you, and are now presented to your eyes, just as once they met their view. In such circumstances, it is almost with a painful feeling, that you wake as it were from a dream, and call to mind, that all this refers back to a hundred years before the earliest settlement of your native land. The ruined castles and massy churches which one everywhere sees, are monuments of still earlier ages; and are associated with the history and the legends of a thousand years. The past and the present here take hold of each other; and the ages that lie between them seem annihilated. This feeling, it is true, is carried to a still higher degree of solemnity and sublimity at Rome; where the monuments of ancient grandeur seem like the relics of another world."

We have abridged the account of the "German Universities," that we may acquaint our readers, in as few words as possible, with some of the more interesting statements.

"A German university is essentially a *professional* school, or rather an assemblage of such schools, comprising the four faculties of theology, law, medicine, and philosophy; the latter of which corresponds to what is elsewhere called the faculty of letters and science, and embraces everything not strictly comprehended in some one of the other three. Hence the different faculties correspond precisely to our professional seminaries and schools; so that could we consent to bring together into one place one of our theological seminaries, a law school, and a medical school; unite the libraries and the advantages of all; and a faculty of letters and science; the result would be a university entirely on the German plan."

"At the present day, all the universities are immediately and entirely dependent on the respective governments within whose bounds they fall. All the professors and instructors of every kind are appointed, and generally speaking their salaries paid, directly by the government; which supports also or directs the whole expense of the university, of the erection and repair of buildings,\* of the increase of the library, and scientific collections, etc.

"The professors are of two kinds, ordinary and extraordinary. They are all appointed alike, but differ in rank. The ordinary professors, strictly speaking, constitute the faculty; they are members of the academical senate, and thus have a voice in the government of the university; they have a dean of the faculty, who is always chosen by and from themselves. The professors extraordinary are simply teachers, and have no further duties nor privileges. Besides these, there is another class of private instructors, *privatim docentes*, composed of young men who have taken the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, (equivalent to our Master of Arts,) and have then permission to read lectures and give private instruction in the universities.

"In some instances literary men, with the permission of the government, give courses of lectures at the universities, and receive fees, without being at-

\* "It has been often said that German universities have no buildings. This is true in one sense, and not in another. All have a building for a library and for scientific collections; some have one with lecture rooms; others have hospitals; and all have a riding school. But it is universally true that there are no buildings for the accommodation of students, who everywhere live in hired rooms, and mostly in private houses.

tached to the institution in any other way, than as *privatim docentes*. Thus the historian Niebuhr, in his character of member of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, reads lectures at Bonn; and at Halle a former major general was lecturing on military history and tactics.

"As a general fact, the professors deliver their lectures at their own houses. The recent universities of Berlin and Bonn occupy former palaces, and have ample room for all necessary lecture rooms, as well as for the public collections. In Halle also the university has one large lecture room, which is occupied by the theological professors in succession. But in Gottingen and at most of the other universities, each professor has to provide his own *auditorium*, and the accommodations for sitting and writing are commonly of the rudest kind. It is not unusual for the students to have to hurry from one lecture to another, at the distance perhaps of half a mile. To accommodate them in this respect, the professor does not commence until five or ten minutes, as the case may be, after the hour has struck.

"The students, before entering the university, are required to have passed through a regular course of preparatory study at the *gymnasia*, or public classical schools. At these schools, boys are taken at the age of from eight to twelve; and are trained in a thorough course of classical study. They are taught, not only to read the Greek and Latin with fluency, but also to write them. They are moreover accustomed to speak the latter language with ease, and in the latter part of their course to hold all their exercises in it.

"The students on entering the university from the *gymnasia*, pass from a state of discipline and close supervision to a state of entire freedom. Having once chosen their profession, they may attend what lectures they please, and as few as they please; they may live where they please, and do what they please. The university exercises no authority over them whatever, so long as they are not guilty of open misconduct. These are circumstances which may serve to account for that wild spirit of insubordination and visionary liberty, which has been represented as so prevalent among the students of Germany. Prevalent it undoubtedly has been and is still; but probably in a much less degree than has generally been supposed. The riots, and duels, and *renewing*, all the noise and folly of crime, are confined to a few in comparison with the great body of the students, who are engaged in a course of silent, persevering study. The noise and bustle of these few have struck foreigners as a peculiar feature of the German students, and have therefore been fully and frequently described; while the more noiseless course of the many has escaped their observation.

"The students, as has been already said, attend what courses of lectures they please. There are however certain professional courses which they must have attended, in order to be afterwards admitted to an examination. In theology, for instance, a man must have heard lectures in all the four departments of *exegesis*, *dogmatik* or doctrinal theology, ecclesiastical history, and *Homiletik* or practical theology. These are significantly called *Brodcollegia*; because a man's future bread depends on his having heard them.

"As a general rule, all the students not only take notes of the lectures, but mostly write them out in full. The professor often spends a part of the time in regular dictation, which is written down by all; while between the paragraphs he gives extempore illustrations, which are also seized and written down by many. It is exceedingly rare to see a student in the lecture room without his writing materials in busy use. These are very simple; consisting of a small portfolio or *Mappe* in which he carries his pens and paper, and a small turned instand of horn, with a cover that screws on, and a small sharp spike on the bottom by which it is stuck fast upon the bench or writing table before him. They are exceedingly punctual; and the few minutes previous to the entrance of the professor, are usually devoted to mending their pens and putting their paper in order. This is accompanied by a general whistling and buz of conversation. The moment the professor enters, all is hushed; he begins immediately to read, and they to write; sometimes without interruption till the striking of the clock. In this way they hurry from one lecture to another, and it is not uncommon for them to attend five or six every day."

"The sovereigns of Germany universally hold the whole power of the country in their hands; and there is not a place of honor or profit, from the minister of state down to the petty schoolmaster of a village, which is not directly

or indirectly dependent on the government. Every lawyer is one, only so far as he is connected with the courts of justice, as an officer of lower or higher rank and name; every physician is one, only so far as he has the license and sanction of the proper department; the church itself is but the slave of the civil power, and must do all its bidding. No man can devote himself to the service of his divine Master, and proclaim salvation to the perishing souls of his fellow men, but in the way which the government directs. Were he to attempt it, without having yielded obedience to all the prescribed formalities, there is not a spot in Germany where imprisonment or banishment would not be his lot. The government mixes itself in everything, prescribes everything, will know everything, and prohibits everything, which does not strictly coincide with its own interests and will."

"Of all who enter the universities, there are probably not so many as one in ten, who are not looking forward to an employment under government; that is to say, there are not so many who are expecting to subsist merely upon their own resources. They all know moreover full well, that the government not only keeps a watchful eye over their conduct while they are students, but that when they have passed through the regular time, they must undergo examinations, not in name alone, but in rigorous earnest, and before men of tried ability. If they fail here, they are indeed permitted to make one more trial; but if they fail again, the fruits of their years of toil, and their hopes of future subsistence, are gone forever. They can never again be admitted to an examination, either under their own government, nor under any other in Germany. It is here that the governments press with their whole weight upon the students, and compel a diligence which can know neither remission nor rest, until its great object be accomplished."

Professor Hahn's Essay on the "Grammatico-Historical Interpretation of the Scriptures," and Professor Stuart's following "Remarks," are very able and satisfactory. Professor Hahn distinguishes between the true principles of interpretation, and those embraced by liberalists and allegorists of every description, and urges substantial reasons why the former should be adopted, and the latter rejected.—In the course of his "Remarks," Professor Stuart endeavors to show, that the prophets understood the import of their own predictions, in opposition to the views of those who regard them as having been little more than mere passive instruments, "the amanuenses of the Spirit." We have no doubt of the correctness and importance of Mr. Stuart's representations on this subject; though it occurred to us in the reading, that they might need a little qualification. Unquestionably, "the prophets, while inspired, were voluntary, conscious, rational agents," and "attached some ideas to every word and phrase which they employed." And yet, is it likely that they *fully* understood their own predictions? Did Ezekiel understand perfectly the last eight Chapters of his prophecy; or Daniel the last two of his; or Paul his prediction of the "man of sin;" or John the various predictions contained in the Apocalypse? Did they so understand these predictions, that they could have fully interpreted them, pointing out the particular events to which they referred, and by which they would ultimately be fulfilled? We presume not; and we have no doubt, from an illustration employed by Professor Stuart, that he would agree with us in this opinion.

There has been not a little discussion in our pages, during the last year, on the question, 'What constitutes Infidelity?' and whether the views expressed by some leading Unitarians, in this country and in Europe, do not amount to a species of Infidelity? Mr. Robinson regards the Rationalists of Germany as Deists.

"The Rationalism of Germany is the *Deism of England*. The difference is, that in the latter country, the enemies of religion were not enrolled under

the banners of the church, but attacked her as open adversaries; while in Germany, the poison has spread through the body of the church itself, and those who have solemnly bound themselves to make the Bible their only rule of faith and practice have been among the first to discard its authority and contest its doctrines."

Dr. Röhr, now general superintendent and first court preacher at Weimar, declares "that, as the advocate of Rationalism, he acknowledges Herbert of Cherbury, and his friends and followers, as his own predecessors." And yet this same Dr. Röhr asserts, that "Christian Rationalism does not deny the fact of an *extraordinary revelation from God in the Holy Scriptures*, but only the irregular, i. e. miraculous mode in which it was effected."

We see in this, that a man may be a Deist, an acknowledged follower of Lord Herbert of Cherbury, and yet be, by profession, a minister of the New Testament, a lauded, promoted, honored minister, and may admit "the fact of an *extraordinary revelation from God in the Holy Scriptures*."

Kant, whom Hahn describes as the father of modern Rationalism, lays down the following principle of interpretation, the same for substance as that which is adopted by the leading Unitarians of England and this country. "*It is necessary that the revelation which has come into our hands should be explained throughout in a sense, which shall coincide with the general practical rules of a religion of pure reason.*" He immediately acknowledges that "this mode of interpretation may often appear, even to ourselves, to be forced, as it regards the more text; OFTEN IT MAY REALLY BE SO; but still, IF THE TEXT CAN POSSIBLY BE MADE TO BEAR IT, this interpretation must be preferred to such a literal one, as either contains in itself nothing favorable to morality, or even goes so far as to operate against it." A precious confession this, that liberalists are conscious of *forcing* the sacred text—of FORCING IT TO THE EXTREME OF WHAT IT WILL POSSIBLY BEAR—and consequently that they know and feel, that the plain, obvious sense of Scripture is hostile to their views.

We might pursue our remarks on the work before us to much greater lengths, but our limits forbid. We only add, that we cordially welcome the Biblical Repository, and earnestly recommend it to the patronage of those who have opportunity and ability to devote themselves to a critical study of the Holy Scriptures. This first number is neatly and accurately printed, and is perhaps all, both in matter and form, which its friends and promoters could desire.

*The Great Mystery of Godliness Incontrovertible*; or Sir Isaac Newton and the Socinians foiled in the attempt to prove a corruption in the text, 1 Tim. iii. 16. *Θεός ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί*; Containing a Review of the Charges brought against the Passage; an Examination of the various Readings; and a confirmation of that in the received Text on Principles of General and Biblical Criticism. By E. HENDERSON, Professor of Divinity and the Oriental Languages at Highbury College. London: Holdsworth and Ball, 1830. pp. 96.

Dr. Henderson commences his elaborate examination of this disputed passage, 1 Tim. iii. 16, by guarding his readers against the supposition, because he had associated the name of Newton with Socinians on his title page, that therefore he regarded Newton as a Socinian.

"In giving prominence to the name of Sir Isaac Newton, and associating it with that of "Socinian," nothing is further from the intention of the author

than to produce an impression, that our celebrated philosopher held the views which are professed by those generally known under this appellation. From all that has yet been developed of his sentiments, it is impossible to draw any conclusion that would warrant such an opinion. That he was no Socinian, in the modern acceptation of the term, is beyond all dispute; for he distinctly avows his belief in the *miraculous birth* of our Lord, which is a doctrine repudiated by the enemies of his divinity: and he asserts, in the most unqualified terms, that he was the *object of primitive worship*. Nor does he hesitate to affirm, that "the words *Χριστός* and *Θεός* are more plainly equipollent than *Χριστός* and *μισθωτός*—a declaration he never could have made, had he believed him to be possessed of nothing more than simple humanity. He animadverts, indeed, with great freedom, and sometimes with considerable asperity on the orthodox; but it does not appear, that this arises from any hostility to their views respecting the doctrine of the Trinity, or that it was opposed to anything besides the unfair mode in which he conceived they had treated one or two passages of Scripture, with a view to the support of that doctrine."

The different readings of the passage in question, which are of sufficient importance to merit examination, are three, and may be thus exhibited:

ΘΕΟΣ	}	<i>εφανερωθη εν σαρκι.</i>
·ΘΣ		
·Θ		
GOD		
WHO		
WHICH		
		<i>was manifest in the flesh.</i>

After examining the external evidence in favor of these several readings, separately, critically, at great length, and with much apparent candor, Dr. H. arrives at the following conclusion:

"In point of *manuscript* authority, *e*, the reading for which Sir Isaac Newton contends, is absolutely *without one positive and indisputable testimony*; *cc*, adopted by Griesbach, is clearly supported by the suffrage of only *three* manuscripts; whereas *Θεός* the reading of the *Textus Receptus*, has been found *upwards of one hundred and seventy*, which as before noticed, are all the other manuscripts of the Pauline Epistles, the collation of which, has yet been published.

"As it regards the Versions, the preponderance of their evidence would certainly be in favor of *e* or *cc*, could it possibly be proved, that they were all made independently of each other from the Greek text, and that the Syriac uses the relative pronoun and not a conjunction; but the want of satisfactory proof in reference to some of them throws a proportionate degree of weight into the scale of those which positively support *Θεός*.

The Fathers are completely divided: the Greeks conformably to their original Greek text, exhibiting *Θεός*; and the Latins, with a few exceptions, exhibiting *quod*, the reading of their Latin Vulgate.

With the amount of this evidence fairly before us, the question now is, whether *three* Greek MSS. not superior in point of age or character to many of the rest, the Latin Fathers, in their quotations of the Vulgate, and six ancient versions, whose testimony is equivocal, ought for a moment to outweigh upwards of *one hundred and seventy* Greek MSS., all the Greek Fathers, and four ancient versions, made directly from the Greek text, at various times, and altogether independently of each other? On every principle of criticism usually applied to decide the amount and authority of external evidence in reference to ancient writings, must not *Θεός* be regarded as the original and genuine reading, and *e* and *cc* rejected as unsupported in their claims to a place in the sacred text?"

In comparing the different readings, on the ground of their *internal* evidence, Dr. H. shows, that neither *e*, nor *cc*, accords with the laws of grammatical construction; nor is either of them consistent with the sense of the whole connected passage. In regard to *cc*, the reading adopted in "the Improved

Version," and followed by most modern Unitarians, Dr. John Jones, a learned Unitarian observes,

"For *Θεος*, the Vulgate reading, Griesbach has introduced *α*, and endeavors to support the change by one of the most elaborate notes in his volumes. Yet I will engage to shew that he has proved nothing but his own incompetence as a critic, and his want of fidelity as a collator of the ancient copies. The new reading is erroneous, because it is neither good sense nor good Greek."

The discussion before us concludes with the following paragraph :

We have now brought our critical examination of this important passage to a close. The charge of corruption, alleged by Sir Isaac Newton, we have shewn to be unfounded. The reading, which he contends to have been that originally in the text, and used by the Church during the first five centuries, we have seen rejected by Griesbach, and all critics of any note, and abandoned even by the Socinians themselves. That adopted by the celebrated German editor, and the "Improved Version of it, have been proved to be as destitute of solid and sufficient authority, as they are contrary to the idiom of the Greek language, and at variance with some of the first principles of biblical philology and exegesis. And the reading of the received text has been established by a mass of cumulative evidence, derived from the sources to which an appeal is ordinarily made on questions of this nature. While, therefore, the enemies of our Lord's Divinity attempt to give eclat to their opinions, by mixing up with the publication of them the name of a great philosopher, it cannot but prove satisfactory to those who have cordially embraced that doctrine, to find that the passage which has been the subject of investigation, so far from suffering any detriment from the most rigid critical scrutiny to which it may be brought, only gains in point of stability and authority, and continues to demand an unhesitating reception of the great mystery which it proclaims: *GOD WAS MANIFEST IN THE FLESH.*"

2. *Human Depravity, or Man a Fallen Being: A Sermon delivered in the Murray Street Church on the evening of March 21, 1830.* By Thomas H. Skinner, D. D., Pastor of the Fifth Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia. New York: Henry C. Sleight. pp. 24.

We know not why this Discourse was entitled 'Human Depravity, or a Man a fallen Being.' The discussion assumes, of course, that man *is* a fallen being; but the subject is, properly, the super-abounding grace of the Gospel over the evils of the fall; or the superior excellence of that constitution under which man is now placed to that under which our first parents originally existed. In order, however, that the superior excellence of the present constitution of things may be duly appreciated, it must be judged of in its connexions, as a whole.

"What architect would not deem himself wronged, if his ingenuity and skill should be estimated from a detached part of a most complicated and profound piece of workmanship? In this way of judging, things are apt to be pronounced against, which, considered in their relations to other things, evince the deepest penetration and wisdom. And shall we adopt this mode of judging, in regard to the ways of the Almighty? When He began his operations, He had a scheme of action before Him, too extended and vast to be comprehended by any other mind than His own. On the fulfilment of that entire scheme, not of any one single part of it, does He depend, so to speak, for the discovery of His perfection. The Scripture, reminding us that we now know only in part, counsels us to judge nothing before the time, but wait till the mystery of God be finished. The precipitancy, which, in opposition to this advice, not only refuses to wait, but will not take into view the whole of what has been done—which grounds a sentence of condemnation on one detached measure, a measure which would never have been entered upon, but for the sake of what was and is to follow—such rashness it is, that leads men to raise their objections to the providence and ways of God: of which a thousand exemplifications might be mentioned, but none more unequivocal than that connected with our present

subject. For when God so ordered things that Adam's disobedience should be the occasion of his posterity's disobedience and condemnation also, did he there stay his ordering hand? Was nothing done toward mankind but just to condemn them? Then God had shown indeed his *severity*, but the glory of his *goodness* had not appeared. But find we nothing else revealed in the Scriptures concerning this subject? Have we not read that the second Adam appeared to undo the mischief perpetrated by the first; that the Son of man came to destroy the works of the devil; that His errand into this world who travailed and prayed in the garden of Gethsemane, was to counteract the evils let into the same world by that man's disobedience who dwelt in the garden of Eden? Nay, not only was the second Adam a restorer of that which the first took away, but Scripture has clearly sounded in our ears the most joyful intelligence, that he bestows inconceivably more than was lost."

3. *The Province of Reason in Matters of Religion: A Sermon delivered, by request, in the Murray Street Church, in the City of New York, May 16th, 1830.* By Leonard Woods, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mass. New York: Henry C. Sleight. pp. 32.

It is no part of the province of reason, says Dr. Woods in this discourse, to 'attempt to *originate* truth,' or to 'sit in judgement upon any of the doctrines or facts which God makes known;' but rather 'to learn what God teaches; to obtain the knowledge of the facts and doctrines which he exhibits, particularly those which he exhibits in his word;' (having first ascertained that the Bible is his word) 'to arrange them in a suitable order, and apply them to their various uses.' To confine reason within this province, it is insisted, is agreeable to 'its nature,' honorable to God, and most favorable 'to our own intellectual and moral improvement;' while to attempt pushing it beyond these limits must not only be 'useless, but will directly hinder the influence of truth,' prove an injury to ourselves, and endanger the peace and welfare of the church of God.

The subject of this sermon is one of great difficulty as well as importance; the plan is judicious; and in the filling up, there is much instruction and warning to ministers and churches, which we trust will not be without its effect. Two remarks have occurred to us, while reading the sermon, which we subjoin.

1. It is the duty of the religious teacher, not to attempt separating philosophy from religion, but to define its province and regulate its decisions, according to the unerring standard. In regard to this subject, there are extremes, and there is danger, on either hand;—danger of indulging in adventurous, fruitless philosophical speculation; and danger of denouncing philosophy, and divorcing it from religion, as unworthy to have any connexion with it. The province of reason in religion, as defined by Dr. Woods, is also the province over which a sound intellectual and moral philosophy may with propriety be permitted to traverse. Take, for instance, the work of *applying* the ascertained facts and doctrines of the Bible. These are to be applied to the *human mind*; but how so applied, without some knowledge of the philosophy of the human mind? These doctrines are to be applied to the understandings, the consciences, and the hearts of men; but who can determine, independently of all philosophical inquiry, what is the understanding, and what the conscience, and what the heart? The fact is, that every intelligent religious teacher, let him talk of philosophy as he may, is obliged to have recourse to it, more or less; and hence the propriety, instead of proscribing and denouncing it altogether, of endeavoring to define its province and regulate its decisions.—We admit, however, that the

greater danger is on the other hand—that of suffering our philosophy to overleap its barriers, and wander in vain conjecture and fruitless speculation. In view of our continual exposure in this respect, we remark again,

2. It is much easier for a vigorous, active mind to prescribe rules on this subject, than it is to keep them. For after all its rules, its efforts, and its prayers, such a mind will have more temptations than it can easily repel, to break away from the proper province of reason, and puzzle itself and others, and vex the church of God, with speculations which cannot profit. There is much faithful warning on this subject in the discourse before us, which we commend to the consideration of all our readers, and particularly of ministers. Let us 'trust in the Lord with all our heart, and *not lean to our own understandings*.' In all our ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct our paths.'

5. *The Life and Times of Richard Baxter*, with a critical Examination of his writings. By Rev. William Orme, Author of 'the Life of John Owen, D. D., 'Bibliotheca Biblica,' &c. In two vols. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1831.

This work presents strong inducements to the reader on account both of its subject and its author. Baxter was one of the most remarkable men of his time, and his times were the most remarkable in English History. The circumstance, also, that this is the last work of the lamented Orme, with which he closed his labors and his life, will cause it to be read with a melancholy interest. A Review may be expected in a future number.

*Extract of a Letter to the Secretary of the Massachusetts Missionary Society.*

The following Extract exhibits the trials which some of the feeble churches of Massachusetts have been called to suffer, as also the artifices to which their adversaries are willing to descend in order to accomplish their favorite measures.

"This people have passed through the same trials that have been so common of late to many Orthodox churches in this part of the commonwealth, *to wit*, they have been exiled from a beautiful church to make room for Unitarianism—have lost their church furniture and their church Records. The last oppressive act they have felt was the taking away of their Records. This was done since my ordination. The manner in which they were taken renders the case more aggravating. The circumstances were these. The Unitarian society requested of my church the privilege of looking at the Records for the purpose of taking a memorandum of dates, &c. Permission was granted them to call and see them at my study. Accordingly a committee of three called upon me, and stated that their '*only object*' was that stated above. Accordingly I produced the book. As soon as they had the Records in their hands, one of their party steps out of the door, and returns immediately with a sheriff, who stood waiting and in readiness to seize the book. He embraced the opportunity thus afforded him by stratagem, and took it by a writ of replevin. This took place about the first of October. Since then we have enjoyed repose."



## SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. IV.

MARCH, 1831.

NO. 3.

## REVIEWS.

TWO LETTERS TO THE REVEREND MOSES STUART, ON THE SUBJECT OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY. By Bernard Whitman. Boston: Gray & Bowen. 1830. pp. 166.

In July last, Professor Stuart published a Letter to Dr. Channing, in which he sets forth the numerous and weighty charges of this latter gentleman against the Orthodox, and calls upon him either to retract or prove them. More than half a year has now elapsed, and the Reverend Doctor has not seen fit to do either the one or the other. In the mean time, a feeble attempt has been made in the Unitarian Advocate, in part to explain away his allegations, and in part to justify them.\* A more recent attempt of the same sort has been made in the Letters which lie before us. We gave a brief notice of these Letters on their first appearance, stating what we then conceived to be their true import and character. We must now go into a more extended examination of them, not because we think them entitled, on their own account, to further consideration, but because of the zealous efforts of the enemies of Orthodoxy to give them currency and favor with the public†—because of the use which is made of them in certain portions of the country—and because the justice of our first account of them has been directly impeached.

The conductors of the Unitarian Advocate, in their remarks on Professor Stuart's Letter, accuse him of misunderstanding, or at least of misrepresenting Dr. Channing.

"The language of Dr. Channing, and of *liberal Christians generally*, was never meant to be taken in that broad and gross sense which the Professor

\* The Articles in the Advocate on this subject were noticed and replied to in our Numbers for Oct. and Nov. 1830.

† Repeated and high encomiums have been passed on these Letters in the Unitarian Advocate, the Christian Register, and in several of the political papers, both in city and country. A writer in the Centinel speaks of them "as *decidedly the most important publication that has appeared during the past year*"!!—as "entirely disproving the solemn asseverations of Professor Stuart," and establishing "the justness and truth of Dr. Channing's charges"!

seems to attribute to it." "He talks of 'conspiracies' and 'plots' in which he would have it thought that we accuse the Orthodox of having embarked, as it were, with *malice prepense*; and to this gross construction of the charge brought against them by Unitarians, the Letter owes whatever of plausibility it possesses. But Professor Stuart knows, as well as we, that *no such direct, formal, and wicked 'plot' or 'conspiracy' is meant to be charged on the Orthodox.*"

The conductors of the Advocate here couple *themselves* and "Unitarians," and "*liberal Christians generally,*" with Dr. Channing in this controversy; and they *expressly deny, on the behalf of all concerned,* that they have ever accused the Orthodox of any "direct, formal, and wicked plot or conspiracy," in the gross sense of the terms. It is very unfortunate for some gentlemen, that they are not blessed with better memories. It would save them not a little self-contradiction, and consequent mortification, if they could remember from one year to another, what things they had said and published. To assist the recollections of these gentlemen of the Advocate, and at the same time to show more clearly the drift and bearing of Dr. Channing's accusations, and the points necessarily to be proved in the Letters of Mr. Whitman, in order to a full justification of himself and his brethren, it will be needful to quote a few passages from certain Unitarian authors and publications.

Fifteen years ago, it was said by a noted Unitarian 'Layman,'

"The Panoplist may ridicule as much as it pleases the suggestion that they (the Orthodox) *aim at Ecclesiastical tyranny.* We perceive from their spirit that *the power only is wanting.* These new (Ministerial) Associations, if not watched and made the objects of jealousy, will soon become tremendous engines in the hands of skilful and ambitious men."\*

In a more recent publication, the same writer accuses the Orthodox of reviving "a spirit of intolerance *which has had no example, from the banishment of Roger Williams, and the murder of Servetus, and the persecution of the followers of Arminius.*" "If the Orthodox party had now the civil power in their hands, for which they have shown of late a great hankering . . . . . they *would not permit a man to vote in civil concerns unless he was a church member.*"†

The Christian Examiner says, "There is to be a combination among the most powerful sects to SEIZE THE CIVIL POWER, and the use they may hereafter make of it is to be sought in the calamitous history of Christendom for the last fifteen hundred years." In the same work, the Orthodox are charged with 'making a *thousand efforts*' to restore "*a tyranny over the minds of Laymen,* the loss of which to priests of certain sects of Pharisaical pretensions is as galling, as the simple doctrines of the despised teacher of Nazareth were to the high priests and scribes of Jerusalem." Again, the Orthodox are charged, in the same work, with wishing

\* Are you a Christian or a Calvinist? p. 65.

† The Recent attempt, &c. pp. 9, 17.

to "overthrow the institutions by which the state is upheld, in order to erect on their ruins a power, which by them may be deemed a blessing, though in all ages it has been found a curse."\*

We quote the following passages from the Christian Register.

"There now appears among the more ambitious and designing leaders of the (Orthodox) party a disposition to form a POWERFUL CONSPIRACY, to crush the growth of liberal opinions, and to render it impolitic, if not dangerous, for a man to avow himself a dissenter from the new-fangled Calvinism now in vogue." "That they have the disposition and the will to reduce the whole country to a state of religious vassalage, we entertain not the slightest doubt."

"We doubt whether the Inquisition itself was more to be dreaded, than that power . . . . which does not scruple, even in this free country, to aim at overturning the noble institutions of our people, by an appeal to the votes of a religious majority." "The Orthodox clergy are too generally spiritual lords, grasping at power, and ruling the churches with a rod of iron."

"We published, some months since, a few remarks on an attempt to form 'a Christian party in politics'—in other words, to unite church and state, and bring all the affairs of the country under clerical influence. That this bold design has been formed, there can be little doubt; and we have reason to fear that the abettors and promoters of the plan are making more progress towards its accomplishment than is generally believed."†

In the same paper, the Orthodox are charged with having "an insatiable thirst of power"—with "aiming at an uncontrolled sway in church and state"—and with having formed "a BOLD BUT DEEP LAID PLOT AGAINST OUR POLITICAL AS WELL AS OUR CHRISTIAN LIBERTIES. Aug. 23, 1828. In September, 1828, a series of numbers, headed "THE CONSPIRACY," were published in the Register, in which the Orthodox are charged with having conspired against the peace and order of the churches. Again, "the self-styled Orthodox" are charged with "secret plots and conspiracies against the peace and liberty of the church and state." Oct. 4th 1828. And again, "It is important that the religious public should be apprized of the scheme now in train to effect a union between church and state." Nov. 22, 1828.

And, to add more, the Rev. Bernard Whitman of Waltham assures us, in his Artillery Election sermon, that "many individuals in certain sects (referring doubtless to the Orthodox) are making the attempt to unite church and state; and that we have the evidence of this in their own writings."

Will the reader now turn back, and review these multifarious accusations. The Orthodox part of the community, and more especially the clergy, are here charged with 'aiming at Ecclesiastical tyranny;'—with reviving 'a spirit of intolerance' like that which led to 'the murder of Servetus;'—with 'treacherously combining to abridge and destroy our religious liberties;'—with designing to form a powerful conspiracy to crush the growth of liberal opinions;—with wishing 'to reduce the whole country to a state

\* Vol. V. pp. 279, 296, 505.

† Numbers for Oct. 27, 1827; Jan. 12, 1828; March 15, 1828; and June 7, 1828.

of religious vassalage ;—with being unwilling that ‘ any man, should vote in civil concerns, unless he is a church member ;’—with ‘ making a thousand efforts to restore a tyranny over the minds of laymen ;’—with ‘ grasping at power, and ruling the churches with a rod of iron ;’—with ‘ making an attempt to unite church and state,’ and having ‘ a scheme now in train’ to effect that object ;—and, again, with ‘ forming the bold design to unite church and state, and making more progress towards its accomplishment than is generally believed ;—with wishing to ‘ overthrow the institutions by which the State is upheld, in order to erect on their ruins’ an odious Ecclesiastical power ;—and, again, with ‘ aiming, in this free country, to overturn the noble institutions of our people.’ “ There is to be a combination,” we are told, “ among the most powerful sects TO SEIZE THE CIVIL POWER ; and the use they may hereafter make of it is to be sought in the calamitous history of Christendom for the last fifteen hundred years.”

Of a piece with these various accusations, and of a character to be grouped and considered with them, are those alleged in the writings of Dr. Channing, to which public attention was called in the Letter of Mr. Stuart. The Orthodox are charged, in these writings, with ‘ defamation and persecution’—a ‘ persecution which breathes venom from its lips, and secretly blasts what it cannot openly destroy.’ They are said to have forged ‘ chains, which eat more deeply into the soul than those of iron,’ and to have established, ‘ an espionage of bigotry, as effectual to close our lips and chill our hearts, as an armed and hundred-eyed police.’ They have ‘ combined to cover with reproach whoever may differ from themselves, to drown the free expression of opinion by denunciations of heresy, and to strike terror into the multitude by joint and perpetual menace.’ ‘ This Protestant liberty, it is said, is, in one respect, more irritating than Papal bondage. It mocks as well as enslaves us. It talks to us courteously, whilst it rivets our chains.’ They (the Orthodox) ‘ menace with ruin the Christian who listens to opinions different from their own, and brand these opinions with the most terrifying epithets, for the purpose of preventing candid inquiry into their truth.’ They have ‘ menaced our long established form of Congregational church government, and attempted to introduce tribunals unknown to our churches, for the very purpose, that the supposed errors and mistakes of ministers and private Christians may be tried and punished as heresies, that is, as crimes.”\* Such is

\* In this last sentence, Dr. Channing refers to the proposal for consociating the churches, which was agitated in the General Association of Massachusetts in 1815. This subject was fully considered in our number for November, 1830. For the benefit of those readers who may not be able to refer to that number, we shall here present a brief abstract of what was then said. The discussion was commenced with the two following inquiries :

1. Were the Consociations proposed in 1815, such tribunals as those described by Dr. Channing ?

a specimen of the accusations which have been pouring forth against Orthodox Christians, almost in one continuous stream, for the last fifteen years. And who are these Orthodox Christians? Who are these aspiring, intolerant, tyrannical and traitorous Orthodox clergymen, who have conspired against the liberties of both church and state, and are wishing to overthrow the free institutions of their country? We appeal to this community for an answer. We ask no special indulgence to be shown to the characters or the frailties of Orthodox clergymen; but we do ask, and we are willing those among whom we live should answer for us, whether a fair proportion of this proscribed class of men are not distinguished for their piety and usefulness; and whether, in point of intelligence, integrity, and an exemplary attention to their appropriate duties, they may not, as a body, compare with any other class of our citizens? And who are those who dare accuse them of such abominable crimes? Are they the debased, the profane, the vicious, the profligate? Yes; these uniformly hate and asperse the Orthodox; but men of this stamp are not alone. They are kept in countenance by others of better cloth. The charges we have quoted are from the pens of learned civilians, and Reverend clergymen—of the Hon. ———, and the Hon. ———, of Dr. Channing, the Rev. Bernard Whitman, etc. etc.—men who walk at large, and hold up their heads, in face of that community, who have heard

---

II. How was the proposal for a Consociation of the churches regarded and treated by the Orthodox clergy of the state?

In answer to the first of these inquiries, it was shown, that the Consociations at that time proposed had no resemblance to the tribunals described by Dr. C., and furnished no colorable ground for his allegations. "He describes 'tribunals unknown to our churches,' whereas Consociations had long been known to them. He describes something with which the churches were '*menaced*,' whereas Consociations, had the proposals for them been approved, would only have been offered to the churches, to be received or rejected, as they thought best. He describes something inconsistent with 'Congregational church government;' but Consociations are entirely consistent with such government. He describes 'tribunals to be introduced, for the *very purpose*' of trying and punishing heretics as criminals; but the Consociations, proposed in 1815, contemplate no such object as this. Where then is the resemblance between the two?"

In answer to the second inquiry, it was observed, that "The plan for consociating the churches of Massachusetts, which was first attempted in 1662, and again by the Mathers in the early part of the next century, was brought forward, the third time, by individuals of the clergy, in 1814. The proposal was made to a body of Orthodox ministers, and never went beyond these ministers. It was never submitted to the churches, or to the people, so far as we know, in a single instance. The result was, that the clergy, after much consideration, did not think proper to urge its adoption. They waived the whole subject by saying, that if the churches in any part of the State wished to consociate, they had no objection. The plan of consociating the churches, therefore, whether good or bad, was put to rest, not by the people, not by the churches, not by Unitarians, (whose opposition weighed not a feather in the minds of those to whom the subject was submitted) but solely through the influence of the Orthodox clergy."

Mr Whitman complains of Professor Stuart for bringing forward this charge of Dr. C. as one recently made, and relating to the present state of things, whereas it was made in 1815, and refers to events existing at that time. But Professor Stuart says expressly, after having quoted this among the other charges of Dr. C., "Most of them are not the hasty effusions of moments when excitement was urging on the thoughts and the pen, but they are declarations reviewed and re-published to the world AFTER A SERIES OF YEARS." p. 11.

their accusations against many of our most worthy and useful citizens.

But it is time that we look more closely to these accusations, and ascertain definitely to what they amount.

1. The Orthodox are here charged with being the combined and determined enemies of religious freedom. They are 'spiritual tyrants,' 'conspirators' against liberty, forging 'chains more terrible than those of iron,' 'menacing with ruin' all those who differ from them, and 'ruling the churches' in the most oppressive manner.

2. They are charged with indulging a spirit of persecution,—a 'persecution which breathes venom from its lips, and secretly blasts what it cannot openly destroy.'

3. The Orthodox are further charged with 'an insatiable thirst of power.' They are said to be 'grasping at power,' and 'aiming at an uncontrolled sway in church and state.'

4. The Orthodox have 'formed the bold design to unite church and state, and have made more progress towards its accomplishment than is generally believed.'

5. The Orthodox are charged with being traitors to their country. 'They would overthrow the institutions by which the state is upheld.' 'There is to be a combination among the most powerful sects to seize the civil power,' &c.

Such are some of the charges of Unitarians in Massachusetts against the Orthodox. In reducing them to particulars, so as to present them in a tangible form, we are not conscious of exhibiting them in a stronger light than the language of those who propagate them will warrant. Indeed, in some respects, their coloring is even higher than our own.

In view of these various and heavy accusations, with which Mr. Whitman must have been well acquainted, he has volunteered his services in aid of Dr. Channing and his brethren—whether by their particular request or not, we are unable to say—certainly, as the event has shown, with the particular approbation of some of them. In regard to the object of his work, and its intended bearing on the charges before us, only two suppositions can be made. He either designed to support these charges, or he did not. If he designed to support them, *has he done it?* This is the first question, and it obviously is one deserving very serious consideration. The charges are before the public in plain black and white English, and so (according to this supposition) are the main facts relied on to support them. Let us pause a little, and compare the one with the other.

The Orthodox are charged, as we have shown, with 'an insatiable thirst of power,' both civil and ecclesiastical—with designing and laboring 'to unite church and state'—and with being traitors to their country. They are 'combining to seize the civil power,'

and 'would overthrow the free institutions of the state.' These are not all the charges presented above, but they are the principal ones, involving (if true) the greatest criminality, and to which, of course, the chief importance should be attached. Are the facts and considerations adduced by Mr. Whitman (should we even admit the correctness of his statements) sufficient to support them?

He urges in his first Letter, that we have *creeds*, and that we make an improper use of them. But do we use them as instruments by which 'to seize the civil power,' and 'overthrow the institutions of the state?' This is the point now in question, and this our author does not seem to have touched.—Our "*ministerial intercourse*," it is also said, is faulty. And suppose it is. Does this go 'to unite church and state?' Or is it treason!!—But we have erected, or attempted to erect, "*Ecclesiastical tribunals*." There are "*Consociations*" in Connecticut; and we have in Massachusetts "*Ecclesiastical Councils*," and "*Ministerial Associations*," and "*Conferences of churches*," which, it is alleged, have not always done as they ought. *Therefore*, we 'are grasping at power,' and mean 'to overthrow the free institutions' of our country!!—Again, the Orthodox are frequently '*establishing new churches*,' and do not always proceed in a manner to please so discreet a man as Mr. Whitman. Alas! we are traitors, then,—or else, in the march of some men's minds, their logic does not keep pace with their 'evil surmisings.'—We are also in the habit of '*denouncing*' Unitarians. We really think they are in essential error, and we have the honesty to say so. But how this proves our insatiable ambition, or our traitorous designs, we are not informed.—It is moreover alleged (for the proofs are numerous as well as strong) that the Orthodox sometimes *misrepresent* the Unitarians, and 'withold patronage' from them, and even pray for them. Now all this may be true, for aught we shall here show to the contrary, as we are not now contesting our author's statements, but examining his logic. Suppose it is true: We have yet to learn the bearing it has upon the charges of grasping ambition, or of bloody treason.

It will be said, perhaps, that Mr. W. did not design to prove the charges here brought forward—that this was no part of his object—and consequently his statements and reasonings could not be expected to bear upon them. But if Mr. W. did not design to prove these charges, where *is* the proof of them? They certainly are weighty charges; they have been publicly made; they stand in indelible lines on the pages of standard Unitarian publications; and if it is admitted that Mr. W. did not design to prove them, and has not proved them, then we call for proof. As a part of the implicated Orthodox community, we demand it. Some men may think to pass over the quotations we have made as mere rhe-

torical flourishes, designed to give edge and piquancy to a few closing sentences, but never intended or expected to be interpreted strictly. But those against whom they are directed are the proper judges in the case, and verily *they* deem them of more serious consequence. It is no light thing to be accused before the public, year after year, of some of the foulest, blackest crimes; nor is it unreasonable, after so long forbearance, that our accusers are put upon the task of proof; and if, after the desperate efforts of Mr. W., it still be said, that no attempt at proving some of their most grievous allegations against us has yet been made, then we demand that it be made forthwith. We call upon the conductors of the Christian Examiner to *prove* that "there is to be a combination among the most powerful sects to seize the civil power," and that the Orthodox are wishing to 'overthrow the institutions of the state.' We call upon the Editor of the Christian Register and his contributors to *prove*, that the Orthodox are "aiming at an uncontrolled sway in church and state," and have formed "a bold but deep-laid plot against our political as well as our Christian liberties." We call upon the Rev. Bernard Whitman, and others who have uttered the same scandal, to *prove* that "many individuals" among us "are making the attempt to unite church and state, and that they have the evidence of this in our own writings."\* The demand here made is certainly reasonable; it must commend itself, as such, to this community; and let there be no wincing or flinching on the part of those to whom it is addressed. You have charged the Orthodox with certain high crimes and misdemeanors; prove your charges, gentlemen;—or retract them;—or consent to stand before the public as false accusers and calumniators.

We have as yet considered only a part of the charges which have been preferred against the Orthodox. Others remain, less gross and palpable, which, perhaps, may not be so readily disposed of. It will be insisted, doubtless, that in the 'use we make of creeds,' in our 'Ministerial intercourse,' our Ecclesiastical tribunals,' &c., &c., we have shown ourselves the determined enemies of religious

\* The Rev. A. Ballou, Editor of the Independent Messenger, a new Universalist paper, speaking on this subject, says, "Let no man suppose that we intend to embark in that clamorous crusade, whose legions under pretence of preventing a "union of Church and State," denounce all the religious associations and institutions of our country as so many engines of *priestcraft* invented to demolish our rights. By those crusaders it would seem that the priest-hood is regarded as a den of treasonable conspirators, and religious movements as so many certain indications of the success of their iniquitous intrigues. Hence they have raised a censorious outcry, which in our humble opinion ought not to be countenanced by any friend of civil and religious order. We heard this outcry (at first with alarm, afterwards with indifference, and finally with disgust) till by scrutinizing the conduct of those who take the lead in it, the conviction has forced itself upon us, that there is among them as much ambition, selfishness, craft, persecuting bigotry, and radical malignity to civil and religious liberty, in proportion to numbers, as among those whom they accuse. They, too, need watching, lest while they cry "thief! thief!" to turn our suspicions upon others, they make booty of our gold, and leave us in poverty to pine away upon the bitter morsels of dear bought experience. God preserve us from State religion, and above all from State irreligion!"



freedom, and have manifested even a persecuting spirit. It will appear, however, on examination, that were we to admit the correctness of no small part of Mr. Whitman's statements (which we do not admit) we have done no more than is perfectly consistent with our religious *principles*, our *liberty*, and *rights*.

We certainly have the right to study the Scriptures for ourselves, to form our opinions in view of them, and to speak and act agreeably to these opinions, so long as we do not interfere with the rights and liberties of others. Mr. W. has no more right to think for us, than we for him—to prescribe and dictate our opinions, than we his. Suppose, then, that after long and careful attention to the Scriptures, we satisfy ourselves of the correctness of the Orthodox faith. We *believe*, that the Scriptures contain and teach the doctrines of the Trinity, of Divine sovereignty, of human depravity, of the atonement, of regeneration by the special influences of the holy Spirit, of justification by faith, of the perseverance of saints, of a general judgement and of eternal retribution. Have we not a right so to believe? Have we not a right to retain and cherish our honest convictions in regard to these most important subjects? And if we have a right so to believe, have we not a right to sum up our belief on paper, and form a written confession of our faith? And if we find two, three, or half a dozen, who have come to the same conclusions with ourselves, have we not a right to *associate*, on the basis of a common faith, and constitute a society, a church? If we are pleased thus to associate, and do it in a peaceable manner, who shall hinder us? Have we not as much right to associate with a creed, as others have to do the same without one? May not we as properly dictate to them on the subject as they to us? And when we have associated, on the express understanding of a common faith, suppose one of our number widely departs from this faith; have we not a right to call him to an account? And if he chooses to exercise his freedom in wandering from us, and violating the express principles of the association, have we not a right to exercise our freedom, in excluding him, or withdrawing from him? Do not all voluntary associations for *civil* purposes consider themselves entitled to treat delinquent members after this manner? And why should religious associations be an exception? We have indeed, no right to injure our erring brother, in his person, property, or good name, any further than to call things by their right names, and tell the truth about him when occasion requires it; and who shall deny us the liberty to do this?

But it will be said, 'If you form your church with a creed, then all who cannot adopt the creed will be kept out of it.' And what if they are? Is there no church in the world, except ours? If persons cannot agree to walk with us, then let them seek those with

whom they can walk. Or if they cannot find any with whom they are agreed, then let them be content to walk alone.

It will also be objected, that by excluding the member who wanders from us ; we render him unpopular, excite suspicion, and inflict an injury. This may be so, or it may not be, according to the character of our association, and the circumstances under which he is excluded. But if he does receive injury, whose fault is it ? The society, surely, are not to blame ; and if he is a reasonable man, he will never blame them.

Suppose, again, that having, in the exercise of our freedom, adopted the Orthodox faith, we regard it, not only as true, but as of *great importance*. We assuredly do thus regard it, nor can we perceive that, in so doing, we exceed our religious liberties and rights. But here is a man who, in the exercise of his freedom, adopts a system the opposite of ours, and disbelieves and derides all that seems to us so precious ; what now shall we *think* of him ? Can we avoid regarding him as in a great and dangerous error ? And if called to express an opinion respecting him, have we not a right to say what we think ? If he is a Unitarian, have we not a right to say he is a Unitarian ? Or if he is a Universalist, a Deist, or an Atheist, have we not a right to say so ? But this, we are told is a "denunciation," and in pursuing such a course, we inflict an injury. And suppose we do ; how is the injury to be avoided ? Must we shut our eyes upon evidence, repress conviction, and thus sacrifice our own freedom of thought, for fear that, in exercising it, we shall come to the knowledge of the truth respecting the opinions of our neighbor ? Or if, having formed an opinion respecting him, we are called upon to express it, shall we tell a lie rather than the truth, through fear that the truth will injure him ?

Again ; in the exercise of our freedom, we not only adopt the Orthodox faith, but come to regard it as the *only true faith* ; so that those who essentially depart from it we cannot think are, in the strictest and best sense of the term, *Christians*. Still they call themselves Christians, and claim our fellowship. But, in consistency with our principles and rights, can we grant it ? They have as good a right to their honest opinions, as we have to ours. They may think of themselves as they please, and call themselves by what name they please. But they have no right to dictate to us what we shall think of them, or what we shall call them. They have no right to insist upon enjoying our fellowship, when, in consistency with our principles, we cannot grant it.

The attentive reader will perceive, in view of the foregoing remarks, that no small part of what Mr. W. charges upon the Orthodox as persecution and oppression, and altogether inconsistent with "free inquiry and religious liberty," is but the *necessary result* of

their religious liberty. They could not have their liberty, and do otherwise. They certainly have the right, as much so as Mr. W. or any other man, to adopt their own religious principles, and to act according to them; and it will be found, on examination, that most of the charges urged against them in his first Letter (bating the false coloring and inaccuracies of statement) are the natural and inevitable result of their honest principles. This, indeed, is acknowledged by the conductors of the Unitarian Advocate.

"We only say, that they (the Orthodox) are the advocates of a system of doctrines which, pushed to its *legitimate consequences*, is unfriendly to Christian liberty."—"We say that the spirit of *their system* is wholly exclusive; that all its tendencies are exclusive; that wherever it is *acted upon*, wherever its *influences remain unobstructed*, there Christian liberty falls a sacrifice." pp. 121, 122.

Here, the blame of our alleged exclusiveness and intolerance is laid wholly to our system. But according to this account of it, how can we do otherwise? We verily believe the Bible to be the word of God, we study it for ourselves, and we can find no other system there. So long as we have a right to think for ourselves, we must adopt this system; and so long as we have a right to be honest and consistent persons, we must act according to it.

But it will be said, 'You have no right to exercise your religious freedom in a way to infringe upon the liberties of others.' Nor do we. They have the same right as we to think for themselves, and if, in the exercise of this right, they become Unitarians, or Universalists, or Deists, or Atheists; so be it. To their own Master, they stand or fall. We will not hurt an hair of their heads. To be sure, if called to express an opinion respecting them, we must tell the truth, as we understand it; and if required to extend to them the hand of Christian fellowship, we must act according to our convictions of duty; but we will lay no restrictions upon their freedom of inquiry and opinion, nor, while they demean themselves as peaceable citizens, will we consent that they shall suffer any more than the necessary consequences of the principles they have imbibed.

In laying the blame of our alleged intolerance to our principles, Unitarians doubtless mean to represent that our principles are dangerous to Christian liberty. But it will appear, on examination, that they are no more dangerous than their own, and that they present no greater impediments in the way of free inquiry than their own. It may not suit the policy of Unitarians to have a written, formal creed; but they have a creed, as really as the Orthodox. In other words, there are points of belief, or disbelief, by which they are known and distinguished from other religious denominations. Now suppose one of their ministers departs essentially from these points, either one way or the other, would he not be liable to suffer at all on account of his opinions? Suppose Mr. W., for instance

should become Orthodox, and should preach the Orthodox faith with as much zeal and pertinacity as he now does the Unitarian faith; would his people hear him,—or would they dismiss him? Or suppose, in the exercise of his religious freedom, he should become an avowed Atheist; would his people hear him, or would they dismiss him? And would his ministerial brethren, in this case, continue to him their fellowship, or would they withdraw it? Would the ministerial Association to which he belongs retain him, or would they exclude him? Can Unitarians answer these questions in the only way in which they would think proper to answer them, without admitting that their views and principles on the subject of religious liberty are no more liberal or tolerant, than those of the Orthodox, of which they complain?

The principles on which Unitarians *found their complaints of the Orthodox* are entirely different from those on which *they themselves act* in relation to some other denominations. In order that the former class of principles may be carried consistently out, a state of society must exist, in which one religious opinion shall be deemed as good, as reputable, and as safe as another, so that a man may turn this way or that, may believe more, or less, or nothing, without any fear or hazard of consequences. Now in regard to such a state of society, it is not enough to say that it is undesirable, and in the nature of things *impossible*, it is a state to which Unitarians are as little ready to come as any of their neighbors: For, as observed already, they act on a very different set of principles in relation to some other sects, from those on which they found their complaints of Orthodox exclusiveness and intolerance. They complain of the Orthodox, because they will not exchange pulpits with them. Why will not they exchange with the professed Universalist? They complain of us for encroaching on their liberty and rights, because we represent their views of doctrine as erroneous and unsafe. And why do they encroach, in the same way, on the liberty and rights, of the Deist and the Atheist, by representing their views of doctrine as erroneous and unsafe?

The amount of it all is, if we understand it, that Unitarians would have their own principles in good repute, at any rate. No one must suspect or question them. No one must open his mouth

\* It will be recollected that the predecessor of Mr. W., a worthy Orthodox Minister, was dismissed from this people, *solely* (as they at the time certified) on account of his opinions. The following is a copy of a note sent to him after the society had voted his dismissal:

REVEREND SIR,

By vote of the second Religious Society at their meeting last evening, *Resolved*, that the second Religious Society in Waltham cheerfully and willingly declare, that they approve of the moral conduct of Rev. Sewall Harding, as the minister of said society; and as their minister he has preached, with faithfulness and an earnest desire to be useful, the Gospel, agreeably to his faith and creed; and that *the only difference subsisting between the society and him is an honest difference of religious sentiments.*—The above is an extract from the records of the Society.

THOMAS GORHAM, P. Clerk.

or lift a finger to oppose or discredit them. We cannot express an opinion of their publications, or sing a doxology in our own churches, as Mr. W. insists (pp. 43, 86,) without affording them just ground of complaint. But while they claim so high immunities for themselves, they are far from being willing to grant the same to others. To say nothing of the censures perpetually cast upon the principles and the publications of Evangelical Christians, those sects which Unitarians regard as beneath themselves on the general scale of unbelief, complain as loudly, and with quite as much reason, of their exclusiveness and illiberality, as they do of the same things on the part of the Orthodox.

We have gone thus at length into an examination of this subject, not merely with a view to answer Mr. Whitman. Had this been our only object, we could have been content to despatch it in few words. But as we had occasion to say something on the subject—a subject important in itself, and almost continually misunderstood—we thought it entitled to a degree of consideration which otherwise would not have been necessary.

Hitherto, we have forbore to call in question the correctness of Mr. Whitman's statements. It will be necessary now to return to his Letters, and examine more particularly what is there alleged. We shall call attention, in the first place, to a class of misrepresentations, which, as the most charitable supposition we can make, we are inclined to attribute to the author's *ignorance*.

Under this head may be ranked the views which he takes of the Orthodox *creeds*, or *confessions of faith*. He uniformly represents these as our "*standards* of religious truth, and" charges us with using them 'instead of the Bible,' and even with 'placing them before the Bible.' But this, he might have known, is altogether an erroneous statement. There is not an Orthodox church or body of men in the world, who have adopted a confession of faith, who would admit that this was (in *his sense* of the terms) their "*standard of truth*." The Bible, and this alone, if they are Protestants, is their *standard*. The word of God they have sought and studied for themselves; and having arrived at what they believe to be its true meaning, they take the liberty—the same liberty which Mr. W. has to write a letter or a sermon—to sum up this meaning on paper, and form a creed. This creed is now the authorized *profession* or *confession* of their faith, but not, in his sense, the standard of it. It *sets forth* what they believe to be the doctrines of the Bible, but is never allowed to take the place of the Bible, and much less to stand before it.

An individual, having satisfied himself as to the meaning of the Bible and formed his creed, perhaps wishes to ascertain whether the views of certain other persons *respecting the Bible* accord with his own; in what way shall this point be determined? To present them the Bible for *this purpose*, and ask them whether they agree

to that, would be preposterous; because the question at issue between him and them, respects not their *reception* of the Bible, but *the sense which they put upon it*. And we know of no way in which he can settle this question, but by stating to them his own views, and requesting them to state theirs; or, in other words, *by exhibiting his creed, and ascertaining whether they assent to it*. It is for this purpose that churches, and some other religious bodies, present their creeds to those who are to be received as members;—not that their creeds are the sources of their faith, or the standards of it;—not that they use them instead of the Bible, or advance them before it;—but that they may ascertain whether those who propose to be admitted as members have come to the *same understanding of the Bible as themselves*, and whether they can pleasantly and profitably associate on the basis of a common faith.

The inhabitants of these United States have all assented to the Federal Constitution; but unhappily all do not understand this important instrument alike. There have been long and learned debates, and our country is now divided into parties, on questions growing out of the different constructions which are put on the provisions of the Constitution. In these circumstances, our citizens do not think it enough to ask respecting the candidate for office under the general government, ‘Does he agree to the Constitution?’ They deem it important further to inquire ‘How does he understand the Constitution? What construction does he put upon it?’ Or, in other words, ‘What is his political creed?’ For a similar reason, and with at least as much propriety, Christians wish to know respecting the candidate for membership with them in the same church, not only whether he agrees to the Bible, but *what construction he puts upon the Bible*.

Mr. W. represents our creeds as inconsistent with that first principle of Protestantism, *The sufficiency of Scripture*. But, without going at large into this subject, our author will doubtless admit that the early Protestants understood the main principles by which they were governed; and if he had studied their history, he would have learned, that they were not more remarkable for their adherence to the Scriptures, than they were for the number and particularity of their creeds. The Augsburg Confession, prepared by the joint labors of Luther and Melancthon, was drawn up the same year, (1529,) in which the memorable protest was entered which gave to the united dissenters from Rome the appellation of Protestants. All the early Protestants, without excepting the Socinians at Racow, had their confessions of faith, and never once dreamed that, in preparing and adopting them, they were putting them into the place of the Bible, or advancing them before it, or detracting at all from the sufficiency of Scripture as a rule of faith. So numerous indeed were their confessions, that (as Mather relates) “they were, by the Papists, denominated, **CONFESSIONISTS**.”

Another subject, of which Mr. W. betrays the most lamentable ignorance, is the doctrine of *election*. He introduces it in a variety of instances, and always in such terms and connexions as clearly shows, either that he entirely misunderstands it, or wilfully misrepresents it. The following may be taken as an example :

“ In your creed the doctrine of election is fully declared. This teaches that God has chosen a certain, limited number for heaven, and foreordained the remainder to an everlasting hell. It also teaches that the number of the elect is *definite*, so that neither more nor less can be saved. Now if you say, the number of the elect is not definite, you give up the Calvinistic doctrine of election. And if you allow that the number is definite, then you must admit, that not one soul more will be saved, by the establishment of your feeble churches. No; none but the elect can be saved, and they will be received to heaven at any rate; and none but the reprobate can be damned, and they must go to hell in spite of Orthodox exertions.”

Were Mr. W. to propound such sentiments to some of the scholars in our Sabbath Schools, they would tell him at once, that where the end is determined, the means are also determined; that the latter are made as sure as the former, and to precede the former; so that should the one fail, the other could not possibly be realized. They might also tell him, that the salvation of men is no more determined in the general plan and purpose of God, than all other events; and that he might as well have said, If my “two Letters to the Rev. Moses Stuart on the subject of Religious Liberty” are to be published, they certainly will be published, whether I put pen to paper or not, as to have said, “If we are of the elect we shall be saved, do what we may; but if we are of the reprobate, we must be damned, do what we can.” p. 98.

Mr. W. exhibits evidence of the depth and accuracy of his historical researches in the account which he gives us of the principal Reformers. He places Zuingle “the third in the order of time,” whereas he was, in fact, the first. The views of this Reformer, he says, “were exceedingly liberal, not differing essentially, except in one or two points, from the liberal Christians of the present period.” But Mosheim says that “this illustrious Reformer,” having been supposed to entertain “false notions relating to the Divinity of Christ, the efficacy of the divine word, original sin, and some other parts of the Christian doctrine, *cleared himself* from the greatest part of these accusations with *the most triumphant evidence, and in such a manner as appeared entirely satisfactory even to Luther himself.*” Vol. iv. p. 74.

Passing over such names as Bucer, Bullinger, Ecolampadius, Carolstadt, Knox, Cranmer, and a host of others, he assigns the fifth and last place in the goodly company of Reformers to — Michael Servetus! ‘Is Saul also among the prophets?’ We have no wish to detract aught from the real merits of the unhappy Servetus, whatever they may have been. We are not aware, however, that any respectable, unbiassed historian has ever ranked him among the Reformers. Mosheim, who had no prejudices against

Servetus, and who had studied his history more than any man now living,\* describes his character and his theology in the following terms :

“The religious system that Servetus had struck out of a wild and irregular fancy, was singular in the highest degree. His peculiar notions concerning the *universe*, the *nature of God* and the *nature of things* were strange and chimerical. He took it into his head that the true and genuine doctrine of Christ had been entirely lost, even before the Council of Nice; and that he himself had received a commission from above to reveal anew this divine doctrine, and to explain it to mankind. His notions with respect to the Supreme Being, and a Trinity of persons in the Godhead, were obscure and chimerical, beyond all measure.” *Ecol. Hist.* vol. iv. p. 475.

Speaking of the “doctrines of the Reformation,” Mr. W. asserts :

“On those points in which they differed from the Catholics, they had very little agreement among themselves. They were agreed in the two great principles of Protestantism; in salvation without human merit; and in certain practical abuses of the mother church. Beyond these, they came to no agreement on any important topic which they discussed.”

Now this representation (unless we reckon the crude notions of Servetus among the doctrines of the reformation) the learned gentleman ought to have known is very far from the truth. That the Reformers differed in their explanations of certain doctrines, and in their views of some of the externals of religion, and that in their controversies one with another they often failed to exhibit a becoming degree of courtesy and affection, is certain; but that, beyond three or four points, “they came to no agreement on any important topic which they discussed,” is what Mr. W. had no reason or authority for asserting. The Protestants represented at the diet at Augsburg were all agreed in the confession of faith there presented. The Helvetic Confession, drawn up in 1566, was assented to, not only by the Swiss churches, but by those of England, Scotland, France, the Netherlands, Poland, Hungary, and many in Germany.” † We have now before us a Harmony of Protestant Confessions, eleven in number, published at Geneva in 1631, from which it appears that in all those doctrines now considered essential by Orthodox Christians in this country and in Europe, there was a very general and happy agreement among the Reformers of the sixteenth century. “The fabulous music of the spheres,” says Mather, “cannot be supposed more delicious, than that *harmony* which is to be seen in the confessions of the reformed churches, which have been published together.” *Magnalia*, vol. ii. p. 156.

“You will ask,” says Mr. W. “if the Reformers were not agreed in the great doctrines of the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the atonement, the utter depravity of human nature, unconditional election, endless punishment, and the like. These, my dear Sir, were not the doctrines of the Reformation. They are the

\*In addition to his general history, Mosheim published a particular and elaborate account of Servetus.

† *Sylloge Confessionium*, p. xiv.



very doctrines which were NOT REFORMED. They were not allowed to be examined. No; they are really and *literally* the doctrines of the Catholic church; for more or less of them had been actually voted into her creed by the holding up of priestly hands, at different times and under various forms; and those which were not so introduced, had been invented and advocated by individual members of her communion, long before the Reformation."

Does not our learned author know better than to assert, that the doctrine of *atonement*, for instance, as held by Protestants, is a 'doctrine of the Catholic church?' We believe that "Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of many;" the Catholic believes that he is offered, as a propitiatory sacrifice, in every mass performed in the church. We regard the atonement of Christ as the *sole* and *sufficient* foundation of hope; the Catholic thinks to add to this foundation, by merits, and penances, and supererogatory performances in abundance. And so, instead of the Protestant doctrine of "endless punishment" for all who die in impenitence, has Mr. W. never heard of the Catholic distinction between venial and mortal sins; and between the fires of purgatory, and those that never shall be quenched? He says that the doctrines he has mentioned "are *really* and *literally* the doctrines of the Catholic Church." But has he never heard of the long and angry disputes in that church, between the Jesuits and Jansenists, and other religious orders, respecting some of these very points, showing that they are not, and cannot be, the established and indubitable doctrines of that infallible body? And besides, has he yet to learn that the doctrines of the Reformers are those doctrines which the Reformers believed, and not merely those which were *peculiar* to them? The unity and spirituality of the divine nature, the natural and moral perfections of God, the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, the general judgement, the eternal happiness of the righteous,—all these are as truly the doctrines of the Reformers—the doctrines of those engaged in promoting the reformation—as though they had been held by them exclusively.

In his account of Calvin, Mr. W. manifests unaccountable ignorance as well as prejudice. He would make the Reformer answerable for most of the disgraceful things done by the Senate of Geneva, during his residence in that city.

"He caused Jerome Bolsec, a French physician, to be banished for his heretical opinions. He served George Blandrata, an Italian physician, who denied the doctrine of the trinity, in a similar manner. His treatment of Sebastian Castalio, his friend and regent of the College, a great, learned, and good man, was much more severe and unchristian. And his causing the death of Michael Servetus has left an indelible stain of disgrace on his character."

He may yet learn that this Genevese Senate were not so obsequious to the will of Calvin, as he represents; that he was once himself banished by their order; that the very year in which Servetus was executed, the enemies of Calvin were a majority in the

Senate; and that he was obliged to contend with a portion of this body during the greater part of his life. Mr. W. admits, however, that Calvin did not burn Servetus, and that he was unwilling he should be burned—at least, with “green wood.” The truth is, he was unwilling he should be burned at all. “I desire,” says he, “the severity of the punishment to be remitted.” “We endeavored to commute the kind of death, but in vain.” “By wishing to mitigate the severity of the punishment,” says Farel to Calvin, “you discharge the office of a friend towards your greatest enemy.” “That Calvin was the instigator of the magistrates that Servetus might be burned,” says Turretine, “historians neither anywhere affirm nor does it appear from any consideration. Nay, it is certain that he, with the college of Pastors, dissuaded from that kind of punishment.”

To show the cruelty and perfidy of Calvin, Mr. W. represents Servetus, during the early part of life, as his intimate and confidential friend.

“All this time he was in constant correspondence with Calvin. He spoke to him with all that unreserved freedom which is manifested by one devoted friend towards another. These familiar and confidential letters were afterwards used by Calvin to destroy his correspondent.”

Now there is no evidence that Calvin ever saw Servetus, or heard of him, until about the year 1534, after the latter had published twice in opposition to the Trinity. They were together at this time in Paris, where Servetus challenged Calvin to a public disputation. Calvin repaired “to the place appointed,” says Beza, “and waited for some time; but Servetus did not appear, because he feared the sight of Calvin.” From this period, Servetus was frequently thrusting himself upon the notice of Calvin; and by various inquiries and objections, proposed in writing, labored to draw him into a dispute. The “familiar and confidential letters” spoken of by Mr. W. were chiefly writings of this description—communications to which the Reformer had no time or inclination to attend, and with which he ought never to have been troubled.

Mr. W. quotes a letter of Calvin, intimating that if Servetus came to Geneva, he ‘should not suffer him to escape with life’—without suggesting a doubt as to its authenticity—which is not printed among his other letters, and which it is improbable he ever wrote. He further says,

*“Servetus was finally condemned to be burnt alive in a slow fire of green wood. And we are informed that his sufferings were excruciating beyond description, and lasted more than two hours.”*

In the words of his sentence, which now lie at full length before us, there is nothing said either of “slow fire,” or “green wood;” and the time of his sufferings, which Mr. W. makes “more than two hours,” is stated in Professor Norton’s Repository to have been “half an hour!” Vol. iii. p. 72.

In stating the doctrines of Calvin, our learned author is not less unfortunate than in giving his history.

"What," says he, "are the grand doctrines of Calvinism? I will give them to you as agreed upon by the large body of Calvinistic divines at the famous synod of Dort. I take them as abridged by Daniel Tilenus. "Art. I. That God, by an absolute decree, hath elected to salvation a very small number of men, without any regard to their faith or obedience whatever; and secluded from saving grace all the rest of mankind, and appointed them by the same decree, to eternal damnation, without any regard to their infidelity or impenitency.—Art. II. That Jesus Christ hath not suffered death for any other, but for those elect only; having neither had any intent, nor commandment of his Father, to make satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.—Art. III. That by Adam's fall his posterity lost their free will, being put to an unavoidable necessity to do or not to do, whatever they do or do not, whether it be good or evil; being thereunto predestinated by the eternal and effectual secret decree of God.—Art. IV. That God to save his elect from the corrupt mass, doth beget faith in them by a power equal to that whereby he created the world and raised up the dead; insomuch that such, unto whom he gives that grace, cannot reject it, and the rest, being reprobate, cannot accept it.—Art. V. That such as have once received that grace by faith, can never fall from it finally or totally, notwithstanding the most enormous sins they can commit."

"No one," says Mr. W. in the simplicity of his heart—"no one acquainted with the writings of Calvin will deny that these are his *real sentiments*."

We will not here stop to inquire into the propriety of going to the synod of Dort to learn the sentiments of Calvin, rather than to his own works. It is of more importance to inquire whether this abridgement by Tilenus is a fair representation of the synod of Dort. And in answer to this inquiry, we appeal to the History of the synod of Dort, published by the Rev. Thomas Scott, author of the Commentary on the Bible, but a little while before his death. Speaking of the abbreviated articles of Tilenus—the same as those above quoted—and more particularly of the first of them, this venerable man says:

"I have long been aware that there is 'no new thing under the sun;' that 'speaking all manner of evil falsely' of the disciples of Christ is no exception to this rule; and that misrepresenting and slandering men called Calvinists has been very general ever since the term was invented;—but I own, I NEVER BEFORE MET WITH SO GROSS, SO BAREFACED, AND INEXCUSABLE A MISREPRESENTATION AS THIS IN ALL MY STUDIES OF MODERN CONTROVERSY. IT CAN ONLY BE EQUALLED BY THE FALSE TESTIMONY BORNE AGAINST JESUS AND HIS APOSTLES, AS RECORDED IN HOLY WRIT."

Daniel Tilenus, in all probability, was about as well qualified to abridge the articles of the synod of Dort, as the Rev. Bernard Whitman is to write a history of the Orthodox of New England.

Mr. W. is equally unsuccessful in detailing events connected with the early history of this country, as in describing those relating to the Reformers. "The third grand, fundamental principle, of our Pilgrim fathers," he says, "was the *perfect independence of every Congregational church*.\* If he means by this that our

\* In illustration of this alleged principle, Mr. W. refers to the case of the first minister of Salem, who was ordained by members of his own church, notwithstanding a deputation from the church at Plymouth was present. Two circumstances relating to this affair, he

fathers considered every individual church as in all respects independent of the neighboring churches, acknowledging no formal connexion with them or responsibility to them,—or if he means that our fathers considered and styled themselves Independents; he is greatly mistaken. “*The world is much mistaken,*” says Dr. Increase Mather, “*in thinking that Congregational churches are independent.*” (Who understood the principles of the Pilgrims best, Dr. Mather, or Mr. Whitman?) “That name has indeed been fastened upon them by their adversaries; but our platform of discipline disclaims the name.\* And so does our renowned Hooker, in his ‘Survey of Church Discipline.’ Likewise those famous apologists in the assembly at Westminster, Dr. Goodwin, Mr. Nye, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Burroughs, and Mr. Bridge say, ‘*It is a maxim to be abhorred,* that a single and particular society of men professing the name of Christ, should arrogate to themselves an exemption from giving an account to, or being censurable by, neighboring churches about them.” †

Our author asserts again :

“The very essence of Congregationalism, the single and peculiar characteristic which distinguished the Independents ‡ from the Presbyterians, was their utter and entire rejection of all authority or jurisdiction of one church over another.” “There was not in Massachusetts, there never had been, a power to call a whole church to account for its opinions.”

It will not be easy to reconcile this quotation with that last made from Dr. Mather; or with the “third way of communion of churches,” laid down and explained in the Cambridge Platform, chap. xv. sect. 2. One church is here expressly authorized to call another church to account for “*ANY public offence;*” to afford admonition; in case of obstinacy, to call in the assistance of neighbour churches; to convene a Council or Synod; and finally, if satisfaction be not gained, to “declare the sentence of non-communion.” Under this provision, to mention but a single instance, the second church in Boston, in 1733, called the first church in Salem to an account, and procured “the sentence of non-communion” from about twenty churches to be declared against it. After several years, the church in Salem penitently acknowledged its errors, and “the sentence of non-communion” was taken off. §

had not sufficient knowledge or candor to state. The first is, that Messrs. Higginson and Skelton, the persons set apart on this occasion, had both of them been ordained in England; so that for them a formal ordination was not necessary. The second, that “Gov. Bradford, and other messengers from the church of Plymouth, being by cross winds hindered from being present in the former part of the service, came in time enough to give them the right hand of fellowship.” See Prince’s Chronology.

\* Chap. ii. sect. 5. “The term, *Independent* we approve not.”

† Order of the Churches, &c. p. 74.

‡ Ignorantly representing Independents and Congregationalists as the same.

§ See Dr. Wisner’s Historical Sermons, p. 105.

After making extracts from several of the church covenants early adopted in Massachusetts, Mr. W. observes,

"Now you will notice several remarkable circumstances connected with these creeds. *First*, you do not find one peculiarity of orthodoxy in any of them;—nothing but what every Unitarian can heartily subscribe. And this must convince you, that they wished to exclude no believer of good morals from their communion. *Secondly*, you observe, that our fathers used the words *congregation* and *church* as synonymous; as meaning one and the same body. You *finally* remark, how much more anxious these Christians were to bind themselves to a faithful discharge of Christian duty, than to fetter their minds with a doctrinal test, or set up a human standard of truth."

Does Mr. W. really believe that our fathers were averse to a public confession of faith; or that they made no distinction between the church and congregation; or that they would have held communion with open Unitarians? If so, we sincerely pity his ignorance. Does he not know that immediately after the landing of the colonists, churches, *bodies in covenant*,\* in distinction from the whole assembly of worshippers, were gathered? that these churches were very strict in the admission of members, so much so, that complaints of their strictness were repeatedly sent to the parent country? and that, besides confessions in "particular churches," they, in a few years after the settlement, adopted the Westminster Confession for all the churches? † and as to their willingness to have communion with Unitarians, he may satisfy himself by referring to their laws, by which every person, adopting errors of this description, and "continuing obstinate therein," was liable to banishment.

Speaking of the unwillingness of Orthodox ministers to exchange pulpits with Unitarians, Mr. W. says, "This system of exclusion was commenced in Connecticut, as early as 1806," "in reference probably to Rev. Mr. Sherman, who embraced Unitarianism about that period." He seems to regard what was then done as a great and lamentable *innovation*; whereas until that time, a professed Unitarian minister could not be found among the Congregationalists of New England. Mr. Sherman's publication, entitled "One God in one Person," the conductors of the Anthology describe as "one of the *first* acts of direct hostility against the Orthodox which has ever been committed on these Western shores." Vol. ii. p. 249. It seems then, according to our author's own showing, that the refusal to exchange with Unitarians commenced here, as soon as there was a professed Unitarian to be refused;—and he will find, as he becomes more acquainted with the history of the church, that this conduct on the part of the Orthodox ministers of New England is in strict accordance with the practice of

\* Our fathers sometimes used the word *congregation* to denote the church, or *body in covenant*.

† Mather says, "If the Protestants have been by the Papists called *Confessionists*, the Protestants of New England have, of all, given the *most laudable occasion to be called so*." Magnalia, vol. ii. p. 156.

such ministers, from the very first century of the Christian era, to the present time.\*

Mr. W. says, "that great allowances should be made" for Professor Stuart, and other clergymen among us "who were reared in Connecticut," because "the very laws under which they were trained taught them to regard Unitarianism as a heinous crime." He then quotes a paragraph from the old repealed statutes of Connecticut—which he *charitably* supposes Mr. Stuart, "Dr. Beecher, and the other gentlemen who have been invited from Connecticut to teach theology in this Commonwealth, regard as *highly commendable*"—according to which those, who "deny any one of the persons in the Trinity to be God," are disfranchised. The learned gentleman did not know, probably, that much severer laws against persons like himself may be found in the statute books of Massachusetts. The following acts were passed, the first in 1646, and the second in 1697, and continued in force, we believe, until the adoption of the present state Constitution :

"It is therefore ordered and declared by the court, that if any Christian within this jurisdiction shall go about to subvert and destroy the Christian faith and religion, by broaching and maintaining any damnable heresies, as . . . . *denying that Christ gave himself a ransom for our sins, or shall affirm that we are not justified by his death and righteousness but by the perfections of our own works, or shall deny the morality of the fourth commandment, . . . . . or shall endeavor to seduce others to any of the errors or heresies above mentioned* ; every such person, continuing obstinate therein, after due means of conviction, shall be sentenced to *banishment*."

"Be it declared and enacted by the lieutenant Governor, Council, and Representatives, convened in general court or assembly, and it is enacted by the authority of the same, that if any person shall presume wilfully to blaspheme the holy name of God, *Father, Son, or Holy Ghost* . . . . . every one offending shall be punished by imprisonment, not exceeding six months, and until they find sureties for their good behavior ; by sitting in the pillory ; by whipping ; boring through the tongue with a red hot iron ; or sitting upon the gallows with a rope about their neck ; at the discretion of the court of assize, and general gaol delivery, before which the trial shall be, according to the circumstances which may aggravate or alleviate the offence."

It will be borne in mind that these laws were superseded or rescinded by *Orthodox* legislators, long before Unitarianism had any visible existence in the councils of Massachusetts.

From some passages in these letters, we fear their author is not much better acquainted with his Bible, than he is with history and law. The following may be taken as a specimen.

"I challenge you, or any other man, to produce one passage of holy writ, which gives an Orthodox church the right to excommunicate a member for heresy, so long as the member makes the Bible his standard of faith, and exhibits a Christian character."

The apostle Paul does not accuse the Judaizing teachers, whom he *anathematized*, with rejecting the Scriptures, or with immoral

\* See Spirit of the Pilgrims, Vol. i. pp. 237—294.

practices, but with *preaching another Gospel*. Gal. i. 8. The apostle John does not charge those who denied that Jesus Christ had come *in the flesh*, with rejecting the Scriptures, or with any wickedness aside from the errors of their faith; and yet they were "deceivers and antichrists" whom "the elect lady" must "not receive into her house." 2 John. "A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject." Tit. iii. 10.

We have noticed a variety of inaccuracies in the work before us relating to things of comparatively small importance—showing the ignorance or inattention of its author, and how little credit can be given to his statements. We shall notice only a few.—He speaks repeatedly of ministerial Associations *excommunicating* their members. He might as well talk of a Lyceum or a mechanic's Association *excommunicating* members. To *excommunicate* is "to eject from the communion of a church by an Ecclesiastical censure."—He speaks of the doings of the General Assembly, of Synods, and of distinguished Presbyterian clergymen, as inconsistent with "the principles of Congregationalism;"—as though the whole Presbyterian church, and all its members, were bound to observe what he deems the principles of *Congregationalism*!—He makes "Dr. Miller the *Principal*" of the Theological Seminary at Princeton; speaks of the "*Delegates* of the Synod;" and describes the "*State Consociation*" of Connecticut. When he travels again, he may learn (if he inquires) that Dr. Miller is not the Principal of this Seminary; that "Synods are not delegated bodies, but consist of all the members of the Presbyteries that compose them;" and that in Connecticut there is no "*State Consociation*," and never has been.

After the specimens here given of the attainments of Mr. W., in theology, history, law, and Ecclesiastical affairs generally, it is not a little amusing to hear him talk so knowingly and positively as he does, in most parts of these Letters. He describes the differences existing among the Orthodox, and the measure of intellectual elevation and improvement to be assigned to the different portions of our community, as he thinks, no doubt, with hair-splitting accuracy.

"The literal fact seems to be this. In religious truth, Andover is fifty years in advance of Bangor and Princeton; New Haven and New York are twenty-five years in advance of Andover; and Cambridge is fifty years in advance of New Haven!"

How fortunate for the different Orthodox Seminaries to be able to know on so high authority, their relative standing, and how far they all are in the rear of Cambridge!!

We shall next call attention to a portion of Mr. Whitman's statements, which indicate, not so much his ignorance, as his *disingenuousness*.

He often insinuates what he dares not affirm, and yet throws out his insinuations in such a way that they have all the effect of direct assertions. Instances of this kind, too numerous to be mentioned, must have forced themselves upon the notice of all his readers.

It is obvious that the statements of our author are nearly all of them *ex parte*. They are the complaints of those who think themselves aggrieved or injured, and who are here permitted—without inquiry or contradiction, and with the additional advantage of Mr. Whitman's coloring—to pour forth their murmurs. What jury would think of bringing in a verdict, when they had heard only one side of a case? Yet they might do it with as much propriety and justice as the public can form a judgement, in view of most of the statements in the work before us.

It is an old adage, "He that is first in his own cause seemeth just, but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him." But in regard to many of the statements of Mr. W. there is no such thing as coming and searching him; for he gives them without names, or dates, or any marks of reference by which they can be traced. We think it right and safe—and our readers will think so before we are through—to set down all such stories as false, until they are accompanied with responsible names, or are presented in such a way that their truth or falsehood may be fairly investigated.

As a similar instance of unfairness, we may notice the *quotations* of Mr. W. These are numerous, and of a character that renders it specially important that they should be examined. Yet there is scarcely a reference to authorities in his whole book, or any means furnished by which his quotations may be verified. This omission is not only vexatious but suspicious. We know of no reason why an author, who uniformly quotes fairly and truly, should be unwilling to inform his readers whence his extracts were obtained, and where they may be compared with their originals.

In some instances, where names are given, we know that our author has not derived his information from the *proper source*. Take the case of James Kimball (related pp. 92, 93,) who several years ago was removed from the theological seminary at Andover, and soon after died: Did Mr. W. go to the Faculty at Andover for information in regard to this painful subject? Or did he take, at second or third hand, the statements of the aggrieved Kimball? We could name a certain Sophomore—not unknown to our author—who, some years ago, was suspended from Harvard University, and who, when his term of suspension expired, refused to return. Suppose the statements of this Sophomore had been carefully noted down, by himself or some of his learned friends, and afterwards published; would they have been received as exhibiting a true and faithful account of the difficulty existing between him and his instructors? Yet they could hardly have been entitled to less con-



ference than some of the insinuations here thrown out (for this is one of the cases in which Mr. W. does not think proper to deal in direct assertion) respecting the grievances of James Kimball.

In stating a case, Mr. W. often gives only a part of it, omitting such things as would not appear in his favor. For example; in his insinuations respecting Dr. Murdock, he does not *pretend* to state the case fully, but intimates that a 'history of the whole affair' may yet be published. Had we no other reasons for not going, at present, into a full consideration of this matter, this last intimation would be alone sufficient. We prefer to wait till the full history is published, rather than attempt replying to a score of inuendos, thrown out by a man who obviously has as little knowledge of the subject, as he has concern with it. The public know already that Dr. Murdock was removed from office in the theological Seminary at Andover, by the unanimous voice of the Board of Trustees; that he then appealed, as he had a right to do, to the Visitors, who unanimously confirmed the decision of the Trustees; that he next appealed to the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth (as he was permitted to do by the statutes of the Seminary and the laws of the State) and that in this Court the sentence of the Visitors was confirmed. The public, we say, already know as much as this; and Mr. W. will find they know enough not to be greatly perturbed or excited by any thing he has said relating to this subject.

One of the most imposing cases stated in these Letters is that respecting Rev. Mr. Hubbard, of Lunenburg. The story, as related by Mr. W., is, in brief, as follows: When Mr. H. came to Lunenburg, it was generally known by Orthodox ministers in that region, that he had been in the practice of exchanging with Unitarians. On this account, they were determined, if possible, to prevent his settlement. Accordingly they went to Andover and earnestly solicited information derogatory to his character. False reports were invented by an individual in Middleton, the place of Mr. Hubbard's former settlement; by him communicated to Rev. Mr. Braman of Danvers; and by him to Rev. Mr. Payson, of Leominster, who took pains to circulate them in Lunenburg, with a view to prevent the settlement of Mr. H. All this is accompanied with an array of "confessions," which, to those unacquainted with circumstances, gives it the appearance of solemn reality.

We will now state the *facts* in the case, as we have received them from the individuals directly concerned, that our readers may compare the one statement with the other. When Mr. H. came to Lunenburg, he was an entire stranger, we believe, to all the Orthodox ministers in the vicinity, certainly to Mr. Payson, who is represented as "the principal instrument in this unrighteous work." Consequently, these ministers could have no prejudices respecting him, one way or the other. Reports, not relating to his doctrinal

belief or his exchanges, but unfavorable to his character, soon followed him to the scene of his future labors, and came to the ears of the neighboring clergy. Being at Andover soon after, at the anniversary of the Theological Seminary, (not going there, as Mr. W. insinuates, for the very purpose of hunting up scandal) they improved the opportunity to inquire into the truth of these reports. They heard them confirmed from several sources, and particularly by Rev. Mr. Braman. On their return, they communicated, as they felt bound to do, to their friends in Lunenburg, the substance of what they had heard.—Such is a brief statement of this imposing case; and what is there, we ask, relating to it, in which Mr. Payson and his ministerial brethren, can be regarded as culpable? Settled in the immediate vicinity of Lunenburg, then a destitute parish, is it strange that they should feel interested respecting the character of its future minister? And when they heard reports unfavorable to the character of Mr. H., who was preaching there on probation, is it strange that they should improve a favorable opportunity to make inquiry respecting these reports? And when they heard them confirmed from respectable sources, is it strange that they believed them—and felt under obligations to communicate what they had heard to their friends in Lunenburg?

As to Mr. Braman, it is not pretended that he reported more than he had heard on good authority, or more than he had reason, at the time, to believe was true. And as to the individual in Middleton, on whom, according to the representation of Mr. W., the blame of the transaction almost entirely rests, we feel constrained to give the following account, communicated by Mr. Braman, of the manner in which his confession was obtained.

“The confession of the gentleman in Middleton was an *extorted* one. He, at that time, was in ill health, suffering under a disorder of the nervous system, and liable in consequence to great mental agitation. Being severely threatened and treated in an overbearing manner by Mr. H.; being taken into a room with several individuals, all Mr. H.’s friends; being pressed with the consequences of refusing to sign the confession *prepared for him*—and with no one to advise and assist him, he put his name to a paper, the contents of which he had not presence of mind enough fully to comprehend. What deserves particular mention is, that his agitation and confession were principally produced and wrung from him, by an unfounded statement which Mr. H. made to him of some declarations I had reported him to have uttered respecting Mr. H.’s moral character. He doubted the truth of what Mr. H. said he could substantiate by witness, and asked for *one hour* to send for me, with a view to ascertain the correctness of the statement; but was told that it *could not be granted*, and that unless he should sign the confession speedily, a legal prosecution would be commenced against him. Fearing that, in case the matter should be brought to such a result, I might appear as an important witness against him, he reluctantly complied with the demand. Had I been sent for, his confession would have appeared in a very different shape from that in which it is presented in Mr. Whitman’s Letters. As it now stands, it *ought never to have been demanded or made.*”

Mr. W. will have it that these reports were ‘invented and circulated to prevent Mr. H. from exchanging with the Unitarians.’ They “were invented,” he says, “by the individual in Middleton.”

But, as it happens, this individual had no objection to Mr. H. on account of his exchanging with the Unitarians. His opposition arose from very different reasons. It happens, too, that the most active and influential opposer of Mr. H. at Middleton, one who said as much to his disadvantage as any person there, was the most decided Unitarian in the place. Mr. Braman likewise assures us that, though he 'disapproves of the practice of exchanging with Unitarians, and could not conscientiously pursue that course himself, yet he had never any feelings of prejudice or hostility to Mr. H. on this account, but felt fully willing that he should be governed by his own views of duty on the subject.' When Mr. Payson and his ministerial brethren learned what the practice of Mr. H. in regard to exchanges had been, doubtless they felt more unwilling than they otherwise would, that he should be settled in their immediate vicinity; but we are authorised to say, that the unfavorable reports which first reached them, and into the truth of which they felt bound to inquire, did not relate to the subject of exchanges, but were of a very different character.\* We have devoted more space to this affair than we otherwise should have done, because, as stated in the letters before us, it has more the appearance of authenticity and accuracy; and has probably excited more attention and inquiry, than any of the stories there detailed.

Mr. W. has much to say in this connexion, respecting "the threatenings of the leaders of the Orthodox party," by which they overawed their too timid brethren, and prevent their exchanging with Unitarians. To this we can only reply, that after many years' familiar intercourse with Orthodox ministers in different parts of the State, we never heard a threat of this kind, nor heard of one, until we were informed of them by Mr. W. It is not a little strange that Orthodox ministers should go to him with their complaints, when they never had whispered them to their own brethren.

He has much to say, also, respecting the *uneasiness* of the people over whom our Orthodox brethren are settled, because they will not exchange with Unitarians, and avers, as what may be 'depended on,' that "parishes will not much longer suffer their ministers" to pursue such a course. We claim to know something on this subject, as well as Mr. W., and we can assure *him*, as what may be 'depended on,' that a vast majority of those who are blessed with faithful Orthodox preaching, are as *sincerely averse* to promiscuous exchanges, as their pastors are. So far from desiring to hear Unitarian ministers, they would absolutely refuse to hear them. Many would not hear them even for a Sabbath. In most of the few cases where promiscuous exchanges are still continued, many of the

\* It is intended to re-publish this Review in a pamphlet, in the appendix to which a more full account of the circumstances of this, and some other cases here examined, may be expected.

people, we know, are uneasy on account of them, and are wishing and praying that the days of their continuance may be shortened. \*

Mr. W. tells a story, p. 21, of an Orthodox minister in Middlesex County, who, previous to his call, concealed his "real theological sentiments," and "manifested a willingness to be liberal in his ministerial intercourse," and who, after settlement, "continued for a year or more to exchange occasionally with Unitarian ministers;" but who, at length, came out on doctrinal subjects, and refused further exchanges of this nature. In this case, though neither name nor date is given, we have been so fortunate as to ascertain the individual to whom our author alludes; and we must say that a more unfair and inaccurate representation was perhaps never spread before the public. The clergyman referred to, we are fully satisfied, did not, previous to his call, conceal his "theological sentiments," or "manifest a willingness" to exchange with Unitarians; nor did he, after settlement, "continue for a year or more to exchange occasionally with Unitarian ministers." †

The account which Mr. W. gives of the 'persecutions' of Rev. John Truair, p. 44, is equally partial and unfounded. It would seem from his statement, that Mr. T. was first employed in West Hampton *after* "the secession of a part of the Orthodox society;" whereas he was employed several months previous to that event, and it was in consequence of his labors that the secession took place. The Hampshire Central Association are represented as being "interested to prevent the formation of a second parish in that town," and as interposing by their "Committee to persuade the two parties to unite, and Mr. Truair to leave the place;" whereas the Association took no order on the subject, until they were requested to do so by a respectable portion of the inhabitants of the town. Mr. W. says, "The seceders agreed to return to the old congregation, and their preacher to retire from their employment, on certain conditions," but "the old society did not comply with their part of the conditions;" whereas it can be made to appear that the old society, and their pastor, did comply with their part of the conditions so far as, in existing circumstances, was possible. Mr. W. copies the resolutions of the Hampshire Central Association, signifying that Mr. T. had 'forfeited their confidence as a minister of Christ,' and then asks, "What had this persecuted man done to merit this severe and destructive persecution?"

\* How astonishing, after all Mr. W. and some of his brethren have said to the discredit of Orthodox ministers, that they should still wish to exchange with them! What shall be thought of a minister's consistency, or his sense of personal responsibility, who should wish to introduce into his pulpit, teachers, such as these are represented to be in the work before us!

† He made one such exchange, and one only.

Nothing half so bad as the Orthodox preachers are doing almost every day in this vicinity." Does Mr. W. know what he has here written? Are the Orthodox preachers in this vicinity in the habit of tolerating and encouraging the greatest disorders and irregularities in their religious meetings? Are they in the habit of continuing their evening lectures till the dead hour of midnight, and in some instances almost till the dawning of day? Are they in the habit of —

— But we will not stain our paper with what we were about to write. Suffice it to say, that the Presbytery of New York, with which Mr. T. is connected, have sent Commissioners to West Hampton to investigate his conduct—that he has been publicly tried on several charges and specifications going to impeach his moral and ministerial character—and that the Presbytery have since "voted that all the charges and most of the specifications" against him "are amply sustained," and "that he be immediately suspended from the ministry and the sacraments of the church." Such is Mr. Whitman's "worthy minister!" worthy confessor! If he has blushes, they may yet be called forth, when he reviews the page he has occupied in decrying what he calls the the "severe and destructive persecution" of Mr. Truair.

The next case considered by our author is that of the Rev. Thomas Worcester of Salisbury, N. H. who, he says, has "been persecuted in almost every possible manner by the Orthodox, because he renounced the doctrine of the Trinity." We are not so particularly acquainted with the circumstances of this case, as with those of some others; but we know enough to feel assured that the above is altogether an exaggerated statement. Mr. W. acknowledges that "for more than ten years after an open avowal of his disbelief of the triune doctrine, he was permitted to hold his place as a pastor, the most of the time in a good degree of peace and comfort." During some part of this period, his greatest trouble seemed to be, that his ministerial brethren let him alone, and declined controversy with him. At length it was reported, that the members of the Hopkinton Association were becoming favorable to the scheme of the Messrs. Worcester's respecting the Trinity. "They hear us with *silence*," it was said,—implying that they heard with silent approbation. This led the Association, at their next meeting, to vote, that they did not approve of the sentiments of the Messrs. Worcesters, but adhered to their former views on the subject of the Trinity.\* It is only a few years ago, that Mr. Thomas Worcester was dismissed by a *mutual* Council. The following is from a Letter of a principal member of this Council:

"Before the Council there was no impeachment of Mr. Worcester's Orthodoxy, nor any complaint affecting his Christian or ministerial character. The act of dismissal was predicated on the divided state and unfavorable prospects

\* We are not able to give the precise words of the vote. The above, as our correspondent assures us, is the substance of it.

of the church and people. The Council, in their result, felt constrained to animadvert on the great error which Mr. Worcester had publicly and repeatedly avowed; but they acquitted him as explicitly of having avowed other errors which are usually connected with it."

As another illustration of our author's accuracy, we may refer to his account of transactions in the second church in Brookfield. He says the original covenant of this church was "so liberal, that Christians of different religious opinions" (evidently designing to include Unitarians) "could give their assent to its requisitions;" whereas the original covenant was *Trinitarian and Orthodox*, and substantially the same with that now used by the original Orthodox church in that place. He intimates that the introducing of a new and more Orthodox covenant in 1825 was that which led to Mr. Stone's dismissal from the parish, "a large majority" of which had become Unitarian. But in the reasons assigned by a Committee of the parish why he ought to be dismissed, not a word is said as to any change in his religious sentiments, or any alteration of the covenant of the church, nor is any dissatisfaction expressed with Orthodox principles and preaching. Mr. Stone is represented by Mr. W. as dismissed from the *church*; whereas he never was dismissed from the church, not even from that portion of it who continue to worship with the parish. Mr. W. says, that when 'the majority of the communicants'—*alias* the *church*—'seceded, they carried off the church records, plate, and Bible, which lawfully belonged to the congregation.' By what right the *church* records and plate belonged to the *congregation*, remains to be shown. The Bible they did not carry away. When the church seceded, two male members remained behind. These, says Mr. W., "were excommunicated," "because they would not follow" their brethren "to a new place of worship and communion." One of these members was excommunicated, in part, for neglecting public worship and the communion of the church, not subsequent to the separation, but *for a long time previous*; and the other for *immoral* and disorderly conduct, and for breach of covenant. But, says Mr. W., he 'had broken no covenant engagements, as he never signed the new Orthodox creed.' Nor did any of the church *sign* the creed. They expressed their assent to it, when it was proposed to them, by rising from their seats,—and this member rose among the rest.

If our readers are as tired of following us in these investigations, as we are of pursuing them, they are certainly to be pitied. We crave their patience only while we lay before them a few more specimens of the fairness and accuracy of our veracious author.—Speaking of the Trinitarian Congregational church in Waltham, he informs us that "an Orthodox minister was settled there, upon the condition that he should leave, whenever two thirds of the voters should so decide;" and that "after five years ministrations," only

“fifteen votes from more than a hundred voters could be obtained for his continuance.” Mr. W. does not mention the number who were denied the privilege of voting, although members of the society, because they had not resided within the limits of Waltham the whole of the preceding year; nor how many of those who voted left Unitarian and Universalist societies, only a few days previous, for the very purpose, as some of them have since confessed, of effecting the dismissal of the Orthodox minister; nor how many were sent for to a neighboring *state* to come and vote on this emergency, though they had been removed from Waltham several months;—nor how many *hundreds*, including females, presented a petition, praying that their pastor might not be dismissed.—The Orthodox minister he says, “left the house of worship with only five male members. They took the records and the plate, which had been presented by the agent of the manufacturing company, a Unitarian; and the Bible, which had been purchased by a subscription among the ladies.” He should have said, that the *whole church*, male and female without an exception, followed their Pastor to another place of worship. They took their records and their plate, for the very obvious and sufficient reason, that they were their own property. To whom did they belong, if not to this church? Not surely to the original church in Waltham, (Mr. Ripley’s) and as to Mr. Whitman’s, it was not then in existence, but was formed *de novo* after the separation. As to the Bible, which Mr. W. affirms the church took, *they did not take it*. It was taken by the original purchasers, or so many of them as still resided in Waltham (whose property it was) and by them given to Mr. Harding’s church subsequent to the separation.—“The Supreme Court have repeatedly decided,” says our author, “that such seceders have no right to the church property. These decisions were known at the very time by those who openly violated the laws of the Commonwealth.” He must be supposed to speak of the kind of property above referred to, as the *plate, &c.* The Supreme Court of Massachusetts had not then decided (we are not aware that they have now) that a seceding church could not hold property of this description. In the case of Baker and Fales, Judge Parker says, “There may undoubtedly be donations to a church which, from the nature of the property given, ought to be considered to be in trust for *church uses*, such as *furniture for a communion table, a baptismal font, &c.* The particular use, implied from the nature of the property given, would in such case *exclude any claim of the parish or society, as such, to such property.*” Term Reports, Vol. xvi. p. 496.

Mr. W. represents, in this connexion, that the Orthodox claim for their churches the sole and exclusive right of choosing a minister, and of holding all the parochial property. He ought to have

known, if he did not know, that this is an unfounded representation. In all our churches, with the exception of a very few, which hold their houses of worship on conditions which render such an arrangement impossible,\* the right of the associated parishes to choose their religious teachers, and to hold and control their own property is sacredly maintained. Our churches assume no parish right. All they claim is the right (in concurrence with the associated parishes) to choose their own Pastors, and to hold and control such property as belongs exclusively to themselves.

A distinct subject of complaint in the Letters before us is the American Education Society. Mr. W. alleges that this Society has obtained "a considerable amount of funds from Unitarians, with the *express* understanding that indigent students of their own sentiments should be assisted." This statement we are *authorized* to deny. That the Directors of the Society do not patronize young men who are known to be Unitarians, is true. That they never *promised* to do this, is also true. Donations have been neither solicited nor received with any such "express understanding" on the part of the Society or its Directors, in regard to their appropriation, as is here asserted. So far from this, the entire amount of donations, with the exception, perhaps, of a few dollars—a mere fraction in comparison with the whole—has been given by members of Orthodox churches and congregations, and with the *fullest* understanding that the money was to be applied to the education of young men for the ministry in Evangelical or Orthodox denominations only. Of such denominations, not less than *seven* have shared in the appropriation of these funds.

Mr. W. further alleges, that if a beneficiary of this Society "wishes to receive his collegiate education at Cambridge, every possible exertion is made to *frighten* him from such a proceeding." This representation is also unfounded. For several years after the American Education Society was formed, and before the sectarian character of Harvard University was so well understood as it is at present, young men of Orthodox sentiments occasionally resorted there for an education, and received the patronage of the Society. Twenty-two young men of this character were aided in that institution between the years 1816 and 1825, and received not far from four thousand eight hundred dollars. Since the period last mentioned, few if any applications have been made from that quarter; and so long as the University is governed by the exclusive and sec-

\* We refer to those places of worship held by *trust deeds*, some of which secure to the male members of the church the exclusive right of choosing the religious teacher. Different opinions are entertained among intelligent Orthodox people as to the expediency of these deeds. Certain it is, they never would have been resorted to in *this* country (in England, *Unitarianism* has subsisted upon trust deeds for the greater part of a century) had it not been for the efforts of the enemies of our faith to despoil our churches of their rights, and get possession of their property.



tarian policy of its present rulers, Orthodox young men will not go there for an education, and consequently will not be patronized there. Should the officers of the American Education Society be requested, as individuals, to *advise* their beneficiaries (and this is all the authority over them which they can exercise) whether they shall seek an education at Cambridge while the present policy is pursued, they will—not ‘make every possible exertion to *frighten* them from’ going—but will doubtless *advise* them not to go.

Mr. W. has given the following account of the associations of the beneficiaries for prayer and Christian conference in the places of their education.

“All those beneficiaries, who reside at the same literary institution, are obliged to assemble together once a month, according to the laws of a printed constitution. They must make one of their number the secretary of the body, who is to keep an account of all absences from the monthly meetings, note all aberrations in thought, word, and deed, and transmit a faithful history of the same to the general secretary. His answer will then be read for the special benefit of all concerned. The constitution further requires, that four prayers be made on each evening of meeting, and specifies the subjects. One is to be especially for their secretary, that he may be faithful in recording their errors and failings; and also for the whole Education Society.”

We consider this one of the most inexcusable and apparently wilful misrepresentations in the work before us. Our author must have had the “constitution” of which he speaks before him;\* with the intelligence of a child he could have understood it; and yet he totally misrepresents it. It is no where said that the beneficiaries are “*obliged* to assemble together once a month,” &c. but only that they are “*expected*” to do this. The “constitution” spoken of is not enjoined on them, as a code of “*laws*,” but simply proposed to them as a model according to which, if they think proper, they may form the rules of their association. What Mr. W. calls “the secretary of the body,” is in the constitution denominated “the presiding member.” The secretary, he says, must “note all aberrations in *thought*, word, and deed.” This is fabrication entire. No such duty is enjoined upon the presiding member, or attempted by him, nor could he possibly perform it, should the attempt be made. Again, we are told, that one of the prayers “is to be especially for *their* secretary (meaning, as the connexion determines it, the secretary of the meeting) that he may be faithful in *recording their errors and failings*; and also for the whole Education Society.” This statement, so far as it relates to special prayer for “their secretary,” is altogether without foundation. It is recommended in the constitution, that the second prayer shall be for “the American Education Society;” for its “several branches;” for its “members and supporters;” for its “Executive officers;” and among these for “the Secretary of the parent society, that he

\* The reader is requested to examine this constitution, published in the Appendix to the last Annual Report of the American Education Society. p. 65.

may have grace and every needful qualification for his various and responsible duties." But that the young men are required to pray "especially for *their* secretary, that he may be faithful in recording their errors and failings," is utterly false.

Mr. W. tells us, p. 144, of "a member of an Orthodox church who left Cambridge College and joined Amherst," and who "has lately affirmed, that there is more roguery, more dissipation, and less order at Amherst than at Cambridge, and that he wished himself well back to the heretical institution." What will be thought of the fairness of this statement, and of the conduct of him who could stoop to make it, when it is known that the individual here referred to—a young man with whom, and with whose circumstances, our author is well acquainted—was, at the time when the above account was published, suspended both from the church to which he belonged and from Amherst College, on a charge of immorality! No wonder "he wished himself well back to the heretical institution!"

Among the anonymous tales with which these letters are stuffed, we have the following:—

"An Orthodox minister called upon a very sick widow, who had been several years an exemplary member of a Unitarian church. His presence was neither solicited nor desired by the suffering patient. He assured her, that she could not expect to be saved, unless she believed in the divinity of Christ. She afterward observed, that such unchristian treatment would have deprived her of her senses, had she not searched the Scriptures for herself, and known in whom she confided."

We have been made acquainted with the circumstances of this case, all which were probably known to Mr. W., and are permitted to publish the following account, received from the Orthodox minister to whom he refers.

"I went at the very earnest *written* request of a brother of the sick widow, who desired me to visit her as soon as practicable after receiving his letter. I found this 'exemplary member of a Unitarian church' disposed to *question the inspiration of the Bible, and the truth of its representations of another world, and to doubt whether there was any hereafter.* I do not recollect saying what Mr. W. says I did. I endeavored to give her such instruction as I thought appropriate and useful to one about to leave the world."

Our author thus describes a certain place which he does not name, but which we have been able to identify.

"There are about one thousand inhabitants in the place. They all attend a Unitarian meeting. One of your disorganizers enters the peaceful fold, and succeeds in turning some of the flock from their present pastor. They are organized into a feeble church. Their secession takes from the annual salary from five to ten dollars. A *shanty* is thrown up for a place of worship; and a minister is ordained over them."

The facts concerning this place we have received from a highly respectable correspondent, and shall give them in his own words.

"In this "peaceful fold," several individuals had long been uneasy. At length, one of the deacons became dissatisfied with the preaching, and was dis-

tressed in view of his situation as a sinner. He communicated his feelings to the other deacon, who was ready to reciprocate them; for he also had been similarly exercised. They, with some others, occasionally met for prayer. They visited their minister, and asked him to attend the monthly concert, and to encourage them in their devotional meetings. They frequently visited him, and had no idea of separating from him, if they could receive encouragement and assistance as they wished; for he had been settled as an Orthodox minister, and professed to be so even then. But all their efforts with him were in vain. They consulted together, and unitedly prayed for divine direction. They then consulted neighboring ministers, who advised them to go to their pastor again. Some of these ministers also visited him, and expressed their ardent desire that he might preach those truths which he had formerly preached, and which he professed at the time of his ordination, and thus keep the society together. At length the deacons and some others became satisfied that they had no reason to expect their minister would preach what they considered as evangelical doctrine. They owned property in the meeting house, and knew that if they separated they should be reproached. But after mature deliberation, and many struggles, they came to the conclusion to abandon their property, disregard reproaches, and claim for themselves the same "Religious Liberty" which they freely granted to others. They concluded to establish an evening meeting for religious instruction, and asked their minister to meet with them; but he refused. They then invited other ministers to come and preach to them; and now, for the first time, one of Mr. W.'s alleged "disorganizers enters the peaceful fold," and "succeeds," as he says, "in turning some of the flock from their present pastor." But had they not turned from their pastor before? And in so doing, had they done anything "inconsistent with free inquiry, religious liberty, or the principles of Congregationalism?"—They wished peaceably to perform what they deemed their duty, allowing to all others the same privilege. But were they permitted to assemble in peace and worship God, according to the dictates of their own consciences? Were not stones and eggs thrown into their place of worship, to the great annoyance and hazard of those who were assembled!! Was not one who, at their request, went peaceably to preach to them the Gospel, treated in a manner even more shameful—in a manner not to be related!! Did they not assail him, on leaving the place of worship, with oaths and curses, and follow him with the most horrible imprecations to a considerable distance from the place! Were not preparations made to burn another clergyman in effigy, who went there peaceably to preach the Gospel! When on a certain occasion, the pious people in the place were assembled for worship, did not their *liberal* neighbors come around the house with drums and horns, and by shaking the windows, getting upon the roof, stamping, and in other ways, make such disturbance as to stop the meeting!!!\* Such was a part of the abuse and suffering of this small Orthodox Society, while quietly assembling for the worship of God, and endeavoring to do their duty. I am as sorry to say these things as any of those implicated can be to hear them; but Mr. W. has compelled me. I could not correct his misrepresentations, and vindicate the injured people whom he traduces and slanders, without saying them. By great exertions, they have built a small but neat place of worship (which he reproaches with the name of a "*shanty*") and have settled a minister. 'Their secession,' he says, 'takes from the annual salary from five to ten dollars. He might have known that *one* of the seceding deacons paid more than this sum himself. He concludes his account by saying, 'Such is an *exact* and *true* description!' If the rest of his book is as 'exact and true,' may it soon be covered with the disgrace it merits."

\* This whole account is confirmed by other correspondents and witnesses, some of whom were the principal objects of abuse on these occasions. We could mention a variety of instances of similar abuse, in which the *liberal* opposers of Orthodoxy have displayed their zeal, by dashing in windows where their neighbors were assembled for religious purposes—in cutting harnesses—shearing horses—pulling out linch-pins—besmearing cushions—privately nailing up houses where meetings were appointed—defiling the steps of churches—drawing ropes across the street to endanger the limbs and lives of females returning from meeting in the evening—and in various other acts of rudeness and violence!! Such things have been done (we blush to say it) in this nineteenth century—at no great distance from our good city of Boston—and by those, too, who claim to be the most strenuous advocates for freedom in religion, and liberty of conscience!!!

Professor Stuart, in his Letter, had referred to the late persecutions in Switzerland, and attributed them to the influence of Unitarianism. In reply, Mr. W. asserts, that "Unitarianism has had *nothing whatever* to do with these persecutions;" but "one party of Calvinists has been persecuting another party for being more zealous and rigid (*more rigid* than their persecutors!) in their views and measures." In 'proof of this,' he proceeds to show, that the persecuting churches, in the Cantons of Vaud and Berne, still adhere, at least nominally, to the Helvetic Confession of faith.—And so the Arians of the fourth century adhered *nominally* to the Nicene faith. This faith was the established religion of the empire, at the same time that its faithful adherents were banished and persecuted for their opinions.\* The elder Socinus professed an adherence to the Helvetic Confession as long as he lived.† In the Genevese churches, which our author admits are Unitarian, the Helvetic Confession has never been formally set aside, although subscription to it is not now enforced.‡ It is no new thing for Unitarians to profess adherence to an Orthodox Confession of faith. "In the year 1772, many clergymen of the church of England, who held Unitarian sentiments, petitioned the Legislature for relief from the necessity of subscribing the articles of that church, because that subscription *was opposed to their conscientious belief.*" And though their petition was rejected, they, with one exception, still persisted in their adherence to the church. It is not long since Unitarians in this country denied that they were Unitarians, and counted themselves slandered when this name was applied to them. "The fact becomes more and more manifest," says Dr. Smith, speaking of the Canton of Vaud, "that it is not *separation*, but *vital religion*, that is the real object of hatred; for many harassments and injuries have been committed upon pious persons, both ministers and others, who remain *attached* to the established church." § "We fear," says one who had travelled in Switzerland, "that, in the Canton of Berne, a *large proportion of the clergy belong to the anti-evangelical party.* We could hear of few instances of that clear and faithful display of truth which is calculated to bring home the gospel to the hearts of men." "The clergy who adopt *Unitarian views* cannot *explain* or *enforce* the doctrines which they are compelled to teach in their catechetical instruction, and it would be too gross an inconsistency to *oppose* them openly." || Such is the character of those, generally, in the Can-

\* See Milner's Eccl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 79, *et alibi.*

† See Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. vol. iv. p. 469.

‡ See Christian Observer, vol. xxvi. p. 684.

§ Evangelical Magazine for Oct. 1829.

|| Christian Spectator for March 1830.

tons of Vaud and Berne, who have been chargeable with persecuting the people of God. They are "*anti-evangelical*"—to a great extent in doctrine, and entirely so in spirit,—let their profession be what it may.

But not to insist on this : Mr. W. acknowledges that the Genevese are Unitarians. And does he not know, or has he not the candor to admit, that on them, too, rests the disgraceful charge of religious persecution ? Does he not know, that in May 1817, all the pastors and ministers in Geneva were compelled to enter into an engagement not to preach on the following topics :

- " 1st. The manner in which the divine nature is united to the person of Jesus Christ.
- 2dly. Original sin.
- 3dly. The operation of Grace, or Effectual Calling.
- 4thly. Predestination."

They were also required to engage that they would not 'oppose, in their public discourses, the sentiments of *any minister or pastor* on these subjects.' For refusing to take this engagement, does not our author know that M. Malan was "deposed from his office as Regent of the College, and deprived of his ministerial character in the church ;" and that, for the same offence, many worthy students have been denied ordination ? Does he not know that the houses of some of these pious men have been violently attacked ; that they have been stoned in the streets ; and that their places of worship have been surrounded with mobs, and assailed, not only with blasphemies, but with clubs and weapons ? Does he not know that attempts have been made to inflict upon some of them fines and imprisonment, for their fidelity in exposing prevailing errors, and promoting the cause of their Divine Master ? Does he not know, too, what disgraceful attempts have been made to calumniate and traduce them ? how every slander that could be invented was greedily propagated through the newspapers for the purpose of bringing them into reproach ? And has he not heard of the attempt recently made on the part of the *Venerable Compagnie*, to drive the faithful pastor of Satigny, from his admiring flock, because he would not introduce the heretical Geneva Catechism into his schools ? And is there no persecution in all this ? Mr. Whitman's tender 'heart bleeds,' and 'his blood runs cold,' as he tells us, in view of the persecutions which have been practised by the Orthodox of New England : How does he feel, then, in view of what he must know has been done within a few years, in Unitarian Geneva ? And how will he reconcile the facts on this subject with his own positive declaration, "that Unitarianism has had nothing whatever to do" with the late persecutions in that country ?

Mr. W. quotes President Edwards, or professes to quote him, (for there is no reference to guide us in consulting the original)

showing that the saints in glory will rejoice while beholding the miseries of the finally lost ; and then adds,

“If I must become so completely hardened, as to take delight in observing the distress even of the vilest sinners ; if I must become so thoroughly brutalized, as to exult in witnessing the excruciating torments of my acquaintances ; if I must become so perfectly demonized, as to have my joys eternally increased by beholding the agonizing writhings of my friends, in the ever enduring, and unmitigated torments of hell, I can truly say,—Good Lord, deliver me from such a heaven.”

To say nothing of the coarseness and profaneness of these remarks, Mr. W. must have known that he was putting an entirely erroneous and unwarrantable construction upon the sentiment and language of Edwards. This great and good man does indeed exhibit the saints in glory as, not grieving, but rejoicing while beholding the final condition of the wicked ; and the inspired writers do the same. See Rev. xviii. 20, and xix. 3. But how does Edwards explain the subject ? Does he represent the glorified saints as “so completely hardened,” “so thoroughly brutalised,” “so perfectly demonized,” as to rejoice *on account* of the endless sufferings of a portion of their fellow creatures ? Such is the representation of our author ; but Edwards says no such thing. On the contrary, he describes the joy of which he speaks, not as the result of malice or envy, but as “the fruit of an amiable and excellent disposition.” It is the same joy, in kind, which every friend of his country feels, when the violators of its laws are brought to justice. It is a joy excited in the breasts of glorified beings above, because they see the law of God honored, his authority sustained, and his glory promoted, in the deserved punishment of those who have rebelled against him ; and it will be consistent, says Edwards, with “a spirit of goodness and love,” as far excelling the greatest instances of such a spirit in this world, “as the stars are higher than the earth, or the sun brighter than a glow-worm.” \*

It is not very creditable to the fairness and ingenuousness of Mr. W. that he in *many* instances accuses and censures the Orthodox for the same things which, in like circumstances, are done *by himself and by those of his own party*. He complains that Orthodox ministers withdraw fellowship from those whom they regard as having departed from the essential doctrines of the gospel. But do not Unitarians withdraw fellowship from those whom they regard as having departed from essential doctrines ? Suppose one of their preachers should become a professed follower of Kneeland or of Owen ; would they continue him in fellowship ?—Mr. W. censures our ministers for not exchanging with those who they believe have adopted essential errors. But Unitarians refuse to exchange with those who they believe have *not* adopted essential errors. Our

\* See Edward's Works, vol. vi. p. 473.

author admits that Universalists 'make the Bible their standard of faith and practice,' that they are 'faithful in examining it,' and 'sincere in their profession.' p. 153. Why then will he not exchange with them? \*—He complains of Orthodox ministers because they will not be dictated and controlled in regard to their exchanges; while he says, almost with the next breath, "I surely am not to be controlled in mine." p. 24.

He complains that ministers, who have changed their sentiments and become Unitarians after settlement, have in some instances been dismissed on account of their opinions. And we have mentioned an instance already, in close connexion with our author, and we could mention several others, in which Orthodox ministers, who have *not* changed their sentiments, have been dismissed (much to their worldly loss and damage) merely on account of their opinions.—Orthodox ministers, he says, by becoming Unitarians, have lost the confidence of their former friends. And we could mention an instance of recent occurrence in which a Unitarian minister, whom his brethren had appointed on a mission, had his commission withdrawn or withheld, because he professed himself a Universalist.

Our author censures Orthodox ministers for sitting in judgement upon Unitarian publications, p. 43. But do not Unitarian ministers sit in judgement upon Orthodox publications? On how many of our publications has Mr. W. passed a summary sentence of condemnation in the Letters before us.—He censures the Orthodox ministers for establishing worship in Unitarian parishes. But in how many instances have Unitarians established worship in Orthodox parishes? If any doubt this, let them make inquiry—at Lynn, at Milton, at North Bridgewater, at Raynham, at Northampton, at Springfield, at Amherst, N. H., at Brattleborough, Vt. and in various other places.—He further censures Orthodox ministers, because they will not dismiss and recommend church members, who wish to remove to Unitarian churches. But we could mention a variety of instances in which Unitarian ministers have treated their members in the same way. We have a letter now before us, in which an aged Unitarian minister assigns reasons at length why he cannot dismiss and recommend one of his members to an Orthodox church; and Mr. W. himself says, that he should "truly call it unsafe and *sinful* to place one of his church members under Orthodox influence." p. 51.—Mr. W. tells a story, p. 56, of certain Orthodox individuals rushing into a Unitarian church, with the intent to take possession of its funds. And we could tell several amusing stories of Unitarians rushing into parishes where Orthodox ministers were settled,

\* In his answer to the call from the society in Waltham, Mr. W. says, "Whenever I meet a fellow sinner who exhibits the fruits of the gospel in his daily walk and conversation, and professes to believe that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God, I shall readily extend to him the hand of Christian fellowship."

with the intent to take possession of the meeting-house and funds. How many once crowded into a certain society in Waltham confessedly for this purpose? And how many have since joined the original society in Framingham apparently with the same intent?—Mr. W. complains that, in our trust deeded churches, some are obliged to assist in supporting the minister, who are not permitted to vote in the choice of him. And does he not know that in his own society, great numbers have been obliged to pay money for the support of a minister, whom they had no voice in choosing, and on whose ministrations they could not conscientiously attend?—Our author complains of the Orthodox for their ‘denunciations’ of Unitarians—that they deny them the Christian name, character, &c. And we can refer him to a Unitarian publication, on the very title of which it is implied that a Calvinist is not a Christian. We can also refer him to a certain sermon preached a few years since by a Unitarian minister, with whom he ought to be well acquainted, the principal object of which was to show that the Orthodox deny the Lord Jesus.—Mr. W. regards the Colleges at New Haven and Amherst, where not “a Unitarian instructor can find employment,” and where the preaching and prayers are Orthodox, as *sectarian* institutions. But when he comes to speak of Cambridge, where all the principal instructors, and all the preaching and prayers are Unitarian, he asks, “In what consists the sectarian character of the institution? For the life of me, *I cannot think of one particular!!*” p. 143.—Mr. W. complains that the Orthodox will not patronise the College, and the public schools of Unitarians. At the same time he affirms that “Unitarians are *afraid* to send their “children to the Academy” at Andover, “where so much is done to prejudice youth in favor of Orthodoxy.” p. 143.—He complains that “Orthodox laymen have withdrawn their patronage from mechanics, merchants, physicians and lawyers, because they embraced Unitarian sentiments.” p. 87.—And we could mention a variety of instances—ten to his one, we doubt not—in which this has been done by Unitarians. He may recollect the case of a physician in a neighboring town, who was once a deacon of the Unitarian church, and who, by his faithful attendance and skill, had secured the confidence and the patronage of all around him; but no sooner did he become Orthodox, and attend an Orthodox meeting, than he began to be reproached and forsaken. His Unitarian neighbors immediately invited another physician to settle among them and take his place; and even his former minister, who for

\* In the Christian Register of Feb. 19, 1831, there is a long complaint of the Universalists, for having crowded into the Unitarian society in Stoughton, and effected the dismissal of their minister. Many Orthodox societies, who have received the same treatment from Unitarians, will know how to sympathize with their afflicted friends in Stoughton.



years had been favored with his services *gratuitously*, dismissed him at once, for the new comer, and advised his people to do the same. Mr. W. complains that the Orthodox *slander* the Unitarians—that they make false and injurious representations respecting them, with the intent to bring upon them reproach and disgrace. How far this statement is correct we do not now inquire. If a single, well authenticated instance could be produced, we should regret and condemn it as sincerely as our author. But is he not aware that the same charge might be retorted upon Unitarians with a vastly increased force? We could name a single Orthodox clergyman who, could he receive a farthing apiece for all the slanders which his “liberal” neighbors have put in circulation respecting him, would, we have no doubt, come into immediate possession of a large estate.—Mr. W. complains of Professor Stuart for calling in question the propriety of administering *an oath* to those who deny the reality of future punishment. He ought to know that the Professor is not alone in his views on this subject. Distinguished Unitarians, on the bench, and in their publications, have expressed the same sentiment. We extract the following from “the Political Class Book,” a work recently published by Hon. William Sullivan of Boston for the use of schools:—“An *oath* supposes that he who takes it believes that there is a God, who will, *in a future life*, reward the worthy and punish the wicked.” \* p. 116.—Mr. W. complains much of the Orthodox—without any foundation, as we have shown—that they do not receive the Bible as the standard of their faith? But do leading Unitarians receive the Bible as the standard of their faith? Or do they deny its inspiration, and charge it with inadvertencies, errors and contradictions? Those who are conversant with their publications will be able to answer this question for themselves.

The class of facts here adverted to may not improperly be ranked under the head of *inconsistencies*,—unless our Unitarian friends think it consistent to require that of others, which does not exist among themselves. There are, however, in the work before us, inconsistencies and contradictions of a more striking character.

In one place, Mr. W. speaks of “the old system of mutual councils” as belonging “to the Congregational form of government,” and as constituting “a sufficient and perfect remedy in cases of difficulty.” p. 35. But in other places, those who made the offer of a mutual council to decide upon existing difficulties are complained of, as pursuing measures “subversive of the principles of Congregationalism.” pp. 12, 41.—In the case of the church at Wilton, the Orthodox *minority* are represented as very unreasona-

\* If we understand Professor Stuart, and others who agree with him in opinion on this subject, they would not deprive the Ultra-Universalist or the Atheist of the right of *testifying* in a Court of justice; but they regard it as solemn trifling to admit such persons to testify under the sanction of *an oath*.

ble, because they would not assent to the wishes of the majority. p. 12. But in other cases, Orthodox *majorities* are told that they have no right "to adopt rules" for the minority, or to hold the property of the church. pp. 20. 55. It would seem from this that the Orthodox, whether a minority or majority, can have no Ecclesiastical rights.—Mr. W. speaks of the Orthodox, in his first Letter, as a single denomination, so closely and harmoniously linked together as to be fairly answerable for one another's language and measures. But before he gets through, he finds it convenient to contradict this account of them, and represents them as sadly at variance among themselves. "There are the old, the new, the moderate, and the rigid Calvinists. There are the Hopkinsians, the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists," &c. p. 126.

It is matter of complaint in some parts of these Letters, that we do not regard the Unitarian churches as churches of Christ. p. 63, 69. But in other parts, it is *assumed* that we do thus regard them, and the complaint is, that we violate "the principles of Congregationalism" in not placing them on an equality with our own churches. p. 136.—Mr. W. insists that our "Pilgrim fathers" practised "open communion," by which he explains himself to mean that, besides their short and scriptural covenants, they had no confessions of faith, p. 131—133. But within a few pages he asserts, and asserts truly, that "soon after the settlement of our country," "our Pilgrim fathers assented" to the Westminster Confession, "as the best human expression of their Orthodox faith." p. 136.—The first of the principles of the Pilgrims, says our author, was to "advance the Reformation."\* The Unitarians, he insists, have *obeyed* this principle in "renouncing many of the absurd doctrines of the Pilgrims;" while the Orthodox have *disobeyed* it, in "renouncing several of their essential doctrines." p. 139. How the Unitarians have obeyed this principle in renouncing their errors, and the Orthodox have disobeyed it in doing (as Mr. W. will have it) the same thing, he does not inform us.—In one place, he represents the Pilgrims as having been so liberal in their terms of communion, that they would have admitted Unitarians to their churches. p. 133. But in a few pages after, addressing Mr. Stuart and the Orthodox of the present day, he says, "They (the Pilgrims) would not have acknowledged your belief as sound or Orthodox, and had they given vent to their persecuting spirit, would have banished you from the Commonwealth." p. 139.—On one page, our author represents the doctrine of unconditional election" as "*peculiar to Calvin.*" p. 116. But on another, he classes "unconditional

\* Mr. W. here quotes, as Unitarians have done before him to the thousandth time, as an apology for their errors, the words of the venerable John Robinson, "The Lord has *more truth* yet to break forth out of his holy word." But instead of finding *more truth* in the Bible than Robinson thought he found, our modern "Reformers" find *vastly less*. The grand difficulty with the Pilgrims, as Unitarians represent the matter, is, not that they did not find *all* the truth which the Bible contains, but that they thought they found *much more than it does contain*.

election" among the doctrines which "the *Reformers* (not Calvin alone) received without discussion," and held *in common with the Papists*. pp. 113, 114.—He says he "well knows" that Professor Stuart *declares* the doctrines of election and reprobation, in his "conversation, preaching, and publications." p. 152. Again, he represents the Professor, and the Orthodox clergy generally, as *not daring* to acknowledge these points, "either in private, or in the pulpit. I have never heard the doctrine of reprobation preached but once in New England." p. 139.—In some places, Mr. W. makes the Orthodoxy of the present day the same identically as that of Calvin. p. 98. In others, he blames the Orthodox for "attempting to make the less informed part of the community believe that they still adhere to the all-important sentiments of Calvin." p. 117.—At one time, we are represented as adopting "various measures for binding down the present generation to the Calvinistic articles of the Assembly's Catechism." p. 130. And then again, our author asks, "Can you aver that your denomination in New England believes the Westminster Confession of faith? I will quote a few passages which I believe *most of you concur in rejecting*." p. 137.—Mr. W. sometimes speaks of the Orthodox and Unitarians as constituting but *one* denomination. "Have you not declared that regularly organized churches (meaning the Unitarian churches) of *your own denomination*, were not Christian churches?" p. 146. At other times, he represents the Unitarians as a *distinct* denomination. "I have nothing to say for or against the *Unitarian denomination*." p. 163.—"*A majority* of the Orthodox denomination," he tells us, on one occasion, believe respectable Unitarians, such as he had previously named, to be *good Christians*, and that all good Christians of every sect will be saved." p. 80. But within less than two pages, we are told again, that "*no Orthodox man will consider a person of known Unitarian views as hopefully pious*." p. 82.—Near the top of p. 54, our author says, "Every man must determine *for himself* whether he is qualified to" come to the Lord's table. But near the bottom of the same page, a different account is given of the matter, and persons must exhibit "*evidence of Christian character*," in order to be welcomed to the ordinances of Christ.—Sometimes, the members of our new societies are represented as "taxed to the *full extent of their ability*;" and then they are promised *an exemption* from ministerial taxes," and that "nothing but their voluntary contributions will be required" of them. p. 62.—Now we have "a *large fund* for the express purpose of establishing and maintaining such societies," p. 62; and then they must be supported "by a system of the most *pertinacious begging*." p. 147.

We have here thrown together some of the manifest *inconsistencies and contradictions* which have occurred to us, on a cursory perusal of these Letters. Our readers will decide, in view of them, how much confidence is to be placed in a writer, who thus

crosses his own track, in all possible directions, and without seeming to know it, just as his convenience or his inclination requires.

But we have still further detractions to make from whatever remnants of confidence any of our readers may still be disposed to place in the representations of Mr. Whitman. He very properly observes, in his conclusion, that "the first question at issue is this, *Are the principal statements in this publication substantially true?*" And he has "authorized" a friend publicly "to assert, that he has stated no facts, *which he cannot fully substantiate in a court of justice.*"\* We have shown already that many of his statements cannot be true. But as so much is depending on this point, we feel justified in taking it up separately, and presenting in one view—not *all* the misrepresentations we have detected and *marked*, for this would be tedious and unnecessary—but *some* of those which seem the most palpable, and which, in the fewest words, may be contradicted and refuted. In doing this we shall proceed in the order of pages, and shall have frequent occasion, as we pass along, to recur to statements which have been previously examined.

1. Speaking of the creed of the Theological Seminary at Andover, Mr. W. says, "Scarcely an article of the whole can be expressed in Scriptural language." p. 6.—The sense of many of these articles, not to say the most of them, "can be expressed in Scriptural language."†

2. Addressing Professor Stuart, p. 7, he says, "Would you inquire into the meaning of the Scriptures, so as to communicate to your pupils the result of your investigations? No. This liberty you have sacrificed."—This liberty Mr. S. has *not* sacrificed, but exercises it freely and continually.

3. Again; "Would you inquire into the peculiar religious opinion of other Christian denominations, so as to ascertain if their belief is not founded on the plain teachings of inspiration? No. This liberty you have sacrificed."—Mr. S. has not sacrificed *this* liberty more than the other.

4. Mr. W. speaks, p. 9, of the creed adopted by the church in the Seminary at Andover, as "long," and "very peculiar," leaving the impression that it is the same as that subscribed by the Professors. Whereas the creed of this church is short and simple, and does not differ in any important respect from those received by other Orthodox churches.

\* See Christian Register for Jan. 15.

† Our author lays great stress, in this connexion, upon the 'very words of Scripture.' But in the judgement of leading Unitarians, the words of Scripture are no better than any other words, as the whole Bible is declared to be a 'human composition.' See Christian Examiner for Jan. 1830, p. 347. But not to insist on this; a creed, set forth in the very words of Scripture would not answer the *purpose* of a public confession of faith, which is to exhibit, not the language of the Bible, but the *received sense* of it. Most sects may be able to set forth *some* of their peculiarities in the precise words of Scripture. The Shaker attempts to justify his whirling dance by quoting, 'Turn ye, turn ye, why will ye die?' The language of Scripture is not unfrequently perverted to the support of positions which are wholly unscriptural.

5. Speaking of a discourse delivered by Rev. Mr. Duncan of Baltimore "before the students in the Theological Seminary at Princeton," Mr. W. says, "These remarks were not relished by the Rev. Dr. Miller, *the Principal of the Institution.*" p. 13.—Dr. Miller is *not* "Principal of this Institution."

6. "For this offence he (Mr. Duncan) was summoned before the *delegates of the Synod.*"—Synods are not delegated bodies.

7. "Being unable to make him (Mr. Duncan) renounce his error, or, in reality, place the human creed *before the Bible*, they excommunicated him."—Nobody wished Mr. D. to place a "human creed *before the Bible.*"

8. "This able and eloquent divine was publicly excommunicated from the *Orthodox denomination*, because he would not acknowledge the utility and *supreme* importance of human creeds."—Mr. D. was not excommunicated, 'because he would not acknowledge the *supreme* importance of human creeds;' nor was he 'ex-communicated from the *Orthodox denomination.*'

9. Speaking of the meeting-houses secured by trust-deeds, p. 14, Mr. W. says, "The control of the building is vested in the hands of certain Orthodox Trustees . . . . *who will furnish the minister* whenever the proprietors refuse to subscribe the human creed."—We know of no trust-deed in this country which gives to trustees such a power as this.

10. "At this very time, *not one in ten* of those who occupy your trust-deed churches, can be allowed to vote for the minister he is obliged to maintain."—If our author includes minors and females in this assertion, it may be true of many churches not held by trust deeds. If these are not included, it is false.

11 "I am happy to learn," says Mr. W., that *very few* individuals have been found . . . . to purchase pews which are fettered by the unhallowed restrictions of trust-deeds."—We are happy to inform our author that he is mistaken on this subject.

12. Speaking of Mr. Hubbard's "practice of exchanging with Unitarians," p. 16, Mr. W. says, "This circumstance *alone* induced some Orthodox ministers in the vicinity of Lunenburg to make great exertions to prevent his installation."—"This circumstance *alone*" did not induce these ministers to oppose the installation of Mr. Hubbard.

13. These ministers "went to Andover, and earnestly solicited . . . . information *derogatory to the character* of Mr. H."—They did not solicit information *derogatory* to his character, but merely wished to know the truth.

14. "The Rev. Mr. Payson, having obtained the *desired misrepresentations,*" &c.—Mr. Payson did not desire to obtain *misrepresentations.*

15. Mr. H. compelled those who had circulated unfavorable reports "to confess *their wickedness* and agency in the base under-

taking."—Neither of them "confessed wickedness," except the individual in Middleton, and his confession was extorted. See p.142.

16. Mr. Braman "was earnestly beset by Orthodox ministers for information *injurious* to the reputation of Mr. H."—Mr. Braman was not "beset for information *injurious* to Mr. H.," but was asked to state what he believed to be true.

17. "Mr. Payson went into Lunenburg to circulate the slanderous reports."—Mr. Payson did not go "into Lunenburg to circulate slanderous reports." He went in the regular discharge of professional duty; and while there, acquainted his friends, as he felt bound to do, with what he had heard respecting the character of Mr. H.

18. Mr. Payson "was asked, before witnesses, if he should have taken such a step, had not Mr. H. exchanged with Unitarians. His answer was, No."—We are authorised by Mr. Payson to declare, that "no such answer was given by him to any such question."

19. Mr. Payson "also intimated, that Mr. Putnam of Fitchburg, and Mr. Fisher of Harvard, in connexion with himself, had taken Lunenburg under their special protection." He "*intimated no such thing.*"

20. This "instance of misrepresentation" was "originated and executed by Orthodox individuals to prevent a minister of their own sentiments from exchanging with Unitarians."—It was not originated or executed for any such purpose. See p. 142.

21. Mr. Payson "desires" his friends in Lunenburg "to put the slanderous reports into immediate circulation."—He did not desire them to circulate *slanderous* reports,—but told them what he deemed *the truth*, and wished them to make such use of it as they thought proper.

22. "This wicked contrivance" was got up, "simply and solely because Mr. H. would exchange with Unitarians."—All false.

23. "Many are deterred from exchanges with Unitarians by the various threatenings of your leaders." p. 19.—This assertion is undoubtedly false.

24. If Orthodox ministers exchange with Unitarians, "the majority commence their measures of persecution by excluding them from the Association, by refusing to acknowledge them as Christian ministers," &c. p. 21.—No instance is adduced, or can be, to justify this representation.

25. Mr. W. speaks repeatedly of an "unholy *combination* of Orthodox leaders to regulate the exchanges of their brethren."—A *combination* for this purpose does not exist.

26. "Orthodox candidates have obtained settlements over comparatively liberal societies, by *concealing their real theological sentiments.*" p. 21.—We have never known an instance of such concealment, and presume none can be mentioned.

27. An Orthodox minister is spoken of, p. 21, who, previous to his call, "manifested a willingness to be liberal in his ministerial intercourse."—This minister assures us that, previous to his call, he said nothing on the subject of ministerial intercourse.

28. "He continued for a year or more to preach practical discourses, and to exchange occasionally with Unitarian ministers."—He did not "exchange occasionally with Unitarian ministers." See p. 144.

29. "One *small* class" of Orthodox ministers "pretend that their consciences will not permit them to exchange with Unitarians." p. 23.—The class is *not* small who urge this reason for not exchanging with Unitarians, but embraces nearly the entire body of the Orthodox clergy.

30. "*Another* class pretend that they cannot exchange with Unitarians, because they are responsible for the sentiments delivered from their pulpits."—This is not *another* class, but the same with that last mentioned.

31. "In Massachusetts, for a few years past, all Ecclesiastical measures have been prepared in a certain conclave, nobody knows who they are, or where they are, invisible beings, Congregational cardinals, to whose decrees every Orthodox clergyman and church is expected to pay unlimited deference and submission." p. 24.—This statement, in all its parts, is entirely without foundation.\*

32. Speaking of Consociations in Connecticut, Mr. W. says, "Delegates from county Consociations form a general *State Consociation*." p. 25.—There is no State Consociation in Connecticut.

33. "He (Mr. Abbot, formerly of Coventry, Conn.) *knew nothing about* any such body as a Consociation." p. 26.—Did he "know nothing about" the order of the churches, where he had been fifteen years a pastor? and "nothing about" the Platform of these churches?

34. "If a Consociation existed, he certainly could not feel himself amenable to their usurped authority."—He was pastor of a Consociated church—a church which had acted in Consociation, and which, on a previous occasion, had called the Consociation together to settle a difficulty in its own bosom. He was a member and the Register of a ministerial Association, formed *expressly* on the basis of the Saybrook Platform, which requires the existence of Consociations. He was present in Association when the church in Marlborough was by vote admitted to connexion with the Consociation, and, as Register, *attested the vote*. †

\* This proposition is *quoted* in the Letters before us; but our author makes himself fully responsible for it, by affirming that it is "true to the *very letter*."

† The church in Marlborough had "*voted*, that it is the desire of the church to be connected with the Consociation of Churches in the County of Tolland." Whereupon the

35. "The church (in Coventry) would not consent to a mutual Council, unless the members should be expressly invited, *not to hear and give advice respecting their troubles*, but to dissolve the pastoral relation."—The church voted (Nov. 21, 1810,) "that we will unite with the Rev. Abiel Abbot and the society in choosing and calling a mutual Council, *to consider and decide on the difficulties subsisting between us and him*, provided we shall be able to agree on the churches from which such Council shall be called."—Reply, &c. p. 18.

36. "The Rev. Abiel Abbot appeared before this *self-constituted Ecclesiastical Court*," (the Consociation.)—The Consociations in Connecticut are not "*self-constituted Ecclesiastical courts*," but *standing Councils*, formed by the *consent of the churches*, and the *authority of the State*.\*

37. "The leaders of the Orthodox party in 1815 made a *desperate effort* to establish Consociations throughout this Commonwealth." p. 31.—They made no "*desperate effort*." Individuals proposed the subject; the proposition was considered in General Association, and virtually declined.

38. Mr. W. says that a Committee of the General Association of Massachusetts, which made report respecting Consociations in 1815, "*loudly complain that there is no regular method by which authority may be exercised over sister churches*." p. 34.—This Committee uttered no such complaint. "*Christian watch and care*" are the words they use;—"authority" is quite another thing.

39. "There is not in Massachusetts, there *never had been*, a power to call a whole church to account for its opinions."—The Cambridge Platform establishes such a power, which, in the days of our fathers was repeatedly exercised. See p. 136.

40. "Our ancestors did not admit that other churches could call any particular church to account for its sentiments."—Our ancestors *did admit* that other churches could call a particular church to account for "*ANY public offence*."

41. In Dr. Channing's "essay" against Consociations, "he simply asserts what *every body knew to be literally true* at the time of publication." p. 38.—"Every body" did not know at that time, nor do they now, that what he asserted "was literally true." We have examined the assertion quoted by Professor Stuart, and shown that it was not true. See p. 120, note.

Association "*voted to comply with the desire of the church in Marlborough expressed in their vote. Passed in Association. John Willard, Moderator. Attest, ABIEL ABBOT, Scribe.*" See Reply to Mr. Abbot's Statement, pp. 11, 12.

\* The conductors of the Christian Disciple say, "It is consistent for Consociations to discipline their members, because they agree to be disciplined." Vol. iv. N. S. p. 105.



42. "You treat an opinion of fifteen years' standing, which was an *undisputed truth* at the time of its publication, as the sentiment of *the present year*."—The opinion here referred to was *disputed* by Dr. Worcester "at the time of its publication."—See Third Letter, &c. p. 78. It is spoken of by Professor Stuart as having been "republished after a *series of years*."

43. Mr. W. asserts that an Orthodox Council at Greenfield would not act with Rev. Mr. Willard of Deerfield "because he would not submit to be catechised by them as to his religious opinions." p. 39.—We are authorised to say, that "none of the Council assumed the right to catechise Mr. Willard."

44. Speaking of Rev. Mr. Field's renouncing the doctrine of the Trinity, our author says, "His ministerial brethren were *unable or unwilling to discuss such controverted questions*, and accordingly excluded him." &c. p. 41.—His ministerial brethren were both able and willing to discuss questions with him, and had been in the habit of discussing them for years.

45. Among those mentioned as having been "excluded from Orthodox Associations for embracing Unitarian sentiments" are "Rev. Preserved Smith, and Rev. Joseph Field." p. 43.—Mr. Smith was not excluded from the Franklin Association; and Mr. Field was excluded, not for his opinions, but for *unchristian treatment* of his brethren.\*

46. Speaking of the conditions on which the two societies in West Hampton agreed to unite, Mr. W. says, "*The old society did not comply with their part of the conditions*, and the seceders therefore refused to return." p. 44.—This statement has been contradicted already. See p. 144.

47. "What had this persecuted man (Mr. Truair) done to merit this severe and destructive persecution? *Nothing half so bad as the Orthodox preachers are doing almost every day in this vicinity*."—It is needless to attempt refuting this statement, as Mr. W. himself cannot long persist in it.

48. Rev. Thomas Worcester "had been persecuted in almost every possible manner by the Orthodox, because he renounced the doctrine of the Trinity." p. 45.—"In almost *every possible manner!*" Who believes such a statement as this!

49. Mr. W. mentions it as a "circumstance of *very frequent occurrence* in our churches," that young persons, on admission, are compelled to 'profess their hearty belief in the articles of a long human creed, which perhaps *they never saw or heard till that moment*." p. 47.—We never knew an instance like this, and doubt whether one ever occurred in our churches.

\* The conduct of members of the Franklin Association is severely censured in this part of Mr. Whitman's Letters. We are promised a full statement from the Association on the subject, which, when received, we shall endeavor to lay before our readers.

50. Mr. W. speaks of "a bull of ex-communication thundered forth from the pulpit of the first church in Newton," against three of the members who had joined a Unitarian church. p. 50.—No such 'bull of excommunication was ever thundered forth from the pulpit of the first church in Newton.' The church signified to the three members that it had withdrawn from them its watch and care.

51. "The same body have also more lately excommunicated two others for attending the communion of the Unitarian church in Watertown."—One of these attended meeting with the Universalists. Both had left the worship and the ordinances of the church, and were considered as having *violated their covenant engagements*. When members abandon a church, may not the church declare itself released from all further obligation to them?

52. "The creed or covenant," in the second church in Brookfield, "was originally so liberal, that Christians of different religious opinions could honestly give their assent to its requisitions." p. 51.—The original covenant in this church was Trinitarian and Orthodox. See p. 146.

53. "A few years after" introducing a new covenant, "the Orthodox minister was dismissed."—This minister has never been dismissed from the church.

54. After speaking of the excommunication of two members from this church Mr. W. says, "Those who passed this vote of exclusion had actually forsaken the church, and worship, and ordinances."—"Those who passed this vote of exclusion" *were themselves the church*, and still maintained its worship and ordinances.

55. "Orthodox churches claim and exercise the right of choosing a minister." p. 54.—They claim no right of choosing a minister for the parish, but only of choosing pastors for themselves.\*

56. When the Trinitarian church in Waltham separated from the second society, Mr. W. says they took away "the Bible" with them.—We have shown that they did not take it. See p. 147.

57. He charges the Orthodox with "setting up a human creed so that few can subscribe it, and then allowing those few (the church) to hold the property of the *congregation*." p. 55.—No one has ever claimed that the church should hold the property of the *congregation*.

58. Mr. W. represents the Orthodox church in Waltham as consisting of "ten male members." p. 56.—He might easily have known that this statement is not true.

59. He charges the Orthodox with aiming to have the laws "altered, so that a majority of the male communicants shall hold the meeting-house and funds."—No person wishes the laws so "altered, that a majority of the male communicants shall hold the meeting-house," or any *parochial* property.

\* The case of the *few* trust-deeded churches has been already considered. See p. 148. They form the only exception to the remark above made.

60. "I regard the Orthodox Conferences of churches as but another name for Consociations." p. 58.—Between Conferences of churches and Consociations, there is not, we had almost said, the *remotest* resemblance.

61. "The liberty of individual churches is *destroyed* by these Conferences. They bring ministers and churches into *utter servitude*."—This representation is false—as hundreds of ministers and churches can testify from *their own experience*.

The next subject of complaint, proceeding in the order of pages, is the "measures" taken by the Orthodox "for organizing and establishing feeble churches." To notice particularly all the misrepresentations of our author on this subject, would be impossible. They are almost as numerous as his sentences. The account he has given can hardly be called a caricature, as a caricature implies some rude resemblance to an intended reality; whereas this statement, in most parts, resembles nothing, unless it be the hideous image in the distempered imagination of its author. A few sentences only will be given in justification of these remarks.

62. "One hundred" dollars "is literally extorted from a single lady by over-persuasion," towards building the meeting-house in Billerica. p. 59.—This money, we are authorized to say, was brought to the house of Mr. Bennett, *unsolicited*. !!

63. "Because the *heathen* people in Billerica will not permit your *Missionary* to insult them in their own houses, the cry of persecution is raised."—We have never heard the people of Billerica called *heathen* except by Mr. Whitman. The Orthodox have no Missionary in that place, nor any one who wishes to 'insult the people in their own houses.'

64. "For supporting the feeble society," "an appeal is made to the Domestic Missionary Society, which has large funds for this very object." p. 63.—There is no "Domestic Missionary Society" in Massachusetts, nor any other Society "which has *large funds*" for the object here specified.

65. "It is generally understood that a large fund has been raised, for the express purpose of establishing and maintaining Orthodox Societies within the borders of Unitarian parishes."—No such fund has been raised, or has ever existed.

66. Speaking of the Orthodox who have left Unitarian congregations, Mr. W. asks, "Were they obliged to hear doctrines advocated which shocked their very souls? *No*."—And we as confidently answer, *Yes*. In many instances, they have been "obliged to hear doctrines advocated which shocked their very souls."

67. Mr. W. charges us with wishing "to confound the two classes" of Universalist "together, and to permit the unlearned to believe that Unitarians have embraced the obnoxious sentiment" that there will be no punishment hereafter. p. 72.—In the article to which

he refers, we expressly *distinguished* between the two classes of Universalists, and were careful to inform our readers that we placed Unitarians in that class who believe in a "future, disciplinary punishment."\*

68. "The *whole* Orthodox party in Germany . . . . have embraced the doctrine of universal salvation." p. 73.—This assertion is not supported even by the authority of Mr. Dwight, whom our author quotes. It is expressly contradicted by the testimony of some of the principal German theologians and commentators.†

69. Speaking of the charge against some Unitarians that they regard "the Bible not as an *inspired* book, and that its decisions are not final and authoritative in the Christian church," Mr. W. says, "A more false and injurious statement was never published." p. 76.—Our readers well know that some Unitarians do regard "the Bible as not an inspired book;" and how they can receive "its decisions as final and authoritative in the Christian church," while they charge it with false reasonings, mistakes, errors, and contradictions we are not able to perceive.‡

70. He says that Canonicus, in his Letters to Dr. Channing, "first attempts to prove that Unitarians do not believe in the personal existence of an *almost omnipotent Devil*." p. 77.—Canonicus attempts to prove no such thing.

71. Our author speaks, p. 79, of "an extemporaneous discourse" (or sermon) "delivered by the Rev. Mr. Green of Boston, at an evening lecture in Salem," "to an audience composed principally of females."—This discourse or sermon was a mere address of a few minutes, and not delivered at a lecture, nor in the evening, nor "to an audience composed principally of females."

72. Of the American Education Society Mr. W. says, "A considerable amount of your funds has been obtained from Unitarians, with the *express understanding* that indigent students of their own sentiments should be assisted." p. 81.—This false statement has been sufficiently refuted. See p. 148.

73. "If the beneficiary wishes to receive his collegiate education at Cambridge, *every possible exertion is made to FRIGHTEN him from such a proceeding*."—This is not true.

74. "All those beneficiaries, who reside at the same literary institution, are obliged to assemble together once a month."—Advised, expected—not "*obliged*."

75. "They must make one of their number the secretary of the body, who is to—note all aberrations in thought, word, and deed."—Entirely without foundation.

\* See Spirit of the Pilgrims, Vol. iii. p. 210.

† See Christian Spectator, Dec. 1829, p. 671.

‡ The reader may learn in what estimation some American Unitarians hold the Bible, by consulting a Tract, entitled "An Exhibition of Unitarianism." pp. 6—12.

76. "One" of the prayers "is to be especially for their secretary, that he may be faithful in recording their errors and failings."  
—All false.

77. Speaking of the doxologies of Watts, our author affirms that he "would have expunged them all from his hymn book before he died, had he not disposed of the copy-right of the work." p. 87.  
—This is said, not only without evidence, but *against* evidence.\*

Mr. W. tells a story, p. 87, of "a high-school established in Geneseo, New York."

"Three young men, graduates of Harvard University, entered into written engagements to take charge of the institution. The simple circumstance of their receiving degrees at Cambridge was sufficient to arouse the enmity of Orthodox leaders. Accordingly the minister of the place drew up a circular," referring to all *three* of the young men (which Mr. W. quotes) "and endeavored to obtain the names of the influential inhabitants of the county." "But it was generally known in that region that one of the three men was Orthodox in his opinions, and but few names could be obtained. A new memorial was therefore circulated, with the word *two* inserted in the place of *three*; and to this a large number of signatures was attached. But instead of presenting that to the stockholders, they took the names and placed them on the one I have copied. It seems they could not, in consistency with their duty to God, have young men from Cambridge, but they could practise a gross deception in perfect consistency with this duty."

Such is the statement of our author. Its various misrepresentations should be corrected as follows:—

78. "The *simple circumstance*" that these young men received "their degrees at Cambridge was" *not* "sufficient to arouse the enmity of Orthodox leaders." Do the Orthodox oppose all, indiscriminately, who have received their degrees at Cambridge? It was well understood that two of these young men were Unitarians, and respecting the third many were not satisfied.

79. "The minister of the place" *did not* draw up "the circular" which our author quotes.

80. It is not true that "but *few* names could be obtained" to this circular. Almost all the names that were obtained, amounting to nearly or quite three hundred, were obtained to it.

81. It is not true that, on the failure of this circular or memorial, a new one was "circulated, with the word *two* inserted in the place of *three*, to which a large number of signatures was attached." A memorial, with the word *two* inserted, was circulated in the single township of Lima (not because the people refused to subscribe the other, for that was not presented to them) and obtained *twenty-six* signers.

82. It is not true, therefore, that, by "a *gross deception*," a *large number* of signatures" was taken from this latter memorial, and appended to the former, which had but "a *few* names."†

\* See Spirit of the Pilgrims, Vol. ii. p. 338.

† The only shadow of an excuse for all this tissue of misrepresentation must have been an *oversight* which occurred on the day of the annual meeting of the stockholders, and is

83. "In 1804," says our author, "it was proposed to convert the Convention into a General Association, and confer upon it the powers usually assumed and exercised by that body." p. 89.—No such proposal was ever made in Convention. It was proposed in 1804, that the Convention recommend the adoption of certain measures *preparatory to the formation of a General Association*; but not that it convert itself into a General Association!

Mr. W. represents it as a "most daring" measure, that, in 1822, the Convention of Congregational ministers in Massachusetts, a body containing the Pastors of several hundred churches, were requested to *define a church*.

"The North Worcester Association proposed the following question: "What is a *Christian church*, with which we *ought* to hold communion, as such?" The whole business had been planned and concluded on with intended secrecy in Park Street vestry. The committee which had been previously selected was chosen, consisting of twelve orthodox members and one unitarian, and authorized to report at the next annual meeting. Exertion was made to have the report printed and circulated during the year, but was frustrated. Your friend, Dr. Woods, was chairman of this committee; but he did not find all the other members so tractable as he wished. He wrote a dictatorial letter to the Rev. Mr. Stearns, of Bedford; and received in answer a few homely but wholesome truths. However, the report was finished, and at the meeting in 1823, was read to the convention. A motion was made by yourself to have it printed. But you mistook your men. No notice was taken of your desire; but the following vote quickly passed: "*That the convention will take no further order on the subject.*" And what was the substance of this famous report. Simply this. *That a Christian church, with which we ought to hold communion, must subscribe the orthodox creed.*"

"Now, Sir, what was the design of your leaders in this most daring attempt? What objects did you expect to accomplish? *Five*. First, you wished to learn what portion of the Orthodox ministers were prepared to take up arms against the sacred rights of Unitarians? Secondly, you wished to ascertain what portion were ready to adopt a human creed, instead of the Bible, as their standard of religious truth. Thirdly, you wished to drive the liberal clergy from the convention, either by adopting a doctrinal test, or by a direct vote of exclusion. Fourthly, you wished to know how far public sentiment would support you in withdrawing ministerial intercourse from Unitarians. And Fifthly, and especially, you wished to obtain complete possession of the *funds* of the convention."

This statement requires the following corrections:—

84. "The *whole business* had" *not* "been planned and concluded on with *intended secrecy* in Park Street Vestry." There had been previous consultation on this and other subjects at meetings in the Vestry; but these were *public* meetings—*publicly* notified, and numerously attended.

85. It is manifestly untrue that a "Committee, *previously selected*, was chosen;" since several Unitarian gentlemen, who were chosen on the Committee, declined serving, and others were sub-

thus explained by our informant. "The memorials were returned the day of the annual meeting of the stockholders, and were handed to a gentleman of this village to be copied. Supposing the memorials to be the same in all the towns, and being pressed for time, he did not take the precaution to read them, but attached all the names to one copy; and among the rest, the twenty six signatures of the Lima memorial. The mistake was not discovered, till after the memorial had been read to the stockholders."

stituted in their place. Dr. Bancroft, the only Unitarian on the Committee, was absent from the meeting, or it is likely he would have declined also.

86. "Dr. Woods, Chairman of this Committee," *did not write* "a dictatorial letter" on the subject "to the Rev. Mr. Stearns of Bedford."

87. "The substance of the report" *was not* "that a Christian church, with which we ought to hold communion, must *subscribe the Orthodox creed.*" Not a word was said in the report about '*subscribing an Orthodox creed.*'

88. Neither of the five objects stated by Mr. W. were expected or desired to be accomplished by this measure, as is evident from the following extract from the report itself :

"As this Convention is not an elected or representative body, it would obviously be *inadmissible* that they should attempt to exercise ecclesiastical power, either legislative or judicial ; or DO ANY THING which should be intended IN THE LEAST DEGREE TO INTERFERE WITH THE RIGHTS OF MINISTERS OR CHURCHES TO JUDGE AND ACT FOR THEMSELVES." And "to prevent all possible occasion of misapprehension, as to the views of this Committee, they beg leave to declare it to be the united result of their deliberations, that after the members of the Convention shall have simply expressed their opinion respecting this report, they CANNOT, with propriety, ADOPT ANY FURTHER MEASURES RESPECTING IT, but must leave it to the unbiassed consideration of ministers and churches."

How a report, expressing sentiments such as these, was to be made the instrument of "*driving* the liberal clergy from the convention," obtaining *complete possession of the funds,*" and accomplishing other nefarious projects specified by Mr. W., it is not easy for common minds to perceive. He informs us that he came to a knowledge of the secrets of the Orthodox clergy in regard to this subject, by conversation with a student in divinity. But, on supposition that the Orthodox at that time had secret designs upon the rights and liberties of Unitarians (which we utterly deny, and which the report of their committee shows to be false) is it certain that this student was correctly apprized of them? Is it certain that what he said was any thing more than surmise and conjecture? And is the declaration of an obscure and unauthorised individual (admitting that Mr. W. has reported it correctly) *sufficient ground* on which to accuse and calumniate a large and respectable body of clergymen—as our author has since *often* done—in direct contradiction, not only to their individual protestations, but to the *language of their report*?

Passing over several pages of insinuation and scandal unworthy even to be contradicted, we come to the following declaration respecting the sentiments of President Edwards :

89. "This divine assures us, that the Being we call Father will be the eternal enemy and tormentor of his own children, *without any fault of their own.*" p. 99.—Will our author, in his next "en-

larged edition," refer us to the page in Edwards where this sentiment is expressed?

90. The views of Zuingle "were exceedingly liberal, not differing essentially, except in one or two points, from the liberal Christians of the present period." p. 103.—If by "liberal Christians," our author means American Unitarians, his assertion has already been sufficiently refuted.

91. "On many other points," besides those relating to "church government," and "the Lord's supper," Calvin "differed, not only from Luther, but *most essentially from the other Reformers.*" p. 104.—This statement will be new and strange to those acquainted with the history of the Reformation, and cannot be supported by any respectable authority.

92. Servetus "was finally condemned to be burnt alive in a *slow fire of green wood.*" p. 105.—He was *not* "condemned to be burnt in a *slow fire of green wood.*"

93. "We are informed that his sufferings" "*lasted more than two hours.*"—In Professor Norton's Repository, they are said to have lasted "*half an hour.*" Vol. iii. p. 72.

94. "Let a minister be Orthodox in sentiment, and adhere to the Scriptures ever so firmly, still you will not welcome him to pulpit exchanges, *unless he will subscribe to the articles of a long human creed.*" p. 107.—This is false. The writer of this article has been in the constant practice of exchanges with Orthodox ministers for the last fifteen years, and *never subscribed a human creed.* Very many of his brethren in the ministry can say the same.

95. Mr. W. represents, that when the members of Unitarian churches 'change their religious opinions,' and wish "a dismissal and recommendation to another church," their request is uniformly granted. pp. 108 and 112.—We could mention a variety of instances in which such requests have been refused.

96. "Orthodox ministers formerly lived on terms of ministerial intercourse with their Unitarian brethren," p. 111.—"Orthodox ministers," in general, *never* "lived on terms of ministerial intercourse" with known Unitarians.

97. "*A combination has latterly been formed* by the leaders of the "Orthodox" "party, to prevent the interchange of kind offices and professional labors."—No such *combination* has been formed or exists. Cannot individuals come to the same conclusion, on a plain question of duty, without formal "combination?"

98. "On those points in which the Reformers differed from the Catholics, they had *very little agreement among themselves.*" p. 112.—This assertion has been examined and refuted. See p. 132.

99. "The doctrines of the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, the atonement, the utter depravity of human nature, unconditional elec-



tion, endless punishment, and the like," "were *not allowed to be examined.*" "The Reformers received them *without discussion.*" p. 114.—These doctrines were largely discussed by the Reformers, as their works testify.

100. Mr. W., having quoted the articles of the Synod of Dort, as abridged (caricatured) by Tilenus, adds, "No one acquainted with the writings of Calvin will deny that *these are his real sentiments.*" p. 116.—These are *not* the real sentiments of Calvin, but a vile and criminal perversion of them. See p. 135.

101. Speaking of discussions held some years ago between Professors Murdock and Stuart, and Dr. Dana, our author says, Dr. Dana "addressed a communication to the directors of the Christian Spectator, and requested its insertion in a forthcoming number. This request being denied, he went on himself, but was unsuccessful in obtaining satisfaction. p. 124.—It happens that Dr. Dana's communication was inserted in the Spectator, and that he made no journey to New Haven on the subject.

102. Mr. W. represents the Orthodox as "agreeing *heartily*" in the three following particulars, and in these only: "First in using certain *words*, while you attach to them very different *ideas*. Secondly, in making a human creed, *instead* of the Bible, your standard of religious truth. And thirdly, in denouncing and condemning those who will not yield to your *dictation.*" p. 127.—We shall not undertake to inform the gentleman in how many particulars *beyond* these we agree or disagree: We certainly *do not agree* in these.

103. "Those who will not make this creed of the dark ages (the Assembly's Catechism) their standard of religious truth, must be *excluded from your communion.*" p. 130.—We could refer to great numbers, who have not made "this creed of the dark ages their standard of religious truth," nor adopted it as their Confession of faith, who are in *full communion* in the Orthodox churches.

104. "Not a church (in Connecticut) has *the least* independence left. *All* have virtually *abandoned the Congregational order.*" p. 135.—This will be a new discovery to the numerous, long established, and well regulated Congregational Churches of Connecticut.

105. "Unitarians "have regarded the parishes of their ministerial brethren (meaning the Orthodox) as *sacred ground.*" p. 136.—They have often intruded into the parishes of Orthodox ministers, with a view to establish Unitarian worship. See p. 155.

106. "They have urged Unitarian minorities in" Orthodox "societies to keep quiet, to pay their ministerial taxes, to attend the Orthodox preaching, and to submit peaceably to Orthodox usurpations of their rights."—They have publicly and strongly "urged

Unitarian minorities in Orthodox societies" to separate and establish worship by themselves.\*

107. "Did the Orthodox benefactors of Harvard University bind down their legacies to the maintenance of their religious opinions? No." p. 142.—The Henchman legacy was left on the *express* condition that the persons receiving the avails of it should "profess and teach the principles of the Christian religion, according to the well known Confession of faith drawn up by the Synod of the churches of New England."

Mr. W. intimates, p. 147, that "an Orthodox church has lately excommunicated some of its members for exercising the liberty of attending the communions of another Orthodox church;" and that "an Orthodox Council, with Rev. Mr. Storrs at its head, has sanctioned its proceedings."—We have ascertained the church to which he refers, and have found that his statement is, as usual, *incorrect*.

108. This Orthodox church has *not* 'excommunicated some of its members for attending the communions of another Orthodox church.'

109. The Rev. Mr. Storrs was *not* 'at the head of a Council' convened at the request of this church.

110. The Result of this Council contains *no intimation* that the members in question ought to be excommunicated.

111. Speaking of a town in this vicinity, where an Orthodox society has been formed within a few years, Mr. W. says, "One of your disorganizers enters the peaceful fold, and succeeds in turning some of the flock from their present pastor." p. 156.—We have shown already that not a few of the flock *had turned from their pastor*, and that he had virtually turned from them, before the alleged "disorganiser" came among them. See p. 151.

112. "Their secession takes from the annual salary *from five to ten dollars*."—A single individual of the seceders paid more than this sum.

113. "Unitarianism has had nothing whatever to do" with the recent persecutions in Switzerland.† p. 157.—We have shown that it has had much to do with them. See p. 153.

114. *Separation* from the national church was the cause of persecutions in Switzerland.—"It is *not separation*," says Dr. Smith, "but *vital religion*, that is the real object of hatred; for many

\* See a long article in the Christian Register for July 23 and 30, 1825, in which various reasons are urged to show, that Unitarians, residing in Orthodox parishes, *ought to separate*, and support public worship by themselves.

† This assertion is repeated, p. 160. The false statements which have been contradicted in the foregoing pages are *often repeated*—some of them *many times*. Had we been intent on numbers, the contradiction and exposure of them might with propriety have been in every instance, repeated. This, however, has not been done.

harassments and injuries have been committed upon pious persons, both ministers and others, who remain *attached* to the established church."

115. Mr. W. says, in conclusion, "I have *nothing to say* FOR, or against the Unitarian denomination." p. 163.—His readers will judge whether he has had "*nothing to say* FOR the Unitarian denomination."

We have thus run our eye over the pages of these Letters, for the purpose of exposing, in one view, some of their more palpable misrepresentations. The result is before our readers, and they must be left to draw their own conclusions. We only protest against their concluding that all the statements of our author are fair and accurate, *except* those which have been contradicted. For we intended, in the outset, to present only a *selection* from his mistakes and errors, and our limits have compelled us to be even more brief than we intended. The false and slanderous insinuations, and the anonymous tales of scandal, with which these Letters abound, we have not thought it necessary, except in a few instances, so much as to notice. And in regard to some of the persons and places which are named, although we know enough to be satisfied that the statements are incorrect, still as we have not yet received full and particular information, we have chosen to pass them over in silence. In some instances, we have omitted whole pages together, because the misrepresentations were so numerous, and so closely connected, that we could only condemn them in the gross. We have omitted, too, almost entirely, the many instances of false and injurious statement, in which the error could be resolved into a difference of religious opinion. Indeed, instead of noticing and correcting all the misrepresentations which we have observed, we have—to use a favorite expression of some of the friends of our author—we 'have but just *dipped* into the subject.' We have but given a specimen of what could be done, were it at all worth while to follow him, in all his devious and distempered wanderings. In view of the whole, we shall not indeed retort the courteous language which he borrows from some of his *liberal* friends, and say, 'Some' Unitarian 'ministers will lie,' (See. p. 95) but we must say that there is *one* Unitarian minister who seems morally incapable of touching almost any subject, connected with evangelical religion, without mis-stating and perverting it.

We shall detain our readers on these veritable Letters, only while we notice a few particulars, too important to be wholly omitted, and which have been passed over in the preceding remarks. Addressing Professor Stuart, p. 7, Mr. W. says,

"Should a prayerful study of the Bible enable you to discover a slight error in some one article of this long creed, could you retain your situation as Profes-

sor? No. This liberty you have sacrificed. The moment you advance in religious knowledge and truth one step beyond the ideas of this human formulary, you must vacate your office," &c.

We could name a certain *Unitarian* Professor who has long received the income of an endowment given for the support of a man of 'sound or *Orthodox* sentiments,'—and also of a legacy given for the support of one who should "profess and teach the principles of the Christian religion, according to the well known *Confession of faith drawn up by the Synod of the churches of New England.*" If Professor Stuart's conscience is like that of this man, why may he not "discover a slight error in some one article of his long creed," and still retain his office in the Theological Institution?

Mr. W. is in the habit of calling certain persons *Orthodox*, whose *Orthodoxy*, to make the best of it, sits very loosely upon them. They may aspire to the honor of the name, but obviously they have little more than the name. We have noticed several instances around us, of late, of this kind of management. Individuals, who have not committed themselves too far on the *Unitarian* side to render a retreat impossible, are beginning to call themselves *Orthodox*, and in some instances 'reformed *Orthodox.*' Others are dropping the name *Unitarian*, and retaining the simple one of *Congregationalist*. The *Christian Examiner* tells us, that were it not "for the existence of a *Unitarian sect*, there could be no obstacle to the rapid and universal prevalence of *Unitarianism.*"\* The plan, therefore, will be, probably, to get the *sect* out of the way as fast as possible. Instead of endeavoring to prevail as a *sect*, an attempt may be expected to mingle silently with the *Orthodox* denominations, in the prospect of leavening the whole lump. We certainly are not unwilling that any of those who have departed from us should return. If they return in good faith, and with honest and good hearts, they will be welcomed with tears of gratitude and joy. But we have no wish, and no intention (if we can prevent it) too see the old arts of amalgamation and concealment acted over again in Massachusetts. And we take this opportunity to warn our readers—our clerical readers especially—against the impositions of those who are beginning to style themselves *Orthodox*, and as such claiming our fellowship and confidence, while, if they have repented of their errors, they bring forth no *fruit* meet for repentance.

The charge of *concealment* against the *Unitarians*, Mr. W. declares that he has never been able to understand. p. 70. And if he cannot understand it, after all we have said and written upon the subject, we despair of making it plain to him by any further efforts. We can only refer him, for satisfactory explanations, to several of

\* Sept. 1830; p. 19.

his own brethren. Let him ask Mr. Parkman what he meant, by attributing to some Unitarian ministers in Boston a '*cautious reserve*, so that neither from their sermons, their prayers, nor their private conversation, it could be inferred that they were Unitarians.' Let him ask Mr. Greenwood what he meant by saying, that "the time may be easily remembered when, in our religious world [in and around Boston] there was nothing but distrust on the one side, and *fear* and *evasion* on the other; when the self-conceited theologian looked awry on the suspected heretic, and the object of his suspicion answered him with *circumlocution* and *hesitation*." Let him consult a certain writer in the Christian Examiner, if he knows who he is, and learn what he meant by saying, "I can remember the time, and I am not old, when, though Boston was full of Unitarian sentiment and feeling, there was *no open profession of it*. A *dead silence was maintained in the pulpit* on doctrinal subjects; a silence which was not disturbed by *the press*."—If Mr. Whitman's own brethren cannot make this subject plain and intelligible to him, it will be vain for us to attempt any further explanations.

Our author informs us, that "since so many churches of the fathers have fallen into the hands of Unitarians, they have been *raking up their first covenants*, and restoring them to their proper and former standing." p. 134. This cannot be true of all "the churches of the fathers," which have fallen into the hands of Unitarians, since in some of them, as we are informed, they have now no covenants at all. The formality of covenanting is quite abolished, and the whole congregation are invited to the Lord's table together.\*—Mr. W. says, "So long as a believer takes the Bible for his guide of faith and practice, and exhibits a Christian character, he is cordially welcomed to our celebration of the ordinances." And so he is, in some Unitarian societies, whether he "takes the Bible for his guide of faith and practice, and exhibits a Christian character," or not. All are invited and "cordially welcomed to ordinances," without regard to any of the old, invidious distinctions about *faith* and *character*.—We have now before us a copy of the covenants lately adopted by the first church in Salem,—the second in age of all the churches of New England. We say *covenants*; for it seems 'the half-way covenant' is still in use there. The covenant, prepared for those who wish the benefit of baptism but are not in full communion, is truly characteristic and appropriate. One would suppose beforehand, that 'half way' between a Unitarian church and the world could not be at a great remove from

\* Mr. W. complains that some Orthodox churches have violated the principles of Congregationalism. He ought to know that some Unitarian churches (if churches they can be called) have *wholly departed* from these principles, and have no longer any just claim to be denominated Congregationalists. If any thing is essential to Congregationalism, it is the existence of a church, a *body in covenant*, in distinction from the congregation.

the latter ; and so it is represented in this 'half-way covenant,'—which is as follows :

" We believe in Jesus Christ as the Messiah ; and we receive his religion, as the rule of our lives, and as a revelation from God."

This venerable church, it would seem, is not one of those which " have been *raking up their first covenants*, and restoring them to their proper and former standing."

Among the numerous passages we had marked, as deserving of animadversion, many still remain untouched. We shall call attention, however, to but *one* more ; and this as indicative of a degree of mental *obduration* which we can but poorly conceive, and shall not attempt to describe. It is that in which our author trifles with the feelings of an afflicted mother, in his own neighborhood, who had been called to weep over the grave of an only son.

" All are willing the Devil should have sinful strangers and enemies ; but they firmly trust that sovereign grace will save all sinful acquaintances and friends. And such a belief the Orthodox do not hesitate to avow in conversation. Nay ; they even proclaim it to the world in the epitaphs they place on the tombstones of the abandoned. The following shall suffice as one example of the many that might be quoted :

' The mother's sigh, nor friendship's tear,  
Cannot recall thy spirit here ;  
Yet may a boon more blessed be given,  
*Hope tells us, we shall meet in heaven.*' "

True, this son had lived an irreligious life ; and although he exhibited some marks of real repentance during his last sickness, which might lead an affectionate mother to indulge a hope on his behalf, yet the mother did neither select nor order the epitaph upon his tombstone. The whole was committed to another person, and the directions for the stone were given, while she was absent on a visit to a sick friend. Our readers must be left to form their own judgement of the feelings of a man who, under these circumstances, could bring this afflicted mother before the public as one of those, who ' are willing the Devil should have sinful strangers and enemies, while they firmly trust that sovereign grace will save all sinful acquaintances and friends ; and who do not hesitate to proclaim this belief to the world in the epitaphs they place on the tomb-stones of the abandoned !!!'

After all that has been said in the foregoing pages, it would be superfluous to animadvert on the qualities of Mr. Whitman's style, or on the coarseness, vulgarity, and profaneness of many of his remarks.—It will be evident to all, that he has adopted a new and very extraordinary mode of theological warfare. He has sought to justify himself and his party, and to bring reproach upon Evangelical

Christians all over the land, not so much by argument, or a recurrence to accredited books and documents, as by 'raking up,' (to borrow one of his own phrases) a variety of stories, traditional reports, and *ex parte* statements,—arraying them before the public as sober history, as fact,—and making these insulated and disconnected narratives matter of serious charge against a whole denomination. It is for intelligent and candid Unitarians to decide, whether they will sanction this new mode of controversy; or so much as tolerate it. They must be aware that their opponents have it in their power to resort to similar measures: Do they wish them to do so? Are they prepared for the result of such a course? And are they willing this community should be thrown into a ferment, like that of a boiling caldron, by such a contest?—We have been constrained to say things in the foregoing pages, which we were very unwilling to say, and which we never should have said, had we not been compelled to it by the false and injurious statements on which we were called to remark. If the controversy shall be continued in the manner in which it has commenced, we may find it necessary to recur to the subject again, though we certainly shall do so with extreme reluctance. We feel that we have more important work on our hands, than to engage frequently in the refutation of idle and slanderous stories, like those contained in these Letters,—and that our readers have more important work on their hands, than to follow us often in discussions of this nature.

In conclusion, we have only to ask pardon of our friends for having detained them so long on the subject of this tedious and disgusting publication. We ask pardon especially, of those respected correspondents who early expressed to us the opinion that the book was *unworthy* of public notice or animadversion. We *knew* it was *unworthy, in itself*, and this conviction has been impressed upon us through all the labor of the foregoing Review. But when we saw the attempts that were made to pass it off before the public, as accurate in reasoning, correct in statement, and altogether a work of great merit and importance; and when we considered that most people into whose hands it might fall, would read it cursorily, without sufficient attention to detect its errors, or discover its true character, and would receive from it impressions tending to prejudice them against all true religion, and thus injure them forever; we could not be silent. We felt constrained, we trust in a spirit of true Christian charity, to take up the subject; and we have endeavored to pursue it in the same spirit. The result of our labors is before the public, in whose candor and indulgence we cheerfully confide. The final issue is with HIM, who can cause the wrath of man to contribute to his praise,—and before whom Mr. Whitman and his reviewers must shortly appear.

## NOTE.

WE have run our eye over the second edition of Mr. Whitman's Letters, but not with sufficient attention to be able to speak particularly of the alterations. He says he has "expunged several sentences, corrected some inaccuracies, and cut out one whole statement to make room for one of a different character." The statement "cut out," is that relating to Rev. Mr. Truair, p. 44. As the preceding Review was chiefly written and printed when the second edition came into our hands, our remarks will be found to correspond throughout to the first edition. Mr. W. professes to be very anxious that his book may be correct, and tells of publishing "a third enlarged and *corrected* edition." In preparing this edition, he is welcome to all the assistance he can derive from our labors. We predict, however, that the work of correction will be found immensely difficult. Like the ancient edifice, from which the name of the builder could not be effaced without destroying the fabric, when all the misrepresentations are taken from these Letters, we are confident there will be little remaining.

## NOTICE.

UNAVOIDABLE hindrances have delayed for a few days the publication of this number. Those who are pleased with variety, with short articles, and with discussions of a practical nature, will be disappointed, probably, on receiving it. Others will think it of more value and interest than our numbers generally. Our future numbers will appear punctually, as usual.



THE  
**SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.**

---

---

VOL. IV.

APRIL, 1831.

NO. 4.

---

---

**COMMUNICATIONS.**

CONTINGENT PROSPECTS OF OUR COUNTRY.

CALCULATIONS respecting the future, based upon the past, assuming as data the growth of this nation in population and in all the sources of national wealth and power since the establishment of our independence, have been so often made, that they may be supposed by this time to be familiar to the religious community. A sublime estimate of this sort, contained in the last Annual Report of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, is now in extensive circulation before the public. God grant, that the most favorable suppositions may be more than realized. But there are awful contingencies—there is another and darker side of the picture. And while the former brings down to our vision all the incitements of hope, the latter should urge us forward in the career of benevolent enterprise by all the motives of fear.

The supposition is indeed interesting, and flattering to our national pride and self-importance, that every twenty-five years will double our population. And it is reasonable, too, on one of the many contingencies which cluster in our prospect; because, such are the historical results of the past. By this rule, the United States, in seventy-five years, will embrace within their jurisdiction, 100,000,000 of souls; and in one hundred and fifty years, 800,000,000—equal to the present population of the globe! Suppose that improvement in the useful and fine arts, in science, in general knowledge and the means of education, in religion and morals, shall keep pace with reasonable expectation, in the meantime—an expectation founded on the present spirit of improvement in all these respects—what a prospect! This is as far as we need go—dare go. This is an experiment long and large enough, under the operation of causes already developed, and now in a rapid train of development, to determine, not only the fate of this nation, but for a long and unknown period, the fate of the world.

One thing is certain, that calculations, resulting from the history of the world, taking all contingencies into consideration, bar this prospect in the outset. It is only on the assumption, that we have arrived at a period in Divine providence, when the elements of human society have obtained such a combination and tendency, as to enforce results which have never before been known, that we can expect to realize more than a moiety of the cheering estimations of advancement, which, on the stage at religious anniversaries and from the religious press, have of late greeted our ears and animated our hopes. In other words; it is only in the confidence, that God is about to turn up to our vision that page of the calendar of his Providence on which are written the days of the Millennium, that we may reasonably indulge these pleasing anticipations. Dreams of this sort, we know, have been told, and told again—editions have been multiplied upon editions, versions on versions, and history has loaned its voluminous interpretations, until it were heresy to doubt. And in coincidence with these more enthusiastic hopes, grave philosophy, from the chair of Christian Theology, and from the pulpit, professes to have discerned in the elements of the moral world, and in their existing current, peculiar combinations, as allied to contemporaneous historical events, going to constitute “the signs of the times.” These predictions, or presentiments, are certainly worthy of great respect, as they are a part of the history of divine Providence, and of the world.

When Christ came in the flesh, the world were in expectation of the event—or of some great event. A long train of previous, and a cloud of contemporaneous circumstances had created and ripened that expectation. And it was not disappointed in fact, though it was in the manner of our Lord’s appearance. The world is now expecting a moral revolution;—and not without reason. The Philosopher, the Statesman, and the Christian, unitedly expect it. The elements of society have assumed a combination and declared tendency of a new character, of a high and momentous bearing, to which even common discernment cannot be altogether insensible.

The wise of this world look upon these aspects, “not knowing what shall come upon the earth.” The Christian, of high hopes, grasping the promises of the God of Abraham, looks upon them with the eye of *faith*. He sees, or thinks he sees, “the new Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven;” and God himself making, “his tabernacle with men.” May he not be disappointed!

James Douglas Esq. thinks that England is the fountain, from which the waters of the sanctuary are beginning to flow, and on every side to direct their purifying streams; and that she is the precursor in all the improvements peculiar to the times we live in. ‘Let her go on, and prosper, and excel’—if it be “in love and

good works." But Mr. Douglas, although he has paid us some splendid compliments, has never been able to sympathize with the moral elements, nor to calculate the resources, of the land in which we live. Without partiality—*here, I believe, is the great experiment.* I could offer a long chapter of reasons. But time, and the purpose I have in view, forbid the attempt.

But notwithstanding the felicitous forms of our institutions, which make the foundation and structure of our society in its great constitutional parts; notwithstanding the apparent healthfulness of the gigantic accretions which have already attached themselves to these elementary substances; notwithstanding the fine accomplishments, with which our great and prosperous community is studded on every side; notwithstanding the most interesting and hopeful developments of the various forms of society under the operation of these institutions; and notwithstanding the combination of the moral elements growing out of such a state of things demonstrates a susceptibility of high endeavor, and of unexampled enterprise, so that it may be said with truth, that another so hopeful an experiment of human society has never yet been made;—yet, are there imperfections in our institutions, which need to be watched, and as soon as may be, remedied; there are monstrous parts, some inherited and some grown with our growth, to remove which, requires the skilful hand of political surgery; there are epidemics of grave and alarming aspect, which demand the administration of severe medicine; there are the seeds of numerous and hurtful diseases, lurking in the blood; there are, in short, many symptoms of no very remote decline, many and powerful tendencies to a dissolution of our fabric, and a blasting of our hopes. And with the ruin of these hopes, I would venture to predict in face even of Mr. Douglas, must come the ruin of the hopes of the world, at least for ages. In such an event, commotion must succeed commotion, and desolation follow upon desolation, till another long round of ages shall erect a similar fabric of free and generous institutions, and give birth to a wiser and more virtuous generation, that shall better appreciate their privileges, and be more alive to their responsibilities. To such an extent are the destinies of this nation connected with the destiny of the world; and the world and God will hold us responsible for the virtue and efficiency, with which we sustain the mighty trust.

To pursue an upright and honorable course, notwithstanding the defects of our institutions, so as to work off all the unseemly accretions and morbid affections from the body politic, *public virtue* is the only and the essential requisite. And that cannot exist independently of *private* virtue, possessed to such an extent, as to form the public character. And the only nurse of virtue, private and public, on a secure and permanent basis, is *Christianity*. Christianity alone embodies all the elements of virtue; and conse-

quently, in the pervading influence of Christianity is all our hope. Let this prevail, and we shall prevail; let this spread and triumph, and the future triumph of our nation is sure. By this alone can we realize the visions of future good, which have sprung up before us in such rich and glorious prospect. We have now come to a crisis of the nations. The harvest of the world is ripe, and bending to our arms. And yet it is possible, that this harvest season should pass by, this summer end, and our nation be lost. The contingencies, on which the grand result depends, are momentous—are awful. They are numerous, too, in their ramifications, although they emanate from one stock, the pravity of our common nature.

What has warranted us to indulge the expectation that the cheering visions, built upon a half century's history and experiment, will ever be realized? Nothing, surely, that can be collected from the history of the world, aside from the revelations and faith of divine prophecy. All that is written there, only makes good the definition, given by one of high respect, of the succession of this world's generations; "a history of crime and calamity." What! we produce a world, in two hundred years, as big as the present world, which dates six thousand years! And this world of our creation to be exempt in its growth and in its maturity from those painful incidents and calamitous vicissitudes, which have hitherto kept all other generations and all other nations in continuous check! The bow of promise, beaming from the stormy cloud, as it passes away in the east, while the sun is declining to the west, teaches us infallibly that the world henceforth is never to be destroyed by a universal deluge. The mouth of the same Being has also declared—that "nation shall rise up against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and that earthquakes shall be in diverse places;" "there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity—the sea and the waves roaring, and men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth"—*"until the Son of man be come."*

Is the Son of man about to come? Can we reasonably be assured, that our hands are collecting, fashioning, and adjusting the materials of the tabernacle of God, that he may descend and dwell in the midst of us? He that can bring this proof, may next assure us, that "*we are the favored people of the Lord.*"

The seeds of civil discord are indeed in the midst of us. They are sown and have taken deep root in our heart. They have already infected and agitated our whole political body. And who can tell which subsequent agitation shall heave the foundation of our giddy fabric, till it shall totter and dissolve? These fearful ingredients can be allayed, reduced, and purified, only by the influence of true religion. And he only who advocates and pro-

motes religion, advocates successfully the stability and permanency of the institutions of his country.

Passing by the numerous contingencies on which depend our uninterrupted prosperity and ultimate triumph—contingencies which cluster at every step of our progress, and hang out their admonitory tokens from every page of our history, I shall notice two *evils* of extreme delicacy, which at this moment demand of us a treatment, executed throughout in the fear of God and of the reprobation of the world;—I refer to the present condition and prospects of the *African race*, and of the *aboriginal inhabitants*, who are now lying upon us, dependant, helpless, injured. The former of these evils is a gangrene of monstrous growth, entering into the muscle, bone, and very marrow of our Republic. The latter is fast becoming so—though not with the same chance of dangerous increase. If we attempt violently to remove it, as we seem likely to do, is there no danger that we destroy ourselves? To proceed in this murderous work, oh, that I could say—we dare not. For this would be partial proof of a remaining virtue, adequate to the safe removal of existing deformities, or the reduction of them to comely and beauteous forms.

That we are responsible to the world and to God for a kind and tender treatment of these unfortunate portions of our race to whom I have referred—the one entailed upon us, and the other, first supplanted as our masters, and then adopted as our children, under the promise of protection and careful nurture; and responsible, too, for the institution and support of such a system of measures, in relation to them, as shall gradually and ultimately redeem them from their present disabilities; he who doubts, is not to be reasoned with, either as being himself an accountable being in his own individual capacity, or as a member of an earthly community which God will judge and visit for all their public acts and measures—especially for their treatment of the oppressed and helpless. There is to us no getting away from this responsibility. It is identified with our existence, and ordained the condition of our prosperity.

As the crisis of our treatment and final disposal of the African race, who dwell in the midst of us, has not yet arrived, unless indeed it has passed and gone forever—which I pray God may not be the case,—we are demanded more especially, at the present moment, to give our attention, and to summon up the virtue of this nation, to watch and control with fearfulness that crisis of Indian destiny, which doubtless has come, and is now passing over our heads, and setting its seal upon the conscience, and character, and prospects of the people of this land.

ANTIPAS.

## CHURCH OFFICERS.

In defining and instituting local churches, do the Scriptures recognize and appoint a *third officer* in distinction from pastor and deacon?

An answer to this question, that shall leave no room for difference of opinion, is hardly to be expected. The language of the Bible respecting it is indeed far from being unintelligible; yet it is not direct and explicit. Hence to some, the subject seems to involve only probabilities; and it is thought that an inquiry after the truth can amount to little more than an arranging of these probabilities, and balancing between them. Still it may be hoped that some good degree of satisfaction is attainable.

The following topics will be found to bear on the general question proposed:

- I. The meaning of the several names, by which the officers of the church are designated.
- II. The import of the passages in which these names occur.
- III. The qualifications and duties of officers.
- IV. The nature and wants of a church.
- V. Ancient, and, if possible, Apostolic usage.
- VI. Authorities, or the opinions of learned men and critics on the subject.

For the sake of brevity, the two last topics will be omitted, and the reader referred to a series of articles on "Lay Presbyters," by J. P. W., in the *Christian Spectator*, vols. V—X.

I. The first inquiry relates to the *meaning of names*. Are there as many officers as names; or are several of the names synonymous, and applied to the same officer?

There are in the New Testament two instances of formal enumeration, which have been supposed to contain all the officers that Christ in person instituted. One of these is found in 1st Cor. xii: 28. "God hath set some in the church; first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers; after that, miracles; then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." The other is in Eph. iv. 8 and 11.—"Wherefore he saith, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. And he gave some apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers."

Many of these officers, as all agree, were temporary, being designed to meet the necessities of the times when they were appointed. Of this description were, "apostles," "prophets," "miracles," "gifts of healings," "diversities of tongues." To these the office of evangelists may be added, as requiring in the present case no discussion; because, if all are not agreed that this office was

temporary, they are agreed that it does not belong essentially to the structure of a local church.

There remain, therefore, for examination, the names, "pastors," "teachers," "helps," "governments;" and such others as were added by the apostles. These are "bishops," "elders," and "deacons." The terms, "ambassador," "minister," &c. are supposed to be of so general application as not to require particular notice. The question now is, what are the meanings of these seven names? Does each designate a separate office, or do several of them apply variously to the same office?

The primary meaning of *Επισκοπος* (Bishop) is very accessible. It has its derivation from a compound word answering to the verb, *supervise*, which is synonymous with *overlook*, *oversee*. From these verbs are derived compound nouns, such as *supervisor*, *inspector*, *overseer*. These, it is believed, express the meaning of *Επισκοπος* (Bishop) with an accuracy not often attainable, without circumlocution. The oversight, it will be observed, is altogether general. Whether it is the oversight of things secular or things religious, he who is appointed to it is designated by the same word. Indeed, Schleusner seems to hit it exactly, when he says of this word, "est nomen generale omnium eorum, qui curam *alicujus rei* sustinent." Philologists show that those were called *Επισκοποι* who were appointed headles, or masters of the Grecian games; and whose business it was to see that every thing was done "recte et ordine." Demosthenes calls Minerva *Επισκοπος* because she was regarded as a sort of presiding genius over her city. Suidas mentions that the Athenians called those *Επισκοποι*, who were sent annually to the cities which they held as provinces, to see what, and how, things were done.

From this it might be inferred, pretty confidently, that *Επισκοπος*, when used in the New Testament, would denote those who have, in some sense, an *official oversight* of men and things in matters of religion. More than this, is not from the meaning of the word itself, ascertainable.

But this does not decide whether *priestly* or only *secular* oversight is intended. Much less does it point out a high department of priestly office, in which an individual is to preside over the church and its ministers.

*Πρεσβυτερος* is an adjective in the comparative degree, from *Πρεσβυς* *old*. The meaning of the word is simply *elder*. In this, its primary and common meaning, it is used abundantly by writers sacred and profane. It is so used in the New Testament: "Now his *elder* son was in the field," &c. "Your *old* men shall dream dreams." It is plain, therefore, that this word, in its primary and literal signification, so far from designating any particular ecclesiastical office, does not relate to the subject at all. Nor can I find that any trope has passed upon the word in the usage of Greek writers, or that

it has come to have any secondary meaning, sufficient to show what technical use might be expected to be made of it in the New Testament. This can be ascertained, therefore, only by an examination of those passages in which it occurs.

The original meaning of ποιμην (pastor) is simply *shepherd*. The word is used in this primary sense, by the best Greek writers; and also repeatedly by the writers of the New Testament.

In classical Greek, there is a tropical use of this word, by which it comes to be applied to kings, subordinate officers, military leaders, and commanders. In the words of a critic, it is "omnis, qui præest, regit, et imperium habet." Office of some kind, therefore, it might be expected to denote; but, as in the case of ἐπισκοπος, what office, whether a spiritual office to be held only by a minister of Christ, or a secular office that might be held by a layman, does not appear; though from the duty of the shepherd to feed his flock, the former might seem the more probable.

The primary meaning of διδασκαλος is *teacher*. Good usage employs it for a teacher, master, preceptor, of any kind. There is good reason, therefore, to believe, from the meaning of the word itself, that the apostles, in employing it as the name of a particular officer in the Christian church, would intend by it one invested with the ministry;—one whose business it was to "preach the word."

Διακονος (deacon) is from a verb which signifies to labor in the capacity of a servant. The word, therefore, means originally a *servant*; perhaps a *permanent* servant. And as there is no limitation as to *place* or *kind of service*, it may mean a servant, aut republicæ, aut patriciæ, aut familiæ, aut (hodie) ecclesiæ.

The two remaining terms are ἀντιληψας, (helps) and κυβερνησις (governments.) Of these, nothing can be said to any purpose in this place, because, neither in their primary, nor in any secondary meaning of theirs, do they seem to have any relation to the subject.

All that has been said, therefore, as to the *meaning of names*, comes to this singularly indefinite result;—διδασκαλος pretty evidently implies one invested with the ministry;—and ποιμην is probably to be classed with it. All the rest are of doubtful import, even as to implying spiritual or only secular office. Should any be led hereby to guard against the danger of being imposed upon by names, one object of the writer will be answered.

II. I come now to the second topic, viz: *an examination of the passages* in which these names occur. This will bring out their meanings more definitely.

Ἐπισκοπος occurs in the New Testament five times. Once in 1st. Peter, ii: 25. "For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the shepherd and Bishop (Ἐπισκοπος) of your souls." Here the term is evidently applied to Christ; and the passage contains nothing explicit on the point at issue.



Another instance of the use of this word is in Philip. 1 : 1. "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the Bishops (Επισκοποις) and deacons." The *form of the address*, is all that gives instruction here ; but this is far from being of doubtful import. Very clearly it implies that there were churches or associations of Christians at Philippi, consisting of believers in a private capacity, and two classes of officers, viz : Bishops and deacons. A more unequivocal representation of the manner in which the primitive churches were constituted, could hardly be given.

But the question still arises, what was the office which the Bishop held? The other passages where the name occurs, will answer.

One is in Acts 20 : 28. "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, (Επισκοπους) to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." This passage teaches expressly that the grand work of Bishops is to preach the Gospel to the church of God. The whole connexion of the passage renders it still more explicit, and shows with great plainness that they are the men who stand invested with the ministerial office.

The two remaining uses of the word are in 1 Tim. 3 : 2, and Titus 1 : 7. To Timothy the apostle says, "A Bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior ;" and among several other particulars it is added, he must be *apt to teach*, and must *take care of the church of God*.—To Titus he says, "For a Bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God ; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine ;" and in the course of the enumeration, which corresponds very nearly with that to Timothy, he adds, "*holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince gainsayers*."—That the office of a Bishop, then, is the *ministerial* office, is clear. And his functions are,—to preach the gospel,—to feed the church of God, taking the oversight thereof,—to exhort and to convince gainsayers ;—in a word, to assert, and vindicate the great doctrines of revelation.

I come next to the use of the term Πρεσβυτερος. It occurs in the New Testament 66 times. Four times it refers simply to age ;—as "your *old men* shall dream dreams." Four times it refers to Jewish Rabbins, or old Testament saints ;—"by it the *elders* obtained a good report." Twenty-eight times it refers to some department, or class of officers, in the Jewish sanhedrim ;—"The chief priests and *elders* and all the Council sought false witness against Jesus to put him to death." Once it denotes the prefects of a town or city, or perhaps the persons who are elsewhere called *rulers of the synagogue*. Luke vii. 3. Twice the beloved disciple applies it to himself as an apostle ; and once, Peter to himself ;—"The *elders* which are among I you exhort, who am also an *elder*." Twelve

times in the Apocalypse it is applied to certain heavenly ones, whom John saw in vision ;—" And round about the throne, were four and twenty seats ; and upon the seats I saw four and twenty *elders*, sitting, clothed in white raiment." In the remaining fourteen instances, it seems to apply to some class of officers in the Christian church ; e. g. " When they had ordained them *elders*, in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed." In nine of these fourteen instances, the word is so used as to denote *office simply*, without defining the kind of office held ; as e. g. " The apostles and *elders*, and brethren, send greeting unto the brethren," &c. There remain, therefore, only five instances of the use of the word from which to decide what kind of office is meant. In two of these,\* the elders are said to be "*ordained*" to their office. Though the common reader hardly catches every shade of meaning that belongs to the words translated, *ordain*, he still correctly understands that the persons referred to were set apart to the *ministry of the gospel*. A criticism, therefore, on the words signifying to *ordain* is here unnecessary. The other instances follow. Paul, having sent for the *elders* of the church at Ephesus, addresses them thus ; " Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and unto all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, (*ἐπισκοπους*, *bishops*) to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." What this passage, as just quoted, proves of bishops, it here proves of *elders* ; and proves that both are the same class of men,—nay, in this case, the *same men*. The elders of v. 17, are identically the bishops of v. 28, and are the men who are to *feed the church of God*."—Peter addresses elders thus, "*Feed the flock of God that is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly ;—being ensamples to the flock.*" Here again all uncertainty respecting the kind of office held is taken away.

The other passage, which I have designedly reserved till the last, is this ;—" Let the *elders* that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine." 1 Tim. 5: 17. Here, too, the elder is seen to be one who " labors in word and doctrine," i. e. who is in the ministry ; and another word would not be necessary, were it not that some have thought two classes of elders are here spoken of—one *governing* and the other *teaching* the church.

But it does not appear that the scriptures elsewhere appoint or even recognize a second and subordinate class of elders. A single passage, it is true, if it fairly taught the doctrine, were enough ; and like the oath of confirmation, should be " the end of all strife." But inasmuch as this text is alone, even in *seeming* to intimate such a sentiment ; and inasmuch as the intimation, if it be one, is very

\* Acts 14: 23, and Titus 1: 5.

remote, while the passage may well be interpreted differently;—in such a case, to graft the sentiment in question, upon the Bible, as an item of scripture doctrine, seems quite gratuitous. The question may well arise, whether the *ruling*, spoken of in this passage, is not the prerogative of the ministry? Of this I think there can be no serious doubt.

“Obey them that *have the rule* over you, and submit yourselves; for they *watch for souls* as they that must give an account.” No one doubts that all this is said of those in the ministry. No one ever thought of making those who *have the rule*, and those who *watch for souls*, two different classes of men. Why then is such a distinction made in the parallel passage in Timothy? “We beseech you, brethren, to know them which *labor* among you, and *are over* you in the Lord,—and to esteem them very highly for their work’s sake.” 1 Thess. 5 : 12. No one ever thought of making *those who labored* among these Thessalonian Christians, and *those who were over* them in the Lord, two different classes of men. Yet the same words occur here, that are used in the disputed passage in Timothy. Why then, in that passage, should such a distinction be made, when not a passage or a doctrine of the New Testament can be found that requires it?

I come to the name *Ποιμην* (pastor) which is used in the New Testament eighteen times. In nine instances it is used literally for a shepherd. In eight it is applied to Jesus Christ. There remains, therefore, but one instance of its application to the officers of the church. This occurs in Eph. 4 : 11, where it is said that Christ, as he ascended, gave gifts unto men. “And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, *pastors and teachers*.” It is evident that the words rendered “pastors and teachers” are used as synonymous terms, and are applied to the same class of officers. This appears from the structure of the sentence in the original. The antithetical force of the Greek *τους μιν* and *τους δε*, *the one* and *the other*, decides “*pastors and teachers*” to be one of the ascension gifts. He gave *τους μιν* one gift, and that was *apostles*; *τους δε* another gift, and that was *prophets*;—*τους δε* another, and that was *pastors and teachers*. Compare also, 1st Cor. 12 : 28, and it will be seen that *teachers* there, stands over against *pastors and teachers* here, as meaning the same thing.

But if *Ποιμην* (pastor) is synonymous with *Διδασκαλος* (teacher) the question arises, what is the meaning of this latter term? It will be recollected that the very import of the name shows pretty clearly that it means the ordinary minister. To this it may be added, that while in two instances the scriptures purport to give by enumeration all the officers which Christ instituted for the benefit of the church; in neither of them is the ordinary preacher recognized, unless he is spoken of, in one, by the joint terms, “pastors and teachers,” and in the other, by *teachers* alone.

The uses made of the term *διακονος*, (deacon) are many and various. It is applied to table-servants; to family servants; to agents in the employ of another, as his servants; to magistrates, as the servants of God; to the apostles and their fellow-laborers, as servants of God, of Christ, and of the gospel; to the devotees of particular persons or objects, as their servants; and finally to men holding a *secular office in the church*, as its servants. See Phil. 1: 1. In this last case, it is used as an *appellative*. This is so obvious,—and so at agreement, as well with the common opinion, as with the Bible, that remark is needless.

The question arises, however, whether there is yet another officer appointed, in connexion with the secular and governmental concerns of the church? Not under either of the five names already examined, as has been shown.

There remain two others, viz: *Ἀντιληψις* (helps) and *Κυβερνησις*, (governments.) It will be recollected that there is nothing in the meaning of these terms, which indicates that they were intended as official designations. Connect with this the fact, that they occur but once in the New Testament; and it would seem they might be passed over without discussion. For it is not to be supposed that an appointment so important as that of an entire and separate office in the Christian church would have been thus made, and no recognition of it afterwards appear.

Still it may be said, these names are found in a formal enumeration of gifts and offices which Christ conferred upon the church. True; but that catalogue does not consist of *names of office* only. "Miracles" is not the designation of an office in the church. Neither is "gifts of healing," nor "diversities of tongues." There is no necessity, therefore, on account of their connexion merely, for supposing that "helps" and "governments" are names of office. The presumption is against it. Both are abstract terms. They do not apply necessarily to the subject of ecclesiastical polity at all. They are nowhere else used, and nothing afterwards appears, which supposes that they are here names of office.

Should it be inquired what these terms do mean, I am free to say, I should be glad to learn. When I read the passage, it suggests thoughts like the following;—Christ not only appointed certain officers in the church, but gave it also certain privileges, rights, or prerogatives. He gave it the right of making and executing rules and regulations in the way of self-control; i. e. he gave it "*governments*." He gave it also the prerogative of employing means to sustain itself,—and of using its gifts of healing, miracles, diversities of tongues, its evangelists and interpreters, for this end; i. e. he gave it "*helps*," subsidiary to sustaining and propagating its influence. In the retrospective interrogatories which follow the names in question, there is, to say the least, nothing repugnant to this interpretation. The apostle having said, "He set in the church

apostles, prophets, teachers, miracles, gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues," proceeds to ask—following the same order—"Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? have all the gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues?"—and in conclusion, not,—Are all "helps?" but what he seems to make the same thing—"Do all interpret?"—After all, I think the remark of Doddridge very just—"We can only guess at the meaning of these words, not having principles on which to proceed in fixing them absolutely." Surely, then, if the language in question involves the appointment of an entire office in the church, the fact of such appointment is but inadequately told.

The result of inquiry thus far is, that there is in the church a ministerial or sacerdotal office, spoken of under different names, and that this office is one;—that there is also a secular office, an office not embracing the ministry, which office is also one;—a conclusion in which the writer feels a confidence that is even new to himself.

III. But it is time to examine official qualifications and duties, to ascertain whether these presuppose two classes of officers, or more than two. And here, there is hardly opportunity to infer the number from the qualifications, because Paul, in giving the qualifications, mentions also the officers who must possess them. There are two prominent examples of this—1st Tim. 3d. chap. and Titus 1st chap. The epistle to Timothy, like that to Titus, was written to a pastor or bishop;—in our more common language, to a minister of the gospel. A principal design of it was to teach him how to proceed in instituting churches and furnishing them with their appropriate officers. Accordingly he tells what officers are necessary to the organization of a church, and what are their requisite qualifications. "A *bishop* must be blameless—apt to teach," &c. "Likewise, the *deacon* must be grave; not double-tongued—holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience," &c. The qualifications he mentions are numerous; but the officers who must possess them are two,—the ordinary pastor or bishop, and the deacon. Of a third, no intimation is given.

The qualifications, mentioned in the epistle to Titus, run parallel to these in an eminent degree. And nothing is hazarded in saying that, as it regards this subject, there is no chapter of qualifications in the New Testament, which is not fairly embraced in these. And if, as is clearly stated, these presuppose only two classes of officers, the same may justly be said of all the others.

The same is true of the duties enjoined. Of these there are various classes; and the question arising is, must the number of offices be equally numerous? Shall we understand that it is the prerogative of one office, to administer the sacraments, of another to minister at the altar, and of another to ordain successors? Into

this mistake we might fall, were it not that, happily, the question is answered for us. By example divinely sanctioned, and by injunction often enough repeated, these duties all devolve upon one and the same office; that officer, who is indiscriminately called bishop, elder, pastor, teacher.

But there are other departments of duty. There is the duty of maintaining church government and discipline,—of holding and appropriating the property of the church,—of caring for its poor,—and of rendering various other services that may be inferred from the required qualifications of deacons. On whom do these devolve, and how many offices do they presuppose? Happily again, the question is not without an answer. They all, with the exception of the first, by divine direction, devolve upon the deacon. And as to the first—the power and duty of maintaining church government and discipline—it devolves solely, with the exception of so much authority as by virtue of his office rests in the pastor, upon *the church*. Republican sentiments would lead one to say, this is the only place where, in the nature of the case, it can rest. And surely nothing can be plainer than that inspiration fixes it there. Look at the appointment of the seven deacons, at the decision about circumcising Gentile converts, and what is more immediately to the purpose, at the casting out of the incestuous person from the church at Corinth. Here is seen, not the acts of an apostle, or a bishop, but the acts of *the church*. The apostle, indeed, gives his voice against the offender, but he calls upon *the church* for the act of excommunication. Nothing can be plainer, than that he considered the power requisite to this act as invested in the church alone.

I am far from believing, however, that this power may in no sense, and to no extent, be delegated. I see not that the principle of delegation contravenes any thing, in the nature of this power, or in the principles of the gospel. The propriety, therefore, on the part of a church, of creating within itself a third office, as a matter of expediency, if by so doing its affairs can be better managed and its purity promoted, I can readily admit. I could become a presbyterian, or I could adopt the system of the consociated churches in New England without hesitation; abating only the *divine appointment* of the lay-eldership, of the principle of delegation, and the court of appeal.

I have now taken the scriptural view of the subject in the particular way proposed. The plan of examining only the names of office, and passages where they occur, has of course led me aside from much argumentation, that would confirm the present conclusion.

It would be pertinent to remark, that throughout the New Testament, it is by one and the same act that men are put into the ministry. By the act of ordination, men become invested with the

same prerogatives ; nor is there any intimation of their being placed in different ranks of office.

The commission of Christ to his ministers is given alike to all ; and evidently implies co-ordinate standing.

Throughout the history of the New Testament it is uniformly implied, that when churches had elders ordained over them, they were in possession of the ministry in all its gifts and prerogatives. "When they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them" (not to the oversight of a prelate, but) "to the Lord on whom they believed."

In no address or salutation throughout the epistles is the term bishop introduced, with but one exception ; \* and that in such a form as to show convincingly that by it the ordinary pastor is meant.

On these and other topics much might be said, tending to substantiate the view resulting from the previous investigation. But I will pass on, and with greater brevity.

IV. The necessities of a church in respect to official agency and influence. How many classes of officers does a church need ?

The church exists as a body politic ; and the prerogative of self-government and discipline, like that of appointing its officers, rests, where alone it can rest, in the body itself. But as it subsists through the influence of the gospel, it needs a department of service involving the preaching of the gospel. This evidently must be an official service. Again, the church cannot answer the purposes of its existence, nor discharge its appointed duties, without holding disposable property, more or less, and appropriating it to certain objects, as exigencies require. It needs, therefore, a secular department of office that may be employed in holding and appropriating such property. What, as to variety of office, shall be named further ? It is true, the necessities of churches vary, with the state of the times upon which they fall. But is it not also true, that they vary rather in the *amount*, than in the *kinds* of official service needed ? Now, though it seems a little like searching for truth from the light of nature after revelation has told us what is truth, the question may still be asked, whether, judging from the nature of the case, we should not have expected Christ to appoint the very officers which, according to the view now taken, he has appointed ? If so, here is corroborative evidence that the view taken is correct.

An examination of the two remaining topics, as I before said, I shall forego, referring the reader to the articles in the *Christian Spectator*. They are much more full and satisfactory than any thing that could here be added. I may remark, however, that the result of the researches there made is, that the primitive churches manifestly

\* Philip. 1 : 1.

knew nothing of any office, save those of pastor or presbyter, and deacon. The writer employs his first paper upon an epistle of "the excellent Clement, whose name Paul declares to be in the book of life." His conclusion is as follows;—"Thus nothing can be more evident than that this letter, which, above all other uninspired productions, is of the highest authority, and at the earliest period, being prior to the revelation of John, does use *πρεσβυτερος* and *επισκοπος* for the same order and office, and allows them but one ordination only; and as it is in the face of those lordly powers, which bishops afterwards claimed, *jure divino*, over presbyters; so it is a standing and perpetual testimony against those, who would degrade the office of the presbyter, to the mute ministrations of a modern *ruling elder*, which is but another name for deacon."

Near the close of his second paper, speaking of the conditions of the primitive churches down as far as the early part of the second century, he says, "*Clement* in the first has decided, in language affirmative and exclusive, for two officers in a particular church; according to Polycrap and Papias, who are the only witnesses known to us in the first part of the second century, *the offices were the same*. Everything, therefore, hitherto exhibits the office of *elder*, in a particular church, *as the only ordinary teacher*, equally without superiority and inferiority."

In reference to writings of Justin Martyr, bearing date about the middle of the second century, he says in his third paper. "Thus history establishes the fact, that the *elder who ruled*, (*πρεσβυτερος προεστας*,) was the same who labored in word, (*κηρυξεν εν λογω*) and that ruling should be understood, not of inferior duties, but of the presidency." Proceeding through the examination of several other documents, he thus remarks,—“Having now passed the middle of the second century and found one kind only of elders, and these the only ministers of the word, we infer that *such is the fair construction of the New Testament*, on the ordinary officers of the church. The innovations which we are soon to witness in their gradual progress, were unauthorized, and consequently *mere nullities*."

It appears, then, from an examination of the names of office used in the New Testament, and more especially from examining the passages in which they occur, that the Christian church is constituted with two distinct departments of office. The qualifications and duties of officers suggests the same conclusion. This conclusion is confirmed by examining the nature of a church, and inquiring what classes of officers it needs. Ancient usage corroborates it still more.

It is not to be expected that the reader will be affected by the perusal of these pages, as the writer has been in preparing them. Still it is hoped that some, who have been in doubt, may be decided; and that some who have believed out of dilemma, may see the reasons of their belief. The subject is left with a strength



of conviction which the writer is free to confess he once did not feel. He leaves it, more deeply impressed than ever, with the near resemblance of Pilgrim New England, to primitive and apostolic times. He leaves it with a quickened desire that the glory and blessedness of sustaining this resemblance may not soon pass away.

I. MEM.

## REVIEWS.

ESSAY ON THE HIEROGLYPHIC SYSTEM OF M. CHAMPOLLION, JR. and on the advantages which it offers to Sacred Criticism. By J. G. H. Greppo, vicar General of Belley. Translated from the French by ISAAC STUART, with notes and illustrations. Boston: Perkins and Marvin, 1830. pp. 276.

(Continued from p. 106.)

The relations between the Hebrews and the Egyptians were of such a character, and of so long continuance, that the history of the latter people, particularly their kings, is frequently alluded to in the writings of the Old Testament. The name *Pharaoh*,\* which, as Josephus informs us, was during thirteen hundred years the appellation of the Egyptian sovereigns, often occurs in the Jewish Scriptures. It is there used to designate no less than twelve of these sovereigns. As they are united under this common name, it has been exceedingly difficult to recognize among the Pharaohs of the Bible, those princes, whose names have been preserved by Greek or Roman historians. The chronological data, furnished by Champollion, serve, in a measure, to remove this difficulty, and thus to render an important service to sacred history.

Champollion Figeac, a brother of the one whose name has been repeatedly mentioned, has succeeded, as M. Greppo states, in restoring, out of the materials already furnished, nearly all the vast edifice of Egyptian dynasties.

"His labors," our author adds, "and the hieroglyphic legends upon which they have been employed, lead us to notice that part of the history and chronology of the Pharaohs, which relates to the Scriptures, and afford us at the same time, new truths on the subject. But it was not sufficient to have found upon the monuments the lists of Manetho, as they were preserved by his abbreviators, and to learn the *official* names of the Pharaohs; it was necessary also

\* Various conjectures have been formed respecting the derivation of this official appellation. Josephus says, it means, in Egyptian language, the *king*. Jablonisky and Gesenius concur in this conclusion. But Champollion has found, that the word *Pharoh* is the Egyptian name of the serpent *Uroeus*, which is a characteristic sign of Egyptian sovereigns. This fact, perhaps, furnishes the true explanation of this royal title.

to determine the *epochs* of their reigns, of which historians have only related the *duration*. Without this new result, the former results would have been insufficient, and existing simply as objects of curiosity, they would have had no real application to history. Champollion Figeac has executed this important service. By the portions he has selected from two writers of antiquity, he has placed in our hands a thread which will guide us in the labyrinths of Egyptian chronology; he has determined with certainty the date of the reign of Menophres, the third king of the nineteenth dynasty."

The calculations from the *Cynic cycle*, on which this result rests, we shall not examine. Though this date, which is fixed in the year 1322 before the Christian era, and the thirty-second of the reign of Menophres or Amenophis, may not be ascertained with such precision as our author supposes, yet it is doubtless determined with sufficient accuracy to constitute a point of departure for chronological investigations. In fixing the epochs of the Pharaohs, to whom the Bible refers, he is guided by this date, which he considers as settled by data of unquestionable character, and satisfactory to the severest criticism.

The first instance, in which the name of Pharaoh occurs in the sacred annals, is connected with the narrative of Abraham's migration from Canaan to Egypt. (See Gen. xii: 10—20.) Though this monarch was probably one of the last of the seventeenth dynasty, little is known respecting him, except what is contained in the narrative just alluded to; nor have we the means of determining precisely the epoch of his reign. About that period, the country suffered more or less from the desolating domination of the Shepherd-kings, in consequence of which, such monuments as might have been reared, together with other memorials of the antecedent ages, perished.

The eighteenth diospolite dynasty, a complete list of which is furnished by the celebrated table of Abydos,—coinciding with that contained in the chronicle of Manetho,—stands pre-eminent among the Egyptian dynasties. "This dynasty," as a contemporary journal remarks, "is the most illustrious in the annals of Egypt, especially if taken in connection with the succeeding one, (the nineteenth) from which it is not easy to say why it should be separated; since the reputed founder of the latter race of kings, Sethos or Ramses the Great, was the son of Amenophis III., the last sovereign of the eighteenth dynasty. This race of Pharaohs swayed the sceptre of Egypt for five centuries and a half in uninterrupted succession; and it was during their reign, that Cecrops and Danaus emigrated to Athens and Argos, and established those colonies which had such an important influence on the early civilization of Hellas.—It was during the same period, that the barbarous yoke of the Hykshos was shaken off, and the tribes of Israel were driven from Egypt, the most splendid monuments of Memphis, Thebes, and Nubia, were constructed, and the Egyptian monarchy was raised to the highest pitch of grandeur, by the con-

quests, and what is better, by the splendid and useful works of Ramses the Great." At an early period of this golden age of the Pharaonic dominion, Joseph was carried to Egypt by an Ishmaelite caravan, and sold as a slave to one of the officers of the crown. It was one of this line of princes, who made the captive Hebrew the prime minister of State, and finally sent for the family of Jacob, to which a goodly territory was assigned on the eastern bank of the Nile. During this period, the patriarchal household increased to a nation, was oppressed by an unrelenting despotism, and at last delivered by the hand of Moses; who, as the adopted son of a princess, was educated in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.

According to the chronological system of Usher, Joseph was carried into Egypt in the year 1727 B. C. Admitting the authority of this learned prelate, and the king who then reigned was the fifth of the eighteenth dynasty, whose name, as given by the monumental legends, is Thouthmosis III., whom Champollion has identified with the Moeris of the Greeks, the enterprising king who excavated the lake which bears his name. He reigned from the year 1736 to 1723, B. C. His name is found on various monuments in Egypt and Nubia, and also upon a fragment of hieratic papyrus, discovered in an Italian museum. Following Usher's chronology, M. Greppo assigns the establishment of the patriarchal family in Egypt to the reign of Amenophis II, the successor of the last named king. His reign continued from 25 to 30 years, terminating about the year 1695 B. C. The hieroglyphic names of this monarch are found upon many edifices; and a colossal statue belonging to him has been removed to an European museum. To him also is attributed the far-famed colossal Memnon, which towers among the ruins of Thebes,—and the palace of Luxar, the temple at Elephantine, and that of Amada beyond the first cataracts of the Nile, are reckoned among the works accomplished by this prince.

The Pharaoh, "who knew not Joseph," is supposed by our author to have been one of the two Achencheres, so called by historians, and who were brothers. Their names, as given by monumental legends, are Ousirei, and Mandouei II. Several monuments bear legendary inscriptions relating to these two kings. To the one first named belongs the splendid tomb, discovered at Thebes by Belzoni, which contained a beautiful alabaster sarcophagus. In this tomb, the oppression of the Hebrews is said to be commemorated. From this circumstance we are inclined to adopt the conclusion, that the barbarous decree, which reduced the prosperous Hebrews to a condition, in which oppression and cruelty were suffered, originated with Ousirei, who was alarmed at the growing number and power of this foreign race of subjects. This system of oppressive treatment was continued, in all probability, during the reigns of several successive monarchs, down to the time of their

departure from Egypt. It seems altogether probable, that during the long and prosperous reign of Ramses Meiamoun, the Hebrews were subjected to heavy labors under task-masters, and that this fact goes, in part at least, to account for the building of treasure cities, and those stupendous edifices, by which the reign of this ambitious sovereign was preeminently distinguished.

The most prominent Pharaoh of the sacred records is the one, to whose court Moses was sent of God to demand the release of the Hebrews. As the Exodus constitutes a memorable event in sacred history, an event which for ages was annually celebrated by the Hebrews at the festival of the passover, it is an important fact that the Pharaoh, then on the throne, has been satisfactorily recognized, and the epoch of his reign ascertained. If the calculation of Champollion, respecting the date of the reign of Menophres, may be relied upon as correct, it determines the date of the reign, under which the departure of the Hebrews took place. This is the confident conclusion of M. Greppo, who remarks as follows:—

“This presumptuous and impious monarch is recognized by many chronologists in the Pharaoh *Amenophis* (third of the name,) seventeenth and last king of the eighteenth dynasty; and this identity is indisputable. It was already established, in our view, by Manetho, in a fragment which Josephus cites (*cont. App. I. 26.*) where he relates this remarkable circumstance, that the king feared to contend against God, or against the gods; *αλλα μωλλον θεωμαχην νομισας.* In this narrative, we cannot but perceive an allusion to the mournful circumstances which transpired at the departure of the Hebrews; and the expression we have quoted seems to us to present a striking relation with the expression of Scripture, *viz. the finger of God is here* (Exod. viii. 19,) and to describe the terror with which the ten plagues had struck Egypt and its king. But this opinion is farther proved by the Egyptian chronology established by Champollion Figeac, from the monuments and the lists of Manetho. This Pharaoh, son and successor of *Ramses Meiamour*, reigned nineteen years and six months, and the known date of the reign of Menophres fixes this period between 1493 and 1473 years before the Christian era. About this time it is agreed to place the departure from Egypt.”

The date of the Exodus is assigned to the third year of the reign of Amenophis, i. e. 1491, B. C., which corresponds with the calculation of Usher. But as this king, according to Manetho, and the corresponding conclusion of Champollion Figeac, reigned twenty years, a difficulty arises in connexion with the inspired narrative, which represents him to have perished with his army in the Red Sea. Here we are driven to the adoption of the conclusion, that the sacred narrative does not necessarily imply the destruction of anything more than the army of Pharaoh, the king himself escaping the catastrophe,—or that there must be some miscalculation in the chronological results, whose accuracy is so confidently relied upon. We feel constrained to adopt the latter alternative.

The considerations which our author has adduced to show, that the account contained in Exodus xiv. does not necessarily imply the destruction of the insolent monarch who pursued the Hebrews

are ingenious and plausible. We confess, however, that to us they are not satisfactory; especially, when we take into the account various other passages, in which there is an allusion to this event. It was the express determination of Jehovah to get him honor upon *Pharaoh*, as well as upon the Egyptians. We do not consider the chronology of those distant epochs to be ascertained with such unerring precision, as must oblige us to adopt a mode of Scripture exegesis, that shall rescue from the catastrophe of the Red Sea, the obstinate and impious monarch, who defied the God of Israel. The representations of the sacred writers, together with corresponding traditions, strongly favor the conclusion, that Pharaoh suffered the exemplary doom, in which his armed hosts were involved. Besides, the date of the Exodus is by other chronologists, as Hales, Michaelis, Pritchard, and Rask, assigned to a period, antecedent to the one which M. Greppo considers to be so satisfactorily determined. By the results of future researches and investigations the existing discrepancies in these chronological calculations may be so harmonized, that there will be no necessity of departing from the obvious and literal interpretation of the sacred text.

One of the most formidable chronological difficulties, found in sacred history, relates to the time which elapsed between the settlement of Jacob in Egypt, and the departure of his posterity for the promised land. In the Mosaic records, the time is stated to have been four hundred and thirty years. (Exodus xii. 40.) This conclusion is supported by another passage, (Gen. xv. 13.) in which Abraham was informed, that his posterity would be afflicted in a strange land four hundred years, the round number being used with an omission of the odd years, a practice not unfrequent in historical narrative. (See also Acts vii. 6, 7.) On the other hand, Paul reckons but four hundred and thirty years from the time when the covenant of promise was made to Abraham, to the promulgation of the law on Sinai. (Gal. iii. 17.) The Hebrew genealogy corresponds with this calculation, but not with the other. M. Greppo accommodates his chronological dates to the latter mode of reckoning, which is also adopted by Usher, followed by most commentators, and has been the generally received opinion from a period antecedent to the version of the LXX. The Samaritan text gives the same account of the duration of the Hebrew residence in Egypt.

An objection to this computation arises from the unparalleled and almost incredible rate of increase, which must have prevailed among the Israelites, in order to swell their population to three millions or more in so short a time. The Hebrew text, however, is by far the most weighty objection; nor have we met with any hypothesis, which removes it to our satisfaction. Professor Rask of Copenhagen has recently undertaken to show, that previous to

the age of Moses, a year included but six, instead of twelve months. This would reduce the four hundred and thirty years, as given in the Hebrew text, to the commonly received period of two hundred and fifteen years, corresponding with the statement of the apostle. But this method of solving the difficulty, is far from being satisfactory. Admit that such was the mode of reckoning time, and what becomes of the longevity of the patriarchs? Why was it so marvellous, that the wife of Abraham should give birth to a son at the age of forty-five;—and how happens it that she was considered as doomed to perpetual sterility, when she had scarcely passed her thirtieth year? Besides, when the writers of the New Testament allude to the age of Abraham, they assign to him the same number of years that is given in Genesis. (Rom. iv. 19.) The speculations of the learned Dane afford not a relief of the difficulty in question, of which we can avail ourselves, without becoming involved in other difficulties equally formidable.

Let it be conceded, that the Hebrew text furnishes the correct account, when it assigns four hundred and thirty years as the time of the sojourning of the Israelites in Egypt, (and we know of no authority superior to that of the Hebrew text,) then it gives ample time for an increase of population, equal to what is implied in the census of adult males, as given, Exodus xii. 37,—especially, when we take into consideration the causes which contributed to the fecundity of the Hebrew people in Egypt.\* So far as the genealogical difficulty is concerned, we may, as others have done, resort to the supposition, that some of the links, in the given chain of genealogy, have been omitted by the sacred historian, a circumstance of no uncommon occurrence. And as to the Pauline computation, it is obvious, that the argument of the Apostle did not require chronological accuracy, nor in this case could there be any insurmountable objection against his adopting a chronological date, as generally understood. The simple fact, which his object required to be stated, was, that a long time after the promises were made to Abraham, the Mosaic law was given. He might therefore, *ex more populari*, express himself in conformity to the Septuagint version, as this was the version used by the persons to whom his epistle was addressd. The Hebrew text, which makes the period, intervening between Jacob's arrival in Egypt and the Exodus, four hundred and thirty years, is considered to be the true calculation, and of paramount authority, by the learned Michaelis, Dr. Jahn, Rosenmueller, and other accomplished critics. Without adventuring on hypothesis for the solution of the difficulty in question, we must suspend a decision, till some new light shall have been shed upon the subject. If the future researches of Champollion, or his coadjutors, shall furnish data, that will enable us to reconcile this chronological discrepancy, and determine the point in

\* See Michaelis on Exodus xii. 37. Also Rosenmueller.

debate, we shall regard it as a precious acquisition to sacred criticism.

But to return from this digression,—we find in the sacred books, that some of the later Pharaohs are mentioned by their distinctive names. The first, whose name is thus expressed, is Shishak. Which of the Pharaohs is referred to by the sacred historian? Different conclusions have been adopted in answer to this question. According to Marshman, he is Sesostris; according to Gatterer, he is Susenes, of the twenty-first Tanitic dynasty; Syncellus supposes him to be Semendes, the first of the last named dynasty; Silberschlag maintains, that he is Sesenchosis, of the twenty-second Bubastic dynasty.\* Champollion has confirmed the conclusion of Silberschlag, by the discovery of two royal legends inscribed on one of the colonades, which adorn the first court of the palace of Karnac at Thebes. These legends contain a name which corresponds with that of the Hebrew Scriptures, written Shishak. M. Greppo relates the following circumstance:—

“A recent discovery made by Champollion in the land of Egypt itself, removes all doubt upon this subject. We transcribe his own description. “In the wonderful palace (that of Karnac) I saw, says he, . . . Sesonchis dragging at the feet of the Theban Trinity, Ammon and Mouth and Kons, the chiefs of more than thirty vanquished nations, among which I have found, written in letters at full length, IOUDAHAMALEK, the kingdom of the Jews or of Judah. This forms a commentary upon the fourteenth chapter of the first book of Kings, which in fact relates the arrival of Sesonchis at Jerusalem, and his success. Thus the identity we have established between the Egyptian Sheshonk, the Sesonchis of Manetho, and the Shishak or Sheshok of the Bible, is confirmed in the most satisfactory manner.”

Shishak invaded Judea in the fifth year of the reign of Rehoboam, the son and successor of Solomon, corresponding with the year 971 B. C. according to Usher. In the same year, Champollion Figeac has ascertained that Sesonchis or Sesenchosis, the Shishak of the Bible, ascended the throne of Egypt. His first grand achievement, therefore, was the invasion and conquest of Judea. Among a collection of portraits, which Champollion has recently gathered from the long neglected depositories of Egyptian art, that of this sovereign is found.

In the reign of Asa, the kingdom of Judea was invaded by a numerous and formidable army, at the head of which was a prince, called Zerah the Ethiopian, (*Zara Æthiops*, according to the Hebrew,) whose dominion appears to have extended over both Egypt and Ethiopia, as his military forces were collected from both these countries. Hitherto it has been difficult to find any notice of this warrior king in the records of ancient historians. The difficulty has arisen, at least in part, from the mistaken supposition, that his dominion was confined to Ethiopia. But it has been ascertained that this powerful monarch was the successor of Sesonchis, and his legends give him the name Osorchon; one of which reads thus,—

\* Jahn's Hebrew Commonwealth, p. 117.—Stowe's edition.

“OSORKON, son of SHESCHONK, king vivifier, approved of ANEBO.” [Anubis.] The time of his reign has been ascertained to synchronise with that of Asa, by whom he was defeated, and utterly overthrown in the battle of Mareshah.

About two centuries now intervene before another Pharaoh is introduced into the sacred history. In the meantime the conquest of Egypt by the Ethiopians took place, the date of which is assigned to the year, 746, B. C., in the latter part of the reign of Jotham. About this time also the city of Rome was founded. The Pharaoh next mentioned is *So*, whom Champollion has recognized to be *Sevechus*, or *Sevekoteph*, as it is read upon several monuments. He is reckoned to be the second of the Ethiopic dynasty. The king of Israel sought an alliance with him, that he might be aided in an attempt to throw off the Assyrian yoke.

In the reign of Hezekiah, there was an alliance between Judah and Egypt. When Sennacherib invaded the kingdom of Hezekiah, he was compelled to hasten his retreat, in order to give battle to the Ethiopian prince, Tirbakah, a renowned warrior, the last and most illustrious of the Ethiopic dynasty. His name, *Tarak*, has been read upon many monuments in Upper Egypt and Ethiopia. He was the greatest warrior of the age, and pushed his conquests, according to Strabo, even to Europe. His war with the Assyrian monarch was rendered memorable, in consequence of its connexion with the miraculous deliverance of Jerusalem from the threatened attack of that impious king.

In the reign of the excellent king Josiah, who distinguished himself by reforming the morals of his kingdom, and restoring the worship of the true God, sacred history alludes to an Egyptian king, by the name of Pharaoh Necho. This sovereign, when on his march with an immense army for the purpose of carrying war into Assyria, had to pass through a part of the dominions of Josiah. Alarmed at the approach of such a warlike host, he attempted to oppose the progress of the Egyptian army, which he met in the plains of Megiddo, where a pitched battle was fought, in which the Jewish king lost his life. The result of this disastrous engagement was the subjugation of the kingdom of Judah. The reign of this Egyptian hero is ascertained with little difficulty. His identity with Necho II., successor of Psammeticus, is confirmed by the concurring testimony of profane history, and Egyptian documents. The duration of his reign was sixteen years. Champollion has read his name upon many statues. His legend is found in hieroglyphic inscriptions upon several monuments of Upper Egypt.

The second Pharaoh in succession from this prince is named Vaphris, and is the same mentioned in the Jewish Scriptures under the name Hophra. Relying on the assistance of this king, Zedekiah rashly revolted against Nebuchadnezzar, which event resulted in the destruction of Jerusalem in the year 588, B. C., the



burning of the temple, and the Babylonian captivity. The legends of this king have been read upon different monuments.

The duration and dates of the reigns of some of the last named Pharaoh's seem not as yet to be disengaged from the confusion in which they are involved, though there is some prospect that they will be, when Champollion shall have completed his investigations. Already has he shed much light upon the darkness of Egyptian chronology, and furnished data for determining many important synchronisms. From the recent nature of these researches, and the chaotic condition of the materials, which the patriarch of Egyptian literature has labored to reduce to order, together with the enthusiasm which new discoveries kindle, we are not, as yet, prepared to confide implicitly in all the results, on which our author has so ably commented, and in the correctness of which he appears to rely with very great confidence. Perhaps, further researches and discoveries will not only furnish other important results, but confirm those already obtained. If such shall prove to be the fact, history and sacred criticism will be laid under a tribute of obligation to those scientific benefactors, whose labors are devoted to so noble a work.

An interesting chapter of the work before us is devoted to geographical observations on Egypt,—a subject which we regard as worthy of a more extended discussion, than was consistent with the design of the "Essay," which our author has modestly adopted, as the title of his book. Biblical geography constitutes a department of critical research, which, in our judgement, has been too much neglected by the Christian student. It is in consequence of this negligence, that many intelligent readers of the Scriptures seem to have as vague and indefinite ideas of the locality of places mentioned in sacred history, as though they had been situated on another planet.

Next to the geography of the Holy Land, that of the ancient country of *Mizraim* is the most important to sacred criticism. By this name Egypt is usually designated in the Hebrew text,—a name derived, probably, from the son of Ham, the supposed founder or patriarch of the first colony that settled on the Nile. Hence the country is sometimes called the *Land of Ham*; and in Coptic, *ⲭⲏⲙⲓ* (Hemi.) The Scriptures refer to most of the ancient cities of Egypt, which were distinguished at the time when the reference was made. Our author has noticed several, concerning which the researches of Champollion have led to some new geographical results. Among those which he has noticed are *On* or *Heliopolis*, *Pithom*, *Raameses*, *Tahpanhes*, *No-Ammon*, *Migdol*, *Moph* or *Memphis*, *Pathros*, *Zoan* or *Tanis*, and the district of *Goshen*. The splendor and power for which these ancient places were once celebrated, and their connexion with Scripture history and prophecy, render inquiries respecting their original location of no small importance;

especially, so far as it respects the royal residence of the Pharaohs in the time of Joseph and during "the sojourning of the children of Israel," and the situation of the land of Goshen, assigned them as their permanent abode.

Among these cities, *Raamses* is memorable, as one which was built by the Hebrews, when the task-masters "afflicted them with their burdens"—and as being the place of rendezvous for them, when making preparation to depart for Canaan. This seems to have been the metropolis of Goshen, and a *depot*, where those stores were consigned, which were exacted as the annual revenue of the crown. We are not a little surprised, that M. Greppo should think the location of this city, as well as that of Goshen, on the west side of the Nile. He has, indeed, the authority of Jablonsky; but the absurdity of this hypothesis must be evident from several considerations, connected with the account given of the march of the immense Hebrew caravan from Raamses to the Red Sea, which was performed on the second day. Moreover we have no intimation of their passage across the Nile, which must have been a slow and difficult labor, encumbered as they were with flocks and herds, not to mention their females and children. Past all rational controversy, the land of Raamses or Goshen, was on the eastern side of the river, the Pelusian branch of which constituted, perhaps, the western boundary, while it extended easterly to the borders of Arabia Petraea, and from Suez on the South to lake Menzaleh and the Mediterranean on the North. This tract of territory seems well adapted, as travellers inform us, to pasturage, and suited therefore to the condition of Jacob and his family, who were shepherds.

In respect to the royal residence of the Pharaohs in the time of Joseph, and subsequently, to the epoch of the Exodus, critics have been divided in opinion. Some have contended for Memphis, the great metropolis of Middle Egypt, and second only to Thebes. Others have supposed that it was Zoan or Tanis, situated, as Rossmueller and others have shown, near the mouth of the Tanitic branch of the Nile, which empties into the lake Menzaleh. Perhaps both places were alternately the seat of royal residence. We are, however, decided in the conviction, that the claims of the latter city, are supported by the most conclusive considerations. It was an ancient city, and its ruins show, that it was once extensive and splendid. That this was the place where Moses, by miracles vindicated the authority of his mission to demand of Pharaoh the liberty of the Hebrews, is evident from the writer of Ps. lxxviii.—"Marvellous things did he in the sight of their fathers, in the land of Egypt, in the field of Zoan." (*Tanis.*) The name Tanis, according to the etymology of Jablonsky, has reference to the situation of the place, it being level and low. Champollion traces the name to a Coptic word, significant of the pleasantness of the place, and equivalent to *Belle Ville*.

An important city is noticed in some of the prophetic books, *No-Ammon*, as written in the Hebrew text, but rendered simply *No*, in the English version. What city was this, which repeatedly was the subject of prophecy? From the investigations of Champollion it appears, that *No-Ammon* signifies *the dwelling of Ammon*. Ammon was the Jupiter of the Egyptians; and the city just mentioned was named in honor of this god, and assigned as his residence, and consequently as under his special care and protection. Now the well known seat of the god Ammon, and the place where he was principally worshipped, was Thebes, the Diospolis of the Greeks, as is shown by Jablonsky, Rosenmueller, and Gesenius. The Septuagint version renders the *No-Ammon* of Nahum 3: 8. by the appellation, *μῦθις Ἀμμων*, *the portion or possession of Ammon*. These translators, doubtless, understood the subject of Egyptian mythology, and they have given a distinctive appellation to this city of the prophetic writings, which, in connexion with the discoveries of Champollion, determine that it was the great city of Thebes.

As we cannot here enlarge upon this geographical topic, we leave it, by referring our readers to several elaborate and highly interesting discussions in the department of biblical geography, contained in Stuart's Hebrew Study, Vol. ii. No. 1. Such discussions, unless we greatly mistake, will awaken the spirit of research in this department, which in this country has received, to say the least, a very disproportionate attention.

Among the important uses to which not a few of Champollion's discoveries may be applied, we notice the triumphant and eternal refutation of certain objections, urged by an erudite infidelity, against the authentic and credible character of the Pentateuch. Although such objections have ever shrunk from the scrutiny of polemic talent, and the believer in revealed religion does not feel any need of new credentials to confirm his faith in the Bible; yet it is a grateful consideration, that science and literature, as they develop their treasures, furnish fresh details of evidence in support of the truth and authority of the sacred Scriptures.

It has been maintained that Moses could not have written the five books, ascribed to him as the author, on the ground, that he lived previous to the age when the art of writing was understood, or the necessary materials for manuscripts were provided. The elegance, purity, and sublimity of the writings, of which he claims the authorship, have been adduced, as being incompatible with the supposed rudeness and ignorance of times so remote in the region of antiquity, as was the age of the Hebrew Legislator. This objection melts away before the light which Champollion has shed upon the renowned eighteenth Diospolite dynasty. The historic documents, rescued from the dust and ruins of tombs and temples, and other monuments, furnish demonstrative proof, that the times of Moses were the golden age of Egyptian learning;—when the

march of mind had reached a high point of culture. Moses, for forty years a resident at the magnificent court of Raamses Meiamoun, and Amenophis, and there instructed in all the wisdom of Egypt, could not necessarily have been destitute of the mental acquirements, evinced by the writings attributed to him.

But what materials existed for manuscripts,—and how could Moses have a sufficient stock for such a volume as the Pentateuch? This objection is readily met and answered by reference to the papyrus manuscripts, found in abundance in places of sepulture, where mummies and other funeral relics were deposited. Champollion has brought to light a papyrus manuscript measuring sixty feet in length. He has also found a series of papyrus fragments, of which M. Greppo gives the following account :—

“The series is very remarkable on account of the number and variety of the pieces; and it has led to the conjecture, that it must have formed the entire archives of a temple or of some other public deposit.\* An immense number of acts are there found, which belong for the most part to the eighteenth dynasty, and of which none are later than the nineteenth. But the most remarkable of all, and very certainly the most ancient manuscript known at this day, contains an act of the fifth year of the reign of Thouthmosis III., the fifth king of the eighteenth dynasty. This memorial is in itself a sufficient answer to the assertions of infidels.

“Behold then a proof that writing was known and practised in the days of this Pharaoh, and that the *hieratic* writing was in use, which was much more easy and cursive than the hieroglyphic. Behold a proof of the use of papyrus, which some learned men, on the authority of Varro, have thought was not employed anterior to the foundation of Alexandria.† Now Thouthmosis III. governed Egypt at a later period, about the time when Joseph was carried there as a slave; and consequently, two centuries at least before the time when Moses wrote the Pentateuch. It is not then true, as Voltaire has pretended, that “in the time of Moses hieroglyphic writing only was in use, or that the art of engraving upon polished stone, upon brick, upon lead, or upon wood, was the only manner of writing, and that the Egyptians and Chaldeans wrote in no other way.” We demand in our turn, whether Moses, who was instructed in *all the wisdom of the Egyptians*, was ignorant of the art of writing? Could he have had much trouble in procuring the thin and light substance so generally used in Egypt, which we find employed by scribes more than two centuries before him? Finally, is it so very astonishing, that the autograph of the legislator of the Hebrews, which was an object of veneration to all the people, and which was so long and carefully preserved in the ark, could have existed until the reign of Josiah, that is to say, about nine centuries after Moses; when the hypogoums of Thebes present us with papyrus, containing certain transactions which were probably between private individuals merely, and which extend back 3500 years and even more?”

The circumstantial description which the Scriptures give of the tabernacle, the ark, the sacerdotal wardrobe, and the sacred utensils, imply a richness of materials, and a skill in the mechanic arts, which the infidel has said could not exist in connexion with a people, situated as the Hebrews had been in Egypt. This objection,

\* *Bulletin des sciences historiques*. tom. ii. p. 301.

† Pliny, who cites Varro (xii. 11.) says (cap. 13.) *Ingentia quidem exempla contra Varronis sententiam de chartis reperiuntur; i. e. striking examples are found which contradict the opinion of Varro concerning charts.* Caylus, according to Guilandin, cites also many similar passages from the ancients. See his *Dissertation sur le papyrus*, in tom. xxvii. of the Acad. of Inscriptions.

likewise, is founded in ignorance of the actual state of the arts, and the condition of the Israelites in that country during the time of their residence. Their condition was not one involving such a degree of degradation, as has by some been conjectured. Nor did they leave, without carrying with them immense treasures.\* The genius of architecture and the arts had traversed the banks of the Nile for ages, and reared her creations there, marked with lines of strength and grandeur, if not with Grecian delicacy. In some of the sepulchral depositories, there have been found suits of drawings, which furnish a living demonstration of the high degree of civilization, and of the maturity attained in the useful arts and manufactures, previous to the epoch of the Exodus. As a specimen of the character of these drawings, let the following extract, copied from Spineto speak :

"In *arts and trades*, Champollion has already formed a collection of pictures, for the most part colored, in order to determine the nature of the objects, and representing the sculptor in stone, the carver in wood, the painter of statues, the painter of architecture, furniture, and cabinet-work of all kinds; a painter with his easel painting a picture; scribes and clerks of all descriptions; waggon-conveying blocks of stone; the art of pottery, with all the operations; the cutting of wood, makers of oars, cabinet-makers, carpenters, swayers, curriers; the staining of common leather and morocco; shoe-making, spinning, weaving, the glass-worker and all his operations; the goldsmith, jeweller, smith, and the like."

Other drawings furnish details equally minute respecting their mode of agriculture; their military education; singing, music and dancing; the rearing of cattle; portrait painting; games, exercises and diversions; domestic justice, and household economy; historical and religious monuments; navigation and zoology. It is understood that Champollion has recently returned from Egypt with 1500 drawings, relating to various objects of nature and art in that country, which, in connection with accompanying hieroglyphic explanations, will doubtless furnish a work of prodigious interest, especially to the antiquary; while it may open new sources of light on the subject of biblical archaeology and criticism. Enough, however, has been discovered, to satisfy the mind possessing the slightest claim to candor, that the Hebrews could not have been incompetent to execute the labored and magnificent works attributed to them, while on their tardy passage through the wilderness. On this point, we add what M. Greppo has remarked :

"Moses, being educated by the daughter of Pharaoh, was *instructed*, as we have often repeated, *in all the wisdom of the Egyptians*. His people, who were for so long a time blended with the Egyptians and employed in their labors, could not remain uninfluenced by the advance of the latter in civilization. After the epoch of the Diospolitan family, there is nothing remarkable in the state of the arts, among the people who have been gratuitously taxed with ignorance and barbarism. The sumptuousness of the tabernacle and its dependencies, the casting of the vessel of gold, and all the works executed by the children of Israel in the desert, are perfectly consistent with what we learn from the monuments concerning the ingenuity of Egyptian artists during this epoch.

\*Stuart's Heb. Study. Vol. ii. No. 1. Excur. iii.

Everything conspires to render the details on this subject in the sacred books probable and worthy of credit. It is unnecessary to recur to a miracle or to a supernatural inspiration for an explanation of the *Spirit of God*, which operated upon the minds of *Bezaleel* and *Aholiab* and the skilful artists who labored under their supervision. Scripture itself seems to explain it by *their wisdom and understanding in all manner of workmanship*, (Exod. xxxi. 3, 6,) which, in a natural manner, the Lord dispensed to them as he pleased; and in the perfection of their works, we may recognize the happy influence of the arts of Egypt upon the people of God. Such was a necessary result of their prolonged residence in the land of the Pharaohs."

When the famous zodiacs of Dendera and Esne were discovered, the former of which was detached from the temple which it adorned, and transported to France in 1821, infidelity resolved to convert them into war-engines against the Bible. By means of hypothetical calculations, assumed as infallible, it was attempted to be shown, that the celestial appearances, sketched on these astronomical monuments, proved them to have belonged to an age extending back from forty-five to sixty-five centuries, an epoch anterior to that of Moses; and that the zodiacal system to which they belonged, dated back 15000 years, far beyond the limits assigned by the Pentateuch to the age of the world. The tocsin of infidelity rung through the continent announcing the triumphant result, which, as was pretended, involved the overthrow of the whole system of Mosaic chronology. While the enemies of revealed religion were actively engaged in the zodiac controversy, which they managed with great dexterity in pushing a fresh crusade against the credibility of Holy Writ, they were boldly met by the genius of Champollion, who silenced forever the swelling words of vanity, which the "dumb mouths" of these astronomical monuments were forced to utter. By a single stroke he exploded the fallacious hypothesis of their high antiquity, showing by indubitable data, that they belonged to the age of the Roman domination in Egypt, and extended not beyond the first or second century of the Christian era. M. Greppo adds:

"There is no more scope for vain conjectures, or for calculations which, though learned, fail of a definite starting point. The monuments speak for themselves, and in a positive manner; their testimony is irresistible. No reply can be given to them, for in fact there is nothing which can furnish an answer; and rumor only, with her vague whispers, can impugn the happy application which Champollion has made of his ingenious discovery. The so long contested question will now cease to agitate the minds of men, and the age of the zodiacs must remain irrevocably fixed.

"Thus has Providence designed, that the first important result of one of the most beautiful discoveries of which the human mind could ever boast, should be in favor of revealed religion; and that, so opportunely, the reading of a simple name should suddenly repress the dangerous errors of science, and the reprehensible hopes of the enemies of Christianity."

We had designed to notice some of the instructive facts which Champollion has ascertained respecting the *mythological* and *psychological systems* of the ancient Egyptians. But the length to which our article has grown, admonishes us to stop. The subject also is too complex for the discussion of a few pages. Their *psy-*

*chology*, so far as it has been developed by recent investigations, becomes important in relation to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and of future retribution. The grand outlines of this system are portrayed in living representations on the walls of several tombs at Thebes. The dark and dismal abode of guilty spirits is sketched, in connexion with the various and appalling forms of punishment which they are doomed to undergo. The terrific imagery of Dante's hell is not more dreadful than is that by which the ancient Egyptians symbolized the future state of their wicked. How much this feature of their religious creed might have been modified by their intercourse with the Hebrews, who possessed the traditions of the patriarchal religion, is a question not unworthy the examination of the archæologist. And on the other hand, a still more important topic of discussion has respect to the kind and degree of influence, that was probably exerted on the religious character and notions of the Hebrews, in consequence of their connexion with a people remarkable for their devotion to the services of a national idolatry. On this general subject, as well as that which involves their mythological mysteries, and religious ceremonies, we look with confidence for much valuable information, to be derived from Champollion's *Panthéon Egyptien*, a splendid work now in progress.

A detailed description of the ancient monuments, to which we have alluded so frequently in this article, does not comport with our design. We only add, that the first object of Egyptian architecture was strength and permanency, rather than beauty. In general, these monuments do not exhibit the symmetry and richness of the admired *chefs d'oeuvres* of Greece. The abounding sculpture, though often full of life and fire, will not compete with the high-wrought productions of a Phideas or Praxitelles. The paintings, though their colors have preserved a living freshness, will suffer, doubtless, in comparison with the enchanting performances of a Raphael or West. And still, in many respects, the Egyptians of the Pharaonic age are unrivalled. "No people," says Champollion, "ever conceived the arts of architecture and sculpture on so sublime and so grand a scale."

In concluding our notice of the work before us, we need give no further assurance of our interest in the subject of which it treats. Though there are some things to which we feel compelled to except, we commend the author's leading object, and the spirit which he has manifested throughout, and most cheerfully subscribe to the sentiments of a concluding paragraph :

"Since the studies of our age have been principally directed to the natural sciences, which the irreligious levity of the last age had so strangely abused to the prejudice of religion, we have seen the most admirable discoveries confirming the physical history of the primitive world, as it is given by Moses. It is sufficient to cite in proof of this fact, the geological labors of our celebrated Cuvier. Now that historic researches are pursued with greater activity than

ever before, and the monuments of antiquity illustrated by a judicious and promising criticism, Providence has also ordered, that the writings of ancient Egypt should in turn confirm the historic facts of the holy books; facts against which a *systematic* erudition had furnished infidelity with so many objections that were unceasingly repeated, though they had been a thousand times refuted. We cannot doubt that human knowledge, as it becomes more and more disengaged from the spirit of system, and pursues truth as its only aim, will still attain, as it advances, to other analogous results."

We hail the fact, as one of the auspicious signs of the times, that the achievements of modern science contribute so many precious materials to the mighty aggregate of documentary proofs, on which the fabric of our holy religion rests. At a time when such stirring efforts are made to give universal circulation to the oracles of God, it is a subject of gratulation, that the flippant cavils of skepticism, and the more daring and specious objections of a reckless philosophy, are being put to "eternal sleep," by the matter-of-fact disclosures of true science. Christianity, every time she is brought to an encounter with the malignant genius of infidelity, whether on the arena of ancient or modern controversy, gathers fresh laurels to adorn the pillars by which her credibility is supported. The monuments of the Pharaoh's, in whose sepulchral chambers embalmed heroes slumber, and over whose summits chiliads have revolved, begin to decay, and will crumble down; but Christianity, which unharmed has endured for centuries the assaults of the "gates of hell," strengthens her claims continually upon enlightened intellect, and confirmed by the various truths and facts developed by human experience and research, will prove to be *the truth of the Lord which endureth forever.*

---

"**ICELAND** : or the *Journal of a Residence in that Island, during the years 1814 and 1815 ; containing Observations on the Natural Phenomena, History, Literature, and Antiquities of the Island, and the Religion, Character, Manners and Customs of its Inhabitants.*" By EBENEZER HENDERSON. *Abridged from the Second Edinburgh Edition.* Boston : Perkins and Marvin, 1831. pp. 252.

THOSE who have paid attention to the recent history of literature, must have remarked the numerous additions which have been made to the department of *Travels*. Probably, more travels have been presented to the world within the last fifteen years, than during the preceding fifty. We regard this as an interesting fact. The works, to which we have referred, not only afford matter of reflection to the philosopher, extending his acquaintance with the worlds of matter and of mind; but they tend to raise the standard of gen-



eral intelligence. Probably there is no class of books so extensively circulated, and read with such uniform, unalloyed pleasure. They amuse the leisure of the statesmen, and excite the wonder of the peasant. It is their peculiar excellence to entertain, while they improve; to yield amusement, while they afford lessons of valuable instruction. They heighten the pleasures of the fire-side, and provide an agreeable employment for those, who, immersed in the busy cares of life, might otherwise be disposed to devote their hours of recreation to pursuits unworthy of a rational being, and dangerous to the interests of immortality.

But it is not to every volume of Travels that we can award the meed of praise. It would not be difficult to point out some, which are strongly tinged with infidelity, and whose tendency is to corrupt and destroy. There are those who have travelled in countries where a low standard of morals exists, who have described the manners and customs of the inhabitants in a manner wounding to delicacy of sentiment, and calculated to inflame the worst feelings of the heart. Some have introduced into their Journals, not so much what was *true*, as what would gratify that thirst for the marvellous, so inherent in human nature; and, like Herodotus of old, have written rather to entertain, than to instruct their readers. Others still are characterised by extreme unfairness and illiberality, presenting a mere caricature, instead of a just description, and abusing, without discrimination and without mercy, the inhabitants of a whole country, to gratify their own prejudices, and those of their friends. Such has been the character of most of the English Travellers in the United States. These gentlemen seem to have settled it in their minds, before they embarked, not to be pleased with any thing, to make the worst of every unlucky circumstance, and to make up their descriptions of scenery and of manners from the most unlovely specimens which might fall in their way. As their injustice and illiberality have been so ably exposed by a Dwight, and a Walsh, we dismiss them without further notice.

From travellers such as these, we turn to those of a nobler aim, and a more generous mind. It is peculiarly pleasing to observe, that while the pursuits of commerce, the ardor of curiosity, and a laudable desire to extend the boundaries of science, have led many to push their researches into regions hitherto but little known; there are not wanting men, who have explored distant countries, to discover where good objects could be most effectually promoted. The great associations of Christian benevolence, which are the glory of this age, have found it necessary, in the prosecution of their various enterprises, to employ agents of this character. They have gone forth, in the eloquent language of Burke, "to survey the mansions of sorrow and pain, and to take the gauge and dimensions of misery, depression, and contempt; to remember the forgotten;

to attend to the neglected ; to visit the forsaken ; and to compare and collate the distresses of all men in all countries." Such was the purpose for which Buchanan visited the South of India ; and Jowett voyaged through the Levant ; for which our own Brigham scaled the Cordilleras, and Anderson trod the classic soil of Greece. The information embodied in the Journals of these Christian travellers, while it yields not to any other in felicity of description, and the power of giving delight, is matter of deep interest to every philanthropist, and to every Christian. Journals such as these constitute an invaluable acquisition to the church of Christ ; as they are suited to call forth her tenderest sympathies, and to engage her to proceed with new vigor in her efforts to ameliorate the condition of mankind.

A purpose similar to that which actuated the travellers last alluded to, induced Dr. Henderson to visit Iceland. He was employed as an Agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society to investigate the want of the Scriptures in that Island, and to make arrangements for a supply. His previous studies and travels in the North of Europe had eminently qualified him for the undertaking. He had become acquainted with the language and literature of Iceland, and was well prepared to appreciate the character of its inhabitants. He was a man of great candor, and seems to have been entirely free from that illiberal prejudice, so common to most travellers, of judging of everything by their previous views, and condemning whatever differs from the scenes of their own country. He was an accurate observer of men and things, and his descriptions are, for the most part, perspicuous and striking. His Journal is the best account we have of Iceland, and is well worthy of a thorough perusal. The scholar will be interested in the antiquities of the island ; the lover of Nature will here see her in her sublimest aspect ; while the Christian's heart will ascend in adoration of that awful majesty and power, which is so strikingly exhibited in this land of prodigies.

For our part we can truly say, that we have seldom perused a volume of this kind with more thrilling interest. For as we follow the traveller on his route, we find ourselves surrounded with some of the grandest scenes of nature, and the most terrible workings of the power of Him, who "looketh on the earth, and it trembleth ; who toucheth the hills, and they smoke." Nor, on the other hand, will the Christian be less interested in the character and manners of the people who inhabit these inhospitable shores,—so artless, so intelligent, so pious. To crown the whole, a moral charm is thrown over the entire volume by the spirit of devotion everywhere breathed, and the constant recognition of the presence and agency of the Supreme Disposer.

But it is time to proceed to a more specific notice of the work itself.

Prefixed to the Journal, the author gives us, by way of Introduction, a general view of the situation and aspect of the Island; of its first settlement and history; of its population, the character of its inhabitants, its literature, and religion. "The Island is situated in the Atlantic Ocean, on the confines of the Polar circle, between  $66^{\circ} 24'$  N. Lat., and between  $13^{\circ} 15'$  and  $24^{\circ} 40'$  W. Lon. from Greenwich;" being about 300 miles in length and something over 200 in breadth.

"That this Island owes its formation to the operations of submarine volcanoes, is evident from the geological phenomena, which every part of it exhibits. In no other quarter of the globe do we find, crowded within the same extent of surface, such a number of burning mountains, so many boiling springs, or such immense tracts of lava. The general aspect of the country is the most rugged and dreary imaginable. On every side appear marks of confusion and devastation, or the tremendous sources of these evils in the yawning craters of huge and menacing volcanoes. Nor is the mind of a spectator relieved from the disagreeable emotions arising from reflection on the subterraneous fires which are raging beneath him, by a temporary survey of the huge mountains of perpetual ice, by which he is surrounded. These very masses, which naturally exclude the most distant idea of heat, contain in their bosom the fuel of conflagration, and are frequently seen to emit smoke and flames, and to pour down upon the plains immense floods of boiling water, or red-hot torrents of devouring lava."

It is a fearful thought, continually obtruding itself upon the mind of the traveller, that a vast conflagration is going on at no great depth below the surface of the island. Only a thin crust of earth seems to roof it over. In some places, the foot is scorched by the ground on which it treads; while the smoke and steam which escape from ever-burning caverns of sulphur, turn the brightness of the noonday sun into the shadow of death. Sometimes the crust gives way, and opens a frightful chasm, which, in the days of Grecian fable, might well have been taken for the entrance to Pluto's burning realms.

"Dismal tracts of lava, whose gloom is barely removed by the columns of smoke that are constantly ascending through the fissures in their surface, traverse the Island in almost every direction. Rents more than a hundred feet in width, sometimes stretch to the length of several miles."

From this circumstance, as also from the extreme roughness of the lava, the immense quantities of scoria, and the rapid streams which gush from the sides of the *Yokuls*, or ice-mountains, some idea may be formed of the difficulties and dangers of travelling. Wheel-carriages are unknown; every thing is borne on horse-back. Through the winter, indeed, travelling, except as far as to the parish-church, is entirely suspended; and it often happens that even this short tour must be abandoned for weeks together. The whole interior of the island is one immense cluster of frightful mountains, vomiting liquid fire, or crested with eternal snow.

Iceland was discovered by the Norwegians in the year 860, and colonized in 874. The settlers, on the one hand, were attracted

thither by the flattering accounts which were circulated respecting its fertility ; and were stimulated on the other by the hope of escaping from the oppression which they suffered in their own country. To an inhabitant of Norway, this island, and even the inhospitable shores of Greenland, would appear to much better advantage, than to the natives of a more genial clime. About the year 928, the inhabitants of Iceland formed themselves into a regular republic ; and thus, at a time when almost the whole world besides was trodden down by the foot of arbitrary power, the sweets of liberty were enjoyed amid the rigors of the Arctic circle. This state of freedom subsisted about 350 years, until intestine division, together with the policy and power of Hacon, King of Norway, effected the subjugation of the Icelanders. But though they at length yielded to a foreign power, they obtained honorable terms of capitulation ; they still retained a good degree of liberty ; and no foreign military force has ever set foot on the soil of their country. Since the year 1387, when the three Scandinavian crowns were united, and placed on the head of Margaret, Iceland has acknowledged the supremacy of Denmark.

The Icelanders claim the honor of the first discovery of America. In the year 1001, Biarni Heriulfson, on a voyage from Iceland to Greenland (which country had been discovered about 120 years before) was driven by a violent gale far out of his course ; and after sailing several days, fell in with the coast of Labrador. Some time after, Newfoundland was discovered by the same enterprising people, and called Vineland.

The population of Iceland was probably much greater in former times than it is at present. It now amounts to about 50,000. The means of subsistence are so scanty, as to prevent much increase of the inhabitants, and to oblige them to live in a state of great dispersion. "It not unfrequently happens," says Dr. Henderson, "that a traveller is denied the pleasure of seeing a human being for several days together. In crossing the deserts of the interior, he may proceed 200 miles without perceiving the smallest indication of an animated being of any description whatever."

It has often been remarked, that while the great Gothic race, which overturned the empire of the Cæsars, and subjected to its arms the fairest portions of Europe, has long since lost many of its original features by intermixture with the nations whom it conquered, it still preserves them in their native strength amid the snows of Scandinavia. This is especially true of Iceland. Separated by a wide ocean from the rest of the world, the inhabitants have maintained, with little alteration, their national character and language. The island, consequently, furnishes ample means for illustrating the genius of that warlike race, who has changed the destinies of so many nations, and whose descendants bear rule, at the present hour, over more than half the globe.

It is a remarkable fact, that from the 12th to the 14th century, when the gloom of death overspread the European horizon, the natives of this dreary isle, begirt with polar ice, were cultivating the arts of poetry and history, and laying up materials which posterity were to use in the illustration of the language and antiquities of other nations. A variety of favorable circumstances concurred to produce this result. The first colonists were descended from some of the best families of their native country. Their mythology and the wonderful scenery around them were calculated to inspire the loftiest strains of the poetic muse. They were secured, by the remoteness of their situation, from those political convulsions, which proved so fatal to literature in other parts of the world.

Among the monuments of Icelandic poetry, none is so remarkable as the *EDDA*, which consists of two parts; one written or rather compiled by Sæmund Frode, in the 12th century; the other written by Snorro Sturluson, about the beginning of the 13th. This work is still extant, and affords rich materials for illustrating a great variety of points in Lexicography, History, and General Literature.

The historical compositions of the Icelanders, called *Sagas*, are very numerous, and highly worthy the attention of the antiquary and the historian. They were at first, like the Homeric poems, treasured up in the memory, and repeated from generation to generation. Even at the present day, many of the people have them by heart, and recite them in the family circle with lively enthusiasm.

If Iceland has declined from that intellectual elevation for which she was once distinguished, it may be owing to two causes; her subjection to Denmark, which, if it has not abridged the personal liberty of her sons, has diminished the proud esteem in which they once held themselves; and the advances in science and literature made by other nations, which, being accomplished under more favorable circumstances, have thrown the former into the shade. Still, under all the disadvantages of her situation, Iceland can boast some names which are worthy to be registered in the roll of immortality. Dr. Henderson met with a clergyman who had translated Milton's *Paradise Lost* into Icelandic, and was then engaged on a version of Klopstock's *Messiah*. Of his translation of Milton, Dr. H. says,—“It not only rises superior to any other version of that poet, but rivals, and in many instances almost seems to surpass, the original itself.” This man's name is Jon Thorlakson. Dr. H. found him living in a room eight feet in length, by six in breadth, on an annual income of about fifteen dollars. “He had also translated Pope's *Essay on Man*, besides different Danish and German poems, and has composed numerous original pieces of a miscellaneous nature.”

Dr. H. found many of the clergy possessing a respectable education, as well as piety. On one occasion, he “was not a little

astonished to find one of them, who had read more of the Hebrew Bible than hundreds of the more opulent clergy in Great Britain." He frequently found their libraries, and those of other gentlemen, well stocked with books in the different departments of literature. What adds to the wonder is, that there is only one school on the island, and the people are, for the most part, too poor to provide themselves with the means of education. Yet scarcely a people can be found on the face of the earth, so universally intelligent.

"It is exceedingly rare," says Dr. H. "to meet with a boy or girl, who has attained the age of nine or ten years, that cannot read and write with ease. Domestic education is most rigidly attended to; and it is no uncommon thing to hear youths repeat passages from the Greek and Latin authors, who have never been farther than a few miles from the spot where they were born. Nor do I scarcely ever recollect entering a hut, where I did not find some individual capable of entering into a conversation with me on topics which would be reckoned altogether above the understandings of people in the same rank of society in other countries of Europe."

Very few books are to be found on the island, compared with the abundance in more favored countries, but they make a good use of those which they have, and often copy such as they can borrow;—a fact which accounts for the beauty of their writing. Dr. H. found a great deficiency of the Scriptures, the book which they value above all others, and which they are most eager to obtain. When he informed them that the object of his visit was to supply them with that sacred volume, their joy and gratitude knew no bounds. Wherever he went, he was treated with great kindness. Hospitality, notwithstanding their deep poverty, is a prominent trait in their character. They are ardently attached to their native soil. Those of them, who from time to time travel into other countries, steadfastly refuse the offers which are made to them to remain; and it is a common saying among them, "Iceland is the best land on which the sun shines."

It would be difficult, perhaps, to find another nation so generally religious. There is an altar for God in almost every family. It is universally the custom to give thanks to God before and after meals. "When an Icelander awakes, he does not salute any person that may have slept in the room with him, but hastens to the door, and lifting up his eyes towards heaven, adores Him, who made the heavens and the earth, the Author and Preserver of his being, and the source of every blessing. He then returns into the house, and salutes every one whom he meets, with 'God grant you a good day!' When they are about to cross a river, or to put out to sea, they recognize their dependence on God; thus acknowledging him in all their ways!"

The climate is severe, owing not so much to the intensesness of the cold, (for the mercury sinks lower every winter in New England than it commonly does in Iceland,) as to its long continuance. Snow falls in vast quantities, and remains on the ground till June.

The mountains, constituting the greatest part of the Island, are covered with it through the year. But nothing so materially affects the climate as the immense masses of floating ice which come over from Greenland. These are sometimes several miles in extent, and so thick as to run aground in 80 fathoms water.

"When the sea is agitated by a storm, they are dashed against each other in the most tremendous manner; the noise is heard at a great distance like thunder; and sometimes the drift-timber jammed in between them takes fire from the friction! The quantity of floating ice is commonly so great as to choke up all the friths and bays, and extends farther from the shore than the eye can reach even from the summit of the highest mountain."

From the accumulation of the ice on the island, and in the neighboring seas, the climate is increasing in severity. This is proved by a series of thermometrical observations, begun in the year 1749, and by the entire extirpation of the extensive forests, which once almost covered the island. The probability is, that in a few ages, the island will become unfit for the habitation of man.

But if the severity of the climate renders Iceland a dreary abode, other causes combine to produce this effect to a much greater degree. We allude to the earthquakes to which it is subject, and to the volcanoes, which from time to time spread desolation and ruin over large portions of its surface. Very many earthquakes have taken place, as we should naturally expect from the volcanic character of the island. These have overwhelmed dwelling houses, buried the inhabitants, rent the earth to a great depth, and shaken and overturned the mountains. In the year 1784, there was a tremendous earthquake, which was felt all over the island, and demolished about 1500 houses.

The volcanoes of Iceland are among the most terrible phenomena of nature. As already observed, the island is literally full of them. We have read of Mount Heckla, and been accustomed to class it with Etna and Vesuvius; but Heckla is only one of a mighty family of volcanoes. It has been more noticed than the others, on account of the number of its eruptions, and its being more exposed to the view of ships sailing by the island. Since the occupation of the island, twenty-three eruptions of Heckla have been recorded, and about thirty from other mountains. In the year 1755, there was a dreadful eruption from the mountain called Kotlugia, situated in the southern part of the island. On the 17th of October, a number of quick and irregular tremefactions were perceived, which were followed by three immense floods of ice, gravel, and water. After the rocking had continued some time, an exceedingly loud report was heard, when fire and water were emitted alternately from the volcano. At times, the column of fire was carried to such a height as to illuminate all the surrounding region, and was seen at the distance of 180 miles. At

other times, the hemisphere was enveloped in total darkness by the immense cloud of smoke and ashes. The eruption continued till Nov. 7th, during which period dreadful torrents of boiling water were poured forth on the low country, a large district laid waste, and the sea filled up with lava, rocks and clay, to the distance of fifteen miles. At the same time, the British Islands, Norway, Sweden, Germany, France, Italy, Spain and Portugal, were rocked with repeated earthquakes, which extended to the coast of Barbary, Persia, and even to America. The city of Lisbon was almost wholly destroyed, and in many other places, villages and churches were overturned and mountains shaken to their base.

But the eruption of 1783 seems to have been unparalleled in history. We shall give an account of it, as we have of the preceding, nearly in Dr. Henderson's own language.

"About a month previous to the commencement of the eruption, a submarine volcano burst forth at the distance of nearly seventy miles from [the land.] and ejected such an immense quantity of pumice, that the surface of the ocean was covered with it to the distance of 150 miles, and the spring ships considerably impeded in their course. A new island was thrown up, consisting of high cliffs, within which the fire was in violent action. The island was claimed by his Danish majesty; but ere a year elapsed, the sea resumed her ancient dominion, and the island has never been seen since."

From the 1st to the 8th of June, 1783, the inhabitants in the neighborhood of the Skaptar volcano were alarmed by repeated shocks of an earthquake, which, as they daily increased in violence, left no reason to doubt that some dreadful volcanic explosion was about to take place. On the 8th, a prodigious cloud of smoke darkened the atmosphere. The vicinity of the mountain was covered with ashes, pumice, and brimstone. More dreadful tremefactions followed, accompanied by loud subterraneous reports, while the sulphureous substances, that filled the air, breaking forth into flames, produced, as it were, one continued flash of lightning, with most tremendous peals of thunder. The extreme degree to which the earth was heated melted an immense quantity of ice, and caused a great overflow of the rivers. A prodigious quantity of red-hot lava now burst from the mountain, and rushed in a fiery torrent down its side through the valley, till it reached the river Skapta, when a violent contention between the two opposite elements ensued, attended with the escape of an amazing quantity of steam; but the fiery current ultimately prevailed, and completely dried up the river in less than twenty-four hours. The channel, lying between high rocks, and in many places from 400 to 600 feet in depth, and near 200 in breadth, was filled up to the brink by the lava, which then overflowed the adjacent country, and pursued its terrific course with great velocity, till it reached the sea. It spread over a tract of country 50 miles in length and 15 in breadth, forming a tremendous lake of liquid fire, which was two years in cooling. An-



other torrent of lava filled up, in the same manner, the river Hverfisflot, and spread itself over an extent of 40 miles in length by 7 in breadth. A different account estimates the territory covered by the lava at 90 miles by 42. The depth of the lava was from 100 to 600 feet. Almost the whole island was covered with ashes, brimstone, and pumice; vegetation was destroyed; the atmosphere was impregnated with noxious vapors; famine and pestilence stalked abroad and glutted themselves with multitudes of helpless victims. The inhabitants were reduced to the extreme of starvation, and even the horses are said to have eaten the flesh of one another. In a word, the accumulation of miseries, originating in this volcanic eruption, was so dreadful, that, in the short space of two years, not fewer than 9336 human beings, 28,000 horses, 11,000 head of cattle, and 190,000 sheep perished on the island! Truly we may "say unto God, how terrible art thou in thy works!"

To this account it may be added, that "the quantity of ashes, brimstone, &c. thrown up into the atmosphere, was so great, that nearly the whole European horizon was enveloped in obscurity, and luminous meteors were observed in England, Holland, and other parts of the continent." Every part of the island exhibits the effects of these tremendous convulsions of nature. Immense masses of lava, vast quantities of slags, and frightful chasms in the earth, continually present themselves to view, and form a scene of indescribable desolation.

Some passages in the Bible seem to indicate pretty clearly, that volcanic phenomena were not unknown to the sacred writers. Thus the prophet Nahum, describing the majesty of God, says, "The mountains quake at him, and the hills melt, and the earth is burned at his presence; his fury is poured out like fire, and the rocks are thrown down by him." So Jeremiah: "Behold, I am against thee, O destroying mountain, saith the Lord, which destroyest all the earth: I will make thee a burnt mountain." None can doubt that the prophet here refers to a volcano. In the book of Job, we have, in the opinion of our traveller, an unequivocal reference to an eruption of lava; Chap. xxii: 15—20. He also thinks, that Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by a volcanic exundation, and supports his opinion by adducing the character of the surrounding region, which is declared by the sacred historian to abound in pits of bitumen, a substance highly inflammable. The ascription of the destruction of those cities to the direct agency of God is in full accordance with the ascription, in multitudes of other passages, of every operation of nature to God, especially of those tremendous events in the natural world, which he sometimes brings about for the punishment of iniquity. In allusion to the shower of sulphur, pumice and hot ashes, thrown by the volcano to an immense height in the air, and falling from that elevation, it might well be said

that "Jehovah rained brimstone and fire from Jehovah out of heaven;" and in the Psalms, "God will send a shower of fire, brimstone, and utter destruction upon the wicked." Such, at least, is the opinion of our author.

The *hot springs* of Iceland constitute a characteristic in its physical aspect, scarcely less striking than its volcanoes. As before intimated, the cause is doubtless the same in both cases. Dr. Henderson met with great numbers of these hot springs, in his tour round the island. Many of them eject water and steam to a considerable height. Some of them exist in the beds of rivers, and some are even found in the sea. Several are strongly impregnated with sulphur. In the crater of Mount Krabla, is a vast caldron of boiling mud and sulphur, which Dr. H. describes as exhibiting one of the most terrific spectacles in nature. It is about 300 feet in circumference, and is about 200 feet below the brim of the crater. It is constantly in a state of violent ebullition, throwing up vast columns of liquid sulphur to the height of from 12 to 30 feet, while a dense smoke arises to a prodigious elevation. The impression made on the mind of a spectator is of the most appalling kind, and might naturally lead him to suppose himself on the brink of Tartarus.

With an account of the GEYSERS, abridged from the volume before us, we shall conclude this article. This name is applied to several hot springs, some of which exhibit, perhaps, the most striking union of beauty and magnificence, to be found anywhere on the face of the globe. The great Geyser, as it is called, situated on the summit of a large circular mound, is an immense well or pipe seventy-eight feet in perpendicular depth, and from eight to ten feet in diameter, opening into a basin fifty-six feet by forty-six in diameter and four feet deep. At irregular intervals, the water, boiling hot, rushes up through this pipe, in a column of at least ten feet in diameter, and is projected, with prodigious velocity and force, to the height of twenty, fifty, seventy, and even one hundred and fifty feet. These *jets* are preceded by a loud roaring, like the report of heavy artillery, and attended by vast columns of steam.

About one hundred and forty yards from the principal fountain, is another, called by the natives *Strockr*, which properly denotes a *churn*. Its pipe is about nine feet in diameter, and forty-four in depth. Though not so large as the great Geyser, its *jets* are more steady, and last longer; at least, it was so when Dr. H. witnessed them. Some of these jets, indeed, rise to the astonishing height of *two hundred feet* perpendicular! This is, however, nearly double the height of the ordinary eruptions, and seems to have been the result of a curious experiment made by our traveller. He threw a great quantity of the largest stones he could find into the pipe; when the spring, as if indignant at the insult, commenced roaring

with more violence than usual, and threw up an immense column of scalding water. The stones, which had been cast in, were ejected even much higher than the water; and some of them of considerable size were raised to an invisible height. This prodigious exertion seemed to exhaust the power of the spring for a time, so that a much longer period than usual intervened before the next eruption.

One morning, our traveller had the pleasure of witnessing *jets* from both these stupendous fountains at the same time. He describes the scene as absolutely enrapturing.

In comparison with these astonishing works of the Creator, all the *jets d'eau*, which have been contrived by man, dwindle into insignificance. The French have water-works at St. Cloud, constructed at an enormous expense; but they throw up only a column of some four or five inches in circumference to the height of eighty feet; whereas the Geysers, as already stated, throw up a column of *ten feet in diameter* to the height, sometimes, of 200 feet! "Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty!"

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### SELECTIONS FROM ROBERT HALL.

In our number for December last, we announced the publication of the works of Robert Hall, and intimated that a further account of them might be expected. In place of a formal Review, we now present our readers with a variety of extracts. The selection has been made with no small difficulty, since in the midst of so much that is beautiful and impressive, it is not easy to determine what to omit. It is as if one were to traverse the fabled valley of diamonds, the whole earth around him being strewed with riches, under a necessity of contenting himself with a mere handful. The selections will be arranged under appropriate heads.

*State of Religion in England during the first half of the last century.*

"The idea commonly entertained in England of a perfect sermon, was that of a discourse upon some moral topic, clear, correct, and argumentative, in the delivery of which the preacher must be free from all suspicion of being moved himself, or of intending to produce emotions in his hearers; in a word, as remote as possible from such a method of reasoning on righteousness, temperance, and judgement, as should make a Felix tremble. This idea was very successfully realized, this singular model of pulpit eloquence carried to the utmost perfection; so that while the bar, the parliament, and the theatre, frequently agitated and inflamed their respective audi-

tories, the church was the only place, where the most feverish sensibility was sure of being laid to rest. This inimitable apathy in the mode of imparting religious instruction, combined with the utter neglect of whatever is most touching or alarming in the discoveries of the gospel, produced their natural effect of extinguishing devotion in the Established Church, and of leaving it to be possessed by the Dissenters; of whom it was considered as the distinguishing badge, and from that circumstance derived an additional degree of unpopularity. From these causes, the people gradually became utterly alienated from the articles of the church, eternal concerns dropped out of the mind, and what remained of religion was confined to an attention to a few forms and ceremonies. The creed established by law had no sort of influence in forming the sentiments of the people, the pulpit completely vanquished the desk, piety and puritanism were confounded in one common reproach, an almost pagan darkness in the concerns of salvation prevailed, and the English became the most irreligious people upon earth. Such was the situation of things, when Whitefield and Wesley made their appearance; who, whatever failings the severest criticism can discover in their character, will be hailed by posterity as the second reformers of England."

*State of things in France at the commencement of the Revolution.*

"If you had wished to figure to yourselves a country which had reached the utmost pinnacle of prosperity, you would undoubtedly have turned your eyes to France, as she appeared a few years before the revolution; illustrious in learning and genius, the favorite abode of the arts, and the mirror of fashion, whither the flower of the nobility from all countries resorted, to acquire the last polish of which the human character is susceptible. Lulled in voluptuous repose, and dreaming of a philosophical millennium, without dependence upon God, like the generation before the flood, *they ate, they drank, they married, they were given in marriage.* In that exuberant soil, every thing seemed to flourish but religion and virtue. The season however had at length arrived, when God was resolved to punish their impiety, as well as to avenge the blood of his servants, whose souls had for a century been incessantly crying to him from under the altar. And what method did he employ for this purpose? When He to whom vengeance belongs, when He whose ways are unsearchable, and whose wisdom is inexhaustible, proceeded to the execution of this strange work, he drew from his treasure a weapon he had never employed before. Resolving to make their punishment as signal as their crimes, he neither let loose an inundation of barbarous nations, nor the desolating powers of the universe. He neither overwhelmed them with earthquakes, nor visited them with pestilence. He summoned from among themselves a ferocity more terrible than either, a ferocity which, mingling in the struggle for liberty, and borrowing aid from that very refinement to which it seemed to be opposed, turned every man's hand against his neighbor, and sparing no age, nor sex, nor rank, till satiated with the ruin of greatness, the distresses of innocence, and the tears of beauty, it terminated its career in the most unrelenting despotism. *Thou art*

*righteous, O Lord, which art, which was, and which shall be, because thou hast judged thus; for they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink, for they are worthy."*

*Character of those who become Infidels.*

"Many, without renouncing the profession of Christianity, without formally rejecting its distinguishing doctrines, live in such an habitual violation of its laws, and contradiction to its spirit, that conscious they have more to fear than to hope from its truth, they are never able to contemplate it without terror. It haunts their imagination, instead of tranquillizing their hearts, and hangs with depressing weight on all their enjoyments and pursuits. Their religion, instead of comforting them under their trouble, is itself their greatest trouble, from which they seek refuge in the dissipation and vanity of the world, until the throbs and tumults of conscience force them back upon religion. Thus suspended betwixt opposite powers, the sport of contradictory influences, they are disqualified for the happiness of both worlds; and neither enjoy the pleasures of sin, nor the peace of piety. Is it surprising to find a mind thus bewildered in uncertainty, and dissatisfied with itself, court deception, and embrace with eagerness every pretext to mutilate the claims and enervate the authority of Christianity; forgetting that it is of the very essence of the religious principle to preside and control, and that it is impossible to *serve God and Mammon*? It is this class of professors who are chiefly in danger of being entangled in the snares of infidelity.

"The champions of infidelity have much more reason to be ashamed than to boast of such converts. For what can be a stronger presumption of the falsehood of a system, than that it is the opiate of a restless conscience; that it prevails with minds of a certain description, not because they find it true, but because they feel it necessary; and that in adopting it, they consult less with their reason than with their vices and their fears? It requires but little sagacity to foresee that speculations which originate in guilt must end in ruin.

"JESUS CHRIST seems to have *his fan in his hand, and to be thoroughly purging his floor*; and nominal Christians will probably be scattered like chaff. But has *real* Christianity any thing to fear? Have not the degenerate manners and corrupt lives of multitudes in the visible church been, on the contrary, the principal occasion of scandal and offence? Infidelity, without intending it, is gradually removing this reproach; possessing the property of attracting to itself the morbid humors which pervade the church, until the Christian profession on the one hand is reduced to a sound and healthy state, and scepticism on the other exhibits nothing but a mass of putridity and disease."

*Folly of dwelling on the Evidences of Christianity, without investigating its Nature.*

"This great cause has been not a little injured by the injudicious conduct of a certain class of preachers and writers, who, in just

despair of being able to handle a single topic of religion to advantage, for want of having paid a devout attention to the Scriptures, fly like harpies to the evidences of Christianity, on which they are certain of meeting with something prepared to their hands, which they can tear, and soil, and mangle at their pleasure.

*Diripiuntque dapes, contactuque omnia fœdant.*

“The folly we are adverting to, did not escape the observation nor the ridicule of Swift, who remarked in his days, that the practice of mooted, on every occasion, the question of the origin of Christianity, was much more likely to unsettle the faith of the simple, than to counteract the progress of infidelity. It is dangerous to familiarize every promiscuous audience to look upon religion as a thing which yet remains to be proved,—to acquaint them with every sophism and cavil which a perverse and petulant ingenuity has found out, unaccompanied, as is too often the case, with a satisfactory answer; thus leaving the poison to operate without the antidote, in minds which ought to be strongly imbued with the principles, and awed by the sanctions of the gospel. It is degrading to the dignity of a revelation, established through a succession of ages by indubitable proofs, to be adverted every moment to the hypothesis of its being an imposture, and to be inviting every insolent sophist to wrangle with us about the title, when we should be cultivating the possession. The practice we are now censuring is productive of another inconvenience. The argument for the truth of Christianity, being an argument of accumulation, or, in other words, of that nature that the force of it results less from any separate consideration than from an almost infinite variety of circumstances, conspiring towards one point and terminating in one conclusion; this concentration of evidence is broken to pieces, when an attempt is made to present it in superficial descants,—than which nothing can be conceived better calculated to make what is great appear little, and what is ponderous, light.

“Were we not familiar with the fact, we should probably think it strange, that such an anxiety should be evinced to rest the truth of Christianity on the firmest possible basis, along with such a profound indifference to every attempt to investigate its import. Some wonderful charm, it seems, is contained in a bare avowal that Christianity is a revelation from God, apart from any distinct perceptions of its truths, or any solemn advertence to its genuine scope and tendency. Embalmed and preserved like some Egyptian monarch, in the form of a venerable and antiquated document, it is to be carefully kept, and always approached with respect, but never allowed to take its place among the living, nor supposed to be useful to mankind according to any known law of operation. The most magnificent appellations are applied to it,—it is the light of the world, the true riches, the treasure hid in the field, and the pearl of great price: all these, and a thousand other encomiums, are lavished on the Scriptures by men, who at the same time feel no scruple in insinuating that this boasted communication from heaven contains no truths beyond the limits of reason, and that what the bulk of Christians in our ages have deemed such, are the distempered visions of enthu-

siasm, if they are not, in some instances, to be ascribed to the erroneous conceptions entertained by the Apostles of the religion they were appointed to propagate. It is the *possession* of a revelation, not the *use*, which these men are accustomed to contemplate and to value. As the miser conceives himself rich by the treasure which he never employs, so the persons to whom we allude, suppose themselves enlightened by a book from which they profess to derive no information, and saved by a religion which is allowed to engage little or none of their attention. This is one of the most distinguished features in the character of those, who with exemplary modesty style themselves *rational Christians*."

*Dangers of awakened Sinners.*

"In the pursuit of eternal good, the heart is extremely inconstant and irresolute; easily prevailed on, when the peace it is in quest of is delayed, to desist from further seeking. During the first serious impressions, the light, which unveils futurity, often shines with too feeble a ray to produce that perfect and plenary conviction which permits the mind no longer to vascillate; and the fascination of sensible objects eclipses the powers of the world to come. Nor is there less to be apprehended from another quarter. The conscience, roused to a just sense of the danger to which the sinner is exposed by his violation of the laws of God, is apt to derive consolation from this very uneasiness; by which means it is possible that the alarm, which is chiefly valuable on account of its tendency to produce a consent to the overtures of the gospel, may ultimately lull the mind into a deceitful repose. The number we fear, is not small, of those who, though they have never experienced a saving change, are yet under no apprehensions respecting their state, merely because they can remember the time when they felt poignant convictions. Mistaking what are usually the preliminary steps to conversion, for conversion itself, they deduce from their former apprehensions an antidote against present fears; and from past prognostics of danger, an omen of their future safety. With persons of this description the flashes of a superficial joy, arising from a presumption of being already pardoned, accompanied with some slight and transient relishes of the word of God, are substituted for that new birth, and that lively trust in the Redeemer, to which the promise of salvation inseparably belongs. Such were those who received the seed into stony ground, and who having heard the word of God *anon with joy received it, but having no depth of earth, it soon withered away*. Others endeavor to soothe the anguish of their minds by a punctual performance of certain religious exercises, and a partial reformation of conduct; in consequence of which they sink into mere formalists; and confounding the instruments of religion with the end, their apparent melioration of character diverts their attention from their real wants, and, by making them insensible of the extent of their malady, obstructs their cure. Instead of imploring the assistance of the great Physician, and implicitly complying with his prescriptions, they have recourse to palliatives, which assuage the anguish and the smart, without reaching the seat, or touching the core of the disorder."

*Difficulties of the Gospel Ministry.*

"Were the change, which the gospel proposes to effect, less fundamental and extensive than it is, we might the more easily flatter ourselves with being able to carry its designs into execution. Did it aim merely to polish the exterior, to tame the wildness, and prune the luxuriance of nature, without the implantation of a new principle, the undertaking would be less arduous. But its scope is much higher; it proposes not merely to reform, but to renew; not so much to repair the moral edifice, as to build it afresh; not merely by the remonstrances of reason, and the dictates of prudence, to engage men to lay a restraint upon their vices, but, by the inspiration of truth, to become new creatures.

"To arrest the attention of the careless, to subdue the pride and soften the obduracy of the human heart, so that it shall stoop to the authority of an unseen Saviour, is a task which surpasses the utmost efforts of human ability, unaided by a superior power. In attempting to realise the design of the Christian ministry, we are proposing to call the attention of men from the things which are seen and temporal, to things unseen and eternal; to conduct them from a life of sense to a life of faith; to subdue, or weaken at least, the influence of a world, which, being always present, is incessantly appealing to the senses, and soliciting the heart, in favor of a state, whose very existence is ascertained only by testimony. We call upon them to crucify the flesh with its affections and lusts, to deny the strongest and most inveterate propensities, and to renounce the enjoyments which they have tasted and felt, for the sake of a happiness to which they have no relish. We must charge *them*, as they value their salvation, not to love the world, who have been accustomed to make it the sole object of their attachment, and to return to their allegiance to that almighty and invisible Ruler, from whom they have deeply revolted. We present to them, it is true, *a feast of fat things, of wine on the lees well refined*; we invite them to entertainments more ample and exquisite, than, but for the gospel, it had entered into the heart of man to conceive; but we address our invitations to minds fatally indisposed, alienated from the life of God, with little sense of the value of his favor, and no delight in his converse. The souls we address, though originally formed for these enjoyments, and utterly incapable of being happy without them, have lost, through the fall, that right taste and apprehension of things, which is requisite for the due appreciation of these blessings, and, like Ezekiel, we prophesy to dry bones in the Valley of Vision, which will never live but under the visitation of that breath which bloweth where it listeth."

*Dignity and importance of the Gospel Ministry.*

"As the material part of the creation was formed for the sake of the immaterial; and of the latter the most momentous characteristic is its moral and accountable nature, or, in other words, its capacity of virtue and of vice; that labor cannot want dignity, which is exerted in improving man in his highest character, and fitting him for his eternal destination. Here alone is certainty and durability;



for, however highly we may esteem the arts and sciences which polish our species, and promote the welfare of society; whatever reverence we may feel, and ought to feel, for those laws and institutions, whence it derives the security necessary for enabling it to enlarge its resources, and develop its energies, we cannot forget that these are but the embellishments of a scene we must shortly quit—the decorations of a theatre, from which the eager spectators and applauded actors must soon retire. *The end of all things is at hand.* Vanity is inscribed on every earthly pursuit, on all sublunary labor: its materials, its instruments, and its objects will alike perish. An incurable taint of mortality has seized upon, and will consume them ere long. The acquisitions derived from religion, the graces of a renovated mind, are alone permanent. This is the mystic inclosure, rescued from the empire of change and death; this is the field which the Lord has blessed; and this word of the kingdom, the seed which alone produces immortal fruit, the very bread of life, with which, under a higher economy, the Lamb in the midst of the throne, will feed his flock, and replenish his elect, through eternal ages. How high and awful a function is that which proposes to establish in the soul an interior dominion—to illuminate its powers by a celestial light—and introduce it to an intimate, ineffable, and unchanging alliance with the Father of Spirits. What an honor to be employed as the instrument of conducting that mysterious process by which men are born of God; to expel from the heart the venom of the old serpent; to purge the conscience from invisible stains of guilt; to release the passions from the bondage of corruption, and invite them to soar aloft into the regions of uncreated light and beauty; “to say to the prisoners go forth, to them that are in darkness, shew yourselves!”

*Excellence of the Gospel Ministry.*

“Blessed is the man,” said the Royal Psalmist, “whom thou choosest, and causest to approach unto thee; blessed are they who dwell in thy house, they will be still praising thee.” If he was so strongly impressed with a conviction of the high privilege annexed to the priesthood, by virtue of its being allowed a nearer approach to God in the services of the sanctuary, the situation of a Christian minister is not less distinguished, nor less desirable. It is the only one, in which our general calling as Christians, and our particular calling as men, perfectly coincide. In a life occupied in actions that terminate in the present moment, and in cares and pursuits extremely disproportionate to the dignity of our nature, but rendered necessary by the imperfection of our state; it is but little of their time that the greater part of mankind can devote to the direct and immediate pursuit of their eternal interests. A few remnants, snatched from the business of life, is all that most can bestow. In our profession, the full force and vigor of the mind may be exerted on that which will employ it forever; on *religion*, the final centre of repose, the goal to which all things tend, which gives to time all its importance, to eternity all its glory; apart from which man is a shadow, his very existence a riddle, and the stupendous scenes which surround him, as incoherent and unmeaning as the leaves which the Sybil scattered in the wind.

The bane of human happiness is ordinarily not so much an absolute ignorance of what is best, as an inattention to it, accompanied with a habit of not adverting to prospects the most certain, and the most awful. But how can *we* be supposed to contract this inadvertence, who are incessantly engaged in placing truth in every possible light, tracing it in its utmost extent, and exhibiting it in all its evidence? Can we be supposed to forget "that day, and that hour, of which no man knoweth," who are stationed as watchmen to give the alarm, to announce the first symptoms of danger, and to cry in the ears of a sleeping world, "behold the bridegroom cometh;" or, however inattentive others may be to the approach of our Lord, can it ever vanish from our minds, who are detained by him in his sanctuary, on purpose to preserve it pure, to trim the golden lamps, and maintain the hallowed fire, that he may find nothing neglected, or in disorder, when he "shall suddenly come to his temple."

*Sublimity and power of the Gospel Truth.*

"To a serious mind, the truths of the Christian religion appear with such an air of unaffected greatness, that, in comparison of these, all other speculations and reasonings seem like the amusements of childhood. When the Deity, the incarnation, the atonement, the resurrection of the Son of God, the sanctification of the church, and the prospects of glory, have engaged our contemplation, we feel, in turning our attention to other objects, a strange descent, and perceive, with the certainty of demonstration, that, as the earth is too narrow for the full developement of these mysteries, they are destined, by their consequences and effects, to impregnate an eternal duration. We are not at all surprised at finding that the ancient prophets searched into these mysteries with great but unsuccessful diligence, that the angels desire to look into them, or that the Apostles were lost in the contemplation of those riches which they proclaimed and imparted. Are you desirous of fixing the attention of your hearers strongly on their everlasting concerns? No peculiar refinement of thought, no subtilty of reasoning, much less the pompous exaggerations of secular eloquence, are wanted for that purpose; you have only to imbibe deeply the mind of Christ, to let his doctrine enlighten, his love inspire your heart, and your situation, in comparison of other speakers, will resemble that of the angel of the Apocalypse, who was seen standing in the sun. Draw your instructions immediately from the Bible; the more immediately they are derived from this source, and the less they are tinged with human distinctions and refinements, the more salutary, and the more efficacious."

*Importance of Retirement and Religious Meditation.*

"If we look back upon the usual course of our feelings, we shall find that we are more influenced by the frequent recurrence of objects, than by their weight and importance; and that habit has more force in forming our characters, than our opinions have. The mind naturally takes its tone and complexion from what it habitually contemplates. Hence it is, that the world, by constantly pressing upon

our senses, and being ever open to our view, takes so wide a sway in the heart. How then must we correct this influence, and by faith overcome the world, unless we habitually turn our attention to religion and eternity? Let us make them familiar with our minds, and mingle them with the ordinary stream of our thoughts; retiring often from the world, and conversing with God and our own souls. In these solemn moments, nature, and the shifting scenes of it, will retire from our view, and we shall feel ourselves left alone with God. We shall walk, as in his sight; we shall stand, as it were, at his tribunal. Illusions will then vanish apace, and every thing will appear in its true proportion and proper color. We shall estimate human life, and the worth of it, not by fleeting and momentary sensations, but by the light of serious reflection and steady faith. We shall see little in the past to please, or in the future to flatter. Its feverish dreams will subside, and its enchantments be dissolved.

"From these seasons of retirement and religious meditation, we shall return to the active scenes of life with greater advantage. From the presence of God we shall come forth with our passions more composed, our thoughts better regulated, and our hearts more steady and pure. Let us not imagine that the benefit of such exercises is confined to the moments which are spent in them; for as the air retains the smell, and is filled with the fragrance of leaves which have been long shed; so will these meditations leave a sweet and refreshing influence behind them."

*Duty of remembering the Poor.*

"To descant on the evils of poverty might seem entirely unnecessary (for what with most is the great business of life, but to remove it to the greatest possible distance?) were it not that, besides its being the most common of all evils, there are circumstances peculiar to itself, which expose it to neglect. The seat of its sufferings are the appetites, not the passions; appetites which are common to all, and which, being capable of no peculiar combinations, confer no distinction. There are kinds of distress founded on the passions, which, if not applauded, are at least admired in their excess, as implying a peculiar refinement of sensibility in the mind of the sufferer. Embellished by taste, and wrought by the magic of genius into innumerable forms, they turn grief into a luxury, and draw from the eyes of millions, delicious tears. But no muse ever ventured to adorn the distresses of poverty or the sorrows of hunger. Disgusting taste and delicacy, and presenting nothing pleasing to the imagination, they are mere misery, in all its nakedness and deformity. Hence shame in the sufferer, contempt in the beholder, and an obscurity of station, which frequently removes them from the view, are their inseparable portion. Nor can I reckon it, on this account, among the improvements of the present age, that by the multiplication of works of fiction, the attention is diverted from scenes of real to those of imaginary distress; from the distress which demands relief, to that which admits of embellishment; in consequence of which the understanding is enervated, the heart is

corrupted, and those feelings which were designed to stimulate to active benevolence are employed in nourishing a sickly sensibility.

"Leaving these amusements of the imagination to the vain and indolent, let us awake to nature and truth; and in a world from which we must so shortly be summoned, a world abounding with so many real scenes of heart-rending distress, as well as of vice and impiety, employ all our powers in relieving the one and in correcting the other.

"Happy they whose lives correspond to these benevolent intentions; who looking toward the transitory distinctions which prevail here, and will vanish at the first approach of eternity, honor God in his children, and Christ in his image. How much, on the contrary, are those to be pitied, in whatever sphere they move, who live to themselves, unmindful of the coming of their Lord. *When he shall come and shall not keep silence, when a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him,* every thing, it is true, will combine to fill them with consternation; yet, methinks, neither the voice of the Archangel, nor the trump of God, nor the dissolution of the elements, nor the face of the Judge itself, from which the heavens will flee away, will be so dismaying and terrible to these men as the sight of the poor members of Christ; whom, having spurned and neglected in the days of their humiliation, they will then behold with amazement, united to their Lord, covered with his glory, and seated on his throne."

*The union of good men in Heaven.*

"If the mere conception of the re-union of good men, in a future state, infused a momentary rapture into the mind of Tully; if an airy speculation, for there is reason to fear it had little hold on his convictions, could inspire him with such delight, what may we be expected to feel, who are assured of such an event by the true sayings of God! How should we rejoice in the prospect, the certainty rather, of spending a blissful eternity with those whom we loved on earth; of seeing them emerge from the ruins of the tomb, and the deeper ruins of the fall, not only uninjured, but refined and perfected, "with every tear wiped from their eyes," standing before the throne of God and the Lamb, "in white robes, and palms in their hands, crying with a loud voice, Salvation to God, that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb for ever and ever." What delight will it afford to renew the sweet counsel we have taken together, to recount the toils of combat, and the labor of the way, and to approach not the house, but the throne of God, in company, in order to join in the symphonies of heavenly voices, and lose ourselves amidst the splendors and fruitions of the beatific vision!

"To that state all the pious on earth are tending; and if there is a law from whose operation none are exempt, which irresistibly conveys their bodies to darkness and to dust, there is another, not less certain or less powerful, which conducts their spirits to the abodes of bliss, to the bosom of their Father and their God. The wheels of nature were not made to roll backward; every thing presses on

towards eternity; from the birth of time an impetuous current has set in, which bears all the sons of men towards that interminable ocean. Meanwhile, heaven is attracting to itself whatever is congenial to its nature, is enriching itself by the spoils of earth, and collecting within its capacious bosom whatever is pure, permanent, and divine; leaving nothing for the last fire to consume but the objects and the slaves of concupiscence; while every thing which grace has prepared and beautified shall be gathered and selected from the ruins of the world, to adorn that eternal city, "which hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it; for the glory of God doth enlighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof." "

---

RELIGIOUS SENTIMENTS OF ZUINGLE.

As the Orthodoxy of Zuingle has recently been called in question, and he has been represented as harmonizing almost, if not altogether, with "liberal Christians of the present period," a few words, in addition to what was said in our last number, in vindication of this distinguished reformer, may be demanded.

Previous to any correspondence having taken place between Luther and Zuingle, the latter thus expresses himself respecting the former: "Luther's interpretations of Scripture are so well founded, that *no creature can confute them*; yet I do not take it well to be called by the Papists a Lutheran, because I learned the doctrine of Christ from the Scriptures, and not from Luther." "I have not on any occasion written a single line to him, nor he to me, directly nor indirectly. And why have I thus abstained from all communication with him? Certainly not from fear, but to prove how altogether consistent is the Spirit of God, *which can teach two persons, living asunder at such a distance, to write on the doctrines of Christ, and to instruct the people in them, in a manner so PERFECTLY HARMONIOUS WITH EACH OTHER.*"

In the year 1529, the Landgrave of Hesse procured a conference to be held at Marpurg between Luther and Zuingle and several other distinguished divines, in the hope of terminating their disputes respecting the Lord's supper. The following are a part of the articles agreed upon and subscribed at the termination of this conference:

"1. We unanimously believe, and firmly agree, that there is one true God, the creator of all things; that this God is one in nature and essence, but three in personality, viz. the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as was decreed by the Council of Nice, which was read in all the churches of the world.

2. We believe that neither the Father, nor the Holy Ghost, but the Son, who is also God, by nature became man, was conceived by the power of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, a perfect man, with a true body and a rational soul, yet without sin.

3. That Jesus Christ, the Son of God, and of Mary, is one person, who was crucified, died, and was buried, rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of God, and shall rule over all creatures, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead.

4. We believe that original sin, descended from Adam, is propagated in us, and renders all men guilty before God; and unless Christ had brought help to us by his life and death, we should have died eternally, and should never have been partakers of salvation or of the kingdom of God.

5. We believe that we are delivered from original sin and all other iniquity, and from eternal death also, if we place our confidence in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who died for us: and that without faith, no good work can deliver us from sin.

6. That Faith is the gift of God, which no man can obtain by any merit or good work, or by any power or strength of his own; but is a work of the Holy Spirit, in the hearts of them who hear the word of Christ.

7. That this Faith is our own righteousness before God, so as thereby God imputes righteousness to us without works or any merit of ours, and thereby we are delivered from sin, death and hell, reconciled to God, and saved on account of his son in whom we believe, by whose righteousness, life, and benefits, we are enriched, and made to enjoy peace and pardon. For this cause we perceive no necessity for vows, or a monastic life, as far as they are supposed to contribute to merit, but think them rightly condemned as unprofitable.

8. We believe that the Holy Ghost, in ordinary cases, never endues men with this faith, unless by the preaching of the word, or gospel of Christ, but begets this faith by the word in a certain measure, and in whom he pleases."

"10. That this faith by the efficacy of the Holy Spirit, after we are justified and sanctified, produces the practice of good works, love towards our neighbour, prayer to God, and patience in tribulation."

"14. We all believe and appoint, that our Lord's supper be observed in both kinds; and that the mass is not necessary for obtaining grace, for either the living or the dead; the sacrament of the altar, because it is a true sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is especially necessary to be observed by all Christians, and for this reason also, because the use of it, as well as the word of God, is appointed by the Almighty to stir up weak minds to faith and love through the Holy Ghost.

And although at this time we do not agree whether the true body and blood of Christ are corporeally present in the bread and wine, yet both parties, as far as they can in conscience, ought to maintain charity mutually for each other, and ought to pray to Almighty God, that he may confirm us all in right sentiments. Amen."

Respecting this conference, Melancthon observes, that Zuingle "came over to the Wittenburg divines in all points, the single arti-

cle of the Lord's supper excepted." Luther judged that, "besides the question on the Lord's supper, there was not a perfect agreement in the article of original sin." The Swiss divines did not question the fact of original sin, but they explained the subject differently from the Lutherans. "Sin," says Zuingle, "is a transgression of the law; and where there is no law, there is no transgression. Our great ancestor sinned; but which of us meddled with the forbidden fruit? There is then no denying that original sin, as it exists in us, the descendants of Adam, is not *properly* sin. It is a *disease*; it is a *condition*. It may be called *sin*; but it is not so, in *strictness* of speech." The difference on this subject depends, obviously, on the definition of the word sin. In the sense of Zuingle, probably Luther himself would not have insisted that we are guilty of Adam's sin.

---

#### RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1 *Dispepsy Forestalled and Resisted: or Lectures on Diet, Regimen, and Employment.* By EDWARD HITCHCOCK, Professor of Chemistry and Natural History in Amherst College. *Second Edition, corrected and enlarged.* Amherst: J. S. and C. Adams. 1831. pp. 452.

We are glad to receive so soon a second, enlarged and corrected edition of these popular and useful Lectures. Besides numerous corrections and improvements, this edition contains, more than the first, an "Address delivered before the Mechancial Association, in Andover Theological Institution, Sept. 21, 1830," and a long and valuable "Appendix of Notes."

2 *Memoir of Howard, compiled from his Diary, his confidential Letters, and other authentic documents.* By JAMES BALDWIN BROWN. Abridged by a gentleman of Boston from the London Quarto Edition. Boston: Lincoln and Edmands. 1831. pp. 352.

This Memoir of Howard is particularly valuable, as exhibiting his *Christian* character. His philanthropy is here shown to have been the result of his *piety*—a piety of the same stamp with that of Brainerd and Martyn. We have read the work with much interest, and can cheerfully recommend it to the religious public.

3 *Discourses delivered in Murray Street on Sabbath Evenings, during the months of March, April, and May, 1830.* By Dr. Spring, Dr. Cox, Dr. Skinner, Dr. DeWitt, Dr. Miller, Dr. Sprague, Dr. Carnahan, Dr. Woodbridge, Dr. Rice, Dr. Woods, Dr. Wayland, Dr. Snodgrass, Dr. Griffin. New York: Henry C. Sleight. pp. 501.

4 *Errors Regarding Religion; and Thoughts on Prayer, at the present time.* By JAMES DOUGLASS, Esq. New York: J. Leavitt; Boston: Crocker and Brewster. 1831. pp. 322.

5. *Letters on Missions.* By WILLIAM SWAN, Missionary in Siberia. With an Introductory preface, by the late William Orme, Foreign Secretary to the London Missionary Society. Boston : Perkins and Marvin. 1831. p. 288.

6. *Influence of Religion on Liberty : a Discourse in commemoration of the landing of the Pilgrims ;* delivered at Plymouth, Dec. 22, 1830. By BENJAMIN B. WISNER, Pastor of the Old South Church in Boston. Boston : Perkins and Marvin. 1831. pp. 36.

This discourse, which is chiefly historical, contains a sketch of the history of the Reformation on the continent, and in England ; of the rise of Puritanism ; of the emigration of the Pilgrims, and their establishment in this country ; and of the influence of their religious principles upon our civil institutions. The whole is characterised by learning and sound judgement, and will be read with interest and profit. The following declaration may be regarded with surprise by some, but we have no doubt of its literal truth : " Much as the name of Calvin has been scoffed at and loaded with reproach, by many sons of freedom, there is not a historical proposition more susceptible of complete demonstration than this ; that *no man has lived, to whom the world is under greater obligations for the liberty it now enjoys, than John Calvin.*"

7. *Dr. Codman's Speech in the Board of Overseers of Harvard College,* Feb. 3, 1831. Boston : Peirce and Parker. pp. 15.

The subject of this able speech—the connexion of the Theological School at Cambridge with the University—has excited, and continues to excite, very general attention. A discussion of it has commenced, and is to be continued, in the Christian Examiner, and Unitarian Advocate. Our readers may expect to hear from us respecting it in due time.

8. *The Duty of Progress in the Christian Calling ;* A New Year's Sermon, delivered in the North Church, Newburyport, Jan. 2, 1831. By L. F. DIMMICK. Newburyport : Charles Whipple. pp. 22.

9. *Importance of a Minister's Reputation :* A Sermon delivered at the Installation of the Rev. Nathaniel Hewit, D. D. as Pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Bridgeport, Conn. Dec. 1, 1830. By LEONARD WOODS, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary at Andover. Andover : Flag and Gould. pp. 22.

10. *Temperance and Religion :* or the Best Means and Highest End of the Temperance Reformation. By SAMUEL NOTT, JUN. Boston : Peirce and Parker. 1831. pp. 36.

11. *Review of Mr. Whitman's Letters to Professor Stuart on Religious Liberty.* Second Edition. With an Appendix not before published. Boston : Peirce and Parker. 1831. pp. 84.



THE  
**SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.**

---

---

VOL. IV.

MAY, 1831.

NO. 5.

---

---

**COMMUNICATIONS.**

ERRORS IN THE APOSTOLICAL CHURCHES.

It is evident from the writings of the apostles, that even in *those* times there were false teachers, and dangerous errors were propagated in the churches. These errors, in some instances, we find directly combatted; while in others, they are alluded to, and refuted or contradicted, without being named. It will help to a right understanding of the apostolical writings, to know distinctly what these errors were. To point them out, so far as they can at present be discovered, and to exhibit the manner in which a variety of passages in the New Testament may be supposed to bear upon them, will be my object in the following communication.

1. A principal class of errors with which Paul and his fellow laborers were called to contend, arose from the attempts of certain teachers to impose *circumcision* and the *Jewish ritual* upon the *Gentile* converts. The controversy respecting this subject originated at Antioch. When Paul and Barnabas had returned from their first missionary excursion among the Gentiles, and reported their proceedings to the church at Antioch, by which they had been sent out; "there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, and said, that it was needful to circumcise" the new converts from among the Gentiles, "and to command them to keep the law of Moses." Had they urged these things as a matter of mere ecclesiastical order and ceremony, the dispute would have been trifling; but they insisted upon them as of vital importance, and even as essential to salvation. "Except ye be circumcised, after the manner of Moses, *ye cannot be saved.*" Here then was the precise ground of dispute: Paul and his companions affirmed that the *blood of Christ* was the sole and sufficient ground of salvation, and that all who truly believed in him would be saved, whether circumcised or not; while their opponents insisted that faith in Christ was not *alone* sufficient, but that all, even Gentiles, must be

circumcised and keep the law of Moses, or they could not be saved. As the brethren at Antioch could not well settle this question among themselves, it was agreed to refer it to the apostles and elders and the church at Jerusalem; where it was determined, as might have been expected, in favor of Paul.

But notwithstanding this determination, the question was far from being at rest. It continued to be agitated, and Paul continued to be troubled with these false and Judaizing teachers to the end of life. The point in debate between them was one, as we have seen, of great importance *in itself*. It respected the foundation of our hope, and the way of salvation. It respected the manner in which the believer is to be justified before his God. Paul insisted that he is to be justified by *faith in the Redeemer*; but his opponents urged, that this would not avail, without circumcision, and obedience to the ceremonial law. It is needless to quote passages, in which Paul examines and discusses the question here proposed, and in precisely this shape of it. In nearly all his epistles, especially in those to the Romans and Galatians, he defends, in opposition to the Judaizing teachers, the great doctrine of justification by faith alone.

And as this controversy was great in itself, so it was in its *consequences*. The adversaries of Paul did not rest with denying the single doctrine of justification by faith. They attached an undue value, a saving efficacy, to the rite of circumcision, and to the abolished ceremonies of the Jewish religion. This led the apostle to affirm, "In Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but a new creature." "*The law*, having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never, with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls, and of goats, should take away sin."

The adversaries of Paul, in order to bring reproach upon his doctrines, disputed his claim to be ranked among the apostles of Jesus. This imposed on him the disagreeable necessity of vindicating his own apostleship. "In nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be nothing." "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds."—In order to disprove the claims of Paul to be considered an apostle, it was urged that his knowledge of the Gospel must have been received from *others*, and not directly from the Head of the church. This furnished him occasion to reply, "The Gospel which was preached of me was not after man; for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." These Judaizing teachers, and their followers, afterwards rejected the epistles of Paul, and refused to receive them as divine revelation.

In consequence of their views of justification by the law, and not by faith in the merits of the Redeemer, many of them were early led to deny the doctrines of Christ's proper divinity, and of atonement by his death. They regarded him as a teacher, rather than a Saviour, and depended for salvation on useless rites and ceremonies, rather than on his blood. Before the close of the second century, they were ejected from the church, and disowned as heretics. They established themselves as separate sects, and are known in history under the denomination of Nazarenes and Ebionites.

2. Another class of errors which infested the apostolical churches, arose from the attempts which were made to incorporate with the holy doctrines of the Gospel the dogmas of the *Oriental Philosophy*. This philosophy was of a very ancient origin. It has been attributed to Zoroaster, a Persian philosopher, who flourished in some unknown period of antiquity. At the time of our Saviour's advent, it had largely mingled itself, both with the religion of the Jews, and with the various philosophical systems of the Greeks. Plato learned it in the East, whither he travelled in pursuit of knowledge; and the religion of the Essenes, a numerous sect among the Jews, more nearly resembled that of the oriental philosophers, than it did that of Moses. The "wise men," (*ματῶν*) who came from the East," to pay their respects to the newborn Saviour, were perhaps philosophers of this class. It was against this corrupt but enticing system, that the apostle warned his Colossian brethren in the following words: "Beware lest any man spoil you through *philosophy* and *vain deceit*, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world and not after Christ." Against the same proud system, he also cautioned his beloved Timothy: "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding *profane and vain babblings*, and oppositions of *science*,\* *falsely so called*, which some professing, have erred concerning the faith."

I shall here notice some of the leading principles of the Oriental philosophy, and then introduce a variety of passages, in which the apostles may be understood as referring to it and contradicting it. It was a first principle with these philosophers, that "*matter is the centre and source of all evil, and of all vice.*" Consequently they inferred that the Supreme Divinity, whom they considered as absolutely perfect, could not have been the author of matter, or of anything material. Hence, to account for the existence of this material world, and of the material bodies of men and animals, they had recourse to the following hypothesis: The Supreme God, "having dwelt from everlasting in a profound solitude, and a bles-

\* From the Greek word here translated *science* (*γνῶσις*) the Eastern sages were sometimes denominated *gnostics*.

sed tranquillity, produced at length from himself two minds of a different sex, which resembled their Supreme Parent in the most perfect manner. From the prolific union of these two, others arose; who were also followed by succeeding generations; so that in process of time, a numerous celestial family were formed, in the regions of light." These inferior divinities were denominated *æons* by the Eastern sages, and *demons* by the Greeks. One of them, possessing it should seem less purity, though not less power, than some of his kindred, degraded himself so far as to become the Creator of this material world. He created the vile bodies of men, and made them the prisons and the corrupters of human souls. From these corrupting prisons, the Supreme Divinity is using all methods to deliver the wretched souls of men,—in which benevolent work he will finally have complete success; when he will dissolve the frame of the material universe, and bury it in a general ruin.

With principles such as these, a disposition was early manifested to incorporate the holy doctrines of the Gospel. The inferior divinities of the Oriental Philosophers were with them objects of religious worship. These were considered by the Gnostic believers the same, in general, as the *angels* of the Christian Scriptures; and hence the propriety of *worshipping angels* was early advocated. This furnished occasion for the apostle to say, "Let no man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility, and *worshipping of angels*, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, being vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind."

The Gnostic philosophers had much dispute respecting the number and rank of their inferior divinities, and in tracing their different genealogies up to the Supreme God. In these disputes, such professing Christians as had been corrupted by them in a greater or less degree participated. It was on this account, perhaps, that the apostle cautioned Timothy as follows: "Neither give heed to fables and *endless genealogies*, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying."<sup>\*</sup>

The Gnostic believers considered the Lord Jesus Christ to be one of their *æons*, or inferior divinities, sent into the world to aid in delivering the imprisoned souls of men from the corrupting influence of surrounding matter. Hence they were unanimous in rejecting the *proper Deity* of the Saviour. And as they believed matter to be "the centre and source of all evil," they were unanimous also in rejecting his *proper humanity*. They could not think that he had a real *body of flesh*; or that he *really* suffered and died. They supposed all this must have taken place in *appearance* only. In both these particulars, their sentiments were strenuously combatted by the apostle John. He wrote his Gospel, near

<sup>\*</sup> Alii intelligunt fabulosas angelorum et æonum geneologas. Rosenmuller in loc.

the close of the first century, for the purpose of establishing, as it is thought by some, in opposition to all who questioned it, the proper *divinity* of the Lord Jesus Christ. In the first sentence, he asserts that "the *Word was God.*" And in many passages, both of his Gospel and his epistles, he asserts, in opposition to those who denied the *humanity* of Christ, that this Divine "Word was made *flesh.*" "Hereby know we," says he, "the Spirit of God; every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come *in the flesh*, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come *in the flesh*, is not of God. Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come *in the flesh.* This is a deceiver and an antichrist."

As the Gnostic believers considered matter to be "the centre and source of all evil," they taught that our material bodies should be mortified and wasted as much as possible by abstinence and neglect. They discountenanced marriage; and, like the Essenes among the Jews, encouraged a solitary, monastic life. This probably led the apostle Paul to warn the Colossians against such things as "have a show of wisdom in will worship and humility, and *neglecting of the body.*" And this, in its full developement, may have been the apostacy spoken of by the same apostle in his first epistle to Timothy. "Some," says he, "shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils," (or *dogmas concerning demons*) "*forbidding to marry*, and commanding to *abstain from meats* which God hath created, to be received with thanksgiving of them that know the truth."

Again, as the Gnostics considered matter to be "the source of all evil," and the material body as the clog and prison of the soul; they were led to deny the future resurrection of the body. They believed in no resurrection except a spiritual one, a rising from the death of sin; and that this, in respect to all true Christians, was already past. Such were the sentiments of "Hymeneus and Philetus, who erred concerning the truth, and overthrew the faith of some, saying that the *resurrection is past already.*" Such also were those among the Corinthians, who asserted, "that there is *no resurrection of the dead;*" in reply to whom the apostle wrote the fifteenth chapter of his first epistle.

There can be little doubt, that before the close of the first century, many of the Gnostic believers were separated from the true church, and held meetings for worship by themselves. It is in allusion to these, probably, that the apostle John says; "They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would have continued with us; but they went out that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us."

3. Other errors, which infested the churches in the days of the apostles, were such as have since been collectively denominated *Antinomianism*. The truths of the gospel were so perverted and

abused, that countenance if not encouragement was derived from them in the practice of sin.—Some took occasion, from the doctrine of justification by faith alone, to represent a holy life as *unnecessary*. ‘It matters little what our conduct is, if we have faith; since it is by faith we are to be justified, without the deeds of the law.’ This error was very properly noticed and refuted by the apostle James. “What doth it profit,” says he, “though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him? If a brother or sister be naked and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto him, depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled, notwithstanding ye give not those things that are needful for the body; what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it have not works, is dead, being alone. Was not Abraham, our father, justified by works, when he had offered Isaac, his son, upon the altar? Ye see, then, how that by works is a man justified, and not by faith only.”—Some so abused the doctrine of *free grace in the pardon of sin*, as to make it an occasion of continuing in sin. “Let us continue in sin that grace may abound.” This led to the very pertinent interrogation of the apostle Paul: “How shall we, who are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in *newness of life*.”

There were those, it appears, in the primitive age, who fancied themselves exalted by the gospel to such a state, that they *could not sin*. Let them do what they might, they were no longer sinners. These perverters of the gospel we find noticed and reprov- ed by the apostle John. “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.”—The *Nicolaitanes* were another class in the days of the apostles, who, under pretence of enjoying the spiritual liberty of the gospel, became the slaves of their fleshy lusts. They “held the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication.” Perhaps they were the same “ungodly men,” spoken of by Jude, who “turned the grace of God into *lasciviousness*, and denied the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.”

4. There were those in the days of the apostles, who erred in their mode of *interpreting the scriptures*. They “adopted that absurd and corrupt custom, used among the Jews, of darkening the plain words of the Holy Scriptures by insipid and forced allegories, and of drawing them violently from their proper and natural signification, in order to extort from them certain mysterious and hid-

den significations." As instances of this, I may refer to the "Shepherd of Hermas," and the epistle attributed to Barnabas, which, if not written in the days of the apostles, were very early written, and are still extant. Interpreters of this class were among the many spoken of by Paul, "who corrupt the word of God," and who "turn away their ears from the truth, and are turned unto fables." To interpretations such as these he may also be understood as referring in his direction to Timothy; "Refuse *profane and old wives fables*, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness."

5. It was an error of the primitive age, into which many seem to have fallen, that the day of judgement and the end of the world were *near at hand*. This idea was for a season so prevalent among the Thessalonians, that they were induced to neglect their necessary avocations, and thus brought discredit on their profession. Wherefore the apostle wrote unto them, "We beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the *day of Christ is at hand*. Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition. Remember ye not that while I was yet with you, *I told you these things*."—Those among them who, under an impression that the end of the world was near, had sinfully neglected their necessary business, he admonishes in the following faithful manner: "We hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busy bodies. Now them that are such, we command and exhort, by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness *they work*, and eat their own bread. For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if *any would not work, neither should he eat*."—It may be supposed also that some, to whom the apostle Peter wrote, had been expecting the coming of the day of God, and had begun to lose their confidence in the promises, because it was delayed. For he thought it necessary to say unto them, "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. For one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. But the day of the Lord *will come* as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works that are therein, shall be burnt up."

In the various errors which infested the apostolical churches, we see that the *love of error* is deeply seated in the human breast. It was one purpose for which the Son of God appeared in our world, that he "might bear witness to the *truth*." And the Holy Spirit

was given to the Apostles, that it might "lead them into all truth." At the period, therefore, of which we have been speaking, a flood of divine truth, pure as the region from which it came, was suddenly poured upon a desert world. And had mankind loved the truth, they might have retained and enjoyed it till the end of time. But how soon was their native aversion to it exhibited? How soon did the streams, which flowed so pure at first, begin to be corrupted? Even before the eyes of the apostles, and under the droppings of their heaven-inspired lips, and among those too who had professed to receive and love the truth, heresies sprang up and flourished, and errors of the most dangerous and destructive kind were broached and propagated. In instances such as these, who does not see evidence of the native depravity of our race; and that a love of error, and a strong aversion to religious truth, are deeply seated in the human breast?

We see also from what has been said, that errors on religious subjects have usually run in the *same great channels*. These channels were marked out in the apostolic age; and the same erroneous views which were entertained then have in general been advocated in all periods since. There were some then, who considered the Lord Jesus Christ as neither God nor man, but as possessing a *middle* nature, and occupying a middle ground. There were others who considered him a mere *prophet* like Moses—a mere *human* teacher, sent from God. There were some, who felt not that they needed the merits of a Divine Redeemer, but depended on their own performances as a foundation of hope;—while others chose to consider themselves so *entirely* dependent on him, as to render good works useless and unnecessary. There were some, who desired and attempted to incorporate the wisdom which was from above, with the boasted wisdom of this present world;—while others, under a pretence of living above the world, and keeping themselves at a distance from it, neglected the most necessary duties of life. A very little acquaintance with the history of the church will be sufficient to satisfy any observer, that these are some of the principal channels in which errors have flowed, from the age of the apostles to the present time.

In view of the *errors* of the apostolical age, we may learn what was the *faith* of the apostles—that precious "faith once delivered to the saints." It must have been the *opposite* of all these errors. From the opposition of the apostles to the various errors which prevailed relative to the *person of Christ*, we may see what they understood and *believed* in regard to this important subject. They believed in the proper *deity*, and in the proper *humanity* of their Saviour—that he was "*God* manifest in the *flesh*." And by the same mode of judging, we may ascertain their belief, in the doctrine of Christ's atonement, of justification by faith, in the necessity of a holy life, and in what have been denominated generally



the *doctrines of grace*. This kind of evidence of their belief in these doctrines is the more convincing, because it is *indirect*. It comes to us in such a way, that it is scarcely possible we should be mistaken respecting it, or deceived by it.

I hope all who read this paper may be deeply sensible of the value of the scriptures—that fountain of pure and heavenly truth to which we have so free access—that “sure word of prophecy to which we do well to take heed, as to a shining light in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in our hearts.” Those who walk by this perfect rule, walk safely and surely; while those who depart from it (as we all are fearfully liable to do) are lost in error, confusion and darkness.

---

COMMUNION OF CHURCHES.

ON the subject of Communion between different Churches, there are extremes on either hand. There is the extreme of regarding the churches as in all respects separate and disconnected communities, acknowledging no mutual responsibilities, and having little or no intercourse one with another. I recollect no example of this nature in the ancient churches. The Brownists, in the latter part of the sixteenth century, approached nearer to it than any previous sect.—The other extreme goes to merge the individual churches in one great, universal or national church. The most eminent example of this is the church of Rome. Between these extremes, there is a *scriptural medium*, which it will be my object in this paper to point out.

That the Scriptures authorise the existence of individual or congregational churches,\* I have no doubt. Nothing is plainer than that such churches are frequently spoken of in the New Testament. We read of “the church at Jerusalem,” “the church at Antioch,” “the church at Babylon,” and “the church of God, which is at Corinth.” We read also of “the churches of Judea,” “the churches of Galatia,” “the churches of the Gentiles,” and “the seven churches which are in Asia.” These churches are spoken of, not as one body, but as *several* religious bodies, in some degree separate and distinct one from another.

The members of these churches were accustomed to assemble in *one place* for religious worship. On the day of Pentecost, the church at Jerusalem were assembled “with one accord, in one place.” The church at Antioch were “gathered together,” in

\* I here use the words, *Congregational churches*, not in their technical acceptance, but merely as denoting distinct societies or assemblies of Christians.

one assembly, when Paul and Barnabas "rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles." Acts xiv. 27. The Apostle addresses the church at Corinth, as being accustomed to "come together in one place." 1 Cor. xiv. 23. "Upon the first day of the week," the church at Troas, "*came together* for to break bread." Acts xx. 7.

These churches are spoken of in the New Testament, not only as distinct bodies, but as exercising separate and independent powers. The church at Jerusalem appointed one to the Apostleship in place of Judas. This church, also, in the presence, and at the instance of the Apostles, chose its own deacons. Acts i. 23, vi. 5. The church at Antioch ordained Paul and Barnabas, and sent them forth unto the heathen. Acts xiii. 3. The church at Corinth labored with, reclaimed and restored the incestuous brother. 1 Cor. v. 5, 2 Cor. ii. 7. The churches of Macedonia chose delegates to travel with Paul and others, and carry their contributions to the poor. 2 Cor. viii. 19. The seven churches in Asia were reprovved and censured for existing errors and irregularities,—implying that they had the power, and that it was their duty, to remove them. Indeed, the existence of individual, congregational churches is so plainly attested in the New Testament, that I wonder it should ever have been disputed.

I proceed to show, that between these churches there exist important connexions, and that a degree of communion should be maintained.

This will be evident from the *character* of those who, according to the Gospel, are to compose these churches. All the members of a church are required to be regenerated persons, real Christians, true members of Christ's invisible kingdom. It cannot be doubted that persons of this character are bound together by many ties, and that, in the primitive age especially, their union was marked and manifest. They were brethren and sisters of the same holy family, united in a common cause, and exposed to common dangers and enemies; and though they resided in different places, and belonged to different particular churches or congregations, still, the bonds of their affection were not broken or impaired. Now it is not possible to conceive that churches, religious communities, composed of persons such as these, should not have been in many ways united. True, these communities had each its particular organization, and no one of them had any authority over another; but being composed of persons so closely drawn together in affection and interest, a degree of union between them would be natural and inevitable. Accordingly we learn from the manner in which the primitive churches are spoken of, and from a variety of circumstances recorded respecting them, that such union and communion did actually exist.

These churches are spoken of, in some instances, as constituting

*one general body.* "God hath set some in *the church*, first Apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers," &c. "That thou mightest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is *the church* of the living God." "Gaius, mine host, and of the *whole church*, saluteth you."

These and similar expressions, in which the whole Christian community is represented as constituting *one general church*, are not to be understood as contradicting the passages previously quoted in proof of the separate existence of churches, but as importing the *connexion* which subsists, and ought to subsist, between them. So closely were the primitive churches united in faith, in affection, and in order, that they might properly be represented as forming but one church. They constituted but one great family of churches, as the members of a particular church constituted one of individual believers.

It is evidence of the union existing among the apostolical churches, that they were established in the *same order*, and formed according to the *same general rule*. "Joying," says the Apostle to the Colossians, "beholding *your order*, and the stedfastness of your faith in Christ." "Let us walk by the *same rule*; let us mind the same thing." The Apostle speaks in another place of the *customs* of the churches. "We have no such custom, neither the churches of God." And in another place he says, "So ordain I in *all the churches*;"—implying that to all the churches, the same general rules were prescribed.\* But why this uniformity of organization in the primitive churches, if communion and fellowship were not intended to be practised? On supposition that each was to be in all respects a distinct and unconnected community, the mode of organization might have been various, according to the caprice or the convenience of individuals.

The degree and manner of communion in these churches may be gathered from various circumstances recorded in the New Testament.—They obviously were to each other objects of mutual concern, interest and prayer.—They had communion, also, in the worship and ordinances of the Gospel. As their teachers journeyed from place to place, it is not to be doubted that they had an interchange of pastoral labors. The members, too, when absent from their own churches, were freely admitted to communion in the assemblies of their brethren.

The primitive churches sent Christian salutations, and letters of instruction, warning and reproof one to another. To the Romans Paul says, "The *churches of Christ* salute you." To the Corinthians he also says, "The *churches* of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with *the church* that is in their house. *All the brethren* greet you." The epistle to the Galatian churches was sent in the name, not only of Paul, but of *all the brethren* who were with him at Rome.

\* See Colossians ii. 5. Phil. iii. 16. 1 Cor. xi, 16, and vii, 17.

The primitive churches administered relief one to another in distress. No reader of Paul's epistles can have forgotten how deeply he was engaged, at different times, in taking up collections among the Gentile churches, that he might send relief to the poor and persecuted saints at Jerusalem. Indeed, he seems to have given order in the churches generally, that something should be laid by, every Lord's day, to be devoted to charitable purposes. 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

The primitive churches sent messengers or delegates one to another, as they had occasion. Thus, the church at Antioch sent delegates to the church at Jerusalem, that they might confer with brethren there on the question of circumcising the Gentile converts. And when this question was decided, the church at Jerusalem sent back delegates to the churches of Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia, that they might carry and confirm the decision. Acts xv. 2, 25. Paul speaks also of "the messengers of the churches," who were deputed to transmit their contributions to Jerusalem. 2 Cor. viii. 23.

It appears from the apostolical writings, that letters of recommendation were frequently sent from one church to another. When Apollos was minded to go from Ephesus into Achaia, "the brethren wrote, exhorting the disciples to receive him." Acts xviii, 27. Paul gave Phebe, a servant (*δῖακονον*) of the church at Cenchrea, a recommendation to the church at Rome, exhorting the brethren to "receive her in the Lord as becometh saints." Rom. xvi. 1. Addressing the Corinthians, he says, "We do not need, as some others, epistles of commendation to you, or letters of commendation from you. Ye are our epistle, written in our hearts, known and read of all men." 2. Cor. iii. 1. It is evident from the form of expression here used, that letters of recommendation were common in those times. See also 1 Cor. xvi. 3. and Col. iv. 10.

It may be gathered from the writings of the Apostles, that the members of particular churches assisted in ordaining elders over other churches, and gave to them the right-hand of fellowship. Thus Paul and Barnabas, who were members of the church at Antioch, ordained elders in every church which they had planted among the Gentiles. Acts xiv. 23. Titus was left in Crete, that he might "ordain elders in every city." Tit. i. 5. We know not of what particular church Titus was a member. He certainly could have belonged to but one church; whereas he assisted in ordaining elders over many. To Paul and Barnabas also, members and messengers of the church at Antioch, "James, Cephas, and John," who belonged to the original church at Jerusalem, "gave the right hands of fellowship." Gal. ii. 9.

It further appears from the writings of the Apostles, that the first Christian churches were accustomed to seek and to take *advice*

one of another ; and that the members of different churches sometimes met together in council, to consider questions of difficulty and to give advice. We have an instance of all this recorded in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts. A very serious question arose at Antioch, a question in which all the churches were interested, touching the propriety of circumcising the Gentile converts. Being unable to determine the point satisfactorily among themselves, the brethren at Antioch prudently resolved to send to Jerusalem for advice. When the delegates from Antioch arrived at Jerusalem, "they were received of the church," and "the Apostles and elders came together to consider of the matter." After much discussion, a decision was formed, and delegates were sent back to carry and confirm it. And although this decision was disregarded by some of the turbulent judaizing teachers, and the evil was not entirely cured ; still it was in a great measure checked. The hands of Paul and Barnabas were strengthened, and the advice from Jerusalem was received by the Gentile churches with unmingled joy.

The remarks here made may serve to illustrate the kind of communion existing in the churches under the ministry of the Apostles. Though they were separate organizations, as I have shown, yet they were connected by mutual responsibilities, and bound together by innumerable ties. They did not, indeed, assume *authority* over one another ; but they were in the constant habit of spiritual communion, in almost every way possible. They lived together as *sister* churches, and strove together for the faith and the diffusion of the Gospel.

This communion of the churches, established by the Apostles, was continued under the ministry of their immediate successors.— Before the close of the first century, Clement of Rome addressed an epistle to the church at Corinth. It appears from this epistle, that, on occasion of some dissensions among the Corinthians, they deputed a messenger to their brethren at Rome to ask advice. The epistle, in answer, commences as follows :—"The *church of God* which is at Rome, to the *church of God* which is at Corinth, elect, sanctified by the will of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." In the course of the epistle, instruction, warning, reproof and counsel are faithfully administered. Messengers were sent to carry this communication to the Corinthian brethren, and to aid in healing the divisions which had arisen among them.

Ignatius was converted under the ministry of the Apostles, and by them ordained over the church at Antioch. In the persecutions under Trajan, he was seized, carried a prisoner to Rome, and thrown to be devoured by wild beasts. On his way from Antioch to Rome, he addressed epistles to the churches of the Ephesians, the Magnesians, the Trallians, the Romans, the Philadelphians, and the Smyrneans. Polycarp, another of the Christian fathers who was instructed by the Apostles, and by them set over the church in

Smyrna, addressed a letter to the church at Phillippi. In these instances, we see the Pastors of particular churches addressing other churches, and administering instruction, exhortation and reproof, as the occasion required. After the martyrdom of Polycarp the church in Smyrna addressed a circular epistle to *all the churches*, containing a circumstantial account of that event. In the next century, "when the church at Antioch was troubled with the heresies of their Pastor, Paulus Samosatenus, the neighboring pastors came unto the church, and joined their concurrence in his deposition."

"It is certain," says Dr. Increase Mather, "that in the next ages to the Apostles, a Pastor was not settled in any church, without the concurrence of others. When the church had elected a Pastor, they presented him to the neighbor pastors for their approbation, nor could he be legally confirmed without it. Eusebius tells us, that when Alexander was chosen Pastor of the church at Jerusalem by the brethren of that place, he had the common consent of the circumjacent pastors. Lib. v. c. 11. And thus, as Cyprian informs us, it was practised in all the churches throughout Africa. He speaks particularly concerning Sabinus, who was elected Pastor of Eremita in Spain, how that neighbor ministers concurred in his ordination, after the fraternity had elected him."\*

In the facts here stated, we may see the fellowship existing between the churches, in the ages immediately succeeding the Apostles. We still find individual churches, each having its own officers and its particular organization, but all united in the bonds of a most intimate and holy fellowship. Advice is mutually sought, given, and taken, and a mutual watch and care are exercised.

Shortly after the period above referred to, the liberties of individual churches were invaded, and bishops in the larger cities began to assume a degree of authority over their brethren. This evil continued and increased, till, in a few centuries, the bishop of Rome claimed to be universal bishop, and to have dominion over the world. The very existence of individual churches was denied, and an attempt was made to unite all Christendom in one great, political, ecclesiastical body.

At the reformation from Popery, the rights of individual churches, which had long been forgotten, were not immediately discovered and restored. In England, when the authority of the Pope was renounced, the monarch was acknowledged as head of the church, and all the churches in the land were by law united in one body. By the progress of light, and the diffusion and study of the Holy Scriptures, the impropriety and error of this state of things were ere long discovered. But in the first attempt to correct the evil, and restore the rights of individual churches, the matter was carried,

\* Order of the churches Vindicated, p. 79.

as might have been expected, to the other extreme. Near the close of the sixteenth century, Robert Brown laid the foundation for a new religious community, the members of which, from the name of their leader, were denominated Brownists. They held to a strict and absolute *independency*. The churches formed and dissolved themselves. They made and unmade, ordained, dismissed and deposed their religious teachers. In short, the churches of this denomination acknowledged no mutual connexion, dependence or responsibility. The minister of one church was no minister to another. He could not preach, administer ordinances, or perform any ministerial act, out of his own body.

The famous John Robinson of Leyden, a part of whose church migrated to America and commenced the settlement at Plymouth, was originally a Brownist. But perceiving the defects of this system—how that in his zeal for the independency and rights of individual churches, its founder had sundered the scriptural bond which ought to unite all the churches, Robinson undertook and accomplished a reformation, particularly in his own church. He cast off the name of Brownist, and with it most of the offensive points in the theory of Brown, and established the Congregational system of church government, much as it exists in England, and in this country, at the present day.

In the year 1643, the Congregationalists of England published a declaration of their sentiments, in which they say that they do not “claim an entire independency with regard to other churches; for they agree that, in all cases of offence, *the offending church is to submit to an open examination by other neighboring churches*, and if it persist in its error or miscarriage, they are then to renounce all Christian communion with it, till it repents.” “It is a maxim to be abhorred,” say they, “that a singular and particular society of men professing the name of Christ should arrogate to themselves an exemption from giving an account to, or being censurable by, neighboring churches about them.”\*

In the year 1658, the Congregationalists of England held an assembly at the Savoy, where they published a Confession of the faith and order of their churches. In this they insist, not upon strict independency, but upon the communion of particular churches,—prescribing that, “in cases of difficulty or difference, relating to doctrine or order, churches may meet together by their messengers in synods or councils, to consider and give advice.” Neal, Vol. iv. p. 217.

In further evidence of the views of the early Congregationalists of England, I quote the following from the “*Irenicum*,” a work published by the celebrated Mr. Jeremiah Burroughs† but a little while before his death.

\* Neal’s Hist. of the Puritans, Vol. iii. p. 138. Mather’s Order of the Churches, p. 74.

† Mr. Burroughs was one of the exiles in Holland during the administration of Archbishop Laud. He was afterwards a member of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster. He died in 1646.

"Those in the Congregational way acknowledge,

1. That they are bound in conscience to give account of their ways to churches about them, or to any other who shall require it.

2. They acknowledge that Synods of other Ministers and Elders about them are an ordinance of Jesus Christ for the helping the Church against errors, schisms and scandals.

3. That these Synods may, from the power they have from Christ, admonish men and churches in his name, when they see evils continuing in, or growing upon the Church, and their admonitions carry with them the authority of Jesus Christ.

4. As there shall be cause, they may declare men or churches to be subverters of the faith, or otherwise according to the nature of their offence, to shame them before all the churches about them.

5. They may, by a solemn act in the name of Jesus Christ, refuse any further communion with them till they repent.

6. They may declare also in the name of Christ, that those erring people or churches are not to be received into fellowship with any of the churches of Christ, nor to have communion with any other in the ordinances of Christ.

I do not in these deliver only my own judgement, but by what I know of the judgement of all those brethren with whom I have occasion to converse; yea, it has been their judgement and mine for divers years, even then when we never thought to have enjoyed our own land again."

The views of Congregationalists in England have doubtless undergone some change, during the last hundred and fifty years; but it is evident from recent publications, the *Congregational Magazine*, the *History of Dissenters*, &c., that they still retain all the important features of their original system. They still hold to the existence of individual churches, possessing distinct and independent\* powers; and also to the communion of churches, in most or all of those ways pointed out by their fathers.

The Congregationalists of New England have ever harmonized, in most particulars, with those of the parent country. Our fathers were strenuous advocates, not only for the rights of individual churches, but also for the communion of churches. The following regulation in regard to the gathering of churches became a law in Massachusetts in the year 1641. "The general court doth not, nor will hereafter, approve of any such companies of men, as shall join in any pretended way of church fellowship, *unless they shall acquaint . . . . . the elders of the neighbor churches where they intend to join, and have their approbation therein.*"

In the Cambridge Platform, adopted in the year 1648, the separate existence and rights of the churches on the one hand, and their mutual relations and responsibilities on the other, are well defined. The name, *Independent*, is discarded. It is expressly said that "the churches ought to preserve *church communion* one with another," and a variety of ways is pointed out in which this communion is to be exercised. See chap. xv. By the Synod of 1662, the communion of churches is defined to be "the faithful

\* A Congregational church is not rightfully subject to the *authority* or *control* of any other church, or religious community. So far it is *independent*. But it does not follow, that it has no connexion, and should have no communion, with other churches. The citizens of these states are individually independent. Yet, in how many ways are they united, and how numerous are the duties which they owe, one to another?



improvement, according to capacity and opportunity, of the gifts of Christ bestowed upon them, for his service and glory, and their mutual good and edification." The following acts of church communion are prescribed :

"I. Hearty care and prayer one for another, 2 Cor. xi. 28. Canticles viii. 8. Rom. i. 9. Col. i. 9. Eph. vi. 18.

"II. Affording relief by communication of their gifts in temporal or spiritual necessities, Rom. xv. 26, 27. Acts xi. 22—29. 2 Cor. viii. 1, xi. 14.

"III. Maintaining unity and peace, by giving an account one to another of their public actions, when it is orderly desired, Acts xi. 2, 3, 4, 18. Josh. xxi. 13, 21, 30. 1 Cor. x. 32, and strengthening one another in their regular administrations ; as in special by a concurrent testimony against persons justly censured, Acts v. 41, xvi. 4, 5. 2 Tim. iv. 15. 2 Thess. iii. 14.

"IV. Seeking and accepting help from, and giving help unto each other in case of divisions and contentions whereby the peace of any church is disturbed, Acts xv. 2,—in matters of more than ordinary importance, as the ordination, translation, and deposition of elders, and such like, Prov. xv. 22, xxiv. 6. 1 Tim. v. 22,—in doubtful and difficult questions and controversies, doctrinal or practical, that may arise, Acts xv. 2, 6,—and in the rectifying of mal-administrations, and healing of errors and scandals, that are unhealed among themselves, Job iii. 9, 10. 1 Cor. xv. 2 Cor. ii. 6, 11, xii. 20, 21, xiii. 2.

"V. Taking notice in love and faithfulness, of the troubles and difficulties, errors and scandals of another church, and administering help, when the case necessarily calls for it, though they should so neglect their own good and duty, as not to seek it, Exod. xxiii. 4, 5. Prov. xxiv. 11, 12.

"VI. Admonishing one another when there is need and cause for it, and after due means with patience used, withdrawing from a church or peccant party therein, which obstinately persists in error or scandal."\*

In the "Heads of Agreement between Congregationalists and Presbyterians," drawn up in London in the year 1690, and assented to by the two denominations in both countries, there is an entire section "on the communion of churches." Six methods of communion are here prescribed, the last of which is as follows :

"That we are most willing and ready to give an account of our church proceedings to each other, when desired, for preventing or removing any offences

---

\* In the *Ratio Disciplinae*, recently published by Professor Upham, a work which ought to lie on the table of every Congregationalist minister, I find the following remark respecting the acts of church communion prescribed by this synod:—"The objects proposed in the three first classes of acts of communion, may in general be effectually and happily accomplished in that plan of stated intercourse, termed Conference of Churches. The objects, proposed under the fourth, fifth, and sixth classes, imply and require the existence of Councils."

It is worthy of notice that the plan of *Church Conferences*, lately adopted in New England with such happy effects, was proposed and recommended by the famous Mr. Cotton, second pastor of the first church in Boston, almost 200 years ago. The following are his words:—"It would, by the blessing of God, conduce much to the increase of brotherly love and unity, the spiritual edification of many by mutual faith of each other, to the strengthening of the hearts and hands of one another in the work of the Lord, if the *elders and brethren* of the churches did meet together church by church, in convenient numbers at set times, (*not to exercise any jurisdiction over any,*) but to enjoy and practise church communion by prayer together, hearing the word preached, and CONFERENCE about such cases and questions of conscience, as shall be found useful or needful for the edification and comfort and peace of every church, or any of the brethren thereof. And this course might tend much to satisfy the spirits of diverse godly brethren, who have thought, that we mind so much the distinction of particular churches, and the duties of fellow members in the same, that we lose much of the comfort of love and the fellowship of the spirit, which we might enjoy, and that we fall short in some brotherly love, which we owe mutually to our dear brethren of the several churches."

that may arise among us. Likewise, we shall be ready to give the Right Hand of Fellowship, and walk together according to the gospel rules of communion of churches."

As early as the year 1639, the Rev. Richard Mather, father of Increase, and grandfather of Cotton Mather, wrote as follows :—  
 "The Consociation of Churches into classes and synods, we hold to be lawful, and in some cases necessary ; as namely, in things that are not peculiar to one church, but common to them all. And likewise, when a church is not able to end any matter which concerns only themselves, then they are to seek for counsel and advice from neighbor churches, as the church at Antioch did send unto the church at Jerusalem, Acts xv. 2." The sentiment here expressed, the author assures us had the approbation of Mr. Cotton and the other elders.

"The world is much mistaken," says Dr. Increase Mather, "in supposing that *Congregational* churches are *Independent*. That name has indeed been fastened upon them by their adversaries ; but our Platform of Discipline, Chap. 2, Sect. 5, disclaims the name. And so does our renowned Hooker in his Survey of Church Discipline." \*

The very first words in the *Ratio Disciplinæ Fratrum Nov-Anglorum*, drawn up by Cotton Mather, and attested by his father, are these, "That the churches of New England have been originally of the *Congregational* persuasion and profession, is known to every one. Their Platform does expressly disclaim the name of *Independent*."—Mr. Samuel Mather's "Apology for the Liberties of the Churches in New England," published in 1738, commences as follows :—"The churches of New England are nominally and professedly *Congregational*. They do not approve the name of *Independent*, and are abhorrent from such principles of *Independency* as would keep them from giving an account of their matters to their brethren of neighboring societies, regularly demanding it of them." In other parts of this Apology, the following sentiments are expressed :

"These Churches, indeed, acknowledge a *Consociation of Churches* for mutual Light and assistance ; and, as they conceive that such churches as will not act in conjunction with others, but confine their duty within the narrow limits of their own assemblies, *cut themselves off from the external communion of the Catholic church* ; they judge also that it will not be safe or prudent for any Christian to commit his soul to the direction and conduct of *such an independent Church*."

"These churches may lawfully consult with one another, and ought to do so as occasion requires ; for it is very probable that *other churches may be better acquainted with persons and causes than ourselves* : and therefore their judgment and council ought to be required. Thus particularly, *when a new church is to be gathered, or officers are to be chosen and ordained over any church, or there is some difference among the brethren about the administration of the censures of the churches, it is fit and proper to consult with neighbor churches* ; and *neighbor churches should be ready to send their elders and other delegates to help them with their advice and counsel*."

\* Order of the Churches, p. 74.

To these testimonies from our Ecclesiastical fathers, numerous others might be added of more recent date. The truth is, a communion of churches has been uniformly practised by the Orthodox of New England, and is an essential feature of the Congregational system. A member in regular standing in one of our churches, is admitted to communion in all of them. A minister, regularly inducted according to the usages of our churches, is regarded and treated as a minister, wherever he may be called to labor. In the formation of churches; in the ordination and dismissal of ministers; in cases of difficulty between ministers and people, or between the different members of a church; in short, whenever, in the judgement of a church, occasion requires, it has been customary to ask the assistance of neighboring churches, and this has been cheerfully and uniformly rendered. Nor is it left wholly to the option of churches, whether they shall seek advice and assistance in the circumstances above mentioned. "So far from this," as Professor Upham remarks, "if they neglect, in cases of evident necessity, to consult with neighboring churches by way of Council, it is considered as matter of *just offence to them.*"

I have shown already that, previous to the revolution, the communion of churches was to some extent incorporated with our laws. It may be added, that the decisions of our highest tribunals still give to it the force of law. "In a proper case," says Chief Justice Parsons, "for the advice of an ecclesiastical Council, if either party offer to the other such a Council to be mutually chosen, and the other, without sufficient cause, refuse to join in the choice, the party offering may choose an ecclesiastical Council, and the advice of the Council thus chosen, and acting fairly and honestly, will justify either party in adopting their result."\*

It should be a grateful task to the members of our churches, and to all who cherish the principles on which they are founded, to look back and compare them with those of the Apostles. The coincidences, in most points, are close and striking. There was not in the Apostles' time one great, national, universal church, swallowing up all others, and subject to the control of a monarch, or a Pope. The churches then, as with us now, were distinct organizations. They had their individual rights, which not even Apostolical authority would invade. Still, between these individual churches, as between ours at present, there subsisted very intimate and endearing relations. They were far from practising a strict and exclusive independency. They acknowledged mutual responsibilities, and by all suitable methods maintained fellowship and communion one with another.

\* Mass. Term Reports, vol. 9, p. 238.

Builded thus on the sacred foundation of the Apostles, it becomes us to guard against innovations and encroachments. There is danger now, as there ever has been, on either hand. Ambition, a love of preferment, a thirst of power, once trampled on the rights of individual churches, and swallowed them up in a rapacious hierarchy. The same evil propensities remain in the human breast, and they may again attempt a similar usurpation. They need, therefore, to be watched with a sleepless vigilance. The emancipated churches have need to be exhorted, to 'stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free, and never more to be entangled with the yoke of bondage.'

On the other hand, the love of liberty has too often resulted in licentiousness. It has broken over the holiest barriers, and trampled on the most sacred things, turning order, harmony and peace into confusion, anarchy and blood. The love of liberty needs therefore to be watched,—and not less in matters connected with the church, than in those of the state. Under a pretended zeal for the liberty and independence of particular churches, a man may become a perfect leveller. He may adopt principles at war with the rights, and with the very existence of the churches. The bonds of union and fellowship between the different branches of the Christian community may be severed, and the plainest principles of the gospel be violated.

Our safety will be to drink deep of the spirit of the Saviour; walk closely by the venerable usages of our fathers, wherein these correspond with the rules of the Apostles; and strive together for the faith, the purity and order of the gospel. Thus our churches may be preserved to future generations—may go down in beauty and glory to Millennial scenes—and never cease, till, with all the different portions of Christ's visible kingdom, they are swallowed up at length in the general, invisible church of the first born, whose names are written in heaven.

---

## REVIEWS.

**THE ARTICLES OF THE SYNOD OF DORT; and its Rejection of Errors; with the History of Events which made way for that Synod, as published by the authority of the States General, and the Documents confirming its Decisions, Translated from the Latin, with Notes, Remarks, and References.** By THOMAS SCOTT, Rector of Aston Sandford, Bucks. London: Seeley and Hatchard. 1818. pp. 185.

THE doctrines of the Reformers began to prevail in the Low Countries as early as the year 1521. The way had been in some

measure prepared for them by the learning and labors of Erasmus, who was a native of Rotterdam, and who preceded Luther by several years. Notwithstanding the efforts of the Emperor, Charles V. to extirpate the growing heresy, it continued to spread in all directions, and multitudes declared themselves in its favor. Philip, the son and successor of Charles, was even more violent than his father, in his endeavors to stay the progress of truth, and support the sinking cause of Rome. "He augmented the number of the bishops, enacted the most severe and barbarous laws against all innovators in matters of religion, and erected that unjust and inhuman tribunal of the *inquisition*, which would intimidate and tame, as he thought, the manly spirit of an oppressed and persecuted people. But his measures, in this respect, were as unsuccessful as they were absurd; his furious and intemperate zeal for the superstitions of Rome accelerated their destruction; and the papal authority, which had only been in a critical state, was reduced to a desperate one, by the very steps that were designed to support it. The nobility formed themselves into an *association*, in the year 1566, with a view to procure the repeal of his tyrannical edicts; but their solicitations and requests being treated with contempt, they resolved to obtain by force, what they hoped to have gained from clemency and justice. They addressed themselves to a free and an abused people, spurned the authority of a cruel yoke, and with an impetuosity and vehemence that were perhaps excessive, trampled upon whatever was held sacred or respectable by the church of Rome. To quell these tumults, a powerful army was sent from Spain, under the command of the Duke of Alva, whose horrid barbarity and sanguinary proceedings kindled that long and bloody war from which the powerful republic of the United Provinces derived its origin, consistence and grandeur. It was the heroic conduct of William of Nassau, prince of Orange, seconded by the succours of England and France, that delivered this state from the Spanish yoke." This valiant prince fell by the hand of an assassin A. D. 1584. His murderer confessed that he was instigated to destroy him by the Jesuits, who "assured him, if he died in the attempt, that he should be placed among the martyrs."

The Confession of faith of the Low Countries, commonly called the Belgic Confession, was published in the year 1563. It accords with the Confessions of the other Reformed Churches, establishing the Presbyterian form of government, and embracing all those points of doctrine which have usually been denominated Calvinistic. It was afterwards confirmed by repeated Synods, and by repeated acts of the States. Other sects were tolerated, not excepting the Papists; but the established religion was that of the Reformed churches, as set forth in the Confession to which we have referred. Great harmony prevailed in the churches of these countries from the period of their establishment "till the close of the sixteenth

century, when attempts were first made to disturb their peace by certain proselytes from Popery, which were repressed by the Provincial Synods."

A more formidable assault was now to be made, the circumstances of which we shall briefly detail. Our principal authority is the History contained in the work before us, which was "drawn up and published by the authority, and under the sanction of the States General and the Prince of Orange, as well as of the Synod of Dort itself, and refers in every part to the public records of the transactions in question."

"No history," says Mr. Scott, "can be attested as authentic, in a more satisfactory and unexceptionable manner; for, whatever degree of coloring, prejudice or partiality may be supposed to have given to the narration; it can hardly be conceived that collective bodies and individuals filling such conspicuous and exalted stations, would expressly attest any thing *directly false*; and then appeal to authorities, by which the falsehood of their statement might at any time be detected and exposed."

We have consulted also, and compared at every step, Brandt's History of the Reformation in the Low Countries, Hale's and Balcanquall's Letters and Expresses concerning the Synod of Dort, and such other sources of information as could be obtained, and seemed to be necessary.

James Hermanson (commonly called Arminius) was born at Oudewater, in Holland, in the year 1560.\* Having lost his father in infancy, he was taken under the protection of a priest who had recently renounced the Romish faith, from whom he received the first rudiments of education. At the age of fifteen, while at school at Marpurg, his native town was pillaged by the Spaniards, and his mother, sisters, brothers, and the greater part of the inhabitants, were inhumanly slain. From Marpurg, he went to Leyden, and passed through the University then recently established at that place. We next find him at Geneva, attending the lectures of Theodore Beza; and then at Basle, where he was offered a doctorate in theology at the early age of twenty-two. He left Switzerland for Italy,—from which country he returned after a few months, under the unfounded imputation of having abjured the reformed religion and become a Papist. He was settled in the ministry at Amsterdam in the year 1588, in which situation he continued for the next fifteen years.

During the early part of his ministry here, his theological views underwent an important change. While preparing to refute a work in opposition to the then commonly received doctrine of predestination, he became a convert to the views he was designing

\* This Review was chiefly written before receiving the last number of the *Biblical Repository*, which contains a long article by Professor Stuart, entitled "The Creed of Arminius, with a sketch of his Life and Times." If any of our statements shall seem not entirely to coincide with those of the Professor, it will be borne in mind, that some of our principal authorities, particularly the History translated by Mr. Scott, and Hale's Golden Remains, he had not seen.

to expose, and carried them even further than the author he was examining. He renounced the doctrines of absolute decrees, of particular election and atonement, and of irresistible grace, and held that none are chosen to eternal life, but in consequence of foreseen faith and holiness. This change in his sentiments excited attention and opposition, but by prudent management, and the concurring authority of the magistrates, he was enabled to retain his place.

In the year 1603, Arminius was appointed to succeed the learned Junius, as Professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden. This appointment was opposed by many of the clergy, on account of the suspicions which rested upon him as to the soundness of his faith; but having abjured the errors with which he was charged, and "*promised that he would teach nothing which differed from the received doctrine of the churches*, he was admitted to the professorship." So much in earnest was he at this time to clear himself of the suspicion of heresy, that he is said to have defended, in his public disputations, the principal articles of the Calvinistic faith.\*

He had not been long, however, in his new employment, before it was ascertained "that he privately attacked most of the doctrines of the reformed churches, called them into doubt, and rendered them suspected to his scholars." "His learning and eloquence procured him converts among both the Belgic pastors and students; but this excited, as might be expected, the displeasure of many of his brethren. Application was first privately made to Arminius, to state his objections to the received doctrine in a friendly conference; but he declined the proposal. A complaint was then preferred by the Classis of Dort to the Synod of the province of South Holland. In order to escape from this, Arminius resorted to his old artifices, and "procured a testimonial from his colleagues, in which it was declared, 'That indeed more things were disputed among the students, than it was agreeable to them; but that among the Professors of sacred Theology themselves, as far as it appeared to them, *there was no dissensions in fundamentals.*'" The Synod, however, were not to be deceived. They required that the Professors of Theology should publicly disavow the opinions imputed to them, and that all the pastors should testify their consent in doctrine, by subscribing the received Confession and Catechism.

Not succeeding in either of these measures, they next "petitioned the States General to convene a National Synod, for the purpose of composing their religious differences. To this the States General agreed,—declaring, however, that some of that body were instructed to add, as the condition of such an Assembly, that there should be

\* "This he did contrary to his own opinion, as John Arnoldi Corvinus," one of his followers, "in a certain Dutch writing ingeniously confesses." Scott, p. 13.

a revision of the established Confession and Catechism—a clause which evidently betrayed the conviction of those who supported it, that the new opinions were not consonant to the received doctrine of the churches. A Convention was held for the purpose of arranging the plan of proceeding in the proposed National Synod; but the sentiments of the respective partizans were so opposed to each other, that nothing could be determined.”

In this Convention, Arminius and those connected with him were requested, “with the *strongest obtestation*,” to state to the other Professors and Pastors their objections to the received Confession and Catechism,—“a promise being added that they would bestow pains fully to satisfy them,” and that nothing to their disadvantage should be communicated beyond the place where they then were. But Arminius could not be induced to comply with this request.

Having failed in this first attempt to obtain a National Synod; the project of a Provincial Synod of the churches of North and South Holland was next resorted to. To avoid this, Arminius petitioned the States General, that cognizance should be taken of his cause by the *lay Counsellors* of the Supreme Court.” His request was granted; and a conference between him and Gomarus, his colleague and principal opposer, was accordingly held in presence of the Council. The result was, a report to the States General, that “the controversy between the two professors was not of much importance, but regarded some subtle disputes about predestination which might be safely merged in a mutual toleration.”

Both parties, however, continued to pursue their respective plans as before; the Arminians refusing to state their objections to the received doctrines of the church, and endeavoring to avoid, or postpone, all ecclesiastical assemblies for the discussion of disputed points; while the opposite party were as earnestly striving to convene them. In June 1608, Arminius found himself compelled to state his opinions. This he did at considerable length in his famous *Declaratio* before the States of Holland; and it is worthy of notice, that his objections to the received doctrine of predestination are as fairly and unreservedly stated in the History before us, as they could have been by Arminius himself. He made a similar exposition of his sentiments, in a second conference with Gomarus, in the Convention of the States General, early in the following year. Arminius at this time complained of ill health; and in October, 1609, he died.

The disputes which he had occasioned in the Belgic churches did not, however, die with him. They continued to be agitated with unabated violence, and with nearly equal success. The followers of Arminius, when their leader had left his concealment, and consented to make a public declaration of his views, became exceedingly bold and open in their objections to the established faith.



They are represented as "defaming the received doctrine with horrible calumnies, and raging furiously (*debacchari*) against it."

In the year 1610, the leading Arminians entered into a formal confederacy, and thus became an organized body. It was at this time they presented to the States of Holland their celebrated Remonstrance, from which they were afterwards called *Remonstrants*. This remonstrance contained their objections to the received doctrines, under five heads, sometimes denominated the five points of Calvinism; also an exhibition of their own views in five articles, often referred to in the subsequent parts of this controversy. By studious efforts, this paper was, for a considerable time, kept out of the hands of the other Pastors, so that no answer could be given to it.

It was through the influence of the Arminians, or (as we shall now call them) the Remonstrants, that Conrad Vorstius, who was strongly suspected, and with good reason,\* of being an Anti-Trinitarian, was elected to the theological chair at Leyden, made vacant by the death of Arminius. Vorstius, however, did not long reside at Leyden, though he was not dismissed from his Professorship until after the conclusion of the Synod of Dort. These divines succeeded also in procuring an injunction from the States of Holland, that nothing further should be enjoined on the theological students, upon the subjects of predestination and grace, than what was expressed in the five articles of their Remonstrance. These articles were discussed by the contending parties in a public conference at the Hague, in the year 1611. The authors of them continued to insist upon a mutual toleration,—a measure which at this time might have been adopted, *provided they would have renounced the errors of Socinianism*. But to this they objected, and their opponents again appealed to a national Synod.

Emboldened by the magistrates, many of whom were understood to favor their cause, the Remonstrants proceeded to acts of violence.

"They labored assiduously with all their powers, that the pastors who especially resisted their attempts should not only be cast out of their ministerial stations, but out of the cities themselves; and that on all the churches which were deprived of pastors, even when reluctant and struggling against it, those should be obtruded, who were addicted to their own opinions; all others being excluded wherever they were able, though excellently furnished with learning, piety, and necessary endowments, and lawfully sought out and called by the church."

\* Vorstius, at the time of his election, indignantly repelled the charge of heresy, and would not admit that he was so much as an Arian. Yet it is evident from a confession which he made near the close of life, that he had long been an Anti-Trinitarian. "I positively declare, as I have done formerly, that *I make a difference* between the Lord Jesus, Son of God, our only and eternal Saviour, and Him, who is the *only true God Almighty*." See Abridgement of Brandt's History of the Reformation, pp. 310 and 724.

In some places, persons under the influence of the Remonstrants, those lovers of toleration, had recourse to arms; the lawful magistrates were compelled to resign; and the officers of the churches were not only deposed, but cast out of the cities. In this way, Cornelius Gezelius, one of the ministers of Rotterdam, was deprived of his ministry, and driven out of the city by the licitors.

In the year 1613, another conference was held at Delft, in hope of accommodating existing differences; but, as might have been expected, nothing effectual was done. The Remonstrants were violent for toleration, as they termed it, insisting that the points in dispute were of small importance, and might be mutually overlooked. On other occasions, they had represented these points as of very great importance,—affirming that the views of their opponents “subverted the gospel, hindered the ministry of the word, and overturned the foundations, not only of the Christian religion, but of all religion.” To promote the cause in which they were now engaged, a formula of toleration was drawn up, and the attempt was made to *compel* subscription to it by force of law. A decree in favor of toleration was passed in the States of Holland, which the pastors were commanded “to obey without any contradiction. And that they might the more easily prefer those who were attached to their party to the ministries of the churches, others having been excluded, they effected that another decree should be joined to this,” taking the choice of pastors in great measure from the church, and putting it into the hands of the magistracy.\*

An immediate consequence of this measure was, the churches refused to acknowledge those as pastors who were imposed upon them by the authority of the magistrate; separations were multiplied; and the separatists were severely persecuted.

“When many pious men were punished by fines, prisons, and banishments, they appealed to the supreme tribunal of justice, and implored assistance against force; and when now the most ample the Senators of the supreme court attempted to succor the oppressed, they (the Remonstrants) obtained by the advocate of Holland, (Barneveldt) that an interdict should be laid on the same court, from protecting them.†”

In the year 1617, the necessity for a national Synod began to be generally felt and acknowledged. It was earnestly recommended by the Prince of Orange, and by several foreign princes, particularly by James I of England. It was as earnestly opposed, however, by the Remonstrants, who, when they found that by no persuasion or

\* It is painful to record that the learned Grotius, at this time Pensionary of Rotterdam, was a principal instrument in these violent measures, and afterwards published an Apology for them.

† “What must the modern advocates for toleration, think of that toleration, which these men pleaded for, while thus employed in persecution; men who have rendered their opponents odious even to this day, as enemies to toleration, for rejecting their illegal measures!?”

management they should be able to prevent it, had the madness to excite the people to arms.

"The rulers of some cities, having made a conspiracy, decreed to levy soldiers, who should be bound by oath, neither to the most powerful the States General, nor to the Illustrious the Prince of Orange, the Commander in chief of the army, but to themselves alone, for the defence of the cause of the Remonstrants, and of their own authority; which for the sake of the same (cause) they had exposed to danger. This was done at Utrecht, in which city the most powerful the States General had a garrison sufficiently strong against tumults and seditions; at Harlem, Leyda, Rotterdam, as also Gouda, Schookhove, Horn, and other places; the Remonstrants instigating the magistrates of the cities, to this, as may be clearly proved by *discers of their letters*, which afterwards came into the hands of the States. And thus the dissensions of the Remonstrants would have brought these flourishing provinces into the danger of a civil war, if this madness had not been early repressed, by the singular prudence of the most powerful the States General, and by the vigilance and fortitude of mind, never to be sufficiently celebrated of the Illustrious the Prince of Orange."\*

These measures only served to show more clearly the necessity of a National Synod, and to hasten its approach. Accordingly it was decreed that the Synod should be holden at Dordrecht (or Dort) in November, 1618.

At this celebrated Synod, ecclesiastical deputies were present, not only from the United Provinces, but from the churches of England, Scotland, Hesse, Bremen, Switzerland, and the Palatinate. The foreign Divines present were twenty-eight; those of the United Provinces were thirty-six, besides five professors, and twenty elders. The Synod was organized Nov. 13th, and continued by adjournments, until May 29th, having held, in all, 180 sessions. John Bogerman was appointed Moderator, and Sebastian Damman and Festus Hommius Secretaries. Commissioners of the States were present at all the sessions, of whom Daniel Heinsius was Secretary. The following oath was taken by the members.

"I promise before God, in whom I believe, and whom I worship, as being present in this place, and as being the searcher of hearts, that during the course of the affairs of this Synod, which will examine and decide not only the five points, and all the difficulties resulting from them, but also any other doctrine, I shall use no human writing, but only the word of God, which is an infallible rule of faith. And during all those discussions, I shall only aim at the glory of God, the peace of the church, and especially the preservation of the purity of doctrine. Thus help me, my Saviour Jesus Christ. I beseech him to assist me with his Holy Spirit."

Soon after the commencement of the sessions, thirteen of the principal Remonstrant divines were summoned to appear, and defend their cause before the Synod. While waiting for these, the Synod took measures for a new translation of the Bible into the Dutch language, and discussed several important subjects, such as the baptizing and catechising of children.

On the 6th of December, the Remonstrants who had been summoned appeared in the assembly. They protested against the

\* Grotius and Hogerbeets were at Utrecht, endeavoring to excite the people, and put the city in a posture of defence, when the Prince of Orange came against it. He succeeded, however, in taking it, and these two men were sent to prison, where Barnevelt was already confined.

authority of the Synod, and refused to acknowledge its members as their judges. Their protest was condemned by the foreign Divines, and they were required to prepare for their examination and defence. After much debate respecting the order and manner of discussing the disputed subjects, which occasioned a long and tedious delay, on the 14th of Jan. 1619, the Remonstrants were dismissed from the assembly. The question of their dismissal was submitted to the foreign Divines, and by them decided in the affirmative. They had liberty, however, to transmit in writing whatever they pleased, with a view "to explain or defend their doctrine"—a liberty of which they largely availed themselves.\* The Synod proceeded, in their absence, to gather their sentiments from their books, and to judge of them from what they had published. The business now proceeded with as much harmony, perhaps, as was consistent with a full liberty of thought and remark, and with as much despatch as could be expected, considering the manner in which things were done.

"The confusion here in handling business," says Mr. Balcanqual, the Scotch deputy, "is very great. They do not know how to put anything to committees to agree of business, and then afterward to propound it to the Synod to be approved or disproved, which hath been the custom observed in all Councils and Synods; but nothing is known till it be propounded in the Synod, and then *there are almost as many several voices as heads.*"

At length, the several articles of the Remonstrants were examined, and, it was supposed, refuted; the Canons of the Synod were prepared; and, on the 23d of April, were subscribed by all the members. The sentence passed upon the Remonstrants, by which they were "deprived of their ministerial and academical functions," was not assented to by the foreign divines, on the ground that "they would pass no sentence upon the subjects of another state."

By request of the Commissioners of the States, the Synod went into an examination of the Confession and Catechism of the Belgic churches; and both symbols, so far as relates to doctrines, were unanimously approved. When these things were accomplished, the foreign divines took their leave; after which the Synod continued to meet for several weeks to transact business of a more private nature. The sessions closed, as already stated, May 29th, 1619.

In a late number (p. 135,) we published what purports to be an abridgement of the articles of the Synod of Dort, by Daniel Tile-nus, with Mr. Scott's remarks on the same. We here present our

\* Feb. 7th, the Remonstrants presented to the Synod a manuscript in defence of their first and second articles, consisting of 204 sheets. Balcanqual says it was "as large as a small history of the martyrs." Feb. 15th, they presented another, explaining their third, fourth, and fifth articles, consisting of 60 sheets. Feb. 25th, they presented a third, containing 80 sheets. March 19th, they presented a fourth containing 333 sheets!! They were charged with a design "to tire the Synod." We think they must, at least, have tired themselves.

readers with another abstract or abridgement of these articles, by the conductors of the (London) Christian Observer, contained in their Review of the work before us. Vol. xviii, p. 794.

“The disputed points, it is well known, respected the Divine Predestination, the extent of man’s Redemption by the death of Christ, the nature of Human corruption and conversion to God, and the perseverance of the saints.

It is by no means our intention to give any extended view of the sentiments held by the contending parties on these difficult points. We shall content ourselves with briefly stating the leading opinions asserted by the Synod. The decree of election is affirmed to be without any view to foreseen faith or worthiness; and *the fruits of election*, such as faith in Christ, true repentance, love to God, and obedience to his commandments, the only ground upon which it can be assumed. The preterition or reprobation of the non-elect is distinctly acknowledged. The death of Christ is asserted to be abundantly sufficient, as an atonement, for the sins of the whole world. All, it is said, are commanded to repent and believe the Gospel, and are sincerely invited to come unto Christ. The unbelief of men is declared to proceed from their own fault. Faith and repentance, which are the free gifts of God, are said to be infallibly bestowed on the elect. The grace of the Holy Spirit in conversion is stated, however, not to operate in a violent or compulsory manner, but in strict accordance with the nature of man, illuminating the understanding, and effectually inclining the will.

Finally, true believers are said to be preserved by the power of God through faith, and repentance where they fall into sin, unto salvation. At the close of each of the preceding articles is annexed a condemnation of the opposite errors, comprising the substance of the Socinian and Pelagian heresies. The Synod solemnly renounced those abuses, and absurd and impious consequences, which were so commonly urged by their opponents against the doctrines which they had unfolded; and earnestly exhorted the pastors under their authority, to adhere closely to the sentiments and language of Scripture, and carefully to avoid every expression which might appear to exceed the limits of its genuine meaning. The decision of the Synod against the Remonstrants follows; in which the pastors, magistrates, and instructors of youth, are admonished to preserve and inculcate the wholesome doctrine which had been propounded, and to use their utmost endeavors to recover those who were in error. The Remonstrants themselves are interdicted from every ecclesiastical function, until they should repent and be reconciled to the church.”

Respecting the articles of the Synod, the venerable Mr. Scott observes. “Fewer things appear to me unscriptural in these articles, than in almost any human composition which I have read upon the subject.” Again, he expresses the opinion, that “the doctrines of Scriptural Christianity are here so stated and explained, as to coincide with the strictest practical views of our holy religion;

and so as greatly to encourage and promote genuine holiness, considered in its most expanded nature, and in its effects on all our tempers, affections, words, and actions, in relation to God and to all mankind." He speaks further of the "holy, guarded, and reverential manner in which the divines of this reprobated Synod stated and explained the doctrines of the Gospel, compared with the superficial, incautious, and often unholy and presumptuous manner of too many at the present day."

Perhaps no religious convocation has been so perpetually traduced, and has suffered so much from the misrepresentations of enemies, as the Synod of Dort. We have an instance of this in the gross perversion of its articles, under the name of an abridgement, noticed by us in a previous number. Other instances not more justifiable may be easily adduced.

Without designing to refute the insinuation of Brandt, that some of its members were frequently intoxicated with Rhenish wine; how often is it represented that the Synod was convened by a mere faction, and with a view to gratify the spleen of Maurice, Prince of Orange.\* In reply to this, Mr. Scott remarks as follows:

"It seems undeniable, that it became the general and almost universal opinion of the different States in the confederated provinces, that such a national Synod, as the Contra-Remonstrants always had urgently requested, was become absolutely and indispensably needful; and that the Remonstrants and their party could no longer resist this generally prevailing sentiment. Indeed, nothing can be more clear, than that all parties, except the zealous Remonstrants, regarded a national Synod as the proper and only effectual way of terminating the controversial disturbances; and not only sanctioned by the example of Christians in every age, but enjoined by God himself."

The members of the Synod, it is said, "were actuated only by the spirit of theological *hatred and contention*;" and hence "their opinions are deserving only of contempt and reprobation."

"Now this," says the Christian Observer, "is so far from being true, that we think no candid person, whatever may be his sentiments on the controverted points, can fail of doing justice to the apparent piety and holiness which characterize all their proceedings. Even allowing them to be erroneous, there seems to be no just ground for accusing them of inveterate malice. It was perfectly natural that the Belgic pastors should be alarmed at the progress of opinions which threatened to overturn their whole system of ecclesiastical discipline, as well as religious doctrine, and that they should conscientiously endeavor to resist and suppress them."

It has been represented, that not a few of the foreign members were greatly dissatisfied with the proceedings of the Synod, and regretted exceedingly that they had been present at it. One of them in particular is quoted as exclaiming, "O Dort, Dort, would to God I had never seen thee!" The person who is reported to have used these words was Martinus of Bremen, a man who had much trouble in the Synod with some of the members, and who Brandt supposes "was a downright Arminian." He kept up a

\* "*Mauritio auctore,*" is the language of Mosheim, in regard to this celebrated Synod.

secret intercourse with the Remonstrants during the sessions,\* and was evidently more in their interest than in that of those with whom he was connected.

The declaration of the excellent Bishop Hall, then Dean of Worcester, and one of the deputies from England, has not been so frequently quoted as the foregoing exclamation of Martinus. Hall was obliged to leave the Synod before its close, on account of the state of his health. "It has been said," says Brandt, "that under *pretence* of an indisposition he cunningly got away, that he might have no hand in several things which he foresaw." But how does this comport with the following declaration of Hall, which he made to the Synod at his departure: "*There is no place upon earth so like heaven as the Synod of Dort, and none where I should be more willing to dwell.*"

It is intimated by Goodwin, in an Arminian publication, entitled "Redemption Redeemed," that the members of the Synod of Dort were bound by a *secret oath*, before entering on their work, to condemn the Remonstrants. This slanderous suggestion Bishop Hall, when far advanced in life, indignantly repelled, declaring that no oath was ever taken by the members, or required of them, except that which we have given on a preceding page.†

Among other things charged to the account of this Synod, are the imprisonment of Grotius and Hogerbeets, and the execution of Barnevelt. But it is certain that all these men were imprisoned before the assembling of the Synod, and that their arrest and sentence were occasioned rather by *political* than religious considerations. We do not mean to assert that they were not deeply concerned in the religious disputes of the day, or that political measures *growing out of these disputes* might not have been the means of their overthrow. But they were in a different party in the *state* from the Prince of Orange; he regarded them as in a conspiracy against the government of the Provinces; and as his party prevailed over theirs, it was deemed necessary to take them out of the way. How far they were guilty of *all* that was alleged against them, we pretend not to say. At any rate, the Synod of Dort, which did not convene until months after their arrest, could have had no concern in their imprisonment.

The reasons why this Synod has been misrepresented and slandered in the manner here pointed out are not difficult to be conceived.—In the first place, it is no new thing for the cause of God and

\* "Feb. 8th, Martinus of Bremen sent word to Poppius, a Remonstrant minister, that he desired to see him *in the night upon the new bridge*. He came to Poppius in a very civil manner, and told him that he had heard of his learning and piety, and was exceedingly desirous to pay him his respects; but that his affairs and the wickedness of the times had prevented it till then, for it was a thing that required *prudence*. He added that he would not side with any party against his conscience," &c.

† His Letter on this subject, as well as his address, quoted above, on leaving the Synod, may be seen entire in Fuller's History of the Church of England.

truth to be reproached and slandered by the world. And more especially may this be expected, when the servants of God furnish some occasion to those who seek it (as we think they did in this instance) to speak reproachfully. In the excited state of feeling existing among the clergy of the United provinces, at the time of convening the Synod, it was scarcely possible that they should meet, and discuss points of difference, in a perfectly unexceptionable manner. Things, it might be expected, would be said and done, which would not bear the scrutiny of impartial eyes, at a distance of more than two centuries from the scene of action. That such things were said and done in the Synod of Dort, we shall by no means deny. In most instances, however, they are to be attributed to a few heated individuals, rather than to the whole body; or they are to be resolved into the spirit of the age, and cannot fairly be judged of by the maxims of the nineteenth century. Such as they are, however, they have furnished occasion to liberalists and infidels in every succeeding generation, and in almost every part of the world, to cast reproach upon the proceedings of the Synod.

It will be evident to all, who carefully examine the articles of the Synod, that *too much* is attempted in them. As a formula of faith to be authoritatively enjoined, they go too much into the minutæ of doctrine, and into explanations, which might more properly be left to the discretion of individuals.

“The very exactness, and particularity, into which, what I must judge scriptural doctrine is branched out, and errors reprobated, powerfully counteracted the intended effect, and probably, more than anything else, or all things combined, has brought on this Synod such decided but unmerited odium and reproach.”

“The terms of communion, even where none are molested who decline them, and of being public teachers, should by no means be carried into all the minutæ of doctrine, which perhaps the ablest theologians are convinced to be scriptural. They should include only the grand principles, in which all the humble disciples and pious ministers of Christ agree; and not those in which they are left to differ. ‘Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations.’”

That which, more than anything else, has brought reproach upon the Synod of Dort, is the rigorous treatment with which its decisions were followed. The sentence of the Synod merely deprived the Remonstrants of their ministerial and academical functions, until they should renounce their errors, and be willing to return to the faith of the church. But on their refusing to cease from the labors of the ministry, they were ordered, by the authority of the States, into immediate exile. Their assemblies were suppressed; and in some instances, when found assembled in disobedience to the laws, they were dispersed by force of arms, and their leaders were punished by fines and imprisonment. It is painful to record proceedings so disgraceful as these, and so abhorrent to the spirit of the Gospel. They are not, indeed, directly chargeable upon



the Synod of Dort; still, as they grew out of the acts of that body, they have been seized upon by its enemies as an occasion of reproach.

It has been often said, and must be repeated till it is better understood, that such proceedings were accordant with the *spirit of that age*, and would have been resorted to by any party who possessed the power. There is, at least, abundant evidence, in the previous acts of the Remonstrants—in the readiness they manifested to enact laws, inflict penalties, and *employ arms* to promote their cause—that, had they prevailed on this occasion, their adversaries would not have met with a milder treatment than that which themselves were called to suffer.

The reproach which has fallen upon the Synod of Dort may be in part accounted for, from the fact that so many men of learning and influence, historians, philcosophers, statesmen, professors, preachers—as Grotius, Vossius, Bertius, Episcopius, LeClerc, Brandt, Limborch, Heylin, &c. &c. were strongly enlisted on the side of its adversaries. Men such as these would be able to bring reproach upon any cause to which they were decidedly and conscientiously opposed; while the weight of their names has given currency and influence to their works, and carried them to almost every part of the earth.

To all this it must be added, that soon after the suppression of Arminianism in the United Provinces, the established clergy began to dispute among themselves. There were the Cocceians, Voetians, Roellians, the Veschorists and Hattemists, followers of different leaders whose names are now almost forgotten, but who created not a little disturbance in the age in which they lived, and withdrew the attention of their brethren from the efforts of those who were misrepresenting and defaming them before the world.

With a few remarks on the character and tendency of those errors which the Synod of Dort was convened to examine, this discussion will be concluded.

It is not likely that Arminius ever disclosed very publicly all his objections to the established religion of his country. The disclosures which he made were literally wrung from him;\* and in all probability they were not more full than the necessity of the case required. He showed himself capable of concealing his sentiments at the time of his accepting the Professorship at Leyden; and similar evasions were charged upon him, to the end of life. He was publicly declared to have departed from the doctrines of

\* In the Synod of South Holland, held in the autumn of the year 1608, Arminius and his followers were enjoined to make known their objections to the received doctrines within the space of one month, "under the penalty of incurring the ecclesiastical censure against the contumacious." It was to escape this censure that he published, soon after, his famous *Declaratio* before the States of Holland.

the church, not only on the *five points*, so called, but in his notions of "justification, original sin, the providence of God, the authority of the sacred Scriptures, the assurance of salvation, the perfection of man in this life, and some other" subjects, and to teach differently in private, from what he did in public. In his *Declaratio*, he affirms, that on the point of *justification*, he is "not conscious of having thought or said any thing different from what the reformed and protestant churches believe," and that he is "ready to subscribe with his own hand" to the sentiments of Calvin on the subject. But in a conference previously held before the counsellors of the Supreme Court, Gomar "produced his own very words, written out from the hand writing of the same Arminius, in which he asserts, that in the justification of man before God, *the righteousness of Christ is not imputed for righteousness, but that faith itself, or the act of believing* (*τὸ credere*) by the gracious acceptance of God, *is that righteousness by which we are justified.*"

The Translator of Mosheim, who certainly had no prejudices against Arminius, expresses the following opinion in regard to his religious sentiments :

"It is a common opinion, that the ancient Arminians, who flourished before the synod of Dort, were much more sound in their opinions, and strict in their morals, than those who have lived after this period ; that Arminius himself only rejected the Calvinistical doctrine of absolute decrees, and what he took to be its immediate consequences, adopting in all other points the doctrines received in the reformed churches ; but that his disciples, and more especially Episcopius, had boldly transgressed the bounds that had been wisely prescribed by their master, and had gone over to the Pelagians, and even to the Socinians. Such, I say, is the opinion commonly entertained concerning this matter. But it appears, on the contrary, evident to me, that Arminius himself had laid the plan of that theological system, that was, in after times, embraced by his followers, and that he had instilled the main principles of it into the minds of his disciples ; and that these latter, and particularly Episcopius, did really no more than bring this plan to a greater degree of perfection, and propagate, with more courage and perspicuity, the doctrines it contained."

But we are not now so directly concerned with Arminius, as with his survivors and followers, whose views were canvassed and censured in the Synod of Dort. It is generally supposed that their departure from the established faith was limited to the five points, insisted on in their celebrated Remonstrance to the States. But we have sufficient evidence that such was not the fact. The toleration of which they professed to be so desirous, "was offered them in a Conference held at the Hague, A. D. 1611, *provided they would renounce the errors of Socinianism ;*"\* but they declined to accept it on these terms. Again, in a Conference at Delft, A. D. 1613, they might have secured the toleration which they sought, "provided they would assure the churches, by a sincere and open declaration, that they thought differently from the reformed churches *in no other heads of doctrine except the five*

\* Mosheim's Eccl. Hist. vol. v. p. 424.

articles" contained in their Remonstrance. Scott, p. 70. But such a declaration they refused to make. Is not here evidence conclusive that they had other objections to the established faith of the Belgic churches, besides those which they had avowed to the States. The zeal also with which they advocated the election of Vorstius, and endeavored to support him, who certainly was a Unitarian, and who (after all his shifts) confessed himself such near the close of life, is evidence to the same point.

The result of the speculations of Arminius and his associates is full of instruction to the church. We see in it that the beginnings of error, like those of strife, are "as when one letteth out water." The stream may be small at first, but it enlarges as it runs, and its course is ever downward. Arminius began, with questioning the received doctrine respecting predestination. Pleased with the new views which he fancied he had discovered, he proceeded to investigate other subjects in quest of novelties. He was uniformly backward to disclose his peculiar sentiments, and most of the points which he publicly avowed would not be considered by the Orthodox of the present day as essentially erroneous. We could ourselves as well subscribe to them, as to the Hyper-Calvinism of some of his opponents. It is not at all likely, however, that he ever fully unfolded himself, except to his pupils and particular friends, and the whole extent of his departures from the high way of truth will not probably be known, until the day when all hearts are revealed.

His disciples were more bold and decided than their master, and many of them pursued their speculations to much greater lengths. In instances not a few, those who commenced their course Arminians, ended it in Socinianism or Infidelity.

On the death of Maurice, Prince of Orange, and the accession of his brother, which took place in the year 1625, the Remonstrant exiles were recalled and restored to favor. As a sect, however, the Arminians have never been numerous. They have prevailed chiefly, by silently mingling with other sects, corrupting their churches, and, without a change of name or form, bringing them over to their views. In this way, the originally Calvinistic church of England became Arminian, under the administration of Archbishop Laud. The church of Scotland, we fear, has not fared much better. From the parent country, the error was brought, about one hundred years ago, into New England, and silently infected many of the churches of the Pilgrims.

Arminianism has assumed a variable character, not only in its outward form, but in its internal, practical influence. In the hands of Wesley and his followers, it is warm, stirring, arousing, and effective. It has awakened many from the slumbers of sin, and brought them to hope and trust in the Saviour. But in other hands, the same general system (if it can be called the same) is

cold, formal, and inoperative. It incorporates easily with the world, sets itself in opposition to the doctrines of grace, and is perpetually running down into Unitarianism and infidelity.

LETTERS TO REV. JOEL HAWES, D. D. in *Review of his Tribute to the Memory of the Pilgrims*. By SAMUEL J. MAY, Pastor of the first Church in Brooklyn, Conn. Hartford: Philemon Canfield. 1831. pp. 72.

THIS pamphlet contains five Letters, on the following subjects: "Fundamental articles of Faith;" "the Primitive Churches;" "Doctrines of the Reformation;" "the Pilgrims;" and "on certain Charges and Insinuations against Unitarians." They are, in many parts, little more than an echo to Mr. Whitman's Letters—written with less ability, though in a better spirit. Mr. May evidently had read the stories of Whitman with great interest and admiration. He assumes his statements as true, and falls with him into a variety of mistakes and errors.

In his first Letter, Mr. May repeats and urges, as Unitarians have done before to the thousandth time, that "the fundamental truth of Christianity" is simply this, "Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ."

"This is the *fundamental* of our religion, and so far as faith is concerned, *there is no other*. Other doctrines are undoubtedly taught in the New Testament; but no one, on the reception of which it is declared *salvation depends*." "He who believes that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, is a Christian, so far as faith can make him one. No church is authorised to decide whether his examination of the New Testament has led him to correct opinions, before admitting him to communion." "He has an indisputable claim to be recognized and treated by all Christians as a brother, unless his conduct shows his profession to be a mere pretence."

It would seem, from the representations of Unitarians on this subject, as though there was some mysterious charm in the mere words, 'Jesus is the Christ;' as on the reception of these, in whatever sense they may be understood, we are assured that Christian character, standing, hope, and even "*salvation depends*." Whether we suppose the Christ to have been a man, an angel, a still more exalted creature, or the Creator; whether we regard him as our atoning Priest, our anointed King, our final Judge and Disposer, or as a mere human prophet and teacher; in short, however we regard him, or whatever we think of him,—no matter, so far as faith is concerned—there must be no questions asked—if we believe that "Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ," that is enough, and all is well.

"I rejoice to know that men of different opinions on all those questions, which have so long agitated Christendom, may yet believe truly in Jesus Christ, and be equally the objects of his favor, if they are equally careful to obey his instructions and follow his example. As neither Jesus, nor his apostles, have explained his metaphysical nature, or the 'modus operandi' of his death, it is a relief to my mind to know, that men may disagree respecting these things, and yet be saved."

We should like to ask Mr. M. whether the Judaizing teachers, who wished to incorporate with the Christian faith the abolished rites of the Jewish religion, did not profess to believe that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ? Yet they are represented by the Apostle Paul as "*perverting* the gospel of Christ," and making it of "*no effect*." And did not the Gnostic believers, who were so zealous for the purity of the Saviour that they wished to see him delivered from the corrupting incumbrance of a *material body*, and consequently denied that he had come *in the flesh*—did not they profess to believe that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ? Still, we hear them censured, in the most pointed terms, by the Apostle John. "Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come *in the flesh*. This is a deceiver and an Anti-Christ." 2 John, 7. Other instances equally in point may be adduced. Thus Diotrophes, who 'prated against the Apostles with malicious words,' and whose evil deeds John promised he would remember, professed to believe that *Jesus was the Christ*. How should he have been in a situation to tyrannize over the church, without such a profession? 3 John 9, 10. "The Nicolaitans" also, and "that woman Jezebel," and those "that held the doctrine of Balaam," no doubt pretended to believe that *Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ*. How should they be suffered to teach in the churches of Asia, or to hold any manner of connexion with them, unless they believed as much as this? Rev. ii. 14—20.

When the apostles commenced their labors on the day of Pentecost, and for a while afterwards, the profession of a belief in Jesus as the promised Messiah implied, and was understood to imply, perhaps all that was requisite in doctrine and character,—so that there was scarcely a necessity of asking many questions. But before the labors of these holy men ceased, the mystery of iniquity began to work, errors were broached, and it became indispensable to be more explicit. Paul would wish to know of those who applied to him for admission to the churches, not only whether they believed that Jesus was the Christ, but whether they regarded the sacrifice of Christ as the sole and sufficient foundation of hope. He would wish to know whether they thought that they must "be circumcised, and keep the law of Moses, *in order to be saved*." And John would be sure to inquire of those who applied to him for admission, not only whether they believed that the Messiah had come, but whether he had *come in the flesh*. He might wish to

know, too, how they regarded the doctrine of "the Nicolaitans," and the teachings of "that woman Jezebel," and the heresy of the Unitarian Cerinthus.\* As errors and grounds of deception were invented and multiplied, a greater number of questions, and a more particular examination, would be necessary;—and it is on account of the various errors and grounds of deception which now prevail, that an examination of candidates for membership has become indispensable to the safety of the church."

Mr. M. insists that the "Trinitarian, who believes that Christ was [is] God," can with propriety "go to the communion table with a Unitarian, who believes him to have been an inferior, created, dependant being." He may not be aware, perhaps, that he is at points on this subject, not only with Trinitarians, but with the most respectable Unitarians. "I do not wonder," says Dr. Priestley, "that you Calvinists entertain and express a strongly unfavorable opinion of us Unitarians. The truth is, *there neither can nor ought to be any compromise between us.* If you are right, *we are not Christians at all*; and if we are right, *you are gross idolaters.*" "Opinions such as these," says Mr. Belsham, "can no more harmonize with each other, than light and darkness, than Christ and Belial. They who hold doctrines so diametrically opposite *cannot be fellow-worshippers in the same temple.*"—Does our author believe that the primitive disciples would have gone to the Lord's Table with professed idolaters? Yet some American Unitarians have not hesitated to say, (with Dr. Priestley, as above quoted,) that those who worship the Lord Jesus Christ are idolaters.†

In his second Letter, Mr. M. objects to the sentiment of Dr. Hawes, that "our Lord Jesus Christ required that all who became members of his church should be holy persons;" and in support of his objection, throws out the strange assertion, that "even the twelve, who were his constant companions, to whom he manifested a peculiar regard, and to whom he administered with his own hand the sacrament of the supper—even *they were not holy persons*, until after they had enjoyed all the privileges of believers." In what sense would our author have this assertion to be understood? Does he mean that the immediate disciples of Christ, during his personal ministry with them, were not *perfectly* holy? And neither were they, after his ascension—after the outpouring of the Spirit—they never were perfectly holy, so long as they remained on earth. Does he mean then, that, with the exception of Judas, they were not *converted persons*, true friends to the Lord Jesus Christ? The connexion shows that this must be his meaning; and we ask him to reconcile it with the following repre-

\* See Milner's Ecc. Hist. vol. i. pp. 121—124.

† "You have reclaimed many persons from the errors of idolatry and superstition." Dr. Freeman of Boston, to Mr. Lindsey.

sentations of the Saviour. "Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile." John i. 47. Could Nathaniel be "an Israelite indeed"—not one in name and profession merely—"in whom was no guile," and yet not be a converted person? Christ often pronounced *blessings* upon his disciples, and addressed them as his peculiar *friends*.\* How could they be the *blessed friends* of Christ, and still not be converted persons? On a certain occasion, Christ "stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren. For *whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven*, the same is my brother and sister and mother." Mat. xii. 50. How these disciples could be in the number of those who *did the will of their heavenly Father*, while yet they were not converted persons, it is not easy to perceive. Again, we are assured that, *previous to the supper*, our Lord regarded his disciples as in a special sense *his own*, and as peculiarly the objects of *his love*. "Now *before the feast of the Passover*, when Jesus knew that his hour was come, that he should depart out of this world unto the Father, *having loved his own which were in the world*, he loved them unto the end." John xiii.

1. If language such as this does not imply that the disciples were at this time converted persons, we confess ourselves at a loss to determine its signification.† In short, there can be no reasonable doubt as to the character of the eleven disciples, during the personal ministry of the Saviour; and neither can there be a doubt as to the correctness of the sentiment advanced by Dr. Hawes, that those who became members of the apostolical churches were expected and required to be holy persons.

It was "those who gladly received the word," and "who continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine, and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers;" those, in short, who *gave evidence of piety*, who were baptized and received into the church, on the day of Pentecost. Immediately after, we read that "the Lord added to the church daily *such as should be saved*"—such as possessed, and appeared to possess, that piety which is the condition of salvation. It was not till the Samaritans "*believed Philip*, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of Christ," and in this way furnished evidence of *piety*, that they were baptized, and admitted to the church. When the eunuch expressed a desire for baptism, Philip replied to him, "If thou *believest with all thine heart*, thou mayest. And the eunuch answered and said, "I *believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God*." The Holy Ghost fell on the family of Cornelius, and thus satisfied Peter of their *piety*, be-

\* See Luke vi. 20. Matt. xvi. 17. Luke xii. 4.

† Should it be replied, that Judas, all this while, was among the disciples, and addressed as one of them; it will be remembered, that Judas, like the others, *professed* to be a true disciple, a *truly converted person*; and until the time came when the mask was to be removed, it was proper and necessary that he should be addressed according to his profession.

fore he would receive them to the church, and administer to them the ordinances of the Gospel. Ananias objected to baptizing Paul, till a voice from heaven assured him of the *piety* of this former persecutor. "He is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel." After the baptism of Lydia and her household, she said to Paul and his company, "If ye have *judged me to be faithful to the Lord*, come into my house and abide there." The Epistles to the churches all proceed upon the supposition that the members were *saints*, at least by profession. "*Holy brethren*, partakers of the heavenly calling"—"*Beloved of God*, called to be saints"—"*To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ*"—this is the style in which the apostles addressed the primitive churches, necessarily implying, that all their members were *professedly pious*.

Persons destitute of piety sometimes gained admission to the apostolical churches; but the terms in which they are spoken of shew that they came in by deceit, and had no right there. They are said to "have crept in unawares." (Jude 4.) Barriers were erected to keep the irreligious out; but, by deception or stealth, some of this character had "*crept in, unawares*."

In furtherance of the design, which has long been adopted on the part of Unitarians, to break down the distinction between church and congregation, and throw open the communion to the whole assembly, Mr. M. observes,

"I am unable to discover anywhere in the New Testament, or in the history of the primitive churches, that the Lord's Supper was to be considered more sacred than the other parts of public worship."

Now we think there is sufficient evidence in the New Testament, that the Lord's Supper was regarded by the early Christians in a different light from the ordinary services of the sanctuary, and as possessing a more sacred and awful character. Else, why was the mode of celebrating this ordinance described so much more frequently and particularly than the other parts of divine service? \* And why did our Lord, who attended *public worship* in the synagogues, and taught *promiscuous multitudes* when about to institute the supper, retire with his disciples apart into an upper chamber? The Apostle speaks of special *preparation* as requisite, in order to come acceptably to the table of the Lord. "Let a man *examine himself*; and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." † He represents the supper as a symbol of holy spiritual communion with Christ, and consequently as appropriated to

\* See Matt. xxvi. 26—30. Mark xiv. 22—26. Luke xxii. 19, 20. I Cor. xi. 23—29.

† "Examine himself"—for what? if *true piety* was not essential, in order to an acceptable receiving of the ordinance, and if there was no danger that persons might be deceived, and come unworthily?



those who alone are prepared to enjoy such communion. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not *the communion of the blood of Christ*? The bread which we break, is it not *the communion of the body of Christ*?" He speaks of the *incongruity* of persons coming to the table of the Lord, who had not separated themselves from the corruptions of the world around them, and taken a stand openly on the side of Christ? "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils. Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils." He speaks also of the dreadful *sin and condemnation* of coming to the Lord's table unworthily. "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, *shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.*" And again, "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, *eateth and drinketh damnation, (αἰμα, judgement, condemnation) to himself*, not discerning the Lord's body."—Such are the plain representations of the New Testament on this subject. In view of them, our readers must decide, whether the Lord's Supper was not regarded, from the first, in a different light from the ordinary services of the sanctuary, and as possessing a far more solemn character.

"As to the estimation, in which the Lord's Supper was held in the Christian Churches, until the second century, no one, I should think, who is at all familiar with ecclesiastical history, can have a doubt. You yourself have not ventured to deny, that it was administered to *all the congregation*. You cannot be ignorant, that it was administered to baptized *children*, no less than to adults. In short, you know, that at first it was but one of the parts of public worship, in which all partook."

Mr. M. had no right to assume that Dr. Hawes, or any other well-informed person, would assent to these positions. We are well persuaded that they are not true, and that they cannot be supported, either by Scripture, or by the current voice of antiquity. We are satisfied that there were *churches* in the days of the Apostles, in distinction from the whole number who came together for instruction; and the administration of the Supper was confined, of course, to those who were connected with the churches. From the vast congregation, assembled on the day of Pentecost, three thousand were *separated and added to the Lord*.—The preaching of Philip at Samaria excited much attention, and drew a great congregation after him, out of which, in due time, a *church was gathered*, of those who believed and were baptized. (Acts vii. 12.) Paul preached at Corinth, and collected a congregation, some considerable time before he gathered a church. (see Acts xvii. 1—8.) And so at Ephesus, when many of his congregation were "hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and *separated the disciples*." (Acts xix. 9.) From the direction of the apostle to the Corinthians on the subject of *speaking with tongues*, we learn that members were

accustomed to frequent their assemblies, who were not of the church. "If all speak with tongues, and there come in those that are unlearned, or *unbelievers*, will they not say that ye are mad?" (1 Cor. xiv. 23.) The different specimens and accounts which remain of the Apostle's preaching may also satisfy us that they often had in view those whom they did not regard as fellow-disciples. They went forth and preached everywhere that men should *repent*—and besought their hearers to become *reconciled* to God. But why preach after this manner, if their worshipping assemblies were mere church-meetings, and if no distinction between church and congregation was admitted?

Indeed the church, in the primitive age, was a distinct and well defined company. The public teachers knew who their members were, knew their names, and knew their number. The number of names, immediately after the resurrection of Christ, was *an hundred and twenty*. On the day of Pentecost, *three thousand* more were added. And shortly after, the church at Jerusalem had increased to *five thousand*. So accurately did the apostles keep the number of their members, and mark the distinction between the church and the world.

As to the pretence that, in the primitive churches, the Lord's supper "was administered to baptized children," we challenge our author to bring a particle of proof, either from the Apostles, or from those who immediately succeeded them, that they knew of any such thing. Cyprian, we believe, is the earliest of the fathers who makes mention of the practice.\* In later periods, when, from a misinterpretation of our Saviour's words, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,' it was believed that a partaking of the supper was essential to salvation, infant communion more generally prevailed. It is mentioned by Photius, Augustine and Paulinus; and it continues among the Greeks to the present day.

Our author supposes that, in the primitive churches, those who "became scandalous in their conduct, and would not listen to the voice of friendly admonition, were excommunicated. They were debarred the privilege, not only of partaking of the Supper, but of appearing in the *assembly* of the called, the chosen, the saints."—If he means to say, that such persons were excluded from the special meetings of *the church*, we admit the fact as probable. But if he means, that they were not permitted to join the assemblies for public worship and instruction, as his argument requires that we should understand him, his assertion is without support. Our Saviour would have the excommunicated person become to his former brethren "as a heathen man and a publican." But did

\* "In Cyprian's time, the people of the church of Carthage did oftentimes bring their children *younger than had been ordinary*, to the communion." Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bap. vol. i. p. 517.

our Lord intend to debar all the heathen, and all the publicans, from ever attending public worship, and from being present where the gospel was preached? Believe this who can. And besides; if excommunication was practised in the churches of the apostles, it ought to be practised now. "The example of Paul," says Mr. M., "should teach us how to act." But as excommunication is described in the work before us, how could it be practised at the present day? What Christian congregation in this land would presume to say to a vicious person residing among them, 'You shall not again attend our religious worship, or assemble with us to listen to the instructions of the Saviour.' Indeed, what Christian congregation could say this, without contradicting and violating the whole spirit of the gospel? Because people are debased and vicious, must they be debarred from those privileges, which were designed and are adapted to make them better? If they are ignorant, the more need that they should be instructed. If they are corrupt in principle or practice, the more need that they should be brought to feel the benign influence of the gospel. Instead of being debarred from such influence, as Mr. M. would seem to direct, they ought to be invited and persuaded to place themselves under it. When did our Saviour ever drive from him the publicans and sinners, and deny them the privilege of listening to his words?

In his third Letter, Mr. M. not only follows Mr. Whitman, but goes beyond him, in reckoning the elder Socinus, as well as Servetus, among the Reformers. The object of this is, that the opinions of Socinus with those of Servetus may stand among the "doctrines of the Reformation." But what claims has Socinus to a name and a place in the goodly company of the Reformers? When he removed to Zurich, he "adopted the Helvetic Confession of faith, and professed himself a member of the (Orthodox) church of Switzerland." Instead of openly declaring his sentiments, "he," as Mr. M. acknowledges, "chose *rather privately* to communicate to a few friends the results of his inquiries." How long would it have taken Luther and his associates to have accomplished the Reformation from Popery by such means?—The younger Socinus pursued, for a long time, the same clandestine course. According to his partial biographer, Toulmin, it was not till the year 1577, that "he began to throw off all *reserve* and *disguise* as to his religious opinions; for, regarding them as the truth of God, *he thought it a crime to conceal them in his own breast.*" p. 5.

Mr. M. touches upon the charge against the younger Socinus of having persecuted Francis David; and refers to Toulmin for an "explanation of that affair." Toulmin does indeed express a doubt whether Socinus was accessory to the imprisonment of David, though he says "it is certain from Socinus' own confession

\* The claims of Servetus to this honor were considered by us in a late number. See page 131.

that he did approve of and agree to *his suspension*, a method of supporting the truth and opposing error, which the more just and liberal sentiments of our times will justly condemn." p. 95. Other writers, not less distinguished and more impartial, are decidedly of the opinion, that David was imprisoned at the instigation of Socinus. At any rate, Socinus believed that obstinate heretics *ought to be imprisoned and confined with chains*. The following are his own words, as given by Toulmin :

"As we restrain, and if it be necessary, confine in chains mad and frantic persons who would otherwise be injurious to others, and at the same time greatly pity them, so an (obstinate) heresiarch ought not to be treated with the utmost severity, but should meet with pity. And the only thing to be regarded is, to hinder his endeavors to propagate his doctrine; and if it cannot be otherwise done, BY CHAINS AND A PRISON. You observe I speak of an obstinate heresiarch: for he who is not obstinate, hath not contracted that rage and madness that he should be confined with chains." p. 105.

In the former part of his fourth Letter Mr. M. labors to prove, what no person acquainted with the subject ever denied, that the first settlers of this country did not dissent materially from the doctrinal articles of the church of England. Dr. Hawes had said, "To our pious ancestors, the doctrines of grace were exceedingly precious. Their excellent characters were formed under the influence of these doctrines. They were the mainspring of their enterprize," &c. Now this is not saying that our fathers could not have retained their belief of these doctrines (except so far as *they stood connected with church government*,) in their native land. Nothing like it. But "*their excellent characters were formed under the influence of these doctrines;*" and in *this way* they became "the mainspring of their enterprize." The belief of these doctrines gave to their characters an elevation, a spirituality, a deadness to the world, a strength of holy purpose, which prepared them to do and to suffer anything, which they considered as devolving on them, in obedience to conscience and the will of Christ. In the reception of Unitarian doctrines, it is not at all likely that our fathers would ever have moved from the other side of the water. They would have concealed their peculiarities, as hundreds had done before them, and thousands have done since, and quietly enjoyed their livings and their homes, submitting to any useless forms which might have been imposed, until an opportunity was presented for the leaven of their principles to work and diffuse itself in the surrounding mass. "The *mainspring* of their enterprize" would in this case have been wanting, and consequently they would have continued in their native land."\*

\* "In 1772, about two hundred and fifty clergymen of the church of England (mostly Unitarians) petitioned the Legislature for relief from the necessity of subscribing the articles of that church, because that subscription was opposed to their conscientious belief. Their prayer was rejected by the house of Commons, and the subscription was enforced. Notwithstanding this, the petitioners, with the exception of Mr. Lindsey, *clung to the emoluments of a church the doctrines of which they had publicly declared they no longer believed.*"

"The first Church ever formed in this country, was formed upon the basis of I. the original, entire equality of all the members of the congregation, so far as rights were concerned. II. The entire independence of each individual church of all others. A few persons calling themselves church members, did not assume the prerogative of leading in the transaction. They all, ministers and laymen, some of them communicants and some of them not, met upon the same level, to deliberate upon the right method of erecting themselves into a religious society."

The insinuation here is, that the distinction between church and congregation, between communicants and others, was unknown to the primitive settlers of New England; and hence the claim of church members to take the lead in ecclesiastical transactions is an innovation. But what is the proof of all this, according to our author's own statement? Why, that before the first church in the country was formed, there was *no church*, and *no church members*. Consequently, the distinction between church and congregation, between church members and others, did not then exist. "They all met upon the same level, to deliberate upon the right method of erecting themselves into a religious society," or church. But because there was no distinction between church and congregation, between church members and others, before any church had been brought into existence, does it follow that there was none afterwards? How could there be a church, before there was a church? And how could there but be one, in distinction from the whole company of settlers, after one had been regularly gathered?\*

Mr. M. quotes a part of Dr. Watts' "Solemn Address to the Deity," imploring light and direction in his inquiries relating to the Trinity,—and *such part* as must leave the impression on those unacquainted with the subject, that this excellent man was in real, painful doubt respecting the *fact* of the Trinity, and the proper Divinity of the Son of God. It is due to the memory of Dr. Watts to give some other parts of this "Solemn Address," in which he expresses himself as follows: "Hast thou not ascribed Divine names, and titles, and characters to thy *Son*, and thy *Holy Spirit* in thy word, as well as assumed them to thyself? And hast thou not appointed to them such glorious offices as cannot be executed, without something of Divinity or *true Godhead* in them?" Speaking of Christ in this prayer, Dr. Watts says, "I believe he is a man, in whom dwells *all the fulness of the Godhead* bodily. I believe he is *one with God*; he is *God manifested in the flesh*; and that the *man Jesus is so closely and inseparably united with the true and eternal Godhead, as to become one person*, even as the soul and body make one man."†

\* In the observations of Mr. M., on the sentiments of our fathers respecting creeds, and on their manner of receiving members, (pp. 45, 46.) he has closely followed his brother Whitman. For our remarks on these subjects, the reader is referred to the *Spirit of the Pilgrims* for March, p. 137.

† For an unanswerable vindication of the Orthodoxy of Watts', so far as it relates to the proper Divinity of the Saviour, see an article in the *Spirit of the Pilgrims*, Vol. ii. p. 334.

Again, Mr. M. represents some of the first and principal settlers of Boston as doubting on the subject of the Trinity, and as harmonizing, in respect to the doctrine of Divine influence, with Unitarians of the present day.

“Nor are we any better able, than Mr. Wilson and Governor Winthrop, and other members of the 1st. Church in Boston were, to find, either in the New Testament, or in the history of the primitive Churches for three centuries, any language which justifies a belief in the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit. And this is an essential part of the Trinity, although comparatively little is said about it, even in the discussions of our day. We believe, as those Fathers of New England seem to have done, that the Holy Spirit is the divine influence, which is put forth to aid men in the religious life.”

The facts on this subject are simply these : During the disputes with Mrs. Hutchinson, soon after the settlement of this country, Gov. Vane, and some others, held, with her, not only that *the person* of the Holy Ghost dwelt in the believer, but that there was formed, between the two, a *personal union*. In opposition to this strange and dangerous delusion, Deputy Gov. Winthrop, Mr. Wilson, and others contended, that “they could not find the person of the Holy Ghost”—using the word *person* in the sense of their antagonists—“in Scripture, nor in the primitive churches, for 300 years after Christ.” But, the historian immediately adds, “*all agreeing in the chief matter of substance, viz. that THE HOLY GHOST IS GOD, and that he doth dwell in believers, as the Father and Son both are said also to do ; but whether by his gifts and power only, or by any other manner of presence, seeing the Scripture doth not declare it, it was earnestly desired that the (abused) word, person, might be forborne, it being a term of human invention, and tending to doubtful disputation in this case.*”\*

The principal object of the fifth and last Letter of Mr. May is, to consider the charges commonly brought against Unitarians, explain their views, and make such an apology for them as should exhibit their case plausibly before the public. We find nothing stated that would be new or interesting to those particularly acquainted with the Unitarian controversy. We think, however, that this part of the work may be productive of good, in that section of country where it will chiefly circulate. It will serve to open the eyes of people to the nature and magnitude of the existing controversy with Unitarians, and to the unspeakable importance of most of the topics involved in this controversy. Many, even in New England, are in a great measure ignorant on this subject ; and no pains are spared to keep them in ignorance. It is still said, and reiterated in the ears of people, wherever it can be done with safety, that the difference between the two parties is of a trifling nature—a mere airy speculation respecting the metaphysical

\* See Winthrop's Journal, Vol. i. p. 206, 207.

nature of Christ, some placing him higher, and some lower, according to their different views of the language of the New Testament. Now Unitarians cannot discuss the subjects at issue between them and the Orthodox, or so much as explain their own sentiments, without destroying this impression—without showing to all around them, that the points in controversy are many, and of momentous consequence. After all the explanations which Mr. M. has been able to give, it will still be apparent to his readers, that he rejects nearly the whole system of theology, as commonly received;—that he rejects, not only the Trinity and the proper Divinity of Christ, but the doctrines of depravity, regeneration, atonement, and the full inspiration of the Scriptures; that he is opposed to Revivals of religion, to Missions, &c; that he is laboring to break down the Congregational, Scriptural distinction between the church and the world, and would throw open the ordinance of the supper to the whole assembly. He will soon find, we suspect, that he has revealed quite too many of his own secrets on these subjects;—that the good people of Connecticut will have sagacity enough to detect his views, notwithstanding the glosses with which they are attempted to be covered, and Puritan principle enough to shrink from them with abhorrence. It will be vain for him to preach hereafter—at least within the region of these Letters—that he differs from the Orthodox only in some inconsiderable matters, about which the public have no reason to be troubled.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### UNITARIANISM AND INFIDELITY.

The two following communications, received from highly respected correspondents, residing at a considerable distance from this place, and remote from each other, will show how the subject of which they treat is coming to be regarded by the religious community.

Infidels, who have renounced the Christian religion, have established a system of their own, which they call Natural religion. Creation is their Bible, and they insist that the principles they embrace are everywhere to be read upon the fair face of nature. Many persons will perhaps be surprised, on being informed that this system is, in all essential points, the same with that which is avowed and defended by Unitarians. The only difference is, the Infidel acknowledges that the Bible teaches a faith totally different from that which he receives; while the Unitarian declares that this

same system is that which the Bible teaches. The Unitarians of Massachusetts, and Paine, Hume, Gibbon, &c. harmonize almost entirely in their religious sentiments. The only question between them is, whether the Bible exhibits those views of religion, which they mutually entertain." I do not here assert, that Unitarians agree with Infidels in discarding the Bible, but that the same truths which Unitarians profess to learn from the Bible, Infidels avow and defend. Paine, in his "Age of Reason," gives us his religious belief. The subjoined extracts from that notorious publication authorize the above remarks.

I. "I believe in one God, and no more."\*

II. *The Character and Perfections of God.* "Do we want to contemplate his *power*? We see it in the immensity of creation. Do we want to contemplate his *wisdom*? We see it in the unchangeable order by which the incomprehensible whole is governed. Do we want to contemplate his *munificence*? We see it in the abundance with which he fills the earth. Do we want to contemplate his *mercy*? We see it in his not withholding that abundance even from the unthankful."

"Our ideas, not only of the Almightyness of the Creator, but of his wisdom and beneficence, become enlarged, in proportion as we contemplate the extent and structure of the universe.

III. *The nature of Religion.* "I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy, and endeavoring to make our fellow creatures happy."

"The true Deist has but one Deity, and his religion consists in ever contemplating the power, wisdom and benignity of the Deity in his works, and in endeavoring to imitate him in everything moral, scientific, and mechanical."

"Religion, therefore, being the belief of a God, and the practice of moral truth, cannot have connexion with mystery. And the practice of moral truth, or, in other words, a practical imitation of the moral goodness of God, is no other than our acting towards each other, as he acts benignly towards all."

"The moral duty of man consists in imitating the moral goodness and beneficence of God, manifested in the creation towards all his creatures; that, seeing as we daily do the goodness of God to all men, it is an example, calling upon all men to practise the same towards each other; and consequently everything of persecution and revenge between man and man, and everything of cruelty to animals, is a violation of moral duty."

IV. *Future state.* "I hope for happiness beyond this life."

"The belief of a future state is a natural belief, founded upon facts visible in the creation."

"We must know, also, that the power that called us into being, can, if he pleases, and when he pleases, call us to account for the manner in which we have lived."

"The probability that we may be called to account hereafter will, to a reflecting mind, have the influence of belief."

\* The edition from which these extracts are made is a small duodecimo, published in New York.



Such is the religious faith of Paine. He believes in the existence of God; in the perfection of his moral and natural attributes; that religion consists in imitating him; and that there is a future state of accountability. Now is not this the same system, which Unitarians insist that Jesus Christ and the apostles taught? We would not only remark, that Unitarians believe all this; but does it not comprise the *fundamental principles* of their faith? Does not this creed embrace everything which they deem *essential* in the instructions of Christ? Would not a sober person, declaring this to be his faith, be admitted to any Unitarian church? Thus do both parties believe the same system of doctrines, and the only question between them is, Do Jesus Christ and the apostles teach it? I appeal to any Unitarian, candid or uncandid, whether Unitarianism and this pure Deism of Tom Paine is not essentially the same thing? Such an one, to be consistent, should say to Paine, 'My friend, you are right; but then you ought not to abuse the writers of the Bible, for they agree with you entirely. If you will examine the Bible more critically and rationally, you will perceive that yours is that pure and holy faith which the Scriptures inculcate.'

Unitarians discard those peculiar doctrines which are usually regarded as the essential principles of Christianity. Paine renounces these also; and he renounces the Bible for teaching them. He thus agrees with Unitarians, not only in what they believe, but in what they do not believe.

1. *The Trinity.* "The ambiguous idea of a man God; the corporeal idea of the death of a God; the mythological idea of a family of Gods; and the Christian system of Arithmetic, that three are one, and one is three, are all irreconcilable, not only to the Divine gift of reason that God hath given to man, but to the knowledge that man gains of the power and wisdom of God."

2. *Divinity of Christ.* "The Scriptures represent this virtuous and amiable man, Jesus Christ, to be at once both God and Man."

"As to the Christian system of faith, it appears to me as a system of Atheism; a sort of religious denial of God. It professes to believe in a man, rather than in God."

3. *Atonement.* "Is the gloomy pride of man become so intolerable, that nothing can flatter it, but the sacrifice of the Creator?"

The writings of the apostles "are chiefly controversial; and the subject they dwell upon, that of a man dying in agony on a cross, is better suited to the gloomy genius of a monk in a cell, than to any man breathing the open air of creation."

"It is an outrage offered to the moral justice of God, by supposing him to make the innocent suffer for the guilty, and also for the loose morality, and low contrivance of supposing him to change himself into the shape of a man, in order to make an excuse to himself for not executing his supposed sentence upon Adam."

I thought "that God was too good to do such an action, and also too Almighty to be under the necessity of doing it."

If it were not known that these extracts were from "Paine's Age of Reason," every one would suppose that they were taken from

some Unitarian sermon or periodical. There certainly is a strong family resemblance.

Paine also shows, at considerable length, that the Bible teaches the doctrine of the existence and agency of *Evil spirits*. He attempts to portray the absurdity of this doctrine, and declares a book containing such irrational sentiments is unworthy to be credited.

How precisely do these objections to the Bible resemble those which Unitarians adduce against the Evangelical system. They are the same, even in their exaggeration and caricature. How can the Unitarian refuse to acknowledge Paine as a fellow-labourer, endeavoring with him to destroy one system of faith, and to build up another? It seems that they not only believe the same truths, but they disagree the same. It would be much more proper for Unitarians to hold fellowship and reciprocate ministerial exchanges with such as Paine, than it would be for an Orthodox minister to hold fellowship and reciprocate exchanges with Unitarians.

I have further noticed a few miscellaneous topics in which there appears a singular coincidence.

1. *Revelation*. Paine says the Bible can be nothing but the record of a Revelation, and therefore he is not bound to believe it. "Revelation is necessarily limited to the first communication—after this it is only an *account* of something, which that person says was a revelation made to him; and though he may find himself obliged to believe it, it is not incumbent on me to believe it in the same manner; for it was not a revelation made to me." To these views of Revelation, do we not find a response in a late number of the *Christian Examiner*?

2. *The Character of Christ*. "Nothing that is here said can apply, even with the most distant disrespect, to the *real* character of Jesus Christ. He was a virtuous and amiable man. The morality that he preached and practised was of the most benevolent kind."

"Jesus Christ founded no new system. He called men to the practice of moral virtues, and the belief of one God. The great trait in his character was philanthropy."—It is not for me to reconcile the inconsistencies either of Infidels or Unitarians. But such are Paine's declared sentiments of the character of Jesus.

3. *The moral influence of this scheme*. "Let him believe this, and he will live more consistently and morally than by any other system. It is by his being taught to contemplate himself as an outlaw—at an immense distance from his Creator—that he conceives either a contemptuous disregard for every thing, under the name of Religion, or becomes indifferent, or turns what he calls devout."

Surely, the Infidel and the Unitarian are brought into very close alliance. They believe the same doctrines. They discard the same. The chief labor of Unitarians now seems to be, to advocate the religious system of Paine, and endeavor to prove that it is taught by Jesus and his apostles.\*

A.

\* Mr. Yates, the celebrated vindicator of Unitarianism, has the following remarks, as containing the distinguishing principles of the Unitarian faith. "If therefore Unitarians maintain, as one of their distinguishing principles, that the Father is the only proper object of religious worship, let them be careful that they *devoutly worship the Father*. If they

For the Spirit of the Pilgrims.

MR. EDITOR,

I live at a distance from the seat of Unitarian controversy, and do not see many publications on the subject. An acquaintance gave me one to read, a few days since, on "the *Beneficial Tendency of Unitarianism*," by Lant Carpenter, L. L. D. I read the first head which is, "I consider it a great excellence of Unitarianism, that it encourages and rewards the sound exercise of the understanding in matters of religion." So does Deism, said I, any respectable writer on that subject being witness.

I looked on to the *second* head, which is, "that Unitarian Christianity presents one object of religious worship, and one object of the highest affections of the heart." Yes, said I, and so does Deism, any respectable writer on that subject being witness.

I read on, and found the third topic to be, that Unitarianism *throws no impediment* in the way of the great practical principles of the Gospel." Yes, said I, and so Deism has always commended the "practical principles" of the gospel. A hundred Deists might be brought upon the stand as witnesses.—I was here struck with the form of the thought, as it must have existed in Dr. Carpenter's mind,—"I have discovered that my religious belief is no *impediment* to my being a religious man!! "Unitarianism *throws no impediment*," &c.

The *fourth* particular reads thus: "Unitarianism throws no impediment in the way of Christian liberality and affection." So the respectable Deist would say, 'I admire Christian morals, and my sentiments "throw no impediment" in the way of them. I wish everybody had more of them.'

The fifth head reads, "Unitarianism shines forth resplendently in respect to the character and dispensations of the Great Father of all:"—A puzzling sentence, which may be construed two or three ways;—but any way you please, the same may be said of Deism, any respectable Deist being judge. The doctrines of Christianity *obscure* the character of God, the Deist says; and it is only in my system, that he "shines forth resplendently." From what has been said, I infer,

1. That, as things equal to the same are equal to one another, the "Beneficial tendencies of Unitarianism," according to Dr. Lant Carpenter, and of Deism, are the same.

2. I infer from this, that Unitarianism throws no more impediments in the way of Christian duties and religious affections, than Deism does.

believe that one of the principal objects of the mission of Jesus Christ was to deliver his admirable precepts of morality, let them *obey* those precepts; that another great end of his coming, was to set before mankind an example of perfect virtue, let them imitate that example; that the chief design of his death and resurrection was to establish the doctrine of a future state of retribution, let them *prepare* for that state of retribution; that a good life is the condition upon which alone God will grant pardon and acceptance and eternal bliss, let them *lead* a good life." This he calls the "beautiful simplicity" of Unitarianism. 1. The existence of God. 2. Christ came to teach morality and set a good example. 3. He taught the doctrine of a future state. 4. A good life is the only condition of acceptance with God. This is also the "beautiful simplicity" of Infidelity.

3. I infer, that Unitarians need not despair, any more than Deists, of the influence "of the great practical principles of the Gospel," in spite of their Unitarianism; as we are here informed that those doctrines do not "throw impediments" in the way of such principles.

4. I infer the agreement of Dr. L. Carpenter, and the "American Unitarian Association," (for this little pamphlet is published by them,) with the following opinion of the Rev. John James Taylor, a Unitarian clergyman of Manchester, England: "I know of no one whose society is more improving, or more calculated to make us think closely and earnestly on the subject of religion, than a serious, candid, and moral Deist."

Now I wish to ask, Mr. Editor, if, among all our young Unitarian clergymen, there are none that think; and if they think at all, whether there are none that see the utter folly of a system that runs itself out into such nonentities as are exhibited in the outline of this pamphlet. Is this the shape in which we are to consider a religion intended to convert the world? Is it thus that our spiritual life is to begin? is to be continued? is to be perfected? Why, sir, the very *idea* of spiritual life, "*a life of faith*," does not seem to be apprehended by this writer. The beneficial tendency of Unitarianism is to produce, what? general, spiritual renovation? a life of faith? not at all. "It exercises the understanding," says Dr. C.; and so does Deism. It "presents one object of religious worship;" and so does Deism. It "throws no impediment in the way of the practical principles of the Gospel;" and neither (as many think) do the principles of Deism. But it "makes the character and dispensations of the Great Father of us all very resplendent;" and so does the apprehension of the Great Spirit, by a North American Indian. Where, in all this, is the conception of a spiritual life, drawing its vitality from the truths of the gospel, from the radiations of the Divinity in Him, in whom "dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

However erroneous my views of religious truth may be, they are to me the grounds of spiritual renovation; they are the bread of spiritual life; they are light to a darkened mind and a depraved heart. They awaken bright visions of hope and joy. They inspire love, and humble confidence before God, and impart foretastes of spiritual bliss; and I cannot comprehend a system, as *Christianity*, which does not do this. The most unintelligible, and, I may add, the most unimaginable of all systems is that, which makes its only positive belief to be a simple, undefined (pantheistic) unity, without passing into personality; for "personality in God," we are told, "must be identical with *personal humanity!*" Such a belief, or such an unbelief—for here both affirmation and negation, both thesis and antithesis, are the same to man—such a belief is *without form, and void*.

A COUNTRYMAN.

## BEARD'S COLLECTION OF SERMONS.

The Rev. J. R. Beard, Unitarian minister in Manchester (England,) has recently published a volume of "Sermons, designed to be used in families," contributed by Unitarian Clergymen in that country. This volume was reviewed and highly commended in the Christian Examiner for Nov. 1830.

"It is, in fact, the Liberal Preacher of England, containing specimens of the sermons of seventeen Unitarian ministers in different parts of the kingdom." "We have read it with great satisfaction. And we recommend it, with confidence, to those who would acquaint themselves with the style of preaching among our brethren abroad, or would possess a book of valuable practical divinity for domestic perusal, or would furnish a parish library with a wholesome work for circulation."

On the strength of this recommendation, Mr. Beard's collection of Sermons has been put to press in this city, and will soon be circulating (we know not but it is already) among the Unitarians of Massachusetts. The conductors of the Examiner intimated, in their Review, that a second volume of sermons, by the same editor and on the same general plan, might be expected; and "we shall hope," say they, "to meet with some names which we have been disappointed not to find in the collection before us."

It seems that this second volume is now in a course of preparation, and that exertions have been made (whether at the suggestion of the Examiner, or not, we pretend not to say) to procure sermons from some, who were not contributors to the first volume. In particular, Mr. Beard has written to Rev. Hosea Ballou of Boston, requesting that he and his brethren in this country will co-operate with the Rev. Henry Ware, in rendering him such assistance as they can afford. The following is part of his Letter to Mr. Ballou, as published in the Trumpet of March 12th.

"I am on the point of publishing a *second* volume of a work, entitled "Sermons designed to be used in families," contributed, as was the first, by several eminent ministers. In this volume, I am desirous of finding the compositions, not only of English Unitarians, but of all who are opposed to the doctrine of the Trinity, and hold the great doctrine of God's essential benignity. Such an union in the volume would have a tendency to bring about, what I am very desirous of seeing, a union for mutual aid and encouragement of all Anti-Trinitarians in the world. You will not therefore, I trust, refuse me, when I solicit a composition for the volume from your pen; and you would still more oblige me, by procuring for me a Sermon from any other minister of America in your communion. I leave you quite free in the choice of your subject. I can with pleasure refer you to the Rev. HENRY WARE, Unitarian minister, Boston, to whom I am personally known, and from whom I expect aid in the volume. Nor is it unlikely that he would be able to enclose whatever you may have to send, in the package that I am expecting from him."

No one can doubt, after reading this, that Mr. Beard and his contributors, so highly esteemed by American Unitarians, are all of them Universalists; and that they are wishing to have fellowship with American Universalists. How far, then, are American Unitarians from being Universalists? And why should they not have fellowship with Universalists? How much better will the Sermons of Messrs. Ballou, Whittemore, and others of the same stamp be, after

they have been sent to England in the same package with those of Rev. Henry Ware, and have there been published and sent back in the same volume, than they were before they left this country? And if Mr. Ballou may speak to Unitarian families in the same volume with Mr. Ware, why may he not from the same pulpit?

#### RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Incidents in the Life of President Dwight, illustrative of his Moral and Religious Character; designed for Young Persons.* New Haven: A. H. Maltby. 1831. pp. 156.

The author of this little volume has succeeded in sketching, in a happy manner, such "incidents in the life of President Dwight," as are of special interest to the young; and few men have lived, whose example is worth more to the young than his. We know not, indeed, in what state of mind the youth must be, who can read attentively the pages before us, and not feel his soul enlarged, and himself impelled to the pursuit of excellence.

The following account of a Revival of religion in New Haven, in the years 1807—8, contains some facts not before published, which serve to illustrate the character of Dr. Dwight, and will be specially interesting at the present time.

"In the month of December, 1807, a revival of religion commenced in New-Haven. This revival had been in progress in the city for months, before any special seriousness was indicated within the walls of college. The exact number of professors of religion belonging to the college church, the writer will not attempt to name; but it was unusually small. The apathy was appalling; and for a time it seemed as if the cloud which was pouring down its refreshing showers upon the city, would pass by without one mercy-drop upon the college. But a blessing was in store for that school of the Puritan fathers, and soon after the commencement of the second term, the time of its descent arrived. On a Saturday afternoon, four students were accidentally (might we not say providentially?) in a room together, conversing on some topic quite foreign from the subject of religion, no one of them at that time being serious, when a fifth student entered. He was in ill health, and the paleness of his countenance attracted the notice of one of the four, who said to the new-comer in a tone of levity, calling him by name "——— you look as if you had the *consumption*." The student addressed paused midway in the room, as if petrified; but he rallied his spirits sufficiently to join, for a moment, in the laugh which followed—and then hastily retired. He afterwards said, that had a severe blow been given him, by some one of the party, the sensation of pain could not have been more evident, than it was when the above words were uttered. An invisible power seemed to convey them with so much force to the conscience of the student, as to excite the sensation of having been struck on the breast, by something external. A few minutes after leaving the room, the college bell rung for prayers. The students entered the chapel, and the service began. President Dwight officiated, as was his practice, at evening. Never will that occasion be forgotten, by at least *one*; and long, perhaps, will it be remembered by several. It was at the close of the week—the day was ending—the Sabbath was beginning—a glorious work was in progress in the city, and around the college—immortal minds were awaking from a death of sin unto a life of righteousness; and were preparing, not only for the earthly Sabbath which was to follow, but for the eternal Sabbath of rest, in the kingdom of God. To this happy state of things in the city, the college presented, as has been remarked, a most melancholy contrast. There indeed stood walls consecrated to religion, as well as to science, but, unless within a room here and there were found the disciples of Jesus, the whole was obviously claimed by the god of this world. On the

evening alluded to, it seemed as if a sense of these things had settled with overwhelming power on the President. The chapter was read with an altered tone—the hymn was recited with a faltering accent; and, as he joined in with the choir, as was his custom, his usually loud and sonorous voice became weak and tremulous. He sung but a single stanza and stopped. Next came the prayer. President Dwight was always remarkable for humility of manner in prayer. Even when his lofty mind rose amidst the inspirations of a near approach to God, and his language became, as it often became on such occasions, sublime, he was humble and abased. But on the evening named, it seemed as if the subduing power of the Gospel was doubly upon him. There was such an apparent coming down—such an obviously holy prostration of soul, as indicated that the spirit of God was with him. He spoke, as if “dust and ashes” were addressing the Eternal on his Throne. The burden of that prayer was, “An acknowledgement of the sovereignty of God in the dispensations of his grace.” And yet he made that solemn truth the foundation of one of the most appropriate arguments, ever presented to a throne of mercy, for a revival of religion. Never did a minister plead more fervently for a people—never a father more importunately for his children, than he did for his pupils before him. The morning service, on the following day, was occupied, as usual, in the delivery of a Theological Lecture. In the afternoon, he preached from the story of the “*Young man of Nain*,” recorded in Luke vii. 11—15, and dwelt particularly upon that touching part of it, “*Young man; I say unto thee, arise.*” That sermon, it is believed, was the immediate instrumental cause of the revival which followed. The interest which President Dwight took in that revival, it was apparent to every one, was deep and affecting. Eloquent before, he was doubly so then; and well remembered is it, that during that season, he almost entirely abandoned his notes, his excited feelings not permitting him to be thus confined.

“It was his custom to meet such students as were anxious, one evening every week, and oftener when occasion required, at one of the tutor’s rooms; and on such occasions it was difficult to tell, whether he displayed more of the feelings of the Christian, or of the parent. Had those who were inquiring the way to eternal salvation been his own children “according to the flesh,” he could not apparently have imparted to them instruction with more kindness and affection, or have been more solicitous to see them in the ark of safety. On a single occasion during that revival, it happens to the writer to know, that his tender feelings were put to a severe trial. A student became deeply anxious for his own spiritual welfare, and while others, who had been awakened at a *subsequent period* to himself, were rejoicing in hope, that student’s alarm seemed steadily to increase. The President was made acquainted with his exercises, and imparted from time to time such advice as the word of God, and his own experience, authorised him to give. Other Christian friends also became deeply interested; and prayers were multiplied, that in respect to that suffering student, “Judgment might be sent forth unto victory.” But it seemed all in vain. The terrors of the Almighty gathered in deeper folds about him. Every passing day added only to the awful sense which he had of coming wrath, and the approach of night seemed like the approach of that day of darkness, which will never be illumined, by even a single ray from the Sun of Righteousness. The hours of that evening passed slowly and solemnly away. A few Christian friends lingered about the bed of the agonized and despairing sinner; and many were the prayers offered, that the balm of Gilead might be applied to his wounded spirit. At length, a messenger was despatched to summon the President, as it seemed to those in attendance, that unless relief were had, death must close the scene. The hour was late—but he promptly attended the call, and came emphatically as one sent of God, as the bearer of good tidings of great joy. For a short time he seemed overwhelmed; so deeply did he share in the agony of the agonized. At length, however, taking a seat by the bedside, he gradually directed the anxious inquirer unto divine sufficiency, the infinite fulness of the Lord Jesus—recited the invitations of the Gospel—and then followed his parental counsel, by prayer to God. That prayer, it is believed, was heard; and the words which he spoke were as healing balm from on high. A sweet serenity seemed to steal over the agitated sinner’s mind—a serenity which was the harbinger of a “joy” which came in a short time after, and which was “unspeakable and full of glory.” To have been made instrumental of the conversion of one such sinner unto God, were to have lived, not in vain.

Yet, how many such will form his diadem and crown of rejoicing in that day, when he shall become a partaker of the divine glory!"

3. *A Remonstrance against an Established Religion in Massachusetts.* By Parsons Cooke. Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1831. pp. 24.

The Author of this Tract commences by observing,

"It will not be believed, without proof, by the good people of this State, that the far-famed "cradle of liberty" has become the throne of an ecclesiastical despotism, and that they themselves are expected to yield homage to it. And it will be needful to my purpose, first of all, to show that this is substantially the fact. The people must not suffer themselves to be deceived longer, with the sounds and names of freedom. If it can be made to appear that there exists at this time, and in this State, all the essential attributes of an established religion, the mere absence of the names and trappings of it should not hinder a conviction of its reality."

"What then, are the essential attributes of a State religion? *If the government bestows a patronage on one denomination, which it withholds from others, or grants privileges to one which it does not to the others; If the funds of the State are applied to promote the spread of the doctrines of a particular sect; If legislation is employed to spread these doctrines, while under the pretext of law other denominations are deprived of their just rights and privileges; If the profession of a particular creed is made a necessary qualification for office; If all these suppositions can be shown to be facts; I trust none will question the existence of an established religion.*"

In the succeeding pages, Mr. Cooke endeavors to show, that these suppositions are facts, and consequently that a religious establishment in Massachusetts is no chimera. Many of his remarks are worthy of serious consideration, particularly those relating to the connexion between the Unitarian Divinity School at Cambridge, and Harvard University.

4. *Objections to the Deity of Christ considered; A Sermon,* by J. H. Fairchild, Pastor of the Evangelical Congregational Church in South Boston. Published by Request. Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1831. pp. 36.

In this Discourse, Mr. F. discusses fairly and forcibly the three following objections to the Deity of Christ: I. "This doctrine is not taught in the Bible." II. "Christ made no pretensions to Supreme Divinity, but rather disclaimed it." And III. This "doctrine is contrary to reason." The introductory and concluding remarks are pertinent and solemn. We were particularly struck with a paragraph in the introduction, on the office of reason in matters of religion.

"To admit the Scriptures to be given by inspiration of God, and at the same time to erect our reason into a standard by which to determine the truth or falsehood of what they contain, is of all conduct the most unphilosophical and absurd. This would be to exalt reason above Revelation; whereas the only office of reason on this point is to determine what God has said. What the eye is to the body, reason is to the soul. The eye, though ever so good, cannot see without light; and reason, though ever so perfect, cannot know without instruction. The eye, indeed, is that which sees; but the light is the cause of its seeing. Reason is that which knows; but instruction is the cause of its knowing. And it would be as absurd to make the eye give itself light, because it sees by the light, as to make reason instruct itself, because it knows by instruction. The phrase, therefore, "light of reason," so common at the present day, seems to be an improper one; since reason is not the light, but an organ for the light of instruction to act upon. Nor do we any more detract from the perfection of reason when we affirm that it cannot know without instruction, than we detract from the perfection of the eye, when we deny that it has the power of seeing in the dark."



THE

# SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

---

---

VOL. IV.

JUNE, 1831.

NO. 6.

---

---

SELECT BIOGRAPHY.

WE extract the following biographical sketch of the late Dr. Samuel Austin from a Sermon preached at his funeral by the Rev. Dr. Tenney of Weathersfield, Conn. Dr. Austin was for many years among the most active, conspicuous, and useful ministers in Massachusetts. He was an able and intrepid defender of the faith; a warm and devoted Christian. He was concerned in originating, and for a time in conducting, most of our Religious charitable institutions, and took a deep interest in whatever promised the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom. He lived respected and beloved by a large circle of Christian friends, to whom his memory will be precious.

DR. SAMUEL AUSTIN, was born in New-Haven, the 7th day of November, 1760. He remained with his parents till the revolutionary war, during which he was called to perform military service in New York, when the British took possession of that city. After this, he returned home and spent some time in occasional military service and in teaching school. He then commenced the study of Law with Judge Chauncey in his native town. Soon, however, finding the need of a more complete education, he devoted himself to classical studies, and was admitted at Yale College into the Sophomore class in the summer of 1781. About this time, after a season of very deep and painful conviction, he indulged the belief, that his heart was reconciled to God through the Redeemer, and in July of the same year, he was admitted a member of the College church by President Stiles. The following, respecting his scholarship and character at that period, is the testimony of one of his distinguished class-mates.\* "He was an assiduous and thorough scholar. Attentive to all the prescribed duties of the College, sober and discreet, he sustained an unblemished character. An excellent linguist, he was a *Dean* scholar. Regarded always as a very good speaker, he received as the reward of merit, the first appointment in the exercises of the commencement, when he was graduated. His maturity of years,

\* Hon. David Daggett of New-Haven.

with unremitting attention to his studies, gave him a rank, to say the least, among the first scholars of his class.

He received his theological instruction under Dr. Edwards. While a candidate, for nearly four years, he taught an Academy in Norwich with unusual popularity, and received two unanimous invitations to settle, which he declined. One was from Hampden in this state. The other was to become Colleague Pastor with the late Dr. Livingston in the Middle Dutch Church in the city of New York. This he declined, because they practised and were disposed to adhere to the half way covenant, under which he could not consent to be their pastor. But in the year 1787, he became pastor of the Society of Fair Haven, in New-Haven. In the next year, he was united in marriage to Jerusha, daughter of the late Dr. Hopkins of Hadley. After faithfully serving his people a little more than two years, he believed it to be his duty to leave them, that they might reunite with the society of which Dr. Edwards was minister. The First Society in Worcester, hearing of his intention, sent him a call before his dismissal. He was installed as their Pastor, September 30, 1790, and continued with them 25 years. In the year 1815, he removed, much regretted by his people, to fill the Presidency of Vermont University. During the six years of his continuance in this station, he performed much ministerial labor in the vacant parishes of the neighborhood. At his own request, he then retired and settled again in the ministry in Newport, R. I. This place he left in about four years, on account of the perceptible failure of his health. Subsequently, he suffered such a failure of health and spirits, that his relatives believed it important that he should reside with them. After passing a year in the family of his brother Hopkins at Northampton, he, more than two years ago, removed into the family of his nephew, the Rev. Mr. Riddel, in this place,\* where, though his health and spirits were manifestly improved for some months past, he closed his life, in an apoplectic state, Dec. 4th, in the 71st year of his age. Such are the more prominent historical incidents in the life of the deceased.

His character deserves particular consideration. Tall, erect and manly in his person, he was dignified and courtly in his manners. He was highly affectionate in his disposition, refined and noble in his feelings. By his natural affability and gentlemanly deportment, he was companionable and interesting in social intercourse, and a most tender, condescending, and devoted husband, who consulted the feelings and wishes of his partner, as much as his own. The same trait of character he invariably and sweetly expressed to all the members of his family.

His *intellect* was superior. Its operations were marked by ra-

\* Glastenbury, Conn.

pidity, vigor and general accuracy. His views were peculiarly enlarged and comprehensive, which, aided by a vivid and strong imagination, enabled him to present subjects with great copiousness of language, and sublimity of description.

His *piety*, not inferior to his understanding, was habitual and ardent, deep and discriminating, affectionate and communicative. His veneration and adoration of the character and attributes of the Supreme Jehovah, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, was profound. The law of God in all its extent and obligation, he cordially approved and supremely delighted in, as the standard of disinterested benevolence and moral perfection. He knew, he *felt*, he *explored*, his own depravity. His language, which seemed to be the expression of his inmost soul, was, "I *know* that in *me*, that is, in my flesh, there dwelleth *no* good thing; I am carnal, sold under sin." But he did hope and glory in the cross of Christ, whose mediation and merits were the theme of his habitual contemplation and delight.

He knew the joys of faith, of unconditional submission, and supreme confidence in the moral and Mediatorial government of God. He felt, he manifested, high complacency in good men, in the church of Christ, and the institutions of the Gospel. He rose in delight, as he dwelt on the glory of Christ, and the good to the universe, which has followed and is yet to follow from his sufferings. In compassion for afflicted believers, for feeble churches, and for the perishing millions of our race, his heart expanded, and his charitable efforts were well directed and abundant. The last time he wrote his name, he did it, in subscription to a charitable object. Doing good was his delight. A discourse which he preached before the Missionary Society of Massachusetts, was but the utterance of his own feelings, on the great duty of the Christian public to spread the Gospel. His text answered to his heart; "*I am debtor* both to the Greeks, and to the Barbarians, both to the wise and to the unwise." Unreserved, distinguishing and highly experimental on the subject of personal piety, he seemed highly gratified to unbend from severe subjects and studies, and to enter, with intelligent Christians and ministers, into a free interchange of sentiments on the most essential of all concerns, "the life of God in the soul." If any ever thought him precise, austere, or forbidding, they needed but to know him better to be convinced, that he united much native tenderness of feeling, sincere Christian kindness, meekness and humility, with elevated spirituality, and the various active graces which adorn the believer's character. Even among the excellent, he excelled in *godly fear*. Greatly and most conscientiously afraid to offend God, and most desirous to please Him, he seemed strongly "to love whatever God loves," and as strongly to detest "whatever he hates." In the devotions of the family, as well as of the sanctuary

and at the table of the Christ, he very commonly appeared as though just within the veil, freely and with reverence addressing his Maker and Redeemer. Indeed, in this service, "his heart seemed to expand and enlarge, and elevate all his views of divine things." Highly ardent in the exercise and enjoyment of gracious affections, he was distinguished by that habitual heavenly mindedness and spirituality, which indicated much devout meditation, and a close walk with God. His were lofty spiritual aims, high attainments in the divine life, and ardent aspirations for the perfect likeness of Christ. His last prayer, which was that he might be wholly sanctified, seems only the counterpart of his holy life, and a most appropriate and happy close of it. *He was a man of God.* He "walked with God, and was not; for God took him."

These traits furnished him, eminently, for the work of the ministry, to which he early devoted his life. As a *writer* for the pulpit, his mind was original and fertile; his style at once copious and discriminating; and his discourses always instructive and interesting, doctrinal and impressive. In delivery, he was animated and vehement; in his whole manner, he was affectionate, dignified and commanding; while, occasionally, he rose to high and powerful eloquence. The topics, on which he delighted most to dwell, were the benevolence, the sovereignty, and the glory of God; the great system of redemption; the character of Christ and his sufferings, with their extensive results upon the universe, and especially in the sanctification and salvation of his *chosen* people. His ministry, as well as his private and pastoral services, was eminently conducive to the growth of Christians in knowledge and conformity to God. In the appropriateness, enlargement, and spiritual glowing fervor of his public devotions, he has seldom been exceeded.

But his usefulness to the kingdom of Christ, was not limited to the sphere of a preacher of the Gospel. In more public services he was, for many years, abundant. In ecclesiastical councils, and as a preacher on special occasions, he was highly valued and frequently employed. In the instruction of theological students, some of whom have been, and others now are, eminent in the churches, he filled a useful department. With two or three others, whose praise is, and ought to be, in all the churches, he was a projector of the Massachusetts Missionary Society.\* He was a trustee, and an efficient supporter of this institution, which was among the earliest of the kind in our country, and had an important influence in bringing forward the present enlarged national systems of benevolent operations. He was active and highly instrumental in originating the General Association of Massachusetts; and was indeed, for many years, among the most prominent and indefatiga-

\* The Rev. Drs. Emmons and Spring, late of Newburyport.

ble agents in most of the benevolent societies in that state. For a period of years, he has been a member of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.

Thus distinguished, he was called, at length, from the ministry to preside over one of our literary institutions. He went to the College after its operations had been entirely suspended for three years by the late war, during which the buildings were rented to the soldiers for barracks, and at a time, when its whole permanent income was little more than one thousand dollars. Under the derangement to which that region of country was subjected by the war and a general depression, produced by a number of unpropitious seasons, together with the loss of his fellow instructors, who were called away to other situations, he felt, that his prospect of usefulness, by which he had been governed in accepting the appointment, was not equal to what he had expected and desired. He found, too, that the ministry, always his favorite employment, was more congenial to his feelings than the tiresome uniformity of academic life. Never did he propose to remain at the institution longer than ten years. When he perceived that his expectations could not be fully realized, he determined upon an earlier retirement. Though by desire of the friends of the University, he remained beyond his own wishes, yet so soon as he perceived an opportunity to retire without injury to the College, he resigned his office and returned, with great pleasure, to the ministry of the Gospel. Still, as a president, he accomplished, as is well attested, all that could reasonably have been expected.

In speaking of his usefulness, it remains to notice his labors as an author, and a publisher of theological writings. Besides a number of single sermons, some able controversial pieces, and numerous contributions to the periodicals of the day, he gave to the public two original and valuable works; one entitled, "A view of the Church;" the other, "Dissertations upon several Fundamental Articles of Christian Theology." He also collected with great care and labor, and published the Works of the elder President Edwards; which was the first and is still the only accurate edition of the writings of that great man. Here, it may be added, that the theological sentiments of the deceased are clearly evinced, by the writings he published, as well as by his preaching, to have been strictly Calvinistic, and in agreement with those of Edwards, Belamy, and Hopkins. In the instance of his servant of God, as well as of many others, it is undeniable, that the influence of these sentiments contributed to give refinement to his feelings, enlargement to his powers, ardor to his benevolence, elevation to his joys, and eminent usefulness to his life. In the translation of such a character from our world, who can suppress the exclamation; "My father; *my father!* The chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof!" Brethren, may a double portion of his spirit rest upon each of us.

But for the last three or four years, a thick and dark cloud has hung over the course and enveloped in dismay the mind of our revered friend. He lost nearly all hope of his own reconciliation to God and interest in the Redeemer. He sunk into a settled deep religious melancholy, which occasionally appeared in paroxysms of despair and horror. His bitter moanings were, at times, sufficient to wring with sympathetic anguish the most unfeeling heart. On this account, however, who, even in the secrecy of thought, can doubt, that he was, in truth, a man of God? *Doubt*, in view of such a life for almost fifty years, the very highest possible evidence of sound piety! *Doubt*, in view of the fact, that he exhibited, most clearly, the Christian graces, except hope, and that he continued and abounded in prayer, and showed the burden of his desires to be, what he uttered, and which were his last words of prayer; "Blessed Jesus! Blessed Jesus! Sanctify me wholly." Who can doubt! The eminent Bellamy was once in despair; Cowper, and others like him, have closed this probationary life in despair; nay, Jesus Christ, *the dearly beloved Son of God*, died in darkness, crying, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me!"

The succession of afflictions, which befell him in the latter part of his life, was exactly fitted to break down the health of a man possessed of his susceptibility. It had this painful effect, and induced an insidious, incurable dyspepsia, which, prostrating his mental energies, and producing, in its early stages, occasional and manifest aberrations of reason, terminated in a confirmed religious melancholy, which rose and fell precisely with his disease; and which, by the mysterious orderings of infinite wisdom, was unquestionably originated and entirely controlled by it.

Respecting the moral cause, let no man imagine that it was the tendency of the doctrines which he believed and taught: For these he most cordially approved to the last, and found the only source of whatever consolation and calmness still lingered in his mind. The veil of mystery, for three long distressing years cast over the condition and mind of the deceased, is, to him, now raised forever; and *all is light*. He knows now what he lately knew not. To know fully, we must die and go where he is. Till then, our Sovereign commands;—"Be still and know that I am God."

---

## COMMUNICATIONS.

WICKED MEN UNABLE TO APPRECIATE THE MOTIVES OF GOOD  
MEN : A SHORT SERMON.

2. Samuel x. 3. *“And the princes of the children of Ammon said unto Hanun, their lord, Thinkest thou that David doth honour thy father, that he hath sent comforters unto thee? Hath not David rather sent his servants unto thee, to search the city, and to spy it out, and to overthrow it?”*

THE connexion of these words will appear from the preceding verses. “And it came to pass after this”—i. e. after David had established himself on the throne of Israel, and subdued his enemies on every side—“that the king of the children of Ammon died, and Hanun, his son, reigned in his stead. Then said David, I will show kindness unto Hanun, the son of Nahash, as his father showed kindness unto me.” This Nahash was an old and cruel enemy of the house of Israel; and it is likely that he showed kindness to David, during his exile, out of hatred to Saul and the Israelitish nation. But whatever his motives were, *he had been kind to David*, and David felt under obligations to requite his kindness. David, therefore, sent his servants to comfort the son of Nahash concerning the death of his father. He probably sent them with some valuable present, and with assurances of his alliance and friendship. “And the servants of David,” in executing their commission, “came into the land of the children of Ammon.” But “the princes of the children of Ammon said unto Hanun, Thinkest thou that David doth honor thy father, that he hath sent comforters unto thee? Hath not David rather sent his servants unto thee, to search the city, and to spy it out, and to overthrow it?” The jealous, selfish, suspicious servants of Hanun had no confidence in the good intentions of David; believed nothing about his pretended gratitude; could not understand or appreciate his benevolent motives, but insisted that, under a show of grateful feeling, he was intent upon searching and spying out their city, that he might destroy it. Accordingly Hanun, in obedience to his unprincipled counsellors, treated the servants of David with great indignity, and sent them back into their own land.—The false interpretation which Hanun and his counsellors put upon the kind and benevolent action of David, suggests for consideration the following truth: *The wicked know not how to understand or appreciate the benevolent motives of the righteous.*

The Scriptures uniformly recognize a broad distinction between the righteous and the wicked. The ground of this distinction is,

not that the righteous are perfectly holy, and the wicked imperfectly so; but that the righteous are *imperfectly holy*, while the wicked are *entirely sinful*. The righteous have some holy, benevolent affections, while the wicked have none at all. Their hearts are "full of evil," and "fully set in them to do evil;" so that in them "there dwelleth no good thing." They may, indeed, from the promptings of selfishness, or from mere natural affection and sympathy, perform actions which render them respectable and useful in the estimation of their fellow-men. But they are destitute of that faith, without which "it is impossible to please God," and of that "holiness, without which no man can see the Lord." Their moral affections are all selfish—the opposite of that holy love which is the "bond of perfectness," and "the fulfilling of the law."

It is easy to perceive, therefore, why the wicked cannot understand or appreciate the benevolent feelings of the righteous. They have never themselves acted under the influence of benevolence. They have never possessed feelings of this nature. Consequently they know nothing about them. There are many things around us which can be known only by experience. A person could form no idea of colors, who had never seen them; or of sounds, who had never heard them. You might explain ever so learnedly the theory of colors to one born blind, or the science of music to one born deaf, and after all, how little could persons in their situation know relative to these subjects? They would lack *experience*—that without which correct and adequate notions could not be obtained. And so it is in regard to the peculiar views and exercises of the Christian. The sinner has never possessed them; has no experience; and without experience, no adequate conceptions of them can be gained.

The Scriptures represent the wicked as in a state of moral blindness, and as, in some sense, incapable of understanding the peculiar nature of spiritual objects. The cause of their blindness is, not that they have no eyes, but that they have not used their eyes in a proper manner; not that they lack faculties, but that they have never exercised their faculties as they ought. They have never put forth holy affections, and hence have no adequate idea of such affections. They have never themselves acted from benevolent motives, and consequently know not how to appreciate such motives in others. The counsellors of Hanun had never felt those grateful emotions which warmed the breast of pious David, when he wished to requite the kindness of Nahash; and consequently they did not believe that David was grateful. They had no confidence in pretensions of this nature. 'He only wishes to spy out our city, that he may come and overthrow it.' Some men seem to think it a mark of wisdom to be suspicious and jealous; to impute sinister motives to seemingly benevolent actions; and to



presume that all around them are as selfish and unprincipled as themselves. Indeed, the wicked generally, who act under the reigning power of selfishness, know not how to understand or appreciate the benevolent motives of the righteous. They know not how to account for the best actions of good men, but constantly attribute them to corrupt motives—such alone as they are conscious would have influence upon themselves.

These remarks, growing out of the text and the subject suggested by it, are strongly illustrated in the language and conduct of sinners in our own times. The motives of good men, and of those who act from religious considerations, are now frequently misunderstood, and grossly misrepresented. A few instances of this kind, out of the many which suggest themselves, may here be mentioned.

When those who have been thoughtless and indifferent on the subject of religion begin to be awakened to a sense of their situation—begin to forsake their former courses and companions, and to seek in earnest the salvation of their souls; how often are their feelings misinterpreted and ridiculed? The most common pretence is, that such persons are *frightened*. They have been somewhere, and have seen somebody, by whom they have been greatly terrified,—and their seriousness is all attributed to their fears.—Those who bring this charge, cannot, probably, account for the change in their former associates in any other way. They know of no motive, except that of fear, which should produce this change. At least, they can think of no other, which would have such an influence on themselves. If they were anxious and distressed, it must be because they were frightened; and they believe, and nothing can persuade them to the contrary, that this is the case with the anxious around them.

There are some Christians who appear uniformly engaged in the duties of religion. They are instant out of season, as well as in season. They not only attend upon stated religious services, but they are fond of special services. They love the prayer meeting, the conference meeting, and opportunities for private religious conversation. They are known and distinguished among their associates as those who are deeply and habitually interested on the subject of religion.—Yet, strange as it may seem, there is a class of men who give them no credit, after all, for their sincerity. There are those around them, who will have it that they are *hypocrites*, and that all their pretensions are hollow and worthless. Such accusers of the brethren probably reason after this manner; 'I do not love the prayer meeting, and conference meeting; and I do not believe that my neighbor does. I have no regard for these special services, and I presume that inwardly he has none. If I pursued the course he does, I should be a hypocrite; and I am confident that he is one.' Now this is a very natural way of reasoning.

What more common mode of judging, than to judge other people by ourselves, and to give them credit for no better feelings than those which we are conscious of possessing?

There are times, when Christians in general seem particularly engaged for the conversion of sinners. They feel deeply sensible of their guilt and danger; and their 'hearts are stirred within them,' as Paul's was at Athens, when he saw the whole city given to idolatry. They are excited to pray and labor for the conversion of sinners, and to do all in their power that they may be brought to the knowledge of the Saviour.—But there are not a few who, when they witness this zeal, are sure to mistake it and misrepresent it. 'It is all party spirit—sectarian zeal—a disposition to make *proselytes*, rather than a benevolent regard for souls. Ye compass sea and land,' it is said, 'to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him two-fold more the child of hell than yourselves.'—The most charitable method of disposing of this charge is to impute it to the blindness and ignorance of those who urge it. Their own experience, probably, has taught them no better. They can think of no motive, aside from a proselyting, party spirit, which would induce them to do, as they see Christians do, and consequently they believe, and will believe, that this is the spirit by which the people of God are actuated.

In the approach of the days of predicted glory to the church, Christians are found engaged, as it might be presumed they would be, in diffusing a knowledge of the Saviour. They are combining their efforts, to circulate the Bible, to give religious instruction to children and youth, to prepare laborers for the great spiritual harvest, and to send them forth to the whitened fields. Some are quitting their homes, and going far hence to the distant heathen; and many are running to and fro, that knowledge may be increased. Now there are those, and those who think themselves of more than ordinary sagacity, by whom this multifiform charitable labor, in all its branches, is entirely misunderstood, and grossly misrepresented. They seem to have no conception of the peculiar feelings of Christians, and persist in attributing their conduct to motives of selfishness. When they see the different sections of the church uniting, to provide teachers, to circulate the Scriptures and tracts, and to promote the religious instruction of youth; they charge them with *ambitious* views. 'Our liberties are to be invaded; there is to be a union of church and state; under a pretence of piety and charity, these Christians are aiming at the civil power. The agents who are employed in collecting and disbursing the contributions of their brethren, and directing the charitable efforts of the age, are *mercenary* men, abusing the confidence of the unsuspecting, and filling their pockets from the earnings of others. The Missionaries, who go to foreign regions, are actuated by various motives;—some by curiosity, or a thirst of knowledge;

others by a love of fame ; and others by a restless, roving disposition.'—Now we are not angry with those who thus egregiously misrepresent the charitable exertions of Christians. We rather pity them, and are disposed to make the best apology for them in our power. The probability is that they know no better. They have never had the peculiar feelings of Christians, and how should they know any thing about them ? They are sensible that no motives but those of selfishness would be sufficient to excite them, and they believe that those around them, whom they see so active, are influenced in the same way. 'What but ambition, a love of distinction, a thirst of power, could engage *us* in enterprises so vast, laborious, and expensive, as those in which we see Christians engaged ; and shall we believe that they are less ambitious than we ? If *we* were employed as agents in a work like this, and entrusted with large sums of money, we should take care of our own pockets ; and we believe these Christians do the same. No motives but those of curiosity, or novelty, or fame, could induce *us* to leave our families and homes, and go and reside in heathen lands ; and we doubt not that the Missionaries who go are influenced by the same considerations.'

In some instances, the conduct of Christians is so manifestly disinterested, and so incapable of being resolved into any principle of selfishness, as to be entirely beyond the comprehension of mere men of the world. In what manner to account for it, or what to think of it, they cannot tell. As something, however, must be said, it is usual to dispose of such cases as these, by alleging that the persons concerned in them are *crazy*. 'They have absolutely lost their reason. Much learning, or enthusiasm, or something else, hath made them mad.' The principle on which this is said, is the same as that on which other reproachful things are thrown out respecting the disinterested exertions of Christians. When ungodly men can think of no *selfish* motive (and they are conscious of no other) to which to attribute a particular course of action, they at once pronounce it unaccountable, and conclude that those engaged in it have lost their reason.

In conclusion, I have a few words to offer to both those classes of persons to whom reference has been made in the preceding discourse.—And, in the first place, to Christians. You see, brethren, how it becomes you to regard those by whom you are reproached, and what should be your feelings and conduct towards them. Never be angry with them ; or vindictive ; or return railing for railing. They are objects of concern, of pity, and of prayer. They cannot enter into your feelings, and have little more conception of them than a deaf mute has of the pleasures of music. They have always been under the influence of selfishness, and every motive which is not selfish is, in their apprehension, powerless. No wonder, then, that they give you no more credit for dis-

interestedness. How should they, when they know little or nothing of its nature, and perhaps deny its existence? You surely cannot contemplate the situation of such persons, notwithstanding their reproaches, with resentment, or with any other feelings than those of pity and concern.

Christians should further learn from what has been said, never to be deterred from their enterprises of benevolence by the reproaches of the wicked. How little should these reproaches be regarded by you? How very little should they weigh with you? They come from those, who know nothing of the subject of which they speak, and who, with their present feelings, can know nothing. Who would be deterred from beholding and enjoying the fair face of nature, because a blind man doubted and derided his joy? Or who would turn away his ear from melodious sounds, because the heart of a deaf-mute was unaffected by them? No more should those who know the joys of religion, the pleasures of piety, the happiness of being actively and disinterestedly engaged for the advancement of Christ's kingdom and the salvation of souls, be deterred from their works of faith and labors of love, by the reproaches and censures of those who charge them with selfishness and hypocrisy.

At the same time, brethren, let us give as little occasion for these charges, as possible. If reproach must come, and come it will, let us endeavor that, so far as we are concerned, it may be causeless. Our spiritual eye should be so single, our concern for others so real, our zeal so well directed, and our whole character and deportment so consistently religious, that when called to bear the reproach of the wicked, it may be indeed for *righteousness*' sake, and not for our own indiscretions and sins.

I have spoken of the *incapacity* of wicked men to enter into the feelings and appreciate the motives of the righteous. The remarks which have been made show the nature of this incapacity. It is not one, sinner, which excuses you at all. It results, not from the want of powers, but from not *exercising* your powers in a proper manner. If you would be in a situation to enter into and understand the feelings of good men, then you must have such feelings;—you must be good men yourselves. If you would rightly appreciate their motives, you must begin to act under the influence of the same motives. Be disinterested. Love God for what he is. Love religion for its own sake. Love the cause and kingdom of Christ. Be concerned for your own souls, and for the perishing souls of others. Endeavor to feel, on all these subjects, as prophets, apostles, and good men in every age have felt; and you will then be qualified to judge of the actions of good men, and will come to regard them as God does, and as they will be regarded by all holy beings in the judgement of the great day.

IS A FUTURE STATE OF HAPPINESS AND MISERY REVEALED IN  
THE OLD TESTAMENT ?

NOTWITHSTANDING all that has been urged in support of the negative of this question, and the many distinguished names enlisted on that side,\* I shall presume to answer it in the affirmative. I fully believe, and think it may be shown to the satisfaction of every mind, that a future state of happiness and misery is revealed in the Old Testament. Nor in support of this opinion, will it be necessary to go into a very critical examination of disputed passages, or to quote all the plain passages in which it is inculcated: For the doctrine of a future life lies so on the face of the Old Testament, and is so strongly implied in many parts of it, that it cannot well be mistaken (and I presume has not been often) by the common reader.

It might be expected beforehand, that the Old Testament would contain this doctrine.—It is not disputed, by those who hold the negative of the question before us, that the doctrine of a future life is true, and that it is a truth of great importance. What is this momentary scene, in comparison with that on which we are about to enter? What is time, compared with eternity? If then God was pleased, in the early ages of the world, to make a revelation of his purposes and will, why should he confine it to the comparative trifles of this life? Why should he hide from his accountable, immortal creatures the infinitely greater and more solemn realities of the life to come? And who that regards the Old Testament as a revelation from God, but must expect to find in it frequent references to that state which lies beyond the boundaries of time?

We have another presumption in favor of this sentiment growing out of the fact, that *in all the religions of antiquity* the doctrine of a future state is plainly inculcated. It is inculcated, not only in the religious systems of the Chaldeans, Persians, Greeks, and Romans, but in that of the *ancient Egyptians*, among whom the Israelites dwelt for several centuries. We have here, says Champollion describing the inscriptions on the tombs of the ancient kings, the "Egyptian psychological system, in an important and religious point of view, that of *rewards and punishments*." We find completely demonstrated all which the ancients have told us respecting the Egyptian

\* Most of the Liberalists of Germany insist that the Jews "had no idea of the soul's immortality," at least until after their return from Babylon. Mr. Belsham represents it as "the one great object of the Christian revelation" to make known "the doctrine of a future life," implying that this doctrine was unknown under the former dispensation. *Calm Inquiry*, &c. p. 470. Unitarians in this country are still more explicit, affirming that "the Hebrew faith never taught the immortality of the soul." See *Christian Examiner*, vol. ix. p. 68.

doctrine of *the immortality of the soul.*"\* "Now was not Moses, the great leader and law-giver of the Hebrew nation, 'learned in *all the wisdom of the Egyptians;*' and was he not therefore acquainted with the doctrine of immortality, which lies on the very face of their religion? And if the patriarchs and Moses knew all this, (to speak of no more,) was this knowledge all lost before the time of David? Was the king of Israel, the man after God's own heart, the anointed of the Lord, more ignorant than the tyrants of a heathen throne, the worshippers of oxen, and blocks of wood and stone? Believe this who will; but when the opposers of *credulity*, the rationalists of our times, lay such a tax as this upon our understandings, for one I must decline to pay it. I revolt, if it be at the expense of being regarded as superstitious." †

The strong faith, and the ardent, persevering piety of many who lived under the former dispensation, can hardly be accounted for, on supposition that they had no knowledge of a future state. The faith of Abraham, the meekness of Moses, the patience of Job, the fervor of David, and the high spiritual attainments of many, very many, who had no revelation but that of the Old Testament, are universally admitted. But how was this piety formed, and how sustained, without any reference to a future state? Suppose all the knowledge we have of the future were suddenly and entirely effaced, so that we had no anticipation or thought remaining, of a world of spirits, a judgement seat, a crown of glory, a prison of despair, or of any thing beyond the passing scene; what motives should we have, under the influence of which *strong* religious affections could be called forth, and *high* attainments in the divine life sustained? Yet, in the judgement of those who hold the negative of the question under consideration, all this supposed darkness, and ignorance of the future, was blank reality to the people of God in ancient times. Where then, it may be asked, were their appropriate means of sanctification? And under what adequate motives were their holy characters formed? How could they solace themselves amidst all the trials of their earthly pilgrimage, if they had no anticipations of a future and better life? And how could they triumph over death in its most awful forms (as in many instances they did) if they had no hope beyond the grave? ‡

The Jews generally, in the days of our Saviour, were established in the doctrine of a future life, and did not object to his instructions relative to that subject. This must be evident to every atten-

\* See Stuart's Translation of Greppo, p. 262.

† Professor Stuart, in the *Biblical Repository*, vol. i. p. 103.

‡ The apostle Paul represents the Scriptures of the Old Testament as 'given by inspiration of God, and profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, THOROUGHLY FURNISHED UNTO ALL GOOD WORKS.' How the Old Testament can be all that is here represented, and yet contain no revelation of a future state, it is not easy to understand.

tive reader of the Evangelists. But where could the Jews have learned this important doctrine, except from the Old Testament? And how came it incorporated in their national faith, if it was not inculcated in their sacred books? Will it be said that they acquired their notions of immortality from their heathen neighbors, and especially from the Babylonians, during their captivity? "Fortunate people, we may exclaim then," says Professor Stuart, "fortunate indeed, that you were carried away to a distant heathen land, and a seventy years' exile! For there, among the gross idolaters of the Euphrates and Tigris' plains, you learned what all the patriarchs and prophets of the living God had never taught you—you learned that you were made in the image of God and destined to live forever! Happy people, who came to such instruction by exile—instruction more important than all which they had ever before received! But seriously; are we then to believe, that when the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, that 'Abraham looked for a city whose builder and maker is God,' and that the ancient patriarchs 'all died in faith, having seen the promises afar off and embraced them, and desired a better country, even a *heavenly*;'—are we to believe that such men had no hope of immortality?"

But on considerations such as these, satisfactory as they may be, I have no occasion to dwell. Let us go directly to the Old Testament, and see if we do not find conclusive evidence, in the facts there related, and in the revelations there made, that its receivers must have been acquainted with the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments.

In various parts of the Old Testament, we have accounts of the appearance and disappearance of invisible beings. When our first parents were driven out of Eden, *cherubim* were placed there "to keep the way of the tree of life." Angels often made their appearance to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and to others of the Patriarchs. So early as the days of Job, "when the *sons of God* came to present themselves before the Lord, *Satan* came also among them." Whatever may be thought of this portion of sacred history, it proves that there was then a general belief in the existence of invisible beings, both holy and sinful. The knowledge of such beings must have impressed upon the ancient people of God the reality of an *invisible, spiritual world*, into which they might naturally hope their own spirits would be removed, when their bodies were mouldering in the dust.

The doctrine of a future life was confirmed to believers under the former dispensation by the translation of Enoch and Elijah. Of Enoch it is said in the Old Testament, that "he walked with God, and was not, for God took him." Gen. v. 24. The Apostle, speaking of the same event, says, "By faith, Enoch was translated, that *he should not see death*, and was not found, because God had

translated him." Heb. xi. 5. There can be no doubt that Enoch was miraculously translated from earth to heaven, and that this event was known from the earliest period of the Old Testament history.—The account of Elijah's removal is still more explicit. "And it came to pass, when *the Lord would take up Elijah into heaven* by a whirlwind, that Elijah went with Elisha from Gilgal. And as they went on and talked, behold there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder, and *Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven, and Elisha saw it.*" 2 Kings ii. 1, 11. If the Israelites had no knowledge of a future state, where must they have supposed these holy men to have gone? And what must they have thought of these chariots of fire, and horses of fire, and of that *heaven* to which they were expressly told that one of them was taken?

The Old Testament contains numerous promises to the righteous, and threatenings to the wicked, which are not fulfilled in the present life. "Say ye to the righteous that it shall be well with him; for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked, it shall be ill with him; for the reward of his hands shall be given him." Such is the current language of the Old Testament, in regard to God's treatment of these two classes of persons. Now it is perfectly obvious that we do not see such representations fulfilled in the present life; and neither did the ancient people of God see them fulfilled, more than we do. So far from this, they in some instances complained, that the wicked were prospered more than the righteous. "They are not in trouble as other men; neither are they plagued like other men. Their eyes stand out with fatness; they have more than heart could wish." In other instances, the Divine Being is represented as treating persons of every character in this world alike. "There is one event to the righteous, and to the wicked; to the good, and to the clean, and to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth, and to him that sacrificeth not." The present distribution of God's favors in a manner so seemingly strange and unequal, connected with the many assurances in his word that he would bless his people and destroy his enemies, must necessarily have led the minds of ancient believers to another world, where the apparent disorders of the present will be rectified, and where the Divine promises and threatenings will all be fulfilled.—It may give additional force to this argument, to consider it in particular reference to a class of passages, of which there are many in the Old Testament (See Ezek. xviii. and xxxiii.) containing assurances of *life* to the righteous, and of *death* to the wicked. What are the life and the death here intended? Not *natural* life and death surely: For of these, both the righteous and the wicked are equally the subjects. Nor can the reference be to *spiritual* life and death: For, as these respect *character* exclusively, they cannot be either promised or threatened. The life here prom-



ised must therefore be (and was doubtless understood to be) a life beyond the present ; and the death denounced is one which kills beyond the tomb.

Our Saviour represents the Old Testament as revealing a future state of happiness and misery. I shall refer to but two or three passages ; but these are decisive. " Search the Scriptures," (the Scriptures of the Old Testament) " for in them ye think ye have eternal life." John v. 39. How could the Jews think to find the doctrine of " eternal life" in the Old Testament, if no such doctrine was there revealed?—" *That the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob : For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living.*" Luke xx. 37. Our Saviour here expressly asserts, that Moses taught the doctrine of a future life.—The rich man in hell entreated Abraham, that he would ' send Lazarus to his father's house to warn his surviving brethren, lest they also should come to that place of torment. But Abraham said unto him, *They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them.* And he said, Nay, father Abraham, but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent. And he said unto him, *If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.*' Luke xvi. 27—31. I should consider this representation of the Saviour decisive, were there no other in the Bible relating to the subject. On supposition that the Old Testament does not reveal a state of future misery, nothing could be more pertinent than the request of the rich man, and nothing more futile and irrelevant than the reply of Abraham. If these surviving brethren had no means of coming to the knowledge of a future state, how important that one should go to them from the dead ? And why speak of Moses and the prophets in such a connexion, and in such terms, as containing all the instructions and motives which could be presented by one from the dead, if it be indeed true, that Moses and the prophets shut up their readers to this passing scene, and give no intimations of anything beyond it ?

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews represents the ancient believers as acquainted with the doctrine of a future life, and as looking forward to it with joyful expectation. Abraham "*looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.*" " These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that *they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth ; for they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country.* And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned ; but now *they desire a better country, that is an heavenly.*" Moses " esteemed the reproach of Christ

greater riches than the treasures of Egypt : for *he had respect unto the recompense of reward.*" "Women received their dead raised to life again ; and others were tortured not accepting deliverance, *that they might obtain a better resurrection.*" How persons professing to believe the Bible can read passages such as these, setting forth the views and hopes of the ancient people of God, and still persist in saying that "the Hebrew faith never revealed the immortality of the soul," it is not easy to understand.

A multitude of passages may be cited from the Old Testament containing obvious references to a future life. "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth ; and though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet *in my flesh shall I see God.*" Job xix. 25. "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell (the grave) neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of *life*, (a life beyond the grave) *in thy presence is fullness of joy, at thy right hand are pleasures forevermore.*" "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness ; *I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness.*" "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and *afterward receive me to glory.* Whom have I *in heaven* but thee ? And there is none upon earth that I desire besides thee. My flesh and my heart faileth ; but God is the strength of my heart, and *my portion forever.*" Ps. xvi. 11, xvii. 15, lxxiii. 24. "The righteous hath *hope* in his death." Hope of what, if he has no knowledge of a future state. Prov. xiv. 32. "Then shall the dust return to the earth, as it was, and *the spirit shall return unto God who gave it.*" Ecc. xii. 7. "*Thy dead men shall live ; together with my dead body shall they arise.* Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust ; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and *the earth shall cast out the dead.*" Is. xxvi. 19. "*I will ransom them from the power of the grave ; I will redeem them from death. O death, I will be thy plagues ! O grave, I will be thy destruction !*" Hos. xiii. 14.

The foregoing passages relate chiefly to a future state of happiness. Others may be quoted, in which the reference is as obvious to a state of future darkness and misery. "*The wicked shall be turned into hell*, and all the nations that forget God." Ps. ix. 17. What is the hell here spoken of ? Not the afflictions of this life ; nor the pains of death ; nor the grave : For into all these the *righteous* are turned, as well as the wicked. It must, then, be a state of suffering reserved for the wicked beyond the tomb.—The writer of the seventy-third Psalm represents himself as having been exceedingly distressed at the prosperity of the wicked, and as finding no relief, until he went into the sanctuary of God. "Then understood I *their end.* Surely thou didst set them in slippery places ; *thou castedst them down into destruction.*" But how should a consideration of the end of the wicked afford relief to the pain-

ed heart of the Psalmist, in the circumstances mentioned, if he could follow them only to the boundaries of life, and had no knowledge of the destruction which awaited them beyond the grave?—"Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Dan. xii. 2.

In opposition to all this testimony from Scripture, showing that a future state of happiness and misery is revealed in the Old Testament, I am not aware that more than one passage has been adduced. "Who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." 2 Tim. i. 10. But is there no gospel in the Old Testament? Was not 'the gospel preached before unto Abraham?' Gal. iii. 8. Are not the same foundation of hope and way of life—the *same gospel*—proposed in one part of the Bible, as in another?—Or if we suppose the declaration of the Apostle to have respect to the New Testament exclusively, does it mean any thing more than this, that 'life and immortality' are here revealed with additional plainness, and brought into *clearer* light, than they had been under the former dispensation? Certain it is, that Paul could not have intended, and ought not to be understood, to represent that the venerated patriarchs and prophets of the Israelitish nation, holy, inspired men of old, lived and died without any knowledge of a future state.

---

## REVIEWS.

OBSERVATIONS UPON THE PELOPONNESUS AND GREEK ISLANDS, made in 1829. By RUFUS ANDERSON, one of the Secretaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Boston: Crocker and Brewster. New York: Jonathan Leavitt. 1830. pp. 334.

THE situation and future prospects of Greece are a theme of absorbing interest to all who have mourned over the pall of desolation that has for ages hung upon the South of Europe,—but especially to the mind of the Christian moralist. The associations hitherto connected with the remembrance of this country have been almost exclusively classical and intellectual, dear in some measure to the heart, but far dearer to the fancy. They have run back to the era of her ancient splendor, and been drawn from the region of taste, the circle of the fine arts, the flashes of her eloquence, the achievements of her heroes. They have been familiar from childhood to those who have mastered the treasures of ancient literature,

and comprehended the riches and splendor of the Grecian tongue. But with all this variety of association little of a moral aspect has hitherto mingled. There is now to be added to the combination of interesting classical pictures, an interest of a more elevated character; as far higher in importance, as the moral and religious welfare of men is superior to what is merely intellectual and imaginative. The scholar is no longer the only individual who contemplates Greece with enthusiasm; the philanthropist and the Christian are adding to the movements of imagination the prayers and sympathies of the heart.

The consequences of the revolution in Greece cannot be confined to the region of its birth, nor to the interesting people it has liberated. The eye of the Christian philanthropist beholds it in its progress and results, encircling the East with the light of civilization, and scattering the blessings of Christianity over countries on which the beauties of nature, so profusely lavished, have seemed but a lavish waste, cursed as they have been for ages with the paralyzing influence of Turkish barbarity and fanaticism. This moral plague, which has been so long festering, and spreading itself in darkness, is soon to be succeeded by returning health. If freedom and christianity can only be made to penetrate the solitary fastnesses of the Peloponnesus, they will not be hemmed in by surrounding midnight, nor stand still in their course, till the banner of the cross floats over the regions of Asia Minor and the farthest people of the sun. The Divan shall soon become the senate chamber of republics, mosques shall be transformed into churches, and harems into places of prayer. Through Greece, we may move the Eastern World.

In the most splendid periods of the existence of ancient Greece, there was perhaps the least of true moral worth. Her whole history is an exhibition of great mental power exerted on a small scale and in petty intrigues, accompanied sometimes by sublime exhibitions of patriotism, but oftener wasted in selfish schemes of aggrandizement; and even when united with public spirit and honorable ends, resorting to cunning or crime as the best methods of promoting them. The mind contemplates a collection of narrow political communities striving for power, engaged incessantly in exterminating jealousies and wars, each seeking to build itself to glory on the ruins of the other. The picture has indeed a brighter side—philosophy, science, and the fine arts; but there is no place where the moral feelings can rest with delight. Yet poetry has thrown her enchantment over the scene, and the splendor of Homer's genius has irradiated the whole landscape, though not with the warm light of religious feeling, with such an inexhaustible richness and glow of imagination, that we forget its moral deformities, and grow insensible to the nature of its moral atmosphere. From Homer's age, through Solon and Socrates to Philopœmen, the last

of the Greeks, the period is bright in imagination, but dark in point of Christian morality.

The history of the Achaian league is an honorable page, but it closes with the domination of the Roman commonwealth. Thence it is a gradual debasement, first of all honor and nobleness in the feelings, and but little later, of all refinement or expansiveness in intellect, and cultivation in the arts. The introduction of Christianity opens a new scene of interest, and we watch with a more heartfelt curiosity the footsteps of Paul, and the increase of the Gospel. But while life and immortality are thus coming to light, the intellectual and patriotic sun of Greece is setting amidst ignorance, oppression, and the gathering storm of Gothic devastation. Soon we meet Alaric in the passes of Thermopylæ, with a corrupt Roman general to yield before him, instead of a Grecian Leonidas to dispute his progress. The successive inroads of the Goths mark the gradual debasement of Greece. Their first irruption in the year 253 is distinguished indeed by a brave exploit of Dicippus, the Athenian; but the cities of Greece were unable even to defend their fortifications. This period is marked by the final destruction of their magnificent temple of Diana at Ephesus, which had been, since its foundation, seven times ruined and restored. In 395—400, Greece was again and more completely overrun by Alaric and his followers; neither was Rome able to cope with these invaders.

But their last conquerors were their worst. The Turks were as savage as the Goths, and if possible more ignorant; they had all their cruelty and fanaticism, without any of their nobleness. They might be taken for the personification of evil to mankind. Their yoke has not been merely external—their devastation was not that of the fields only—it was that of all refinement, civilization, and intellectual life. Where the Turk stops, it becomes as impenetrable to the rich dews of knowledge and moral refinement, as if it were marble. Three grand eras of desolation in literature, science, and the arts present themselves to the mind, in connexion with the idea of Mahommed, and his followers. They burnt the Alexandrian library; nor can the mind ever become so familiarized to the contemplation of that event, as to look upon it without sorrow and indignation. They burnt the great Byzantine library when Constantinople fell; and well was it for the world that a few precious volumes had been previously scattered over Europe. When they ravaged Scio, they burnt its beautiful Greek library of more than 60,000 volumes;—but this irreparable loss is almost forgotten, in the sensation of horror produced by the recital of the awful cruelties attending that event.

These haters of mankind still rule over some of the most populous and fertile regions in the world; but the Greeks are free. They have become a theme of deeper interest than ever, and de-

mand the attention of all wise and philanthropic men. The volume before us is one of great value, as exhibiting, with unquestionable accuracy, their present situation, the nature of their country, their capabilities, their moral, intellectual and religious wants, and the results which may be expected from the late revolution. It is written in a style perfectly simple and pure, though not devoid of ornament. What cannot often be said of travels, it is a book eminently for *use*, affording the reader a great quantity of real information, which he can obtain nowhere else in the same compass. The first part contains the narrative of the tour, including observations upon the more interesting localities and scenery; upon the soil, agriculture, and productions; the effects of war on the towns, villages, and plantations; and the manners and customs of the inhabitants. The second part contains observations upon the territory, population, and government of Greece; upon the state and prospects of education; upon the Greek church; and upon the measures to be pursued by Protestants for the benefit of oriental churches. It is by far the most valuable book among the multitudes that have appeared in regard to Greece; the most interesting, and at the same time the most to be relied upon.

It was the object of the Rev. Messrs. Anderson and Smith to explore rather the moral than the natural features of the country. The sketches of natural scenery in this volume, though frequent and delightful, are only outlines, having much for the imagination to supply, and making the reader regret that pictures so beautiful in their general design could not have been minutely filled up. The observations on the country were recorded almost invariably on the day in which they were made. The impression left on the reader's mind is therefore uncommonly clear and satisfactory.

The moral charm of the volume is very great. It is written in a strain of unaffected Christian feeling, leading the mind of the reader from the thing formed up to Him who formed it; the observations on the country being intermingled constantly with the reflections which a refined and truly religious disposition would suggest. It would be happy for the world if all the books of travels were thus ameliorating in their moral influence. There are not a few striking illustrations of passages of Scripture. One of the most pleasing of these is the following. The place of encampment for the travellers was solitary, but close beside a spring of water and a shepherd's fold, "welcome objects when we wished to encamp."

"Being wakeful at night, I occasionally heard noises from the hills, which our attendants said proceeded from wolves. The watchful shepherds shouted, and the sheep probably escaped. I was forcibly reminded of the "Good Shepherd." Were the flock near our tent to be forsaken by the shepherd for a single night, it would be scattered and devoured. Just as certainly would it be so with the flock of Christ in this world."

"One of the great delights in travelling through a pastoral country, is to see

and to feel the force of the beautiful imagery in the Scriptures borrowed from pastoral life. All day long the shepherd attends his flock, leading them into "green pastures" near fountains of water, and he chooses a convenient place for them to "rest at noon." At night he drives them near his tent, and if there is danger, encloses them in folds; and at the first alarm he is roused for their protection. They know him, they know his voice, they do not flee from him, they follow him. The tender lambs he often keeps at home while their dams are feeding on the mountains, lest they be wearied, or lost, or fall down the fatal steep. When travelling, he tenderly watches over them, and carries such as are exhausted in his arms, or stops the flock till they are rested. Such a shepherd is the Lord Jesus Christ to his spiritual flock. Nay, far more; for he says, "I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand."

Mr. Anderson's principal object in visiting Greece was to ascertain, with as much precision as possible, what kind of efforts in behalf of the country were incumbent on the American Board. Yet the Missionary is not insensible to classical enthusiasm, or to the love of nature. The following extract will give some idea of the delight, often experienced by the traveller in Greece, arising from the combination, in the same landscape, of the most enchanting natural beauty with interesting recollections, historical, classical, and Christian. In the preceding passage, Mr. Anderson speaks of Corinth as associated with apostolic remembrances, having once enjoyed the distinguished ministry of Paul, Apollos, Timothy, and Titus.

"One clear morning, while at Corinth, we ascended the isolated mountain on the southwest, shooting a thousand feet above the city, and crowned by the citadel called the Acrocorinthus. We wished to enjoy the view from its summit. Entering the citadel on the west side, where the mountain is least precipitous, we passed three successive gates and a ruined village—round to the Pyrene spring—then to the highest point, where, from the foundations of an ancient temple, we had one of the finest prospects in the world. Regarding only the mere natural scenery, the mountains, plains, seas, and islands, there is a charm, which no man gifted with reason and taste can fail to perceive, or can perceive without admiration. But how many pages of interesting recollections, historical and classical, does a single glance here call up to the mind of the scholar. Every object seems a volume;—the isthmus of Corinth, with its games, and wall, and the numerous armies and barbaric hordes that have crossed it—the Saronic gulf, and *Ægina*, and "unconquered *Salamis*"—the Athenian acropolis, like a speck at the foot of mount *Hymettus*, the mountains of *Attica*, and others great in song, round to the long and lofty ridge of which *Parnassus* is a part—the site, and plain, and gulf of Corinth—the road to *Nemea*, to *Mycenæ*, to *Argos*, now seldom trod—and the mountains of *Arcadia* and *Achaia*, with *Cyllene* towering in snowy majesty above them all! One needs time, when on such a post of observation, to gaze long at single objects, and to reflect upon the several classes of great events with which they stand associated."

Our limits will not permit us to make very copious extracts, though we shall indulge ourselves and our readers with several more; and after noticing the second part of the volume, shall close with a brief enumeration of the capabilities of Greece, and of the results which it may be hoped will follow the revolution, both in regard to herself and the adjoining countries.

The following interesting little circumstance, which occurred as the traveller first entered the sweet region of *Arcadia*, shows the

power of early native associations, when recalled to the heart of the missionary in a distant land.

"The next morning was serene. Almost the only clouds were hovering mysteriously on distant summits. The air was bracing, and cheering to the spirits, like many of our own mornings in June, and we pleased ourselves by tracing resemblances to our beloved New England. My companion had spent several years in the Mediterranean, had travelled in Egypt and Palestine, and climbed the heights of Lebanon; but without having seen the white clover, so common in our New England pastures. It covered this Arcadian plain; and that, with a few yellow spires of the mullen blossom among the rocks, threw him into a reverie, in which I found he was living over again the days of childhood, when, with a basket on his arm, he used to wander over the hills of Connecticut gathering these humble ornaments of a New England spring. My own ear was at the same time arrested by the distant notes of a shepherd's pipe, all in unison with the sensations of my mind."

The delightful scenery at the head waters of the Ladon, in Arcadia, is described in a manner not only pleasant to the imagination, but grateful to the pious heart.

"We were now upon the head waters of the Ladon, the beauty of which struck Pausanias so forcibly, that he pronounced this river to be the most beautiful of all that flow in Grecian or foreign lands. Just below the bridge, the Darsiko receives a streamlet from the south. We follow the river, and soon the plain contracts into a narrow valley, about a league in extent, cultivated with maize. Then the mountains advance on both sides, and form a beautiful glen, filled with willows, wild vines, and magnificent plane trees—a delightful asylum for coolness and repose. The river dashes rapidly along, yet with a gentle murmur, and amid its overhanging foliage "the fowls of heaven have their habitation" and "sing among the branches," joyful for such a refuge from the ardent beams of noon. Our feelings rose higher, I trust, than mere gladness; for we saw around us the hand of Him, whose goodness is such that, in a world he framed for discipline rather than for enjoyment, he has yet bountifully diffused the means of happiness. I thought of the comparison which Montgomery has clothed in the language of poetry:—

If God hath made this world so fair,  
Where sin and death abound,  
How beautiful, beyond compare,  
Will Paradise be found!"

Throughout Greece, Mr. Anderson seems to have found a hospitable reception; and through the operation of the system of passports established by government, making all men responsible for the safety of travellers, as well as from the fact that the people had been generally disarmed, travelling was attended with great security. But everywhere in the Peloponnesus, he met with the most affecting proofs of the terrible devastation caused by the war. Hardly a town or village, except those situated in remote and inaccessible places, which was not laid in ruins. Turk, Arab, and Greek carried the storm of fire over the whole peninsula. In the beautiful regions of Arcadia, the Egyptians ravaged almost every plain, valley, and mountain, town, village, and hamlet. The manner in which the Turks make war was seen in the terrible tragedy at Scio; wherever they could, they acted over the same in miniature. A year only had elapsed, to the period of Mr. Anderson's tour, since the evacuation of the country by the Egyptian army; yet in that short time, such were the necessities of the Grecian



families, and such the security of their possessions, that great progress had been made in the cultivation of the soil. The country was beginning rapidly to recover from its desolation, and to present to the eye a promise of its former luxuriance.

While at the island of Tenos, Mr. Anderson had the pleasure of uniting Mr. King in marriage "to a lady of congenial mind—of Grecian descent, but a native of Smyrna, where her family still resides under the protection of France":—

"It was gratifying to observe, that there was nothing in this marriage which seemed to alarm the prejudices of the people, although Tenos is one of the most bigoted islands in the Archipelago. In the course of two or three days, nearly all the people of standing in the place, both male and female, called to express their good wishes. A Greek priest, too, a worthy man, but himself unmarried, sent a pair of doves the next day, and soon followed them with his blessing, in which he appeared to be cordial."

Our readers will be pleased with the following account of Professor Bambas of the University at Corfu.

"Having letters of introduction to Professor Bambas, we made his acquaintance at an early period of our visit. This man, perhaps the most interesting Greek now living, spent nine years in study at Paris under the celebrated Coray. I had heard little of this worthy man for some years past, except that he had escaped the scimitar which crimsoned his native island with blood, and that he had become connected with the Ionian University. How rejoiced we were on coming to the place of his residence, to hear an intelligent and judicious friend, who is well acquainted with Bambas, express a decided opinion in favor of his piety and preaching. We were led into his study by an attendant, and Bambas himself immediately coming in welcomed us with great simplicity and affection. His age appeared to be fifty. His dress consisted of a long under garment bound round the waist by a silken zone. Over this he wore a warm loose garment bordered with fur, and on his head a black cap flat at the top. His fine dark beard, which is allowed to grow in consequence of his ecclesiastical profession, his sweet countenance enlivened by a quick eye, and the deliberation, judgement, and kindness, with which he replied to our inquiries, combined with his reputation for learning, benevolence, and piety, most agreeably impressed our minds at the first interview; and this impression was sustained by our subsequent intercourse."

The Peloponnesian territory is not larger than Massachusetts, and Mr. Anderson thinks the two countries might sustain about the same number of inhabitants. The Peloponnesus contains about 280,000; with the islands and continental Greece, 635,000. The whole population of the country, Greek, Turkish, and Albanian, has been estimated at 2,350,000. At the close of an account of the existing government of Greece, which Mr. A. observes is regarded as provisional and experimental, he remarks:

"The Greeks suffered enough in their late struggle, to entitle them to a government that shall be modelled to suit their views and wishes as a people, and administered with wisdom, energy, and kindness; and the friends of Greece and of true Christian liberty will rejoice if that country may be allowed the blessing of such a government, whatever be its form; only let it secure to the people the enjoyment of all those rights, which the Author of nature and of the Gospel has given them."

Previous to their revolutionary struggle, the means of education enjoyed by the Greeks were fast accumulating. The two most

celebrated Greek colleges were those of Haivali and Scio. These, with all their apparatus and means of instruction, have been utterly destroyed. The Greeks do not seem to have regarded a perfectly finished education as attainable at any of their own seminaries; and young gentlemen of respectable families were in the habit of resorting to foreign universities. Five hundred of these educated young Greeks exhibited, in 1821, the most heroic patriotism.

They "abandoned their colleges and the mercantile houses where they had been placed after finishing their collegiate studies, and, completely armed, repaired from Italy, Russia, and Germany, to the standard of Ypselantes in Wallachia. There they enrolled themselves in a corps called the "sacred band," inscribed on their banners "*Death or Freedom*," and also the motto which was upon the Spartan shield, "*Either this, or upon it*,"—and shortly afterwards, while emulating the heroism of Thermopylæ and Marathon, were nearly all cut to pieces by the Turkish cavalry on the fields of Drageschan."

Previous to the revolution, elementary schools had been neglected by the educated classes in Greece; but at the period of Mr. Anderson's visit, the people seemed more anxious to possess primary Lancasterian schools than academies and colleges. The government, by some of its acts, indicated a disposition to bring all the common schools in the nation under its own control; but in one of the President's communications to Mr. Anderson, speaking of the articles to be provided necessary for the organization of schools, he declares, "In the number of those articles I cause to be entered *the Bible, the New Testament, and the Psalms, translated and printed in modern Greek*." This is a most encouraging declaration; and if it be carried into effect, an enduring foundation is laid for the moral improvement, and of course the safety and welfare, of this whole people. Government have stated that there is need of 400 Lancasterian schools; when Mr. Anderson was in Greece, only twenty-five had been established, and these mostly by the Greeks themselves, without foreign aid. A strong and universal desire prevails among all classes, but especially among the youth, to enjoy the blessings of well-arranged schools; of this the liberality displayed during the year 1829, in subscriptions for the establishment and support of free-schools (a liberality truly astonishing considering the situation of the country) is a cheering demonstration. Besides the general subscriptions, there were distinguished instances of individual munificence.

The most interesting school in Greece is that at Syra for the education of females. It contained in 1828, 330 pupils, about one third females. It was commenced under the auspices of the American Board, and is still called, "The American School," though now under the care of Dr. Korck, a worthy English missionary. The following account of Dr. Korck's Sabbath school will be read with pleasure.

"We had the pleasure of attending Doctor Korck's *Sabbath-school*. There were about an hundred and ninety children present, of whom seventy were

girls—the latter all in the Frank dress, and twenty-six of them in white. They belonged in general to the higher classes of people.”

“The school was opened with a prayer read aloud by the senior monitor, at the end of which the scholars said, *Amen*; but without crossing themselves, as is customary in most Greek schools. This, however, has never been forbidden by the superintendent, nor has anything been said about it by the parents. The monitors then heard the lessons repeated from the Alphabatarion, the Parent's Assistant, the Summary of Christian doctrine, the Psalter, or the New Testament. This being done, the larger children assemble around their teacher, with their New Testament in their hands, open at the chapter which he reads audibly. This chapter he familiarly explains, frequently asking questions, which are promptly answered, sometimes by a dozen simultaneous voices. It was truly delightful to see how the bright eyes of these Greek children sparkled, while they were hearing and repeating the glorious truths of the Gospel. The pupils then retire to their seats, and write what they remember on their slates, while a class of smaller children are called out to hear an explanation of some part of the Alphabatarion given in the same Socratic manner. At the close, such as have distinguished themselves by a diligent and successful application to their lessons, receive tokens, a certain number of which entitles them to specific rewards; and then the school is closed with a prayer, read by the monitor as at the beginning. Not the beautiful scenery of Arcadia, nor the grand prospect from the acropolis of Corinth, awakened such an interest in my mind, as did these children, thus occupied on God's holy day.”

Only three or four years since, no books of elementary instruction existed; the whole supply for the schools established was to be created at once. The schools are, therefore, of necessity, laboring under the severest embarrassments on account of the extreme scarcity of books; nor is it possible that the Greeks, for a long time to come, can obtain from their own resources anything like an adequate supply of the necessary apparatus for study. They must rely on the benevolence of other nations for the support, in a great measure, of the schools already established; much more for the establishment and success of future ones. For what is a school, unless there be appropriate means of instruction—books which the children may use, and such as are adapted to their wants? The appeal to Christian philanthropy, on this subject especially, is powerful and affecting. A wide and effectual door of usefulness is opened to us, and shall we let the occasion pass by? On our aid this interesting people are in a great measure dependant for the first instruments of education—a seasonable supply of appropriate elementary books. In the preparation of such books, and the power of introducing them to general use, we possess a precious opportunity of preparing the way for the full power of unadulterated Christianity to work upon the whole nation.

There is no objection to such aid from abroad, on the part of the Greek people; on the contrary, they earnestly desire it. And they seem to expect it from Americans, more than from any other nation. They have unbounded confidence in us as a people, and have formed an exalted estimate of our character and institutions. The Rev. J. J. Robertson, Episcopal missionary to Greece from this country, observes:—

“The name of American is in all directions a passport to kindness and attention. Dr. Korck states, that Americans will undoubtedly possess more influ-

ence, than benevolent agents from other nations, and that he attributes no small portion of the public favor which he himself has secured, to the fact that he has generally been mistaken for an American."

The same gentleman has given a most affecting description of the thirst for knowledge, even where the people scarcely possessed the most common necessities of life. Their desire for books is like a passion, especially for the word of life. More than 7000 copies of Psalters and Testaments were circulated by Dr. Korck, (the greater part sold) during the short space of sixteen months' residence at Syra. The agent for the British Bible Society, when at Ægina, was surrounded, morning, noon, and night, by anxious throngs of all descriptions, crowding to obtain some portion of the Sacred Word. Nor do they neglect its study when they have obtained it.

"That the Greek people do now earnestly desire such aid from their foreign friends, we had the most abundant proofs in every place. With their own hands they can build school-houses from the stones and clay of their native soil, but books they feel that they cannot make; and these they everywhere solicited, and often they accompanied their solicitations by every argument, which necessity and earnestness could suggest. Poor as the Greeks were—and we often saw them houseless, ragged, and obliged to live on the coarsest fare—they *seldom importuned us for anything, except schools, and school-books*. And if our books be discreetly prepared, no one will object against them because they have a religious aspect. The Greeks have always used religious books in their schools, so that when books are placed in their hands for similar uses, they naturally expect them to say more or less on the subject of religion; and it is an interesting fact, on which I shall yet have occasion to remark more fully, that the ground of received doctrines common to the Greek church and evangelical Christians in Protestant countries, is so broad, that there is much room for Christian effort, without necessarily awakening prejudice."

The importance of this opening for evangelical effort, cannot be too highly appreciated. When will such another occur? A people so anxious for books, that they implore them from us as the best gift in our power, and so ready to receive religious instruction, that we may introduce the vital principles of the Gospel in their very spelling books, without awaking the least jealousy or suspicion! While instruction from stationed missionaries would at present be impracticable or imprudent, we may penetrate the very frame-work of the nation with the purifying spirit of Christianity, and preach the Gospel in every village, by the general system of instruction, and impregnate the youthful hearts of thousands with an influence of Sacred Truth that shall never be lost! It shall prove the most effectual means of utterly redeeming Greece from her enthrallment, of ennobling and regenerating her national character, and preparing her to send out from her own bosom a renovating light over all Asia. We cannot neglect such an opportunity without great guilt. Sooner or later the Greeks must and will have school books of some kind or other; but if we leave them in their difficulties without assistance, whatever ignorance and superstition now debase the national character must in great meas-

ure be propagated to another generation, and we loose the power of bringing them out from the twilight of an adulterated christianity into the clear knowledge of the Gospel of Christ. Or else, such is the astonishing activity of the Grecian mind, and its readiness to improve the smallest intellectual cultivation, it is to be feared, that the accession of knowledge will precede moral improvement, and the result will probably be—*Infidelity*, awful and universal throughout the whole nation. Surely there is no Christian heart but must be deeply interested in the welfare of a people so critically situated.

Mr. Anderson observes, that ultimately the elementary books of foreign origin will be superseded by those prepared among themselves; but that these may be useful, that they may even be preserved from becoming actually deleterious, the schools must for the present be provided with the best books from abroad, or books prepared under the direction of enlightened Christians. The greater number of such works we throw into the country, the more excellent will those be that shall ultimately take their places. From our models, the Greek authors will form their own standard high and pure.

“The design,” says Mr. Anderson, “would be fraught with inconceivable interest, if our aim were merely to assist the Greeks in preparing their own books of education; but the case becomes one of distressing urgency, when we reflect upon the certain consequences of compelling the Greeks, notwithstanding their present embarrassments and necessary disqualifications, to perform the whole work, unaided and unbefriended.”

“The improvement of school-books has excited great attention of late years in the United States, and we have now so many, that the parent is bewildered when he attempts to make a selection for his children. And shall the youth of Greece, who are so generally panting after knowledge, be refused the means of improvement? Shall many thousands of them be compelled to remain long without a single intelligible school-book, when the the smallest piece of silver in circulation among us, is sufficient to furnish a Greek boy or girl with one, from which they might not only learn to read, but also be made wise unto salvation? Every feeling of benevolence answers, No.”

We must pass from this interesting subject to say a few words upon the Greek Church. Mr. Anderson has given a brief but clear view of its melancholy decline from its ancient original standard of faith and practice, and of the introduction of its most remarkable corruptions and usages. Spiritual darkness now overshadows this ancient church, and the errors and superstitions amidst which its correct doctrines lie buried are very great. Yet there are many reasons to encourage the expectation of a glorious reform. Mr. Anderson enumerates five important ones; we can only name them.

1. A general conviction and confession of ignorance, and of departure from primitive simplicity and purity.
2. The government professes to aim at a reform in the church.
3. People and Priest are universally disposed to favor the circulation of the Holy Scriptures.

4. They are anxious to receive school books possessing a sound religious character.

5. Platon's summary of Christian divinity, recommended by Professor Bambas as containing a faithful exhibition of the doctrines of the Greek Church, and destined probably to become the manual of theological students throughout Greece, though deformed by some great defects, coincides in all important points of doctrine with the opinions of evangelical Protestant churches. Its views of Inspiration are elevated. The fundamental doctrines of human depravity, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, atonement by the death of Christ, and justification by faith in him, are clearly and satisfactorily stated. Its views of the sacredness and obligations of the Christian Sabbath are such as the New England churches would approve.

Great injustice has been done to the Greeks in the opinion formed of their merits as a nation. In all essential respects, they are the same people whose genius and energetic patriotism we are accustomed to admire in the pages of ancient history. They possess materials out of which, in the leisure of quiet times, the discipline of intellectual and moral culture may rear an elevated national character. They are brave; none can doubt it, who know anything of their late fearful struggle. We have seen heroes treading the consecrated soil of Greece, whom the mind involuntarily places in its admiration with the virtuous Leonidas of her best days. Such an one was Marco Botzaris, to whose memory an American poet has dedicated a Lyric worthy of its subject. Admiral Miaulis is one of the first examples of disinterested patriotism, courage, and simplicity, to be found in her whole history. The Greeks are kind and hospitable; lively, inquisitive, and cheerful; and remarkable for their perspicuity and quickness of mind. They appreciate the value of learning, and long for it as an exile for his native land. They are frugal and industrious. Remembering the ruthless influence of centuries of Turkish despotism, we cannot but wonder at their comparative purity in point of morals. They are not a people of drunkards, or sensualists in any form. The only vice that seems in any degree national is that of falsehood, a degraded and criminal one indeed, and were it not evidently a transitory stain, induced by the circumstances of their situation, and soon to disappear with the other marks of their bondage, most painful and repulsive to the mind. "As in ancient days," observes Mr. Waddington, whose book on the Greek church is well worth an attentive perusal, "political circumstances were such as to bring forward and illustrate the loftier features of character, throwing a partial shade over its defects, so, in later times, the perverse hand of slavery has forced into light whatever therein is humble, and barren, and misshapen, and hung a cloud over the heights and eminences of its virtue. But the cloud at length has burst, and the long con-

cealed pinnacles begin to unfold and develop their proportions." Not a noble or delightful quality can be named, as having ever adorned the Grecian character in any times of antiquity, which may not now be looked for in far greater perfection, under the blessed influence of Christianity, to be active in the soul and manners of the modern Greeks.

A right view of the geographical position of this country is of great importance in estimating its resources and prospects. It needs but a glance at the map of Greece to tell the beholder that nature formed it for a commercial empire. England only is superior to it, because of her insular situation; and even she has inconveniences which the position of Greece avoids. The Peloponnesus is almost an Island, yet so locked on the north, that this circumstance offers no facilities for invasion from a foreign foe. The Gulf of Patras joins the Gulf of Corinth by a strait, commanded by impregnable fortresses; the Gulf of Corinth almost meets the gulf of Egina on the southeast; the Gulf of Argos is not twenty miles distant at the northwest extremity from both. In continental Greece, from the southern promontory of Sunium to the northern-most boundary established by the protocol of February 1830, there is not a spot in the whole extent of country more than forty miles distant from communication with the sea. Col. Leake observes that the noble basin of water in the Corinthian gulf forcibly attracts the notice of travellers for its natural adaptation to the purposes of a most extensive commerce. The winds of Greece are said to be nearly the same in their quality as those of England. Its proximity to all the rich countries on the Mediterranean—to Asia Minor on the East, to the south of Europe on the west, to Africa and Egypt on the south, and to Arabia, Persia, and other oriental countries through the Red Sea, is a circumstance also of great importance. Nor must its beautiful islands—"those precious stones, set in the silver sea," be forgotten. Indeed the whole of Gaunt's beautiful description of his much loved native Isle might well be applied to Greece.

Accordingly the Greeks have always been essentially a maritime people; and such is now their enterprise and acuteness, that with all their embarrassments, other merchants find it difficult to compete with them at the same port; and to this fact Mr. Robertson refers, as one probable reason for the charge of dishonesty and deceit, so often brought against them: the Frank merchants, though they slander each other, unite in slandering the Greeks. For the beauty and symmetry of their ships they have long been celebrated. They have excellent harbors; the noble one of Navarino is memorable to all our readers, for that most providential and magnificent naval contest, which finally assured independence to Greece.

The face of the country is very remarkable ;—a succession of fertile and beautiful plains and valleys, intermingled continually with rough mountainous fastnesses and impregnable defiles. Its agricultural resources are abundant, and so are its manufacturing facilities. At the same time it is so locked and guarded by the nature of its lofty mountains and strong passes, that in a state of preparation on the part of its inhabitants, it would be impossible for an enemy ever to set foot on its luxuriant soil, which may be sown and reaped for ages with perfect security. The face of the country is such, moreover, as renders the irrigation of the cultivated lands easy and plenteous. On the mountain and hillsides, the surface capable of cultivation is increased by artificial terraces. Only let the Greeks be instructed in the science of agriculture, in all its modern improvements, and they may make their whole country an Eden.

The numerous productions of its luxuriant soil and climate need hardly be named. The traveller passes through a rich succession of vineyards and cornfields, orchards of mulberry, groves of olive and fig-trees. Hundreds of thousands of these different trees, the wealth of the country, were destroyed by the Egyptian army ;—where stood continuous forests for leagues in succession, scarce a solitary tree was sometimes left. The majestic plane tree, the cypress, 'shooting up its dark column above the soft green of the olive,' the walnut, the chesnut, (*Virgil's mollis castanea*,) are familiar to the eye. Extensive forests of oak furnish materials for a navy, and the mountainous ridges are covered with the pine and fir. Oranges, lemons, pomegranates, peaches, apricots, almonds, and a variety of shell fruit are produced in abundance. The myrtle, the ilex, the laurel, the mastic, the tamarind, the juniper, the cherry, and others of a kindred description, ornament the country. Various kinds of grain may be cultivated in profusion ; wheat and barley are most common in winter, maize in summer.

Of the climate and scenery of this country it is difficult to speak with justice. Mr. Anderson indulges in no enthusiasm, but the brief sketches he has given of the rich and romantic views that constantly met his eye are striking. The mountainous scenery is majestic beyond description ; that of the plains and valleys luxuriant and picturesque. The shrubbery, among which are the spicy scented laurel, the arbutus or strawberry tree, the lentiscus, the oleander, rhododaphne or rose-laurel, and its constant companion the agnus castus, is abundant and beautiful. Nothing, it is said, can be more so than the oleander, with its slender stem, delicate leaf, and clusters of large crimson flowers.

If the scenery is rich and romantic, the climate is not less diversified ; for an hour's ride may sometimes carry the traveller through the peculiar atmosphere of almost every season. From the sultriness of summer he may pass to the delicious coolness of autumn, and from that to the breath of a perennial spring. In the



plains, the valleys, and on the hill sides, he may find himself amidst the spicy and fruit bearing plants of tropical regions, while on the sides and summits of the mountains he is surrounded by the dark forests of the North. The air of Attica is the purest and most salubrious in Greece ; the islands are celebrated for their delicious temperature in autumn.

That such a climate and scenery must have exerted a powerful influence in moulding the genius of the ancient Greeks, there can be no doubt. Its power will be equally great in expanding and ameliorating the intellectual and moral character of their descendants. The scenery of Paradise could not indeed impart the tinge of its beauty to the souls of a nation of slaves,—but the Greeks are now free ; and when knowledge and a pure Christianity shall have rendered their minds attentive to the lessons of nature, and susceptible of their sweet influences, then will the sublimity and beauty of the region they inhabit be reflected more vividly than ever in the development of their character as a people. It is beyond all doubt that the influence of cultivated mind on nature, and of natural scenery on the mind, are reciprocal. A man of taste and piety cannot cultivate a flower garden, without having his own spirit made more gentle and thoughtful, in return.

In estimating the prospects of a people, their language forms an important topic for consideration, since the prevalent manner of thinking and the advancement of mind will depend very much on the nature of that which is the instrument of thought. In this respect, the Greeks are superior to every other nation in the world. Their language is a prodigy for its versatile strength and beauty, its combined copiousness, comprehensiveness and acuteness, for every quality, in short, which can render speech adapted to its purpose. This is the character of the ancient Greek, from which the modern is not widely dissimilar. Though disguised under various dialects, and a corrupt pronunciation, it retains its youthful vitality, and is fast approximating to its original and unrivalled excellence. He reasons but poorly, who does not look for uncommon developements of intellect, when there is an instrument so perfect for its movements. We cannot but anticipate the most glorious results, when the genius of this people, free and elastic as the air they breathe, baptized with the spirit of Christianity, strengthened and prepared for action by a diffusion of knowledge such as in ancient times could not even be imagined, shall apply its regenerated energies to literature, science, and the arts ; shall illustrate the mysteries of Redemption, and enforce the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, in that enchanting language which makes the very obscurities of Plato fascinating.

A very brief consideration must make it evident, that the capabilities we have now enumerated, as well as others which have not been named ; the elements of Grecian character, the com-

mercial and agricultural resources of Greece, her internal security against invasion, her delicious climate and scenery, the nature of her language, the admiration with which all enlightened nations look upon the character and literature of her ancestors awakening an unavoidable impression in her own favor;—that all these things, and other circumstances which might be enumerated, prepare this people to take a very high rank in the world's great community of nations. Whether she will or can embrace the opportunity which Providence has offered in her emancipation, depends on the education of her rising generation, especially in principles of vital, unadulterated Christianity. Darkness, infidelity, and moral corruption are thick all around her, and ready to pour in for her destruction. Her friends in Christian lands need to be prayerful in her behalf and watchful to seize every occasion on which they may contribute to her defence.

Should the cause of liberty, knowledge, and piety flourish in Greece, the noblest results may be expected to follow to other nations around her, in the train of her own revolution. She holds a station of high relative importance in regard to Asia Minor, the oriental countries, and the south of Europe. Should the Greeks, in the glorious providence of God, become *His people*, truly evangelical themselves, and active in His cause, what an incalculable addition would there be to the strength of the Missionary enterprise. What vast materials and opportunities for religious effort in all that quarter of the world!

The religion of the Greek Church prevails not only in Greece, but in other countries of Europe, in Western Asia, and in the Eastern parts of Africa; the whole number of its members is estimated at about 70,000,000. Should the reform which there is reason to anticipate, be witnessed in the church of Greece, it cannot but extend to these other countries; and there will be an opening through which the uncorrupted light shall enter, where it has been for ages excluded. Should our anticipations in regard to the regeneration of Greece be realized, she is destined to exert, in all respects, an unmeasurable influence in regenerating the morally degraded but naturally delightful countries around her.

---

A REPLY TO THE REVIEW OF WHITMAN'S LETTERS TO PROFESSOR STUART in the "*Spirit of the Pilgrims*," for March, 1831. By Bernard Whitman. Boston: Gray & Bowen. 1831. pp. 84.

PERHAPS no similar effort ever more entirely answered the end for which it was designed, than the Review of Mr. Whitman's

Letters to Professor Stuart, published in our number for March. We did not expect to silence the author of those Letters; indeed, except from a regard to himself and his friends, we did not desire it. Nor did we expect to satisfy the zealots of his party, who we well knew stood ready to misrepresent and condemn whatever we might publish, weeks before our number was issued. But we did expect so to exhibit the false representations and reasonings, the inconsistencies and contradictions contained in the Letters, as to counteract, in a measure, the very extraordinary efforts which were making to give them currency, and furnish an antidote in the minds of candid and considerate men. By exposing the manifest object of the writer, and the spirit and manner in which he had attempted to accomplish it,—the irrelevancy of his positions, the insufficiency of his arguments, his ignorance, his disingenuousness, and the total unfairness of most of his traditional and *ex parte* statements, we did expect so to acquaint our readers and the public with him, that neither we nor they might have occasion to be troubled, at any considerable length, by whatever he might offer on the same subjects in future. And so far as we can learn, from individuals of different parties near and remote, and from the various indications of public sentiment and feeling, our expectations in these respects, have been fully realized. Notwithstanding the exertions of some of Mr. Whitman's zealous partizans and friends, (and no exertions of theirs have been wanting) the ephemeral credit of his book is gone, and there is nothing more to be apprehended from it, or from anything he can publish for a similar purpose. The pamphlet before us may be disposed of, therefore, in comparatively few words. To reply to it at length would be altogether needless, nor should we think it necessary to notice it at all, were it not that some of our readers may not have the opportunity to see it, or the inclination to plod through it, and still may wish to be informed respecting its contents. For the satisfaction of such persons, we shall now show as briefly as possible,

I. What Mr. W. has here not done. And,

II. What he has done.

1. He has not retracted, nor attempted to prove, the many and grievous accusations of Unitarians against the Orthodox, to which attention was called near the commencement of our Review. We there showed, by accurate quotations from Unitarian authors, and from Mr. W. among the rest, that the Orthodox part of this community have been publicly charged with certain atrocious crimes; such as attempting "to unite church and state," forming "a bold but deep-laid plot against our political and Christian liberties," and conspiring "to seize the civil power," and "overthrow the institutions of the State." We called earnestly upon those who had made these charges, either to 'prove them, or retract them, or consent to stand before the public as false accusers and calumnia-

tors.' To this reasonable demand, Mr. W. has attempted no reply. The accusations referred to are not retracted, and not proved; and consequently those who made them are left by their champion hanging before the public in the odious light of "false accusers and calumniators."

2. Mr. Whitman has not set aside our reasoning to show that Christians, agreeing in their interpretation of the Scriptures, have a right to exhibit their sense of them in a creed; on the basis of this to associate and form a church; and to withhold communion from those who refuse to accede to the fundamental principles of the association. "This," he says, "is not a question for carnal reason to decide;" and intimates that the church is an institution of so sacred a character, that all attempts, such as we had made, to illustrate its rights, by analogies drawn from other bodies, must be fruitless. It is amusing to hear those, who have stripped the church of nearly every right which has ever been thought to belong to it, and almost if not altogether denied its existence, merging it in the world, and making it the mere appendage of a civil corporation,—to hear such men, when occasion requires, talking of the sacred character of the church, and of Jesus Christ as the sole head and ruler of this divine institution. We rejoice in the assurance that Christ is the sole head and ruler of his church; and have no doubt, from the records he has left us of his will, that he would not receive those as worthy members and communicants, who deny his divinity, and the merits of his death, and justification by faith in his blood. If others think differently, they may enjoy their opinion unmolested by us. They may form societies and institute ordinances for themselves; but they have no right to force themselves upon our churches and ordinances, contrary to what we believe the revealed pleasure of the Saviour.

3. To our examination of his statements, Mr. W. in many instances makes no reply; and in others, where a reply is attempted, he utterly fails. The following instance is taken almost at random. We had contradicted one of his statements, as we were authorized to do, by asserting that the original covenant of the second church in Brookfield "was Trinitarian and Orthodox," p. 146. In reply, he publishes a covenant adopted by that church in the year 1801. Now he must have known—if he had read Mr. Stone's letter published in the Appendix to our Review, or if he had reflected that there was a church in the second parish in Brookfield long before the year 1801—that this was *not* the original covenant of the second church in Brookfield. Consequently, it was nothing to his purpose. He might as well have published the covenant of his own church, if he has any.—But further, the covenant which Mr. W. has published, though less explicit on some points than would be desirable, is still, in its obvious signification, "Trinitarian and Orthodox," and such as no Unitarian, like

himself, could honestly adopt. In proof of this, to those who have not the opportunity of consulting it, we need only observe, that it was adopted by a Trinitarian church, and used by a Trinitarian minister in the admission of members, for more than twenty years.

In several cases, where Mr. W. has undertaken to refute our statements, his own witnesses and observations have gone to justify them. For example; he had represented, in his first Letters, that when the members of Unitarian churches request a dismissal and recommendation to Orthodox churches, their request is uniformly granted. We denied this representation, affirmed that we could point to many instances of a refusal, and quoted Mr. Albro as saying that three members of a neighboring Unitarian church (Mr. Allen's of Chelmsford) had been refused letters to his. In reply, Mr. W. publishes a letter from Mr. Allen, confirming, in all material points, the statements of Mr. Albro, and assigning reasons why the letters were refused. p. 33.

Take another instance: In his first Letters Mr. W. had said, that when the Trinitarian church in Waltham seceded from the second society, they took away the Bible with them. In reply, we asserted that *they* did not take it, but that it was taken by the original purchasers, or so many of them as could be consulted, and by them given to the Trinitarian church after the separation. Mr. W. devotes two or three pages to an explanation of this matter, and for the purpose of showing that we "have committed as many errors as our sentences contain ideas."\* The result of the whole, however, is, to contradict his previous statement, and show that the account which we gave is substantially correct.

4. To more than half of the *one hundred and fifteen* misrepresentations numerically arranged near the close of our article, † Mr.

\* It should seem that in his statements respecting Waltham, Mr. W. ought, if anywhere, to be correct. Yet we are assured, on the best authority, that the long account given in these Letters, like that in his former ones, relative to matters in his own village, is disfigured by palpable, and injurious misrepresentations.

† As we have been made acquainted with several additional misrepresentations in Mr. Whitman's first Letters, since the publication of our Review, the list may now be increased as follows:

116. "They (the Franklin Association) proceeded to convene an *ex parte* Council at Greenfield . . . . for the trial of Mr. Field." p. 41.—This Council was not convened for the trial of Mr. Field, but to look into differences existing between the Association and him, and give their advice.

117. "They (the Council) invited the people of the surrounding country to hear "their Result" read in the meeting-house, so as to make their sentence of condemnation as widely known as convenient."—This Council gave no such invitation to "the people of the surrounding country," nor can their result be called "a sentence of condemnation."

118. Mr. W. represents Mr. Thomas Worcester as having been excluded from an Orthodox Association "for embracing Unitarian sentiments," p. 43.—Mr. Worcester retained his connexion with the Hopkinton Association 14 years after his avowal of Unitarian sentiments, and was then dismissed, partly on account of his treatment of the Association, and for having declared to a Committee of the Association that he did not consider himself a member of that body.

119. "The Hopkinton Association filled up the measure of his (Mr. Worcester's) sufferings, by publishing to the world that he was not worthy to be owned or employed as a

W. attempts no reply. In other cases, where a reply is attempted, it is not accomplished. As instances of the latter description, we select the following. In his first Letters, Mr. W. had spoken of "the Domestic Missionary Society," as having large funds for the support of feeble churches. In reply, we told him, what is known to nearly every Orthodox person in the state, that there is no society of this name in Massachusetts.\* Still, he labors to prove that there is. What will not a man do who, instead of acknowledging and correcting an error, undertakes to disprove a *fact* of public notoriety!!

He had said, in his first Letters, that the views of Zuingle "were exceedingly liberal, not differing essentially, except in one or two points, from the liberal Christians of the present period." This statement we contradicted; and have since more fully vindicated the character of the Reformer.† Still Mr. W. insists that he is correct, and labors to prove, what everybody knew before, that Zuingle and Luther did not perfectly harmonize, and that their language respecting each other was in some instances uncourteous. And what if it was? Will this prove Zuingle almost or altogether a Unitarian? By the same evidence we might prove that Calvin was a Unitarian.

In his first Letters, Mr. W. had said that "an Orthodox church has lately excommunicated some of its members for exercising the liberty of attending the communions of another Orthodox church;" and that "an Orthodox Council, with Rev. Mr. Storrs at its head, has sanctioned its proceedings." This whole statement we denied, not as having been made, absolutely out of nothing, but as untrue in the manner in which he had expressed it. In his second Letters, he devotes about four pages to an explanation of this case; and still the facts remain the same. The Orthodox church referred to did *not* "excommunicate some of its members for attending the communions of another Orthodox church;" the Rev. Mr. Storrs was *not* at the head of a Council convened at the request of this church; nor did the Result of this Council contain an *intimation* that the members in question ought to be excommunicated.

Christian minister on account of his great errors." p. 45.—The Hopkinton Association made no such publication.

120. "A little Orthodox Church in the place, (Salisbury, N. H.) a minority of a minority, have passed a vote of excommunication against" Mr. Worcester.—This "little Orthodox church, a minority of a minority," is the Congregational church in Salisbury, and the only one which ever existed there.

121. Mr. W. informs us that, in the spring of 1823, he "was pursuing theological studies with an Orthodox clergyman." p. 90.—The clergyman here referred to, he is understood to have said was the Rev. Mr. Davis, late of Wellfleet. But Mr. Davis assures us that Mr. W. never did pursue theological studies with him.

\* There was such a society formerly, but for years it has been merged in the Mass. Missionary Society.

† See Spirit of the Pilgrims, vol. iv. p. 233.

5. In our Review, we exhibited a long list of Mr. Whitman's contradictions, covering two or three pages, and some of them of the most glaring kind. These, with a single exception, he has not attempted to remove. He suffers them to remain as they were,—only remarking, in the general, that similar contradictions might be charged upon the Bible. We know not how other people may regard this subject, but for ourselves we must say, that when as many *real* contradictions shall be found in the Bible, as we discovered and pointed out in Mr. Whitman's Letters, the objections of infidels will be entitled to a more serious consideration than they have ever yet received.

6. We showed at length, in reviewing Mr. Whitman's Letters, that most of his objections to the Orthodox lie with equal weight against his own party. Unitarians, in most instances, are chargeable with the same things. This he does not deny or dispute; but he insists that it is nothing to the purpose, because Unitarians "are bound together by no system of sectarianism; every individual is perfectly independent." And so the Orthodox of New England "are bound together by no system of sectarianism; every individual is perfectly independent." This may be said with as much truth of the one class as the other. The Orthodox are bound together by no compact, written or unwritten, expressed or implied. They are bound together, only as they choose to act together; and Unitarians are bound as much as this. Indeed, if all is true, which Mr. W. has alleged respecting the *differences* among the Orthodox, this bond of union, on their part, cannot be very formidable.

7. To sum up all we have to offer under this division, it may be observed generally, that many of the more important parts of our article—those in which the facts are best attested, and the most directly against him—Mr. W. has not thought proper to notice at all. He has exercised his own judgement, as he had a right to do, in determining what was deserving of notice, and what not, and it is worthy of remark, that he has in general avoided those very parts which he would have been most likely to have encountered, had he known in what manner to dispose of them. In this, we think he has shown a degree of discretion rather unusual, for him.

But we have detained our readers long enough in showing what our author has *not* done. We proceed to consider, secondly, what he *has* done. And,

1. He has made large quotations from Mr. Baxter and President Stiles on the subject of creeds. We shall not here go into a particular examination of what these venerable men are represented to have written. So far as their sentiments appear in these quotations, we approve some things and some we disapprove. They were strongly opposed to the enforcement of a creed by the *civil power*, and so are we. It may help to a right understanding

of their language to reflect that both of them lived and died connected with churches which not only held to the lawfulness of creeds, but actually used them. Mr. Baxter was a decided Presbyterian,\* and President Stiles occupied a commanding station in connexion with the consociated churches of Connecticut.

2. In a few of the cases examined by us, Mr. W. has brought forward testimony contradictory to that on which our statements are founded. Of these cases, it is needless to go into a farther examination in our pages. We rely implicitly on our witnesses, as Mr. W. does on his; and as these do not in all points agree, the candid reader must do that which is often necessary in a court of justice,—he must compare the credibility of witnesses; consider the nature of their testimony, the temper and manner in which it is given, and all the circumstances of the case; and endeavor to form a just result.†

3. Mr. W. has brought forward three new cases with a view to illustrate and strengthen his positions‡—one relating to the formation of a church in Southborough, another to the late Preceptor of Atkinson Academy, and another to the alleged “concealment” of the Pastor of the church in Raynham. To his account of the formation of the church in Southborough we shall have occasion to refer in another place. Of the circumstances of the other two, we know nothing particularly, and should not have mentioned them, but that it is our business, under this division, to state fairly what our author has done. If they do not contain more truth than some of his other stories, they are hardly entitled to a serious consideration. If, however, individuals concerned think proper to reply to them, they are requested to send their papers to this office as directed in a previous note.

4. In repeated instances, Mr. W. has grossly misinterpreted our language. He charges us with “calling in question the *independency* of the Congregational churches.” p. 65. But instead of this, we have been contending for the proper independency of these churches (not for the name, *Independents*, nor for such an independency as would insulate every individual church) against the encroachments of Unitarian parishes, Jurists, and apologists, from the commencement of our Journal to the present hour.

Again, he charges us with *admitting* that all the various allegations contained in his first letter to Professor Stuart, are but the natural result of our religious principles.

\* Mr. Baxter often subscribed a Confession of faith, and did it, so far as appears, without any scruple.

† If those brethren, whose testimony is contradicted in the pages before us, feel sufficiently interested in the subject to reply, and will send their papers, as soon as convenient, to the Publishers of the Spirit of the Pilgrims, they may probably be published in a pamphlet together. Several important documents have come to hand since the publication of our Review, the substance of which we should be glad to throw into such a pamphlet.

‡ It seems his advertisement for stories was not altogether in vain.



"Let any man read over attentively my First Letter to Professor Stuart, if he wishes to know what the organ of the exclusionists acknowledges to be the natural result of their religious liberty and religious principles. I call upon the community, I call upon every boy and girl, upon every man and woman, to remember this confession. I call upon the freemen of this nation to banish those views of liberty and religion which lead necessarily to such unchristian measures and abominable practices. I call upon them to ascertain if the religion of Jesus sanctions or even tolerates such conduct."

The passage in which Mr. W. would persuade his readers that "this confession" of ours is made, is the following :

"The attentive reader will perceive, in view of the foregoing remarks, that no small part of what Mr. W. charges upon the Orthodox as persecution and oppression, and altogether inconsistent with "free inquiry and religious liberty," is but the necessary result of their religious liberty. They could not have their liberty, and do otherwise. They certainly have the right, as much so as Mr. W. or any other man, to adopt their own religious principles, and to act according to them; and it will be found, on examination, that most of the charges urged against them in his first Letter (bating the false coloring and inaccuracies of statement) are the natural and inevitable result of their honest principles."

Every reader must perceive, at once, that the latter of these passages furnishes no sufficient ground for the former. Indeed, there is no excuse for the man who, with his eyes open, should endeavor to build the one on the other. Is "no small part," of a thing the same as the *whole* of it? Is "most of the charges" in a Letter, with the *exception* of its "false coloring and inaccuracies of statement," *nearly every sentence of which is falsely colored or inaccurately stated*, the same as the whole of it?—But since the above paragraph has been misunderstood and perverted by other Unitarians, as well as by Mr. W., and inferences have been drawn from it for which it furnishes no foundation, we will state, in few words, what we do admit, and insist upon, as 'the natural result of our religious principles.'

We insist, then, that we have a right to study the Scriptures for ourselves. Satisfied that the Scriptures inculcate Orthodox principles, we have a right to adopt these principles, and to express them in the form of a creed.\* When we find a convenient number who hold the same principles, we have a right peaceably to associate on the basis of a common faith, and form a church, a Ministerial association, or any other religious society that shall seem to us important. Having associated in this way, we have a right to refuse admission to those who hold principles the opposite of ours; or if one of our number departs from the fundamental principles of the association, we have a right to call him to an account, and, if need be, to exclude him. As our principles seem to us of great importance, and indeed as essential to Christianity, we must regard those who reject, ridicule, and oppose them as in great errors—as not being in the strictest and best sense of the term Christians; and when occasion calls for it, we must address them, speak of them,

\* Not to take the place of the Bible, but to set forth summarily our understanding of the Bible.

and pray for them, in this light. We may likewise do all in our power, consistently with Christian courtesy and kindness, to expose and refute the errors of such persons, persuade them to renounce them, and lead them to the adoption of better views. Thus much we hold to be 'the natural result of our religious principles,' and necessary on our part to the possession of religious freedom; and no more inconsistent with the freedom of others, than the efforts of disagreeing philosophers or politicians to refute each other's arguments are inconsistent with their freedom. Thus much was stated and explained in our Review, in the sentences immediately preceding those which Mr. W. has quoted; so that it is difficult to see how he or others could honestly have mistaken our meaning.

It was further stated, that these principles are received and acted upon by *other* religious denominations, not excepting the Unitarians themselves. They insist on their right of studying the Scriptures, and of deducing from them their religious principles, as well as we. On the basis of these principles, they associate; and when they have occasion to elect a Pastor, a College Professor or Overseer, we had almost said a civil ruler, they show that they can be as infallible and as exclusive without the aid of paper creeds, as others are with them. They will no more admit those to their pulpits or their churches, who they think deny essential doctrines, than the Orthodox. They speak of such as in great errors, refuse to acknowledge them as brethren, and endeavor to convert them to their own faith. If any part of this statement is denied, the Universalists, the followers of Kneeland and Owen, and other classes of Free Inquirers, stand ready to confirm it.

In concluding our article, we took the liberty to ask intelligent Unitarians—those haters of personality, acrimony and bitterness—what they thought of the spirit and language of Mr. Whitman—how they liked his mode of conducting controversy—whether they were willing that those on the other side should resort to similar measures—and whether they were prepared for the result of such a contest. This our author interprets as 'sueing hard for peace.' If he had said it was 'sueing hard' for truth, in opposition to falsehood,—for candor and fairness, in opposition to prejudice and party zeal,—for decency, in opposition to vulgarity and abuse; he would have come nearer our intention, and the obvious meaning of our words. *We* 'sue hard for peace!' Why should we? If we wished to increase our own subscription;—if we wished to impress more deeply on the whole Orthodox community the importance of sustaining us in our labors;—if we wished, after shaking off from this great community a few individuals who have showed themselves unworthy of a name and a place in it, to bind the remainder together as one man;—if he wished to make more wide and visible the distinction between Evangelical Christians and Unitarians; (and

we confess that we do wish to further all these objects) then might we be tempted to 'sue hard' to Mr. W. to *carry on* this controversy, as he has hitherto conducted it. For though 'he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so,' these assuredly are the results which his labors are tending to produce. But we cannot, on this account, ask him to continue them. From a regard to our own good, we cannot lawfully wish a fellow creature thus to make shipwreck of everything which ought to be dear to him. If he *will* continue them, he must; and in this case, God will continue to bring good out of intended evil, as he has already done. It is no new thing for God to 'cause the wrath of man to praise him,' or for the wicked to be 'snared in the work of his own hands.'

5. In his recent Letters, as in the former ones, Mr. W. makes some very ridiculous statements. Take the following as an example :

"Sir, were you present (in Park Street Vestry) when a question of this nature was discussed; What must be done to promote the cause of religion, or orthodoxy? And do you recollect that the three following propositions were definitely stated? 'First, we must cease controversy, for the unitarians gain the advantage. Secondly, we must use all possible exertions to produce revivals. And thirdly, we must especially endeavor to secure the influence of the women.' You may wonder how I should come by this information. To satisfy you that I have no special communication with his Satanic majesty, I will simply observe, that honest, candid, orthodox men were present on that occasion. They were disgusted with such proposals. They lost their confidence in the honesty of the leaders. They told of these things to others less orthodox in sentiment, who now feel under a necessity of exposing some of your secret machinations."

As Mr. W. has thought proper to ask us whether we were present at this alleged discussion, we can only say that we were not; nor can we find an individual who was, or who ever heard or dreamed of such a discussion, until the account of it appeared in the Letters before us. And if any persons can be found who shall testify that they were present at such a discussion, it will appear that they must have begun and ended it themselves.

6. In these Letters Mr. W. is chargeable, as usual, with almost continual misrepresentations. The following, if no more, occur in his account of the recent formation of a church in Southborough :

"An attempt is now making to break up that Society, (in Southborough) *simply* because Mr. Parker will not *refuse to exchange with Unitarians.*" p. 20. On the next page, a very different reason is assigned for the formation of the new church, by which it is pretended the old Society is to be broken up: "Whereas Rev. Mr. Parker and his church ARE NOT EVANGELICAL, . . . . THEREFORE it is expedient that another church be formed." Which page shall be believed?

Mr. Whitman's correspondent styles the Council which formed the church a "*self-constituted ecclesiastical Council.*" The Council was called and constituted in the usual manner by letters missive

from the persons wishing to form a church, and by vote of the churches there represented.

"The meeting was organized by choosing Mr. Rockwood Moderator, and Capt. Webster Johnson of Southborough, a member of Mr. Parker's church, scribe or secretary."—Capt. Webster Johnson is not, and never was, a member of Mr. Parker's church, nor was he chosen scribe or secretary.

"A notice or summons to Mr. Parker was then *drawn up*, in which it was stated that it had been represented to that body, that Mr. Parker did not preach evangelical doctrines, that he was not evangelical in sentiment, and that the church in Southborough was not evangelical, and called upon him to appear before them to show cause why, for the reasons stated, a new evangelical church should not be established in that town."—No such summons to Mr. Parker was drawn up by the Council.

"A messenger was despatched with the summons."—A messenger was *not* despatched with the summons. A committee of two were sent to inform Mr. Parker that the Council was in session, and would receive any communication which he should be pleased to make.

"They" (the Council) "resolved, that, whereas Rev. Mr. Parker and his church were not evangelical, and whereas due notice having been given him of the premises, and he not appearing, therefore it is expedient that another church be formed in Southborough."—No resolve such as this was passed by the Council.

"The platform, or creed, or confession of faith, adopted and used by Mr. Parker and his church, is taken *verbatim* from that used by Mr. Rockwood in his church at Westborough."—This statement, we are assured, is not true.

"That adopted by the Council for the new church (for I presume the Council prescribe what shall be believed) is substantially the same as Mr. Parker's."—The Council neither adopted a confession of faith *for* the new church; nor *prescribed* what one the church should adopt; nor is the one they did adopt substantially the same as Mr. Parker's.—Let the reader now reflect, that all the misrepresentations here noticed (and probably many more) occur on little more than a page of these Letters, and in relation to a single case; and then let him decide how much confidence is to be placed in the various statements here made.

We must give another instance of misrepresentation as illustrating, not only the extent of our author's reading, but his accuracy, and regard to truth. We had said that "our fathers did not consider or style themselves Independents."

"In proof of your assertion," says Mr. W. "you have made *two* quotations. One is from the apologists of the Westminster Assembly. Now in the name of common sense, what has the opinion of these men to do with the independency of the New England churches. You might as well have quoted from the

proceedings of the Council of Trent. Did you bring forward this extract through ignorance, or to blind the eyes of the more ignorant of your own denomination? Your other quotation, you ascribe to Increase Mather. You have given no reference to the place where it is to be found. I believe you have perverted his meaning; for I find no such sentiment in any of his writings; and I find the place from which your other quotation is taken.\*

In regard to this matter, let it now be particularly observed, that what Mr. W. ignorantly calls "two quotations" is in reality but *one*—all taken from Dr. Mather. It is Dr. Mather who quotes the "Apologists in the Assembly at Westminster" (not *of* them) and his quotation from them is embraced in the single quotation which we made from him. If our learned author had known that these "Apologists in the Assembly at Westminster" were the very Patriarchs of Congregationalism, who, instead of apologizing for that venerable body, as he ignorantly thought, opposed much of its proceedings, and apologized *in* it for their dissent, he might have seen that their judgement in the case was rather more to our purpose than "the proceedings of the Council of Trent."—But we have not yet come to the worst of the case. "Your *other* quotation you ascribe to Increase Mather." We made but *one* quotation—all from Mather. "You have given *no reference* to the place where it is to be found." We gave a *correct reference* which stands in plain English at the bottom of our page. p. 136. "I believe you have perverted his meaning; for I find no such sentiment in any of his writings; and I find the place from which your *other* quotation is made." What *other* quotation? We made but one; and if our author had found one, he must have found the whole! Yet he declares that he did find one, but the rest he could not find! Will not some of his learned admirers volunteer their services to help him out of this difficulty?

7. It is due to Mr. W. to say that, in the work before us, he has corrected *some* of the mis-statements contained in his former Letters. We did not note particularly every instance of such correction. Several occurred to us on a perusal of these pages. What he has done, however, in a way of correction, is as nothing compared with what he ought to do, and with what he must do, before the public will have the least confidence in any thing he may publish on the same subjects in future.

8. Last of all, Mr. W. 'warns us to be *very careful* how we assert that no proper answer has been returned to our statements,' assuring us that he has whole masses of materials all in readiness (a large part of which he admits, however, consists of "*mere quibbles!*"\*) with which to rebut and bear down such a daring assertion. He will accept our thanks for this seasonable warning, and

\* "I found my manuscript would make a pamphlet of nearly two hundred pages. I accordingly cut out about one quarter, as *mere quibbles.*" p. 84. We wonder he did not cut out more of the same character.

for all the concern which he seems to feel for us. The public will judge of the completeness of his answer; and, meanwhile, we shall endeavor so to take care of ourselves as not to impose on him the disagreeable necessity of crushing and destroying us.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF THOMAS PAINE.

The following sketch of the Life of Thomas Paine, author of the "Age of Reason," &c. is from a Review of Harford's Life of Paine in the Christian Observer for April, 1820.

THOMAS PAINE was born at Thetford, in Norfolk, England, in January, 1737, and was educated at the free-school of that place. In 1759, he settled at Sandwich as a stay-maker, to which trade he had been brought up, and married Mary Lambert, who died the following year, it is alleged by some, in consequence of a premature birth caused by his ill usage. In 1761, he obtained a place in the excise at Thetford, from which he was dismissed for some irregularity, but was subsequently restored. In 1768, he was acting as an exciseman at Lewes, where he lived with one Samuel Olive, a grocer, who soon after died. In 1771, he married Olive's daughter, Elizabeth. In 1774, he was again dismissed from his office, on a charge of fraud, and all his efforts to regain his situation proved ineffectual. His affairs soon fell into such disorder, that his property was sold to pay his debts. In May, of the same year, he and his wife, whose life he is said to have rendered miserable by neglect and unkindness, separated by mutual agreement. He went to London; but not obtaining suitable employment there, probably in consequence of the loss of his character, he resolved to try America. He arrived at Philadelphia, in April 1775. Here he became a violent partisan of the colonial cause, and commenced his career as a political writer. One of his publications, entitled "Common Sense," was marked by a singular degree of natural acuteness; and being well-adapted to the state of feeling which then prevailed in America, it gained him much celebrity, and produced an extensive and powerful effect, in deciding the public mind in favor of independence. Paine now rose into consequence. His writings were rewarded by Congress with a sum of money; and in 1777, he was appointed secretary to the committee for foreign affairs. Here he was soon found guilty of a breach of trust, and was ignominiously expelled from the office. After a time, however, he succeeded in procuring the inferior employment of clerk to the House of Assembly of the State of Pennsylvania. When the war ended, he sunk into obscurity; and for five years little is known of him, except that, from a letter he wrote to General Green, he appears to have been very desirous of

coming to England, in order to excite disturbances here. It was not, however, until 1787 that he revisited this country. At first, the state in which he found men's minds afforded him little prospect of success. But as the French Revolution proceeded, the unusual ferment which it caused, not only in France but throughout Europe, greatly raised his hopes. In 1789, he had been arrested for a debt of 700*l.*, but having been released from prison by the intervention of the American House of Claggett and Co., he went over to Paris to take a nearer view of the scenes which were then acting there. Animated by the spectacle, he returned to London, where he became extremely active in spreading revolutionary principles. In 1791, Paine published the First Part of "*The Rights of Man,*" which was followed in 1792 by the second Part, both containing direct and very powerful excitements to rebellion and revolution, supported by a style of reasoning well calculated to delude the ignorant, and to swell the ranks of the turbulent and disaffected. The good sense of the country at large, however, was not to be thus imposed upon; and instead of producing its designed effect, this work appeared to serve the purpose only of rousing the loyal spirit of the people, and rallying them around the throne and the altar. A prosecution was instituted against Paine; but, afraid of the issue, he quitted the kingdom, and repaired to France, having narrowly escaped arrest at Dover. He had previously been elected by the department of Calais a member of the National Convention, and he palliated his evasion by alleging the necessity he was under of attending his duty at Paris. He was tried before Lord Kenyon, and found guilty by the jury without a moment's hesitation. The attorney-general read in court a letter from Paine, addressed to him. It was filled with gross insults on the king; and it denounced vengeance on the judge and jury, should he be found guilty. Not surrendering to meet the award of court, sentence of outlawry was passed upon him. Paine did not long fill his seat in the French Legislature. Having been in some measure identified with the Brissotine faction, he shared its fate, and in December 1793, was thrown into prison, where he was seized with a fever, brought on as it is said by intemperance, and thus narrowly escaped the guillotine. He was released from prison on the death of Robespierre, and invited to resume his seat in the Convention, but all his attempts to attract public regard in France proved abortive. He turned his attention, therefore, once more to England; and perceiving that the chief obstacle to revolution in this country arose from the influence of Christianity, his efforts were now directed to the object of bringing the Scriptures into contempt. With this view he composed and published "*The Age of Reason,*" the first Part of which appeared in 1795, and the second in 1796. Paine himself was beyond the reach of our courts of justice, but the publisher of the libel was prosecuted and convicted. Mr. Erskine, now Lord Erskine, conducted the prosecution; and his speech on the occasion ranks deservedly high among the most splendid effusions of forensic eloquence. After his liberation from prison, Paine had been received into the house of Mr. Monroe, then the American Ambassador at Paris, now the President of the United

States. But his habits of intoxication rendered him a very uncomfortable inmate. He continued to reside in France for some years longer, neglected and contemned. But in 1802, having received an invitation from President Jefferson, he repaired to America, where he spent the remainder of his days. He was accompanied by a Madame Bonneville and her two sons. This woman he had seduced from her husband, in whose house he had lived, and whose hospitality he thus repaid. In June 1809, this unhappy man died at New York. It is during this period of his residence in the United States, that we have the most authentic accounts of the private life of Paine; and little more seems necessary to convince us of the real source of his infidelity, than the perusal of these details: "For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved."

He lodged for a time with a Mrs. Dean. "Mrs. Dean," says Mr. Cheetham, "with whom I have conversed, tells me that he was daily drunk at their house; and that in his few sober moments he was always quarrelling with her, and disturbing the peace of the family. She represents him as deliberately and disgustingly filthy. It is not surprising, therefore, that she importuned her husband to turn him out of the house; but owing to Mr. Dean's predilection for his political writings, her importunities were, for several weeks, unavailing. Constant domestic disquiet very naturally ensued, which was increased by Paine's peevishness and violence. One day he ran after Miss Dean, a girl of fifteen, with a chair whip in his hand, to whip her, and would have done so, but for the interposition of her mother. The enraged Mrs. Dean, to use her own language, 'flew at him.' Paine retreated up stairs into his private room, and was swiftly pursued by his antagonist. The little drunken old man owed his safety to the bolts of his door. In the fall of the year, Mrs. Dean prevailed with her husband to keep him in the house no longer." He then went to live on his farm.

Being now alone, except in the company of the Bonneville's, of whom he took but little notice, he engaged an old black woman, of the name of Betty, to do his house work. Betty lived with him but three weeks. She seems to have been as intemperate as himself. Like her master, she was every day intoxicated. Paine would accuse her of stealing his New England rum, and Betty would retort by calling him an old drunkard. Often, Mrs. Dean informs me, would they both lie prostrate on the same floor, dead drunk, sprawling and swearing and threatening to fight, but incapable of approaching each other to combat. Nothing but inability prevented a battle.

He afterwards removed to different families; but in all of them he appears to have acted not only in the most disgusting and offensive, but in the most unprincipled manner, paying the debts which he contracted for his board and lodging only when compelled to do so. He lived five months with a Mr. Jarvis, a portrait painter. At this place he was not so constantly intoxicated as formerly; and though frequently falling into violent passions, Mr. Jarvis appears to have successfully studied the means of calming his rage. Still he



was only comparatively improved, and would, occasionally, sit up at night tipling, till he fell off his chair. In this posture and plight he would talk about the immortality of the soul. One day, as he was sitting with a volume of the *Age of Reason* before him, a maid servant took it up and began to read it: Mr. Jarvis instantly seized the book out of her hand; upon which Paine rose up angrily, and asked why he did so. Jarvis professed his fear that the girl, whose character was then excellent, would become corrupted in her principles by that book; in which case, he added, she may cheat me, rob me, and be undone. They had now reached the window, and Jarvis pointed out a black man to Paine, as a striking instance of the efficacy of Christianity to enlighten and reclaim the ignorant and immoral. This man, it appears, had been a notoriously bad fellow, without any sense of religion, or even of common moral feeling; but he had since been truly converted, and had gained the character of a sincere Christian, by his upright and excellent conduct. Paine had no answer whatever to make, but 'Pshaw—I had not thought you were such a man.' He saw, added Jarvis, the fact, and it was unanswerable.

We now come to his last hours, when it will evidently appear, "notwithstanding his vain boasts," "that he met death with terror and consternation." He was nursed in his last illness by Mrs. Hedden, a very worthy and pious woman, who did her best to serve him, not only as a kind attendant, but also as a spiritual counsellor. During the first three or four days, his conduct was tolerable, except that he grew outrageous whenever Madame Bonneville entered the room. About the fifth day, his language to Mrs. Hedden was so bad, that she resolved immediately to quit the house; but sensible how necessary she was to his comfort, he made concessions which induced her to remain. Often he would, for a long time together, exclaim, 'Oh, Lord help me! Oh, Christ help me! Oh, Christ help me!'

About a fortnight before his death, he was visited by Mr. Milledoler, a Presbyterian clergyman, who exhorted him to repentance; but Paine grew angry, desired that he might not be disturbed by popish stuff, and ordered him to quit the room. Sometimes Mrs. Hedden read the Bible to him for hours together, and he appeared to listen attentively.

He was attended by Dr. Manly, a respectable physician, who furnished the following particulars of Paine's behavior on his death-bed. Cleanliness appeared to make no part of his comfort; he seemed to have a singular aversion to soap and water: he would never ask to be washed, and when he was, he would always make objections; and it was not unusual to wash and to dress him clean very much against his inclination. In this deplorable state, with confirmed dropsy, attended with frequent cough, vomiting and hic-cough, he continued growing from bad to worse, till the morning of the eighth of June, when he died.

Mr. Paine professed to be above the fear of death; and a great part of his conversation was principally directed to give the impression, that he was perfectly willing to leave this world, and yet some

parts of his conduct are with difficulty reconcilable with his belief. In the first stages of his illness, he was satisfied to be left alone during the day ; but he required some person to be with him at night, urging as his reason, that he was afraid that he should die when unattended : and at this period, his deportment and his principle seemed to be consistent ; so much so, that a stranger would judge from some of the remarks he would make, that he was not an infidel.

During the latter part of his life, though his conversation was equivocal, his conduct was singular ; he would not be left alone night or day ; he not only required to have some person with him, but he must see that he or she was there, and would not allow his curtain to be closed at any time ; and if, as it would sometimes unavoidably happen, he was left alone, he would scream and holla, until some person came to him. When relief from pain would admit, he seemed thoughtful and contemplative, his eyes being generally closed, and his hands folded upon his breast, although he never slept without the assistance of an anodyne. There was something remarkable in his conduct about this period (which comprises nearly two weeks immediately preceding his death) particularly when we reflect, that Thomas Paine was author of the *Age of Reason*. He would call out, during his paroxysms of distress, without intermission, 'O Lord help me, God help me, Jesus Christ help me, O Lord help me,' &c. repeating the same expressions, without the least variation, in a tone of voice that would alarm the house. It was this conduct which induced me to think that he had abandoned his former opinions ; and I was more inclined to that belief, when I understood from his nurse (who is a very serious, and I believe, pious woman) that he would occasionally inquire, when he saw her engaged with a book, what she was reading ; and being answered, and at the same time asked whether she should read aloud, he assented, and would appear to give particular attention.

On the 6th of June, Dr. Manley, struck by these expressions, which he so frequently repeated, and seeing that he was in great distress of mind, put the following questions to him :—' Mr. Paine, what must we think of your present conduct ? Why do you call upon Jesus Christ to help you ? Do you believe that he can help you ? Do you believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ ? Come now, answer me honestly ; I want an answer as from the lips of a dying man, for I verily believe that you will not live twenty-four hours.' I waited some time at the end of every question ; he did not answer, but ceased to exclaim in the above manner. Again I addressed him. ' Mr Paine, you have not answered my questions ; will you answer them ? Allow me to ask again—Do you believe ? or let me qualify the question—do you wish to believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God ?' After a pause of some minutes, he answered, ' I have no wish to believe on that subject.' I then left him, and know not whether he afterwards spoke to any person, on any subject, though he lived, as I before observed, till the morning of the 8th.

The following fact seems to attest, still more strongly, his distrust of the infidel principles which he had professed. A gentleman of the neighborhood occasionally furnished him with refreshments from

his own table, of which a respectable female of the family was the bearer. She frequently found him engaged in writing, and believes from what she saw and heard, that when permitted by his pain, he was mostly so engaged, or in prayer; in the attitude of which she more than once saw him when he thought himself alone. In one of the interviews thus introduced, he inquired whether she had ever read his 'Age of Reason,' and on being answered in the affirmative, he desired to know her opinion of that book. She replied, that she was but a child when she read it, and that he probably would not like to hear what she had thought of it. On this he said, if she was old enough to read it, she was capable of forming some opinion concerning it; and that from her he expected a candid statement of what that opinion had been. Thus encouraged, she told him, that she thought it the most dangerous book she had ever seen; that the more she read the more she found her mind estranged from all good; and that, from a conviction of its evil tendency, she had burnt it without knowing to whom it belonged. To this Paine replied, that he wished all its readers had been as wise as she; and added, 'If ever the devil had an agent on earth, I have been one.' At another time, when she and the benevolent neighbor before alluded to were with him, one of his former companions came in; but on seeing them went hastily out, drawing the door after him with violence, and saying, 'Mr. P. you have lived like a man; I hope you will die like one.' On this, Paine turning to the elder of his visitors said, 'You see, sir, what miserable comforters I have.' Mrs. Bonneville, the unhappy female who had accompanied him from France, lamented to his neighbor her sad case; observing, 'For this man I have given up my family and friends, my property and my religion: judge then of my distress, when he tells me that the principles he has taught me, will not bear me out!'

And here we close the curtain round the death-bed of a man who 'being dead yet speaketh' by those pestiferous publications which still pollute our atmosphere, and by the unhappy effects which, in common with the writings of French and German philosophers, they have assisted in producing throughout the civilized world. In one respect, Paine seems to have deserved the highest seat in this 'bad eminence;' for while most of his infidel predecessors and compeers were directing their weapons against the higher and average classes of intellect, this leader in the campaign of sedition and blasphemy knew how to enlist the populace under his banners. What Addison effected in polite literature, Paine performed in the department of infidel sophistry; he brought it down from the schools of a perverted erudition, to the level of the shop-board and the manufactory. He introduced a sort of 'universal suffrage' into the ranks of literature, by which those who could not reason might rail, and thus vote down, by the invectives of popular clamor, what is venerated by the wise as undoubted revelation from Heaven, and loved by the good as the foundation of all that is virtuous in human conduct, and the only sure guide to temporal or eternal felicity.

## ELECTION WEEK.

The week of our annual solemnities, with its usual variety of excitement and interest, has once more passed away; and although it does not come within our province to go into a minute detail of proceedings, our readers will indulge us in a few words. Notwithstanding the unfavorable state of the weather during the first part of the week, the anniversaries of the different charitable societies were numerously attended, and the contributions were, we believe, larger than usual. A great number of Evangelical clergymen assembled in the city, and their various meetings were characterized by unanimity and brotherly love, and by an uncommon savor of piety.—The principal subject of interest before the Massachusetts Convention of Congregational Ministers was the Report of a Committee, recommending that in future there be no Convention Sermon, but that contributions be taken up by the Pastoral Association of Orthodox Ministers, and the Berry Street Conference of Unitarian Ministers, to be paid by them to the Treasurer of Convention, in aid of its charitable objects. The occasion of this Report was the *complaints* which for several years have been thrown out against the Orthodox part of the Convention (who constitute a majority of more than two to one) because they did not, and in conscience could not, appoint a Unitarian to preach the Convention Sermon. The above Report was designed to remove this source of contention, and at the same time to secure, and perhaps to increase, the contributions to the funds. After a long and spirited discussion, in which the adoption of the Report was opposed by gentlemen on the liberal side of the house, and advocated by individuals on the other side, a motion was made by Dr. Woods to lay the Report on the table, to be called up at a future time should the Convention judge it expedient, and to proceed to the choice of a preacher as usual. This motion was almost unanimously adopted, and the preacher chosen was Rev. Dr. Osgood of Springfield. The speeches of Rev. Doctors Wisner and Beecher on the above mentioned Report were very able and satisfactory to a majority of the Convention.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *The Introductory Discourse and Lectures*, delivered in Boston, before the Convention of Teachers and other friends of Education, assembled to form the American Institute of Instruction, August, 1830. Published under the direction of the Board of Censors. Boston: Hilliard, Gray, Little and Wilkins. 1831. pp. 352.

In August last, a Society, styled "the American Institute of Instruction," composed of teachers and other friends of Education from different parts of the United States, was organized in Boston. The principal object of the meeting at that time was to discuss and adopt a Constitution. The intervals of discussion, which continued for several days, were profitably spent, in listening to the discourses contained in this volume. Besides an Introductory Discourse by President Wayland, thirteen Lectures on important subjects previously assigned, were delivered, and are here published. Our readers will be interested

in the following extract from the Lecture by Dr. Warren, illustrating the power of the mind, in removing diseases of the body.

"The production of physical changes in a sudden and sensible way, by the action of moral causes, is comparatively rare, and difficult to comprehend. Yet medical men do sometimes have an opportunity of observing changes effected by this power, which might appear incredible, and almost miraculous, to those not aware of the force of mental operations on the human organs. I could adduce many such cases. Perhaps it will be proper to state one or two in detail.

"When, some years ago, the metallic tractors were in the height of their reputation for the cure of diseases by external application to the part affected, the following experiment was performed by Dr. Haygarth, of Bath. Two tractors were prepared, not of metal, but of a substance different from the genuine tractors, and made to resemble them. These were applied, in a number of instances, with all the good effects of the real tractors. Among other remarkable cures was that of a person with a contraction of the knee joint, from a disease of six months duration. After a few minutes' application, this man was directed to use his limb, and, to the surprise of all present, he was able to walk about the room. Such instances are not very unusual. Many empirics succeed by calling into action the same principle.

"I will relate another case of this kind. Some time since, a female presented herself to me, with a tumor, or swelling of the submaxillary gland of the neck, which had become what is commonly called a wen. It was about the size of an egg, had lasted two years, and was so very hard, that I considered any attempt to dissipate it by medicine to be vain, and advised its removal by an operation. To this the patient could not bring her mind; therefore, to satisfy her wish, I directed some applications of considerable activity to be made to the part, and these she pursued for a number of weeks, without any change. After this, she called on me, and, with some hesitation, begged to know, whether an application recommended to her would in my opinion be safe. This consisted in applying the hand of a dead man three times to the deceased part. One of her neighbors now lay dead, and she had an opportunity of trying the experiment, if I thought it not dangerous. At first, I was disposed to divert her from it; but, recollecting the power of the imagination, I gravely assured her she might make the trial without apprehension of serious consequences. A while after, she presented herself once more, and, with a smiling countenance, informed me she had used this remedy and no other since I saw her; and, on examining for the tumor, I found it had disappeared."

2. *The Divine Authority and Perpetual Obligation of the Lord's Day*, asserted in seven Sermons, delivered at the Parish Church of St. Mary, Islington, in the months of July and August, 1830. By Daniel Wilson, M. A., Author of Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity, &c. First American edition, with a Recommendatory Preface, by Rev. L. Woods, D. D. Professor in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1831. pp. 212.

We cannot better express our opinion of this work than in the language of a "Recommendatory Letter" prefixed to it, from Eleazer Lord Esq. of New York:

"It can hardly fail, I apprehend, to convince and satisfy every candid reader, of the *divine authority and perpetual obligation of the Lord's Day*. The arguments and practical inculcations of which it consists, all rest on this firm foundation, instead of being derived from considerations of mere expediency. And it is to be noticed and commended as alike rare and inestimable in such a work, that the author, having exhibited his positions in a strong light and sustained them by suitable arguments, brings them, with all the sincerity and fervor of his own spirit, to bear on the conscience and heart. To succeed in argument, and convince the understanding, does not satisfy him; he labors to gain the will, the affections, the whole inner and outer man. In the spirit of true friendship he takes his reader along with him as an accountable fellow-being in

whom he has an interest, and to whom it is at once his office and happiness to do good."

"There is another characteristic of this work which I may be excused for mentioning, namely, the Christian spirit which pervades it—the humility—the benevolence—the reverence of the Supreme Being and of his inspired teachings and requirements—the deep sense of the prevalence and evil of sin, and of the unspeakable blessings of salvation—the manifestations of faith and hope—the harmonious and comprehensive view which seems ever present to the author of all the objects, doctrines, duties, blessings and prospects of religion."

"There is at this moment great need of such a work in this country, full of warmth and earnestness, establishing in a satisfactory manner every position, answering and obviating objections and difficulties and carrying home to the bosom of the reader the practical lessons and sanctions of the subject."

3. *Memoirs of the Life and Character of the Rev. Matthias Bruen*, late Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, in Bleecker Street, New York. New York: John P. Haven. 1831. pp. 358.

We are glad to receive and to recommend this volume—a fit memorial of the lamented Bruen. Our readers may expect a more extended notice of it in a future number.

4. *The Truths of Religion*. By James Douglas, Esq. Boston: Perkins & Marvin. 1831. pp. 247.

This work is divided into eight parts or sections, on the following subjects:—  
 "1. The Evidences of religion. 2. Genius of the Scriptures. 3. Fall of Man. 4. Divinity of Christ. 5. The Atonement. 6. Justification. 7. Sanctification. 8. Heaven." As the works of Mr. Douglas seem likely to have a wide circulation in this country, the following brief account of the man may be acceptable to our readers.

"Mr. Douglas, resides on his paternal estate, at Cavers, about forty miles from Edinburgh, Scotland. The extensive wealth which he inherits from his ancestors is cheerfully expended in promoting those great objects of benevolence, which he has so eloquently illustrated and enforced by his writings. We were recently informed, by a gentleman from Scotland, that he supports, entirely from his own funds, several domestic missionaries, in the destitute places in his own country. As a testimonial of his interest in the well-being of the United States, he transmitted, not long since, through the hands of a friend, £25 to our more important benevolent societies."

"Mr. Douglass, though a young man, has published several volumes, which indicate extensive powers of mind, and which are destined to exert a very beneficial influence."

5. *Reflections on the Character and Objects of all Science and Literature, and on the Relative Excellence and Value of Religious and Secular Education, and of Sacred and Classical Literature*. In two Addresses, and an Oration, with additions, and improvements. By Thomas Smith Grimke' of Charleston, (S. C.) New Haven: Hezekiah Howe. 1831. pp. 201.

6. *The Christian Ministry*, with an inquiry into the causes of its inefficiency. By Rev. Charles Bridges, Vicar of Old Newton, Suffolk, and Author of 'An Exposition of Psalm cxix.' In two volumes. First American from the second London edition, corrected and enlarged. New York: Jonathan Leavitt. 1831.

"This work," says the excellent Dr. Milnor, "will be found eminently

adapted to the use of students preparing for the work of the ministry, and of those already engaged in its sacred duties, who, called to their responsible office by the Holy Spirit, desire to show 'themselves approved unto God, as workmen that need not to be ashamed.'

7. *The American Common-Place Book of Poetry*, with occasional Notes. By George B. Cheever. Boston: Carter, Hendee & Babcock. 1831. pp. 405.

"None can tell how much good a volume like this may accomplish, if an editor keeps such a purpose in view. A thought upon death and eternity may be rendered acceptable, through the medium of poetry, to many a mind, that would otherwise have fled from its approach. A voice from the grave and the other world may possibly here find hearers who would listen to it nowhere else. A devout and solemn reflection may steal, with the poetry of this volume, into the most recret recess of some careless heart, and there, through the goodness of Him, who moves in a hidden and mysterious way, "his wonders to perform," and whose spirit can touch the soul with the humblest instruments, prove the first rising of that blessed well of water, which springeth up to everlasting life."

8. *The means of a Religious Revival*. By John Howard Hinton, M. A. With an Introductory Essay. Boston: Lincoln & Edmands. 1831. pp. 103.

9. *The Theological Class Book*; containing a System of Divinity in the form of Question and Answer, accompanied with Scripture Proofs; designed for the benefit of Theological classes, and the higher classes in Sabbath schools. By William Cogswell. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1831. pp. 195.

The very title of this work suggests its utility. The "system of divinity" inculcated in it is strictly evangelical, and the mode of inculcation such as to engage the attention of the young. We think it adapted to be extensively useful.

---

OBITUARY NOTICE.

During the last month, it has pleased the great Head of the Church very deeply to afflict his people particularly in this region, by the removal of JEREMIAH EVARTS Esq., Corresponding Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, by death. It is known to many of our readers that, on account of impaired health, Mr. Evarts, in February last, undertook a voyage to the West Indies. Here he remained till the middle of April, when, in a seemingly improved state, he set his face towards home. He had proceeded on his return as far as Charleston (S. C.) where he became seriously ill, and where, after lingering for several days, he expired. During the sickness of Mr. Evarts, his mind was uniformly tranquil, reposing with cheerful confidence on the merits and mercy of the Saviour. He died May tenth, in the fifty-first year of his age.

Mr. Evarts was graduated at Yale College in the year 1802, and was spoken of by the late President Dwight as one of the finest scholars ever educated at that institution. After leaving college he commenced the study of law, and practised for several years in New Haven, where he was married to a daughter

of the celebrated Roger Sherman. About the year 1810, he removed to Charlestown, Mass., to take the editorial charge of the *Panoplist*, which was conducted by him with distinguished ability." He was the first Treasurer of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and from the organization of the Board to his decease, ever bore a leading part in the deliberations and enterprizes of that venerable body. No person living, understood its various operations and concerns as well as he, and consequently—although plans have indeed been formed, and a system of measures has been devised which it will be comparatively easy to carry into effect—it is obvious that, without years of experience, no person can be qualified, as he was, to fill the important station from which he has been removed. Of the other various labors of Mr. Evarts, all tending to the advancement of religion and the happiness of his fellow men, it would be superfluous, in this short article, to speak. Suffice it to say, that for the last twenty years, he has been among the foremost of the Orthodox Congregationalists of New England in works of faith and labors of love, and that no important trust committed to his hands has ever suffered through his neglect. He has 'fought a good fight, has finished his course, has kept the faith; and henceforth there is laid up for him a crown of righteousness which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give him at that day.'

Of the character of Mr. Evarts it may be difficult to speak; and we shall be excused in applying to him what (with a slight change of phraseology) was originally said of another eminent servant of Jesus Christ.\*

"After all the deductions which may be due to the paramount claims of truth, or urged by the severer demands of a less friendly scrutiny, there remains to the subject of this notice a residue of solid, and undoubted, and indefeasible excellence, of which the conviction and estimate will, it is firmly believed, be gradually and certainly augmented. He may be slighted by some, and misrepresented or misunderstood by others; but among those who can justly appreciate distinguished worth, genuine piety, and enlarged and active philanthropy, there can surely be but one opinion—that he of whom we speak was "a burning and shining light," and a signal blessing to the church and world. We may, indeed, safely leave his eulogy to be pronounced by future generations, who will assuredly honor his memory, and unite in venerating him as one of the best benefactors of mankind; as having labored to impart to those, who in a spiritual sense are "poor indeed," a treasure,

———"Transcending in its worth  
The gems of India"——

But if it were possible that men should forget or be insensible to their obligations to this excellent person, he is now far removed from human censure and applause; his judgement and his work are with God; his record is on high, and his witness in heaven. He has "entered into peace," and will doubtless stand in no unenvied lot "at the end of days;" when "they that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever." "

\* Dr. Buchanan.

---



THE  
**SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.**

---

---

VOL. IV.

JULY, 1831.

NO. 7.

---

---

**COMMUNICATIONS.**

SKETCH OF THE LIFE OF EZRA STILES, D. D. LL. D., FORMER  
PRESIDENT OF YALE COLLEGE.

Abridged from Holmes' *Life of President Stiles.*

EZRA STILES was born at North Haven, Conn., on the tenth day of December, 1727. His father was the Rev. Isaac Stiles, and his mother a daughter of the Rev. Edward Taylor of Westfield in Massachusetts. Born with a feeble constitution, he was, from his infancy, subject to infirmities; and it long remained doubtful, whether he would survive the age of childhood. But the providence of God preserved, through this critical period, a life destined for future usefulness and eminence.

At the age of nine years he began to learn his Latin grammar; and having finished his preparatory studies, under the instruction of his father, at twelve he was prepared to enter college. An admission at so early an age being judged inexpedient, he waited three years longer; and in September, 1742, entered Yale College, in the fifteenth year of his age. A small estate in Glastenbury descending to him in right of his mother, his father sold it, in 1741, to defray the expenses of his education; but, from some cause now unknown, he did not receive all the avails till 1747. Hence his situation, while at college, was rendered dependent, in a degree, on the patronage of friends. A youth of a fine genius, of amiable manners, and of a promising character, easily found those who had a disposition, as well as ability, to patronise him. President Clap, among others, was his friend and benefactor; and, by various acts of friendship, lessened the expenses of his education. The vestiges of his progress, while at college, are not now easily traced. His favorite researches, however, are discernible in his observations on a comet, which appeared in the beginning of his Sophomore year; in an account taken at the same time of the number, periods, distances, velocity, and other prop-

erties of the comets ; in numerous geometrical mensurations ; in the calculations of eclipses ; and in a copious chronological compendium of the history of the Old and New Testaments. While an undergraduate, he stood, if not the first, yet among the first of his contemporaries ; and when he proceeded Bachelor of Arts, he was esteemed one of the most perfect scholars that had ever received the honors of this seminary.

In 1749, he was chosen a Tutor of Yale College, and was inducted into office on the 25th of May. This was the completion of his wishes ; "truly," to use his own words, "not so much for the honor of the office, as for the advantage of a longer residence at the seat of the Muses."—Having received a license from the New Haven Association of ministers, he preached his first sermon at West Haven, in June. At the public Commencement, in September, he received the degree of Master of Arts, and pronounced a valedictory oration.

In the summer of 1752, he was afflicted with a hectic complaint. This was the fiftieth year from the first Commencement at Yale College, holden in September, 1702. At the President's desire, he composed a Latin half-century oration for the Commencement. This year he was invited to a settlement in the ministry at Kensington ; but he declined the invitation. The exercise of preaching being prejudicial to his health, he determined to pursue the profession of the law, and applied himself to the study of it. In November, 1753, he took the Attorney's oath before the County court at New Haven ; and practised at the bar till 1755.

In April, 1755, being invited to preach, during the vacation, at Newport, in Rhode Island ; he went, for the benefit of the journey, and with no view of settlement. In May, the second church and congregation in that town gave him a unanimous call to settle with them in the ministry ; which call, after mature deliberation, he thought it his duty to accept. The ordination of Mr. Stiles was solemnized October 22, 1755 ; on which occasion his venerable and pious father preached a discourse, which is an interesting specimen of his ministerial talents, and of parental affection.

On the tenth of February, 1757, he was married to Elizabeth Hubbard, the eldest daughter of Colonel John Hubbard of New-Haven ; a woman of excellent accomplishments, intellectual, moral, and religious ; and who, therefore, deservedly possessed his tenderest affection. By her prudence, and exclusive care of everything pertaining to domestic economy, she left him in possession of his whole time for literary pursuits and pastoral duties.

We have seen already that, after having been licensed to preach the Gospel, Mr. Stiles resolved to devote himself to the profession of law. His health was not the only consideration which led him to adopt this course. He entertained many doubts, not only as to the doctrines of the Gospel, but respecting its Divine inspiration

and authority. After his mind had become settled on these great subjects, and he had entered on the work of the ministry, he wrote an account of his previous views, and of the manner in which his scepticism had been removed. From this interesting narrative, the following passages are extracted: "I was always charmed with the character of the Saviour, who, in every respect, appeared to me infinitely superior to the best philosophers, both as to sublimity of doctrine, and purity of morals. But his incarnation was a difficulty; whether he were supposed to be coeternal with the Father, or the highest created being. In either case, it appeared a condescension amazingly too great, to become incarnate, and submit to such a scene of indignity and sufferings, to recover even the whole of such an infinitesimal part of the universe as this little despicable world, of whose deplorable apostacy and ruin I had always a most awful sense, and never the least doubt. I longed for the joy of seeing the redemption of Jesus a verity. I was not clear in the supreme divinity and atonement of Jesus; but was satisfied, if Revelation was true, that the excellency and dignity of his character were the basis of all acceptance with God, and accordingly entirely relied on a union and connexion with him for salvation; and to all his institutes and laws I most freely submitted. I believed the Holy Spirit to be the great illuminator and sanctifier of men."

"In 1749 I had read Taylor on the Romans, and on Original Sin. The Key of the former I read with great approbation, except his two-fold justification, which, to me, was always absurd. But I never could get through his Paraphrase, nor his piece on Original Sin, to this day. They always appeared to me to stumble at the threshold. I also read, with pleasure, Scott's two volumes of Sermons, though I was not pleased with his explaining away the eternity of future punishment, because I thought he proceeded on principles equally giving up the perpetuity of happiness. I judged it a too great concession to the Deists; besides, the Bible seemed to assert it positively."

"The dispersion of the Jews I could but regard as a standing and unquestionable fulfilment of prophecy, showing that the Old Testament contains matters which could be derived from inspiration only—hence, that inspiration had been conversant in the sacred writings. If so, I felt the reasonableness of presuming that there was more inspiration in the Old Testament than what related to this dispersion; and that the fairest way was to examine the whole as inspired. This opened my mind to the discerning of more and more of this inspiration, particularly in those parts which instituted a *sacrificature* pointing to a future Messiah, which describe his sufferings, and the future glory of his kingdom."

"I have seen great glory in the doctrines of Revelation, since I have studied it as an inspired volume. I particularly now

clearly see, that the whole scheme of the Gospel salvation is founded on a supposition, and certain implication, that the human race was totally corrupted, in a lost and ruined state; and that its redemption is wholly founded on the vicarious sacrifice of the Son of God; and I perceive the necessity of regeneration by divine grace."

After stating the religious sentiments, which he had been imbibing for several years, and in which he was established when he wrote this Review, he subjoins: "In general, the more I examine the Scriptures, I see the more reason to believe the doctrines of grace, exhibited in the confessions drawn up at the Reformation, and particularly held by the Puritan divines in England, and the venerable fathers of the New England churches. I thank God, that I have lived to obtain this precious and satisfactory faith in the most holy religion of our Lord Jesus Christ."

In the spring of 1765, Mr. Stiles was honored with the degree of Doctor in Divinity from the University of Edinburgh. He continued to labor with much diligence and usefulness among the people of his charge until the autumn of the year 1775, when Newport was in a great measure evacuated, and his congregation dispersed, by the breaking out of the revolutionary war. He removed his family to Dighton, Mass., where they continued for more than a year. After having received several pressing invitations to labor in the work of the ministry, at Taunton, at Providence, at Boston, and other places, he concluded to accede to a proposal of this kind from the first church in Portsmouth, N. H., lately made vacant by the removal of Dr. Langdon to the Presidency of Harvard College. He commenced his labors in this place, in the spring of the year 1777. His residence here, however, was short, as in September of this year he received notice of his appointment to the Presidency of Yale College. After much consultation and prayer, and a long and painful struggle on the question of duty, he signified his acceptance of this appointment in the spring of 1778.

Before we follow Dr. Stiles to the Presidential office, it may be proper to present in one view the more prominent traits of his pastoral character. His early discourses were philosophical and moral; and, at first, "he was not so much admired as a preacher, as he was, as a friend, gentleman, and scholar. But, gradually becoming *less a Newtonian and more a Christian*, he became a serious, zealous, and powerful preacher of the momentous truths of the Gospel." He "employed his time in preaching *faith and repentance*—the great truths respecting our *disease and cure*—the Physician of souls, and our remedy in Him—the manner of a sinner's being brought home to God in regeneration, conversion, justification, sanctification, and eternal glory—the promises of future rewards—the terrors and glories of the world to come—the influ-

ence of the Spirit, and the efficacy of truth, as well as of the Spirit, in the great change of the moral character, preparatory for heaven, and a glorious immortality."\*

The doctrines of the Trinity in Unity, of the Divinity and Atonement of Christ, with the capital principles of the great theological system of the doctrines of grace, he believed to have been the uninterrupted faith of eight-tenths of Christendom, from the ascension of Jesus to this day. "This system," he observed to his flock, "I have received from God, in the Scriptures of truth; and, on the review of my ministry, I hope you will find, that I have preached *the unsearchable riches of Christ.*"† On this great system of evangelical truth, which had been the burden of his ministry for many years, he cheerfully rested his own salvation, and that of those who had heard him. "I am apprehensive," says he, "that, for half a century, the evangelical doctrines of human nature in ruins, and its reparation, commencing radically in a change of heart, the propitiation and Atonement of the Redeemer, and justification through his vicarious sacrifice, and the doctrines connected with these grand principles of the Christian system, may have a little too much given place to what is called a more rational and polite manner of preaching."

"We find the great Atonement making a principal figure in the Gospel, as being the only basis of the recovery and reconciliation of this world to the favor of Jehovah, and of its reunion with the innumerable myriads of moral systems which compose the universe."

Dr. Stiles entered on the duties of President and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College in July, 1778, being at this time about fifty years of age. "I have a difficult work to accomplish," says he in his journal, "similar in many respects, to the sacerdotal office; especially do I become accountable for the formation of some who may go into the ministry, and who may adopt their religious principles from me; if they should be erroneous, how shall I answer it at the last great day? Blessed be God, I hope I am so well assured of the great principles of my faith, especially of the capital doctrines of the Divinity and Atonement of Christ, and, in general, the doctrines of grace, that I can propagate them with an undoubted confidence of finding them true, ten thousand ages hence, even to eternity. I pray God that I may be directed in this arduous undertaking. To me it is weighty as eternity."

Dr. Stiles continued his connexion with College, much to the honor and success of the institution, his own credit, and the acceptance of the public, until the 12th of May, 1795, when, after a

\* President Stiles' Sermon at the Ordination of the Rev. Mr. Channing.

† Valedictory Address.

short illness, he was removed from earthly cares and labors to his eternal rest.

He was a man of low and small stature, of a very delicate structure, and of a well proportioned form. His eyes were of a dark grey color; and, in the moment of contemplation, singularly penetrating. His voice was clear and energetic. His countenance, especially in conversation, was expressive of mildness and benignity; but, if occasion required, it became the index of majesty and authority. Passionately attached to the interests of science and of religion, his delight in observing, as well as in accelerating their progress, was next to enthusiasm. His own literary acquirements were as profound, as they were diversified and extensive. He had a thorough knowledge of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages; and very few on this side of the Atlantic have made so great progress in the knowledge of the Samaritan, Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic. On the Persic and Coptic he bestowed some attention. The French he read with facility. He was well versed in most branches of mathematical knowledge. In natural philosophy and astronomy he excelled. With the exception of *sacred* literature, astronomy was his favorite science. "I have known no man," says his elegant panegyrist, "express so sublime and magnificent conceptions of the majesty of God, as exhibited in the works of creation."—He was familiarly acquainted with the jurisprudence and civil politics both of ancient and modern nations. The treasures of ancient history were made his own, by a diligent investigation, facilitated by his thorough acquaintance with languages; and of modern history he possessed an exact knowledge. His historical information has seldom been equalled.

Theology was his most favorite study. To perfect himself in this was the ultimate aim and object to which his vast and various scientific attainments were directed and devoted. Whatever had a tendency to confirm the evidences of natural and revealed religion, to assist our conceptions of the divine nature, or enable us to understand more clearly the discoveries made by revelation, engaged his serious and attentive regard.—He had read extensively the works of divines in various languages, and very few have had so thorough and perfect acquaintance with the writings of the Fathers of the Christian church.\* But he relied not implicitly on human opinions, nor settled the articles of his faith by human authority. He thought and judged for himself, with a freedom and independence worthy of a philosopher and a Christian.

If a thorough study of the Scriptures, in their original languages, as well as in many translations; a familiar acquaintance with

\* Professor Meigs' Funeral Oration.

the Rabbinical writings ; a comprehensive knowledge of ecclesiastical history, and of the various systems of polemical and positive divinity, maintained in the successive ages of the Christian church ; joined with deep contemplation, fervent devotion, and a pious life, constitute a great divine—he seems to have had a just claim to this character.

Dr. Stiles was particularly attentive to the religious character of his pupils. During the whole period of his Presidency, it was his practice to meet them on Saturday evenings, and expound to them the Savoy confession of faith.\* “I take great pains,” say he, “to look carefully into the interior state of the college, and to converse with the students, *seorsim*, [apart] both scientifically, and religiously. As the college chapel has devolved on me the year past, I have endeavored to preach *the unsearchable riches of Christ*, and salvation by the cross, and holiness, as consisting in the supreme love of God, for the innate excellencies, purity, and glory, of his nature and character. I have earnestly and sincerely importuned the youth of this University, to devote themselves to that Divine Jesus, who hath loved them to the death. And, praised be God, I have reason to hope the blessed Spirit hath wrought effectually on the hearts of sundry, who have, I think, been brought home to God ; and experienced what flesh and blood cannot impart to the human mind.”

He was very liberal to meritorious but necessitous students, affording them pecuniary assistance perhaps beyond his ability. “I took occasion,” says a friend, “once to hint to him, that perhaps the situation of his family made it rather a duty to lay up something for them, than to give so much, as I apprehended he did, to needy students. He gave me indirectly to understand, that, early in life, he had devoted a tenth of his income to the *great Melchizedec*—this was his expression—and he seemed determined to adhere to his resolution. He appeared unwilling to say much on the subject ; and I never introduced the delicate topic again.”

In his domestic relations, Dr. Stiles was not less estimable, than he was eminent in his public character. As a husband, his tender attentions greatly endeared him to the friend of his bosom. Fondly affectionate, as a parent, he carefully and assiduously attended to the intellectual and religious improvement of his children.

Of his religious character, in addition to his holy and useful life, the best evidence is furnished in his letters, his birth day reflections, and other private devotional writings. From these the following passages are selected :

Dec. 10th, 1771. “O most holy God ! how awful the reflec-

\* An attempt has lately been made to convince the public that Dr. Stiles was an enemy to creeds and confessions of faith.

tion, that I have been forty-four years a sinner against thee! The review of my life astonishes me with a sense of my sins. May I be washed in the blood of Jesus, which cleanseth from all sin. Purify and sanctify me, O blessed Spirit! and prepare me for a sinless state, for the enjoyment of a holy Deity, transfused and displayed through all the works of immensity.

"I hope I love my Saviour for his divine excellencies, as well as for his love to sinners: I glory in his divine righteousness; and earnestly beseech the God of all grace to endue me with true and real holiness, and make me like himself. I commit myself wholly to the guidance and blessing of Him, who guideth and bleaseth the universe."

Dec. 10th, 1774. "Having obtained help of God I continue to this day. The year past I have had clearer views of the wonderful condescension of the Lamb of God, in his incarnation, and in the assumption of a human soul, our holy brother, into union with the uncreated, eternal Word, the second person of the adorable Trinity. A most venerable mystery!—How graciously hath my heavenly Father dealt with me! Bless the Lord, O my soul! and forget not all his benefits. God hath so ordered, that I have spent my life, from my earliest youth, among books; but the most valuable knowledge which I have obtained, is not the mathematical and philosophical sciences; not the ancient learned languages; not ecclesiastical history, and the history of nations and empires; not the knowledge of law, and the political constitutions of Europe:—but that, in which I have found the greatest entertainment and satisfaction, is, the knowledge of JESUS CHRIST, and the redemption of the cross. The sacred oracles open the most wonderful discoveries, and enlarged views, of the august councils of infinite Wisdom and Grace. Through the blood of the cross, Jesus has laid the foundation of our reconciliation, and union also, to the Divinity. Glorious salvation this! God manifest in the flesh, seen of angels, taken up to glory. Of the blessed Jesus I am an unworthy minister. O that I could serve him equal to his deserts from man! But, alas! what little fervor have I, in the service of so glorious a Master! When I review my ministry, it has been so poor and mean, so selfish, so unfaithful, so little animated with the spirit and great cause of Christ, so filled with neglect, ill conduct, and imperfection, that I blush to think of a reward from my Master, to whom I owe my all; and can think of nothing but of going to receive (if I can escape rebuke) mercy and forgiveness only, if possible, for doing his work so poorly. The good Lord pardon me for Jesus' sake; and lay not iniquity to my charge."

Dec. 10th, 1777. "Through the care and patience of a holy God, I am, this day, fifty years old. God hath graciously taken care of me, all my life, to this day. How little have I lived to his glory in the world? It is my greatest happiness to entertain some



hopes, that, in my short pilgrimage on earth, in this state of existence, preparatory to eternity, I have experienced a work of grace on my heart, and been brought to a saving acquaintance with the Lord Jesus Christ. His person is to me most excellent, truly adorable, and altogether lovely. His merit, atonement, and righteousness, are all the foundation of my justification, and the joy and glory of my life. I think the collective excellency, transfused through the universe, does not, would not, command a love in my mind, equal to the supreme affection with which I love the all-glorious Jehovah. His will I wish to reign in me, through time and eternity."

On other similar occasions he writes as follows: "My whole life is such an incessant labor, that I have scarcely time to be religious. I hope I am standing in my lot, and fulfilling my day, as an hireling. While operated upon by many motives, from within, and from without, I hope the grace and glory of God are sometimes found among them. But, O the imperfections, the wickedness of heart and life! Enter not into judgement with me, O God! for, unless sprinkled with the blood of the Lamb, the merit of my all-glorious and holy Redeemer, I cannot stand in judgement before thee. To this all-atoning blood would I fly, and take refuge in the wounds of a bleeding Immanuel. My sins damp my joys and hopes; yet, at times, and this frequently, I am blessed with views and apprehensions of the great Jehovah, and the holiness and benevolence of his government, which I would not part with for all worlds. Quicken me, O Lord, in thy statutes."

"When I review my life, from my earliest years to this day, I find it filled with the care, protection, and goodness of Heaven—filled with infirmities of body and mind—filled with imperfection and sin. My sins are so numerous, so constant, so prevailing, and so uncontrollable, that I am covered with remorse and confusion. I know that the Atonement and merits of my Redeemer are all-sufficient; and so they are for all the miserable in hell. But the imperfections, follies, and iniquities of my life, and of my very heart, excite in me great doubts and fears, lest I shall prove a cast-away. I keep up, indeed, a constant, daily, and unremitted course of prayer, reading of the Scriptures, meditation, and mental devotion; and am habitually seeking God's grace, and energetic influence, to enlighten and sanctify me. But, alas! how little progress do I make in religion!"

"Through the lengthened patience of a holy God, my life has been protracted to old age. May God not forsake me, now that I am old and grey-headed. The nearer I approach to that awful, and oh that it may be a glorious, eternity before me, the more may I be abstracted from this world, the more heavenly minded may I become, and the more, by divine grace, fitted for the world of holiness, rest, and peace. May the solemnities of eternity

come with a daily increasing weight upon my soul, and urge me to more vigilance and vigor in the divine life.—To the most high God, and to his grace, I commit myself, my family, the College, the church of God, my all. May I be entirely devoted to the Divine Jesus. Amen.”

On the forty-sixth anniversary of his public profession of religion, he has the following reflections : “ May I never forget the solemnity of my dedication to God ; never forget, that the vows of Jesus are upon me ! Now that I have been in the vineyard forty-five years, I would not be disunited from the blessed Saviour, nor retract my vows and covenant obligations, for all worlds. Oh that I had lived better !—The good Lord pardon, purify, have mercy on, a sinning and repenting, a repenting and sinning, a reforming and relapsing, a variable and worthless professor ; who yet, if he knows his own heart, in his calm moments, wishes to be the Lord’s, wishes to be purified from all iniquity, and to live a holy life.”

As Dr. Stiles was learned without pedantry, so he was religious without superstition. A Christian believer on unshaken principles, he gloried in nothing so much as in the cross of Christ ; and next to his own immortal interest, his zeal and his talents were unitedly employed, to bring others to the saving knowledge of divine truth.

If he highly estimated human learning, he placed a higher estimate on Religion. Living daily under the influence of its precepts ; supported through life by its promises ; having that *hope in death*, which it is calculated to inspire ; he nobly finished his course, and with Christian triumph, received the summons to his heavenly mansion.

---

THOUGHTS ON RELIGIOUS DIFFERENCES IN MASSACHUSETTS ; IN  
A LETTER TO A UNITARIAN FRIEND.

*Dear Sir,*

I infer from your last, that you regard the differences between the Orthodox and Unitarians of Massachusetts as relating to mere doctrinal, speculative points ; and you inquire, whether the time has not arrived for these differences to be dropped, and for all who pass under the general name of Congregationalists to unite and act as one body.—In reply, I would observe, that I am not less a friend to union than yourself, where this can be effected without the sacrifice of principle, and where it can be carried to such an extent as to be productive of valuable results. But is this the

case in regard to the differences between the Orthodox and Unitarians of Massachusetts? And what union or communion on *religious* subjects can there be between these two denominations? You say our differences relate to mere doctrinal points. And suppose in the first place, that they do. Are doctrinal points of no importance? Or is it not true, that the doctrines of religion lie at the foundation of all that is experimental and practical?—Is it of no importance, for example, whether the Bible is regarded as a revelation from God, or as only a human account, a narrative, *respecting* such a revelation? Is it of no importance whether the God we worship exists in three persons, or in one? whether the Saviour in whom we trust is truly Divine, or merely human? and whether there is, or is not, any Holy Ghost? Is it of no importance, whether Christ has died to make expiation for our sins, or has only lived to instruct us and set before us an example of virtue? whether we regard ourselves as entirely depraved beings, who must be born again and become new creatures in order to see the kingdom of God, or as comparatively virtuous beings, who need only to be reformed and improved, in order to the perfection of our characters and the consummation of our bliss? Is it of no importance whether we rest our hopes of heaven on the atonement of Christ, or on our own meritorious performances? whether we seek to be justified by faith, or by the deeds of the law? Is it of no importance whether there is to be a day of judgement? whether the punishment of the wicked is to be eternal? and whether the whole human race are, or are not, to be made forever happy?

These inquiries, to which many of a like nature might be added, will satisfy you, that what you may have thought mere speculative differences, hardly deserving a serious discussion, are in fact *mighty* differences, affecting the most essential articles of our faith, and going to the foundation of all religion. If there is any thing in the Gospel, I do not say worth contending for, but worthy of serious thought and consideration, certainly it is involved in those great inquiries to which your attention has here been directed. And what spiritual communion can exist, between those religious teachers who think differently on most or all of these subjects, and who carry their differences, not only into the public instructions of the Sabbath, but into the more private walks of pastoral duty?

But my principal object in addressing you at this time, is to show you, in the second place, that the differences among us do not respect mere doctrines, however important, but are in a high degree of a *practical* nature. It will appear, on examination, that the two denominations differ as widely in point of *practice*, as in point of faith.

What different views, for example, are entertained by them re-

specting the nature and the proper observance of the Sabbath. The Orthodox regard the Sabbath as of Divine appointment, instituted at the creation, confirmed to the Israelites by Moses, changed by Apostolic example from the seventh day of the week to the first, but still retaining all its authority as an institution of God. Unitarians, on the contrary, consider the Sabbath as one of the Mosaic institutions, purely Jewish in its origin and nature, and peculiar to the former dispensation. What is called the Christian Sabbath, they tell us, is a very different thing from this, the obligation to observe which rests rather on expediency, than on any positive command of Jehovah.

The Orthodox consider themselves bound to observe the Sabbath according to the fourth commandment, abstaining from all unnecessary labor and recreation, 'not doing their own ways, nor finding their own pleasure, nor speaking their own words,' but filling up the sacred hours with the public and private duties of religion. Unitarians, on the other hand, insist, that 'a Jewish rigor is not to be imposed on Christians'; that 'in us it would be superstition'; that they 'want no demure looks, nor gloomy penances, nor unnecessary or severe restraints, on a day which is preeminently designed for the promotion of religion and happiness.' The Sabbath, they say, should be 'a delight; and in order to render it so, there must be recreation.'<sup>\*</sup>

Consider, in the next place, how different are the views entertained by these two denominations as to the proper mode of spending the other days of the week, besides the Sabbath. The Orthodox love the public duties of religion, and they feel entitled to enjoy them, at stated seasons, during the week. They insist upon the propriety and expediency of meeting occasionally for united prayer, for religious conference, and for mutual encouragement and quickening in the way of duty. They think that 'those who fear the Lord should speak often one to another', and should 'exhort one another daily, while it is called to-day, lest any be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin.' But by Unitarians in general, these special services are considered as useless if not injurious. Except by a few, they are not observed at all; while by many, they are pointedly disapproved and condemned. Instead of them, Unitarians plead for a class of indulgencies which their Orthodox neighbors cannot tolerate. They must have their parties, assemblies, balls, and cards; and even the theatre (except when abused) is spoken of as a very commendable place of resort. †

The two denominations of which I am speaking entertain very different views, and pursue different courses, in regard to *revivals*

\* Christian Examiner.

† "We have no doubt," says a Unitarian of Boston, "that Unitarians form a large part of those who resort to doubtful or positively injurious amusements, who patronize theatres, and are averse to social religious meetings."

*of religion.* The Orthodox are the warm friends and promoters of revivals. They regard those seasons of special attention to religion, when sinners are awakened, and converted, and the people of God are edified, as inestimably precious. They pray much for them—use all likely means for their increase—and when they occur, rejoice in them.—Unitarians, on the other hand, are opposed to what are technically called revivals of religion, and to all the means by which, ordinarily, they are promoted. They deride them, and endeavor to counteract and suppress them. They consider them as altogether a human device, and as productive of far more evil than good.

Cases of religious *awakening* and *conviction* are regarded and treated very differently by these two denominations. The Orthodox rejoice in such awakenings, as furnishing evidence of the presence and strivings of the Holy Spirit. They caution those who are the subjects of them against concealing or resisting their impressions, and so grieving the Holy Spirit from them, and urge them by all the motives of the Gospel, to repent immediately, submit to God, and thus secure peace to their souls.—Unitarians, on the contrary, use no appropriate means for the awakening of sinners; and if, from any cause, an instance of awakening occurs among them, they endeavor to hush it as soon as possible. They tell the pained, alarmed sinner, that his distress is unreasonable; there is no ground for it; and he must endeavor to overcome it. He must frequent cheerful company, read diverting books, shun Orthodox meetings and associates; and do all in his power to drive away superstitious fears, and restore himself to his former state of quiet and peace.

The two denominations of which I have spoken have entirely different views respecting *the church*. The Orthodox regard the church as a body in covenant, and to consist of those, and those only, who believe the essential doctrines of the Gospel, and appear to have felt their efficacy upon their hearts. It is to consist of those who, in the judgement of charity, have been renewed in the temper of their minds, and are thus prepared to enjoy spiritual communion with the Saviour. Consequently, when persons are proposed for admission to Orthodox churches, they are strictly examined as to their doctrinal belief and religious experience, to ascertain, if possible, whether they can, with safety to themselves and the church, be admitted to its communion.—But by Unitarians, the church is regarded as a very different thing. The popular doctrine with them is, that the whole congregation is the church; that the formalities of covenanting should be laid aside; and all be invited to the table of the Lord. And where this doctrine has not yet been reduced to practice (as I am not aware that in very many instances it has been) the door of the church is thrown wide open, and all are permitted and urged to enter, who do not lie under the imputation of palpable vice.

In the Orthodox churches a good degree of *discipline* is maintained. If any of the members are known to neglect their appropriate duties, or to fall into open sins, they are visited, reprov- ed, admonished, and if not brought to a satisfactory confession of their faults, are excommunicated. But in most Unitarian churches, nothing of this kind, I believe, is attempted. Indeed, where the whole congregation is considered as the church, how can offenders be excommunicated, unless the doors of the house of worship are shut upon them, and they are excluded from the public assembly?

Enough has been said to show you that the differences existing between the Orthodox and Unitarians of Massachusetts are *practical* differences, and of a nature to preclude all pleasant and profitable union between the two denominations. Suppose such a union were now effected. Suppose the two parties had agreed to drop their differences, and to unite and act as one body. In the judgement of many, a union such as this is 'a consummation most devoutly to be wished.' Suppose then it were accomplished; how long would it continue; and what would be the result of it? Unitarian ministers often seem desirous to be ordained over Orthodox churches. Suppose such an ordination to occur; and suppose the parties to agree, in the outset, that there should be no difficulty on the ground of doctrines. How are they to get along in *practice*, so that the views and wishes of each may be met and gratified?

On the Sabbath, the church might wish their minister to attend three meetings; but he would insist that two were enough. On Monday (if it should be the first in the month) his brethren would expect the Monthly Concert; but he would be so much fatigued with the labors of the preceding day, and would have so many scruples respecting the utility of Foreign Missions, that he could not attend. On Tuesday evening, they would request, perhaps, to have an extemporaneous discourse, or an exhortation, in their chapel; but owing to his doubts as to the propriety of these extra services, or to his being engaged with a party of friends at home, his presence must be dispensed with. On Wednesday morning, they might wish a prayer meeting at sunrise; but he would feel no interest in such a meeting; and besides, the party kept him up to so late an hour the evening before, that he cannot rise in season to attend. Through the prayers and efforts of the church, and the accompanying influence of the Holy Spirit, some among his people might be awakened from the slumbers of sin, and might go to their minister to be directed in the way to heaven; but he would tell them that they were safe enough as they were, that their distress was groundless, and that they ought to resist it and rise above it. Appearances would indicate, perhaps, a revival of religion,—at which the brethren would greatly rejoice, but at which

their pastor would be as greatly perplexed. They would endeavor to forward it as much as possible, and he to check and hinder it by all means in his power. As he passed about among his people, and visited them at their homes, they would expect him to have conversation with them on religious subjects, and to close his interviews with prayer; but to this perpetual talking upon religion, and praying from house to house, he would have an intolerable aversion. When individuals were proposed for admission to the church, the members would insist on their being examined; but he would object to such a course, not only as needless, but as a snare to the consciences of the candidates, and an abridgement of their rights. He would also be likely to propose persons for admission to the church whom the existing members would not think gave satisfactory evidence of piety, and to countenance and encourage an attendance upon amusements which they would think of injurious tendency.

Such, my dear Sir, are some of the troubles which would immediately ensue, consequent upon a union, an ordination, such as has been supposed. They could not be avoided, even for a month. How long then would the union continue, and be mutually profitable and agreeable?

And were we to suppose an enlightened and zealous Orthodox minister established over a Unitarian congregation, the case would be little if at all better. For unless the Spirit of God was soon poured out, and a large proportion of his congregation converted, he would be a continual trouble to them, and they to him. He would insist upon many things to which they would not consent or submit; and they would insist upon as many, to which he could not submit. His strictness, earnestness, and faithfulness would be a continual vexation to them; while their laxness and worldliness, their love of pleasure and want of interest in what he deemed the greatest of all concerns, would be a perpetual grief to him. He would be obliged to cross their wishes, and they his, perhaps daily; so that the connexion would soon be found to be productive only of irritation and trouble.

My design in these remarks is sufficiently obvious on the face of them. I wish to satisfy you that the religious differences existing in this region are of such a nature, and are so extended through the whole system of Christian doctrine and practice, as to render a union of the Orthodox and Unitarian denominations not only useless but impracticable. 'How can two walk together, except they be agreed?' This interrogation was uttered thousands of years ago, and it is as pertinent now as ever. It is to be regretted, indeed, that there should be differences in opinion and practice on the great subject of religion. It is a source of unutterable grief, that so many in this region—men of learning, talents, and influence, and distinguished for many of the social virtues—should have imbibed what I must consider essential errors, and should

pursue a course which I think in opposition to the Gospel. But to their own Master they stand or fall. I desire to be thankful that they are not responsible to me, and that it is no part of my duty to judge them. What I wish to say is, that while these differences continue, there can be no *real* Christian union between the two denominations, and any attempts at an external union would be undesirable. They are separate in fact, and they ought to be in form. They cannot agree to walk together, and they had better walk apart. An entire separation—more entire, if possible, than now exists—instead of increasing difficulties, would, under present circumstances, help to prevent them; and instead of injuring either party, would tend to the ultimate benefit of both.

With much respect, I remain yours, &c.,

Boston, June 6, 1831.

---

## REVIEWS.

AN INQUIRY CONCERNING THE OBLIGATIONS OF BELIEVERS TO THE VISIBLE CHURCH. BY JOSEPH HARVEY, A. M. *Pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Colchester, Conn.* New Haven: Nathan Whiting. 1830.

At a period when infidelity is increasing in our land, and the moral restraints of former generations are in a measure removed, and many are ready to confound the church of Christ with the common mass of unbelievers, we hail, with joy, every new publication, which sets forth the distinctive character of the church, and urges its claims on the attention of men. Differences of opinion and practice among believers in regard to the organization of the visible church, have contributed, in no small degree, to sink its high and holy character, in the estimation of the world. While unbelievers have beheld these differences, and have considered their results, in destroying the peace and union of the church of Christ, it is not surprising, that they should regard the church as an unimportant institution, and its laws and ordinances as of little value.

Whatever causes may have contributed to obscure the moral beauty and glory of the visible church of Christ, or to retard its progress and prosperity in the world, we are authorized to regard it as the *same* church, under every succeeding dispensation, and under all the differences in its outward ordinances and forms of worship. In this world, the *visible* church is the representative of the real, invisible church. Christ is the head of it, his atonement



is the foundation of hope to all believers, and his word is the only perfect standard of faith and practice. The identity of the visible church, under different dispensations, consists in the identity of its foundation and its object. While these remain the same, changes in its mode of worship, or its ordinances, do not alter its character as a church.

Notwithstanding we have several ecclesiastical histories, and many digests and compends of such history, from which the general character of the church, and the design of Christ in relation to its visible existence in the world may be gathered, and from which, also, the general duties of its members may be inferred; still, we have long felt the need of some work like that before us, to spread out before the minds of believers their obligations to the visible church in a more distinct and tangible form, than they are to be found in any mere outline of church history.

It will be found, on surveying our churches in their different branches, that not a few of the members are in a weak and sickly spiritual state, comparatively inactive and inefficient, through mistaken views of their obligations. Many do not seem to have any clear understanding of their relation to the church of Christ, and can hardly tell why they became members, or what they have to do as members. They feel under no particular obligation to practice self-denial, or to be watchful, and prayerful, and exemplary in their lives. They seem to act without any settled convictions of duty, and without any very strong attachment to the worship and ordinances of the church. Others we find, who are better disposed to do their duty, but who are in doubt and uncertainty as to what their duty is. They lack information, and either from this cause, or from the influence of prejudice, are unprepared to come forward to the work of the Lord.—In our congregations, also, we find more or less, who think themselves believers and hope they are in the way to heaven, some of whom give evidence of a change of heart, who are prevented from entering into covenant with Christ, through the influence of causes which imply a sad deficiency in the knowledge of their duty. In reference to all these classes of persons, we rejoice in the appearance of the work before us. It embraces much useful discussion in a small compass, and contains that instruction which they need.

The author, in the selection and arrangement of his subjects, evidently intended to dwell upon those points which, in other treatises, had been passed more slightly over, yet a knowledge of which is requisite in almost every day's experience. We present to our readers the following brief analysis of the work.

After a summary view of God's care and faithfulness towards the visible church, the author informs us, in his Introduction, that the essential interests of the church may be regarded as consisting in the following particulars: "*The union of all believers in*

*her fellowship and labors;—the dedication of her children in baptism, and the training of them up for the service of Christ, and the blessedness of his kingdom;—her internal purity and strength, by means of the faithful dispensation of the truth, and the administration of discipline;—and her extension in this healthful state, and by appointed means, to all the kindreds of the earth.* To secure these great interests in the church, it is necessary for believers to know their obligations in respect to them, and under the influence of appropriate motives to be excited to fulfil them. The Author's design is to illustrate these obligations, not with a view to expose faults, but to discover duty; not to censure those who differ from him, but to instruct and unfold the will of Christ.

The work is divided into seven chapters, the subjects of which are I. Origin of the visible Church. II. Design of the visible Church. III. Obligations of believers to unite with the visible Church. IV. Obligations of professed believers to bring their infant children to the ordinance of baptism. V. Obligations of parents and churches respecting baptized children. VI. Obligations of professed believers to each other. VII. Obligations of professed believers to support and extend the Church.—These subjects, it must be admitted, are very important, and they are here discussed with great candor and clearness of illustration. The author employs no studied ornament of style, but expresses his thoughts forcibly, and at the same time so perspicuously, that the plain, unlettered reader has no occasion to repeat a sentence to ascertain its meaning. It was manifestly the author's design to be *useful to believers*, and in this way to advance the spiritual prosperity of the church. How far, in the Providence of God, his little volume may be rendered subservient to this purpose, it does not become us to predict. Sure we are that it well accords with that system of means, which is appointed of God for this important end.

The prosperity of the church evidently requires that more attention be paid to the admission of members. On this subject, two extremes are to be avoided;—the one respects the admission of members, without sufficient evidence of their being duly qualified, either before they have had time to examine themselves after their supposed conversion, or before they have a proper understanding of the obligations under which they act;—the other respects an unreasonable delay of the duty, through mistaken views of the nature and degree of evidence which authorizes a person to go forward in its performance, or through the influence of excuses, which imply a deficiency of knowledge in regard to the extent of obligation. In the one case, persons are hurried into the church, whose piety, to say the least, is very doubtful, and whose subsequent conduct, in many cases, proves that their conversion was a delusion; and in the other, real believers, who would prove worthy members of the church, are prevented from coming for-

ward to the enjoyment of her fellowship, and are left to mingle with the world, in a state of great bondage and fear. In the words of our author,

“The Head of the church has not left for his people to judge, whether it is expedient for them to confess him, and observe his ordinances:—he has already settled this point. All they have to determine is, whether they are his people. If the evidence is sufficient to produce a prevailing judgement to this effect, then follows immediately the command, sanctioned by all the authority of Christ himself—‘This do in remembrance of me.’ Here, then, we arrive at the conclusion, that the true ground of the obligation in question is a prevailing conviction in our minds, that we have, in some degree, become new creatures.”

In answer to the question, What is the degree of evidence, which renders it the duty of any one to unite with the visible church, our author replies,

“Just that degree, which is necessary to produce the abovementioned conviction, and which would, in any other important concern, make it our duty to act. Just that degree which will enable us honestly to say that, so far as we know our own hearts, in the light of God’s word, we verily believe, that whereas we were blind, now we see; that old things have, in some measure passed away, and all things have, in some measure, become new; that our desire is holiness, our burden sin, and our hope Christ.”

The reasonings of our author in the chapter on this subject, extend to believers in the different connexions of life, with different degrees of knowledge, and in different states of bodily and mental excitability; and are calculated to remove many existing prejudices and mistaken views in regard to a public profession of religion, and at the same time to restrain persons from acting rashly, inconsiderately, and in the dark, on a point of such solemnity and high responsibility.

Though the union of all believers in the ordinances and worship of the visible church is exceedingly desirable, yet in the present low state of experimental piety, and in view of long established modes of worship, it is scarcely to be expected; still, we rejoice in the increase of a spirit of kindness and love in the different religious denominations, and it is very grateful to see them acting in concert in some of the grand benevolent enterprises of the day.—Our author is to be commended for his candor and kindness of feeling towards those who differ from him in regard to the organization and ordinances of the church. On the subject of infant baptism, he expresses himself in the following manner:—

“I shall endeavor to arrive at the conclusion by the nearest practicable route, that will satisfy the candid mind of the correctness of that conclusion. And I shall esteem myself happy, if in doing this, I shall not unreasonably wound the feelings of any disciple of Christ, who may differ from me in opinion. My only purpose is to illustrate what I believe to be truth. And while all claim the right to do this, they must, on the same principle, allow it to others. Obligation, in regard to a subject of this nature, it is freely admitted, must be founded in the revealed will of God. The result of our present inquiry, therefore, turns on the question, whether God has in any manner or form revealed it as his will, that the infant children of professed believers should be baptized.”

We recommend to our Baptist brethren to peruse this little volume with attention and candor. If it does not convince them of the correctness of our practice, it must satisfy them of the sincerity and charity with which some among us hold what they are pleased to term our errors. We cannot see, that God has excluded the children of visible believers from the seal of the righteousness of faith under the present dispensation, more than under the ancient. To assume the principle, that we must have an express command in the New Testament, in order to authorize the practice of infant baptism, is virtually saying that we cannot observe the will of God, unless it come to us in the form of an express command. We are as well satisfied, that it is the will of God that the infant children of believers should be baptized, as though he had enjoined it by express authority. The scriptural argument on this subject is exhibited by Mr. Harvey with much clearness, and is vindicated from the more common objections in a very happy manner.

It is matter of regret, that there should be, in any of our churches, a backwardness on the part of believers to bring their infant children to the ordinance of baptism; for, in general, this backwardness is attended with remissness in other respects. The covenant engagements which are recognized by believers, when presenting their children before God in baptism, will greatly strengthen and encourage them in the future performance of their duty. No parent, who has any just views of his obligations, can feel that he has nothing more to do, after he has brought his children to this ordinance. He now stands solemnly and publicly pledged to train them up for God and heaven. By requiring the seal of his covenant to be placed on the children of believers, God has made the best provision for their religious education, and for securing to them the appointed means of sanctification, through the promised fidelity of their parents, and their relation to the church. And were parents, and churches but alive to their obligations in this respect, it is impossible to calculate the blessed fruits of such fidelity. But alas, in too many instances, parents are slumbering over their duty, and churches are neglecting theirs, while the children of the church are left to all the exposure of temptation in this evil world, without instruction or restraint, and are found growing up, like the children of unbelievers. Probably many are led to regard infant baptism as a mere ceremony, in consequence of such parental negligence and unfaithfulness. Still, after making due allowance for the influence of this unfaithfulness, the history of the church furnishes ground of belief, that infant baptism has been an important means of preserving and perpetuating Christ's kingdom upon earth!

"Among the apparent subjects of grace in the world, it will be found, that a very large proportion is composed of those who were baptized in infancy. Unfaithful as his professing people have been, God has yet owned and blessed this institution, so far as to give evidence of the estimation he puts upon it. But what would infant baptism produce, if its design were carried into full execu-

tion? This is the proper question. And who will deny that the ordinance of baptism, when understood as applied for this purpose, is calculated to stimulate to the more faithful performance of duty? Who will question, that duty faithfully performed will be followed by most happy and extensive consequences to the church and the world?"

The duty of churches, in this case, extends to children *through their parents*. They are baptized in consequence of the faith of their parents, and by means of their parent's membership in the church, are brought into a peculiar relation to this holy society; a relation designed to secure to them a strictly religious education, and place them in circumstances most favorable for their becoming wise unto salvation. The field of duty thus opened before parents and churches is immensely important. To enter this field, and survey its limits, and lay off to parents and churches their respective portions of labor, would exceed our present design. The subject, as presented in the work before us, is fitted to excite a deep interest in the heart of every Christian reader. It presents motives before Christian fathers and mothers, to be up and doing in the work of training up their children for Christ and for Heaven; and it spreads out before churches and the pastors of churches, high motives to diligence and fidelity in duty. Our author, in his reasonings on this subject, brings into view the importance of correct maternal influence, and makes an appeal to Christian mothers which we cannot forbear to transcribe.

"Children, when their habits, especially their religious habits are to be formed and established, are under the immediate influence and care of mothers; and their habits will be a transcript of maternal sentiments and example. What an immense moral power is committed to maternal hands! The rudiments of all that the world esteems and respects; of all that adorns the church and will shine in heaven, are forming to shape and consistency under maternal discretion. Archimedes believed, that if he knew where to fix his prop, he could, with his lever, raise the solid globe. But, Christian mothers, you have a prop; you have solid ground on which to operate in the covenant of promise; and in the moral influence which you are to exert over your children, you have a *lever*, which literally moves the world, and which extends in its consequences to eternity. Remember this when you attend your little ones to their pillows at evening, and place their bodies in a situation to be refreshed; remember to lead their minds forth to converse with God. And feel not that your duty is done, until you have made an impression upon them of the presence of Jehovah, and of their dependence. And when you receive from your little ones the morning salutation, remember to remind them of their obligations to love and praise their heavenly Benefactor."

Sure we are, that this subject needs to be brought more frequently before Christian parents; and it is high time for churches to take more decided and systematic measures to secure the religious education of baptized children.

It is manifestly the design of God, that the visible church shall be perpetuated in the world, and that its limits shall be extended, until they embrace all nations; and it is no less apparent, that God's gracious designs in respect to the continuance and future enlargement of his church are to be accomplished through the instru-

mentality of his people. The obligations of believers do not terminate in their admission to the church ; they are bound to *act* as the Lord's people, and to fill their stations, as members of the visible kingdom of Christ, in obedience to his laws. Their obligations require of them mutual love ; mutual and habitual watchfulness in conforming to the laws of Christ ; and a vigorous use of all appointed means to promote the purity, peace and enlargement of the church. The obligations of believers to uphold and advance the kingdom of Christ extend to all that they have and are. They are binding on them as redeemed subjects, and no statute or ordinance of men can loose them. Believers are required to stand by the church of Christ and its institutions and interests, as long as they live, and if at any time they wish to be discharged from these obligations, they cease to maintain the character of Christians.

It is a melancholy fact, that many professing Christians appear to have no settled convictions of their obligations to support and extend the church. They take no lively interest in her internal purity, nor in those great objects of benevolence, which stand connected with her enlargement. They care little for the spiritual wants of their fellow immortals among the heathen, and are greatly indifferent, in some cases, to the support of a preached Gospel in the congregations of which they are members. When an appeal is made to their benevolence in behalf of any of the great enterprises of the age, they plead that they have as much as they can do to support their own pastors ; and when called to aid in the support of their pastors, they urge the necessity of providing for their families. At the same time, they are able to give liberally for the gratification of their fleshly appetites, and shrink from no toil or hardship to increase their earthly substance, or to train up their children according to the customs and fashions of the world. Possessed of abundant means, and occupying stations of responsibility and influence, they stand still, and see the church struggling for existence, or for enlargement, and will not come forward to her help. They are in some instances behind the people of the world in their readiness to promote the interests of religion, and to them the expostulation of Christ may with great propriety be addressed, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Such professors would do well to inquire wherefore they made a profession of religion, and what are the nature of the engagements which they have assumed. They would do well to recall the sacrifices of believers in the primitive church, and in their example read an explanation of their own obligations. Speaking of the primitive believers, our author says,

"They kept nothing back, life, talents, property, friends, all were Christ's, and Christ's in the service of the church. And were the spirits of Apostles and Martyrs now in the flesh, with the present wants and calls of the church

before them, what would they do, how would they understand Christian duty, how would they interpret the Christian covenant? Would they be hoarding up money for their children, or wasting it on their follies and vices, when the field of Christian charity on every side is white to the harvest? In a word, let the question come to a rational, a scriptural, a conscientious issue; can a person love Christ, and not love his church?"

When we look upon the history of the visible church, and see how it has been preserved, and what influence it has exerted; when we regard it as embodying the revealed will of God, the appointed means of salvation for a world in ruins, and the visible institutions of the Gospel; or if we consider its holy character as the visible body of Christ, and the infinite price he has paid for his redemption; or if we look forward to what this church is destined to be and to do in the coming ages; we see the transcendent claims which it has on every believer. Yet, in view of the present state of the church, who does not see that there are many things in it which call for a reformation? Who does not see a worldliness, a conniving at sin, a neglect of discipline, a supineness and indifference to the means of its support and extension, very unbecoming its holy character? In this age of religious wonders, when God owns the efforts of his people in a peculiar manner, and causes great and rapid changes to take place in their favor, he is calling upon them by all the signs of the times, to awake to duty, and let their light shine. He is summoning them to united and vigorous effort; and while some whole churches, and many individual members, are beginning to evince a spirit of efficient benevolence corresponding with the age, other churches and other members are still clinging to the world, and refusing to cooperate in extending the Redeemer's kingdom. What then shall be done? Shall no efforts be made to bring the whole church to act in obedience to the calls of Christ? Rather let us arouse to effort; let the light of truth be poured upon the minds of church members; let their obligations to Christ and his church be urged, and let them continue to be urged, till a sense of obligation is deeply impressed. It is high time, that the talents, and wealth, and influence in the church should all be consecrated to her precious interests. She does not yet know her own resources. Individual members are insensible to their means of usefulness, because they do not place their standard of effort sufficiently high. Were the members of our churches aroused to a full conviction of their obligations; were they to show forth the spirit of the primitive believers, and tread in the steps of those who through faith and patience now inherit the promises; were they to come up to the full measure of their duty to the church, in holy activity and obedience, with no more means, or resources than they have at present, the result, in the speedy enlargement of the church, would be glorious. All the forms of benevolent effort, which are brought into operation for the extension of Christ's kingdom

would be sustained, and vigorously prosecuted, with the most encouraging success, in connexion with a great increase of internal purity and strength on the part of the church. Blessed be God, that we are encouraged to pray, and hope, that such a day of enlargement is not far distant !

When, in the light of prophecy, we look forward upon the future extension and glory of Zion, remembering that the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof ; when we contemplate the omnipotence of his power to accomplish the promises of his word, and to employ the resources of the world for the advancement of his cause ; when we indulge the pleasing hope, that ere long the enormous sums now expended on destructive vices will be directed to other uses, and that the millions wasted in war shall flow into the treasury of the Lord ; we have no reason to doubt, that the church will yet become fruitful in resources, will appear in her glory, and be *the joy of the whole earth* : yet there remains much land to be possessed, and much is to be done on the part of the church in the maintenance of her cause amidst dangers and enemies. On believers of this age are devolving immense responsibilities ; and every means employed of God to arouse and quicken them in duty is to be encouraged. The volume before us is clearly of this character. Wherever it is read it must do good ; and were an hundred volumes of a similar character prepared and sent forth throughout the land, we should rejoice. Though the enemies of religion were never more active, and the church was never assailed at more points than she is at present, and though the churches of New England are called to experience new forms of trial, amid the spread of error, and the changes of civil society ; still we have no occasion to despair. God is revealing his covenant faithfulness in his providence, and is presenting before the minds of believers the most animating considerations, to encourage them to effort for the extension of his kingdom. The visible church, notwithstanding the attacks of all her enemies, is spreading out her tents and enlarging her borders. Heathen nations are beginning to be enlightened,—the veil in many instances is removed from the hearts of the Jews ; Ethiopia is stretching out her hands unto God, and the isles of the sea are waiting for his law. The Papal and Mahomedan powers are evidently falling, and the political changes in the nations of Europe show, that God is fulfilling the Prophetic declarations, is overturning, and overturning, and preparing the way for a more prosperous and happy state of the church. Let, then, the friends of Zion rejoice, that He who is King in Zion is governing the world with ultimate reference to the good of his kingdom,—which, in his appointed time, shall embrace all other kingdoms, and all nations shall worship before him, and glorify his name !



DR. CODMAN'S SPEECH IN THE BOARD OF OVERSEERS OF HARVARD COLLEGE, FEB. 3, 1831. Boston: Peirce & Parker. pp. 15.

LETTER TO GOVERNOR LINCOLN IN RELATION TO HARVARD UNIVERSITY, FROM F. C. GRAY. Second Edition, with an Appendix. Boston: Carter, Hendee, & Babcock. pp. 60.

ARTICLES IN THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER, for March and May, 1831, on the Theological School in Harvard University.

There are few subjects in which the religious community feel more deeply interested, than in discussions relative to the theological character of Harvard College. The publications, whose titles are above given, with several others which might be named, show, that such discussions have been frequent of late, and that they have enlisted names on both sides of high respectability. It is now ascertained beyond a doubt, that there is a general dissatisfaction in Massachusetts, not in one religious denomination only, but in every denomination, perhaps, except one, with the theological character which has been given to our venerable University. And although vigorous efforts have been made to remove this dissatisfaction, and convince the people that everything is fair and right, still they are not convinced. The impression remains, notwithstanding all that has been said, that the University is an institution of common interest, and that for one religious denomination to take possession of it, stamp upon it its own theological character, and turn it to its own account, is doing great injustice to the community at large.

Harvard College, it cannot but be remembered, is peculiarly and emphatically *the institution of the State*. It was *founded* and *originally endowed* by the State;\* and by the State it has been nourished and sustained from its foundation to the present hour. It has been estimated, that this institution has received, from legislative enactments in Massachusetts, not less than 500,000 dollars; — a prodigious sum, sufficient surely to entitle the Commonwealth to consider and speak of it as her own. Most of the high officers of state are also members *ex officio* of the Board of Overseers, and have a general superintendence of its concerns. And besides, by the Constitution of the State (in which an entire chapter is devoted to the University) this institution is placed under the control of the legislature, with power to 'make such alterations in the government as shall be conducive to its advantage, and the interests of the republic

\* "A general Court held at Boston, Sept. 8, 1636, advanced 400 pounds by way of essay towards the building of something to beget a College." Mather, vol. ii, p. 7. Harvard died in 1638.

"The first gift of the revenues" says Blackstone, "is the foundation; and he who gives them is in law the founder." 1 Com. 430. 10 Co. 33. The State, then, or the Colony to which the state has succeeded, was properly the founder of Harvard College. Nor have the rights of the state in the institution been affected by subsequent, individual donations: For says a high legal authority, "When a donation is made by the legislature or others to a charity already existing, without any condition, or the specification of any new use, the donation follows the nature of the charity," 4 Wheaton's Reports, 568.

of letters, in as full a manner as might have been done by the legislature of the late province of Massachusetts Bay.'

It has been said, indeed, that Harvard College is no more the institution of the state than Amherst College, or than Yale College. But facts disprove such an assertion. Amherst College was founded and originally endowed, not by the state, but by *individuals*; and it actually went into vigorous operation before so much as a charter from the state could be obtained. Instead of half a million of dollars from the legislature, Amherst College has not yet received a cent. And neither Amherst College, nor any other literary institution in the state except Harvard, is placed under the superintendence of the high officers of state, or honored with a particular mention in the Constitution.

Yale College, too, was *founded*, not by the legislature, but by a society of Congregational ministers, who appointed trustees, and made and obtained donations to a considerable amount, *before a charter was given by the colony*.\* A few years after, it was voted by the Trustees, "that every individual elected to the office of President should give his solemn assent to the Saybrook Platform, the constitution of the Congregational Church." In the year 1792, Yale College was brought into a nearer connexion with the state, by a donation from the latter of a considerable sum of money, and by an accepted provision, that "the Governor, Lieut. Governor, and six senior Councillors should, for the time being," be members of the Board of Trust. This, however, did not, and could not, change the original object and destination of the College, but went merely to further this destination, and carry it into more complete effect.

When, however, we speak of Harvard University as the Institution of the state, and of the *rights* of the state in regard to it, we do not so much refer to rights which may be legally enforced, as to those to which every one can *feel* for himself, and which those who understand the subject *must feel*. If this institution was founded and originally endowed by the state; if it has been, and is, continually receiving money from the state; if it is connected with the state in the manner and ways already pointed out; then, obviously, it is an institution of common state interest;—and for any religious denomination to attempt to control it, and convert it to sectarian purposes, is unjust and wrong. Whether the excluded sects may or may not be able to obtain redress by force of law,

\* In reply to a memorial, presented to the General Assembly of Connecticut in 1763, praying that the Legislature would authorize an appeal from any and every sentence given by the authority of the College to the Governor and Council of the Colony for the time being, President Clap observed, that "the General Assembly have the same authority over the College, and all the persons and estates belonging to it, as over all other persons and estates in the Colony, and allowed that a special respect and gratitude are due to them as the greatest benefactors of this seminary; but denied that they are to be considered as *founders* or *Visitors*, in the sense of common law." See Hist. of Yale College in Holmes' Life of Dr. Stiles. p. 399.

the injury is one which they can feel, and respecting which they can and should take proper measures to make their thoughts and feelings known.

As the first settlers of Massachusetts were Orthodox Congregationalists, it was natural, and it was right, that the College which they instituted for their common benefit should then receive a theological character conformed to their own. And as the College was originally undertaken by this denomination of Christians, it was natural that it should continue, for a course of years, under the same general influence. And so long as the great body of our citizens were essentially agreed in opinion and practice on religious subjects, there was no impropriety or injustice in this course of things. But for a considerable time past, the religious state of Massachusetts has been very different. Owing to the increase of our population, and to the freedom of inquiry and opinion which is here enjoyed, there has come to be, as might have been expected, a variety of religious sects. No small portion of our citizens are not now Congregationalists, even in name; and among those who bear this general name, there is a marked and radical division in point of religious sentiment and practice. A portion of those styling themselves Congregationalists, in the exercise of that freedom for which they are responsible to God alone, have renounced the leading principles of the religion of their fathers, and adopted an opposite system of faith; so that the two classes of Congregationalists are now more widely separated from each other, than they are from several of the other sects. Under these circumstances, it would no longer be right for the University of the State, in which all the people are alike interested, to remain in exclusive possession of the Orthodox Congregationalists—the denomination to whose hands it was originally committed. Much less can it be right that it should be in exclusive possession, or nearly so, of the Unitarians, a sect of recent origin, comprising but a fraction of the whole population, and retaining little or nothing of the ancient Congregational system except the name.

The first step, publicly taken, towards bringing the University under Unitarian influence, was the election of Dr. Ware to the Hollis Professorship of Divinity. This Professorship was founded in the year 1721, by Mr. Thomas Hollis, a Trinitarian, a Calvinist, a Baptist, of London. He enjoined "that the man chosen from time to time to be professor" on his foundation, should be one "of sound or *orthodox* principles;" and the Corporation pledged themselves and their successors, by a written bond, that his orders in this respect should be fulfilled. Much discussion has since arisen as to the meaning which Mr. Hollis attached to this word, *Orthodox*. It has been proved, and is admitted, that *this word had a definite theological meaning among the Dissenters of*

England, at the time when it was used by Mr. Hollis;—that he customarily used the word in this sense himself;\*—that his own religious principles were, in the received sense, Orthodox;†—and that such were the principles of his first Professor,‡ chosen while he was yet living, and with whom he declared himself “mightily pleased.”

But if these propositions are true, it would seem as though there need be no further dispute respecting the meaning of the word in question. How can we ever determine the signification of a disputed word, but by the application of principles such as these? But then, in this sense of the word—the sense in which (according to every fair principle of interpretation) Mr. Hollis must have used it, Dr. Ware is not Orthodox, and never was; and consequently, not only his appointment, but his whole subsequent course, has been one continued violation of trust—one continual course of perversion. This, we know, is a heavy charge, one which we are sorry to make, and from which we should be glad to see, not only Professor Ware, but those who elected him and have sustained him in office, *fairly* cleared. But how can they be cleared? How can they show that, in the sense of the Calvinistic Hollis, Dr. Ware, an avowed Unitarian, is a man “of sound or Orthodox principles?”

The conductors of the Christian Examiner affirmed almost two years ago, that “nothing was farther from Mr. Hollis’s intentions, than tying up the hands of the electors.” “The candidate should be a man of Orthodox principles, that is, of sound and correct principles; leaving it, of course, for the electors to decide what shall be considered as evidence of sound and correct principles.” p. 101. But to this we then replied, and now reply again, If Mr. Hollis intended to leave everything to the discretion of the electors, why did he frame any orders at all? Why did he enjoin that his Professor should be “of sound or Orthodox principles,” if he meant to leave it to the electors to determine, without any regard to his sense of the words, what such principles were? Was he really afraid that they would choose men, whose principles they regarded as unsound and dangerous? On the hypothesis here examined, Mr. Hollis must be supposed (after consultation with some of the most learned divines in Europe,) gravely to have directed the Corporation of Harvard College never to choose a

\* “Doubtless the term in question was often used by the Dissenters in Mr. Hollis’s time, and by Mr. Hollis himself, as *synonymous with Calvinistic.*” Christian Examiner, Sept. 1829, pp. 97, 102. The Christian Register, too, speaks of Calvinism as the Orthodoxy “which prevailed among the English Dissenters in the time of Hollis.”

† Mr. Hollis, says the Examiner in the Article above referred to, “used the language of a Calvinist, and *thought himself one.*” The Register also admits that Hollis was “in speculation, in form, if not in fact, a Calvinist of the old fashioned stamp, retaining the original features of the Genevan image.”

‡ The first Professor Wigglesworth, admitted on all hands to have been a decided Calvinist.

man as his Professor, whom *they* thought to be a bad man—whose principles *they* regarded as unsound, unscriptural, and of pernicious tendency! Yes, and he must be supposed to have insisted “frequently and imperatively,” as the Examiner tells us he did, “upon a written bond, by which the Corporation should *bind themselves*\* and their successors forever”—to do what? To choose men “of sound or Orthodox principles,” according to *his* sense of the words? Not at all. This would have been the extreme of bigotry. But to choose men of such principles, according to *their own* sense of the words—that is, to choose men whose principles *they* thought correct, of whatever nature or character they might be!—It appears there was some hesitation on the part of the Corporation in regard to binding themselves and their successors to fulfil the written orders of Hollis. But why hesitate, if these orders only required them to elect men whose principles *they* thought sound or Orthodox? Can it be supposed that they were *afraid* to bind themselves to do as much as this?

Mr. Gray regards every man as Orthodox in the sense of Hollis, who ‘believes in the Scriptures exactly as they are written, and interprets them according to the best light that is given him.’ But it may well be doubted whether, even in this sense, Dr. Ware is Orthodox. Does he ‘believe in the Scriptures *exactly as they are written*’? Or may he not be supposed to harmonize with other leading Unitarians, who openly charge the sacred writers with inadvertencies, contradictions, mistakes and errors?—But what evidence has Mr. Gray that Hollis used the term, Orthodox, in the sense he supposes? Did he so use it in his other communications? Or was it customarily so used by the Dissenters of that period? Not an instance of the kind can be produced. And besides, to what does the order of Hollis amount, according to this interpretation? The Professor must ‘believe in the Scriptures as they are written, and interpret them according to the best light that is given him.’ But every believer in the Scriptures professes, of course, to interpret them according to the best light that is given him; so that the order, in effect, requires no more than this—the Professor must be a believer in the Scriptures. In other words, *he must not be an infidel*. And we are to suppose that Hollis was so fearful that an avowed infidel would be appointed to his Divinity Professorship, as to insist upon a solemn written engagement that such a thing should never be done!!

Mr. Gray endeavors to justify the sense which he puts upon the orders of Hollis, by comparing them with ‘the Plan or Form for the Professor to agree to at his Inauguration.’ In this ‘Plan or Form’, the Professor is made to promise that he will ‘explain the Scriptures to his pupils according to the best light that God shall give him.’

\* And yet “nothing was further from Mr. Hollis’s intentions, than *tying up* the hands of the electors”!

"Now, supposing the Scriptures, interpreted according to the best light given to the Professor, either when chosen or at any subsequent period, should be opposed to the Trinity, is he not here most expressly commanded to explain them according to his light? But he is also commanded to be sound or orthodox, and if Hollis by this meant Trinitarian, then he must at the same time, support the Trinity. How shall we reconcile this contradiction?"

For ourselves we see no contradiction to reconcile. The Professor, at the time of his inauguration, must be Orthodox, in the sense of Hollis. In other words, he must be a Trinitarian. If he explains the Scriptures according to the best light he has, he will, of course, explain them to support the Trinity. But suppose his opinions are subsequently changed, and he adopts Unitarian or Universalist sentiments, or some other wild and dangerous theory. In this case, he is disqualified for office on the foundation of Hollis; is no longer entitled to his money; and, if he is an honest man, he will no longer receive it. He will retire, and leave the place to one, who can fill both parts of Mr. Hollis's injunction—who will interpret the Scriptures according to the best light he has, and whose light is Orthodox.

Mr. Gray refers to some events in the life of Hollis, which, he thinks, go to illustrate his liberality, and the sense in which he would be likely to use the term Orthodox,—particularly to the part which he took in the famous Salter's Hall controversy.

"In the year 1718, a few dissenting Clergymen at Exeter and other places, in the west of England, having preached sentiments which savored of some doubt in the Trinity, were examined by their parishioners, for the purpose of ascertaining their opinions in relation to that doctrine; and when it appeared that they disbelieved it, were dismissed from their offices. This led to further inquiries of the same nature, and producing the same results, and finally to a controversy, which agitated the whole body of the English Dissenters. At length a meeting of the Dissenting Clergy, in and near London, was called to be holden at Salter's Hall, in that city, to consider of advices to be sent to their brethren in the West. Shortly before the time appointed for this meeting, a Committee of gentlemen, belonging to the three denominations of Dissenters, (of which Mr. Barrington, afterwards Lord Barrington, was Chairman, and Mr. Hollis, himself, was a member,) prepared "a paper of advices," with the design of healing the breaches, that had been made, and promoting charity and forbearance; which paper they recommended to this meeting of the Clergy, for their adoption. Its great object was, to disapprove the setting up any form of men's invention, in matters of faith; or any other test, than that unerring form of sound words, the Holy Scriptures. The Clergy met, and one of them proposed amending this "paper of advices," by inserting a declaration of their own belief in the Trinity, so that they might not be suspected of indifference to the truth. This proposition was rejected, by a vote of *fifty-seven*, against *fifty-three*. It was then proposed, that, before acting on the advices, they should voluntarily sign a declaration, of their belief in the Trinity, simply to prevent the fact from being doubted. This was resisted, on the ground, that any such statement, would seem to warrant the claim of a similar statement from others, since the number and respectability of the meeting would, of itself, confer some authority on their declaration, and give it the effect of a Creed or Test. Upon this question, whether any such declaration of their own belief should be made or not, the meeting separated into two parties, and a controversy arose, which raged for some time all over England, gave rise to a multitude of pamphlets, and ended, as such controversies usually end, in rendering both sides more violent, and more obstinate in their respective opinions.

Meanwhile, the two parties met in different places. One made its declaration of belief in the Trinity, and then sent its address, recommending peace and moderation. The other, refusing to declare any belief at all, sent an address, insisting that the Holy Scriptures themselves are the only rule of faith. The latter, though most of them as good Trinitarians as ever lived, had their names published in what was called "THE BLACK LIST—a list of the names of those Dissenting Ministers, who refused to subscribe the declaration for the Blessed Trinity."\*

Speaking again of the Committee of which Mr. Hollis was a member, and of the 'Advices' which they prepared, Mr. Gray remarks,

"Their object was to heal the breaches, that had been made, and promote charity and mutual forbearance, by preventing Clergymen in Exeter and elsewhere from being turned out of office, or from being censured or questioned, for disbelief of the Trinity. It is most manifest, that this was the precise object of Mr. Hollis and his friends. Is it not utterly incredible then, that those, who at this day, desire to have any man turned out of his office, or compelled to resign it, or subjected to censure or scrutiny, on account of his disbelief of the Trinity, should pretend to shelter themselves under the authority of Hollis—whose example is their condemnation?"

In remarking on these passages, we are sorry to be obliged to say, that Mr. Gray has totally misapprehended the nature of the Salter's Hall controversy, and the state of things out of which it grew; and consequently his statements, in several instances, are aside from the facts. He represents it as a *given point* with the Dissenters at London, at the time when they met to give advice, that the suspected ministers at Exeter denied the doctrine of the Trinity. But this, so far from being a given point, was then a principal point in dispute. The Exeter ministers positively *denied* the charge of Arianism, or that they had taught anything in opposition to the proper Divinity of the Saviour. The following declaration, dated Exon, May 6th, 1719, was subscribed by Messrs. Peirce and Hallet, and seventeen others:

"Whereas it hath been industriously reported, that some Protestant Dissenting Ministers are Arians, denying the Divinity of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and holding him to be a mere creature, and that they baptize only in the name of the Father;—we, whose names are hereunto subscribed, do declare, that these reports, *as to us*, or to any of our brethren as far as we know, are false and slanderous; and we solemnly protest, as in the presence of God the searcher of hearts, that we hold fast the form of sound words, believing all that the Scriptures say concerning the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost,—particularly, that the only begotten Son of God is the Word, who was in the beginning, who was with God, who *was* God, by whom all things were made, who was made flesh, and that *he is* God, whose throne is forever and ever," &c.\*

The same year, Mr. Peirce declared that no "proof had been brought against him of having fallen into, persisted in, and taught" what was "called the pernicious error of denying the *proper God-head* of Christ and the Holy Ghost."† Again he says, in the same year, "We never taught *anything like Arianism*," but "have

\* Remarks upon the Account of what was transacted in the Assembly at Exon, &c. p. 37.

† Animadversions, &c. p. 19.

taken all proper occasions to offer *our reasons against it*, and have *sufficiently guarded against all suspicions of Arianism* in our public ministrations.”\*

It was in this state of things, though a little previous in the order of time, that the aggrieved people at Exeter requested advice of their Dissenting brethren in London. Accordingly a Committee of the three denominations (of which Committee Mr. Barrington was chairman and Mr. Hollis a member) was appointed, and drew up “a paper of advices.” For what purpose? Was it to “prevent clergymen from being turned out of office, or for being censured or questioned, for *disbelief of the Trinity?*” So Mr. Gray would have us believe; but *such was not the fact*. In these “advices,” the London Committee exhort their brethren at Exeter to “endeavor to allay all *unreasonable jealousies* concerning the sentiments and opinions of others, particularly Ministers;” and recommend that, if “some Christians shall accuse their ministers, as *not holding the Christian faith*, or as *propagating opinions which they conceive to be inconsistent with it*, no such accusation should be in the least regarded, by ministers or others, unless two or more persons shall subscribe their name to it;” and “that when there is a proper accusation made, and duly supported, the person accused should be first privately admonished,” &c. It is clear from the language of these “advices,” had we no other evidence in the case, that the question, as it is presented itself to this committee, was not, “Shall our brethren at Exeter rest satisfied and contented with their Arian ministers?” but ‘Are these ministers indeed Arians? Is there sufficient evidence that they are? Are not our brethren unduly suspicious of their ministers? Are they not proceeding against them, without previous admonition, and without proof?’ This was the true state of the case, as it presented itself to the committee at London, and it was entirely to such a state of things that their very seasonable and conciliatory “advices” looked.

When the “advices” had been agreed upon in the committee, the Dissenting Ministers of the three denominations in and about London were called together at Salter’s Hall, to consider and act upon them. In this assembly it was proposed by some, that the Ministers present should accompany their “advices” by a *written and subscribed declaration of their belief in the doctrine of the Trinity*. On this proposal, after much warm debate, the assembly divided, a majority of three or four being opposed to the subscription. The result was, that two papers of “advices” were sent to Exeter, the one accompanied by the proposed subscription, and the other without it; and the ministers of London were known, for some considerable time after, under the distinctive appellations of *subscribers* and *non-subscribers*.

\* Answer to Mr. Enty, p. 102.



Mr. Gray admits that most of the *non-subscribers* were "as good Trinitarians as ever lived." He should have said that they *all* professed to be Trinitarians; for although they would not personally subscribe to an article on the Trinity, they accompanied their "advices" with a letter, signed by their chairman in *their name*, in which they say, "*We utterly disown the Arian doctrine, and sincerely believe the doctrine of the ever-blessed Trinity, and the proper Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ.*" Hist. of Dissenters, Vol. iii. p. 244.

There is no doubt that, in these debates, and in the divisions which grew out of them, the sympathies of Mr. Hollis were with the non-subscribers. But what conclusion are we to draw from this? That he harmonized with known and professed Unitarians? That he held them to be Orthodox? Or that he was willing to have fellowship with them as Christians? No such thing;—but only that, as a Dissenter, he was opposed to every form of subscription; and he was led to fear—as the suspected ministers at Exeter denied, in the most solemn manner, the charge of Arianism, or that they had ever 'taught anything like Arianism?'—that their aggrieved people were too jealous of them, and were likely to proceed against them without previous admonition and sufficient proof.

"There is a document in the College, dated August 2, 1721, and entitled 'Rules and Orders relating to a Divinity Professor, in Harvard College, New England, drawn up at the request of Mr. Hollis, and unanimously recommended by us, as necessary to answer his useful design.' It is signed by seven Clergymen, and agrees in everything material to this discussion, with the statutes adopted by Mr. Hollis, in establishing his Professorship, which statutes bear date January 10, 1722. The form of the Declaration was added afterwards. Of these seven Clergymen, one signed the declaration of belief in the Trinity, at Salter's Hall; one refused to join either party in that controversy, and *five* are on the **BLACK LIST**. Now is it possible to believe, that Hollis and his friends on the **BLACK LIST**, meant to require his Professor to submit to a *Test*, and formally to declare his belief in the Trinity?—the very thing they had been contending against so strenuously."

"Of these seven clergymen," as Mr. Gray calls them, one (Mr. Shallet) was an Orthodox and pious *layman*, a member of parliament, and a distinguished member of the Independent church in Thames Street, London, under the pastoral care of the excellent Thomas Bogue.\* A second (Mr. Wallin) was among the subscribers at Salter's Hall, and is admitted, on all hands, to have been a decided Calvinist. A third (Mr. Neal, the historian of the Puritans) was not present at the debates in Salter's Hall; "but to every one who asked him, he gave the most satisfactory assurances of his agreement with the subscribers" in the doctrine of the Trinity. A fourth (Dr. Harris) was "an avowed Calvinist," who wrote the notes on the Epistles to the Philippians and Colossians in Mr. Henry's Commentary. A fifth (Dr. Oldfield) we are told in the History of Dissenters, "was *zealous for the Ortho-*

\* Wilson's Hist. of Dissenting Churches, Vol. i. p. 140.

*dox doctrines*, and published his sentiments on the Trinity." Vol. iii. p. 281. A sixth (Mr. Lowman) in a work published more than twenty years after signing and recommending the orders of Mr. Hollis, asserts that Christ was the *Jehovah of Hosts* whom Isaiah saw, (Chap. vi.) that he "was *God manifest in the flesh*," that he was "*truly God with us*," &c.\* While the seventh (Dr. Hunt) whatever he may have become before his death, was, in 1721, and during the life-time of Hollis, professedly Trinitarian and Orthodox.—The fact that Mr. Hollis procured the signatures of such men to his orders, is evidence, not surely of the laxness of his theological views and requisitions, but of the contrary;—evidence that the orthodoxy he required was intended to be of the right stamp.—It is true that the names of four of these men (not five) are found on what Mr. Gray calls 'the black list.' But what are we to infer from this? Not that they were Unitarians; or that they would hold fellowship with professed Unitarians; or that they wished to uphold them in their errors; but only that, as Dissenters, they were averse to a subscription, and were unwilling that any of their brethren should be deposed or censured, as they supposed upon suspicion, without trial or proof.

Mr. Gray thinks it incredible, considering the principles of Hollis, that he should impose a *test* on his Professor of Divinity. But did he not impose a test? What is the first Article of his orders, in which the Professor is required to be "in communion with some Christian church of one of the three denominations, Congregational, Presbyterian, or Baptist," but a test? And what is "the Plan or Form for the Professor to agree to at his inauguration," but a test,—and one, too, of a very solemn character?

On this part of the subject, we have dwelt longer, perhaps, than was necessary, especially as all these points were fully discussed in an article in the *Spirit of the Pilgrims* for Nov. 1829, to which the reader is referred. There is a single remark, however, which we wish to make, on the impropriety of admitting the evidence of circumstances—remote, doubtful, improbable circumstances—to set aside that of a written and express document. Mr. Hollis did require expressly that his Professor should be a man of "sound or Orthodox principles." We know in what sense the word *Orthodox* was then commonly used; we know what were the principles of Hollis, and consequently in what sense he would be likely to use it; we know how he did use it on other occasions; hence, we have all the evidence ordinarily required in like cases, to show in what sense he used it on this occasion. And now, shall we resort to mere circumstances, remote and improbable circumstances, to set aside his express words? Is this fair? Is it Christian? And were such a mode of procedure commonly resorted to, what documentary evidence could stand against it?

\* Rational of the Ritual of the Hebrew Worship, pp. 374—395.

It has been urged last of all, that it is not important that the Professor of Divinity at Harvard College should be altogether such an one as Mr. Hollis enjoined, since he receives but a small part of his present salary from the Hollis endowment,—as though to pervert a small fund were a small sin. But Mr. Gray, so far from admitting this consideration, drops a remark which shows its utter futility.

“A century ago, the College made a contract, that for the payment of a certain sum of money, they would support *such a Professor* for ever. If the interest of the sum thus paid is sufficient for his support, it is very well; but if not, the College must make up the difference, or violate the contract. This always has been the case, and always must be so, until we shall be willing to infringe the obligation, or unable to fulfil it.”

It is here insisted that the College are in contract with Mr. Hollis, or his representatives, to support “*such a Professor*” as he enjoined—one “of sound or Orthodox principles”—forever; and if the interest of his fund is not sufficient for this purpose, the Corporation must make up the difference, be it more or less, or violate the contract. Let us hear no more, then, about the smallness of the Hollis fund, and that the Professor receives only a tenth of his present salary from this source. The orders of the venerable Hollis are still binding on the Corporation in all their force, and they are solemnly holden, either to support such a Professor as he directed, or to relinquish the endowment.

We intended to have said something here respecting the Henschman legacy; but as Mr. Gray has passed it over in silence, it will not be necessary to enlarge. Suffice it to observe, that in the 1747, Daniel Henschman Esq. of Boston made an addition to the Hollis fund, on the express condition that the person receiving the proceeds of it should “profess and teach the principles of the Christian religion according to the well known Confession of faith drawn up by the Synod of the churches in New England.” Let the questions, then, come home to the consciences of Mr. Gray, and those associated with him as members of the Corporation of Harvard College: *Does Dr. Ware “profess and teach the principles of the Christian Religion, according to the well known Confession of Faith drawn up by the Synod of the churches of New England? Has he received, and does he continue to receive, the income of the Henschman legacy?*

An impression has gone abroad extensively, that Harvard University, the venerable College of Massachusetts, in which all her citizens have an equal and common interest, has for several years been almost entirely under the influence and control of a sect—the Unitarians. Several things have contributed to make this impression; as the known Unitarian character of the Professor of Divinity; the character of his ministrations in the chapel, which many of his pupils have declared are distinctively Unitarian; the

known Unitarian character of the other principal Professors and teachers; the manner in which honorary degrees have been, in most instances, distributed, and in which vacancies in the Corporation, the Board of Overseers, and in the several departments of instruction have been filled; the Unitarian character of most of the students who resort to the University, and of a still greater proportion of those who leave it; and the concessions and boasts of Unitarians themselves. "This ancient University," it has been said, "is the pure, uncorrupted fountain head of *Unitarianism*." "The College," says the Christian Examiner in the article before us—"the COLLEGE, without this new department (the theological school) WAS UNITARIAN." And again; "We suspect the true ground of hostility is not to the place, but *the doctrine*; not that young men should not learn theology at Harvard College, but that SUCH THEOLGY AS THEY DO LEARN THERE SHOULD BE LEARNED NOWHERE." pp. 159, 142. Now what is this but an acknowledgment, the more satisfactory for being undesigned, that Harvard College is in the hands, and under the control and influence, of the Unitarian denomination?

But notwithstanding the concessions and boasts of Unitarians as to their possession of Harvard College, when this is charged upon them in proof of the sectarian character of the institution, both the fact and the inference are denied. The College, it is said, is not Unitarian; or if it be, it is not *sectarian*, because Unitarians *have no creed*. But what are we to understand by the declaration so often repeated that Unitarians have no creed? Is it meant that they have no belief? that they *believe nothing* on the subject of religion? This surely will not be pretended. Are we to understand, then, that there are no *particular articles of belief* by which they are distinguished from other denominations? Neither can this be intended; as these articles not only exist, but have in repeated instances been published. The first tract published by the American Unitarian Association, contains a longer and shorter confession of faith,—the former of which is drawn out in not less than twelve or thirteen articles.—But Unitarians, we are told, are not so bound by their articles, that their faith cannot at any time be modified or changed, as they find occasion. And neither are the Orthodox so bound by their articles, that they cannot change their minds, whenever they see, or think they see, sufficient reason.

It has been said, further, (and on this the question respecting the sectarian character of the College in no small degree depends) that although Unitarians have distinctive points or articles of belief, yet these are *not at all regarded* in managing the concerns of the University. A man is just as likely to be appointed among the curators and officers of the institution, who is not a Unitarian, as one who is. This is particularly insisted on by Mr. Gray who would have us believe that more than half of those who have been appointed to office within the last ten years, are Trinitarians.

"Since I began this Letter, I have taken a list of the College officers, and marked the names of all, who have been appointed within ten years; selecting that period, not with any reference to the result, but because I thought it long enough, and was persuaded that nobody will hold us responsible for the sins of our predecessors, generation before generation. There is but one member of the Corporation, who has been in it so long. I did not know to what religious sects one half of the persons, whose names I noted down, belonged, but sent to Cambridge to obtain information on this point, and will now state to you the result of my inquiry." "The only permanent officers, having any connexion with the undergraduates, or receiving any pay from the College funds, who have been chosen within that period, are the President, whom I consider Orthodox according to Hollis, and who does not allow himself to be called either Unitarian or Trinitarian, or to be designated by any party name, and the following persons; the Librarian, the Steward, the Janitor, the Professors of Chemistry, German, and Latin, three Tutors, the Instructors in French, Italian, and Eloquence, the Curator of the Botanical Garden, and assistant Steward, in all fourteen. Of these, I understand, that three are Catholics, that one is of the Evangelical reformed Lutheran Creed, one a Calvinist, one a Sandemanian, that one attends the Episcopal church, and one belongs to a family of Quakers; eight in the whole; and I suppose these sects to be all Trinitarian. The other six, I am told, are Unitarians."

In order that this whole subject may be properly understood, it will be necessary to inquire, with some particularity, into the religious denominations of those concerned in the direction and government of the University.—Of the seven gentlemen composing the Corporation, all are undoubtedly Unitarians. The only exceptions we have heard made, relate to President Quincy and to Mr. Gray. The President, who is also a member of the Corporation, Mr. Gray "considers Orthodox, according to Hollis, and he does not allow himself to be called either Unitarian or Trinitarian." If he is Orthodox, according to Mr. Gray's *interpretation* of Hollis, he 'believes the Scriptures as they are written, and interprets them according to the best light he has.' And who, that is not an open infidel, is not as Orthodox as this? As to the President's not 'allowing himself to be called a Unitarian,' there are many of the sect around us who have the same scruples. It is but a few years, since scarcely any of the Unitarians in Massachusetts would allow themselves to be called by this name. In a few years more, most of those who now bear it will be glad, we presume, to shake it off. The fact that President Quincy is not willing to be called a Trinitarian is proof enough that he is not one,—as no consistent Trinitarian is ashamed of the name. And the fact that, for many years, he has been an acknowledged and active member of the Unitarian fraternity, and does not profess now to have experienced any change, except that he has cast off an unpopular name, is proof enough of what he is.

Of Mr. Gray it is said, in the Unitarian Advocate, that, "*being connected with an Orthodox church, he cannot be supposed to feel any undue partiality for the doctrines of Unitarians.*"—That Mr. Gray is connected with an Orthodox church, is not true. That he is a pewholder and an occasional worshipper in an Orthodox congregation, we shall not dispute. But unhappily for the infer-

ence to be drawn from this fact, his views of Orthodoxy are plainly enough exhibited in the pages before us.

“Hollis thought it sound and Orthodox to believe in the Scriptures, as interpreted by the conscience of each believer for himself. And *was he not right? Is not this true Orthodoxy?*”

“True Orthodoxy” for a man “to believe in the Scriptures, as interpreted by his own conscience;” or, in other words, to believe in the Scriptures according as he understands them! Will Mr. Gray inform us, in his next edition, who are the heterodox? Who are they that believe in the Scriptures, *not* according as they understand them?—But we have not yet reached all the profundities of Mr. Gray’s orthodoxy.

“Every man may endeavor to propagate his own religious sentiments, by reason, argument, and persuasion;” “but this does not give him authority to condemn the sentiments of others. He may allege that they do not accord with his convictions, but he has no jurisdiction to decide that they are repugnant to the Scriptures.”—“But it has been asked, if I really believe that certain doctrines are *essential* to Christianity, may I not assert this? I answer, certainly, you may assert that you *believe* them essential, for that is an opinion; but not decide that they *are* essential, for that is a judgement. I would ask these inquirers in turn, what they think of him, who interpreting the Scriptures according to his best light, considers the same doctrines unessential? If they reply that he is right, they are orthodox; if they say that he is wrong, they are sectarians. They are not asked to pronounce their own opinions erroneous. Their opinions are right for them, and his opinions right for him.”

Mr. Gray furthermore expresses the hope and belief, that the theological Professors at Cambridge will tell their pupils that none of the doctrines of the Christian sects “are obligatory; that none of them are even *right* for him who does not find them, according to his own light, in the Scriptures.”

In order to test these principles in few words, let us apply them to some of the plain doctrines of religion;—to those, for example, of *the Divine existence*, and of *a future state*. “Every man may believe *these* doctrines, if he can; but he must not condemn the sentiments of those who do not believe them! He may allege that their sentiments do not accord with his convictions, but he must not decide that they are repugnant to the Scriptures! He may *believe* that the existence of God and the doctrine of a future life are essential to Christianity; but he must not *decide* that they are essential: for those who deny them may think them not essential; and their opinions are right for them, as his are for him! The theological Professors must be sure to tell their pupils, that neither these doctrines, nor any others, are obligatory—that they are not even right for those that do not find them, according to their own light, in the Scriptures!”\*—After such exhibitions of thought and sentiment, it is not of much consequence what name

\* We wonder whether there is any such thing as *truth* in the abstract; and whether it is any better to believe the truth, than to embrace error.

Mr. Gray chooses to take upon him, or whether he is willing to take any. The Unitarians profess to be greatly pleased with his performance, and he naturally enough falls into their company.

Of the elective part of the Overseers of Harvard College, consisting of fifteen clergymen and fifteen laymen, only nine of those who were members at the time of the organization of the Board, in 1815, are still in office. All the others have been since elected. And it is remarkable, that nearly the whole of this number are acknowledged Unitarians. The *clerical* members who have been elected, though one or two of them may dislike the name, are Unitarians without an exception.\* The same also may be said of the lay members, with the exception of two or three, who have connected themselves with Episcopal congregations.

Of the Instructors in Harvard University, the Faculty of theology is entirely Unitarian. The faculty of law, too, is entirely Unitarian. The Faculty of Medicine consists entirely of Unitarians, with the exception of Dr. Warren, an Episcopalian, but who, at the time of his appointment, was supposed to be Unitarian. The College Faculty also, comprising those who are concerned in the instruction of undergraduates, consists entirely of Unitarians, with the exception of two of the tutors. We find the names of several instructors on the Catalogue, who are not included in either of these Faculties, all of whom are Unitarians.

What then becomes of the assertion of Mr. Gray, that of 'the permanent officers, having any connexion with the undergraduates, or receiving any pay from the College funds, who have been chosen within ten years, a majority are Trinitarians.' Who are these Trinitarians? Aye, *who are they?* 'According to the best light that is given us,' we will endeavor to explain.—It will be observed, then, that Mr. Gray does not say that all these *individuals* are Trinitarians (this he would not dare to say;) but the "*sects*," to which they or their families professedly belong, are Trinitarians. Three of them are foreigners—*professedly* Catholics—how *sincerely* so, it might not be easy, and is not important, to decide. One of these Catholics is an Irishman (a very obliging man as we can personally testify) whose duty it is to wait on the Librarian, to

\* Mr. Gray would account for this, by alleging the necessity of "choosing most of the elective members from the vicinity of the College." We submit for his consideration the following fact, and ask him to reconcile it with this hypothesis: In the winter of 1828—9, a vacancy was to be filled in the Board of Overseers. "The Rev. Dr. Jenks of this city was in nomination. This gentleman was brought up in Boston, was a school-mate of some of the leading men now in the government of the University, and has continued his acquaintance with them till the present time. He is a graduate of Harvard, resided at the College for some time after he completed his education, and has ever manifested a deep interest in the reputation and prosperity of his Alma Mater. He is a gentleman of distinguished learning and most exemplary character. No man in the community is more universally esteemed, and none more universally considered eminently qualified for this station, and in none can be found united equal claims to the honor. No objection to him could be *imagined* but that he is not a Unitarian. Yet he was rejected, and Mr. Brazer, a young Unitarian clergyman from Salem was chosen!"

bring and carry books, and shut the doors after him. A prodigious influence he will exert, no doubt, in checking the predominance of Unitarianism, and forming the religious character of the College! The individual of "the Evangelical Reformed Lutheran creed," is supposed to be the Professor of German, a popular and efficient officer, whose influence is extensive in the University. But is this Professor a Trinitarian—a Lutheran, in the sense of Luther—a *bona fide* receiver of the Augsburg Confession of faith? Or is he not known to be a Unitarian of the most liberal class—a German of the school of De Wette? Two of the tutors we have already excepted from the general charge of Unitarianism. The office of Steward, or assistant Steward, is filled by a Sandemanian, who, in providing sustenance for the *bodies* of the students, will, no doubt, be able to oppose formidable barriers to the progress of error in their souls. The individual who "belongs to a family of Quakers" we have not been able to identify; nor is it material that we should. How many belong to families of Quakers, who are not Quakers; and how many in this country now call themselves Quakers, who are Unitarians or Infidels?

From the account here given, our readers will be able to form an estimate of the manner in which the different religious sects prevailing among us are represented in the University at Cambridge; and also of the fairness of Mr. Gray's statements in relation to this subject. We wish to treat the gentleman respectfully; but truly we are astonished that he should make such statements;—that he should make them on the ground of information received from Cambridge;—that he should address them to the Governor of the Commonwealth!

The Orthodox Congregationalists, the denomination by whom Massachusetts was settled, to whose hands the University was originally committed, and who still constitute a large proportion of the community, are now represented there by a single tutor; and the choice of him is spoken of by Mr. Gray as a striking instance of liberality. The Baptists, a numerous and respectable denomination of Christians, have no man there. The Methodists, too, have no man there. The Episcopalians are more respectably represented, having one Professor and one tutor. The Universalists also—only as the Unitarians are Universalists—are excluded from all participation in the affairs of the College. On the other hand, the Corporation, we have seen, are all Unitarians. Those of the Overseers who have been elected since the organization of the present Board, with the exception of two or three nominal Episcopalians, are all Unitarians. The Faculties of Theology and Law are composed entirely of Unitarians. The same may be said of the Faculty of Medicine, with the exception of a single Professor. The members of the College Faculty, excepting two of the tutors, are all Unitarians. Several other instructors, not



connected with either of these departments, are also Unitarians. And yet Mr. Gray, a member of the Corporation, and after having received information from Cambridge, would endeavor to persuade the Governor and the public that *there is nothing sectarian in the management of this institution—that one who is not a Unitarian is just as likely to receive an appointment as one who is—and that more than half of those who have been appointed to office during the last ten years are Trinitarians!!* In contemplating this statement, we can only say, Shame on such disingenuousness! Shame, thus to insult the understanding of our chief magistrate, and impose on the credulity of the uninformed portions of the Commonwealth!

The conductors of the Examiner pursue, for once, a much more honorable and consistent course. They not only admit that the appointments at Cambridge have been, for the most part, confined to Unitarians, but insist that of right it should be so.

"The professors of religion, as of science, in any College, will of necessity partake of the character of the individuals by whom they are appointed. These individuals in Harvard College are at present the seven members of the Corporation." These "members must discharge their duties by the light of their own conscience, in reference to the solemn responsibility that is imposed on them. The vote of the Overseers, on a question of concurrence, depends on the same principles; and Dr. Codman and his friends invariably give their vote with the same freedom that they would, if they were a majority of the Board. *If they cannot conscientiously vote for a Unitarian, why should they suppose Unitarians can conscientiously vote for Calvinists; or if conscience permitted, and expediency only was concerned, how can they expect that, in ANY DEPARTMENT OF THE COLLEGE, men should be appointed to give instruction, whose instructions they who appoint them believe would be erroneous.*"

Now this, gentlemen of the Examiner, is what we like. It is intelligible; it is plain; and we thank you for it. We all know very well that those concerned in making appointments at Cambridge have for a long time intended to confine their appointments almost entirely to Unitarians. Their works show that such have been their intentions; and it is much more honorable to confess the truth, than vainly to endeavor to cover it up.

It will be said in this connexion, perhaps, that although the officers at Cambridge are Unitarians, still they do not teach Unitarianism. They teach the sciences. They teach the ancient and modern languages, philosophy, and the liberal arts.—But is it not true, that *religious* instruction of some kind is communicated at Cambridge? Is it not communicated by Unitarians? And who, that knows any thing of the subject, will pretend that it is not imbued, in a greater or less degree, with their peculiar sentiments?—But suppose it be otherwise. Suppose it true, that Unitarianism is not taught at Harvard College. Will it follow that there is no influence exerted there in favor of this doctrine? Is the student never to know the fact, that his instructors are nearly all of them Unitarians? Or knowing this, is he never to think of it?

Or thinking of it, is he expected not to feel its appropriate influence on his heart? Who will believe, that the whole corps of officers connected with a literary institution can be openly enlisted in favor of a particular doctrine, without rendering that doctrine popular,—and its opposite unpopular? Without creating an influence in its favor, which it is next to impossible for the young mind to resist? In comparison with an influence such as this, what are paper creeds and covenants? A mere dead letter, and as things of nought.

But there is another fact, to which we have not yet distinctly adverted, which shows, beyond any other, the sectarian character of Harvard University;—we refer to its connexion with the *Unitarian Theological School*. The history of this School is as follows: In 1815, the late President of Harvard College, “in behalf of the Corporation, and with the assent of the Board of Overseers, addressed a circular letter to a large number of the sons and friends of the College, asking their assistance in providing additional means for theological education in Harvard University.” In consequence of this letter, subscriptions to a considerable amount were obtained. The subscribers held a meeting, July 1816, and formed themselves into a “*Society* for the promotion of Theological Education in Harvard University.” The Trustees of this Society, in conjunction with the Corporation of the College, soon after laid the foundation of the Theological School, and undertook the charge of it by a joint superintendence. In 1819, a Theological Faculty was instituted, and a system of rules adopted for its regulation. Uneasiness, however, existed in the minds of many Unitarians, on account of the connexion of the School with the University. ‘One respectable Committee,’ to whom the subject was referred, recommended (in 1824) that the School and the University be entirely separated; but their report was rejected. Another Committee, instead of proposing to withdraw the School *entirely* from the University, recommended that the superintendence of it be committed to the *Directors of the Society*, subject only to the assent of the Corporation. This report was accepted, and the Society, by its Directors, took charge of the School. It was under the supervision of these Directors, that the building for the accommodation of theological students was erected. During the last year, the Directors, and the Society by which they were constituted, resigned all their power and authority over the School into the hands of the Corporation of the College; so that the Society has no longer any connexion with the School or its funds. The Corporation having accepted the trust committed to them, and taken the School into their own hands, new statutes were required for the regulation of it. These statutes were submitted to the Overseers during the last winter, and it was on the subject of their adoption that the speech of Dr. Codman was delivered.

According to these statutes, the President of the University is to be the head of the Theological School. The Hollis Professor of Divinity is to be the first Professor in the School. The theological Professors are to "perform Divine service in the chapel of the University on the Lord's day throughout the year;" they are also to offer "the daily prayers in the chapel of the University." The appointment of the theological Professors, and the concerns of the School generally, are placed entirely under the control of the Corporation; so that the connexion between the School and the University is now as intimate and complete as it can well be made.

Still there are many Unitarians who are not satisfied with this connexion. Indeed the dissatisfaction is probably as great, at this time, as at any former period. Mr. Gray informs us that 'he entered the Corporation with the strongest conviction, that the separation of the Theological Institution from the College was *most important and desirable*, perceiving how much prejudice against the College was caused by the union of it with this Institution.' Other Unitarians, especially laymen, have the same opinion in regard to this subject with that formerly entertained by Mr. Gray. They think the connexion of the Theological School with the University impolitic and wrong, and would gladly do whatever they might to separate the one from the other.

But whatever diversity of opinion may exist in regard to this connexion, it has now been formed and consummated. The theological School has been saddled upon the University, and, as many insist, *cannot be separated*. Here then we have a finishing, conclusive argument in proof of the sectarian character of the University. *Its whole theological department is avowedly and entirely Unitarian*. We say *avowedly* Unitarian;—for what is the language of the Christian Examiner in relation to it?

"We do not deny that the Professors of the School are Unitarians; and we rejoice in the fact. We do not deny that the probability is, that the students will come from the School, *impressed with the truth of the Unitarian faith. God forbid that it should be otherwise.*"

It is here distinctly acknowledged, that the theological Professors connected with the University, by whom alone religious instruction is to be communicated, and daily religious services are to be performed, are all Unitarians, and are intended and expected to be Unitarians. Whether a state of things such as this does not give a character to the University, and render it thoroughly Unitarian and sectarian, the public must judge.

We shall be told, doubtless, that though the preaching in the College chapel is Unitarian, no student is compelled to hear it. "Every one," says Mr. Gray, "may attend any other church, which he or his parents prefer." We are sorry to be obliged to correct the errors of a member of the Corporation in regard to

regulations adopted by that body. But is it true that "every one may attend any other church which he or his parents prefer?" We had understood that (if the student be a minor) both he and his parents must concur in a request of this nature, in order that it may be granted. Nor is this difference of small practical importance. Instances have occurred already, since the adoption of the rule, in which students have wished to attend public worship out of the chapel, but the consent of their parents could not be obtained. And the instances, in all probability, would be frequent, were the institution patronized by Orthodox families, in which parents would wish their children to attend public worship out of the chapel, but the consent of the young men could not be obtained. In the present state of things at Cambridge, it requires no little resolution in a student, to separate himself from the great body of his companions, and worship stately with another sect. And were he, at the request of his parents, to commence his collegiate course in this way, he would soon be induced, that he might remove suspicion and restore himself to favor, to sit down with the multitude under the droppings of the chapel.

As a palliation of the evil of which we complain, it has been said that *the funds of the University* have not been applied, and never will be, for the support of the Theological School. But is this true? We appeal to the publications of Unitarians themselves. In the Circular, published by Dr. Kirkland in 1815, calling for subscriptions by means of which to found the Theological School, we find the following assertion: "The Corporation are disposed and determined to *apply the resources of the College to this object*, as far as other indispensable claims admit."

The statements which follow are from the report of a Committee of the "Society for Promoting Theological Education in Harvard University," on separating the Theological School from the College:

"The students, whom it is our purpose to assist, whilst they continue in this connexion with the University, will be entitled to receive instruction from the *officers of the College*, to the *use of the library*, and to the *numerous benefactions which have been given from time to time to the Corporation*, to be distributed among students of this description. The Hopkins charitable fund alone (the property of the University) produces an annual income nearly equal to that of this Society, the greater part of which is applicable to theological students, but *is confined to such as are students in the University*; and this is believed to be the case with most, if not all, of the charities of this kind. In case of a separation, THE STUDENTS IN THE NEW SCHOOL WOULD BE DEPRIVED OF ALL THESE BENEFITS."

In a paper submitted to the public by the Directors of the Society, who had charge of the Theological School for several years, these gentlemen say, "*Some charitable foundations in the College for this object, together with a portion of the income of the theological funds . . . . . give means of affording pecuniary aid to such students as require it.*"

In a Tract published by the American Unitarian Association, the writer, (Rev. F. W. P. Greenwood) after having described the course of study in the Theological School, as it was a year ago, observes,

"NO PERMANENT PROVISION IS YET MADE FOR ANY PART OF THIS INSTRUCTION. Dr. Ware is a *professor in the University*, and acts as College Chaplain; he cannot, therefore, devote much of his time to the students of the Divinity School. Professor Willard is also a *University Professor*, and has numerous duties in the College. Professor Norton" (*an University Professor*) "receives \$300 from the Dexter fund, and the rest of his salary from the general theological funds. Dr. Follen is *altogether paid from the College funds*, except one hundred and fifty dollars, which comes from the theological funds. Mr. Paley is to receive his compensation, of four hundred dollars per annum, from the rents of Divinity Hall. The provision of Mr. Ware's professorship expires in ten years.

It is very desirable that permanent provision should be made for some part of the above instruction, as in that case the general theological funds would be relieved from the disbursement of sums, which might be applied to the increase of the theological library,\* the building of houses for the instructors, and other needful purposes, and more ample instruction would be also secured."

From this statement it is evident, that the Theological School has been sustained in a great measure, from the first, by *College officers and funds*, and could never have subsisted or gone into operation, but for the support derived from this source. The amount of instruction received in past years from its connexion with College, could not, on a moderate computation, have been provided, short of 3000 dollars annually,—which is the interest of 50,000. Not less than 50,000 dollars of College funds, of public property, have thus been virtually made over to the use and benefit of this Theological School.

By the new statutes, sanctioned February last by the Overseers, the Hollis Professor of Divinity *in the University* is first Professor in the Theological School, with directions to "give instruction to the theological students in Natural Religion, Ethics, and the Evidences of Revealed Religion; also in Ecclesiastical History, and in Dogmatic Theology." But how is this Professor supported? *Entirely*, as is on all hands admitted, *from the College funds*.

The truth is, that this Theological School, about which so much has been said, has no proper foundation of its own. It could not have commenced operations, nor can it now continue them, without continual aid from the University of the State. Indeed we are informed on good authority, that, according to an existing arrangement, not less than 700 dollars go directly and yearly from the treasury of Massachusetts, for the support of students in the Theological School at Cambridge.

Citizens of Massachusetts, are you acquainted with these things? And if so, what do you think of them? Is it right that the venerable University, so munificently endowed by your liberality and

\* The College Library now answers the purpose to a great extent, of a Library for the Theological School.

that of your fathers, and once the glory of our land, should thus be monopolized by a particular class of religionists, and converted by them to their own party purposes? Is it right that this noble institution should be surrendered "to the exclusive use and benefit of Unitarians—a little sect, which twenty years ago had not courage or honesty enough to admit that they had a being"? Is it right, that the funds of this State Institution, and the services of its officers, should be employed to sustain and build up a Unitarian Theological School? Other sects endow and support their own Theological Schools; why should not Unitarians do the same? Other sects are at the expense of educating their own ministers; why should Unitarian ministers be educated, either wholly or in part, at the public expense?

We know, fellow citizens, what you think of the statements which have here been made. We know what you *must* think. But you are ready to ask, 'What can we do? The evil is great and palpable, but how can it be remedied? Unitarians have no right to monopolize the College of the State, to unite with it and support out of it their Theological Institution; but this Institution is already connected with it, and, as its friends insist, cannot be separated.'—Whether the Theological Institution at Cambridge can now be separated from the University, and if so in what manner, we pretend not to say. The mode of dissolving this unhallowed connexion may be left to the consideration of those who have been instrumental in forming it. *One thing* certainly may be done by those who are dissatisfied with the late proceedings in relation to Harvard College: They may take all proper, Christian methods to let their dissatisfaction be known. Let them show, not malice or anger, but a just and proper resentment, at the manner in which themselves and this community have been treated. Let them shew this, at least, by *withdrawing all patronage from Harvard College*, until their rights in it shall be acknowledged and restored.

This advice, we know, will not be agreeable to the present Curators and Governors of the University. They wish the patronage of the other denominations, though they are unwilling to admit them to a just share of influence. They wish their assistance in supporting the Institution, though not in guiding and controlling it. As though it was not enough to take possession of the College, instituted and endowed for the benefit of the whole State, they insist that we shall give them our sons, to be educated under their direction, and moulded into a belief of their principles. But to this demand, we may not, cannot, for a moment listen. And we would say to all Orthodox parents, who read our pages, and on whom they be expected to exert an influence, many considerations forbid you, under present circumstances, to select Harvard as the place of education for your sons. A regard for the spiritual safety

and happiness of your children forbids this. Consistency of character on your own part forbids it. But especially is it forbidden by the facts exhibited and commented on in the preceding pages. You have seen how the funds of this institution have been perverted, and the expressed wishes of those who gave them, and the solemn promises of those who received them, have been disregarded. You have seen how the institution itself, a concern of common state interest, has been turned into an instrument of sustaining and fostering a particular sect. Are you willing to sanction such perversion and injustice? Are you willing to encourage it by your patronage? If not, *withhold from it*, for the present, *your sons*. If those into whose hands it has fallen are determined to keep it, and make it an instrument of promoting their own purposes, then let them support it. The most which they ought to expect of the excluded denominations is, that they will quietly withdraw, and give their support to institutions of a different character.

There are other Colleges to which our sons may repair—Colleges blest with able instructors and with the special smiles of heaven. To say nothing of the highly respectable institutions in our neighboring states, the friends of truth in Massachusetts (during their exile from Harvard) can be well accommodated within their own borders. Williamstown, though remote from the Atlantic villages, is a favored spot, and the institution there established must not be forgotten. The good accomplished by it has already extended to distant regions of the earth, and is celebrated, doubtless, in other worlds. Amherst College, too, is well deserving all the patronage it has received, and more. Situated in a beautiful village in a central part of the Commonwealth, remote from the bustle and temptations of the city, and where the means of living are abundant and cheap,—blessed too, beyond example, with the special operations of the Holy Spirit,\* this rising, flourishing institution commends itself to the support and countenance of all who love the truth. If it is not, in its present infant state, every thing that could be desired in point of advantages, its advantages may be increased almost beyond limits. The friends of religion in this community have the means of making it all that they could wish it to be, and it is high time that their attention was directed to the subject. It cannot, we think, be doubted by any intelligent, reflecting Christian, that the interests of truth and the church in this Commonwealth for years to come are very intimately connected with the growth and prosperity of Amherst College.

We close with a few words relating more particularly to the publications which have been before us.

For his "Speech in the Board of Overseers of Harvard College," Dr. Codman deserves the thanks of his brethren and of the

\* Since the establishment of this institution, it has been blessed with four seasons of special attention to religion, three of which have occurred within the last four years.

religious community. It is direct and forcible, dignified and courteous, gives a clear and full exhibition of the subject, and has been instrumental in drawing a degree of public attention to it which could scarcely have been secured in any other way. While this gentleman retains his seat in the Board of Overseers, (and may he long retain it) the cause of truth and righteousness there need never want an able advocate, or sectarian projects a faithful exposé.

On the Letter of Mr. Gray it would be superfluous to enlarge, after the remarks which have been already made. He often treats the Orthodox part of the community (we hope without intending it) with great unfairness. "The College," he says, "is condemned, not because it is in the hands of a sect,\* but because it is not in the hands of the *right sect*;" intimating that the Orthodox only wish to displace the Unitarians that they may come into exclusive possession themselves,—a purpose which they have uniformly and sincerely disclaimed. He speaks of them, also, as the *enemies* of the institution, and as wishing to *crush* it,—when they only wish to remove from it a weight which has more than half crushed it already, and under which it can never rise and prosper. He even descends, much in the style of one of his Reverend admirers and coadjutors, to tell stories about his Orthodox neighbors, as having "been concerned in calling secret meetings, for the purpose of pledging themselves to each other to use all their influence to prevent those parents who might otherwise do so, from sending their sons to Harvard University;"—a thing respecting which he must be better informed than those whom he accuses, or he has no knowledge. We were disgusted, also, in reading this pamphlet, with the lofty, boastful, aristocratic spirit in which no small part of it is written,—assuming that Cambridge is far superior to all other Colleges, and that the education of those who resort there will, of course, be superior to that of other men. A spice of this vanity might be pardonable in a Sophomore; but in an Hon. member of the Corporation, it is little less than ridiculous.

The article in the Examiner for March is chiefly a collection of documents. That in the Examiner for May is written with ability, and with more apparent ingenuousness than usually characterizes the controversial articles in that work. The writer admits that the College is Unitarian. He insists that a theological department ought to be connected with it, and that this, too, should be Unitarian. The reason he assigns for entertaining such sentiments is, no doubt, a very satisfactory one to himself—"This system is *truth*, and *only truth*."

\* A virtual admission, after all he had said to show the contrary, that *the college is now in the hands of a sect.*



## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Ministerial Courtesy*: A Sermon delivered before the Convention of Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts, in Brattle Street Church, Boston, May 26, 1831. By JOHN CODMAN, D. D. Pastor of the Second Church in Dorchester. Boston: Peirce and Parker. pp. 22.

The situation of Convention preacher in Massachusetts is one of high responsibility. Appointed by the suffrages of the assembled Congregational Ministers of the State to address them on subjects of the greatest importance, the speaker (if not destitute of sensibility, as well as piety) must regard his station as one of special interest to the church; and we envy not the feelings of him who, departing from the great principles of the Gospel, could use such an occasion as one on which to display a mere party zeal.—Under a deep sense of responsibility to God and his brethren, we doubt not the late Convention preacher performed the duty to which he had been called. His text was, Eph. iv. 31, 32. "*Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice; and be ye kind one to another.*" His object was, "to soften, if possible, the asperity of religious party, and to infuse a spirit of mutual kindness and forbearance into the breasts of those who profess to be the ambassadors of God to man."

This subject was suggested, doubtless, by the differences of sentiment known to exist in the Convention, owing to the departure of a portion of the members from the religious system of their fathers, and their adoption of an opposite faith. On this account, the discussion is seasonable, and we trust will be productive of good. A scene of religious controversy, such as has existed in this region for several years past, is a scene of peculiar temptation, into which the friends of truth have, not needlessly run, but been reluctantly driven; and it is well, not only for those who have wandered to be admonished, but for those who continue steadfast to hear the voice of a friend, warning them of their dangers, and calling them to self-scrutiny and watchfulness.

Near the commencement of this discourse, Dr. C. gives a very correct account of the origin of the difficulties existing among those who were once united as Congregationalists.

"There exists among Congregational ministers a wide, and important, and, as some conceive, a radical and essential difference of opinion in regard to the doctrines of Christianity. There are those, who adhere to the system of faith, embraced by the puritans and early settlers of New England, and embodied in the Confession of Faith, adopted at Cambridge in the year 1680, and there are those, who have departed from that system of faith, and rejected some of those doctrines, which their pious ancestors, in days, as they suppose, of comparative darkness, received as the word of God."

In the progress of the Discourse, the preacher justifies and vindicates most of the measures of his Orthodox brethren, particularly their separation from professed Unitarians, and their refusal to continue ministerial intercourse with them.

"Nor is it now a question whether they (the two parties) can be so united, as to act together with mutual benefit and advantage. Candid and discerning men of both persuasions, I believe, are convinced, that it is neither judicious nor desirable, in the instructions of the sanctuary, nor in the promotion of doc-

trinal opinions, and the religious objects connected with them, that such a union should be attempted. The peace of the community is better promoted by an agreement to differ, than by a constrained attempt to unite opinions so opposite, and objects so diverse."—"We do not plead for an interchange of ministerial labor; for we believe, that, among those who differ so widely, it is both *inexpedient and injurious*."—"He (the speaker) is convinced, that peace and quietness are not to be obtained by a vain attempt to unite those, who are so widely separated in religious belief,—but by an agreement to differ, and a readiness to allow each other, in all its generous extent, the right of private judgement. Many of the evils we so much lament, if he is not mistaken, have been occasioned by a disregard of this important principle, and by an attempt to enforce, if not an uniformity of faith, an acknowledgement of the innocency and safety of error."

Dr. Codman insists, however, that these differences need be no bar to the exercise of a spirit of kindness, and to the courtesies and charities of social life.

"But although those of a different faith may feel it their duty to act separately in promoting the cause of what they consider to be truth, there is no reason for the indulgence of a bitter and unkind spirit. Such a separation ought to be perfectly consistent with kind and friendly feelings. In this land of religious liberty, it should never be forgotten that we have equal rights, and that no one sect possesses any exclusive privileges. We may honestly believe, that our sentiments are scriptural, and the belief of them in our opinion essential to salvation, and that those who differ from us, embrace dangerous errors, but this gives us no right to control the faith of others, nor to entertain towards them any other feelings than those of kindness and benevolence. Indeed, the very fact that we differ, and that we view the difference important, if not fundamental, ought to inspire the kindest feelings towards those, who, in our judgement, have embraced opinions that hazard their salvation.

"Nor ought we to regard the respective measures, which each religious party conscientiously adopts to advance its own interests, with suspicion and jealousy. Do not the men of this world combine and associate together to promote their worldly objects and designs? Do they not readily obtain from constituted authority all necessary facilities to carry their combinations and associations into effect? And shall professing Christians indulge in suspicions and jealousies against those, who are anxious to combine their means and influence to advance the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, to promote what they sincerely believe to be the cause of vital piety and practical religion? Nor should the fair and open attempts, which each religious party may make to spread the knowledge of its own peculiarities, and to increase its numbers and influence, be the subject of severe reprehension and unkind remark. Do we not live in a land, that knows no religious establishment, where no compulsion is used to enforce the belief of a religious creed or the observance of ecclesiastical ceremonies? Has not every denomination the unalienable right of supporting itself by its own energies, of putting forth all its strength, consistently with a regard to order and the rights of others, to build its own walls, to repair its own breaches, and to enlarge its own bounds? We may honestly differ in the views we entertain of the expediency of these measures. We may decline the adoption of them ourselves, and avoid, as carefully as we please, any participation in them. We may go further,—we may express our disapprobation of them, and give our reasons for disapproving of them, with a Christian spirit, but we are not justified, in the sight of God or man, in loading those, who favor them, with obloquy and reproach, in holding them up to the world as *disturbers of the public peace*, in endeavoring to excite a popular odium against them in our own community, as aiming to *destroy the liberties of the people, and to fasten upon them a yoke of bondage*."

These remarks are reasonable and important, and entirely in accordance with our own views.

Again Dr. C. observes,

"In the agitating controversy, that exists among us, it cannot be denied, that a spirit of bitterness has manifested itself, that has given pain to good men of

every communion. The personalities, that have been suffered to obtrude themselves upon the notice of the public eye, cannot but be regarded with disapprobation, by the truly liberal and catholic of every religious sect. Is there not a want of kindness and impartiality in representing each other's religious sentiments? Are not opinions imputed to opposite sects, which they expressly disclaim, and results from their principles charged upon them, which they unhesitatingly disallow? Are not the most extravagant caricatures offered to the public as correct representations of religious peculiarities? It is wrong for any one sect to represent another as sectarian and exclusive, because they are not ready to admit that others are right as well as themselves, and because they deem it inexpedient and improper to interchange the services of the sanctuary with those, who differ from them in opinion on the leading doctrines of the Gospel. Nor is it right for those, who believe that their brethren have embraced dangerous errors, to reproach them with the charge of infidelity, while they acknowledge the inspiration and sufficiency of the Scriptures."

This last remark has been thought by some to apply to us; and if it does, this is no reason why it should not have been uttered. We have never claimed to be infallible or impeccable; and we should poorly deserve the title we have assumed, if we could not receive a friendly rebuke without impatience. But the remark does not apply to us; neither do we believe that such was its intention. We have never 'reproached those with the charge of infidelity, who acknowledge the inspiration of the Scriptures.' Nor have we ever charged Unitarians, as a body, with being infidels. We undertook to show, in our last volume, what constitutes infidelity; and after defining it, and offering the only definition which could be given and cover the whole acknowledged ground, we ascertained to a certainty that a number of Unitarian writers and preachers, in this country and in Europe, fell clearly on the side of the Infidel. They openly deny the inspiration of the entire Scriptures; charge them with mistakes and errors; and speak of them, not as the inspired word of God, but only as *containing* the word of God. They are not a revelation, but the human record of revelation. To these persons we applied the name of Infidel. What else should we call them? But to Unitarians, as a body, we have never applied this name.

Some Unitarians profess to regard this Sermon with entire approbation, and speak of it as "worthy to be bound together with the best numbers of the Liberal preacher." But what are we to understand by such commendations? That those who utter them really approve of the sentiments which the sermon contains? Do they admit, at length, that the Orthodox are to be justified in separating from them, and refusing to hold ministerial intercourse with them, on account of their great errors? Do they admit that it is wrong for them to 'represent the Orthodox as sectarian and exclusive,' and to 'excite a popular odium against them, as aiming to destroy the liberties of the people, and to fasten upon them a yoke of bondage'? Do they think it wrong, too, to 'regard with indifference, if not with complacency, the vile aspersions and base calumnies that are cast upon those, who are active in the propagation of what they believe to be the truth of the gospel'? Do they sincerely coincide with the preacher, in holding sentiments such as these? Let them, then, show their sincerity by their works; and let them no longer object to the possibility or the *reality* of instantaneous conversions.

In the inculcation of doctrine, Dr. C. evidently did not intend to say aught which would be offensive to his hearers of either party. But in approaching his conclusion, he alludes, as every faithful preacher might be expected to do, to the day of Judgement.

"In our professional services we often direct the attention of our people to

that eventful day, when the secrets of all hearts shall be made manifest, and every one rewarded according to his works. At that dread tribunal, we, too, reverend fathers and brethren, must stand, and be called to give an account, not only for the manner in which we have discharged our duty to the flocks committed to our care, but, also, for the spirit we have cherished and manifested towards each other."

It probably did not occur to the speaker, that some Unitarians (we hope not all) do not believe that there will be a general Judgement.

"I do not believe," says a writer in the Christian Examiner, "there will ever be any general judgement. The assembled universe, so often spoken of as gathered at once before the throne of God to be reciprocally spectators of each other's trial and judgement, is, I believe a mere coinage of the human brain. Certainly the Scriptures assert no such thing." Vol. ix. p. 30.

In conclusion, we would express our approbation of the leading object of this discourse, of the spirit and manner in which it is executed, and of its contents generally, and would cordially recommend it to the attention of our readers.

2. *A Sermon preached at the Annual Election, May 25th, 1831, before his Excellency Levi Lincoln, Governor, his Honor Thomas L. Winthrop, Lieutenant Governor, the Honorable Council, and the Legislature of Massachusetts.* By LEONARD WITHINGTON. Boston: Dutton & Wentworth. pp. 48.

This Discourse is an apology for the clergy. The author assumes, correctly enough we presume, that the clergy of this land are not now held in such veneration as they once were. He proceeds to assign reasons for the change, and to show *how* and *why* he would have his ministerial brethren to be estimated. From the following quotations, some idea may be formed of the object and manner of the author:

"I know not how it is, but so it is—the world is much more disposed to make all answerable for the faults of one in our profession, than in any other. If a merchant fails in a fraudulent bankruptcy, no body supposes that any logic will prove, from these premises, that all merchants are cheats. But if a preacher departs from the simplicity of his character—"See," they say, "the priests of all religions are the same, and all priests are alike." It would seem, from some conclusions that we hear, that nature lost her variety by entering the sacred office; that the moment a man put on a black coat, his identity was merged in the whole class who wear black. In this way, not only the faults of the fathers are visited on the children; but the faults of every weak man, and every bad man, are visited on the whole profession; and thus the poor clergyman goes down—down into that low valley, where he needs all his humility to give sweetness to its repose."

Again,

"It would be idle to say that our profession have not sometimes carried on their controversies with a wrong spirit, and how we are to defend these things at the bar of God, I know not. It is fearful to think of it. But at your bar, I apprehend, we have something to say. For as Origen told the Pagans, that though the Christian assemblies were not what they ought to be, yet they were far superior to theirs, so may I not say to you, that no religious strife has borne any comparison in violence with the bitterness of political strife. You reproach us with our *odium theologicum*. But do statesmen always love one another? Do you find perfect simplicity in the halls of legislation? Do you know nothing of the fierce conflicts of opinions; and how insensibly a man loses his temper while he is pursuing his end? Have you never seen two honest men not in casocks disagree—and lose their charity because they could not see with each others eyes? It seems to me there are some examples even

in political life, which might teach us serious lessons of candor and forbearance. Remember, too, the subjects on which you contend are trifles compared with ours. They have not half the heart-stirring and absorbing interest—as the truths which swim before our vision and overwhelm our souls. The more magnificent the interest, the harder it is to be calm. You express your wonder that clergymen cannot differ in their speculations without a breach of charity. Well—it is wrong. But you remember there were two such men as Charles Fox and Edmund Burke. They were two of the most enlightened men Europe ever saw. And yet, when these two great men came to differ seriously in political opinion, they could scarcely speak to each other."

A year ago, our civil fathers were called to listen to a miserable story, relating to persecutions here inflicted and endured. Mr. Withington very properly scouts the idea of such persecution.

"Nor is there one protestant sect, which as a sect, would wish to set up any kind of persecution. It is true, all preachers are warmly attached to their own tenets, (you would certainly despise the man that was not) and would be glad to make as many proselytes as possible. This is to their honor; for what a strange preacher would he be, who did not believe his own doctrines! A belief in a system of doctrines, naturally implies their importance to human happiness; and hence we are urged by our most benevolent feelings, to offer them with earnestness to mankind. But there is no respectable class in our land, that wishes to pass over the line of persuasion. Persecution for opinions! Why, we are the men who have the most reason to dread an influence of this kind. We are continually dealing in opinions. By a measure of this kind, we should be the first to suffer."

This Discourse is evidently the production of a man of genius; is written in an easy, natural style; and, interspersed with some allusions of a lighter character, contains many shrewd and sensible remarks.

3. *A Vindication of the Fundamental Principles of Truth and Order in the Church of Christ*, from the Allegations of the Rev. William E. Channing, D. D. By the Rev. FREDERICK BEASELEY, D. D., Rector of St. Michael's Church, Trenton, N. J. Trenton: Joseph Justice. 1830. pp. 144.

It will be sufficient to draw the attention of some of our readers to this work, to apprize them of its existence, and give them an extract from its pages. It consists of seventeen Dissertations, the most of which are written with ability, and are well worthy the attention of all who would form a just estimate of Dr. Channing.—The following is from the Dissertation in which Dr. Beaseley "inquires concerning the fact, whether Newton, Locke, and Clarke did really depart from the Orthodox creed of their church, and entertain a preference for the Unitarian doctrine upon the subject of a Trinity."

"The claims of the Unitarians to Mr. Locke, are even less founded, than those which they present to Newton. Upon this point, we speak with more confidence than about Newton, since we have carefully read his works, and studied several of them with minute and close attention. To those who will take the pains thoroughly to understand this author, it is a subject of curiosity and amusement to remark, how frequently his authority is given in support of doctrines of which he never thought, and how often his opinions are egregiously misunderstood, and his principles perverted. If we are to believe writers in their own cause, not an error has been broached, or an absurdity hatched in any crazy brain, that cannot find Mr. Locke at hand to cleanse the wretched bantling from the pollutions of its birth, and lick it into comeliness and proportions. Even Helvetius can find in this great Metaphysician, a Father for his fooleries."

" Mr. Locke has written copiously upon several theological topics, and upon some of those intimately connected with this doctrine, (the Trinity,) and yet, during the whole course of the controversies he maintained, and the correspondences he conducted, he has never uttered a single expression, which the utmost ingenuity at perversion could distort into an acknowledgement of any dissatisfaction with this article. We admit that there is something singular in the circumstance, that, during his protracted controversies upon subjects relating to this point, he never made an open declaration of his sentiments. But there would be something still more unaccountable, if he disbelieved it, in the excessive solicitude he discovered, in his correspondence with Bishop Stillingfleet and others, to convince them that no opinions which he had ever advanced, were unfavorable to this doctrine. If he utterly discredited it, as is alledged, why take so much pains, and devote so much intellectual toil to convince the Prelate, and the rest of the Orthodox, that he had never advanced anything which could fairly be turned against it? It would seem impossible to explain this mystery, and to clear his character from the suspicion of egregious disingenuousness and equivocation. We must believe, that, whatever difficulties might at times embarrass his understanding in reflecting upon the topic, he did not seriously reject it. And in looking over his works, we discovered one passage, which, in the want of positive evidence upon the other side, we think ought decidedly to turn the scale in favor of his soundness in the faith. It is found in a letter which he wrote, in Latin, to the celebrated Limborch, and we are not aware that it was ever before noticed by any writer upon this subject. He had, in a previous epistle, mentioned to Limborch, that Dr. Allix had lately published a work in England, in which he understood, for he had not yet obtained or read it, the Dr. had undertaken to demonstrate, that the doctrine of the Trinity might be traced among the Jews and Rabbins. In this second letter, he again recurs to the subject, showing that it occupied some share of his attention, and makes use of the following remarkable expressions. " In the mean time, you will give me information of what you shall hear said of it. There are some among us, who think it egregiously paradoxical, to attribute to the Jews the doctrine of a Trinity, and to expect from the Synagogue a confirmation of that dogma. Others, on the contrary, declare that here lies the very hinge upon which the controversy turns, and that upon this foundation the Orthodox doctrine may be firmly established, and the arguments of the Unitarians overturned. I wish to see what the thing speaks for itself, for I have not hitherto been in the habit of expecting any aid in this cause from the Jews and Rabbins; but light is very delightful, from whatever source it may shine." Now, we are willing to leave it to the judgement of every intelligent reader, to decide, whether any one who was not a decided Trinitarian in his heart, would ever have expressed himself in this style. He evidently considers himself enlisted upon the side of Orthodoxy, and as an opponent of Unitarians. He delivers himself precisely as any one would do, who had an interest in supporting the doctrine of the Trinity, who had not, indeed, anticipated any aid in sustaining it from the Jews and Rabbins, but who would be agreeably disappointed, if it should be obtained from that quarter. I have not hitherto "*expected*," are words worthy of observation. We are not in the habit of expecting what we do not wish, if we can avoid it. And if he had been an opponent of the tenet, would he not rather have said, I have not hitherto apprehended that Trinitarians would attempt to sustain their cause, by arguments derived from that quarter? "I have not expected *aid*." Would he have denominated such proof aid, if he had not at heart, the successful issue of the cause? The heart is the best interpreter, oftentimes, of its own sentiments; and we cannot help thinking, that, in this passage, we detect the latent feelings and tendencies of Mr. Locke. The last sentence, too, is in perfect accordance with the whole strain of the passage. "Light is very delightful" or acceptable, from whatever quarter it may beam. Would he have honored that speculation with the appellation of light, which was to confirm error, or establish absurdity? With these illustrations of this passage, from Locke's letter, we leave this subject in the hands of every intelligent and reflecting mind, with this single question addressed to Unitarians; would any one of them have used this or similar language, under the same circumstances? Let them answer it to their own

feelings, and we think that they cannot but perceive, that, whatever difficulties might, at intervals, have perplexed the mind of Mr Locke, yet, in his habitual convictions, he was in favor of a Trinity."

4. *The Christian Citizen, or the Duty of Praying for Rulers*: Two Sermons, preached in the Chapel of the Theological Seminary, Andover, on the State Fast, April 7, 1831. By EBENEZER PORTER, D. D. President of the Seminary. Second Edition, with an Appendix. Boston: Peirce and Parker. pp. 44.

The design of these truly able and excellent discourses is to enforce the obligation of *praying for rulers*. Such prayer is represented as important, because 'it is a becoming acknowledgement of that superintending providence which overrules the affairs of nations,'—because of 'the agency of rulers in accomplishing or frustrating the ends of civil government,'—because 'their duties are often difficult, as well as important,'—because 'the habit of praying for rulers tends to make good citizens,'—because of 'the salutary influence of such prayer on rulers,'—and because 'prayer for rulers tends to prevent the prevalence, or to diminish the mischiefs of party spirit.'—In conclusion, Dr. Porter remarks on the 'importance of national habits being formed under the influence of religious principle;' on 'the true connexion between religion and government;' and on the 'important part which good men have to act, as citizens.' From what he says under the second of these concluding remarks, the following passages are extracted:

"Religion, like the air and the light, is an element not subject to the regulation of government. Subjects have as good a right to see and breathe as rulers; both are absolutely and equally dependent on God for this privilege. Just so, as to rights of opinion and of conscience. Human governments do not confer these rights, and have no concern with them, except to protect individuals from violence in their enjoyment, and to prohibit any extravagant abuse of these rights to the public injury. My animal life, though not derived from human government, may be forfeited by gross transgressions against society. For my *actions*, that are wrong, I am responsible, even to the abridgement or entire loss of personal liberty. But my *rights of opinion* merely, for which indeed I am accountable to God, are as independent of human authority, as my immortal existence. Religion stands in its own strength, or rather stands by leaning on omnipotence. Government stands, if at all, by leaning on religion. Take away from a free community belief in a God, and a final retribution, and you cut all the cords of conscience and moral obligation. Tell me then, what principle remains, that can give efficacy to laws in that community.

"Can it be done by the mere *authority* of good laws? The penalties of the statute book,—the array of tribunals, and executive officers, and prisons, all are frail as the spider's web, to restrain the passions of men, let loose from the ties of religion. Besides, how are good laws to be *enacted* in such a community? Would theft and drunkenness be punished in a republic consisting of thieves and drunkards?

"Can the force of *example* give efficacy to good laws? Example of whom? Once in an age, some illustrious model of excellence might arise, but the general current of example sweeps *downward*, in an overwhelming tide of licentiousness.

"Can *standing armies* do it? In a despotism, the sword may enforce obedience; but no people, retaining the rights of self-government, will feed and pay armies to keep themselves in subjection.

"Can *education and intelligence* diffused among a people do it? So our orators and politicians have told us a thousand times; and doubtless knowledge among a people is an indispensable auxiliary to moral principle, where government depends on popular suffrage. But is this *enough*? The men of Greece and Rome were enlightened; yet Greece and Rome were convulsed with end-

less revolutions, and to escape the fires of faction that consumed them, took refuge in despotism.

"Will patriotism and love of national glory do it? I know that this is a principle of great efficacy, to which warriors and poets are wont to appeal. But this sentiment of itself, is no basis for good government. Whose tongue does it keep from perjury? whose hand from theft or murder?—*Conscience*,—a public conscience, that regards God with reverence, can make good citizens, and nothing else can do it. Short of this, theories that presume on the perpetuity of our institutions, because the people are enlightened and free, may do for political declaimers, but they are mere talk. There must be some principle that goes deep to the springs of moral action, and derives efficacy from a perfect law, and an eternal retribution."

In these discourses, the author is exhibited, not only as an enlightened Christian, but as, in the best sense of the term, a PATRIOT. We would that the sentiments he has uttered were echoed, in notes of thunder, through the length and breadth of the land.

5. *Memoirs of Mrs. Susan Huntington*, of Boston, Mass., designed for the Young. By an Early Friend. New-Haven: A. H. Maltby. 1831. pp. 129.

The design of this little work is to "portray the character of Mrs. Huntington in her childhood and youth, with more minuteness than was found convenient in the larger volume." It is intended particularly for the benefit of the young, and can hardly be read by them, especially by young females, without interest and profit. It is of great importance, as the authoress observes, "that the lives of those who were pious in childhood be presented to the young; that, at this erring period, they may have models continually before them, not only of ministers, missionaries, and martyrs, who have fought the good fight, but of little children and youth also, who were beset with temptations like their own, and were enabled to triumph over them."

---

#### REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

We cannot be supposed to have been indifferent spectators of the recent Revivals of Religion, with which God has been pleased to bless our country, and to distinguish our age, beyond that of almost any other since the times of the Apostles. So far from indifference, we have watched these Revivals, their origin, their progress, and the means used to promote them, with intense interest. Hitherto we have neglected, partly from necessity, and partly by design, to speak of them in our pages. A reasonable portion of several succeeding numbers will be devoted to the subject of Revivals.



THE  
**SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.**

---

---

VOL. IV.

AUGUST, 1831.

NO. 8.

---

---

**COMMUNICATIONS.**

THE RECENT REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

A REVIVAL of Religion is a season when the children of God are specially engaged in the duties of religion, and feel and exemplify in an unusual degree its power; and when sinners, in considerable numbers, are awakened and converted. It is evident both from scripture and facts, that revivals of religion are to be attributed to the special operations of the Spirit of God, exerted through the instrumentality of truth, and with the concurring prayers and labors of his people.

Revivals of religion have not been peculiar to any country or period of the church, but in every place, and in every age, when the people of God have awaked to their duty, and his ministers have faithfully dispensed his word, he has followed their labors with a blessing.—The primitive age of the church was a season of special and powerful revivals of religion. The Spirit of God was gloriously shed forth, sinners in vast numbers were converted, and the religion of the cross spread, in a few centuries, over the greater part of the then known world.

The reformation from Popery was accomplished, in no small degree, by revivals of religion. The phraseology at present applied to them was not, indeed, at that time in use, but the things signified by it were every where visible. God's ministers were excited to great earnestness in prayer, and boldness and faithfulness in preaching the gospel, and their labors were eminently successful. Sinners by hundreds and thousands were converted, churches were purified and established, and the professors of a corrupt religion were induced to forsake it and embrace the gospel.

Near the commencement of the eighteenth century, there were powerful revivals of religion in some parts of Germany, in connexion with the labors of Arndt, Franke, Spener, and others.—The history of the Moravians, and of their various settlements, is little else than a continued narrative of revivals of religion.—The times

of Owen, Bunyan, and Baxter were seasons of spiritual refreshing in many parts of England. No one can read the accounts of Baxter's labors and success at Kidderminster, without perceiving that the scenes there exhibited, in every thing except the name, resembled the modern revivals of religion. In the next century, religion was greatly revived in England, under the ministry of Whitefield and the Wesleys.

There have been revivals at different periods in Scotland, from the Reformation to the present time. Mr. Fleming records "an extraordinary outpouring of the Spirit in the West of Scotland about the year 1625," called by the "profane rabble the *Stewarton sickness*." He also mentions a season of "communion at the Kirk of the Shots, June 20, 1630," when as many as *five hundred* were hopefully converted in a day.\* In the *Christian History*, a periodical published in Boston, in the year 1743-4, more than forty places are mentioned in Scotland in which revivals of religion were at that time in progress.—A revival took place in the north of Ireland, about the year 1628, which Mr. Fleming regards as "one of the largest manifestations of the Spirit, and of the most solemn times of the down-pouring thereof, that hath been seen, since the days of the Apostles."—There have been frequent revivals of religion, during the last half century in Wales, by means of which the number of hopeful Christians in the Principality has been greatly increased. A revival commenced there so late as 1827, in consequence of which, within about fifteen months, more than 3000 persons were added to the independent churches.—"There is," says a sensible writer, "a nearer approximation to what are called revivals of religion in some of the Congregational churches in England, than is usually supposed in this country. The admission of two hundred members in one year to a single church, as at Manchester, would be thought a Revival in America. Yet it was not *spoken of* as such in the religious circles in England."—The revivals which have occurred, within a few of the last years, at the Society and Sandwich Islands, at Ceylon, and at various other places among the heathen, show also, that these visits of mercy are not, as has sometimes been sneeringly represented, peculiar to the United States, but are enjoyed in every place, where there is earnest effectual prayer, connected with the faithful ministration of the gospel.

It would be wrong, however, not to admit, with humble gratitude and joy, that our country has been distinguished, perhaps above every other, by the special operations of the Divine Spirit, and by the frequency and power of revivals of religion. Revivals commenced here almost as soon as the country was settled. "It pleased the Lord," says Gov. Winthrop, "to give *special testimony* of his presence in the church of Boston, after Mr. Cotton was call-

\* Fulfilling of the Scriptures, p. 302.

ed to office there. More were converted and added to that church, than to all the other churches in the Bay. Divers profane and notoriously evil persons came and confessed their sins, and were comfortably received into the bosom of the church." It appears from the records that *thirty-seven* were added to the church in Boston (for there was then but one church) in the space of three months. Similar tokens of the presence of the Holy Spirit were manifest at that early period in Dorchester, in Cambridge, and at several other places.\*

The general and powerful revivals with which our country was visited near the middle of the last century, have been often described. The work commenced in Northampton, under the searching and powerful ministry of Mr. Edwards. Here it continued and prevailed, "till there was scarcely a person in the town, either old or young, that was left unconcerned about the things of the eternal world." In the spring of the next year, it extended into the neighboring region, and nearly all the towns in old Hampshire county were visited and revived. It also prevailed in different parts of Connecticut, and in New Jersey.

In 1738, the celebrated Mr. Whitefield first visited the country. He commenced his labors in the southern provinces, and did not visit New England, until the autumn of 1740. During his first visit, his labors in Boston and other places, were followed by a very unusual and general attention to religion. "Multitudes were greatly affected, and many awakened, with his lively ministry. Great numbers in Boston," says Mr. Prince, "were so happily concerned about their souls, as we had never seen any thing like it before." In the winter following, Mr. Gilbert Tennent came into New England, where his labors also were abundant, and were greatly blessed. The revival in Boston exceeded any thing ever before witnessed in this part of the country. "The very face of the town seemed to be changed," so as to occasion "great surprise" to the strangers who visited it. From Boston the work spread in every direction over the settled portions of New England. In the Christian History, mention is made of nearly fifty towns in the several provinces,

\* Mr. Roger Clap, speaking of events which took place soon after the settlement of Dorchester, says, "In those days, did God manifest his presence among us, in *converting many souls*; and in gathering his dear ones into church fellowship by solemn covenant." "Our hearts were taken off from old England, and set upon Heaven. The discourse, not only of the aged, but of the youth also, was not, 'How shall we go to England?' but 'How shall we go to Heaven? Have I true grace wrought in my heart? Have I Christ or no?' O the many tears that have been shed in Dorchester meeting house at such times, both by those who have declared God's work on their souls, and by those who have heard them!"

Of Mr. Shepard of Cambridge Mr. Prince observes, "I was told when a youth by elderly people, that he scarce ever preached a sermon, but some or other of his congregation were struck with great distress of soul, and cried out aloud in agony, 'What shall I do to be saved?' And when the people returned from meeting, it was a question which those who had been detained at home were wont to ask them, 'Whether any body appeared to be wrought upon to day? Whether there were any visible effects of the word?' Christian History, vol. i. pp. 72, 216.

on which the Spirit of God was specially poured out, nearly at the same time.

From the close of this season of refreshing, until after the termination of the revolutionary war, the work of God in this country was fearfully at a stand. The minds of people, ministers and others, were engrossed with other subjects, and the interests of religion and the soul were neglected. But near the beginning of the present century, a new era seems to have commenced. Revivals became more frequent, and were marked with more signal tokens of the Divine presence and power. And from that period to the present, the work may be said, in general, to have continued and increased. There have been intervals, indeed, of religious declension, and the withdrawal of the Holy Spirit; but these have been followed, in most instances, with humiliation and prayer, and by a speedy renewal of the Divine blessing.

The year 1829 was one of uncommon spiritual desertion. The number of revivals was comparatively few, and the inquiry was often urged upon the hearts of Christians, 'Wherefore is the Lord contending with us?' Near the commencement of the last year, the prospect became more cheering. Drops of mercy were scattered here and there, and revivals occurred in different places. It was not, however, till the latter part of the year, that these drops began to thicken, and to show indications of a general shower.

The *recent revivals of religion*, as they have been termed, appear to have commenced in the Western part of New York, in Rochester and the surrounding region, in the autumn of 1830. During the next three or four months, the work spread rapidly, and extended itself over a considerable portion of the state. In the course of the winter, favorable appearances were observed in the city of New York, which, at the opening of the spring, assumed a most cheering and decisive character. Nearly all the evangelical churches in the city have shared in the revival, and thousands, it is hoped, have been born of God. Whilst the work was thus pervading the city and state of New-York, it made its appearance in the Western parts of Massachusetts, and in various places in Connecticut. At the same time, the tokens of God's presence and power were displayed in some of the principal towns in Maine. About the first of March, an unusual spirit of prayer was imparted to the churches in Boston, and it began to be apparent that the Lord was there. From that time, the work has been in progress in Boston, and the surrounding region, and many have been made the happy subjects of renewing grace. At the same time that the revival was thus extending itself Eastward, it was also spreading to the South and West. Philadelphia, Charleston, the District of Columbia, Cincinnati, and various places in the Middle, Southern, and Western States have been visited, and in nearly every place to which the work has come, it is still in progress. It has been estimated

by one who has paid particular attention to the subject, and has the best means of forming a judgment,\* that as many as a "thousand congregations in the United States have been visited within six months, to a greater or less extent, with revivals of religion; and that the whole number of conversions is probably not less than fifty thousand"!! Truly this is a great and glorious work—sufficient to fill the hearts of God's people with humility and gratitude, and their mouths with thanksgiving! A work, in the promotion of which holy beings on earth and in heaven have combined their influence, and have rejoiced together!

This work derives additional importance from the *situation and rank* of many of the principal places that have been visited. "It is worthy of special notice that those places have partaken most largely of the blessing which exert the greatest influence upon society. *Cities and colleges* have been the scenes of the deepest interest, as if the divine Spirit would correct the streams of moral influence by purifying the fountains. The colleges which have been most favored are Yale, Amherst, Middlebury, Bowdoin, Williams, Hamilton, Jefferson, Kenyon, Union, Hampden Sydney, New-Jersey, Western Reserve, Brown University, and the University of Ohio. The whole number of students who appear to have become subjects of piety in these institutions, during the present revival, is *three hundred and twenty*. The effects of this change will not be limited to these young men. Hundreds and thousands will, doubtless, experience in consequence of it a similar change in their characters and destiny for eternity, and a multitude which no man can number will rejoice in the result for ever."

"The character of this work," say the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, "so far as we can learn, has generally been such as the friends of God must approve, and desire to see continued,—still, solemn, and in some cases overwhelming. In general, there has been but little to produce distrust, or to awaken fear in the mind of the most timid and cautious Christian. And it is worthy of remark, that we hear but little of open and violent opposition. The presence and power of God have been so manifest, that the most vile, though they refuse to repent, have not the hardihood to oppose or revile. And for this we should give thanks to God, that while revivals are becoming more frequent, and more powerful, they are also becoming more pure from every thing of human origin."

In this work of salvation, individuals of all ranks, ages, and characters have been included. "The child of six and seven years, yet in the infant school, and the aged sinner who had passed his fourscore years in rebellion, have, in the same congregation, been brought together at the feet of Jesus, and some of all the intermediate ages. The great and learned officers of state, and the most

\* The Secretary of the American Education Society.

illiterate servants, have been found together in the same prayer meeting, on a level before the throne of God. The man of wealth and the poor man, have united in *begging for mercy* of Him who is no respecter of persons. It is however believed that no previous revival ever took so large a proportion of the wealth and learning and influence of society as this has done. Literary and professional men who are at the head of society, giving the tone to public sentiment, have been brought into the kingdom in far greater numbers than ever before was known. Moral men, who have regarded themselves as approved of God on account of the purity of their lives, and the openly vicious and profane, have been alike humbled before God on account of their vileness, and the just sentence of wrath which was upon them. In many instances the intemperate, tottering upon the verge of a drunkard's grave, have been rescued by the sovereign mercy of God, and made temperate, sober Christians. Some of every character and condition in life have been taken, so that we need not despair of any, but should labor and pray in hope and faith for all.

“In some congregations, especially in the western section of the state of New-York, the work has been so general and thorough, that the whole customs of society have been changed. Amusements and all practices of a doubtful character, the object of which is simply pleasure, have been abandoned, and far higher and purer enjoyment is found in exercises of devotion, and engagements for the glory of God, and the salvation of men. The new converts come at once into all the designs and plans of benevolence which are the glory of the present day, and rejoice in bearing their part in the conversion of the world. It is also worthy of remark, that in very many instances, and we do not know but in all, where a person has wronged another, on his professing repentance before God, he has been solicitous to make a speedy and full restitution for the injury; and in all cases, the converts are immediately zealous friends of the temperance reformation, and friends of every thing that favors the cause of the Redeemer. Should these revivals continue and increase, as we pray they may, and produce no other effects than they have already done, they will shortly bring into our country all the blessings promised of God to the church in the latter days. They multiply the families that call on the name of the Lord; they change the moral aspect and habits of society, by giving the tone of Christianity to public sentiment and practice; they silence the clamor of opposers, and close the lips of the profane; they rescue the Sabbath from under the feet of the impious, break up the deep and strong foundations of iniquity, disperse the assemblies of the wicked, and fill the churches of God from the haunts of dissipation. They close up the fountains from whence flow the desolating streams of intemperance, licentiousness, and every vice, and give increasing energy and triumph to all the

plans of benevolence, by which this revolted world is to be brought back to the service and favor of God. What more, or what different, then, does the church need, to bring in her millennial glory?"

Among the means which have been instrumental in *preparing the way* for this general and mighty movement of Divine grace, three deserve particular mention: Sabbath Schools, the distribution of Tracts, and the measures which have been taken for the promotion of temperance. By means of the system of Sabbath school instruction, which has been in vigorous operation for several years, a vast amount of good seed had been sown, and sown in a soil where there was comparatively little resistance to its springing up. A portion of it has now sprung up, and the result is glorious. Thousands of persons connected with the Sabbath schools have, within a few months, been hopefully gathered into the fold of Christ.

By the general distribution of religious tracts, divine truth has been brought in contact with another class of minds, scarcely more instructed in some instances than those of children, though much more prejudiced and hardened. Here also it has taken effect, and those who were farthest removed from the ordinary channels of saving mercy have tasted and seen that the Lord is gracious.

In years past, the general use of ardent spirit has proved a mighty hindrance to the progress of truth, and the free course of the gospel. Little can be done, as is now seen and acknowledged, for the spiritual good of any person, so long as he continues to use this poison. But in consequence of measures recently pursued, the use of it is greatly diminished. Thousands, and it may be hundreds of thousands, who a few years since were drinkers of rum, have now done with the practice forever. In all these minds, an effectual bar to the saving influence of truth has thus been removed, and the consequence is, that the Divine word, when exhibited, almost immediately makes an impression.

A principal *direct* means of promoting the existing revivals has been *the preaching of the gospel*. The sinner has been shewn his exceeding sinfulness and danger, as a transgressor of God's law, as a rebel against his government, as lying in his hands and at his mercy, and as constantly and justly exposed to feel his righteous indignation. Under deep impressions of this nature, he has been led to Calvary, to the cross of Christ, to the finished and accepted atonement of him whose blood was shed for the remission of sins. And here he has been urged, by all the motives of the gospel, to lay down his weapons, and submit;—to do it *freely—unconditionally*—and IMMEDIATELY. If the preaching in these revivals has been peculiar in any thing, it has been in urging, with unwonted power, the obligation and motives to *immediate* repentance. Religion has been presented as a concern in which sinners must themselves *act*, and act on the spot. They have been warned against

quieting themselves in sin, under the impression that they must wait God's time; for God's time is the present time, and they have no occasion to delay a moment. Ministers have preached on these subjects, not with a half-suppressed incredulity, as doubting whether any thing could or would be done, but as though they believed what they said, were in earnest about it, and expected sinners would give immediate attention; and in thousands of instances they have given immediate attention, and soon have found joy and peace in believing.

These revivals of religion were preceded, and have been attended, by a very unusual spirit of prayer. Christians have been led to feel, that they needed a blessing, and that it must come from God; and they have gone to him in humble, earnest supplication that he would bestow it. While obligation and immediate action have been urged upon the sinner, the influence of the Holy Spirit has been sought, as that *without which nothing would be done*.—The spirit of prayer here spoken of has manifested itself in the establishment of *morning prayer meetings*. These meetings, which have not been common in previous revivals, have been attended with much interest and profit. The morning is, on many accounts, a favorable season for *social* as well as for secret prayer. The mind is then vigorous through relaxation and rest, is free from distracting worldly cares, and is prepared (if ever) to rise in humble devotion to the God of grace. A prayer meeting in the morning will moreover exert a salutary influence through the day. It will not be easy for the Christian to go from such a meeting into the business of life, and forget his heavenly Father, and give his heart supremely to the world.

Another mean employed in these revivals with great success, has been the *protracted meetings*, or meetings continued at intervals through several successive days.—Objections have been made to these meetings which it may be proper briefly to notice.—By some they have been represented as *disorderly* meetings.—That they may be made disorderly meetings, there is no doubt; and that in some few instances they have been such, is not improbable. But surely they need not be attended with disorder, and in no instance of which we have any personal knowledge, has this been the case. They are capable of being conducted with the utmost stillness and decorum, and are scarcely more liable to abuses of the kind referred to than the ordinary services of the Sabbath.

These meetings, it has been said again, consume an unreasonable portion of time. But what is an unreasonable portion of time to be devoted to the concerns of the soul? What is time compared with eternity? What are the body and the world, in comparison with the soul? And for what was our time on earth given us, but as a space in which to prepare for future scenes? If it is true, then, that the protracted meetings have been instrumental in pro-



moting revivals, and in the awakening and conversion of immortal souls; if it shall appear that they have a tendency, an adaptation to produce such results; who shall say, that the time devoted to them is unreasonably spent?—It is admitted that the bodies, the families, and the necessary worldly avocations of most persons require a considerable portion of their time; and were these meetings held frequently in any particular church or town, they might interfere with other duties. But this has not been the case, and is not likely to be; nor would it appear, on examination, that the friends of protracted meetings have not attended as diligently and as successfully to their ordinary business, as the generality of their neighbors. There is a degree of sensitiveness, on the part of many, as to the time proper to be spent in religious duties, which requires to be corrected. Persons may devote whole days, and many days in succession, to journeys, visits, diversions, and amusements—yea, if they have the means of subsistence, they may spend their lives in literal idleness, and no fault is found, no objection uttered; but if, in a few instances, they think proper to devote two or three days in succession to the services of religion, there is a great complaint of the waste of time.

It has been thought by some, that the meetings in question are calculated for excitement, rather than for permanent benefit, as they hurry people along, without sufficient opportunity for retirement and reflection. But is this true? During the days of meeting, not more than four or five hours are ordinarily spent by any individual in the place of worship, leaving nearly *twenty hours* of the twenty-four for sleep, meals, relaxation, and private religious duties. And, if well improved, is not this enough? To those who attend the meetings and wish to profit by them, a sufficient space is *not* furnished for worldly thoughts and cares to intrude, and banish the pleading Spirit from the soul; but may not time enough be secured, in addition to that spent in the meetings, for all the necessary purposes of relaxation and reflection?

It has been objected, finally, that the protracted meetings were unknown to our fathers—that they are *new* measures. But neither is this strictly true. Meetings, continued at intervals through several successive days, have been known in the church perhaps in all ages. Such were the festivals under the former dispensation; and we read in one instance, that when the people had fasted seven days, “they took counsel to keep other seven days.” It is said of the early disciples, that they “continued *daily* with one accord in the temple, and in breaking bread from house to house.” Sacred seasons are enjoined in the Episcopal church, during which the people are expected to assemble daily for purposes of devotion. From time immemorial, the sacramental seasons in some parts of the Presbyterian church have been attended by daily suc-

cessive meetings. And in our own churches and our own times, what are the General Associations, the Church Conferences, and many of our religious anniversaries, but a series of successive meetings?—Should it be admitted however, as it must be, that the class of meetings of which we have spoken are in some respects *new* measures, still, this is no valid objection to them. As the kingdom of Christ advances, and we approach millennial scenes, are we not to expect new modes of disseminating truth, and promoting the salvation of men? And besides, how many of the most popular and useful modes of religious operation at the present day, might be stigmatized as new measures? How old are Sabbath schools and Bible classes? How old are the monthly concerts of prayer? How long is it since most of the existing charitable institutions were put in operation? It is too late for Christians to object to tried and approved methods of doing good, on the mere ground that they are new.

Whatever objections may be made to the protracted meetings, *experience* has shown them to be eminently useful. That they have been blessed of God beyond almost any other means, in promoting the awakening and conversion of sinners and extending revivals of religion, there can be no doubt. Instances too numerous to be mentioned are before the public, in which revivals have either commenced, or have received a new and powerful impulse, in the progress of these meetings. Nor is there any thing mysterious in this. The reasons for the efficacy which has attended them, and why they have been thus honored of the Holy Spirit, are beginning to be obvious. These meetings serve to restrain and hold in check, for a time at least, that overflowing tide of worldliness, by which serious impressions ordinarily are swept away. They keep divine truth before the mind, till an impression is made too deep to be effaced. It is not uncommon, at the close of public worship on the Sabbath, for persons to leave the house of God with very serious impressions. They feel the importance of religion, feel their need of it, and are ready to resolve that they will give it their attention. But as the cares and business of the week press upon them, their feelings subside, and their good resolutions are forgotten. Perhaps the same process of awakening and relapsing is often repeated, until the conscience becomes seared and the heart is hardened. This difficulty in the way of conversion (which all who understand the subject know is as common as it is formidable) the protracted meetings are adapted to obviate; and it is to this circumstance in great measure, that their power, under God, is to be attributed. Religious impression, in these meetings, is followed up; before the benefit of one sermon is lost, another is heard; and soon the arrow of truth has pierced too deep to be easily withdrawn. A wound is inflicted, which none but the great Physician

can heal. The current of the affections is turned, and the soul is born of God.\*

That these meetings, like every other good thing, may be abused,—or that they may be called so frequently, or with so little previous preparation, or under circumstances so unfavorable, as to be productive of little good,—there can be no doubt. But it can be as little doubted that, when judiciously called, and judiciously conducted, they may be productive of immense advantage. Indeed, like many other important measures, now that they are frequently attended, and the tendency and benefits of them are seen, we are ready to wonder why they have been, in past years, so much neglected.

The present is unquestionably a most interesting and important crisis to the churches of this land. Should the existing revivals continue and prevail, free from disorders and objectionable mixtures, as we hope and trust in God they may, there is no estimating, even as it respects this world, their blessed and glorious results. Our land may soon become Immanuel's land—the glory of all lands; and we may be that happy people whose God is the Lord. But should the Divine Spirit be grieved to depart from us, and the revivals cease, a season of coldness, hardness, and out-breaking iniquity may be expected to ensue, the disastrous consequences of which can be fully estimated only in eternity. May every Christian be grateful, and humble, and in a state of preparation for further blessings; and may every one, who has a heart to feel, or a hand to labor, or a tongue to plead, resolve that nothing shall he wanting which he can do, to aid in promoting the work of the Lord.

---

#### THE NEW CREATURE.

“If any man be in Christ,” says the Apostle, “he is a new creature.” In the first part of this sentence it is more than intimated, that some men are not in Christ, are not true Christians. Such was the fact in the days of the Apostle; such it is now. There still are enemies to the cross of Christ. There still are

\* Let it not be said that in speaking thus of the adaptation and probable effect of means, we detract aught from the necessity or sovereignty of the operations of the Holy Spirit. It is, indeed, the work of the Spirit to give efficacy to means, and make them quick and powerful to the sanctification of the soul; but as, in performing this work, the Spirit operates through the medium of our faculties, and in conformity with the established laws of the human mind, we may reason from what we know of these laws in regard to the probable effect of means, just as though the special operations of the Spirit were not needed or concerned.

open opposers, decent objectors, and multitudes thoroughly indifferent to Christ and heaven, the soul and eternity. We see them all around us. The world is full of them. In the straight and narrow path that leadeth heavenward, only infrequent prints of the feet of travellers are to be seen; while the broad road is thronged by an unnumbered multitude, regardless whence they came, and whither they are going.

The few who have chosen to desert their companions in folly and sin, and become Christian pilgrims, in search of a heavenly city, are called by the Apostle "new creatures." This, and other language of similar import, the sacred writers frequently employ, to describe a regenerate state, a transformation from the complete dominion of sin to the dominion of holiness. Every truly converted soul is turned from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God. This is no eastern allegory, no oriental fiction, no dream of a disordered fancy, but the simple statement of a tremendously important fact—a fact which, whether regarded or not, takes fast hold on the interests of the soul, and the destinies of eternity.

The new birth, the new creation in Christ Jesus, regeneration, &c. are words of strange and unimaginable import to many minds. And well they may be. These persons know little about them, and what little they suppose they know, is often any thing but truth. They may talk, but they do not understand. They may fancy, but fancy and fact are seldom at one.

Notwithstanding the mystery which, in the view of many, hangs over this subject, to the honest and humble mind it may be simplified and rendered intelligible; and this is what I shall now attempt.

The new creation produces no change in any of our bodily or mental *faculties*. The subject of it sees with the same eyes, hears with the same ears, and labors with the same hands, which he had before. Neither is the sight of his literal eye, nor the hearing of his ear, nor the vigor of his hand strengthened. The same also may be said as to any change of his *mental* faculties. No person, by becoming spiritually a new creature, receives a new understanding, or a new imagination, or a new memory, conscience, or faculty of choice. His mental faculties may indeed be invigorated, through the influence of the Spirit, and by a proper use; still, they are not essentially changed.—In what, then, does the great change of which we are speaking consist? In what respects is the subject of it a new creature?

Man, in the full extent of his capacities and affections, possesses something more than mere organs by which to look abroad upon the earth, and hear the voice of his fellow man, and procure subsistence for his perishing body. He is something more than a mental being, who can recollect, and reason, and imagine. He

can wish as well as see ; desire as well as hear ; love as well as recollect ; hate as well as reason ; choose and refuse as well as imagine. The existence of powers and faculties corporeal and mental is comparatively a small matter. *How are they employed*—is the great question. How does a man feel ? What are his affections ? What are his principles ? What is his practice ? These are questions which go deep into the soul, and discover what a man is, in the sight of Him who looketh on the heart, and cannot be deceived.

I say, then, with reference to the point before us, that the truly regenerate soul has a *new object of supreme affection*.

Formerly self was first and last with him. Morning, noon, and night,—in youth and manhood, and declining years,—at home and abroad, in the church and in the field, seeking property or bestowing it on the destitute, in health and in sickness, in life and in death, the unregenerate heart pours forth its highest affections upon self. If it looks upward, to God and abroad to his kingdom, these are regarded as secondary objects. He cannot think complacently of God, as ruling for himself, for the display of his perfections, for the manifestation of his character, and as making the impenitent sinner illustrate that character throughout the universe and through eternity. Such thoughts, if they force themselves into his mind, are unwelcome intruders, and are banished, as you would drive from your house a suspected guest, who you feared would rob you of your treasures, and deprive you of life. Just so it is with self. Whatever it suspects as inimical to its little, paltry ends, it eyes with suspicion and fixed hostility, and opposes with all the vigor that sin and Satan can impart. God, his character, his government, his perfections, his will,—these are objects that cross the path and thwart the purposes of self. Both cannot be first. 'Ye will love the one and hate the other.' This is the irreversible law of man's moral nature.—The selfish person may for a time be ignorant of his selfishness, and may think himself actuated by noble, generous, disinterested views ; but even when the wrappers are taken off, and his true character is revealed, still, he will continue to love himself. Still, he will dread and hate the holy character and government of Jehovah.

But here is a *new creature*. That Divine character, once so hateful, is now lovely ; that government once so dreaded, is seen to be established in wisdom and goodness ; while those perfections, once odious, break forth and beam out with a heavenly splendor, the source of joy and of unfailing confidence to all holy beings. 'Be thou exalted, O God, above the heavens. Let thy glory be above all the earth.'—Truly, this is a great and wonderful change. 'Old things have passed away ; all things have become

new.' The principle, which ran through and actuated the whole man—the entire mass of his moral nature, has been changed, renewed, supplanted. A new and hitherto unknown principle has entered the heart, from which the former occupant has fled abashed. The ground, formerly overgrown with the weeds and tares of selfishness, now brings forth, under divine culture, the fruits of holiness,—one of the first of which is supreme love to God, itself the seed, the germinant principle, the proof, the pledge, of all the rest.—It may be said then with perfect truth, that when a man becomes a Christian, he has a *new God*,—a new object of supreme regard, affection, and veneration. Self formerly occupied the throne; but self is now upon the footstool and in the dust that covers it, while God, his Maker, Redeemer, and Judge, is enthroned in his rightful supremacy.

The regenerate man is a new creature, because *he has a new rule of duty.*

Formerly his own inclination, his own will, provided there was no outward impediment which prevented, directed his actions. Who does not wish to gratify his own desires? Who would not do it if he could? We have seen human nature work itself out, in our day, in the late Emperor of France. His own pleasure was his law. Every man naturally is a Napoleon, at least so far as this, that the only law by which he wishes to regulate himself and others is his own will.

But here is a *new creature.* The first question the new born soul puts forth is that of Saul, 'Lord, what *wilt thou* have me to do?' The will of another being, a being invisible to human eye, impalpable to human touch, whose literal voice no man hears, is now the rule of duty to the new creature. The law of God takes the place of man's desires, wishes, and propensities. He who formerly took counsel of his own selfish heart, now yields to the revealed word; he who once sought to please himself, now seeks to obey his heavenly Master; he who followed his own headlong propensities now holds them in check, while he consults the lively and life-giving oracles of truth. And these utter no uncertain, ambiguous responses, but plainly point out the path of duty, which, to the regenerate man, is the path of peace.

The unregenerate man, on becoming a true Christian, exhibits a marked novelty, a noticeable transformation of character, in the trait here specified. He puts aside his old rules of duty, whether they were his own will, or supposed advantage, or the maxims of the world; and, in place of them, adopts God's law, as the standard by which to estimate his character, mould his affections and regulate his conduct. This is a great change, very great, greater far than most people imagine.—Reader, Do *you* know what it implies? Are you ready to adopt the will of God as your rule

of duty? You must do it or you can never be a new creature. Heaven and hell turn on this pivot. Let God's will govern; and holiness, heaven, peace in life, triumph in death, and joys, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, are yours. Follow your own will, in opposition to that of God, and you shut yourself out from Heaven, cut yourself off from all holy affections, and poison the fountains of life in your soul. You deprive yourself of all certain present peace, plant thorns in your dying pillow, make the final Judge your eternal enemy, murder hope, and shut yourself up in the prison of despair.

What can be more proper than that a creature of yesterday and liable to err, should look up to his Creator, who is from eternity to eternity and who cannot err, for instruction and guidance? Would it be proper that children scarcely out of the cradle, should follow their shortsighted and perverse whims, rather than the kind and wise commands of their experienced parents? Your child has lived three years. You have lived thirty. Surely it is proper that the child of three should be directed by the parent of thirty years. And is there no propriety that the creature of thirty should be directed by the all wise and Eternal Creator? The simple statement of the subject carries home conviction to every mind with irresistible force.

Another distinctive trait of the new creature is, *new views of man's native character.*

The moral, reputable, but impenitent man may, by reading, by observation and reflection, become convinced that something is wrong about man, very wrong. He may see that unhesitating truth, and fearless honesty, and straight forward integrity are but seldom to be met with. He may know that pride, and vanity, and jealousy, and envy, and suspicion, and anger, weave a large portion of the web of human life. He may call falsehood contemptible, and intemperance beastly. He may acknowledge that laws are necessary to intimidate, that judges and courts are required to convict, and that prisons and penitentiaries are indispensable to confine the thief and the robber. All this presents to his mind a dark picture of human life and character. But then he contemplates another part of the picture, and finds some relief. He sees the kinder sympathies of our nature discovering themselves in various forms. He sees conjugal, parental and filial affection warm and vigorous in many bosoms, and the sight is pleasing. But he does not see that the father and mother and child may all be supremely selfish, while exhibiting these generous natural affections. He does not see, at least he is not apt to see, that all these and similar principles of human conduct come under that description of which the Saviour said, 'Verily I say unto you, they have their reward.' There is no holiness in them. They do not spring from holi-

ness; they do not produce holiness. Who thinks, when he sees the red-breast bearing in its bill food for its young, that the bird is holy? Yet has it not affection for its young? Is not the sight pleasant? Others must have different feelings from mine, if it be not so. Often have I watched the efforts and parental solicitude of the warblers of the woods, and admired the wisdom of the God of nature, who feedeth the young ravens when they cry. Is the fond mother, rocking her sleeping infant and smiling as it smiles, therefore holy? Is her love to her child necessarily connected with love to God, and with penitence for her sins? There are those that tell us that these natural and kindly affections, of which, (were we destitute,) we should be below the very brutes, are proof and exhibition of holiness! 'Blind leaders of the blind!'

But here is a *new creature*. He sees, that the most amiable unrenewed men, in all their moral, accountable exercises, are sinful, only sinful, and sinful without any mixture of holiness. Once he did not believe this. It was a harsh and uncomfortable view of the human character and condition. Or if he did believe it, as a doctrine too plainly revealed to be doubted, still it was a bare intellectual assent to a repulsive dogma of revelation. But now it comes home to his bosom, as a truth of awful, personal import. 'I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee; wherefore *I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes.*'

Truly, here is a great change. He who exalted now abases, he who excused now convicts, he who justified now condemns, himself. He who rose in opposition to God's laws, now rejoices to submit to them. He who raised objections, sought out difficulties, and uttered complaints of injustice and partiality, now ascribes righteousness to his Maker and takes shame to himself. He sees, realizes, and feels through his whole soul, that the only difficulty was in an impenitent, selfish, unhumbled, unholy heart, that, knowing its Lord's will, would not do it. The truly regenerate man knows, by an evidence of consciousness and personal feeling equal to demonstration, that the natural heart is enmity to God. He has felt this enmity in his own heart, and he knows that, as in a glass face answereth to face, so does the heart of man to man.

The new creature has a *new foundation for his hope of acceptance with God.*

Formerly he was as good as his neighbors. He was no hypocrite. He did not make any great pretensions to religion, it is true, but he was honest in his dealings, kind to the poor, and ready to do what he could to relieve the suffering and deliver the oppressed. Or if his circumstances did not admit of his really *doing* this, he was disposed to do it. Had he possessed the means, he certainly should have done it, and he who looketh on the heart and



requires only according to what a man hath, will readily take the will for the deed.—Some make a great merit of their sobriety. They are not intemperate, not dishonest, not profane, respect the Sabbath, read their Bibles, have read them for a long time, attend meeting regularly; surely, putting all this together, their characters must stand fair, and their hopes be good.

But here is a *new creature*. He no longer compares himself with his neighbors. He examines himself by the law of God, and he cries 'Woe is me, for I am undone; I have broken God's holy laws, and there is no health, no strength, no soundness in me. I am guilty. I am ruined.' His honesty, integrity, and kindness, his attention to the means of grace, his attendance in the sanctuary, his reading of God's word, all his feelings and actions, are now seen to be defiled. He can no longer look to them for hope. He turns away from these refuges of lies, and flies to the hope set before him in the gospel. He no longer balances his good deeds against his defective ones. He no longer attempts to number his benevolent actions, and weigh his holy desires. He feels that he never did a good deed, not one; that he never performed a benevolent action, not one; that he never entertained a right feeling, not one. In the light which heaven pours down upon his book of debt and credit, which he has been keeping so long, astonished he perceives that the sum total of his life stands against him in characters black with sin. He despairs of all hope from himself. His own fancied merit, the idol so long worshipped, now is a burden of sin that would sink him to perdition, were there not outstretched a divine arm to rescue him from impending ruin and raise him to hope and peace. He turns, self-loathing, to the cross of Christ, and sees that thereon only can a sinner like him hang his hope of forgiveness and heaven. It is the blood of Christ, applied to his accusing conscience, that alone can calm his agitation, and speak peace to his troubled soul.

Here, then, is a great change. Every thing else is renounced as a ground of hope before God, but Christ and his cross. Truly, the regenerate man is a new creature. He has a new Saviour. Jesus, formerly a despised Nazarene, deserving none of his confidence or love, is now his Lord and his God. 'Old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new.'

Reader, is it so with you? Is self, or God, your object of supreme love? Is your own will, or the will of God, your rule of duty? Do you think yourself commendable or abominable in the sight of God? Do you trust to your own merit for salvation, or do you see and deeply feel, that it is only by repentance for sin and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ that any can be saved?

## ARIUS.

Arius, the celebrated author of the Arian heresy, was born in Lybia, near Egypt, near the close of the third century. He was a person of uncommon address, of respectable acquirements, and was thought in early life to possess promising talents. He became connected with the church at Alexandria during the administration of Peter, a Bishop who suffered martyrdom in the persecution under Diocletian. He began to manifest, however, in these troublesome times, that his winning manners and imposing exterior were associated with a restless, aspiring disposition. He espoused the cause of the Meletians against his Bishop, and was separated from the church; and though he afterwards made concessions and was restored, his reformation and friendship were of short continuance. He could not brook the strictness of Peter's discipline, took it upon him to censure and condemn the transactions of his superiors, and after several fruitless attempts to reclaim and humble him, he was again separated from the communion of the faithful. In this state, the excellent Peter left him, when called to seal his testimony with his blood.

Achillas succeeded to the see of Alexandria, and to him the insinuating and artful Arius presented his acknowledgements. They were accepted, he was restored to the church, and was even advanced to the office of Presbyter. This office he held through the life of Achillas, and through some part of the administration of Alexander, who succeeded him.

During this period, however, Arius was not quiet. He was distinguished for bold and unwarrantable speculations. His adventurous spirit could not submit to follow "the footsteps of the flock," but he was bent on discovering a new path for himself. His peculiar sentiments were known, a considerable time before they became the subject of public animadversion. Alexander was slow to contend with him. He preferred to exhaust all milder methods, before he publicly engaged an enemy so dangerous.

At length the matter could be no longer concealed. Arius asserted openly, that "there was a time when the Son of God was not; that he had a beginning of existence; that he was a creature, and was peccable and mutable as creatures are."\* He preached these sentiments in his own church, and diffused them by all methods, and in all companies. He published them in a poem, "which he called *Thalia*, the style of which," Socrates

\* Sozomon Lib. i. Chap. 15. That this is not an unfair representation of the sentiments of Arius is evident from his Letters, only two of which remain. "We are persecuted," he says, "because we say the Son hath a beginning; but God is without beginning." Again; "We are persecuted because we say that the Son is from non-existence; and thus we say, because he is not part of God."

tells us, "was loose and dissolute, much resembling the verses of Sotades." With a view to spread his opinions among the lower orders, he descended to the composition of "songs, for the use of travellers, seamen, and those who work at the mill." Nor were his exertions without effect. He soon found numbers, both of the clergy and laity, who sympathized with him and were ready to support him.

It is not difficult to account for the success of Arius, without attributing much, either to the strength of his arguments or the goodness of his cause. He was formed by nature to impose upon his fellow creatures. His personal appearance is represented as venerable, his manner of life grave, his dress almost monastic, his conversation agreeable, his eloquence captivating.\* A small acquaintance with mankind may satisfy any one, that such properties and powers could not be long and diligently exerted for the diffusion of principles that were in any degree plausible, without an effect.

The effects of Arius' exertions were at length too great to be longer disregarded by his Bishop. Alexander saw that something must be done to check and eradicate the widely spreading evil. As forbearance and argument had been tried in vain, he thought proper to convene a synod of Bishops to look into the subject and determine respecting it. They met at Alexandria, condemned the doctrines of Arius, and separated him, with several of his adherents, from the church. But Arius, though defeated, was not disheartened. The measures which had been taken seemed rather to excite him to greater efforts. He entered into an alliance with several Bishops, particularly with Eusebius of Nicomedia.† Alexander, too, did every thing in his power to counteract his exertions. He wrote letters to many churches, informing them of the opinions of Arius, and warning them against his influence. He also convened another synod, consisting of nearly a hundred Bishops, by whom the heresiarch was again condemned.

The disturbance had now risen to such a height, that the Emperor, Constantine, undertook to quell it. He addressed a letter to both the parties, in which, without directly censuring either, he expressed his earnest desire for their agreement. This he sent to them by Hosius, Bishop of Corduba, a man venerable for his age and weight of character, and greatly distinguished for the faith and fortitude he had exhibited during the late persecutions. But neither the authority of the Emperor, nor the exertions of the venerable Bishop were of any avail. The breach was wide, the subjects in dispute were admitted on all hands to be important, parties too were formed and feelings enlisted for a long struggle.

Disappointed in his first attempt, Constantine next took the res-

\* See Sozomon, Lib. xv.

† Not Eusebius Pamphilus, the Historian.

olution of summoning a general Council, that through the influence of so large a body, he might suppress all divisions, and bring the christian world to an uniformity of faith. In obedience to his command, and at his expense, the Clergy assembled, A. D. 325, at Nice in Bithynia. The whole number of Bishops was 318, but of Bishops and Presbyters not less than 600. The Emperor himself presided in the Council, and, without attempting to impair the freedom of debate, exerted all his influence to promote harmony and peace.

When the sentiments of Arius came to be discussed, the Bishops found it extremely difficult to draw him out, or to deal with him, on the subjects at issue. If they proved that Christ was God, he would admit it, but in the same sense that holy men and angels are termed gods. If they proved that Christ was *truly* God, he would admit it, and that he was made so by God. If they proved that the Son was *naturally* of God, this too was admitted, as all things are said to be of God. If they proved that Christ was the *power*, *wisdom*, and *image* of God; Arius and his adherents would say the same, as man was formed originally in the image of his Maker. Such is the account given by Athanasius of these disputations.\*—The Orthodox part of the Council at length became satisfied, that they must depart without accomplishing any thing, and leave the difficulty more unsettled than they found it, or they must give a summary expression of *their sense* of the language of Scripture in regard to the subjects in debate. This necessity gave origin to the *Nicene creed*, which was drawn up chiefly by the venerable Hosius, and in which the Son was distinguished from all creatures, in that he was declared to be (*ομοουσιος*) of the *same substance with the Father*.

Of the whole Council, there were not more than twenty who were not cordial in this confession of faith; and of these twenty, all except two at length subscribed to it. Here, then, at a remove of but little more than two centuries from the Apostles, we have the testimony of almost the whole Christian world to what is now termed, in the strictest sense, the DIVINITY OF CHRIST. We have the testimony of hundreds of Bishops and Presbyters to this point, many of whom then "bore in their bodies, the marks of the Lord Jesus," having been branded with hot irons, or having lost their eyes or limbs in the recent and terrible persecutions.

The Nicene creed received the sanction of Constantine, and thus became the established religion of the empire. Arius was deposed, and excommunicated, and forbidden under heavy penalties to enter Alexandria. He was afterwards banished into Illyricum. His books were burned by order of the Emperor, and it was made a capital offence to read or retain them.

\* See Cave's Life of Athanasius.

It might have been supposed that the ruin of Arius was now complete; but the event was far otherwise. The character of the heresiarch was not yet fully developed, nor was his race of dissimulation and error run. His courtly intriguing friends, whose pliant consciences would permit them to subscribe any thing when their interest required it, were still retained in the imperial palace and family; and by their means, Constantine was induced, after a five years' banishment, to readmit Arius to his presence. This was all that the artful man desired. He pretended to retract some of his former expressions, and had no difficulty in satisfying the credulous Emperor, who is represented as a child in religious discernment, that his opinions had been misrepresented and he abused, and that he was really an asserter of the established faith. Constantine was so far persuaded, that he sent him back to Alexandria, and even wrote in his favor to the churches.

But although Arius returned to the place of his former residence, fortified with letters from the Emperor and others, he came thither to no purpose. Athanasius, who now filled the Alexandrian see, was a man not to be trifled with. He knew the character of his visitant, saw through his designs and artifices, and absolutely refused to admit him to the church. Nor was this resolution shaken by the subsequent commands and threats of the Emperor. He persisted in his refusal, and after a severe struggle against absolute power and disguised heresy and impiety, was himself banished from his people and country.

Being thus rid of the dauntless and inflexible Bishop, Arius remained at Alexandria in a kind of triumph. But it soon became so apparent that he was acting a double part—that, while pretending to support the established faith, he was plotting to overthrow it, and laboring to disseminate his old opinions—that the Emperor summoned him to repair to Constantinople, there to give an account of his conduct. He came as required, prepared to practise new impositions. When called into the imperial palace, and asked whether he agreed to the Nicene faith, he without hesitation answered in the affirmative. He readily subscribed to the creed, and when, to remove all doubt, the Emperor required him to swear that he believed as he had written, *he solemnly swore that he did!!* It is evidence of the power of conscience, that not even Arius could go through all this, without equivocating; and Socrates has informed us of the manner of his equivocation.\* At the time of the oath, he had concealed under one of his arms a paper, on which he had just written his real sentiments; and the oath was, according to his intention of it, that he believed as he had written on the paper under his arm!!

The Emperor now could doubt no longer. He appointed a

\* Lib. i. Chap. 38.

day on which the Bishop of Constantinople was ordered, under severe penalties, to admit Arius to communion in that city. But the excellent Bishop, Alexander (whose name deserves to be recorded) was not wanting to himself or his charge on this trying occasion. He renounced all dependence on human aid, resolved not to dispute, but gave himself to incessant prayer. He shut himself up alone in the great church of Irene, prostrated himself under the holy table, and prayed, that if Arius' opinions were true, he might not himself live to see the day the Emperor had appointed; but, if his own sentiments were true, that Arius might suffer the punishment due to his crimes. At length, the day of trial came. The Arians paraded through the city in triumph, with their champion in their midst, and drew the attention of all the citizens. But the hour of retribution was hastening on. When they came near to Constantine's forum, a sudden terror, with a disorder of the bowels, seized upon Arius. He was obliged to hasten to an out-house (*latrina*) that was shown him, where, with a vast effusion of blood, his very bowels gushed out—he fainted—and expired!

Thus died Arius, one of the most deceitful and hypocritical of men, and the renowned leader and father of all the Arians. The place of his death was long memorable, and was shown to strangers in the days of Socrates.

As respects the *manner* of Arius' death, the testimony of history is uniform, and there can be no dispute. Respecting the *cause* of it, there were two opinions in ancient times,—that of the Arians, who ascribed it to magic, and that of their opponents, who regarded it as a special judgement of God. It was reserved to modern ingenuity to assign a third cause, *viz. poison*. Of this, it is enough to say, that it is improbable in itself, and it rests on mere suspicion without a particle of proof. Instances of death by poison were common in the days of Arius, and the indications and effects of poison were better understood then, than now. There were not wanting, too, thousands of watchful eyes and prejudiced minds, ready to impute such a charge, had there been the least occasion for it. Yet it was not imputed, and, so far as we know, not a thought of it at that time was indulged. Invented at the distance of more than a thousand years, the fruit of mere suspicion, opposed to all the probabilities of the case, and without a particle of positive proof, the degree of credit to be given to it must be left to the judgement of the reader.

The cause of Arianism was destined to outlive its founder. Constantine was succeeded by his three sons, the second of whom, Constantius, ruled in the East, and eventually obtained the whole empire. He was a superstitious and bigoted Arian; and “during his whole reign, a controversy was carried on between the Church and the heretics by arms and resources suited to the genius of the parties;—those of the former were prayers, treatises and

preaching;—of the latter, policy, intrigue, persecution, and the friendship of the great.” The most eminent and godly men were scourged, banished, put in irons, and in some instances put to death.

During the reigns of Julian and Jovian, the Arian controversy was less agitated than it had previously been. It was resumed, however, under Valens, with whom Valentinian divided the empire, the former ruling in the East, and the latter in the West. Valens was an Arian, who imprisoned and banished the friends of truth, and revived the persecuting measures of Constantius.

Arianism next made its appearance in the West, under the younger Valentinian and his mother Justina; but was in a measure suppressed and driven out of the empire by Theodosius. It was driven out, however, only that it might gather strength and return, in a form more terrible than it had ever assumed. The dispersed Arians took refuge among the Goths, Vandals, and other barbarous nations; and when these commenced their ravages upon Rome, together with all the other miseries they inflicted, were mingled the horrors of an Arian persecution. “The Vandals in a special manner, who reigned in Africa, surpassed all other savage nations in barbarity and injustice towards the Orthodox. The kings of this fierce people, particularly Genseric and Huneric, his son, pulled down the churches of those Christians who acknowledged the Divinity of Christ, sent their Bishops into exile, and maimed and tormented in various ways such as were nobly firm and inflexible in the profession of their faith.” Indeed, no persecution through which the church has been called to pass, has exceeded in studied and revolting cruelty this Arian, Vandalian persecution in Africa.

It would be wrong to omit mentioning in this place the miracle, said to have been wrought during these persecutions, “by which the Supreme Being is supposed to have declared his displeasure against the Arians, and his favor towards their adversaries. This miracle consisted in enabling those persons whose tongues had been cut out by the Arian tyrant, Huneric, to speak distinctly, and to proclaim aloud the Divine majesty of the Saviour of the world. “This remarkable fact,” says Mosheim, “can *hardly be denied*, since it is supported by the testimony of the most credible and respectable witnesses;\* but whether it is to be attributed to a super-

\* Victor, Bishop of Vita, an eye witness and sufferer in these persecutions, and who wrote the history of them, says, “If any doubt” the fact above stated, “let him go to Constantinople, where he will find a sub-deacon called Reparatus, one who was thus treated, who speaks plainly, and who has a particular respect shewn him in the palace of the emperor Zeno, especially by the empress.”

Aeneas, of Gaza, a Platonic philosopher, a cautious and prudent person, was at that time at Constantinople, and writes thus in the conclusion of his dialogue on the resurrection. “I myself saw them, heard them speak, and wondered, that their utterance could be so articulate. I searched for the organ of speech, and not trusting my ears, was resolved to have the proof of the eyes. Causing them to open their mouths, I saw that

natural and miraculous power is a matter not so easily decided," and concerning which those who have information must form a judgement for themselves.\*

Arianism, which so cruelly triumphed during these persecutions, was crushed almost at once, "when the Vandals were driven out of Africa, and the Goths out of Italy, by the arms of Justinian. However, it revived again in Italy, under the protection of the Lombards, in the seventh century, and was not extinguished till about the end of the eighth." From this period, we hear no more of Arianism, until subsequent to the Reformation from Popery. To trace its progress and write its history in modern times, is no part of the object of the present article.

---

## REVIEW.

A MEMOIR OF THE REV. HENRY MARTYN, B. D. *Late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Chaplain to the Honorable East India Company.* BY THE REV. JOHN SARGENT, M. A. *Rector of Lavington. From the tenth London Edition, Corrected and Enlarged. With an Introductory Essay and an Appendix by the American Editor.* Boston: Perkins & Marvin, 1831. pp. 432.

No man, it has been said, ever put pen to his Diary, without a side glance at his window. A close examination of our own state of mind so well satisfied us of this, that we committed to the flames every scrap of the records of our feelings and thoughts, being unwilling to seem to have written under an assurance of secrecy, while there was a lurking misgiving at heart. We are truly sorry thus to disappoint the world. We should have been content with this general direction—"To be burnt unread"—had we not learned, that even writing in cypher and throwing away the key was no security, as nearest friends would forge a key and unlock our secrets to the public,—that indeed, short of extinction, there was no security against publicity. We have witnessed with our own eyes

their tongues were plucked out even by the roots, and was then more surprised, that they could live, than that they could speak. Procopius, the historian, in his history of the Vandalic war, says, "Huneric ordered the tongues of many to be cut out, who were afterwards seen in the streets of Constantinople when I was there, talking without any impediment, or feeling any inconvenience from what they had suffered." Count Marcellinus, in his *Chronicons*, says, "I have seen some of this company of faithful confessors at Constantinople, who had their tongues cut out, but spake without any imperfection in their utterance." To name only one more witness: the emperor Justinian, in a constitution published by him for Africa, after it had fallen into his dominion, testifies that he had seen the same.

\* Milner not only admits the fact, but believes it to have been strictly miraculous.



the burning of our scroll, have seen the faint traces of the lines in the blackened mass, repeating, as we looked on, the humorous couplet of the melancholy Cowper,

There goes the parson, O, illustrious spark!  
And there, no less illustrious, goes the clerk.

And with these bright personages, went our Record—a record, such as must make up the life of even the most favored of the sons of earth—a record of sinning and repenting, of much sorrow and of little joy.

Whether it be best for a man to keep a *secret* journal of his states of mind cannot now be a matter of discussion. There is no longer any such thing as secrecy in this world. In that graceless and bitter article upon “The Evangelical School,” in a late number of the *Edinburgh Review*, are some clever remarks upon the evils that must result from the breaking in upon all a man’s sacred retirements. And it is now well understood that if a man gains a battle for his country, or writes a book for its entertainment, the penalty he must pay for it is, the vulgar exposure of every emotion that he had ever written down for one nearest his heart, or of every treasured thought and feeling that he had recorded for his soul’s good. This is the most awful form of bondage; for it holds the mind enslaved. It is a weight upon the free spirit, and shuts up in dead stagnation those waters which might have flowed out from the heart, and blessed the man himself and those he loved. In proportion to a man’s refinement is his sensitiveness on this point; and as is the beauty of the soul, so is the withering power of this distrust upon it. He who has made the world his debtor, becomes thereby its bondman. He can treasure up no little testimonies of the love of those who are gone, lest when he too is departed the rude palm of the public should handle and soil them. He must part even with these also; and the dead must speak to him only in memory, any more. A letter to a close friend must be written as under the public eye;—in short, the throng possess themselves of every secret outlet of his soul. This begets a habit of reserve, and that, in time, brings coldness and hardness upon the gentlest spirit. There are fibres of the soul too delicate to be thus felt and probed. We recollect having read, in an account of the inmates of a hospital for the insane, of one who formed a head-piece out of a pewter bason, which he fitted close to his skull, complaining that his neighbors were in the habit of sending little spirits in at his ears, who, after coursing his brains and getting information of his embryo inventions, flew back to their masters with their stolen knowledge. We much doubt whether a man who should appear abroad in a like head-piece, now-a-days, ought, on that account, to be held a proper subject for Bedlam.

No sensible man can now keep a diary, under a reasonable expectation that it will never meet the public eye; and if he is an

honest man, and one in whose account of himself we may put trust, he will not affect to do so—will not talk in soliloquy loud enough to be overheard by his neighbors. Whatever he writes in this way he must regard, not only as property for his own particular use while he lives, but as a legacy to the public when he dies. Let writer and reader henceforth understand each other, and the world will be better able to judge what allowances to make in these records of one's self, and the man himself be less likely to be deceived as to the sincerity with which he makes them.

With respect to the particular kind of Diary of which we have been speaking, it is well, perhaps, that things have come to this definite result. For, to write under an equivocal state of feeling, at any time, must endanger the clear integrity of the mind, and make it liable, at all times, to a subtle bias which may warp the plain and simple truth. Had the honest man any distinct apprehension of his state, he would turn away from his work. It is but the more dangerous for its secret and unobserved character; and before one is aware, may spread like weather-stain over the mind, and change its whole hue. It is difficult to suppose an indirectness of mind in one particular, which may not infect its sincerity and weaken the strength of its uprightness in all.

And, especially, will a misgiving of exposure, when setting down the results of self-examination, not only lead to a false view of some part of one's character, but it will throw the whole out of its true proportions. No one can look into a Diary of the Mind without observing, that no mention is made of some of those evil propensities which would have been the subjects of long and sorrowful consideration in hours devoted to such reflections as were never intended to be put upon record—that a self-examiner, with pen in hand, is a very different creature from a self-examiner empty-handed.

But how is a tolerably honest man to make amends to his own conscience for this partial view of things? Why, one way is, so to wrap the vice up in general and indefinite terms, that neither he nor any one else can clearly distinguish what it is, and then to call it by the hardest names he can think of. He lays on the most violent blows; but the folds are so thick, he might as well have spared himself the labor of the beating. Or he passes by one sin and lays a double load on the next, which has to bear the two-fold weight of reprobation—its own and its neighbor's; and thus, excess in one point answering for deficiency in another, and the *whole* man receiving his due share of self-reproof, conscience is quieted, as the amount of evil in the character is made up, and the world (for it is thoughts of the world that leads to all this) is not deceived in the sum total.

But the world *is* deceived; and what is worse, the man himself is deceived; and saddest of all, is encouraging a spirit of self-

deception. Every time he goes to his task, a secret principle is at work in him, which is blinding him more and more to one fault, and bringing out another in monstrous and exaggerated proportions. In certain diseased states of the senses, parts of the body will appear to the patient to be swelling to an enormous and horrid size; his fingers, for instance, will seem to him to be growing to the size of arms and legs, while he takes no notice of his other members, nor looks to see whether they also are undergoing this fearful change. Now, could the character, wrought out in the process of self-examination of which we are speaking, assume a body and stand up in its uncouth deformity before the examiner, when in his right mind, how horridly unlike himself would its aspect be; and how would he flee from it, in terror and amaze. Yet here would be made visible to him the product of his own well meant labor;—here would be the result of self-examination—here, self-knowledge!

A false aspect is also given to the character, by a proneness to dwell upon the compunctions of conscience and the gloomy and agonizing thoughts that sin occasions, rather than upon the cheerfulness and serenity that religion imparts to the soul. To record the former savors of humility to us, while to set down the other in black and white has a cast of self-commendation. So that if a man should look back upon the history of his past life merely through his diary, he would by and by be persuaded that he had all his days been the most miserable of men, when, after all, he had lived the life of a tolerably happy Christian. Now this is one way in which a man deceives himself into an unfortunate view of himself, and leads others into a false estimate of his character, and a very unfavorable and gloomy view of his religion; and it all comes of his secret misgiving of exposure, with a commendably honest fear that if he should speak the whole truth, the world might think too well of him.

In his intercourse with the world, the honestest man is too much of his time a double character. There is an outward and an inner machinery, a set of processes of thoughts and feelings for his fellow men, and another set for himself. Without any fixed purpose at assuming to be that which he is not,—on the contrary, with a full dislike of all forms of hypocrisy, unless he is willing to lay his heart bare to the common gaze, he must be content to be thought other than he is. This he does, not by assuming the false, but by concealing the true. O, how has the upright man been humbled, when praise for some known good has set before him all the sins with which it is surrounded, which no earthly eye but his own ever saw, and which the most censorious never guessed to be within him! A man's refinement, his very love of purity, his sense of propriety, his abhorrence of sin, all render him, if we may be allowed the expression, but a better sort of dissembler: There is

a shameless honesty found only in the lowest recklessness of vice.

How does such a man feel the need of getting away from the world, and of acquainting himself in solitude with his own heart; and how does he hurry to strip it bare, and see it just as God sees it—that God who

spares all beings, but himself,  
That hideous sight, a naked human heart.

Let such a man beware how he takes the world with him into his closet. The door and the window must be barred, and every little crevice stopped; not the smallest gleam must come in from abroad; there must be an absolute certainty, a perfect rest of the mind, that no human being knows, or can by any possibility ever know, what passes in this his communion with himself. Let him be thoroughly honest with himself then, and throw away his tablets, if he would truly and entirely know himself. Let him be his own master, a freeman, for once. The world, at best, has but too much dominion over us, biasing our opinions as to what is without, and what is far worse, warping our judgements of what is within.

If this Diary of the inner man is more or less attended by a secret mistrust that it will one day betray us to the world; if this misgiving infects all our reflections, and insensibly sways the mind; there are also some lesser evils waiting upon it. We think it has a tendency in some minds to make the act of recording, partially a substitute for the act of close and deep examination. A man has a little time at the close of the evening for meditation; and the question is, 'What entry shall I make in my Diary for this day?' The mechanical process comes into the mind, and 'What shall I say of myself and how shall I say it?' though it would seem only to lead to another and prime question, 'What have I been and done?' does more than merely lead to it; it enters into and interferes with its simplicity and directness, and its thorough, un-sparing search. And not only is this preparatory process of meditation interfered with; but when the man comes to make his entry, there is another subtle but no less injurious influence upon the mind. The man is writing *about* himself, and by this very act, he *about* whom he writes becomes to him, if we may so express it, in a sense, a third person; he in some measure, without wholly losing a secret, unobserved partiality, sets himself off from himself; the pungency of his convictions are weakened; conscience, shame, remorse are more or less dulled; and though he applies all the language of those passions to this outer self, the inner self, the real man, is not so pierced by them to the quick, has not that vivid, sharp sense of them which he would have felt, had he simply given himself up to reflection and self-examination alone.

And here we are half inclined to ask the question, whether, by this process, conscience does not, as it were, write a sort of partial

discharge? and whether a man gets up from making an entry in his Diary with that same sense of unworthiness accompanying him and abiding on him, as would have gone with him, had he simply arisen from meditating upon his soul?

Once more:—What we commit to paper, we are very apt to free the mind from the burden of carrying about. One man makes it a rule never to rely upon a memorandum for what he has to do. Another trusts to his memorandum; and it will be well for him if he does not forget what he has to do, and his memorandum both. The same principle applies to this diary-keeping. The only difference is, that the latter concerns infinitely more important things. And it is much to be doubted, whether occasionally turning over the leaves of such a journal will compensate for what is lost by keeping one at all.

Some may question these views altogether; others may think we are over refining. We advise the latter to study the workings of the soul a little more closely. And if any are ready to ask us, whether we mean to apply our remarks to such men as Brainerd, and Martyn, and Payson, we must be allowed to reply, in those much abused terms, "*Principles, not men;*" and to add, that elevated Christians as these men were, we believe they might have been just as good Christians, if they had never put down a line for a record of their thoughts; and we think it possible that they might have known themselves more truly, and have been much happier men. Not that the habit of recording their states of mind was the main cause of their partial self-ignorance and consequent sufferings; it only performed a kind of under service in continuing and increasing these. The great cause lay far deeper. And here we are naturally led to another subject,—*the self inflicted sufferings* which they, and many other excellent Christians like them, have endured, and the principal *causes* of these sufferings.

We are aware that this is a difficult, not to say dangerous, matter to treat upon. Were we writing for the regenerate only, we should not fear that our meaning would be misunderstood, or be put to an evil use. But living where there is enough of nominal christianity, with but little of experimental religion, we have experienced how delicate a thing it is to point out the faults or mistakes of the pious, and not bring disrepute upon them and their cause with "your easy Christian;" and how impossible it is to shew that the renewed in heart have endured unnecessary self-infliction, without its being made an occasion to question the depravity of man, and the whole plan of grace and salvation growing out of that awful truth. On the other hand, the misery that many holy men have endured, and the serenity and cheerfulness of which they have deprived themselves, through erroneous views of their duties and relations, have led to as much skepticism respecting the true gospel, as any unsound speculations of its friends, not to say, any attacks of its enemies.

There is an extreme scrupulosity in some minds as to bringing the failings or mistakes of a good man before the world. This is being wiser than the Bible. When God permitted the crimes of David to be published to all generations, he knew that it would make David the jest of the thoughtless and unregenerate through every age of the world. But God had to teach men not to depend upon themselves; he had to save his backsliding children from despair, and to point out to them the way of repentance; and he did not refrain from this, though he foresaw that it would be made an occasion to the sinner of scoffing at his word, of hardening the unrenewed heart, and leading to a heavier condemnation. There are also very honest men who are sometimes as much afraid of letting out a truth upon a sinful world, as they would be of setting loose a wild beast, as it will evidently lead to the destruction of so many. And what truth has not? "There is a soul of goodness in things evil;" and so, to sin, there is a soul of evil in things good. No truth can be brought fully out, nor its virtue proved, till it has undergone every experiment to which perverted ingenuity can subject it, and every modification which the mistakes of its friends can give to it. God is using this world as the great laboratory of his universe; and every truth, as well as every error, is undergoing moral processes enough to make the most knowing chemist stare. There will be dross enough; but when the work is done, and the shop shut up, there will be no more mistakes as to what is dross and what pure gold. The metals that come out of this fire will have no baser mixture, it will be all smelted out.

For eighteen hundred years the great truths of the gospel have been operating upon portions of the world;—the same principles have been acting upon the same natures. As man was when Christ appeared, so is he now; in his natural state an enemy to God, and in his renewed state still a sinner; and the gospel is a system of mercy and salvation for him, and the Holy Spirit the regenerating power. These great truths admit of no change, and every man must have received them who is born of God. But with these and other leading principles of the gospel may be connected minor principles, and modes of operation, and diversities of relations and influences and bearings and applications, which many a saint now in heaven once never thought of, or greatly misunderstood. As in the material world, developments have been taking place and all things maturing for ages; so in the moral world, the leading principles of the gospel, in themselves unchanged, have been gradually working upon the individual and social man, and opening out secret relations and bearings, with which, in principle, they have always stood connected, but with which they have been slowly coming into contact in act. In the mind of God, the union has always existed; but he did not make his mind fully known at once. Gradual development, if not necessary in the very nature

of things, has, at least, always been God's mode of working, and must, therefore, be considered the best. His purposes are both particular and universal, and in these he may be said, in an inferior sense, to be represented in man in his individual and social characters; and as he does not regard any particular independent of the universal, neither universal independent of the particular, so, he has not as yet set forth all the bearings and purposed influences of the gospel in any individual, but is gradually bringing them more and more into action and manifestation in the individual and in society at the same time. A few simple principles thus operating upon subjects single or in masses, or closely or slightly related, are continually unfolding cheerful varieties, healthful freeness, and beautiful dependencies, going to make up a whole full of harmony. It is scarcely exaggeration to say, that christianity, as a political, (or to avoid giving alarm) as a social scheme, is just beginning to be in some little measure understood. The wisest Christians, till lately, have been in the habit of looking upon christianity only as a system by which individuals were to be converted, forgetting that it was also to shine upon society in the mass, and so to change it as to bring clearly out into the light its obligations and the right and wrong of its pleasures, labors and purposes. This is beginning to work; and the consequence is that Christians, if not more pious than of old, are becoming more intelligent of the right in their social relations.

All who have philosophy enough to perceive how necessarily one truth bears upon another apparently remote, must see, that if society in the mass becomes enlightened by christianity as to what concerns itself, the individual is let into a better apprehension of the bearing of religion upon the character and uses of his individual attributes, and an enlarged knowledge of the attributes, purposes and acts of the Deity; that with the advance of what surrounds the individual, he himself advances in self-knowledge; and that, though not a more pious man at heart, religion leads him to a more enlightened view of things, and to juster action, and fills his mind with a more expansive wisdom, than belonged to those who lived before him.

The more objects to which a man sees religion applied, the more purposes which he finds it fulfilling, the better will he understand the nature of it when brought home to himself, as the laws of light and its beautiful effects are perceived, not by looking upon one object, but seeing it as it falls on all the varieties of form, and is thrown back in shifting hues from things around him. Taking this view of religion has led to the discovery of the sinfulness of many a deed which good Christians once never questioned; and it will lead to the conviction that many a practice, from which they now refrain as sinful, may be indulged in, not only without harm, but with benefit. Newton did not feel the criminality of

the slave-trade, while he was scrupulous about some things which may now be held innocent and healthful. Christians deny themselves many things, because of the perverted use to which the evil minded put them; but the time is to come, when the influence of christianity having spread far and wide, this motive to restraint will become less and less; and religion will be found to be a regulating and subordinating system, rather than one of entire self-denial.

It is the character of sin not only to love what is sinful, but to pollute whatsoever it touches; to make that which is in itself pure seem impure to the conscientious, and thus to deprive a good man of many an innocent enjoyment. It is probably, from this, that some scrupulous people have cut themselves off from the pleasures of music, and that others look upon the taking of delight in the fine arts as a questionable indulgence;—from poetry, painting and sculpture many turn off their eyes, as if they were the works of the man of sin; or, at best, the products of laborious idleness. Dress, too, comes in for a share of condemnation; and no distinction is made between gaudiness and extravagance, and a becoming tastefulness of costume, till confined views produce sour feelings, and there is something like a secret sensation of doubt, whether it would not have been as well if the Creator had been less prodigal of beauty in his universe; and when they see some bright flower perched upon the peak of a rough cliff, they cast an eye of half contempt upon the fantastic thing, as it dances in the morning air on the very edge of danger. Now, God's works and Word are both in opposition to such views, and we read from both their condemnation in language of surpassing beauty and simplicity uttered by our Saviour:—"Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin; and yet I say unto you, that Solomon, in all his glory, was not arrayed like one of these." What a personification is here! What living, fair creatures!

Our senses were given us for something more than the plainer uses of life; and our pleasurable perceptions through them were meant for other than mere temptations. They were designed to administer, under every form, to the health and fulness of the soul. We were once at table with a man who said he ate from a sense of duty; and we could not but admire the exemplary manner in which he fulfilled the obligation laid upon him. We wished in our hearts that we could as easily have followed the law which bade us refrain, as he did that which bade him to do.

It is not a true view of the subject to consider our pleasurable perceptions as merely pleasurable. The soul would 'cream and mantle like a standing pool,' were not these bright, rippling streams continually running in and out and freshening its waters. You might as well deprive certain animals of their feelers, as the soul



of these uses. What exhilarating variety they give to the mind; how do they quicken the soul's sensations, and brighten up the thoughts. If the love of God flows into the heart, it may flow out through these, enriching what it passes through, and reflecting itself back, from all those differing and modified forms with which he has kindly diversified the world.

There is no power which the soul exercises, which has not an intimate and frequent relation to all the other powers; and to cut it off from all its natural uses, as well as to use it in excess, is an injury to the general constitution of the soul. The application to higher purposes of those powers which act through the senses enriches the mind with new conceptions of beauty or grandeur in sound or sight; the mind is filled with fair or magnificent ideas; our contemplations and reflections become indefinitely multiplied as we look upon that mysterious inner world of the soul; and those spiritual regions are relieved from a flat and wearisome sameness, and broken up into all the invigorating variety of hill and valley, wood, rock and stream which we find in the outer world.

The soul, to say the least of it, must be as complicated as the body; and it is with the former as with the latter, its very strength depends upon its antagonist powers,—its opposition makes its oneness. When it was instituted with the power of abstraction and of turning inward upon itself, it was at the same time provided with appetences to allure it outward, that (amongst other reasons) it should not be kept too tense at one hour, to become lax and feeble the next, thus living between joyless lassitude and over-working effort. It was made with this great multiplicity, not only because the multiplicity gave a pleasurable sensation, but that through a variety of moving powers there should be no overstrain upon one or two parts, but that the whole should play easily and without forcing. There was no one part provided but in wisdom, serving, in its turn, to relieve every other part, and going to make up a perfect whole.

Besides keeping the mind fresh by such means, another object with the Creator was to draw it out into action, and so make it healthy and vigorous, cheerful and benevolent. The social principle is thus put in motion, and the individual in some sense forgets himself, in his acts. We must be understood now as speaking of the faculties of the soul when not in introverted action, but carried out towards the world. The religious character of this age is peculiar for its social form; and it is probably for this reason that we see comparatively so few melancholy Christians. The religious *individual* becomes a part of the religious *community*. Formerly, even putting himself forth in act did but little towards diminishing the presence of self to the mind of a leading Christian; for he acted nearly altogether *for* the community, rather than *with* it, and thus was alone in the crowd, and self-absorbed, while doing for

others. The present system of action seems, in the main, the true one—the society and the individual working with and upon each other, and imparting to and improving one another. Whether there is not danger of our carrying the principle too far, and of sinking the individual in the society, is a question. We think there is danger.

By keeping the mind long turned inward upon itself, even for the examination of our religious condition, as it puts it into a more abstract state, and deprives it, in a measure, of help from those faculties which keep the feelings more easily in play,—to feel becomes an effort; and then we grow impatient, and fall to condemning ourselves and to stirring up remorse for our stupidity, and, finally, make ourselves very miserable by miscalling exhaustion sin. In this morbid state, too, we prefer being miserable to being lifeless; and are in some danger of mistaking a craving after excitement, for the agony of repentance.

To know ourselves we must be content, sometimes, to go out of ourselves; and it is a vain struggle to endeavor to feel much or justly a long time together with the intellect under the strain of abstraction, and with but one power of the soul in action, and that upon a narrow circle of subjects. The mind must become monotonous under such a system, and this must produce insensibility, from which the only escape is into exaggerated and short lived excitement, to go back again into insensibility. Take up the diaries of the best men that ever lived, and if you find them speaking of the “happy frame” they had been in through the day, you will feel absolutely certain of seeing it followed by three or four days of intense sufferings, and these, again, by a course of self-upbraiding for great stupidity of soul. Now, this series of extremes is not at all necessary to a religious life; it grows out of our confined views of our duties, and our ignorantly warring against those laws of our nature which God has established for us. Instead of the Christian living with a deep sense of blessedness within him, he becomes his own tormentor, and if he is not very careful, may be so from an unobserved feeling stealing upon him, which may involve in it something of the notion of the merit of works; and while the Catholic flogs the body, *he* may be inflicting upon himself a spiritual flagellation. O, what work sin, and, in the regenerated, the remainder of sin, makes in the mind, as well as heart! In what woful ignorance—self-ignorance does it involve us! See the feeble Martyn, worn down with the excess of toil through the day, and with spirits wholly exhausted, in bitterness because he could not *feel* more in his protracted devotions at night; whereas, had he commended his soul to his Saviour in quiet prayer, and laid himself to sleep upon the arm of his God, he would have endured no anguish, and have awaked in the morning cheered and filled with love. Brainerd, Payson, and some others, lived long

enough to lament these errors, and to be sensible that much which they had endured neither sprung from a right cause, nor tended to a good end. We must remember, however, that these men were of peculiarly delicate and sensitive frames—that, from their constitutions, life in them might be said to be a state of intensity for the little while it lasted, and that if they unnecessarily suffered much from mistaken views, their miseries would probably have been past enduring, and they would have been swallowed up quick, had not religion possessed their hearts.

After all, we cannot measure the *how much* one good man needs to feel, by what another, equally good, may feel; the degree must depend upon relations about which we can know little or nothing; but this we know, that every regenerated man, from a sense of his sins, must have his times of suffering. The more the purity of God's character opens upon him, the more clearly must he see and abhor his own pollution; and the more he feels what Christ has done for him, the more he must sorrow that *he* should have wounded him in the house of his friends.

But are we wrong when we say that, unless the mind is affected by bodily disease, or by erroneously gloomy views, no true Christian's sufferings can be so unmixed as, at times, appear to have been those of the men to whom we have so often referred? It appears to us that a Christian's sorrows and a Christian's remorse for sin, have blended with them an alleviating sense of good; that in the darkest hours and darkest places of his mind, rays of light are always stealing in with cheering influences; and that these influences make the heart tender, and while they melt it, comfort it. A sense of forgiven sin is somewhere in his heart, and the thought is not wholly lost, that the time will come when he shall sorrow no more, neither sin any more.

Let us not then attempt to be wiser than God, or think that he has been mistakenly indulgent, in bestowing upon us so many faculties for intellectual culture and bodily enjoyment. As that body is the most perfect in which not only each part is beautifully formed, but each bears a due proportion to the others, and is most completely developed when every part is brought into exercise, just so is it with the intellectual and moral man. With the love of God in our hearts, we need not fear to use freely those powers he has bestowed upon us, or to find refreshment and delight in any thing he has condescended to make. With all allowances for the mistakes of different periods of the world, much of this scrupulosity is being righteous overmuch; and this, in the mildest form of it, is sad self-deception. And there is no little danger in the endeavor to annihilate the variety of our occupations and enjoyments; there is a perpetual risk of some awful outbreak; whereas, let the thoughts and feelings of a sanctified man run gently, and they will become purer and purer as they flow along. Why! out of "a

pestilential congregation of vapors," what glories has God spread over the skies; and yet, there are persons, who, if they could have had the making of the world, and have carried out into creation the principles they apply to men, instead of a sky piled up with clouds of dazzling whiteness, and a sun setting in gorgeous yet solemn pomp, from one end of the heavens even unto the other they would have had one dull, heavy cope of cold, melancholy blue. It is as weak in this case, as it is in all others, from the abuse, to reason against the use, of these things. And when we have learned that the grand purpose of religion upon a regenerated heart, is to keep our faculties and affections in well-subordinated action, and not to put one half of them into fetters, the Christian's mind and heart will be much healthier, and that serenity which comes from on high will not be so often driven from his soul.

But beside the sorrowful hours that we must pass on account of our own sins, it may be said, 'Is not the world all around us lying in wickedness, and how can we talk of being happy?' We will tell you how. Set immediately about making the world better. When a man is in earnest in God's work, he has very few spare minutes to be unhappy in. It is the old sluggish system of waiting God's time, which breeds melancholy and every unclean thing. Men had much rather mope over the world than labor for it. But this will no more carry on the work of sanctification and peace and joy in the soul, than it will convert a soul. God's time is now; and he who waits for it never sees it. Then act. And while you do your part, depend upon it, God will do his. And along with this, take care that there be an entire absorption of your will into the will of God. Learn to rejoice with all your heart and mind in his glorious sovereignty; then will you see the wrath of man praising him, and the remainder of wrath restrained. Do you think the angels in heaven are made miserable by the thoughts of their fallen compeers, or by the folly and madness of men? Strive, then, to live near God's throne, as they live; be, as they are, his swift messengers, and be happy.

And, now, we would warn you who have dim views of the evil of sin, who would sink God's justice in his mercy, and bring that mercy down from a wise, and universal benevolence, to the partial and weak fondness of humanity, to beware how you strive to draw encouragement from what we have said, or affect an approval of it. You have, indeed, cause to go mourning all the day, while yet the song in your mouths is, "To enjoy, is to obey." If unconcern for your own soul's welfare, if vague thoughts about your accountability, the laws of God, and what he will require of them who have disobeyed and not repented and turned to the Mediator, have left you to find your chief enjoyments, the coarser or the more refined, in the world; if the sciences and the arts are your graven images, and nature another God to you; if by thus abusing

God's bounties, you have driven the mistaken Christian from their uses; beware how his error cause your own sin to recoil upon you, and how, in deriding him, you make mock at your own state and all that is dreadful in eternity. If your sin has occasioned his error, let not his error prove your madness.—Some things that we have written, may be to your good. They may lead you to see that these men's sufferings came of human infirmity, and are not the legitimate offspring of the great doctrines they believed. And take home to you seriously this one thing—it was not the fear of God, it was not alarm at the *consequences* of sin, but a sense of guilt, that weighed upon their souls. To be sure, they sought not relief always, when and as they should; but amidst all their sufferings, where do you find them doubting God's forgiveness and their own salvation? O, with all their errors, is there not something heroic in this? Is not the Christian Hero a glorious being by the side of the world's paragon? Consider, too, that diaries, as we have said, give the reader a very imperfect notion of the man; and that though you might read Martyn's entries, and conclude that he was always bent down with sorrow, yet, his English editor says, "They also with me can aver, that Henry Martyn was not less cheerful as a companion, than he was warm-hearted and constant as a friend." —"Those who imagine that a smile scarcely ever played upon his countenance,—that his manner was cold and forbidding, would have been startled at hearing his hearty laugh, which still sounds in my ears, and in seeing little children climbing his knees, affording him a pleasure as great as they themselves received." And one\* who knew Payson well in conversation, has also exquisitely said of him,—"His thoughts flew from him in every possible variety of harmony and beauty, like birds from a South American forest."

Poor Henry Martyn, too,—how, after all, did he love nature! "A dried leaf, or a straw, makes me feel myself in good company." It was not long after saying this, that his leaf withered. But he is gone now where there is no more decay forever.

We have made this most interesting Memoir a mere text for what we had to say. We have a good apology for it, as no Memoir has been more read than this. The present edition, however, will compel the owners of the former ones to lay them aside. Beside the additions to the body of the work, are a full and interesting Appendix, and an Introductory Essay, written with great purity, and crowded with striking and just thoughts. All who love Henry Martyn, or the cause of Christ, are under great obligations to the American editor.

\* Mr. C. E. Stowe.—We wish our readers would turn to p. 29, of the last January No. of our work,—"*Appended Remarks on Dr. Payson*,"—and look over Mr. S.'s short, but philosophical analysis of Dr. P.'s mind.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## THE PERSEVERING PURITAN.

Extracted from Gillies' Historical Collections.

Old Mr. Studley was a lawyer in Kent, of about 400*l.* a year. He was a great enemy to the power of religion, and a hater of those that were then called Puritans. His son followed his steps, until the Lord awakened him as followeth. The young man was at London, and being drunk in company, and going late at night to his lodgings, fell into a cellar, and in the fall was seized with horror, for he thought he fell into hell. It pleased God he took little harm, but lay there some time in a drunken state, his body being heated with what he drank, and his soul awakened, so that he thought he was actually in hell.

After he was come to himself, and had returned home to Kent, he fell into melancholy, and betook himself to read and study the scriptures, and to much prayer; which at length his father perceived, and fearing he would turn Puritan, was troubled, and dealt roughly with him, making him dress his horses, which he humbly and cheerfully submitted to do. When his father perceived he sat up late at night reading his Bible, he denied him candle-light; but being allowed a fire in his chamber, he was wont to read by fire-light; and long after told a friend, that while he was dressing his father's horses in his frock, and reading by fire-light, he had those comforts and joys from the Lord, that he had scarce experienced since.

His father seeing those means ineffectual, resolved to send him into France, that by the lightness of that country his melancholy might be cured. He went, and being at his own disposal, the Lord guiding, he placed himself in the house of a godly Protestant minister; and between them, after they were acquainted, (and such is the likeness of saving grace in different subjects, that a little time will serve for Christians to be acquainted) there grew great endearment. He made great progress in speaking the language, and his father expecting an account from the gentleman with whom he lived of his speaking French, he sent it to him; but soon after, he had orders to return home. The father directing, or the son intreating, his landlord came with him into England, and both were welcomed at the father's house, he not knowing that his son's landlord was a minister. At last, the father found the French gentleman and his son at prayers, was angry, and sent him away.

Then Mr. Studley, having interest in a person of honor, a lady at White-hall, and his son now by his education being accomplished for such an employment, prevailed with her to take him for her gentleman, to wait upon her in her coach. The father thought by a court life to drive away his son's melancholy, as he called his seriousness in religion. The lady had many servants, some given to swearing and rudeness, whom this young gentleman would take upon him to reprove with that prudence and gravity, that sin was

abashed before him. If any of the servants were ill employed, and heard him coming, they would say, Let us cease, or be gone, for Mr. Studley is coming. After a year's time, his father waited on the lady to inquire of his son's behavior. She answered, that she was glad she had seen his son, he had wrought such a reformation in her family. She, that had formerly been troubled with unruly servants, by his prudent carriage, was now as quiet in her house, as if she had lived in a private family in the country. Upon receiving this information, the father stormed, 'What, will he make Puritans in White-hall?' He told the lady that was no place for his son, that he would take him with him, which, to her trouble, he did. When he had him at home in Kent, as his last refuge, he thought of marrying him; and to this end found out a match which he thought fit for his ends, to stifle the work of religion in his son. One evening, he bade him put on his best clothes the next morning, and ordered his servant to make ready their horses, and himself to wait on them. When they were riding on the way, he bade the servant ride before, and spoke to his son to this purpose: 'Son, you have been a great grief to me, and having used much means to reclaim you from this way you are in to no purpose, I have one more remedy to apply, in which, if you comply with me, I shall settle my estate upon you; else you shall never have a groat of it. I am riding to such a gentleman's house, to whose daughter I intend to marry you.' The son said little, knowing that family to be profane, but went with his father, who before had been there on the same errand. They were entertained nobly; he had a sight of the young lady, a great beauty, and fell much in love with her. When they had taken their leave, and were on their way home, the father asked the son what he thought of the young lady. He answered, 'There is no man living but must be taken with such an one;' but he feared she would not like him. The father bid him take no care for that. The wooing was not long: at three weeks end they both went to London, to buy things for the wedding.

The father had charged that, in the time of wooing at the house of the young lady's father, there should be no swearing nor debauchery, lest his son should be discouraged. Wedding clothes were bought, the day came, and the young couple were married. At the wedding dinner at the young lady's father's house, the mask was taken off; they fell to drinking healths and swearing among their cups; and, among others, the bride swore an oath; at which the bridegroom, as a man amazed, rose from the table, stepped forth, and went to the stable, took a horse, none observing it, (all were busy within) and rode away, not knowing what to do. He bewailed himself, as he rode along, as undone, and deservedly; for that he had been so taken in love, and the business so hurried on in design, he said he had at that time restrained prayer, and slackened his communion with God; when, as in that grand affair of his life, he should have been doubly and trebly serious; and so might thank himself that he was utterly undone. He sometimes thought of riding quite away: at last, being among the woods, he led his horse into a solitary place, tied him to a tree in his distress, and betook

himself to prayer and tears, in which he spent the afternoon. The providence of God had altered his argument of prayer, which was now for the conversion of his new married wife, or he was undone. This he pressed with tears a great part of the afternoon, and did not rise from prayer without good hope of being heard.

At the house of the bride there was hurry enough; messengers (after they missed the bridegroom) were sent every way. No news of him could be obtained: he was wrestling, as Jacob once was, at Peniel. In the evening he returned home, and inquiring where his bride was, went up to her, and found her in her chamber pensive enough. She asked him if he had done well to expose her to scorn and derision all the day. He entreated her to sit down upon a couch there by him, and he would give her an account of what he had been doing, and tell her the story of his whole life, and what the Lord, through grace, had done for him.

He went over the story here above mentioned with many beautiful particulars, with great affection and tears, the flood-gates of which had been opened in the wood, and often in the relation would say, *through grace*, God did so and so for me. When he had told her his story, she asked him what he meant by those words so often used in the relation of his life, "*through grace*," so ignorantly had she been educated; and asked him, if he thought there was no grace for her, who was so wretched a stranger to God. Yes, my dear, said he, there is grace for you, and that I have been praying for this day in the wood, and God hath heard my prayer and seen my tears: let us now go together to him about it. Then they kneeled down by the couch side, and he prayed, and such weeping and supplication was there on both sides, that when they were called down to supper, they had hardly eyes to see with, so swelled were they with weeping. At supper, the bride's father, (according to his custom) swore. The bride immediately said, 'Father, I beseech you, swear not.' At which the bridegroom's father in a rage rose from table: 'What, says he, is the devil in him! Hath he made his wife a Puritan already?' and swore bitterly, that he would rather set fire, with his own hands, to the four corners of his fair built house, than ever he should enjoy it; and accordingly he did: for when he made his will, he gave his son (when he should die) ten pounds to cut off his claim, and gave his estate to several persons, of whom a Dr. Reeves was one; and not long after died.

Dr. Reeves sent for the gentleman, paid him his ten pounds, told him he had been a rebellious son, and had disobliged his father, and might thank himself. He received the money, and meekly departed.

His wife (the match was so huddled up) had no portion promised, at least that he knew of; so that she was also deserted by her friends, only having two hundred pounds in her hands that had been given her by a grandmother, with which they stocked a farm in Sussex, where the writer of these memoirs hath often been, and seen her, who had been highly bred, in her red waistcoat milking her cows. She was exceedingly cheerful, and was now become the great comforter and encourager of her husband. 'God,' said she, 'hath had mercy on me, and any pains I can take are pleasant.'



There they lived some years with much comfort, and had several children.—After about three years, he was met in Kent, on the road, by one of the tenants of the estate, and saluted by the name of landlord. Alas! said he, I am none of your landlord. Yes, you are, said the tenant, I know more of the settlement than you do. Your father, though a cunning lawyer, could not alienate the estate from you, whom he had made joint purchaser. Myself and some other tenants know it, and have refused to pay any money to Dr. Reeves. I have sixteen pounds ready for you which I will pay to your acquittance, and this will serve you to wage law with them. He was amazed at this wonderful providence, received the money, sued for his estate, and in a term or two recovered it. “He that loseth his life for my sake and the gospel’s, shall find it.”

---

BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

In our number for February, we published some extracts from the first number of the Biblical Repository, relating to the German Universities. In the second number of the Repository, the course of study at these Universities is particularly described. The remarks, in the third number, on the same general subject are of a miscellaneous character, and will be read with much interest. Extracts, ranged under appropriate heads, will here be given.

*Character of Theological Students.*

Theological students while at the universities, are very much like all other students. Having adopted (at least the majority of them) the study of this profession, without any reference to the high and holy motives which ought to govern all who assume it, and regarding it in no more sacred point of view than if they were pursuing the study of law or medicine or philology, what reason have they to put on an appearance of seriousness to which their hearts are strangers? or to abstain from practices which they have never felt, and do not now feel, to be incompatible with their future standing, any more than they are incompatible with the standing of a lawyer or a physician? The consequence is, that all the vices for which German students have been famous, are no less common among the theologians, than among others; and they are as likely as any to be found engaged in gambling, drunkenness, broils, duels, and every species of *renowning*. In looking abroad upon the German churches, and reflecting upon their prospects and destiny, it is melancholy to think that such must, for a time at least, be the character of the great majority of their future pastors and teachers. Among the nine hundred students of theology at Halle, not more than from one hundred to one hundred and fifty can be reckoned as possessing seriousness of character in any degree, or as having chosen their profession from any other than the most worldly motives; and of this comparatively small number, not more than one half can be regarded as possessing personal religion, or as actuated in choosing their course by motives of religious duty.

*Attachment to Music.*

As a nation, the Germans may be said to be more fond of music than even the Italians; and it is notoriously the fact, that both vocal and instrumental music, and especially the latter, is more generally cultivated there than among their more southern neighbors. In sacred music they take the lead of all other nations; and in all their seasons of worship, this holds almost an equal place with prayer; or indeed, it is in itself prayer, the pouring out of the soul to God in strains of harmony, as well as tears of contrition. An organ is an essential part of the furniture of a church; as much so perhaps, in popular opinion and feeling, as the sacramental vessels of the altar. In the ordinary singing of the psalms, the congregation all join; the music being wholly of the slow choral species, which admits all to take part, without the need of great skill or practice. Every church has a small number of boys, who are instructed in music, and who thus sing around the streets. They are called the *Currende*, probably from *currere*; and although their singing is generally boyish and wretched enough, yet this has sometimes been the school, in which genius has first gathered strength to mount upwards in long and lofty flights. In such a choir in the cathedral church of Halle, Handel commenced his career in the last decennium of the seventeenth century. As a member of such a choir, Luther as a boy sung through the streets of Eisleben; and amid all the business and turmoil of his future life, he never gave up his taste and talent for music. One of the most pleasing prints relating to him, represents him seated at the harpsichord in the midst of his family, consisting of his wife, children, and one or two other persons.

*Neglect of Former Writers.*

There are in Germany no works like Butler's Analogy, or Leslie's Short Method, or Baxter's Call and Saint's Rest, or Doddridge's Rise and Progress, which, having a fixed and permanent value, are perhaps more current and exert a greater influence now, than they did for a long time after their first publication. When a man dies, he and his works are forgotten. Many of the names of German writers, whom we have been accustomed in our own country to venerate and to consider as of the highest authority, are now rarely mentioned in Germany itself. J. D. Michaelis is there no longer regarded as a profound scholar, and his works are rarely quoted. Eichhorn, though just dead, is reckoned as superficial and declamatory. Storr still retains the praise of solidity and accuracy, but his authority has passed away. Jahn is still more rarely heard of; and Schleusner, though yet alive, has outlived both his influence and his fame. These are but a few of the more prominent examples. It is not meant to be said by all this, that their names are no longer known, or their works no longer purchased. Indeed, you find their works in the library of every theologian of eminence; but then the *authority* both of the writer and his writings exists no more; his works are referred to by way of historical illustration; but they are no longer reprinted, because the public does not call for them.

*Learning of the Clergy.*

In no other land, probably, will the clergy at large, both in city and country, be found to be so generally and deeply learned and studious. Go where you will, among the most miserable villages or hamlets, you still find learning and talent; would that it could be justly added, devotedness and zeal! The writer once spent a night with the pastor of a small hamlet about fifteen miles from Magdeburg, a miserable assemblage of mud huts, to which no parallel could probably be found in the United States. The parsonage was in ruins, affording hardly a decent shelter even during the summer months. The whole population were peasants of the lowest class, with the exception of the family of the proprietor, which resided there part of the year, but which held no intercourse with the pastor, because of his so called *mystical* proceedings. The village lay at a distance from any great road, and was accessible only by paths across the fields, (like the greater portion of German villages,) which in spring and autumn, or after continued rain, are almost impassable. In this humble spot you find as pastor a young man, the son of one of the first dignitaries of the church, thoroughly educated and highly intelligent, who had travelled in England and France, and spoke fluently the Latin, English and French languages, in addition to his native German. You find in his wife the daughter of a distinguished professor in one of the most celebrated universities, a lady of polished manners and cultivated mind, conversing also at ease in both English and French. What is more than all, you find in this pastor a humble, faithful, and devoted servant of the cross, willing to spend and be spent in his Master's cause, and esteeming no residence too obscure, and no service too humble, 'if so be he may win souls to Christ.' This is perhaps an extreme case; but similar instances are to be found in every part of the country; indeed, one might almost say, in every village.

*Professional Intercourse, Preaching, Attendance on Public Worship.*

That species of intercourse with his flock, which an American clergyman justly deems so essential, and which not unfrequently is of more effect than all his other ministrations, viz. the visiting from house to house, and an intimate and familiar acquaintance with families and individuals, is in Germany almost unknown. The pastor feels that he has done his duty, (and public opinion and universal practice sanction this belief,) when he has gone through with the public services of Sunday, and the catechising of the children, and has attended the funerals, baptisms, and weddings, that occur. It is in this way that the pastors find time to apply themselves to study. Some become editors of classic authors; others write books on theology; some cultivate botany or mineralogy; and others again become farmers. It is in this way, also, that distinguished professors in the universities can, at the same time, be pastors of churches. They have time for all these things; because they do not 'give themselves wholly to their ministry.'

As there is little intercourse between the pastors and their people,

so also the clergy have little professional intercourse among themselves. Associations of ministers for the purposes of friendly intercourse or mutual improvement, or to devise means for promoting the great objects to which their lives are professedly devoted, are almost unknown. Within a few years, a meeting of this kind has been set on foot by the evangelical clergy within a wide circle around Halle, which has sometimes been attended by twenty persons or more; some of whom have travelled fifty miles in order to be present. Whether it will prove permanent, remains to be seen. But this was the only thing of the kind which the writer heard of in Germany; although he made much inquiry on the subject. There may not improbably, however, be other similar meetings established in other parts of the country among the evangelical clergy; certainly not among the rationalists; but it is obviously so rare an occurrence, that a knowledge of it is not generally diffused.

The character of German preaching is such as would naturally arise out of the circumstances and character of the clergy. Among the great body it is of course merely moral preaching, in which the *gospel* occupies a very inferior part. But even among the evangelical clergy, the preaching is rather of the general, hortatory, declamatory kind, not direct and pointed, nor calculated to arouse sinners, and make them feel their dangers and wants, and the necessity of flying to a Saviour's cross.

To an American it is a striking and painful sight to enter the house of God, and find it almost uniformly destitute of worshippers. The preacher is there; the services are there; the voice of song rises from the choir and organ; but a worshipping *assembly* can hardly be said to be there! Go where you will, in every part of the country, and you find the same neglect of public worship; or at most, you will find the churches thronged only on particular occasions, as on Christmas or Good Friday. There are, however, some exceptions. Many of the churches in Berlin are always well filled. When Strauss or Schleirmacher preach, they are sure to draw a crowded audience; as is also the case with most of the evangelical preachers. In one small church, where the Gospel is literally 'preached to the poor,' there is always such a throng, that it is almost impossible to obtain admission. At other times, the churches of Berlin are not more filled than others. At Wittemberg, under the ministrations of Heubner and other pious pastors, the principal church is filled to overflowing. The other church, on whose door Luther posted up his celebrated theses, and in which he and Melancthon lie buried, has been assigned to the use of the theological seminary; and the students preach there to empty pews.

The same neglect of public worship in general, which keeps so many wholly away from the church, induces most of those who profess to attend, to limit their presence to the time occupied by the sermon. It is the common practice to arrive just before the preacher commences, and to leave immediately or soon after he has closed.

#### *Neglect of Family and Social Worship.*

Where public worship is disregarded in the manner above describ-

ed, we cannot suppose that the private worship of families will be found to flourish in vigor, or be widely practised. It does not indeed follow, that where the churches are thronged at the public services, family worship is of course habitually attended at home; but the converse of this proposition may be assumed as perhaps universally true, viz. that the latter cannot flourish when the former is neglected. The extent to which family worship had been laid aside in Germany, until a recent period, will hardly be believed in this country. The writer himself could not at first yield credit to the statements that were made to him, but supposed that they must refer to peculiar cases, from which no general inference could be drawn; until he found them repeated and confirmed by unquestionable testimony in every part of the country. As a general fact, then, throughout the whole of Germany, or at least the whole northern division of it, family worship is entirely *obsolete and unknown*, except among the evangelical Christians, or *mystics* as they are there called; and even among them, it is only within the last fifteen years, that the custom of morning and evening prayers has again been introduced.

Of course, meetings for social prayer are almost unknown. A few families in Berlin, and some of them of rank, have a private circle in their houses every week, for the purposes of religious conversation and social worship. To these circles, however, none are admitted but invited guests. In Halle there was regularly a religious meeting every Saturday evening, at the house of a mechanic, where students sometimes attended. This meeting was ever a subject of ridicule among the greater part of the citizens, and of jealousy to the magistracy; and several attempts were made to bring home upon it charges of disorder and irregularity, in order to have a pretext for putting it down.

#### *Characteristics of the truly Pious.*

Among these, we may reckon that frankness and sincerity, that open-heartedness and candor, which characterize the Christians of Germany. One might almost say, that they carry their hearts in their hands; they rush to meet a Christian brother with a full and overflowing tide of Christian affection, and pour out all their feelings and their whole hearts before him, unchecked by the embarrassments of English or American reserve, or the calculations of a cold and wary prudence. We have seen and and admired in our own land the exhibitions of religious character among the Moravian Christians. These are here mostly Germans; and it is in fact the *national* character that we have admired, and not the peculiarities engrafted upon them by their religious faith and discipline. The same purity and unaffected piety, the same zeal and self-devotedness, the same 'simplicity and godly sincerity,' constitute the distinguishing traits of the great body of German believers. It is the national frankness and affectionate, open-hearted kindness, purified and elevated and ennobled by the influence of the religion of Christ, and pouring itself out in the habitual and ardent practice of 'whatsoever things are pure and lovely and of good report.'

We might here go on to speak at large of the humility, the pa-

tience, the zeal, and other virtues of the Christians of Germany. The whole however may be summed up in a few words by saying, —and it is a testimony which is deserved, and which the writer rejoices with his whole heart at being permitted thus publicly to pay, —that in no nation under heaven is the gospel, when received into good and honest hearts, more fully and faithfully carried out in practice; nowhere is the spirit of the gospel more fully exemplified, or 'every thought and deed brought more into captivity to the obedience of Christ.' Would that this testimony could apply to the nation at large!

But with all their excellencies of private character, our German brethren in Christ have not yet learned the grand secret of producing great public effects. They do not act in concert. They have not yet learned that *united* action is *powerful* action. There are indeed Bible societies, and missionary societies, and tract societies, some of which have long existed, and have individually done much good. But they have as yet no united plan of action. The missionary society of Berlin, for instance, which one would suppose might naturally extend its branches, at least throughout the north of Germany, has no branches. So also of Leipsic and other cities. The nearest approach to union is in the south of Germany; where the Missionary Seminary of Basle forms a *nucleus*, around which cluster the affections and the exertions of Christians in the neighboring states of Baden and Württemberg.

#### *Church and State.*

We have in the case of the German churches a practical exhibition of all the benefits which can ever be expected to arise from a dependence of the church on the state; with perhaps only those evils which are inseparable from such a connexion. We see the church armed with the power of authoritatively regulating the qualifications of her pastors; and furnished with all the apparatus of schools and universities and able and learned teachers, to carry her requisitions into complete effect. We see the civil power lending its aid to enforce all these requisitions; to erect and repair churches; to augment the income of the clergy; to recommend attendance on public worship and the practice of virtue and religious duty. What more, it may be asked, can a church need, in order to go on and prosper, and grow every day in strength and influence and usefulness? Alas! these things are but the frame-work, the naked skeleton strung together with wires, which an external hand moves and regulates at will! Unless the flesh and blood, the warm vigor of life, the all pervading and directing soul, be there, then is all power and authority, all talent and learning however profound, of no avail whatever. In Germany, the governments give to the church all the aid which human power can afford; but still they are but the external hand that manages the wires. Nor can it be otherwise. How can laws infuse religious life and spirit into a body politic? How can they render this pastor Orthodox, or that one pious? They may make, indeed, such a requisition; but how can they enforce it? Laws can do no more than establish a creed; and this creed may demand of all those who take it, the fullest Orthodoxy

and the holiest feelings. But can it excite or produce them? Can it reach the heart and conscience and bring them into subjection? The example of every nation, where a creed is thus enforced, proclaims the negative; and proclaims, moreover, that wherever law thus undertakes to regulate religious belief, there the latter droops and dies; and that wherever religion has flourished and shone with the greatest splendor, it has been in spite of such laws, and often against the influence and power of civil government.

## INEPT INTERPRETATION.

Among other valuable articles in the last number of the Biblical Repository is one on the "Causes of forced Interpretations of the New Testament," by J. A. H. Tittman.

We call that a forced interpretation, says Tittman, *which, although it may be contained in the words taken by themselves, nevertheless expresses a sense foreign to the intention of the writer; inasmuch as it is repugnant either to the USUS LOQUENDI of the writer, or to TIME and PLACE, or finally to the CONTEXT.*

There are two species of interpretations of this sort. The one by a certain violence put upon the words, is calculated to displease the learned; while the other, by a certain appearance of art and refinement, allures the unlearned. The former species may be termed *inept*, and is exhibited when a sentiment is obtruded upon a writer, which is alike foreign both to his constant manner of thinking and speaking, and to his intention and object. As if one should say that Paul, in Eph. 1: 7, had in mind the system of Christian doctrine; and he should go on to interpret "*redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins,*" of a deliverance from sin, which is effected by this doctrine, confirmed by the death of Christ. Such an interpretation is supported neither by the manner in which the apostle is accustomed to speak of the death of Christ, nor by the object of the writer and the method of the whole discussion, nor by the mode of thinking among the Christians to whom the apostle wrote; unless the utmost violence be put upon the words.

Our readers are aware, that this is precisely the interpretation put by American Unitarians on all those passages which speak of *forgiveness or redemption by the blood of Christ*;—"a deliverance from sin effected by the doctrine of Christ, confirmed by his death." This is cited by Professor Tittman, and justly too, as a striking example of forced, *inept interpretation.*

## CHRISTIAN EXAMINER FOR JULY 1831.

*Articles on 'German Rationalism,' and on 'Whitman and his Reviewers.'*

The Article on German Rationalism in the last Examiner strikes us as a curious specimen of that sort of writing, which aims to accomplish a given purpose without saying any thing that is really either *true* or *false*.

In the Biblical Repository, No. I. (p. 122) an Article from the pen of Professor

Hahn contains some developements of the principles of Rationalism, extracted from the writings of Dr. Roehr, a distinguished leader of the sect. Respecting these disclosures the Examiner says: "Now Professor Hahn knows, and the editor of the Biblical Repository knows, and every body knows, that knows any thing about the matter, that this statement is incorrect." Whether the statement be incorrect or not, it is certain that neither Professor Hahn, nor the editor of the Repository is responsible for it, but Dr. Roehr; and if the Rationalists are misrepresented, they are misrepresented by one of their own leaders. But the statement, says the Examiner, "is made up of passages taken out from their connexion, in order to convey a false notion of the author's opinions." When the Examiner has given us 'the passages in their connexion,' so as 'to convey a right notion of the author's opinions,' we shall be better able to judge whether the Biblical Repository is to be relied upon.

The Examiner gives, from the *Allgemeine Literatur Zeitung*, a description of the Evangelical party in Germany, and a definition of Rationalism, from which an estimate may be made of the character of the Article on which we are remarking. The following is the description of the 'Evangelicals.'

"This party distinguishes itself as the only faithful, the true evangelical church; beyond its own circle, the church is laid waste; its servants are priests of Baal. They insist upon the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures; on adherence to the various confessions of faith; and on unity of opinion in the church. They surpass Flacius in their extravagant notions of the depravity of human nature, and hold Schwenkfeldt's theory of the "inner" or "internal word." Add to this the rejection of all cheerful views of life, and even of the most refined and cultivated enjoyments. The watchword of the party, however, is a glowing hatred and an unwearied persecution of Rationalism. They look upon it as Infidelity, and as an attempt to undermine the church, and overthrow all true faith."

The Examiner allows that this sketch is 'somewhat exaggerated,' or applicable 'only to the most violent.' A truly liberal concession, for which we are under great obligations to the candid writer!

The definition of Rationalism is in the following terms:

"Rationalism is nothing more nor less than the necessary consequence of the intellectual and scientific developement of the times. It is the attempt to reconcile with theology the results of the progress which the last few years have seen in all the departments of knowledge, and thus make it acceptable to those, whose minds are so constituted, that they cannot believe except on conviction."

This definition, says the Examiner, "will strike many as the only fair one." After contrasting these two pictures, who can doubt but the writer in the Christian Examiner is the proper person to give a fair representation of the questions at issue between the Evangelical and the Rationalist parties in Germany? There is such an air of fairness and candor, such an evident impartiality on the very face of the statements above quoted, that he must be blind indeed, who cannot see that the writer has no particular bias in favor of the one or against the other! But the Examiner would seem to suppose that the above definition of Rationalism must be correct, because it is given by Dr. Bretschneider, a man of 'high character and great learning,' and 'not a Rationalist.' What? The above Dr. Bretschneider's definition of Rationalism, and himself *not a Rationalist!* Read the definition again: "Rationalism is nothing more nor less" &c. as above. Does Dr. Bretschneider, then, profess to be indifferent or opposed to "the necessary consequence of the intellectual and scientific developement of the times?" Or does Dr. Bretschneider publicly declare, that he does *not* wish to make theology "acceptable to those, whose minds are so constitu-



ted that they cannot believe, except on conviction?" We have too good an opinion of Dr. B.'s 'high character and great learning, to admit the inference which would seem necessary from the statements in the Examiner. Dr. Bretschneider, perhaps, is not willing to be called a Rationalist;—and we have lately been informed that President Quincy, of Harvard University, does not allow himself to be called a Unitarian. Dr. Bretschneider, no doubt, is as far from being a Rationalist, as President Quincy is from being a Unitarian; and the difference in both cases is about as important as that between a Mahometan and a Mussulman.

Dr. Bretschneider, we know, professes to believe in the *supernatural origin* of Christianity, and in this he would seem to differ from Wegscheider and Roehr; but his views of the inspiration of the Scriptures, as stated in the last edition of his great work on theology, and the whole spirit and tendency of his various and learned writings, show that he regards the Bible merely as *the human record of a divine revelation*, and 'distinguishes between the Bible and the Word of God therein contained.' This we suppose to be the fundamental principle of Rationalism, and that which essentially distinguishes it from Evangelism, (or Orthodoxy as we say in this country;)—the one subjects every doctrine and precept of the Bible to the amendments of reason before it will receive it as a part of the Word of God; the other receives every doctrine and precept of the Bible as the Word of God, exactly as stated in the Bible, and simply on the authority of the Bible. To the one, human reason is the ultimate standard of truth; to the other, the Scriptures are the ultimate standard. The Rationalist can appeal from the Bible to reason; the Evangelical Christian makes the Bible the sole judge of what is reasonable and true, and allows of no appeal from its decisions. The Evangelical Christian does not receive *unreasonable doctrines*, any more than the Rationalist; but he supposes that God is more competent than man, to decide what is reasonable, and that the decisions of God are contained in the Scriptures, the whole of which was given by inspiration of God, and not in the human understanding, depraved as it is by the consequences of the apostacy. The distinction, it appears to us, is perfectly obvious, and of easy application. According to this distinction, Unitarians are generally Rationalists, in their views of inspiration. Unitarians differ from Rationalists of the class of Wegscheider and Roehr in allowing that the Christian religion was established by the evidence of miracles, and *this is the only difference*; and we strongly suspect that if the two parties were to define their notion of what constitutes a miracle, this difference would appear very small.

The Christian Register, a few months since, in reply to some remarks in the Boston Recorder, contended very strenuously that American Unitarianism has nothing in common with German Rationalism; but we are confident that the Article in the Examiner, on which we have been remarking, will convince every one, that Unitarians and Rationalists have the same views of the inspiration of the Scriptures, (the most important, and indeed the *fundamental* point, on which they are at issue with the Orthodox or Evangelical,) and that if there is any real difference between them it consists in this, that the one admits, and the other rejects, *the evidence of miracles*. Let us attend to Dr. Bretschneider's description of the Rationalists, as translated in the Christian Examiner; and we may see whether the difference between Rationalism and Unitarianism is so very important as the Register pretended.

"They" [the Rationalists] says Dr. Bretschneider, "acknowledge in Christianity an institution of divine benevolence, meant for the salvation of mankind.

They see in Jesus the messenger of divine Providence, and believe that the true and unchangeable word of God is contained in the Scriptures, to be there preserved and spread abroad amongst men. At the same time they deny any supernatural and direct divine interference in the establishment of Christianity, and suppose its end to be the introduction into the world of a religion suited to our reason. They distinguish, therefore, the essentials from the non-essentials in Christianity; that which is local and transient, from that which applies alike to all times and all places."

Now, taking out the denial of "any supernatural and direct divine interference in the establishment of Christianity," what is this but pure Unitarianism? The definition of Dr. Wegscheider, however, brings the Rationalist and the Unitarian into still nearer relationship. It is as follows:

"The Rationalists admit a divine revelation in Christianity, as well as the Supernaturalists. The true distinction between them lies in their different views of the manner in which this revelation was made. The Supernaturalists believe in a supernatural and direct, or literally miraculous divine influence, whilst the Rationalists admit only an indirect, providential divine influence. The consequence of the one system is, that reason must in all things bow to the authority of the Scriptures, as being the substance of a miraculous divine revelation; whilst the other system leads to the result, that the Scriptures, as the records of a divine instruction, which was conveyed in the usual course of Providence, are to be examined and proved by the aid of the moral principle, in order to distinguish what is divine in them. Consequently it is not the adoption or rejection of the Scriptures, as the source of Christian knowledge, but their adoption or rejection in the light of a miraculous revelation, which marks the distinction of the two systems."

It is here said that Rationalism does admit 'an indirect, providential, divine influence,' in revelation; and does receive the 'Scriptures as the records of a divine instruction,' 'to be examined and proved by the aid of the moral principle, [or reason,] in order to distinguish what is divine in them.' Is not this precisely what Unitarianism admits? Dr. Wegscheider, it must be remembered, is a Rationalist of the most liberal class, and has been mentioned by name in the Unitarian Advocate, as a Deist or infidel. If Dr. W. is an infidel, what are Unitarians? And if Unitarians can call him an infidel, why should they feel so uneasy at the supposed application of the name to themselves? They have the same views of the nature and the authority of the instructions of Scripture, and differ only in their opinion respecting the mode in which Christianity was established; one holding that it was established miraculously, the other holding that it was established providentially. If this is all the difference that exists between him that believeth and an infidel, the terms are very nearly synonymous.

In the very number of the Christian Examiner now before us, there is a labored article on 'Harmonies of the Gospels,' giving, so far as we can see, the same views respecting the Bible that are maintained by Dr. Wegscheider and his brethren. It speaks of the Gospel history as being written "without the necessity of a continued miraculous superintendence and suggestion;" (p. 363,) of the Evangelists as writing "for their contemporaries, and with but little anticipation of the wants of posterity," (p. 358)—as being "not exempted from human fallibility," (p. 361)—and as having committed some mistakes from "imperfect recollection," and "imperfect information," (p. 364.) Why the same sentiments should be infidelity in a German Rationalist, and pure Christianity in an American Unitarian, is more than we can comprehend.

"A part of the plan of the Spirit of the Pilgrims" (says the Unitarian Advocate), "is to confound American Unitarians with GERMAN DEISTS. This is an act of injustice too gross to be overlooked. We were shocked at the coolness

with which it is perpetrated.—In good truth, there is in this country no such thing as a theology like that of WEGSCHEIDER, and others abroad."

Let the reader compare the extracts above made, and see how much reason Unitarians have to be *shocked* at the *gross injustice* done them!

As a companion to the above quotations from the Examiner, we translate a single paragraph from Dr. Wegscheider, the "Deist;" which is just a fair specimen of his general mode of reasoning, being neither the best nor the worst of his "deistical" effusions, but of a medium quality. We beg the reader to point out (if he can) the difference between the theology of Dr. W. as here exhibited, and Unitarianism. Speaking of the doctrine of the Trinity, Dr. Wegscheider says:

"There are indeed various elements (*semina*) of this doctrine in the sacred books themselves, which are not to be neglected by the candid interpreter; but they ought to be derived and explained, *in part*, from certain Jewish and Platonic philosophemes, *breathing the spirit of an uncultivated age*, which had already been divulged even before the origin of the Christian religion; and, *in part*, from a certain *pious feeling of reverence* towards their divine Master, (a parallel to whom was sought in vain,) with which the authors of the sacred books being imbued, either wrote down and *amplified* the opinions concerning Jesus and his dignity as Messiah, or the *mythical* narrations concerning the single events of the life of Jesus, (of which many had been already overhastily published, Luke i. 1,) *variously conceived and understood, according to the peculiar genius and judgement of each writer.*" (*Institutes of Chr. Theology, Sect. 92.*)

Any one who will take the pains to compare the standard writings of Rationalists and Unitarians, cannot help seeing that the fundamental principles of both parties are essentially the same; and Universalists do not fall a whit below their *liberal brethren* in point of religion, though considerably their inferiors in regard to philosophy, learning, and politeness.

We have but few words to spare on the subject of "Mr. Whitman and his Reviewers," and but few are necessary. Unitarians themselves, if we mistake not, begin to perceive that they have very much diminished their own respectability, and rendered their cause more than ever suspicious in the public estimation, by the favorable notice which they have taken of such a mass of vulgar slander as is contained in Mr. W.'s writings; and not a few of them, it is probable, would be glad to retrace their steps. How many Unitarian clergymen have been told by their more respectable and judicious friends, that a regard to their own character and standing in society ought to prevent their countenancing the "remarkable Letters?" If the Letters had contained *FACTS*, in *proof of the allegations made by Dr. Channing*, we should have had nothing to say against them; but, it has been shown in a former number of this work, that this is not so, and to every unprejudiced eye they bear on their face marks of the grossest misrepresentation and the most bitter scandal. But enough of Mr. W.; we will pass to his Reviewer.

The Examiner complains of the terms of church fellowship adopted by the Orthodox, as an encroachment on the religious liberties of Unitarians.—The Orthodox have no terms of church fellowship but those which they sincerely believe to be established by Christ, the Head of the Church; and they cannot change them without violating the commands of their Saviour. Whoever is excluded by these terms, they suppose to be excluded by Christ, and not by themselves. The Orthodox claim no right and exercise no power to establish other conditions of Christian fellowship than those which are prescribed in the New Testament; nor do they feel themselves at liberty to make these conditions

either more or less strict than they are made by the Word of God. All complaints on this head they must regard as directed against the Bible, and not against themselves. If they have not interpreted the Bible rightly, they are responsible for their error to God alone, and not to their fellow men.

In regard to the matter of ministerial exchanges, Unitarians appear at last to be coming to their senses. After some remarks on this subject, the Examiner says:

"Still, as a matter of abstract right, it is not denied that Exclusionists are at liberty to decline exchanging with Unitarians, just as Unitarians are at liberty to decline exchanging with them, or with Universalists, or with one another. The proper rule, to be observed alike by every minister, seems to be this; to be willing to exchange with those of his brethren, and those only, whether of his own denomination or not, who are likely, all things considered, to be satisfactory and edifying to his people. As for Unitarians and Universalists, they have never been in the habit of exchanging pulpits, and we presume never will be, until the arrangement is mutually agreeable."

Here is all that we have ever contended for; and we trust we shall hear no more, after this, of the illiberality of withholding exchanges. But we must attend to the Examiner's distinctions.

"It is not denied, that the Orthodox have a right to decline ministerial exchanges with Unitarians; but it is denied, that they have a right to do it on the ground that Unitarians are not Christians. When Exclusionists of the Congregational denomination in this State, who from time immemorial had been in the habit of exchanging with their liberal brethren in the vicinity, suddenly, simultaneously, and, as it would seem, by concert, declared their determination to discontinue the practice, the measure led, as was natural, to considerable warmth of expostulation. As a measure of public expediency, ministerial courtesy, or Christian charity, it would not be easy, perhaps, to justify the step; and its consequences, so far as developed, especially in the small country towns, have certainly been ruinous to the harmony and integrity of the Congregational parishes."

"In regard to the first period above quoted, we observe, that exchanges are not refused on the ground that 'Unitarians are not Christians,' but on the ground that *Unitarianism is not Christianity*: we claim no right to judge the hearts of our fellow men, but we do claim the right of forming our own opinion as to what constitutes the essentials of Christianity, and of acting accordingly. As to the second paragraph, we remark, that this measure was adopted neither 'suddenly nor simultaneously,' but gradually, as Unitarianism was forced out of its hiding places and compelled to show its head. The honor of leading the way in this matter belongs to Rev. Dr. Codman of Dorchester, who discontinued promiscuous exchanges more than twenty years ago; and the same practice was adopted by his ministerial brethren, one after another, as fast as they became acquainted with the actual existence and real nature of Unitarianism; till, within two years, such exchanges have almost entirely ceased. In regard to the third period above quoted, it is difficult to see why "ministerial courtesy" and "Christian charity" are not due to Universalists as well as Unitarians; and as to preserving "the harmony and integrity of the Congregational parishes" "in the small country towns," the argument is *a fortiori* in favor of exchanges with Universalists; for in those parishes there are, probably, on an average, two Universalists to one Unitarian."

But, "Unitarians," (says the Examiner,) "do not decline exchanges with Universalists on the ground that they are not Christians;" nor, (we suppose he would be willing to add,) on the ground that Universalism is not Christianity. Then, we say, so much the worse; for, on this supposition, the Unitarians withhold the same privilege from Universalists, for the withholding of which from

themselves, they so loudly complain of the Orthodox; and confessedly *with much less reason for so doing*. The Orthodox refuse exchanges with Unitarians on the ground that Unitarianism is not the Gospel,—and this is a violation of Christian charity: Unitarians refuse exchanges with Universalists on the ground that Universalism, though comprising the essential truths of the Gospel, is not sufficiently respectable; and this is an observance of Christian charity! This appears to us to be strange logic; but we know not what else to make of the argument in the Examiner. It is well known that there is no important difference of religious opinion between Unitarians and Universalists. Universalists are generally Unitarians in their opinions of the Trinity, and Unitarians are generally Universalists in their views of future punishment; and there is no *religious motive*, that we can see, for the distance at which the Unitarian clergy stand from their Universalist brethren. It is true that Unitarian ministers are in general better educated than those of the Universalist denomination; but if the Universalists were to make as free use of the funds of the Commonwealth for the promotion of clerical education in their sect, as the Unitarians have done, we can see no reason why this difference would not soon cease to exist.

The Protean, disingenuous, deceptive policy, which has always characterised the proceedings of Unitarians, they are still pursuing, both in regard to the Universalists and the Orthodox. We trust, however, that the people will not always be blind to the arts by which they have so long been abused. Unitarians themselves appear to be conscious that their day of retribution is fast coming; for it is evident, from the part which they have recently taken in regard to a proposed amendment of the Constitution of this State, that they are afraid to rely simply on the affections of their people for the support of their cause; and they cannot be ignorant of the progress which the standard Orthodoxy of the Episcopal Church is making in some of their most influential congregations.

#### RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *On the Formation of the Christian Character.* Addressed to those who are seeking to lead a religious Life. By HENRY WARE, Jr. Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care in Harvard University. Boston: Gray & Bowen. 1831. pp. 175.

The style of this little work is neat and in general perspicuous, the spirit displayed in it is candid and serious, and it contains many passages which, were it not for their connexion with others of a different character, might be instructive and profitable to the enquiring Christian. Having said thus much, we trust that the exceptions we shall be compelled to take will not be imputed to a fault-finding disposition.

It is evident to us, that Mr. Ware mistakes the nature of true religion, and the nature of that change through which he admits all must pass, in order to attain it.

“There is an animal life, and there is a spiritual life. Man is born into the first at the birth of his body; he is born into the second, when he subjects himself to the power of religion, and prefers his rational and immortal to his sensual nature. During his earliest days he is an animal only, pursuing, like other animals, the wants and desires of his body, and consulting his present gratification and immediate interest. But it is not designed that he shall continue thus. He is made for something better and higher. He has a nobler nature and nobler interests. He must learn to live for these; and this learning to feel and

value his spiritual nature and to live for eternity ; this change from the animal and earthly existence of infancy, to a rational, moral, spiritual existence,—*this it is to be born into the spiritual life.*"

Now we do not admit, in the first place, that man, 'during his earliest days, is an *animal only.*' If at the moment of his birth, when God breathes into him the breath of life, he does not receive a rational and immortal soul, when does he receive it? At what period is this most essential part of the human being bestowed?—But on supposition that man at the first is a mere animal; it does not follow that the 'change from the animal and earthly existence of infancy, to a rational, moral, spiritual existence,' is the same as regeneration. Vast multitudes of our fellow men live long enough to emerge from the state of infancy, who are not born of the Spirit of God.

Perhaps, however, this is not the meaning of our author, though it would seem to be the sense of his words. What he intends may be, that persons become Christians, when they cease to consult exclusively for their animal nature, and begin to act for the good of the soul—to act from serious, religious considerations. But how easy it is for persons to become serious, and to act from considerations of the soul and eternity, and yet be entirely under the dominion of selfishness. Their own personal security and happiness, and not the love of God, and a regard for his glory, may be their predominating motive. Persons may be as selfish in their religious concerns, as in their worldly concerns; and when this is the case, they may be as criminal in the sight of God for their prayers, and tears, and religious performances, as for any of the actions of their lives.

The state of infancy, in which the child is represented in the passage before us as a mere animal—a state out of which all future corruption proceeds, and in a change from which religion essentially consists—Mr. W. represents in other places as a state of *innocence*, and the sinner is made to lament his departure from it as the source of all his troubles.

"He looks back to the early and innocent days when, if his Saviour had been on earth, he might have taken him to his arms, and said, 'Of such is the kingdom of God.' But alas, how has he been changed! He has parted with that innocence, he has strayed from the kingdom of heaven, he has defiled and lost the image of his Maker. While he dwells on this thought of what he was, and what he might have become, and contrasts it with what he is, he is filled with remorse."

The man is now 'changed from the animal and earthly existence of infancy into a rational and moral,' if not 'spiritual existence;' but, instead of being regenerated, he is worse than before! 'He has parted with innocence, has strayed from the kingdom of heaven, has defiled and lost the image of his Maker!' Strange, that a man of Mr. Ware's intelligence should be so blind to the obliquities of a favorite system, as to be drawn unconsciously into contradictions such as these!

In describing the feeling of the awakened sinner, Mr. W. observes,

"He exaggerates to himself all his failings, paints in blacker colors than even the truth, all his iniquities, counts himself the chief of sinners, and is almost ready to despair of mercy." "And we need not be too anxious at once to correct this feeling. The abasement is well; for no one can feel guilt too strongly, or abhor sin too deeply. The time will come, when he will learn to follow the direction of the Apostle, and 'think of himself soberly, as he ought to think.' But at this first fair inspection of the deformities of his character, it is not to be expected that he should make his estimate with perfect sobriety. Only let everything to be done to guide and soothe and encourage him, and nothing to exasperate his self condemnation, or drive him to insanity or despair."

A greater mistake could hardly be committed, than that of supposing the pained, convicted sinner, just beginning to wake up to a sense of his sins, but unable to endure, in this life, a full apprehension of them, as 'exaggerating to himself his failings, and painting his iniquities in blacker colors than the truth.' And a more hazardous experiment could not be made upon the interests of the undying soul, than to endeavor to "soothe" such a person, and persuade him by degrees that he ought to think better of himself, and that he is not so great a sinner as he supposed. Rather let him be told, after the manner of the Apostles, to *repent, and become reconciled to God*. Let a sense of his sins be kept before him, and urged home upon him, till in view of them his heart melts and breaks, and he is willing to accept of mercy on the terms of the Gospel.

The Christian life, as exhibited by Mr. Ware, is essentially different from that described in the New Testament in several respects. We shall notice only two. The early Christians supposed they had much to fear from the influence of fallen, wicked spirits. Accordingly they were admonished in the following terms: "Be sober, be vigilant, because your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." But in the pages of Mr. W. we find no such admonitions. He evidently regards them as unnecessary, if not unmeaning.

The dependence of the primitive believers, in their labors and conflicts, was on the aids and influences of the Holy Spirit. They were said to 'walk in the Spirit,' to 'pray in the Spirit,' and to be 'led by the Spirit.' It was through 'the Spirit that they mortified the deeds of the body,' and 'by the Holy Ghost that the love of God was shed abroad in their hearts.' No such phraseology occurs in the teachings of Mr. Ware. He does not believe there is any Holy Ghost. And the language of Scripture implying the existence of such an Agent is so rendered by him as to have quite another meaning. 'The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in—a *holy spirit*; i. e. in a holy frame or temper of mind.

It ought to be said, however, that the sentiments of Mr. Ware differ, in several respects, from those of some of his brethren, and are more at agreement with the truth. For instance, instead of regarding the whole congregation as the Church, and inviting all without distinction to come to the supper of the Lord, placing this ordinance on a level with the other services of public worship he gives the following very suitable directions and instructions concerning it:—

"By your attendance at the Lord's table you declare yourself to be, from principle and affection, a Christian; and you seek to revive and confirm the sentiments, purposes, and habits, which belong to that character. These are the two objects which the ordinance is intended to accomplish, and which you are to have constantly in view. By considering the first of these, you will be enabled to decide how soon, and at what period, you ought to offer yourself for this celebration. Can you say, that you are in principle and affection a follower of Jesus Christ? And are you resolved perseveringly to maintain this character? Look at this question. Ponder its meaning. Put it to yourself faithfully. If you can conscientiously reply in the affirmative, if you have already showed so much constancy in your efforts, that you may rationally hope to persevere, you may make your profession before men, and take the promised blessing. Hasty minds have sometimes rushed forward too soon, and only exposed their own instability, and brought dishonor on their calling. Be not therefore hasty. But timid men have sometimes hesitated too long; have delayed till their ardor cooled, till they fancied they could stand and flourish without any further help, till death or age overtook them, and they were called to meet their Lord without having confessed him before men. Beware therefore, that you delay not too long."

In regard to the author of the work before us, we cherish no feelings but those of kindness. The difficulty under which he labors, lies rather with his

system, than himself, and it is evidence of the looseness and vagueness of this system, that not even its most intelligent advocates (among whom is Mr. Ware) can exhibit it in a serious, practical form, without falling into palpable inconsistencies and dangerous errors.

2. *Sermons by the late Rev. Edward Payson, D. D.*, Pastor of the Second Church in Portland. Boston : Wm. Hyde. 1831. pp.400.

This second volume of *Sermons* by Dr. Payson will be cordially welcomed by a numerous body of readers, and will not disappoint their reasonable expectations. It contains twenty-eight sermons, on a variety of important subjects, written much in the style of those already before the public. They are in general adapted to awaken the careless ; to direct the ignorant, the inquiring, and distressed ; to try the hearts of God's people ; and to afford them warning, encouragement, and comfort, as their circumstances may require. They will be read with much interest, and will be useful, in the present revivals of religion.

3. *Memoirs of the Rev. John Townsend*, Founder of the Asylum (in England) for the Deaf and Dumb, and of the Congregational School. First American edition. Boston : Crocker & Brewster. 1831. pp. 244.

The subject of this work was a pattern to Ministers of patient industry and indefatigable zeal. To Christians in private life, the perusal of it will be useful, showing them how to live, to labor, to suffer, and to die.

4. *The Child's Book on the Soul*. By T. H. GALLAUDET. Hartford : Cooke & Co. 1831. pp. 127.

The single object of this work is, by a variety of easy illustrations adapted to the capacities of little children, to impress upon them that they have souls—“distinct from the body, unlike it, superior to it, which will survive it after death, and live forever.” This, it is well observed, “is the simple, elementary principle of all religious instruction. It is one of the first truths of religion, if not the very first, which the child is best able to comprehend, and which excites in him the deepest and most abiding interest.” The work is neatly executed, and should be in the hands of all Christian Mothers.

5. *Mrs. Rowe's Devout Exercises of the Heart*. Revised at her request by Rev. ISAAC WATTS, D. D. With Notices of her life compiled by Rev. WILLIAM JENKS, D. D. Boston : William Hyde. 1831. pp. 192.

This beautiful miniature edition of Mrs. Rowe's *Devout Exercises* will be an acceptable offering to the religious public. May her pure spiritual image be deeply impressed on many a reader's heart.

6. *A Visit to the South Seas*, in the U. S. Ship Vincennes, During the years 1829 and 1830, with Scenes in Brazil, Peru, Manilla, the Cape of Good Hope, and St. Helena. By C. S. STEWART, A. M. Chaplain in the U. S. Navy, and Author of ‘A Residence in the Sandwich Islands.’ In two Volumes. New York : John P. Haven. 1831.

7. *Letter to Eleazer Lord, Esq.* in Defence of Measures for Promoting the Observance of the Christian Sabbath. By LEWIS TAPPAN. New York : John P. Haven. 1831. pp. 24.

8. *An Oration* Addressed to the Citizens of the Town of Quincy, on the fourth of July, 1831, the fifty-fifth Anniversary of the Independence of the United States of America. By JOHN QUINCY ADAMS. Boston : Richardson, Lord & Holbrook. pp. 40.



THE  
**SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.**

---

---

VOL. IV.

SEPTEMBER, 1831.

NO. 9.

---

---

**SELECT BIOGRAPHY.**

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. BASIL WOODD.

The readers of the English Religious Magazines are familiar with the name, and know something of the excellent character, of the Rev. Basil Woodd. This eminent servant of Christ departed this life, April 12, 1831, in the 71st year of his age. The Discourse at his funeral was preached by the Rev. Daniel Wilson, author of "Lectures on the Evidences of Christianity," and, "Sermons on the Divine Authority and perpetual Obligation of the Lord's Day." From this Discourse, the following account of the life, character and labors of Mr. Woodd is extracted. It will be read with interest by every lover of true religion, and may furnish important hints to those who are engaged in the sacred ministry.

This holy and devoted clergyman was born August 5, 1760, at Richmond, Surry. In 1778 he entered Trinity College, Oxford; he was ordained deacon March 18, 1783, and priest, Sept. 19, 1784, to the curacy of West Cowes, Isle of Wight. In 1784, he was chosen lecturer at St. Peter's, Cornhill; in 1785, he was appointed minister of Bentinck Chapel; and, in 1808, he was instituted to the living of Drayton Beauchamp, Bucks, which he resigned in favor of his son, the Rev. C. S. Woodd, Aug. 1830.

A sound and spiritual knowledge of religion in his own heart was the foundation of his ministry. Early in life had he given up himself to the Lord. He knew the gospel by a personal subjection to its grace, and a holy joy in its promises. The doctrines he taught were the springs of his own conduct. The faith he inculcated he first felt. The operations of the Holy Spirit, which he invited others to implore, had first transformed his own soul. The grace of God, which he laid as the corner stone of the gospel, he clung to as the rock of his own salvation. The scope of his ministry, in adding souls to the Lord, was sustained by a conviction of his own union with that adorable Saviour. His pastoral labors were fed from the sources of personal devotion, actual joy in Christ, and individual adherence with purpose of heart to him.

This, this is the indispensable pre-requisite to a fruitful ministry—a personal experience of religion. A consistent conduct then follows. You know your late beloved minister's private course of

life—his domestic habits—his care of his household—his separation of heart from the world—his integrity, purity, disinterestedness—his enlarged and almost excessive liberality—his holy and constant devotion of spirit and behavior. Abating for human feelings, which we always must do, and without which our commendations would be entitled to little credit, he ‘adorned the doctrine of God his Saviour in all things.’

His loveliness of private deportment was almost proverbial. This made him emphatically a good man. Kindness appeared in all his words and actions—it overflowed. He could not live but as he communicated happiness. His family knew the sympathy, the tenderness, the unwearied kindness of his inmost soul. Benevolence, it has been said, is a universal language: no man spoke this language more completely than your late pastor.

The general amiableness of his mind was connected with an habitual openness of heart and urbanity, which enabled him to bring all his powers to bear on every occasion. He differed from many lovely men, who are shrinking, nervous, retiring, apprehensive, quickly hurt, and collapsed, as it were, by the rudeness of mankind. The cheerful, unembarrassed frankness of our late friend, left him always at liberty, always prompt, always in possession of himself. He was the farthest removed from concealment, suspicion, fear. You could see through him. There was nothing behind. This made him peculiarly suited for the station in which he was placed, and the times in which he lived. Amongst persons most hostile to his views of religion, he could speak with the same ease and hope of being kindly received as amongst the warmest friends. Thus he won insensibly upon them. He disarmed opposition. He exhibited the doctrines of the grace of God in a way to engage their attention and regard.

His influence was increased by the moderation which his turn of mind almost unavoidably gave to his views of Christianity on subordinate or doubtful points. He had studied and read much in early life; he knew most of the great writers on the questions agitated in his day, and he had settled down into a plain, scriptural, moderate divine, who held no extreme opinions on debatable matters, and insisted not controversially on those which he embraced. The fallen, depraved state of man, void of every thing spiritually good; the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; justification by faith alone; regeneration, conversion, and sanctification by the Holy Spirit; communion with God; love to Christ; a watchful, humble walk; obedience to the moral law as a fruit of faith; the ascription of salvation from first to last to the grace of God;—these were his topics. On predestination, election, the assurance of faith, and the manner of stating final perseverance, he confined himself to the language of Scripture. His moderation was not compromise, not timidity, not lukewarmness, not worldliness, but the wise

and enlightened determination of an amiable man, who was not formed for controversy, and instinctively recoiled from dogmatical assertions.

On main questions and trying occasions, his firmness and intrepidity proved the divine principles which governed his character. The grace of God demonstrates itself in nothing more clearly than in carrying men on, against and above their natural bias. Openness of heart and moderation were easy to our dear friend, but courage and resistance were unequivocal fruits of the Spirit. No one could turn him aside from avowing the faith of the gospel; no one could detect him in shrinking from the doctrines of a crucified Saviour; no one could induce him to renounce the friendship of the humblest follower of Christ, however differing from him in many points.

Read his sermon before the University. It is respectful, indeed, as it ought to be; it is carefully studied and prepared, as it ought to be; it treats a defined subject in an orderly and scholar-like manner, as it ought to do; but it sets forth the truth, it glorifies Christ, it appeals to the conscience: it is, perhaps, the strongest of his sermons.

His steadiness again was seen in his adhering to the simplicity of the gospel, during a long life, and amidst the various fluctuations of opinion that prevailed at different times. He went on his way firmly and undeviatingly. The novelties of these later years only distressed, but did not move, him. About four years since, he thought it his duty to enter his protest against the rash and unscriptural assertions on assurance, advanced by an amiable and pious foreign Protestant divine; and he defended boldly his own sentiments when attacked in a respectable periodical work.

The firmness of our lamented friend, however, was not merely seen in his doctrines, but extended to his constant practice. He showed a moral courage on every important occasion. Very early in life this determination appeared, in refusing at once an engagement to visit one of the Universities, when, by a change in the first appointment, he found it would intrench upon the Lord's day. He often mentioned in after years that this one circumstance led, under the guidance of Providence, to his eventful station in the church of Christ. So his courage in visiting the sick was not less observable. Nothing could keep him from the dying chamber, and often has he faced considerable perils from contagious disease on such occasions.

But I pass on to mention his unwearied diligence in his particular line of duty. No man discovered more exactly his proper talent, and more assiduously occupied with it. He was the minister of the young; he was the friend of the stranger; he was the comforter of the destitute; he was the instructor of servants; he was the writer of little periodical treatises; he was the distributor

of tracts; he was the teacher and encourager of schools. And in all these ways he used an extraordinary diligence, a diligence ever on the watch for opportunities, never weary of repetition, never waiting for invitation. Thus he multiplied schools and benevolent institutions in his chapel and parish in the country. He visited, he moulded, he encouraged them. Tracts and little books he dispersed on all hands, so that few young persons ever entered his house without having some present made them. He composed also a variety of smaller works for their benefit. 'Had I to live life over again, I would write more books' said an aged minister, 'but they should not be folios, but penny tracts. Folios are read only by the the tens, tracts by the ten thousands of the people.' On this principle our friend proceeded: and who can estimate the blessing which these writings have produced? One of his tracts is, I observe, in the forty-sixth edition, another in the fortieth, a third in the thirty-fourth, and so on. It is not always by a few great efforts that the largest measure of good is produced; but by the perpetual recurrence of small but well-directed endeavours. Human life is made up of daily-occurring and minute circumstances: and a good man, like our friend, often supplies by diligence what may be wanting in great talents or striking opportunities.

The humility of your beloved minister accompanied and adorned his other graces. He was unfeignedly lowly of heart. He carried his faculties meekly: he never assumed the station of an elder. In his prayers there was peculiar tenderness, spirituality, and unction—a confession of sin, a repose on divine mercy, a submission to the will of God—which marked the real humility of his character. The same was apparent when the numerous churches and chapels erected in his neighbourhood—some of them filled with very energetic and attractive preachers—drew off many of his congregation. He rejoiced, indeed, in every kind of intellectual superiority devoted to religion, and derived gratification from the exercise and success of those qualities and powers in others, to which his own turn of mind was least allied.

His resignation under afflictions was akin to this grace of humility.\* He had to pass through much domestic sorrow. The first Mrs. Woodd left him a widower with four children, at the age of thirty-one; and all these children he followed afterwards in succession to the grave. He lost also the second Mrs. Woodd, after a union of nearly forty years, whose death, indeed, hastened his own. His tender heart was broken almost with grief, as these and other painful scenes of a domestic nature occurred.

I must not omit to mention that devotion of mind, and habit of referring every thing to the providential government of God, which marked our friend. He walked with God. His element was devotion. He was full of Christianity; and out of the good treasure of his heart he brought forth that which was good.

His candor in judging of others, and his readiness to acknowledge errors in himself, must not be omitted. No man received suggestions more candidly; no man confessed a fault more unreservedly; no man changed an opinion upon conviction more frankly. An example of this occurred but a short time before his death. He had, like many other amiable persons, believed the representations made to him of the improved condition of the slaves in our West India colonies. He could not conceive that so many benevolent and upright persons as are confessedly found amongst the West India body, could be guilty of the cruelties which are charged upon them. When, however, he considered the proofs of the constant mortality occasioned by the system; when he considered the necessary consequences of absolute power entrusted to man over his fellow-man; when he perceived the degradation and misery generated by the very nature of a slavery enforced by the cart-whip, and the utter hopelessness of the authors and perpetrators of the mischief becoming the repairers of it—he acknowledged his mistake. ‘The anti-slavery reporters terrify me,’ said he to a friend; ‘I cannot sleep on my bed. Here is a little subscription which I have collected for the society.’

But I shall be expected to say something of our beloved friend as a preacher. Here he took a most important and honorable station. If he did not attain the highest walk of popularity in the ordinary sense of the term, he was popular in the best and only scriptural sense, in the esteem and love of an attentive and numerous audience. A mild, persuasive, affectionate statement of the gospel pervaded his discourses. His subjects were well chosen, his divisions of them clear, and the recapitulation which he was accustomed to make, rendered them easy to be remembered by youth. I have already said that he was the minister of the young—and elementary topics were his favorite theme. If he did not bestow so much labor upon his preparation for the pulpit as it may have been wished, for the sake of his more experienced or fastidious hearers, this was owing to his regard for the young, and to the large demands upon his time made by his pastoral duties. He was admirable, also, for excluding all doubtful matters from the pulpit. The same holy evangelical strain of instruction with which he began, concluded his ministry, to the utter neglect of of novelties, vagaries, over-statements. No minute discussion of unfulfilled prophecies, no new hypotheses upon subordinate questions, no shibboleths of a party, no unscriptural tests of discipleship, no vehement condemnation of those who differed from him on minor points, no perverseness of interpretation or application of texts, appeared in his preaching. He was of the old school; he preached ‘Jesus Christ, and him crucified.’

But it is time for me to advert to his last illness. I lay no undue stress upon it, because it is not the death, but the life, which

the Scriptures lead us to consider as the real test of character. The effect of disease, the torpor or irritability produced by medicine, the very decline and languor of the powers of body and mind, may prevent any considerable demonstrations of faith and love in the last conflict. Still, where it pleases Providence to preserve the intellect unimpaired, there is a sensible pleasure in collecting the dying observations of those whom we love.

It was in the beginning of February, that, after a long period of sorrow and of declining health, he fainted away in this chapel in the midst of the service; and, though he recovered so far as to assist in the administration of the sacrament, he never regained any considerable vigor. His last discourse was delivered on the following Sunday (Feb. 13,) from these words,—‘Christ in you the hope of glory.’ It was in many respects, as I am informed, a most remarkable and affecting sermon. He was still able to take occasional drives for the benefit of the air, and to make remarks to the kind friends that accompanied him. A few of them are as follows:—

March 23.—‘If I should recover, and be permitted to labor a little longer, I hope I shall return with an increased conviction of the importance of eternity. I am thankful that God has condescended to use me as an instrument in his hand, and in some measure blessed my labors; but I desire to come to him as a sinner, in deep humility, ashamed and abased before him, relying only on the all-sufficient grace, the all-sufficient atonement of my blessed Saviour, for pardon and acceptance with him.’

March 30.—He spoke with great feeling respecting Bentick Chapel, where he said he had labored for forty-six years. He said he had much reason to be thankful that it had pleased God to permit him to labor there, adding, ‘I have good reason to hope that many have been born there.’ He also spoke with great thankfulness of the many charitable associations connected with the chapel, and mentioned particularly the Church Missionary Association, which, he said, ‘was the first that lent its aid to the parent society.’ ‘I think,’ he said, ‘we have sent them as much as five or six thousand pounds.’

He then spoke of Baxter;—‘Some of my friends have sometimes accused me of being a Baxterian. I do not go quite so far as Baxter upon some points, but my sentiments correspond with his more nearly than with those of almost any other divine.’

‘I have been found fault with, too, for being too much of a Calvinist. On most points, I think, I agree with Calvin; but I cannot think with him [or agree with him, I do not recollect which of the two expressions Mr. W. made use of,] on the doctrine of reprobation. I cannot, from what I have been enabled to learn in my study of the Scriptures, resolve it, as he does, into the absolute sovereignty of God. I cannot reconcile that view of it, with his not willing the death of a sinner. But it is astonishing how much more moderate men become upon these points as they grow older. Calvin himself was much more moderate in the latter part of his life. His Commentary was written after his Institutes, and it is surprising how much more moderate it is, though he died at the age of fifty-four or fifty-five.’

On arriving at home.—When he was quietly laid down, he closed his eyes, and began, as meditating aloud, to say, ‘I sometimes feel as if I were going home—sweet home! Oh, what mercy, to be with my Saviour, who has done so much for me! I have no righteousness of my own to stand in—none—none; clothed in his righteousness—he is my righteousness. What mercy to a poor sinful worm, called at an early age, and upheld, through his grace, in his ways ever since; so that, though I am compassed with infirmity, I have not “wickedly departed from my God,” but he has led me on. I trust there is a place

prepared for me in my Father's kingdom. Oh, what a mercy, to have a hope, sure and steadfast, through my Saviour, who is entered for us within the veil!

April 5. After speaking of his bodily ailments, he proceeded as follows:— 'It seems like a breaking-up of nature; whether I shall rally or not, God only knows. I sometimes think I may recover, for with God all things are possible; but, whether I live or die, I thank God I am prepared to do his will. When I feel as if I should not recover, the prospect before me, the near prospect of the glory that awaits me, almost overwhelms me. I can hardly bear to speak of it, or to think of it.' (He stopped and wept, but soon regained his composure and went on.) 'Thank God, not one doubt disturbs me!—if I live, to me to live is Christ, but to die will be great gain. God has been very merciful to me a sinner—very merciful. He has redeemed my soul from death by the precious blood of Christ. He is my Father in Christ. Jesus Christ is my Saviour, and in Him, my elder brother, I trust for acceptance with my Father, and lay my humble claim to the inheritance of the sons of God in glory everlasting; and I hope, my dear, I shall meet you there, and your dear family. God is a sovereign. He acts as a sovereign: sovereign in power, sovereign in wisdom, sovereign in love. He is too wise to be mistaken—too good to be unkind. I bow to his sovereignty. I do not understand it. I do not know why his purpose is thus and thus, but I know that all his purposes are directed by infinite wisdom, infinite mercy, and infinite justice too. I am brought into entire acquiescence with his will, whether it be for life or death.'

As death approached, he said to one of his family, 'Let my hand be placed upon the Holy Bible, that that blessed book, which has been my guide and support through life, may be my support in my last trial. At four in the morning of the day of his departure, he said, 'Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, that mine eyes may see thy salvation,' which he repeated several times in the course of the day. At six in the evening, he said, 'Let me soon see that salvation! Good bye!—it will soon be over—it is hard work;' these were his last articulate words.

Thus died in the Lord the reverend and good Basil Woodd, on Tuesday, April 12, 1831, in the 71st year of his age.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

### THE NECESSITY OF REVIVALS OF RELIGION TO THE PERPETUITY OF OUR CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS.

The dangers which threaten these United States, and the free institutions here established, are numerous and appalling. They arise, in part, from our vast extent of territory, our numerous and increasing population, from diversity of local interests, the power of selfishness, and the fury of sectional jealousy and hate. All these are powerful causes of strife, and never were they in more powerful or terrific action.

These causes, alone sufficient to set on fire the course of nature, have, during several of the last years, been wielded, concentrated, and blown into fury, by a mad ambition. The thirst of power and dominion has fallen upon some of our leading politicians, to whom the ordinary elements of strife seem tame and lazy in the work of ruin; and they—regardless of consequences, and with a view to subserve their own political ends—have heated the furnace of an-

ger seven-fold, and raised to a seven-fold height the winds and waves of political commotion.

To these must be added the corrupting influence of a pre-eminent national prosperity, productive of voluptuousness, extravagance, and rash speculation, and leading, in many instances, to reckless poverty and misery.

The increase of intellectual power too, without a corresponding increase of moral restraint, and this connected with the universality of suffrage, presents an ocean of unstable mind to the ruthless power of mad ambition.

Nor are these our only sources of danger. There is the Atheistic, anti-social conspiracy which, amid the war of elements, would blot out the sun, suspend moral attraction, dissolve society, and turn out the whole family of human animals into one common field of unbridled appetite and lust. And there is religious party spirit, destroying the confidence of the great Christian denominations in one another, inflaming them with jealousy and hatred, and paralyzing their energy of action against a common foe, and for the cause of their common Lord. There is also the perversion of governmental influence to foment these jealousies, and break the moral power of Christianity, by playing off one denomination against another, still drawing the church in some form into an alliance with the state, and cursing the nation with the double curse of a religious and political conflict, agitating us in all our elections.

Another danger not to be overlooked, arises from the intrigues of Catholic Europe, through the medium of our own Catholic population, to give a predominance to their religion with all its anti-republican tendencies, and thus to divide us, and destroy our institutions.

Such are some of the dangers which threaten us. And they are not fictitious; nor are they trifles magnified for rhetorical effect. The language I have employed is indeed strong language, but it falls unmeasurably below the amplitude and imminence of the evils which have been described. The laws of the moral nature of a great nation are here operating powerfully in a state of perversion, and with such unmanageable violence, as bids defiance to human wisdom and to human power. Unless some subduing, tranquilizing influence can be applied, superior to all which man can apply, our race as a nation is swift, and our destruction sure.

Let me then call the attention of my readers to *our only remaining source of hope—God—and the interpositions of his Holy Spirit, in great and general Revivals of Religion, to reform the hearts of this people, and make the nation good and happy.*

There is for us assuredly but one remedy, and that is, such a state of the affections towards God and our neighbor, as the Law and the Gospel require:—Not the ascendancy of Christians over the world, but the world, in the day of God's power, becoming



Christian. The influence which is necessary to save us is the influence of truth, made effectual by the supernatural influence of God's Holy Spirit;—not supernatural as revealing any new truth, or creating new faculties, or suspending or doing violence to their exercise; but supernatural in this respect, that God accomplishes by the truth that change in the affections which the interests of time and eternity alike require, and which no human skill avails to achieve.

It is not to be supposed a thing beyond the power of God, to effect such a change of human character as will reconcile universal liberty and boundless prosperity, with their permanence and purity. Neither reason nor philosophy requires us to suppose, that God has created a race whom he cannot, if it seems good to him, reclaim and govern, in accordance with the highest degree of temporal prosperity.

The benevolence and mercy of God would lead us to infer, from what he has done in providing redemption, that he will do much more than he has yet done in its application. Every thing shows that his purposes are tending to intellectual, and civil, and social results, much beyond what has ever before existed. And this analogy, coupled with his mercy, would lead us to anticipate a more than corresponding moral and religious amelioration. In this too we are confirmed by the consideration, that every other cause has been tried and has completely failed.

1. Force has failed. It may intimidate and perpetuate ignorance, superstition, and hypocrisy, but it cannot compel benevolence, honesty, purity, and the graces of the Christian character; and the more force has been relied on, has human nature been brutified and debased.

2. The cultivation of intellect has failed. Ages the most distinguished for intellectual culture have been alike distinguished for voluptuousness, and all the elements of moral dissolution.

3. The insufficiency of *creeds* to preserve faith and holiness has been long since determined. It is the right of men to express their views of Christian doctrine in creeds, as much as of states to express, in bills of right, and constitutions, their political faith. Nor are creeds any encroachment on other men's rights, so long as they are not required to subscribe them. Religious liberty includes the right to have creeds, if men please, as really as to have none, if they please. Nor are creeds the setting up of human opinion above the Bible. This is a gross misrepresentation. They are simply an honest avowal of the particular sense in which the Bible is understood, on points in which Christians differ. Is there any treason in this? Nor have creeds been without their use. They have been powerful memorials of truth, descending from age to age, and regarded with affectionate veneration by those who re-

ceive them, as the faith once delivered to the saints—the faith of the Reformers, and of a pious ancestry.

Nor is it true that those who denounce creeds have none. Do they believe nothing? Then are they sceptics, and not Christians. Do they believe Christianity in any form? Then do they have creeds. They may not indeed be reduced to articles and printed; but are they the less real, or the less efficacious? Is a living creed less influential than a creed on paper? a creed in the head and heart, than a creed in the pocket? Those whose creeds are not printed understand one another, and act in concert for the defence of a common faith with as much accuracy as veteran soldiers, and with as much zeal and perseverance as characterise any sect whatever. Creeds which are ambulatory, each page of which, as it moves on, is cancelled as mistaken, to be followed, not by new truths discovered, but new mistakes to be cancelled, ought not to be printed. As well might the Almanack for 1831 be stereotyped for all future times.

But scriptural, venerable, and useful as creeds have been and are, their efficacy falls unspeakably below the exigences of our national necessity. They do not produce holiness of themselves; nor do they, of course, ensure it; nor can they perpetuate themselves against innovation and subversion, in seasons of religious declension. While they remain, they are mere technical landmarks between truth and error—mounds against which the waves beat and are rolled back—and their existence in the letter only, without the spirit, killeth instead of giving life. Of all stupidity, orthodox stupidity is the most dreadful. It ought to be remembered that ice palaces may be formed, and have been formed, of orthodox as well as of heterodox materials, and when the creed, which is but the means of promoting religion, is regarded with more zeal than religion itself, the reign of high church and creed idolatry has begun.

4. A faithful evangelical ministry is not alone sufficient to diffuse and perpetuate moral purity. It is doubtless the most powerful cause which man is permitted to wield. But they who wield it are not suffered to continue by reason of death, and they cannot form to holiness the heart of a single successor to the pastoral office, or of a single person of the generation to follow—without a concurring supernatural agency.

Instances are not wanting in the primitive age, at the reformation, and in our own country, of the rapid declension of the evangelical ministry, both in doctrine and piety. And if the race of holy ministers could be succeeded by holy men, their power is unequal to the toil and effort which is indispensable to bring a great, intellectual, rich, contentious, and proud people into a willing subjection to the laws of Christ. Amid the elements of selfishness, and pride, and covetousness, and ambition, the mere human power

of preaching is like the impotent expostulation of old Eli to his sons, or like binding Sampson with cords of flax.

5. Evangelical churches, were they formed and extended over the land, would be no sure defence. Their action would extend only through one generation,—and then, without the renovating power of the Spirit, the churches would be filled with mere nominal Christians, and a cold and formal orthodoxy, falling back upon heresy and error, would ensue.

There is no remedy for self-ruined man but regeneration; and there is no remedy for corrupt, agitated, and threatened communities, but revivals of religion. 'Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord.'

6. Alike impotent for the preservation of truth and holiness are the various forms of church organization. These have been the occasion of bigotted attachment, of furious controversy, and of unfounded confidence, as if the grace of God and life eternal hung on modes of worship and forms of discipline. They are important, doubtless, as means to an end, as the scaffolding to the spiritual building it helps to raise; and some modes of organization, without doubt, approximate nearer than others to the real evangelical pattern. But if we had that pattern to a certainty, and all the churches with one accord were organized exactly right, the influence of this church order to produce holiness, and control the mighty causes of national ruin, would be but the power of the cobweb to hold the whirlwind, or chain down the ocean. That estimation of forms which overlooks the vitality of religion and the powerful energies of the Spirit in its rapid production, and with denominational selfishness looks only to its own formal, slow-paced movement, is the Christianity which has ruined, but never saved the nations; and however, in days of tranquillity, it may rear temples to be admired, and sustain the fine-arts of God's worship—the architecture, sculpture, music, and oratory of Christianity—it is not a religion which will stand the conflict which is coming on. It is the religion behind whose shield the enemies of Christ will find shelter, instead of resistance, and whence they will aim their shafts at the followers of the Lamb.

The government of God is the only government which will hold society, against depravity within and temptation without; and this it must do by the force of its own law written upon the heart. This is that unity of the Spirit and that bond of peace which alone can perpetuate national purity and tranquillity—that law of universal and impartial love by which alone nations can be kept back from ruin. There is no safety for republics but in self-government, under the influence of a holy heart, swayed by the government of God.

But even these principles of national conservation, to avail, must become immensely more extensive and operative than they have

been or are ; for it is not the church which is to govern the world, but the world must become Christian and govern itself. There is as much liberty in self-government, according to the laws of Christ, as in self-government, according to the laws of the Devil ;—as much free agency and republicanism in holiness, as in vice and irreligion. The renovating power must then operate on greater masses of mind, than it ever has done. It must move onward in the work of mercy more rapidly, more simultaneously, through towns, and cities, and states, and nations. It was by such powerful and simultaneous changes of character that Christianity moved up the tide of human hate and prejudice and scorn, and rose to empire over Paganism. The existing moral power of the Gospel, with all its supernatural efficiency, is nothing to those tremendous causes of opposition which are every day developing their strength and concentrating their power. A few drops in the Mississippi might as well attempt to stop and turn back the whole descending flood, as Christianity attempt, in its present state, to turn the public sentiment of the nation. The wicked will do wickedly, and will claim the right to do so, without the hindrance of law or shame, and there is no stopping the insurrection, but as the hearts of men, by the grace of God, shall be radically changed.

Since the overthrow of Puritan public sentiment, it is only recently that Christian principles have been thought of, as exerting any influence in national policy. And the first indication of such intrusion of conscience and principle, has been met with sneers and contumely in the halls of national legislation, while it has sent alarm through all the ranks of worldliness and sin. An eternity of such slow-paced and limited success, as has for centuries past attended the preaching of the Gospel, would leave the nation still under the dominion of the powers of darkness.

We have fallen upon other times than the church of God ever saw before—times in which the same amount of religious and moral influence which once availed to advance the cause of Christ will not now enable it to hold its own. The intellect of man has waked up to a new activity—has burst the chains that bound it, and the barriers that confined it, and with ten-fold means of influence, is going forth in its mightiness to agitate society. Old foundations are broken up, and old principles and maxims are undergoing a thorough and perilous revision, and that too upon a mighty scale.

In our colonial state we were few, and poor, and feeble. Intercourse was difficult and rare, and moral causes insulated and local. What was said in one colony was not heard in another, and what was done in one state was not felt in another. But now, each colony is a state, and each state a nation, and intercourse is rapid, and local causes tell in their results throughout the whole, as every stroke on the body is felt through all its members. Nations compose our confederacy, and nations our religious denominations,

and nations the army of the aliens. Since then such new and increased action has commenced, for the moral energies of religion to be stationary, is relatively to retrograde to imbecility and insignificance. The relative increase of unconverted population, by birth and emigration and irreligious and corrupting influence, without a corresponding increase of divine influence to render the government of God effectual, would supersede the persecution of the church only by placing her in such obscurity, as to be overlooked both by fear and by hate.

Some who, reasoning from past analogies, think it most desirable that conversions should be rather dilatory and gradual, than sudden and multitudinous, forget that the revivals in the kingdom of darkness are moving on with terrific haste and power. Millions are bursting into that kingdom, while hundreds only are added to the kingdom of Christ. It is no time for ministers to think themselves faithful and successful without revivals. The seed cannot be long buried without being trodden down past coming up, or being choked instantly by thorns when it vegetates. The springs of evil are bursting out, and sending their hasty and copious contributions, to form the river whose mighty and angry waves roll and dash and foam against that stream which is destined to gladden the city of our God. On steamboats, and canals, and railroads, and turnpikes, the ungodly are gathering together against the sacramental host, to obliterate the Sabbath, and raze Zion to her foundations. Nothing but the power of Almighty God can sustain the churches in this tremendous conflict. Nothing but speedy, extensive, and powerful revivals of religion can save our nation from impending ruin. Patriotism may help, but cannot be relied on as a principal. Philosophy may speculate correctly, but cannot stand the shock of so mighty a collision. Religious education is that without which we cannot stand, but not that whose efficacy alone will avail. Nothing but a phalanx of holy hearts around the Sabbath can save it. Nothing but such a national change of heart and affections as will cause the Sabbath to become a delight, and the sanctuary of the Lord honorable, can preserve our institutions from desecration and ruin. In the day of God's power, the nation must become willing to obey him, or its destruction is inevitable.

Theological Seminaries can do much. They can extend the field of knowledge, increase the amount of learning, and elevate, in respect to elocution and style, the productions of the pulpit and the press. They can provide a ministry—such as the ministry must be to meet the exigences of the day—more literary and respectable than that of past generations. But let it not be thought that all this can be gained, unattended by new temptations and dangers. There is danger that, studying in classes and receiving instruction from lectures, the tax of personal responsibility and the discipline of personal, original investigation may decline. There is

danger that a general, indeterminate Orthodoxy may gradually supplant that precision and exactness of definition and knowledge which was given to theology by Edwards, and has descended through the schools of private instruction. There is danger that our young men will be much more perfected in taste and literature, than in the duties of the pastoral care,—that they will get more of the theory and less of the practice of their profession, which will render their ministry formal and imbecile. There is danger that the ambition and rivalries of the college may be transferred to the seminary, and the seeds of future jealousy and envy be nurtured, just where they ought to be extinguished: And there is danger that in the severity of protracted study and the acquisition of much learning (both of which are good) there may be a relative diversion of the mind from the means and duties of vital godliness, and a cold chill, a dead palsy, fasten upon the heart;—the very door, wide open day and night, through which all faithful revival preaching goes out of the church, and all heresies come in. Let me not be thought to depreciate the blessings of theological seminaries; but he who supposes them beyond perversion, dreams. He who does not understand that Satan surrounds them with all his wiles, does not yet understand his policy; and though all the good men to whom they are committed watch and pray, as they do, against these dangers, there is no effectual safeguard, but in such copious revivals, as will bring out in the community around them a tone of evangelical sentiment and feeling which will not permit them to retrograde,—a public feeling and judgement and taste, which will render learned dullness intolerable, and the glittering eloquence of words, without thought and weight, contemptible.

Revivals are indispensable to sanctify the literature of the nation, and to associate intellectual culture with holiness of heart. In all our systems of education, from the common school up to the college, these have been dissociated. The care of the heart, if any care was bestowed upon it, has been turned over to the nursery, while the intellect and the memory have been sent to school to receive a separate education. The result has been such as might be expected. The depravity of the heart, unwatched, unresisted, and in some respects deliberately fostered, has made fearful proficiency in the government and perversion of the understanding.

The neglect of moral culture and the power of social contamination in our common schools is in many instances dreadful. And in academies and colleges, the principles most sedulously cultivated and relied on, as the spring of action, are pride, emulation, and ambition. As if they needed no check in this bad world—as if they could not by hot-bed culture, added to native strength of soil, be made to grow too rank—the principles, which of all others have most obstructed vital Christianity, setting the world on fire without, and exciting the most unyielding controversy within till

the Christian's dying day, are all the way from childhood up studiously cultivated. Unless this unhallowed fire can be put out, instead of being kindled, in the progress of our national education, we are undone. What wonder is it, that ministers should have jealousies and envyings, who, from their cradle till their public education is completed, have been stimulated to action by principles of pride, rivalry, and ambition? What wonder that ministers and Christians of different denominations should be filled with envy, instead of joy at each other's prosperity, whose entire intellectual culture has been goaded on by the stimulus of such ungodly principles? What wonder that physicians, and poets, and orators, and lawyers, are agitated with feuds, and behold each other through the medium of green-eyed envy? What wonder that Bonapartean hearts burn hot and beat high under the unostentatious garb of republican simplicity, setting on fire the course of nature, as if set on fire of hell? How can we expect every where to move men by pride in their education, and have them meek and lowly in heart in their subsequent action? But how shall the evils of an antichristian education be remedied? They cannot be, until regeneration has formed a public sentiment which in education will cooperate with the Gospel, to repress and extirpate, and not to nurture, the most baleful and powerful passions of the human heart.

No influence but that of the wisdom from above, which is pure and gentle, and easy to be entreated, can unite the local, jarring interests of this great nation, and constitute us benevolently one,—so that if one member suffers, all will sympathise; and if one is honored, all will rejoice. Nothing, short of this, will put out the fires of ambition, and permit our troubled sea and heaving earth to rest. The people, might they be let alone, would not rush upon one another in such angry collisions. But there are men who will not let them alone. Opposing partisans need them as the ladder of their ambition, and as if jealousy and furious hate were harmless and safe as the breath of zephyrs, they blow the coals of strife, and rouse up the divided nation to contend furiously against itself. The political papers vomit forth invective, and scorn, and slander, till the national heart burns with malignant fires and throbs with indignation. While in the highest places, the men whose fortunes we have followed walk naked, and before the nation and the world foam out their shame.

Equally hopeless, without an effusion of love by the Holy Ghost, is the cessation of religious strife, and the concordance of the great denominations under the banners of a common Christianity—in all the fundamental principles of which they are agreed. Like troops of different nations, our Lord is calling us, and the enemy is compelling us to a coalition; but how slow, and with what jealousies, and hesitations, and reluctances, do we bear with or give up our little differences; and with what divided and balanced ef-

iciency do we serve Him, who gave his life for the world ! Oh for those days of grace and supplication, which shall cast out fear, and fill our hearts with love, and our hands with those implements which are to reap the harvest of the world—which will fill the garner of every denomination and make their place too strait ! One pentecostal day would do more to tranquillize and harmonize the church of God, than ages of controversy.

Nothing but the grace of God, subduing opposition and shedding abroad love in the hearts of men with unparalleled rapidity and power, can wake up the world from its Lethan sleep, stimulate to feeling its paralytic heart, and stay the floods of worldliness and the vortex of pleasure, and burst the chains of caste, by which the god of this world keeps up the non-intercourse of his subjects with holiness and heaven.

The revival of real holiness never commences and moves on in a congregation, or town, or city, without a strong reacting sensation ;—and it is only by the prostrating rapidity of revivals, that the infuriated resistance of persecution can be superseded. The witnesses must rise suddenly ; a nation must be born in a day. The activity and resources required to enlighten and disenthral the world, demand a vast and rapid increase of holiness by the power of God's Spirit. Religion, real heartfelt religion, is to become, at no distant day, the predominant characteristic of man, the governing principle of empires and of the world. But this, though not to be accomplished by the might and power of man, is to be accomplished by his instrumentality, and by moral means as much in advance of what have been applied, as the results are to be greater than have ever yet been witnessed.

The political renovation of the world by revolutions will demand enterprise, and treasure, and blood. But the whole boundless sacrifice and victory will be a wanton waste of life and treasure, unless Christianity, with its healing and tranquillizing power, may follow the shock of battles, and staunch the flowing blood, and bind up the wounds of a bleeding world. But to do this, no accidental effort will suffice ; no handfuls of charity occasionally dropped, as the reapers of Boaz met the exigences of a single individual. The world itself must be aroused,—the Redeemed and emancipated part, to enlighten and emancipate those that sit in darkness and the region of the shadow of death. The emancipation of man—the intellectual, political and moral emancipation of the world, must engross the desires, and concentrate the wisdom, the charity, and the enterprise of the world itself.

Revolution is to liberty and virtue only what the breaking up of winter is to a future harvest. It only removes obstacles, and throws the field open to cultivation, which must be desolate still, unless the plough pass over it, and the seed of future harvests be sown.



But who shall break up this wide spread fallow, and sow this harvest of the world? I weep to think how many oppose it,—and how few and faint the efforts which urge it on. Truly the harvest is plenteous but the laborers are few; pray ye the Lord of the harvest, that he would send down his Spirit, and thrust in laborers.

I am aware that revivals of religion, so called, have been regarded by many with suspicion, and by not a few with aversion, as the device of men, and the result of human weakness and credulity. But all who thus judge, form their opinions from hearsay, through prejudiced mediums, and not from a correct knowledge of the real, moral results of these days of mercy. That they may be *abused*, is certain; and so may civil liberty be abused. That sometimes they are alloyed by enthusiasm and fanaticism is true; but what great change of human character and condition was ever accomplished without defect? The Reformation, though the sunrise of liberty, was attended by noxious vapours and obscurations, which its growing light has chased away. The defects of Luther and of Calvin were spots on their sun; but still they were suns, without whose blessed light, the night of ages might still have brooded over the earth. In the civil wars of England, there were defects enough in the Puritans for infidels to ridicule and Christians to lament; but if, to escape these defects, the world had been bereft of their virtues, still the untutored savage had dwelt in his forest, and the rod of iron had ruled the children of the Pilgrims. Our own blessed revolution, was it marked by no excess and folly, and stained by no crime? and yet the great *principle* which beat in the heart of the nation was that of liberty.

Why must the moral renovation of man alone be expected to move on, unattended by the accidents of human imperfection,—or be discarded as wholly human, and unworthy of confidence and gratitude to God? When any thing which God in his mercy does for man, by human instrumentality, is perfect, the imperfection of revivals may occasion doubt concerning their origin and their utility.

For more than thirty years, there have been a series of revivals in our land, with increasing power, extent and frequency—unalloyed in a great measure by those irregularities which had marred some of the previous seasons of refreshing. Generally, they have been free from enthusiasm and excess—have been seasons of silent attention and deep feeling, of clear, intellectual, argumentative, doctrinal preaching, with pungent applications to the conscience, attended with deep convictions of sin, and with subsequent joy and peace in believing. Their effects upon religion and morals has been most auspicious. They have furnished, probably, three fourths of the living ministry of the evangelical churches of our land, and nearly three fourths of the members of these churches. They have reared and sustained the family altar, and trained up the ris-

ing generation in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. They have provided hearts, and hands, and means, to superintend the manifold ministrations required to organize infant and Sabbath schools, and all our benevolent voluntary associations. Thirty years ago, it was a rare thing to meet with a young person in the church; and now, more than half the professors of religion are in early life. And it may be truly said, that almost the entire moral energy by which the cause of Christ now moves on from conquering to conquer, is the result of those revivals of religion which for thirty years have been enrolling, augmenting and disciplining the sacramental host.

It has been objected, that revivals of religion are seasons of mere temporary excitement—transient as the overflowing of the summer's brook, and evanescent as visions of a heated imagination. But instead of this, they are the moral heart of this great nation, whose pulsation throbs with unceasing stroke and rising healthful tone, propelling the life-blood from the centre to every extremity. And instead of febrile dreams, and ephemeral emotions, they are fast waking up the nation to the abiding realities of God's eternal government, and affording fast practical illustration that 'godliness is profitable unto all things, both for the life that now is, as well as for that which is to come.'

It is true that the intense interest of a revival, when in a few weeks or months hundreds are brought out of darkness into marvellous light, does not continue. It is not needed, perhaps could not be permanently sustained; but that the results are transient is not true. If there be religion on earth, sustained by the exhibition of all the fruits of the Spirit, Christian graces, and good works, that religion is the abiding product of revivals. If death-beds of peace, and hopes full of immortality, are the seal of heaven's work in the soul, then does God progressively, for forty and fifty years after the revival has past away, set his seal to it that it is his own most blessed work.

It has been inquired, whether a more gradual dispensation of the Spirit were not better than these sudden outpourings. But we have been accustomed to feel that God is the best judge of this matter, and that man cannot make a revival either gradual or sudden. When he gives us drop by drop, we are thankful; and when the cloud of mercy above bursts and pours down a flood at once, we dare not request him to stay his hand,—we cannot but exult and rejoice in the exuberance of his mercy. Nor can we perceive how it is possible that 800,000,000 of souls, or any considerable part of this number, can be washed from their sins, within the most distant time to which the millennium can be deferred according to prediction, by single drops falling in such slow and deliberate succession as should not excite the fears, and should satisfy the prudence, of some apparently very good men. We doubt not

that greater revivals than have been are indispensable, to save our nation, and to save the world, by giving universal and saving empire to the kingdom of Christ; and as clouds thicken and dangers press, we look for them with strong confidence, and with the increased urgency of unutterable desire.

---

Since the preceding sheets were written, what they anticipate as demanded by the exigences of the church and nation, has begun to be verified in the providence of God. From the first of January, a series of revivals have burst out and are moving on, so extensive, numerous, and rapid, as to surpass enumeration and outrun calculation. The scenes of wonder and joy which are opening upon us in these times of refreshing it is impossible to describe. Those who witness them, and those who feel their transforming power, and those angelic messengers who bear to heaven the tidings of souls renewed and sins forgiven, can alone appreciate the glories of this rising day. We can only say 'The night is far spent, and the day is at hand.' 'Lo, this is our God, we have waited for him.' 'Joy to the world, the Lord is come!'

---

ON THE USES AND ABUSES OF THE DOCTRINE OF GOD'S PURPOSES.

The purposes of God are his eternal and universal *plan* of providential government. It is no part of the object of this paper to prove the doctrine of his purposes. It will be taken for granted that he 'worketh all things after the counsel of his own will,' and 'hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass.'

The doctrine of God's purposes is not exclusively a doctrine of revelation. It is inculcated in the Bible; but it would have been true, and the truth of it might have been discovered, even if the Bible had not been written. It is regarded as a fundamental doctrine of religion, and as standing connected with the most important practical results. At the same time, it is liable to be perverted and abused; and by the abuse of it, much prejudice has been excited against it, and much mischief has been occasioned in the church and world.

It will be my object, first, to point out the *abuses*, and, secondly, the practical *uses*, of the doctrine under consideration.

1. It is an abuse of the purposes of God to endeavor to pry into the nature and grounds of them, any further than these are disclosed in his works or in his word. In some leading particulars, God has been pleased, by the mouths of his holy prophets, to

make known his purposes. These particulars, however, are comparatively few, beyond which we are left in entire, blank ignorance. But men have not been satisfied to remain in ignorance. Attempts have been made in all ages to open the seals of fate, and pry into the secret counsels of the Most High. This was the object of the various pretences to divination and augury, which so much prevailed in ancient times. A variety of expedients have also been resorted to in modern times to gain a knowledge of future events. Some persons have presumptuously decided that they were *not* in the number of the elect,—and have abandoned themselves to consequent despair. With equal presumption, others have decided that they *were* in the number of the elect,—and in a vain confidence of heaven, have neglected to prepare for it. Some have rashly presumed that individuals around them were reprobates,—and on this account have relinquished all exertion to bring them to the knowledge of the truth.—Conclusions of this nature, and the practices growing out of them, are sinful and vain. They are an unwarrantable prying into those secret things which belong only to the Infinite Mind.

And it is equally presumptuous, in most instances, to decide upon the *grounds* or *reasons* of God's determinations. What can we know respecting the reasons of his eternal counsels, any farther than these are unfolded in his providence or in his word? He doubtless has reasons, the best reasons, for what he plans, and for what he does; and in some instances, these may seem plain to us. But beyond where they are made plain, we have no occasion, nor are we at liberty, too curiously to search.

“Not Gabriel asks the reason why,  
Nor God the reason gives;  
Nor dares the *fav'rite* angel pry  
Between the folded leaves.”

In numberless instances, the most we can say respecting the purposes and dealings of God is, ‘Even so Father, for so it seemeth good in thy sight.’

2. It is an abuse of God's purposes to set them in opposition to human freedom and accountability. This has been often done. How often do we hear it said, ‘If God has an eternal plan according to which all events are ordered, then man is a machine. He must act just as he does act, and has no freedom or accountability left.’ But is not this a rash and unwarrantable inference? Is it not rushing upon a conclusion in the dark? The fact of God's eternal purposes is demonstrable, both from reason and scripture. There need be no doubt about it, and among thinking men there would be none, any more than there is about the omniscience or omnipresence of God, were it not for the inference which has been drawn in opposition to human freedom. On the other hand, we know that man is a free agent. He has all the freedom which a

creature can have, and freedom enough to render him entirely responsible. Of this fact we have the evidence of our own consciousness; and on the ground of it are based all the dealings of God towards us. Suppose, then, that we cannot reconcile, to our own satisfaction or that of others, the purposes of God with human freedom. Are we sure, from this circumstance, that they *cannot* be reconciled? Who of the sons of earth is competent to draw a conclusion such as this? Who knows enough of the purposes of God and their influence on the one hand, and of moral agency and the things implied in it on the other, to decide peremptorily that the two cannot harmonize? How much more reasonable and safe to conclude, as the two doctrines are true, that they must be consistent, and to attribute whatever seems inexplicable to us to the darkness and imperfection of our present views?

3. It is an abuse of the purposes of God to confound them with his law, and to undertake ourselves to accomplish them, in violation of his law. Misguided and unprincipled men have not unfrequently attempted to do this. The Crusaders in the dark ages supposed it was the purpose of God that the Infidels in Palestine should be destroyed; and in violation of all law and justice, they entered on the bloody work of destroying them. The abettors of slavery have sometimes urged, in justification of themselves, the presumed *purpose* of God that negroes should be slaves. The enemies of Indian rights believe it to be the *purpose* of God that the Aboriginal Americans should waste away before their white neighbors; and hence they think themselves justified in wasting and oppressing them. But all such modes of judging are in the highest degree deceptive and wrong. The *law of God* is the only rule of our actions. His eternal purposes, or his universal plan of providential government, is a very different thing. The law of God is clearly made known to us; but respecting the purposes of God, beyond the mere fact of their existence, we can know but little;—and the little we do know was not revealed that it might be made the rule of our conduct. Long before the death of Saul, God revealed to David his determination that this proud and envious monarch should be destroyed; but David did not, on this account, feel authorized to destroy him. The law of God required him to treat Saul with respect and kindness; and with the purposes of God respecting him David had nothing to do. God would himself take care of them. God revealed to Jeremiah his determination to destroy the Jewish city and temple; but Jeremiah did not feel authorized, on this account, to join the Babylonians in the work of destruction.—The distinction here illustrated between the law and the purposes of God is one of great practical importance,—one which cannot be confounded or lost sight of, in the daily occurrences of life, without perpetual hazard.

4. It is an abuse of the purposes of God to set them in oppo-

sition to the invitations of the gospel. The invitations of the gospel are made alike to all. 'Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.' 'Whosoever will let him come, and partake of the water of life freely.' These free and universal invitations, those who preach the gospel are not only authorized but required to urge. They must urge them sincerely, earnestly, and indiscriminately, upon all their hearers. But in doing this, religious teachers have sometimes felt a check from the doctrine of God's purposes, especially his purpose of election. 'If God has determined to save only a part of mankind, why does he extend his invitations to all? How can he do it with sincerity? And how can I, believing as I do the doctrine of election, invite and urge all men, to come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved?'—To attempt reconciling the doctrine of election with the free and universal invitations of the gospel, is no part of my present object. That both doctrines are true, and consequently reconcilable, I have no doubt. It is true, on the one hand, that God did in eternity determine to save a part, and only a part, of the human family from that deserved ruin into which all had plunged themselves by sin; and it is true, on the other, that he does himself invite, and he authorizes and requires his ministers to invite, all men to partake of the water of life freely. Whatever else is false, these things are undoubtedly true. And whether *we* can reconcile them or not, in the view of God they are, beyond all question, harmoniously consistent. Consequently, it is an abuse of these doctrines to array them one against the other. It is an abuse of God's invitations to array them against his purposes; and it is an abuse of his purposes to array them against his invitations. The minister of God's word is bound to urge the invitations and motives of the gospel with as much impression and power, and with as little check and embarrassment of any kind, as though God had made and revealed no determination respecting the final salvation of men. The Apostles seem to have felt no embarrassment in going out into all the world and preaching the gospel to every creature, from any views which they entertained respecting the purposes of God; and whenever religious teachers now feel embarrassments of this sort, they may be sure that they have departed from the ground of the Apostles, and do not hold the truth as it is in *JESUS*.

5. It is an abuse of the purposes of God to make them a means of inducing sloth and discouraging effort on the part of Christians. Abuses of this nature, there is reason to fear, are not unfrequent. Christians believe that God has purposes respecting the salvation of individuals; that he is able to accomplish his purposes; that all his elect will be gathered in; and in these views they find a pillow for their consciences, and an excuse for their sloth. They quietly resign a world lying in wickedness to be disposed of according to

the sovereign will of God.—By the same considerations, they may excuse their negligence in regard to themselves and their fellow Christians. They believe that God will keep his own elect, that his promises secure the salvation of all true believers, and why should they be anxious either for themselves or for one another?—Excuses of this sort may have more influence with Christians generally, possibly with ourselves, than we have imagined. We may not be willing to speak them out in words, but the feeling which prompts them may be lurking in our hearts, and spreading its stupifying influence over all our conduct.

These excuses are the more dangerous, because they are usually associated with high notions of Orthodoxy. Those under their influence think themselves very Orthodox, it may be almost exclusively so, while they pervert their Orthodoxy to purposes of sloth and carnal indulgence.—It is worthy of notice, that the excuses here spoken of are allowed to have influence *only* in the concerns of religion. Those who hold the doctrine of God's purposes believe that they extend to all other events, as well as to the final condition of individuals. It is as certain, for instance, in the beginning of spring, whether the husbandman shall have a crop, as it is whether the souls of his children and neighbors shall be saved. Yet he uses all necessary means to secure the one, while he submissively leaves it to what he calls Divine sovereignty to take care of the other. How long shall the children of this world be wiser in their generation than the children of light!—And how long shall the children of light be wiser in things pertaining to this world, than in those pertaining to the kingdom of Christ! The purposes of God respecting the salvation of individuals were never designed to discourage the efforts of Christians, and they have no tendency, when properly understood, to produce discouragement or diminish obligation. So far from this, their whole tendency, as will be shown, is the other way. Professing Christians, ministers and others, are under as much obligation, and have more reason, to labor faithfully for the salvation of souls, than though they knew that God had formed no purposes respecting them, but all was left to their individual exertions.

6. Sinners abuse the purposes of God, when they urge them as an excuse for continuing in sin. This species of abuse is akin to the one last mentioned, and is also of frequent occurrence. How many are there, and among these not a few who ought to know better, who, when pressed on the subject of religion, are ever ready to reply, 'Why should we give ourselves any trouble about it? If it is the purpose of God to save us, we shall be saved, and if not, we cannot be, let us do what we may.' It need not be said here, that this is an egregious abuse of the doctrine of God's purposes, and an application of it to the concerns of religion which is never made in the ordinary affairs of life. The avaricious

man does not say, 'If it is the purpose of God that I shall gain an estate, it will come to me, and if not I cannot obtain it, and therefore I will give myself no further trouble on the subject.' Neither does the ambitious man say, 'If it is the purpose of God that I shall rise to honorable distinction, I shall rise, and if not, I cannot, and why should I exert myself more?'" In worldly things, persons know very well how to unite their faith in the purposes of God, with vigorous and persevering efforts to secure the objects of their desire; and why should they be less knowing, or less in earnest, in securing the salvation of their souls?

7. Those abuse the purposes of God, who draw from them arguments tending to diminish, if not destroy, a sense of sin.—There is no end to the deceptions which men have practised on themselves, and no shifts too absurd for them to make, in favor of their darling lusts. The doctrine of God's purposes has sometimes been held in such a way, as to destroy the very existence of sin, and even render it impossible that sin should exist. 'The purposes of God,' it is said 'fix every thing, and every thing takes place exactly according to them. One man answers the end for which he was made as much as another. One man does the will of God as well as another. None have it in their power to break the decrees of God, or to act contrary to his eternal will.'—It is remarkable that the abettors of this philosophical mania are as quick to feel and resent injuries done to themselves, as any other persons whatever. But why, according to your principles, resent an injury? The man who defames and robs you, who fires your dwelling and murders your family, you say answers the end he was made for, and does the will of God, as truly as the most virtuous citizen. Why then be angry with him, or seek his hurt? If, in order to escape the restraints of religion and the punishment of our sins, we are willing to be blocks, then let us be consistently so. And let not one block be angry with another block, because this other has been jostled against it to its hurt.

8. Those abuse the doctrine of God's purposes who draw arguments from them to contradict his word. This is indeed true of most of those characters to whom reference has been already made. But there are other classes who have not yet been mentioned.—The scriptures inform us that a portion of our race, notwithstanding all that has been done for them, will persist in their sins and perish forever. 'These shall go away into everlasting punishment.' 'Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power.' But a metaphysical argument has been constructed, based on a perverted view of the purposes of God, which goes to contradict these declarations of his word. 'The plan of God,' it is said,

\* It is generally understood that Bonaparte was a Fatalist. Yet he did not sluggishly leave it to the fates to accomplish the purposes of his ambition.



‘ which secures the highest good of all his creatures, will be infallibly executed ; and hence the highest good of all will be attained. How then can there be sin or misery in the future world ? And how shall any creature be made forever miserable ?’—Were I disposed to examine this specious argument, a variety of questions might be asked respecting it, and insurmountable objections to the positions assumed in it might be urged. But this is no part of my present plan. We *know* the argument is fallacious, as it contradicts not only the plain testimony of God’s word, but also the experience of all mankind. We might prove just as well, by the mode of reasoning here used, that there is no sin or misery in this world, as that there will be none in the other world. Yet who would rely on his metaphysics, in opposition to his own experience and senses, to prove that there is no sin or misery upon the earth ?

I have here briefly exhibited some of the more common perversions of the doctrine of God’s purposes. It may be thought, perhaps, that a doctrine so easily perverted ought not to be muddled with. If true, it ought not to be publicly discussed. But why should men be wiser than God ? If God has inculcated this doctrine, in his works and in his word, then it is safe for men to study it, and endeavor to understand it. It ought, indeed, to be handled with caution, and doubtless with greater caution than in some instances it has been. Still the perversions and abuses of it furnish no sufficient reason why it should be neglected.

But this will more clearly appear, in view of the important practical *uses* to which the doctrine in question may be applied.

[*To be continued.*]

---

JAPAN.

The empire of Japan consists of three large islands, and a multitude of small ones, at the eastern extremity of Asia. Its rank among the Asiatic monarchies is next to that of China in political and moral importance, and it claims special attention from the singularity of its government, its numerous population, its progress in the arts of civilized life, and the peculiar manners of its people. The signal success which here once crowned the effort to introduce Christianity, the subsequent extirpation of that religion, and the jealous and effectual care since taken to prevent its re-introduction, entitle this country to the particular consideration of the friends of missions.

The group of islands which form this powerful monarchy, stretches from the 30th to the 41st degree of North latitude ; and from the 131st to the 142d degree of longitude East from Greenwich. Nippon, the most considerable, is about 750 miles in length, by

about 80 of medial breadth. Ximo, or as it is sometimes called, Kiusiu, is about 150 miles by 90; and Sikokf, the third, is about half the size of this, or 90 miles by 45. The whole group, especially if we include the island of Matsmai or Jesso, has about the same superficial extent as the British Isles, whose physical and moral influence at one extreme of the eastern continent, it seems capable of rivalling at the other. Matsmai, just mentioned, is a large island at the N. E. extremity of the group, which has received some Japanese colonies; but is regarded rather as a foreign conquest than an integral part of the empire.

The area of the Japanese territories may be stated, in round numbers, at 100,000 square miles. The population cannot be estimated with any precision. All who have ever visited the country unite in representing it as astonishingly great. The most moderate accounts rate it at between 15 and 20 millions; while recent estimates make it from 35 to 50 millions. It is certain that the empire contains some of the largest cities in the world, that it everywhere teems with life, and that agriculture is here carried to a degree of perfection scarcely conceived of elsewhere. Even the steep declivities of the mountains are, by being cut into terraces, made to reward the reaper's toil. The whole surface is in a state of high cultivation. The maxims of Japanese industry, which are very rigid, admit of few domestic animals; consequently more land is devoted to the sustenance of man, the inhabitants confining themselves chiefly to a vegetable diet. In view of these facts, the population of the empire, prodigious as it seems, will not appear incredible.

The country is full of mountains and hills, presenting a very picturesque appearance. High and precipitous rocks line the coasts, which are lashed by the surges of a stormy ocean, seeming to forbid all access to the adventurous voyager. Kämpfer says the navigation of the Japanese seas is the most dangerous in the world. They are foggy and tempestuous, with strong and rapid currents. In the days of Portuguese commerce, he was regarded as having traded successfully with Japan, to whom one ship out of four returned in safety.

Jeddo, the capital of the empire, is one of the largest and most populous cities in the world. The Japanese have stated it to be 63 miles in circuit, which was probably meant to include its suburbs,—and to contain ten millions of inhabitants. I cannot but regard the latter part of this statement as exaggerated, while several considerations oblige me to estimate the population at not less than one million.

Miaco, the second city of the empire, is in an inland situation, and contains about 500,000 inhabitants. Here are excellent manufactures of velvets and silks, of gold, silver, and copper. Those of steel are carried to the highest degree of perfection; of which their incomparable scymitars, said greatly to surpass the best Span-

ish blades, afford proof. Here the royal coin is struck, and all the books are printed. Here is the palace of the Dairi, or ecclesiastical emperor, with his court of literati. There are many other large and opulent towns, of which little is known.

Inland communication is greatly facilitated by good roads, kept in constant repair. The harbors, though shut against the commercial enterprize of Europeans, are filled with large and small craft. In the shops and markets are found all sorts of wares. The Chinese is the most important part of their foreign trade. That with the Dutch is now very inconsiderable, two vessels a year being all that are employed by that nation in it. These ships undergo a close examination by the Japanese, before permission is given to unload their cargoes. As soon as they cast anchor, they are boarded by Japanese officers, all the warlike implements taken into custody, an exact inventory made of everything on board, and an accurate list of all the people who belong to the vessel. Officers are stationed in every part of the vessel while discharging, to see that nothing is taken away clandestinely. All communication with the shore is cut off. At night the seamen are carefully counted over to see that none are missing. A fact is related, which serves to shew their excessive care to prevent foreigners from entering their country. It once happened that a sailor fell overboard in the night, unobserved, and at the review next morning was not to be found. Suddenly, all proceedings were stopped; and the fear lest it should be a Romish priest, who had made his escape into the country, filled the Japanese with such consternation, that they appeared like men frantic, and some of them were already preparing to put an end to their lives, to avoid being compelled to atone, by an ignominious death, for their neglect, when the man's body, being seen floating in the sea, at once dissipated their fears.

The Japanese shave the top of the head, the hair on the sides being turned up and fastened on the crown. They entertain a high sense of honor, and observe towards each other the most ceremonious politeness. They exercise great forbearance in debate; but their pride is excessive; their resentment deep, rancorous, and invincible; and their revenge is satiated only by the poignard, which they always carry about their persons. Their public amusements consist of dramatic entertainments, which are said not to be inferior to those of the most polished nations of Europe. The state of public morals appears to be very corrupt.

While the nations of Southern Asia are, in general, characterized by imbecility of body and mind, the Japanese are a hardy, robust, and warlike race. This difference is without doubt to be attributed, in some degree, to the difference of surrounding scenery; the former having their birth on widely extended plains, where the eye seeks relief in vain from the unvarying, sameness which every-

where presents itself ; while the latter dwell in Alpine regions, encompassed on every side by the most striking and sublime of nature's works.

Captain Golownin of the Russian Imperial Navy, who spent about two years, from 1811 till 1813, in this remarkable country, and whose narration contains the latest account we have of it, considers the Japanese as one of the most enlightened nations in the world. Though they cannot pretend to rival the Europeans in the abstruse sciences, and the cultivation which pervades the upper classes of society, they far excel them in the general circulation of knowledge. There is no man, however humble his station, who cannot read and write. They are exceedingly fond of reading ; even the common soldiers on guard read almost incessantly. When Golownin was passing through the country, the common people manifested an eager curiosity, and wrote down his answers to their inquiries. Perhaps no people are better acquainted with the history of their own country. They understand Geometry, which enables them to survey with tolerable accuracy. They have a system of Astronomy, and construct maps. I have seen a Japanese map of the empire, drawn with a good degree of skill and correctness. Schools and colleges are numerous, and education is said to be conducted without having recourse to corporeal punishment.

In writing, they make use of two alphabets : 1. The Chinese, in which almost every word has a separate sign. These signs, the Japanese say, they borrowed some thousand years ago from the Chinese. This sort of writing is employed in books of the higher kind, in official papers, and in the correspondence of the upper classes. 2. The Japanese alphabet, properly so called, consisting of 48 letters, and used by the lower classes.

How near the resemblance is between the languages of Japan and China, is a problem of great interest to the friends of missions. We are told, on the one hand, that the learned language of the former is the ancient Chinese ; and some are of the opinion that their vernacular tongue, literature, civilization, and nation itself, were derived from China. On the other hand, the language, so far as it has yet been investigated, betrays few indications of a Chinese origin ; its words are not monosyllabic like those of the Chinese ; its conjugations and syntax have a distinct and original character.

The Japanese are more inquisitive, and discover greater elasticity of mind, than is general among the Asiatic nations. Their civilization, like that of the Chinese, seems to be stationary ; but in the language of an eminent modern geographer,\* “ Japan has germs of improvement, which offer some possible prospect of a moral revolution. The brave and intelligent Japanese comes

\* Malte-Brun.

nearer to the European, by possessing a more masculine character, and a higher degree of civil liberty."

The government of this empire is of a singular nature. There are two monarchs, one secular, the other ecclesiastical. For the last 250 years, the secular emperor, or *Kubo*, has been the sole sovereign of Japan. The *Dairi*, or pontiff, resides at Miaco, where he keeps a splendid court, chiefly literary. He superintends the ecclesiastical affairs of the empire, but has no concern in the temporal administration. His palace is inaccessible to strangers. He is never allowed to go out of its precincts, but is held in a kind of princely captivity by the *Kubo*.

The empire is made up of 66 principalities, ruled by chiefs, who are nearly absolute in their respective domains, but are vassals to the supreme monarch. These princes are responsible to him for their administration, while each enjoys the services of his own district, maintains a court of his own, and keeps up a military force. The civil constitution of Japan bears no distant resemblance to the old feudal system of Gothic Europe.

The laws are few and brief, and are posted up in some convenient place in every town and village in the empire. The penal code is without doubt the most severe that has been enacted since the laws of Draco; and, like them, may be said to be written in blood. There is scarcely a crime, but is punished with death; attended, often, with the direst ignominy, and the most excruciating tortures. Public officers, found guilty of mal-administration, not only suffer punishment themselves, but their whole families, and even their more remote relatives, are put to death at the same hour, however distant from each other. Parents are made responsible for the conduct of their children; and the crimes of an individual involve the whole street or town where he resides in the same punishment with himself. This leads them to subject the character and conduct of their neighbors to a severe scrutiny, and gives them the right of excluding from habitancy among them any person with whose character they are not satisfied. Such institutions may indeed lessen the number of crimes, and they have therefore been applauded by certain travellers; but they deprive innocence of its security, and invade the tranquillity of domestic life. Who would not run the risk of being robbed once in his life, rather than be every moment shuddering at the apprehension of having his life taken for the offences of his neighbors!

Japan has no political relations with other states. Secure in its insular position, and confiding in the valor of its immense population, it dreads no foreign attack. There is little hazard in saying that no power on earth could effect its subjugation. The vast empire of China has been repeatedly overrun and reduced to vassalage; but Japan has never yet received a foreign yoke. On the other hand, it has no disposition to intermeddle in the concerns of

its neighbors. The maxims of its external policy are reducible to this one—to exclude all foreign influence, and shut up itself within its own sea-girt domain.

To China, the Japanese still pay great deference, as appears, from the regard they have for its language and literature. The books of Confucius are read in their schools, and furnish, to a large part of the nation, the basis of religious belief. Their annals go back to the year 660 B. C., when a king named Sin-Mu is said to have lived, who is regarded as the founder of their monarchy. He seems to have done for them, what Cecrops and Cadmus did for the Greeks,—having, as is supposed, introduced a colony from China, and with it civilization, laws, and a regular form of government. From him descended a long line of emperors, 107 in number, known by the title of Dairi, and uniting in their persons all spiritual and temporal authority. In the twelfth century of the Christian era, the Dairi was obliged to admit the Kubo, or commander of the forces, to a share in the civil administration. About the year 1585, Faxiba, the son of a peasant, and who had himself gained a subsistence by the employment of a wood-cutter, having raised himself by his superior abilities to the command of the army, reduced to subjection all the Japanese princes, and stripped the Dairi of the last remains of temporal power. Unwilling, however, to do violence to the prejudices of the people, who had been accustomed to hold their ancient sovereigns in the highest veneration, he permitted the Dairi still to be supreme in spiritual affairs, to keep a splendid court, and to enjoy the most ample honors, while he contented himself with the modest title of *Kubo*, or general of the army. In a few years, however, he assumed the name of Taycosama, Most-high and sovereign lord; and commanded himself to be adored, after his decease, as the god of war.

There are two leading sects of religion; the sect of Sinto, and that of Budso. The former is the more ancient. It acknowledges a Supreme Being, who dwells in the highest heavens, and is too far exalted above men to receive their homage, or take notice of their concerns. Its votaries, therefore, confine their adoration to inferior deities, whom they suppose to control the operations of nature, and to have the power of obtaining for them the rewards of a future state. They believe that while the souls of the virtuous are admitted to the realms of light just beneath the thirty three heavens of their gods, the wicked wander in the air till their offences shall be expiated.

The other sect, that of Budso, was originally from Ceylon, and is the same with that of Buddha or Boodh, which spread over Hindoostan, Burmah, Siam, China, and Corea. Buddha, from whom this sect took its rise, and who is adored as a god, is said to have been born in Ceylon, 800 or 1000 years before Christ. One of the most prominent articles of his religion is the *Metempsychosis*,

or transmigration of souls. This sect believe the souls of animals, as well as of men, to be immortal, and both to be of the same nature; consequently it is a great crime to slay an animal, and still more to eat its flesh. The virtuous will be admitted to a paradise of gay fields; while the wicked, after being tormented awhile in a place of misery, are sent back to earth to inhabit the bodies of loathsome reptiles.

Besides these two sects of Polytheists, there is a third, consisting of moralists and philosophers, known by the name of Shuto, or Sjooto. They seem to be a kind of Deists. They concur for the most part in the dogmas of Confucius, maintaining the existence of a supreme, all-pervading Intelligence, whom they suppose to be *the soul of the world*, from which the minds of men originally emanated, and to which they will eventually return, as rivers to the ocean. They place the supreme good in virtue; but alas! not in such virtue as the law of Jehovah prescribes. They allow of self-murder, when it is the only means of avoiding a shameful death: it is therefore often practised. They worship no subordinate deities, and have no temples or forms of religious worship. Having formerly been suspected of favoring Christianity, they deem it expedient to pay an ostensible homage to the gods of their country.

The temples of the Sintoists do not contain any visible idol or representation of the Supreme Being; but there is sometimes in a box a little image of some inferior deity, to whom the temple is consecrated. The temples of the Budsoists, on the contrary, abound with idols, of singular shape, and sometimes of stupendous size. Thunberg visited and has described the great temple at Miaco. It is 500 feet long, supported by ninety-six pillars, some of which are more than six feet in diameter. It has several lofty but narrow entrances, and the interior is gloomy. The idol Dai-bud, placed nearly in the middle, is of a magnitude sufficient to strike the spectator with terror and awe. Six men may sit, it is said, on the palm of his hand; and the distance across the shoulders appears not less than thirty feet. The image, which is richly gilded, is in a sitting posture, with its legs crossed before it, in the Hindoo manner. Another temple, little less magnificent, is sacred to the god Quanwon, who sits in the middle, furnished with thirty-six hands, and surrounded by inferior deities, to the number, it is said, of 33,333. The number of these is designed to represent the infinite greatness and power of the Supreme Being.

Some of the gods are malignant beings, whom the Japanese worship to prevent their doing them any harm. Others are the spirits of departed kings, heroes, and learned men. Of these, the most eminent is Amida, whose worship came over from China many ages ago. Each god has a paradise of his own, to which he ultimately receives his worshippers. The paradise of Amida

is at such a distance from the earth, that souls cannot reach it till after a voyage of three years. Any body can be admitted there after death, by frequently repeating the words—"Blessed Amida, save us." In the account which these people give of their god Xaca, we may perhaps detect a corruption of the doctrine of the Messiah, preached by the apostle Thomas in India, and thence conveyed to these distant shores. They pretend that Xaca was born of a virgin queen; that he retired into the deserts of Siam, and there underwent severe sufferings to expiate the sins of men; that coming out of this wilderness, he assembled some disciples, and preached a heavenly doctrine in divers countries. He wrote several books, which disclose the doctrine of a future life, or rather of an almost endless series of transmigrations, and which are received by the Japanese as the oracles of divine truth.

An incredible number of temples have been built to the honor of Amida and Xaca; the cities are full of them, and their magnificence is equal to their number. On the delightful plain which surrounds the lake of Oitz, there are, it is said, 3000 pagodas. The votaries of these gods go to great lengths of superstition; they inflict severe tortures upon themselves; sometimes throw themselves headlong from rocks, or bury themselves alive in caves; and not unfrequently go out from the shore in barks, with stones tied to their necks, singing the praises of their gods, and cast themselves into the sea. These devotees are regarded as saints and martyrs, and their memory held sacred by the survivors.

(To be continued.)

## REVIEWS.

THE CASE OF THE CHEROKEE NATION AGAINST THE STATE OF GEORGIA, argued and determined at the Supreme Court of the United States, January term, 1831; with an Appendix, containing the opinion of Chancellor Kent on the Case; the Treaties between the United States and the Cherokee Indians; the Act of Congress of 1802, entitled 'an Act to regulate Intercourse with the Indian Tribes' &c.; and the Laws of Georgia relative to the Country occupied by the Cherokee Indians, within the boundary of that State. By RICHARD PETERS, Counselor at Law. Philadelphia: John Grigg. pp. 286.

In our last Volume, we repeatedly and in strong terms expressed our opinion relative to the pending controversy between the Southern Indians and the State of Georgia. See pp. 51, 141, 492, 517. Considering the injustice and cruelty with which these In-



dians were menaced, and the disgrace which must inevitably attach to our national character, so far as the nation became involved in this controversy, we could not be silent. We must at least wash our hands of the wrongs about to be perpetrated, and leave a memorial behind us, not only that we had no part in them, but that we did what we could, with our means of influence, to prevent them.

For similar reasons, we have thought it high time to recur to the subject. This dreadful controversy is still continued, and wrongs and oppressions, which a year ago were only feared, have now become matter of shameful history. The territory and rights of the offending Cherokees have been invaded, and their liberty, property and lives have been violently taken away. Redress has been sought, but not obtained; and the nation is becoming more and more involved in this bloody quarrel.

It is generally known that, in March last, the case of the Cherokees was argued and determined in the Supreme Court of the United States. The volume before us contains a full report of that case, drawn up by Richard Peters Esq., Reporter of Decisions. Our principal object now is, to make our readers acquainted with this interesting volume, with the case it contains, and with the present state of the controversy relative to the Indians.

The case was submitted by Mr. John Ross, principal Chief of the Cherokee nation. It was on a motion for 'an injunction to restrain the state of Georgia from the execution of certain laws of that state, which go to annihilate the Cherokees, as a political society, and to seize for the use of Georgia the lands of the nation, which [in addition to their original claim] have been assured to them by the United States in solemn treaties, repeatedly made and still in force.' The grounds of this motion are set forth in a Bill, detailing at length the rights and the grievances of the Cherokees, and their claims to the interposition of the Judiciary of the United States. Their cause was argued, with great eloquence and power, by Mr. Sergeant and Mr. Wirt. The state of Georgia made no defence. The arguments of the gentlemen above named, the decision of a majority of the Court pronounced by Chief Justice Marshall, and separate opinions by several of the dissenting Judges, are here given. Before the complainants were permitted to bring their case, they were required to consult, and did consult, some of the most eminent Jurists in the country,—by whom they were unanimously encouraged to proceed. One of these was Chancellor Kent of New York, whose opinion is published in an Appendix to the volume.

This case of the Cherokees, in every view which can be taken of it, was one of pre-eminent interest and importance. On the one side was an exasperated and powerful community, one of the original states of this Union, who sullenly refused to come forward

and defend its alleged rights, but who, if the decision should be against it, had virtually threatened to set it at defiance. While on the other, was a venerable body of the Aborigines of our country—who had been oppressed and persecuted, whose soil had been invaded and whose rights trampled on—pleading for justice, where alone they could expect to be heard. The fates, not of one or two, but of thousands—of a whole nation, with all its varied interests and concerns—seemed to be hanging on the decision. No wonder the Counsel for the Indians felt themselves oppressed, nigh to be overwhelmed, with the weight of responsibility which lay upon them. Their sense of the delicacy and importance of the case are happily expressed by Mr. Wirt in the opening of his plea.

“The complainants and their counsel are fully aware of the delicacy of this question. They feel all the difficulties and embarrassments, judicial and political, which surround it. They have thought it their duty, therefore, to weigh the measure well, in all its aspects, in advance. They have not come hither rashly and unadvisedly. The complainants have not been permitted to proceed on the opinion of any single individual of the profession. They have been required to consult, and they have accordingly consulted, several of the most enlightened and eminent jurists of this country, residing in different and distant parts of the continent; and it was not until the perfect concurrence of them all had been ascertained, on all the points involved in this motion, that the resolution was taken to bring it before the court. These jurists unite in the opinion that the laws of Georgia, here in question, are unconstitutional, as being repugnant to the constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States; that this court has perfect jurisdiction on the subject, and may award the injunction which is prayed; and that in the exercise of this jurisdiction they stand, of right and duty, free of all control or influence from any other department of the government. With such a unanimity of opinion, no other course of duty remained for us but to bring this subject before the court. The fact of this previous consultation is mentioned with no expectation that it will influence the decision of this court. We know too well the character of this tribunal, to entertain any such vain and idle expectation. We mention it, to acquit ourselves of all rashness and inconsiderateness in taking this step: to satisfy your honors that we know too well what is due to our country and to this high tribunal, to have been guilty of the levity and folly of acting on this solemn subject as on a professional matter of every day's occurrence. Even after all this precaution, all this previous deliberation and consultation, we approach the subject with great anxiety; for we perceive, and it would be a vain attempt to disguise it, the delicate and painful situation in which the motion cannot fail to place this honorable court.

“We say nothing of our own responsibility on the occasion. This we are content to bear. But for the sake of the court, if we could have perceived any other course of moral or professional conduct that remained for us, than to do our duty and to leave the issue

to Providence, we should not have troubled your honors with this motion. It is best, however, that the question should be decided and put to rest; for so long as the complainants shall be instructed that they have relief here, they cannot rest contented until the experiment shall be made. If your honors believe that you can give them relief, and shall give it, we have a firm belief that you will be sustained by the moral power of the American community, and that all doubt and resistance will disappear. If, on the other hand, you shall decide that you have not the jurisdiction which we claim; however much we regret it, we shall bow with respect to your decision, and the complainants will learn that they must look to some other quarter for the redress of their grievances; though to what other quarter on this earth they can look, with any shadow of hope, God only knows. They have not come to you, in the first instance, with their complaints. They have tried the quarter from which relief was most naturally to have been expected; the quarter to which their past experience had taught them to look with confidence, and and to which they have never looked in vain until within the two last years. They have tried that quarter, and they have failed. They have come to you now; because without your aid they have found, as they allege in their bill, that they are wholly remediless."

By the Constitution of the United States, the Supreme Court has jurisdiction in all cases in which a *state* shall be a party; and this same instrument, as narrowed by an amendment, declares that a state may be a party, when called before the Supreme Court by another state, or by a *foreign state*. In the case under consideration, the state of Georgia was a party. There was, therefore, a proper defendant. And the only question as to jurisdiction was, whether there was a proper plaintiff,—or whether the Cherokees were, in the sense of the Constitution, a *foreign state or nation*.

"This," says Mr. Wirt, "is the very knot of the controversy, which requires to be deliberately and carefully untied.

Let us resolve the question into its elements and inquire,

1. Whether the Cherokee nation be a *state*? And,
2. Whether it be a *foreign state* in the sense of the Constitution?"

We would gladly follow the eloquent speaker in his examination of these questions, and present an analysis of the argument, especially of those parts in which he comments on the several treaties with the Indians; but our limits will not permit. We may have occasion to recur to it, and furnish some extracts, before we close. The following is an epitome of it, as summed up by the speaker.

"Upon the whole, may it please your honors; we are not aware of any test that can be fairly applied to the subject, which will not conduct us to the same conclusion, that the complainants are a *state* and a *foreign state* in the sense of the judicial branch of the constitution; which is manifestly a sense purely *political* and not at all *geographical*.

"1. Is *allegiance* the test? Then are they a *foreign state*; for they owe no allegiance to any other government than their own.

"2. Is recognition by treaty the test? Then are they a *foreign state*; for they have been so recognized by the government of the United States, from the treaty of Hopewell in 1785 down to the present day.

"3. Is the right to hold the exclusive possession of their territory, and to give the supreme law upon it the test? Then are they a *foreign state*; for every branch of the government of the United States has concurred in according to them these rights.

"4. Is the right to make legitimate war upon the United States the test? Then are they a *foreign state*; for all our treaties with them, and all our practice under those treaties, admit this right as unquestionable.

"5. Is individual alienage the test? Then are they a *foreign state*; for all our treaties, laws and constitution, admit that they are not citizens of the United States, and if not citizens, they are necessarily aliens, there being no middle class recognized by our political institutions.

"6. Is the language and reason of this constitutional provision the test? Then are they a *foreign state*; for by the language they are a *foreign state*, if *foreign* to our confederacy: and by the reason they are a *foreign state*; since standing upon a *national compact with the United States*, they have a right to the jurisdiction of the *national court* in the exposition that contract.

"7. Are civilization, religion, agriculture and a capacity for self-government essential to the consummation of their character as a *foreign state*? Then are they a *foreign state*; for according to the allegations of the bill they are at least upon a *par* with their white neighbors in these respects, whose political existence as a state is not to be questioned.

"Thus they unite in themselves every test which, according to the law of nations, is deemed essential to the constitution of a *foreign state*. If we look to the specific clause of the constitution under question, and construe it either by its letter or reason, we are conducted to the same conclusion, that they are a *foreign state*. If we regard the test which has been heretofore presented by this court itself, a *recognition by our own government*; this too concurs in repeated and solemn acts, in affixing the same character to them, that of a *foreign state*.

"On the other hand, if the objections to their being a *foreign state* be considered, we have seen that they proceed either from confounding the *geographical* with the *political* meaning of the words *foreign state*; or from erroneously considering a *partial dependence* on the United States as *such a dependence as destroys their political existence as a separate state*.

"For, 1. if the objection be that they lie within the *territorial limits* of Georgia, we have seen that they do not lie within the *territorial jurisdiction* of Georgia; and that although her chartered limits give her the *ultimate domain*, they give her *no present dominion*, and do not, in the slightest degree, affect the *present political condition* of the Cherokee nation.

"2. If the objection be that the principle of discovery, as agreed upon by the potentates of Europe, leaves them only the *occupancy* of their lands; we answer that it is a *perpetual occupancy to them and their heirs*: for in the language of this court, *they have a legal and just right to retain their lands and to use them as they please: they have a right to give the law exclusively on these lands*, in the character of a separate state, and this *for ever*; and they have a right to make *legitimate* war for these lands, even upon the United States.

"3. Is the objection that they have acknowledged themselves under the protection of the United States? Vattel, we have seen, looks at this specific objection, and declares that it does not impair their sovereignty as a state; provided they retain the rights which we have shown they have retained.

"4. Is the objection that they are a *domestic* state, because within the territorial limits of the United States? But this is changing the idea of this clause of the constitution from a *political* to a *geographical* one. *We have no domestic states except the states of the union*. All other states, if they be states at all (as we have found the Cherokee nation to be,) are necessarily, *foreign states*."

Having settled, as he supposed, this previous question, Mr. Wirt proceeded to show, first, that the case, as made by the Bill, is of a judicial and not of political character, and in all respects a *proper one* for the jurisdiction of the Court; and, secondly, that it is a proper one for an *injunction* from the chancery side of the honorable Court.

In discussing this latter point, we have the following eloquent passage, which, in connexion with the concluding paragraphs, it would be injustice to our readers not to quote.

"Shall we be asked (the question has been asked elsewhere) how this court will enforce its injunction, in case it shall be awarded? I answer, that it will be time enough to meet that question, when it shall arise. At present the question is, whether the court, by its constitution, possesses the jurisdiction to which we appeal; and it is beginning at the wrong end of the inquiry to ask how the jurisdiction, if possessed, is to be enforced. No court takes this course in deciding such a question. They examine the question of jurisdiction by the law which creates the tribunal and marks out its powers and duties. If they find the jurisdiction there, they exercise it; and leave to future consideration the mode of enforcing it in case it shall be resisted.

"Sir, what is the value of that government in which the decrees of its courts can be mocked at and defied with impunity. Of that government did I say? It is no government at all, or at best a flimsy web of form, "capable of holding only the feeblest insects, while the more powerful of wing break through at pleasure."

"If a strong state of this union assert a claim against a weak one, which the latter denies, where is the arbiter between them? Our constitution says that this court shall be the arbiter. But if the

strong state refuses to submit to your arbitrament, what then? Are you to consider whether you can, of yourselves, and by the mere power inherent in the court, enforce your jurisdiction, before you will exercise it? Will you decline a jurisdiction clearly committed to you by the constitution, from the fear that you cannot by your own powers give it effect, and thus test the extent of your jurisdiction, not by the constitution, but by your own physical capacity to enforce it?

"Sir, unless the government be false to the trust which the people have confided to it, your authority will be sustained. I believe that if the injunction shall be awarded, there is a moral force in the public sentiment of the American community, which will, alone, sustain it, and constrain obedience. At all events, let us do our duty, and the people of the United States will take care that others do theirs. If they do not, there is the end of the government, and the union is dissolved.

"For if the judiciary be struck from the system, what is there of any value that will remain? Sir, the government cannot subsist without it. It would be as rational to talk of a solar system without a sun. No, sir, the people of the United States know the value of this institution too well, to suffer it to be put down, or trammelled in its action, by the dictates of others. It will be sustained in whatever course its own wisdom, patriotism and virtues shall direct, by the respect, the affections, the suffrage, and, if necessary, by the arms of the country. It has been an object of reverence to the best and wisest men of our country, from the first movements of our constitution to the present day. It has been considered by them all as the key-stone of our political arch, the crown of its beauty, and the bond of its strength: nor will the people suffer it to be touched by rash and unskilful hands, for the worst of purposes, in the worst of times, even if there are any among us so hardy as to meditate it. If, then, I am asked how the injunction of this court, if granted, is to be enforced, I answer, fearlessly, by the majesty of the people of the United States, before which, canting anarchy (under the prostituted name of patriotism) and presuming ignorance, if they exist, will hide their heads.

"Sir, I have done.

"I have presented to you all the views that have occurred to me as bearing materially on this question. I have endeavored to satisfy you that, according to the supreme law of the land, you have before you proper parties and a proper case to found your original jurisdiction: that the case is one which warrants and most imperiously demands an injunction, and, unless its aspect be altered by an answer and evidence (which I confidently believe it cannot be,) that if there ever was a case which called for a decree of *perpetual peace*, this is the case.

"It is with no ordinary feelings that I am about to take leave of this cause. The existence of this remnant of a once great and mighty nation is at stake, and it is for your honors to say, whether they shall be blotted out from the creation, in utter disregard of all our treaties. They are here in the last extremity, and with them

must perish forever the honor of the American name. The faith of our nation is fatally linked with their existence, and the blow which destroys them quenches forever our own glory: for what glory can there be of which a patriot can be proud, after the good name of his country shall have departed? We may gather laurels on the field and trophies on the ocean, but they will never hide this foul and bloody blot upon our escutcheon. "Remember, the Cherokee nation," will be answer enough to the proudest boasts that we can ever make—answer enough to cover with confusion the face and the heart of every man among us, in whose bosom the last spark of grace has not been extinguished. Such, it is possible, there may be, who are willing to glory in their own shame, and to triumph in the disgrace which they are permitted to heap upon this nation. But, thank heaven, they are comparatively few. The great majority of the American people see this subject in its true light. They have hearts of flesh in their bosoms, instead of hearts of stone, and every rising and setting sun witnesses the smoke of the incense from the thousands and tens of thousands of domestic altars, ascending to the throne of grace, to invoke its guidance and blessing on your councils. The most undoubting confidence is reposed in this tribunal.

"We know that whatever can be properly done for this unfortunate people will be done by this honorable court. Their cause is one that must come home to every honest and feeling heart. They have been true and faithful to us, and have a right to expect a corresponding fidelity on our part. Through a long course of years, they have followed our counsel with the docility of children. *Our* wish has been *their* law. We asked them to become civilized, and they became so. They assumed our dress, copied our names, pursued our course of education, adopted our form of government, embraced our religion, and have been proud to imitate us in every thing in their power. They have watched the progress of our prosperity with the strongest interest, and have marked the rising grandeur of our nation with as much pride as if they had belonged to us. They have even adopted our resentments; and in our war with the Seminole tribes, they voluntarily joined our arms, and gave effectual aid in driving back those barbarians from the very state that now oppresses them. They threw upon the field in that war a body of men, who proved by their martial bearing, their descent from the noble race that were once the lords of these extensive forests—men worthy to associate with the "lion," who, in their own language, "walks upon the mountain tops." They fought side by side with our present chief magistrate, and received his repeated thanks for their gallantry and conduct.

"May it please your honors, they have refused to us no gratification which it has been in their power to grant. We asked them for a portion of their lands, and they ceded it. We asked them again and again, and they continued to cede, until they have now reduced themselves within the narrowest compass that their own subsistence will permit. What return are we about to make to them for all this kindness? We have pledged, for their protection and for the guar-

antee of the remainder of their lands, the faith and honor of our nation; a faith and honor never sullied, nor even drawn into question until now. We promised them, and they trusted us. *They have trusted us. Shall they be deceived?* They would as soon expect to see their rivers run upwards on their sources, or the sun roll back in his career, as that the United States would prove false to them, and false to the word so solemnly pledged by their Washington, and renewed and perpetuated by his illustrious successors.

“Is this the high mark to which the American nation has been so strenuously and successfully passing forward? Shall we sell the mighty meed of our high honors, at so worthless a price, and in two short years, cancel all the glory which we have been gaining before the world, for the last half century? Forbid it, Heaven!

“I will hope for better things. There is a spirit that will yet save us. I trust that we shall find it here, in this sacred court; where no foul and malignant demon of party enters to darken the understanding or to deaden the heart, but where all is clear, calm, pure, vital, and firm. I cannot believe that this honorable court, possessing the power of preservation, will stand by, and see these people stripped of their property and extirpated from the earth, while they are holding up to us their treaties and claiming the fulfilment of our engagements. If truth and faith and honor and justice have fled from every other part of our country, we shall find them here. If not,—our sun has gone down in treachery, blood, and crime, in the face of the world; and, instead of being proud of our country, as heretofore, we may well call upon the rocks and mountains to hide our shame from earth and heaven.”

The decision of the Court was delivered by the Chief Justice, and is a short but luminous exhibition of the views entertained by a majority of the Judges.

“If courts were permitted to indulge their sympathies, a case better calculated to excite them can scarcely be imagined. A people once numerous, powerful, and truly independent, found by our ancestors in the quiet and uncontrolled possession of an ample domain, gradually sinking beneath our superior policy, our arts, and our arms, have yielded their lands by successive treaties, each of which contains a solemn guarantee of the residue, until they retain no more of their formerly extensive territory than is deemed necessary to their comfortable subsistence. To preserve this remnant, the present application is made.

“Before we can look into the merits of the case, a preliminary inquiry presents itself. Has this court jurisdiction of the cause?”

This inquiry is directly resolved into another, ‘Is the Cherokee nation a *foreign state*, in the sense of the constitution?’ It is admitted by the Court that the Cherokees ‘are a state, a distinct political society, who have an unquestionable, and, heretofore, unquestioned right to the lands they occupy, until that right shall be extinguished by a *voluntary cession* to our government;’ but are



they a *foreign state*? With some apparent hesitation, the honorable Court return answer in the negative, choosing rather to regard the Indians as "*domestic, dependent nations*," than as foreign ones. Consequently, they are not entitled, as *foreign nations*, to be heard before the Judiciary of the United States, and this Court has not jurisdiction of their case.

Justices Johnson and Baldwin delivered their opinions separately, each of which is more adverse to the cause of the Indians than that of a majority of the Court.\*

Justices Thompson and Story delivered a joint opinion, which is altogether in favor of the claims of the Indians, showing,

"1. That the Cherokees compose a foreign state within the sense and meaning of the constitution, and constitute a competent party to maintain a suit against the state of Georgia.

"2. That the bill presents a case for judicial consideration, arising under the laws of the United States, and treaties made under their authority with the Cherokee nation, and which laws and treaties have been and are threatened to be still further violated by the laws of the state of Georgia, referred to in this opinion.

"3. That an injunction is a fit and proper writ to be issued, to prevent the further execution of such laws, and ought therefore to be awarded."

This opinion is drawn up with great ability, and does much credit to the honorable Justices who concurred in it. Perhaps it appears with additional advantage in contrast with the two which precede it, in which we hardly know which most to admire, the extraordinary statements of facts, or the equally extraordinary expositions of our national constitution, treaties, and laws.

The opinion of Chancellor Kent, published in the Appendix, is a valuable document, declaring the acts of Georgia in this controversy unconstitutional, and establishing the claims of the Indians to redress. Referring to the act of the legislature of Georgia of the 19th of December, 1829, annexing the territory of the Indians to the several adjoining counties in Georgia, and extending the laws of the state over it, the learned Chancellor remarks,

"This act will in its operation go to the entire destruction of the Cherokees in their national capacity. It annihilates all the rights, privileges, powers and relations, which they had before enjoyed as a distinct and independent community. As a consequence of the annihilation of the Cherokee nation, the act of Georgia, by necessary implication, abrogates all the treaties, laws and ordinances of the United States, applicable to that nation. It is an act of most momentous import, not only to the Cherokees, but to the people of this

\* Mr. Justice Johnson in a previous decision (6 Cranch, p. 147) says, "Innumerable treaties formed with them [the Indians] acknowledge them to be an independent people; and the uniform practice of acknowledging their right of soil, and restraining all persons from encroaching upon their territory, makes it unnecessary to insist upon their right of soil."

country ; inasmuch as the authority which it assumes and the precedent which it establishes, affects the character of the national government, and the stability of its treaties with all the various nations of Indians throughout the United States."

This is nullification with a witness.

Before leaving the argument of Mr. Wirt, we intimated our intention of returning to it, that we might present some farther specimens of his eloquence.—Speaking of the progress of the Cherokees in civilization and religion, and of the consequent offence which has been taken by Georgia, he proceeds as follows :

" The Cherokees are no longer subject to the charge of heathenism. The religion of the cross has been introduced among them ; and, most opportunely for them, has been embraced extensively. Such is the allegation of the bill, and it remains to be contradicted by an answer.

" If it be necessary to the political existence of a state, that they should cease to be wandering savages ; they have ceased. They have become cultivators of the earth, herdsmen, and mechanics. If it be necessary to their political existence as a state, that they should have a settled and organized government, and a regular administration of laws and justice ; they have them all ;—and, until this invasion of their rights, were prospering in peace and advancing rapidly in civilization and religion.

" But such is the strange perverseness of the human mind, especially when darkened and distorted by interest, that this very change in their intellectual and moral condition, which, one should have thought, *a priori*, would have removed all shadow of objection to the force of any treaties with them, has become itself an offence, and a new and substantial ground of persecution. Georgia, as one of the United States, has been laboring for nearly half a century, in conjunction with her sister states, with the most humane and christian assiduity and perseverance, to bring about a change in the intellectual and moral condition of these people ; and having completely effected the purpose, she finds in this very change a ground of quarrel with her pupils, as well as with her sister states, her auxiliaries in this work of piety ; accusing the latter of a hypocritical affectation of benevolence in bringing about this reformation, and the former of a violation of her sovereignty in setting up an independent government within her chartered limits. So long as they were savage, they were permitted to govern themselves by their own laws and customs without complaint ; but having now, under the tuition of Georgia and the other states of the union, become civilized, and having established a regular and well balanced government, and a code of just and rational laws, their right of self government is at an end. So it would seem that, in the estimate of their preceptress, their right to govern themselves diminishes in the ratio that their capacity for self government increases, and expires entirely when that capacity becomes complete."

The opposers of the Indians have represented it as extremely

*paradoxical* to deny to Georgia a right to the *immediate* and *exclusive* possession and jurisdiction over all the lands within the limits of her charter. But Mr. Wirt replies,

“The charter of Georgia gives her, and has ever, heretofore, been considered as giving her *only* the *ultimate domain* over the lands in the Indian occupancy, *to take effect when they shall choose to cede them*: but she chooses to confound the *ultimate domain* with the *immediate possession*, and thus to create a paradox where none, in reality, exists. It is a paradox erected by the impatience of cupidity, not by the light of truth and justice. She chooses to consider a *future contingent* title, as a *present, absolute* one, a *mere possibility*, as a *certainty*: and boldly assuming this novel construction as an obvious truth, she proceeds to act upon it, in entire and open disregard of all the treaties, as well as the laws and constitution of the United States, to which she is herself a party. Shall then these things be permitted, and does there exist no power in any branch of our government to arrest this fatal madness, and to save the faith and honor of our nation? Then we have no nation. Our constitution, laws, and treaties are empty pageants, that but mock us with a show of national existence. And it were well for us if we could persuade the world of this fact; for better, far better would it be for us to be no nation, than to be a nation without faith and honor.”

Our readers will be interested to hear this accomplished speaker dispose of another objection to Indian rights.

“To the same error is to be traced the trite objection that the right of self-government, claimed by the Cherokees within the chartered limits of Georgia, is the claim of an *imperium in imperio*. Half enlightened persons, who see men only as trees walking, seem to consider this as an unanswerable objection: for no other reason that I can imagine, than that it is expressed in a foreign and learned language which they do not understand; and that men always fancy there is something unfathomably deep in what lies beyond the reach of their own lead. Those, who understand the objection in its true meaning, see that it has no manner of application to the case. A *government within a government* does not mean a *state surrounded by the territories of another state*, and yet retaining its *separate political character*: for in this there is nothing more incongruous than in the every day's occurrence of a small land-holder having his estate surrounded by the lands of his more wealthy neighbor, and yet retaining his separate independence and sovereign right of property. If this were the meaning of the objection, the free Hanse towns of Germany would be so many *imperia in imperio*, because surrounded by the territory of the German princes, within whose districts or circles they lie: the District of Columbia would be an *imperium in imperio*, because it lies within the chartered limits of Maryland and Virginia; and Castine was an *imperium in imperio*, while the British held the possession, and gave the law within that port; because it lay within the territorial limits of the United States. The *imperium in imperio* has no application to two distinct

governments operating at the same time on separate territories ; for the one government is not within the other government, although the territory over which the one acts, may be encircled by the larger territories of the other. It is the conflict of two sovereignties on the same territory at the same time, that is meant by the *imperium in imperio*. Even in this sense, it is no longer a paradox in the United States, for every state exhibits an example of it. But in this sense it has no application to the state of Georgia and the Cherokee nation : for they are separate sovereignties exerted over separate territories ; and there is therefore no *imperium in imperio* in the case. It has fared with this imaginary objection as it has often fared with imaginary facts, which are repeated and circulated until they are at length believed, even by their inventors."

It has been often asked, since the failure of the application of the Cherokees, as a nation, to the Supreme Court of the United States, 'What can these oppressed people do? Have they no remaining resource? Or must they submit to be trampled on and destroyed?' The following questions, proposed to Chancellor Kent, and answered by him, suggest several courses which they may pursue, if they please. As to the expediency of pursuing either of them, we pretend not to decide.

1. "If the Cherokees be not a foreign state, in the sense of the constitution, can John Ross, or the principal chief of the Cherokee nation, and duly authorized by them to represent them and their rights, be entitled to sue out from the *Circuit Court* of the United States process of injunction against the officers of Georgia acting in execution of the statute of Georgia?

"I have no difficulty in the opinion that John Ross is to be deemed an alien, even though the Cherokee nation should not be deemed a *foreign state*, in the sense of the constitution. That being the case, a Cherokee Indian is entitled to sue in the *Circuit Court* of the United States, equally with any other alien ; and though he cannot sue the state of Georgia as a state, he can sue its officers in their individual character, for doing acts that will sustain a suit, though those acts be in pursuance of and in execution of a state law held to be invalid.\*

2. "Can any individual of the Cherokee nation, personally affected in his rights by the operation and execution of the act of Georgia, sue out such process, or maintain a suit for a personal injury produced in the execution of the act of Georgia, in the *Circuit Court* of the United States for the district of Georgia?

"This question has been essentially answered by the answer to the preceding question. The Cherokee Indians are aliens, and can sue in the federal courts the persons acting in execution of the law of Georgia for an injury that is personal.

3. "Has the Supreme Court appellate jurisdiction under the twen-

\* The Supreme Court of the United States has not decided, we trust they will not, that the Cherokees, as individuals, are not aliens. If they are not citizens, as surely they are not, they must be aliens.

ty-fifth section of the judiciary act of Congress, in case of a decision in the highest court of law or equity in Georgia, under the said act, in favor of its validity, or against the constitution, treaties, and laws of the United States?

"I cannot hesitate to give an affirmative answer to this question. If, in rendering a final judgement or decree in any suit in the highest court of law or equity of a state, the validity of a treaty is drawn in question, and the determination is against its validity; or the construction of a treaty is drawn in question, and the decision is against the right, title, or privilege set up or claimed under it; or, if the validity of a statute of the United States, or authority exercised under it, be drawn in question, and the decision be against that validity; or, if the validity of any statute or other state authority be drawn in question, on the ground of its being repugnant to the constitution, treaties, or laws of the United States, and the decision be in favor of its validity; or if the construction of any clause of the constitution of the United States, or of a treaty or statute, be drawn in question, and the decision be against the title, right, or privilege claimed under the same: *in all these cases* the Supreme Court of the United States has appellate jurisdiction; and these cases reach and embrace every controversy that can arise between the Cherokees, and the state of Georgia or its officers, under the execution of the act of Georgia."

The opposers of the Indians seem to be aware that they may appeal, as individuals, from the highest court in Georgia to the Supreme Court of the United States; and hence, while they continue to harass them by judicial proceedings, their policy is to cut them off from appealing, by declining to bring any case to a final adjudication. This design, and a variety of facts in illustration of it, are stated by the Cherokees, in the Bill published at the commencement of this volume. Some of these facts are worthy of attention.

"In the autumn of the year 1829, one Jesse Stanal, a white man, entered the Cherokee territory and stole a horse, the property of one of the Cherokee people; he was arrested within the Cherokee territory, tried for the offence before a regularly constituted court of the Cherokee nation, found guilty by the jury, and, in strict conformity with the Cherokee laws, was sentenced by the court to be whipped; which sentence was carried into effect. For this act, done within their own territory according to their laws, the Cherokee judge and jury were indicted by the grand jury of Hall county, in the state of Georgia, at the March term last of that court, for trespass, battery, and false imprisonment, alleged to have been committed on the said Jesse Stanal, contrary to the laws of the state of Georgia, and the good order, peace, and dignity thereof. On this indictment a warrant was issued by judge Clayton, the judge of the court of Hall county, against John Saunders, the Cherokee judge, and the Cherokee jury who tried the cause; under which warrant the Georgia sheriff of Hall county entered the Cherokee territory, and there arrested the aforesaid John Saunders, the Cherokee judge, and George

Saunders, one of the jury, and transported them a distance of seventy or eighty miles to the jail of Hall county, to which they were committed, to await their trial under that indictment. The counsel retained by them filed pleas to the jurisdiction of the court, setting forth the facts of the case, and relying upon the aforesaid treaties, and intercourse law of Congress. The pleas were overruled, and the prisoners tried and found guilty by the jury; whereupon errors in arrest of judgement were filed by the prisoners' counsel, and there the prosecution stopped; the judge having not, to this day, passed judgement on the errors in arrest, and the prisoners having been admitted to bail.

"In another case, a white man, by the name of Ambrose Harmage, entered the Cherokee territory some years ago, in indigent circumstances, took the protection of its government, married a Cherokee woman, and, under the fostering care of the laws of that nation, acquired property and a large family, whose interests are identified with those of the nation. This man, having entered into a mercantile partnership with two Cherokee men, named Alexander M'Coy and Leonard Hicks, fell out with them in a short time, and their controversy was, in due form, submitted to the proper tribunal of the Cherokee country, and decided against Harmage. After this, he filed a bill in the Superior Court of Gwinett county, in Georgia, sitting in chancery, of which the before named Augustin S. Clayton was judge, in which bill, among other things, he prayed for a writ of *ne exeat*, against the said M'Coy and Hicks. The bill, with its annexed affidavit, was presented to judge Clayton, who thereupon awarded the *ne exeat*, as prayed. This writ was served by the deputy sheriff of Gwinett county, on Alexander M'Coy, a native Cherokee, at his dwelling house, in New Echota, a town of the Cherokee country, on the 20th day of August last, and, under a guard of three men, he was carried about eighty miles to the common jail of Gwinett county, where he was kept in close confinement for ten days. He was then taken out under a writ of habeas corpus, and allowed the prison bounds until the sitting of the Superior Court of Gwinett county on the second Monday of September, was then brought up for trial before his honor, judge Clayton, and discharged on the ground that the affidavit of the plaintiff was not sufficient to have warranted the issuing of such a writ. Your complainants exhibit as part of this bill, the copy of the original process under which M'Coy was arrested, together with his affidavit."

These proceedings, to which many of a like kind which have since occurred might be added, exhibit the policy of sundry of the highminded citizens of Georgia,—to worry out the poor Indians by vexatious suits, while they refuse to carry them to such an issue, that an appeal can be had to the Judiciary of the nation.

The existing legislative warfare between Georgia and the Indians commenced in December, 1828, when an act was passed to annex the territory of the Indians to the several adjoining counties in Georgia, and to extend over it the laws of the state. The following year another act was passed, going 'to annul all the laws

and ordinances made by the Cherokee nation of Indians,' and providing that 'no Indian, or descendant of an Indian, shall be deemed a competent witness in any court of the state, to which a white man may be a party, except such white person resides with the Indians.' At the session of the Legislature of Georgia in 1830, laws were enacted relating to the Cherokee country, the purport of which is as follows :

"An act to authorize the survey and disposition of lands within the limits of Georgia, in the occupancy of the Cherokee tribe of Indians, and to authorize the governor to call out the military force to protect surveyors in the discharge of their duties, and to provide for the punishment of persons who may prevent, or attempt to prevent, any surveyor from performing his duties, as pointed out by this act, or who shall wilfully cut down or deface any marked trees, or remove any land-marks which may be made in pursuance of this act. This act received the assent of the governor of the state on the 21st December, 1830.

"An act to declare void all contracts hereafter made with the Cherokee Indians, so far as the Indians are concerned ;" which act received the assent of the governor of the state on the 23d December, 1830.

"An act to provide for the temporary disposal of the improvements and possessions purchased from certain Cherokee Indians and residents ; which act received the assent of the governor of the state on the 22d December, 1830.

"An act to prevent the exercise of assumed and arbitrary power by all persons under pretext of authority from the Cherokee Indians and their laws, and to prevent white persons from residing within that part of the chartered limits of Georgia occupied by the Cherokee Indians, and to provide a guard for the protection of the gold mines, and to enforce the laws of the state within the aforesaid territory.

"This act received the assent of the governor of the state on the 22d December, 1830.—By this act, it is made a high misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment in the penitentiary at hard labor for four years, for the Cherokees to call a council or legislative assembly in their territory, under their constitution and laws, or to hold such council or assembly, or to hold any court or tribunal whatever, or to serve process or execute the judgements of their own courts, with various other provisions of a like character. White persons are excluded from the territory, unless they go under a license from the governor of the state, and take the oath of allegiance to the state of Georgia, when they are authorized to reside within the limits of the Cherokees. The turnpike roads and toll bridges erected by the Cherokees are abolished. And the governor is authorized to station an armed military force in the territory to guard the gold mines in the country of the Cherokees, to which the state of Georgia asserts an exclusive right, and to enforce the laws of Georgia upon them.

"An act to authorize the governor to take possession of the gold,

silver, and other mines, lying and being in that section of the chartered limits of Georgia, commonly called the Cherokee country, and those upon all other unappropriated lands of the state, and for punishing any person or persons who may hereafter be found trespassing upon the mines."

This act received the assent of the governor of the state on the 2d of December, 1830.

It is in pursuance of the act here referred to, by which "white persons are excluded from the territory of the Indians, unless they go under a license from the governor of the state, and take the oath of allegiance to the state of Georgia," that the missionaries of different denominations, benevolently laboring for the good of the Indians, have been arrested, chained, beaten, and put in prison, where some of them were recently lying at the mercy of those, whose tender mercies have been proved to be cruel.

Mr. Thompson, Missionary of the American Board at High Tower in the Cherokee nation, was a second time arrested by a military force on the 23d of June last. He requested the privilege of riding his own horse to head quarters, but this was denied him. At the close of his second day's march, he says,

"A little before sunset we arrived at our lodging place for the night. Owing to the fatigue of the day, and having been somewhat unwell before, by this time I was greatly afflicted with a pain in my head, which was attended with considerable fever. Very soon, notwithstanding, chains were produced, and the prisoners directed to sit together. As I was indisposed, I requested the privilege of lying down before the chains were put on me. My request was granted, and the woman of the house kindly furnished me with a good bed. The chain was attached to my right ankle, and extended to one which confined the other prisoners together. After a few minutes Col. Nelson, who had taken a different route, rode up, and gave orders, as I presume, to release me from chains on account of my ill health. At a late hour I obtained some rest, and in the morning felt somewhat better."

On the third day, he arrived at head quarters, and was thrown into prison.

"The door was locked, and I began to survey the mansion to which I had been conducted with so much military display. But soon a messenger at the door turns the key, and announces that Col. Sanford wished to see me at his quarters. With him I had a few moments conversation, and he then said I was at liberty to go where I pleased. No intimation was given, either that I would be detained there, or delivered over to the civil authority. No particular inquiries were made as to the fact, whether my residence had been legally removed. A few complaints merely were made as to the freedom which I had used in conversation with certain Georgians, and some general denunciations of missionaries.



"Thus I had been dragged fifty miles from the place appointed for preaching, and set at liberty 90 miles from my family, with the privilege of going where I pleased. I might walk home, or hire a horse, or resort to any other course which I might choose. Not the least apology was given for putting me to all this inconvenience. I am not disposed to comment upon a transaction so strange. You have the facts before you. The object was unquestionably to put me to inconvenience and trouble."

Dr. Butler, assistant Missionary at Hawsis, was arrested on the 7th of May, and taken about twelve miles, when he was permitted to return, under a promise of surrendering himself at head quarters as soon as the circumstances of his family would permit. Accordingly he surrendered himself about the middle of June, but was permitted to return home, after hearing a *talk* (as the red men say) from Col. Sanford, the very dignified and gentlemanly commander of the guard.

"He (Col. Sanford) accused missionaries and Christians as being guilty of nearly all the evils existing in the world; and called them political fire-brands, who were sending their baneful influence through the United States. He said, also, that they were engaged in a systematic plan to unite church and state; and many other things equally ridiculous.

"In the course of his conversation, he said that the missionaries could make such arrangements as they pleased for their families, but that if they continued where they were, he would shortly turn them and their effects into the highway, and put very different families into their dwellings; and added, that it would probably be better for missionaries and Christians to wander in the mountains and caves of the earth, clad in sheep-skins and goat-skins, as they did of old; and that this would probably produce an increase of piety. He told me that if I did not get out of the way, he would arrest me again in a few days."

Dr. Butler was again arrested, together with Mr. Worcester, another Missionary of the American Board, and Messrs. Trott and M<sup>r</sup>Leod, Methodist Missionaries, early in July. The following extract of a letter from Mr. Worcester, dated Jail, Camp Gilmer, July 18, 1831, will show the manner in which they were treated.

"Early on Friday morning, July 8th, I with my guard joined sergeant Brooks, at the house of a near neighbor, and rode thence ten miles, to where Col. Nelson was with a detachment, of which that under Mr. Brooks, by which I was arrested, was only a part. There I found the Rev. Mr. Trott, a Methodist Missionary who has a Cherokee family, and a Cherokee by the name of Proctor. Proctor was chained to the wall of the house by the neck, and had another chain around his ankle. He had been arrested, on Tuesday, on the charge of digging for gold; chained the first night by the ankle only, the

second and third by the neck to the wall, and by the ankle to Mr. Trott. Mr. Trott was arrested on Wednesday.

"We were marched on foot 22 miles to the same place from which Mr. Trott and Mr. Proctor were taken the day before, Proctor being again chained to the waggon. We had proceeded about three miles when we met Messrs. McLeod and Wells, two Methodist clergymen, not residing within the charter of Georgia. With leave of Col. Nelson, they turned and rode along some distance in our company. In conversation, Mr. McLeod asked Mr. Trott whether he had been chained the preceding night, and being answered in the affirmative, asked if it were according to law to chain a prisoner who manifested no disposition to escape. Mr. Trott said he thought not, but that we ought not to blame those under whose charge we were, as they were obliged to act according to orders. Mr. McLeod remarked, "It seems they proceed more by orders than by law." This gave offence. A few words had passed between Mr. McLeod and some of the guard, when Col. Nelson rode up, and being told of the remark, asked Mr. McLeod where he resided. He replied "in Tennessee." Col. Nelson, with a curse, ordered him to "flank off." Mr. McLeod, turning his horse, said, "I will, sir, if it is your command," but added, hastily, as he afterwards said, "You will hear from me again." He was then riding away, when the Col. ordered him to halt, and then to dismount and lead his horse along in the rear. He then inquired of Mr. Trott whether this was "one of their circuit riders." Mr. Trott answered "Yes." Mr. McLeod's horse was then taken from him and delivered to Mr. Wells, and he was declared a prisoner, and ordered to walk on with the rest. For a short distance Brooks compelled him to keep the centre of the road, through mire and water, threatening to thrust him through with the bayonet if he turned aside.\* In the mean time, he was heaping upon all our heads a load of tremendous curses, and reviling missionaries and all ministers of the gospel in language which, for profaneness and obscenity, could not be exceeded.

"Mr. Wells, after Mr. McLeod's arrest, pursued his journey in the opposite direction, till he met Mr. Thompson, riding in the same direction with the guard. He then turned, and rode in company with Mr. T., intending to see what should become of Mr. McLeod, and to render him any assistance in his power. After some time, they came up with the guard. When Col. Nelson saw Mr. Wells, he ordered him to ride out of his sight, either before or behind, threatening violence if he did not. Mr. Wells, without replying, fell back a little and followed on. Col. Nelson cut a stick, and making up to Mr. Wells, gave him a severe blow on the head. Towards the end of our days' journey, Mr. McLeod was afflicted with

\* The following is Mr. McLeod's statement of his treatment at this time: "After going a few steps, my horse was taken from me, and sent back to brother Wells, while I was made to run on foot to get up with the other prisoners. A furious storm of human vengeance was beating upon me in all the violence of infuriate oaths and horrid imprecations. I was told if I opened my mouth, I should be run through with a bayonet; and Brooks urged that I should receive a hundred lashes! I was driven through mud holes and branches for some distance; but when their anger cooled a little, I was suffered to have equal privileges with the other prisoners."

a severe pain in the hips and knees, to which he had been subject, and requested the privilege of riding, which was denied him.

"At night, the four prisoners were chained together by the ankle in pairs. Sometime after we lay down, a small detachment arrived with Dr. Butler. He had been arrested at Haweis on the preceding day. After crossing a river, three or four miles from home, a chain was fastened by a padlock around his neck, and at the other end to the neck of a horse, by the side of which he walked. Night soon came on. The horse was kept walking at a quick pace, and Dr. Butler, unable to see any obstruction which a rough wilderness road might present, was liable at any moment to fall, and so to be dragged by the neck till the horse should stop. After walking some distance in the dark, on representing the danger of his situation, he was taken up behind the saddle, his chains being still fastened to the horse's neck, and short enough to keep his neck close to the shoulder of the guard. In this situation the horse fell. Both his riders fell under him, and neither the horse nor either of the men could rise, till others could come, and, after ascertaining their situation by the sense of feeling, roll the horse over. Dr. Butler was considerably hurt, but the soldier more, having two ribs broken. Their lodging place was only 14 miles from Dr. Butler's, but it was midnight when they arrived, well drenched with rain. When they lay down, the prisoner was chained to his bedstead by the ankle, the officer putting a handkerchief around under the chain. The next day they had 35 miles, or more, to travel. Dr. Butler wore the chain on his neck, but no longer fastened to a horse. He was occasionally permitted to ride, one or another of the soldiers walking in his stead. At night he was chained to Mr. McLeod and me.

"On Friday morning we had to cross the Hightower river in a boat. Proctor was now mounted on his own horse, (which had been taken as a prize when he was arrested) wearing a chain, as Dr. Butler had worn it the day before. Afterwards Mr. Trott, being likely to fail, was mounted on Proctor's horse in his stead. Still later Mr. McLeod, having become so lame that he could scarcely walk, solicited the privilege of riding. Brooks, with much cursing, compelled him to walk on. Afterwards, however, he ordered Mr. Trott to dismount, and placed Mr. McLeod in his stead. Our day's journey was 35 miles.

The Sabbath came, and we had 22 miles to travel. Remonstrance would only have irritated. We were under the command of armed men, and must travel on. Arrived here, we were, as a matter of course, marched into camp under sound of fife and drum.—We were then introduced to the jail, Brooks saying as we entered, "There is where all the enemies of Georgia have to land—there and in hell." Happily, man has not the keys of the everlasting prison.

"Our prison, when we entered it, presented no very pleasant appearance. The floor was sufficiently dirty, and there was little air or light, and a very unpleasant smell. All these evils we have in a good measure remedied, so that our dwelling is comparatively comfortable. The want of air and light we have supplied in some de-

gree, by enlarging some holes already made through the daubing of the wall, and making others new, no man forbidding us. True the floor is rough, but we contrive to sleep on it soundly enough. We have no chairs, bench, or table, but these are not indispensable.\*

"Mr. McLeod sent a note to Col. Nelson on Monday, requesting a personal interview. On Tuesday morning Col. Nelson sent for him, and dismissed him. He was not permitted to return and bid us farewell.

"On Saturday evening, July 16, we were at supper. The door of our prison was thrown open to give us light. Several of the guard came and stood by the door, and one of them commenced insulting us, and me in particular, with such language as made it appear that even sergeant Brooks could be equalled in filthiness of conversation. One or two others joined him. Such men do not consider that they are paying us a compliment by taking it for granted that profaneness and obscenity are torture to our ears."

We cannot pursue this tale of injury and suffering farther. Suffice it to say that the Missionaries—after having been threatened by the Governor, that if the *Court released them*, they should be arrested again—gave security for their appearance at the next term of the Superior Court, and returned home.

And now what will our readers think or say of proceedings such as these? Had they occurred in the dark ages of Popish superstition, in Algiers (as it was,) or in the Pachalics of the Turkish empire; though they would have been outrageous and cruel, they would not have so much surprised us. But they have occurred here—in this year of our Lord, 1831—in our own Christian Republic—and under the government of one of the states of this union!! Our own nation is to bear the disgrace before the world of being the *first*, to tear Protestant Missionaries from their families and fields of labor, and to immure them in prisons, for the the single crime of endeavoring to teach the heathen the arts of civilization, and guide them in the way to heaven!!

The facts in this case need no rhetorical coloring—they admit of none. These Missionaries, let it be remembered, are our own free-born citizens, connexions of some of the best families in our country, men of highly cultivated minds, and irreproachable morals, ministers of the Gospel, well known and highly esteemed in all our churches. They were living in their own houses, and on their own lands, whither they had gone with the express approbation of the government of the United States, and under a solemn promise of protection. They were quietly pursuing their benevolent labors, translating and publishing portions of the Bible, superintending schools, gathering churches, and breaking to them the bread of life. See these men, on a sudden, surrounded with armed troops, who 'without any civil precept, are scouring and foraging

\* The floor, as is learned from another letter, was of poles or small logs, split into halves, crooked so as to occasion great unevenness and holes. They had no beds; and on such a floor they must stand, walk, sit, and sleep.

the country, arresting whom they please, detaining them as long as they please and releasing them when and where they please! See them loaded with curses and blasphemies—chained—beaten—dragged through forests by the neck—their horses taken from them, and they compelled to travel long and perilous distances on foot—threatened with lashes, and with being run through with the bayonet—and finally immured in loathsome prisons, without table, bed, or chair!! See them, at length, brought forth like felons of the first order for trial—charged with crimes which they never committed—and threatened, by a nominally Christian Governor, that if the Court release them, they shall be immediately arrested again!! And is there no remedy, under vexations and injuries such as these? Does our government afford no means of redress? Then, in the expressive language of Mr. Wirt, “we have no government.” Or if we have any, it is worthless—worse than none—and the sooner it comes to an end, the better. For if a government cannot, or will not, fulfil its promises—if it cannot, or will not, protect unoffending citizens against oppressions and persecutions such as these; then has it utterly failed of its object, and is more a burthen to its supporters than a blessing.

#### RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Elements of Moral Philosophy*: Comprising the Theory of Morals, and Practical Ethics. By JOHN L. PARKHURST. Concord: Moore & Shepard. 1825. pp. 257.

*The Moral Class Book, or the Law of Morals*; derived from the Created Universe, and from Revealed Religion. Intended for Schools. By WILLIAM SULLIVAN, Counsellor at Law. Boston. 1831. pp. 282.

Perhaps no two works on the same general subject, and both so respectably executed, ever differed more widely, or on more points, than these. The former, (Mr. Parkhurst's) is the production of a student, a metaphysician, a speculative man, whose definitions are studied with care, and whose words are selected, for the most part, with accuracy. The latter is the production of a man of business, a practical man, who has “seen all the varieties of human character,” and “has had opportunities, which professed teachers cannot have, to apply sober truths to human life as it actually occurs.” The former is a labored *treatise* on Moral Philosophy, requiring close study, and suitable to be used as a text book in Academies (we had almost said Colleges) and the higher schools. The latter is a popular discussion, requiring to be read rather than studied, and designed for the upper classes in common schools. The former is based on strictly Evangelical principles, and is a brief application of such principles to the entire system of Morals. The latter, we are sorry to say, has no such foundation, and consequently the superstructure is at best of a doubtful character. The work of Mr. Parkhurst was published several years ago, is now out

of print, and a new edition is called for. With such improvements as the continued reflections of the author will enable him to make, this new edition, will, we doubt not, be highly deserving of public patronage. Mr. Sullivan's is a new work, just from the press, whose claims to patronage are yet to be tested.

Mr. Sullivan, we have already said, is a practical man; and the more practical parts of his book, as might be expected, are decidedly the most valuable. What he says, for instance, of cleanliness and health, of the use of spirits and tobacco, and of most of the relative duties, is excellent. Some of his speculations, though well intended, we do not think of so much value, and in a reading book for schools might better have been omitted. The following is a favorable specimen of his manner:

"Let us look in upon a gay company of young persons, around a table, and half concealed by tobacco smoke. What sort of air are they breathing; what sort of substances are they casting into their physical system, already bursting with excess: what sort of thoughts have they in their minds; and what sort of words are flowing from their lips? We *could*, but will not answer these questions for them. Let us pass by this revel, and go to the next day's morning. We might then propound some other questions. Are not their heads heavy, hot and throbbing? Are not their eyes thick and burning? Are not their tongues white and parched? Do not the nerves tremble? Is not the mind muddy and confused? In what condition are they to perform duties to themselves, to those they serve, to instructors, to affectionate parents? *Is not this dear bought pleasure?* How long can nature bear to be *pleased* in this manner? This matter does not stop here. The same scene is repeated again and again. *Soon, habit asserts its awful dominion*; and then the scene *must* be repeated. The craving cannot be resisted. From social drinking, the step is an easy one to solitary drinking. *There is no resting place for habit; everything in this system of being must keep on, or end.*"

2. *A Letter to the Candid*; occasioned by the Publications of REV. BERNARD WHITMAN. By ELIPHALET PEARSON, of Waltham. Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1831. pp. 36.

The object of this publication is thus stated by the author in his introduction:

"I shall not attempt to notice the numerous imputations and aspersions scattered through Mr. W.'s pamphlets, but only such facts as I have a personal knowledge of, and can therefore speak with perfect confidence of truth. I have resided in Waltham longer than Mr. Whitman, have been a member of the second church in this town, from the time of its formation in 1820, and have been present at its meetings and known all its doings from the beginning. I have also been present at many meetings of the Second Religious Society, and have surely been placed in circumstances more favorable to a knowledge of the history of affairs in Waltham for twelve years past, than Mr. W."

It will be seen, that Mr. Pearson is qualified to speak with confidence of whatever he proposes to speak, and it is not too much to say that, by all who know him, *his statements will be believed*. They relate chiefly to affairs in Waltham, and, as far as they go, are entirely confirmatory of what has been published on the same subject in our pages.—Mr. Pearson contradicts several stories in Mr. Whitman's "Letters on Revivals"—a work which we have not yet thought it necessary to notice. The following is Mr. W.'s account of a case of mental derangement which occurred some time since in Waltham, and which he attributes to religious anxiety.

"The person was a young and modest female from a neighboring state. She became alarmed for her soul's welfare, and exposed her health while attending evening meetings. Insanity followed. I cannot recall the unpleasant circumstances without extreme pain; for she was the stay and staff of aged, and infirm,

and indigent parents; and it was truly melancholy to see one so young and fair and promising, exhibiting the most malicious behavior, and repeating the most horrid oaths and blasphemies."

Hear now Mr. Pearson's contradiction of the story.

"I speak advisedly, when I say, that Mr. W.'s conduct in making such a statement ought to be exposed in terms of the most unmeasured rebuke. This young female is first misrepresented, and then held up before the community to prejudice the whole public mind against revivals of religion, and against the most numerous denomination in the commonwealth. The statement is false. This young female had not for a long time attended meeting any where, or of any kind. One rainy night when in feeble health, she went out a shopping, wet her feet, and took a violent cold, and the next day was sick with a brain fever, and her mind perfectly deranged. She now thought and spoke of almost everything, and religion among the rest. As yet, notice, she had attended no Orthodox evening or day meeting in connexion with this sickness and derangement. Notice too, that she was heard to say nothing on religion till after she was sick and deranged, and then read again Mr. W.'s statement, and notice his regret at what Orthodox views and Orthodox evening meetings had done !!

"I shall not make a single comment. I shall only say that I am ready to prove all I have stated by responsible witnesses. The man who made this statement has been publishing pamphlet after pamphlet of statements of pretended facts which go to asperse the characters of the most worthy men, and the most worthy measures. And Unitarians have professed to believe him. It is time for the candid to pause and consider."

Most cordially do we wish the Letter before us a general circulation, and an attentive perusal. It is written, as a serious, honest man in common life might be expected to write; and is the production of one who speaks from "personal knowledge," and whose reputation for integrity and candor Mr. W. will in vain attempt to injure.

3. *An Appeal in behalf of the Illinois College*, recently founded at Jacksonville, Illinois. New York: D. Fanshaw. 1831. pp. 16.

In the brief notice which our limits permit us to take of this Pamphlet, we despair of being able to present anything like an adequate view of the importance of the subject of it. The facts in the case are briefly these: The inhabitants of the Mississippi valley—such are its extent and resources, and the unexampled rapidity with which it is filling up—are soon, beyond question, to sway the councils of this nation. It is as important, therefore, as the continuance of our institutions, and even of our political existence, that they be prepared to give a right direction to that mighty influence which they are destined ere long to exert. But they cannot be thus prepared, without education; and they cannot be educated, without colleges and schools.

There are two difficulties in the way of colleges and schools being established in the Western country *by the people themselves*, in sufficient numbers, and of a character, to meet their necessities: In the first place, they are scarcely able to do this, if they were disposed; and, in the second place, although there are many who deeply feel the importance of the subject, there is not that universal sense of the value of the higher schools, and especially of colleges, which is necessary to induce vigorous and united endeavors for their endowment. The consequence is, those who are disposed to act must receive assistance, or the work will not be done; and if the work be not done, the whole land must suffer for the neglect. *But the work will be done*,—if not by Protestants, by Catholics! The Jesuits, in large numbers, are already on the ground, and are doing their utmost to fill it with their institutions and their doctrine.

"Not an hour, then, is to be lost. The tide of population rolls on, obstacles increase, and the work neglected becomes yearly more difficult. Neglect it fifty, or even twenty years more, and it may be too late. The golden opportunity may be forever gone. A crisis hastens on, more important than this Union or the world has ever seen. And before the present generation has passed away, the fate of our free institutions will in all probability be decided forever."

The state of Illinois is itself nearly as large as New England, and is probably capable of sustaining quite as numerous a population. Owing to its extent and local situation, it must ultimately be a community of great power, and will exert a commanding influence on the destinies of the West. The new college at Jacksonville—the only one in the state—is favorably and pleasantly situated, near the centre of Illinois. It has grown out of the united exertions of the friends of learning and religion there, and in New England, and will be likely to engage the best feelings of the intelligent and benevolent in both sections of the country. "One college building has been erected, and a President and two Professors have been appointed. The number of students has already increased, so as to render enlarged accommodations necessary; and nothing but an increase of means seems to be wanting to insure the establishment of a flourishing institution." The present, it is very evident, is a most important point in its history. Its necessities are urgent. Vigorous efforts, well applied, may in a few years put it into complete and successful operation; but without such assistance, it cannot meet the exigencies of the times.

The subject, we think, speaks for itself, and pleads its own cause. We earnestly invite our readers to make themselves acquainted with the facts in the case, and we cannot doubt they will feel that it demands all the efforts which they can make, and that its ultimate success will repay them all.

4. *The Daily Scripture Expositor*: Containing a text of Scripture for every day in the year, with explanatory Notes, and brief Reflections. New York: H. C. Sleight. Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1831. pp. 280.

The work before us—a beautiful miniature volume—"consists of three hundred and sixty-five selected verses of Scripture, one for every day in the year, and each is followed by a brief exposition, taken from some commentator of good repute." Among these commentators, it is sufficient to mention the names of Scott, Henry, Doddridge, Burkitt, Gill, Leighton, Horne, Lowth, Owen, Calvin, Clarke, and Burder. "The selections are brief, but exceedingly judicious, comprehensive, and profitable." The volume will be found convenient for the pocket, the parlor, or the closet.

#### QUESTIONS.

The following Questions have been received, and are entitled to solemn and prayerful attention:

1. What relation do baptized children sustain to the church of Christ?
2. Are church members, in general, under any peculiar obligations to baptized children?



THE  
**SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.**

---

---

VOL. IV.

OCTOBER, 1831.

NO. 10.

---

---

**COMMUNICATIONS.**

THE GLORY OF GOD, MANIFESTED BY THE CHURCH.

THE infinite perfection of God constitutes his essential glory. The *display* of this perfection forms his declarative glory. Many of the perfections of God are displayed in the works of nature, and in the operations of his common Providence. But the brightest display of them all is made through the church, which is "the pillar and ground of the truth."—By the *church*, I mean the whole body of real believers—all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and manifest this love by obeying his commandments.

1. The glory of God appears in the *selection* of the church. An illustration of his procedure in the choice of those who shall love and serve him is furnished by Ezekiel in his description of the Jewish church. "Her birth and her nativity is of the land of Canaan"—a land filled with wickedness and devoted to destruction. "Her father was an Amorite, and her mother an Hittite"—idolaters, lying under the curse of heaven. "In her nativity, she was cast out into the open field, to the loathing of her person"—filthy and offensive. "When God passed by her, and saw her polluted in her own blood, he said unto her, Live! He made a covenant with her, and she became his." Nothing in the original character of the Jews, then, led to the choice of them, as God's peculiar people. The same is true, of all who compose the Christian church. When God 'looks down on the children of men, to see if there be any that understand, and fear his name, lo! they are all gone out of the way; there is none that doeth good, no, not one.' What shall be done? Shall the world be swept with the besom of destruction? Shall deserved and undistinguished ruin come upon all men? No! 'I will raise up a seed to serve me,' says Jehovah, 'even from among these mine enemies, and with that seed, I will establish an everlasting covenant, and they shall live before me.'—Here is self moved and discriminating mercy. 'God has compassion on whom he will have compassion.' None deserve his love. None desire his love. All are saying with a loud voice, 'We will not have thee to reign over us;' and justice

demands that all be bound hand and foot, and cast into outer darkness. But sovereign mercy interposes, and plucks a part of them as brands from the burning. How clearly is the benevolence of God displayed, in thus creating a people for himself from the vilest materials, and converting vessels of wrath into vessels of mercy.

2. The glory of God appears in the continued *purification* of the church. He makes her 'righteousness to go forth as brightness, and her salvation as a lamp that burneth.' The ornaments with which grace invests her render her beautiful as Tirzah, and comely as Jerusalem, and the renown of her beauty is spread abroad among the heathen. Purity is her essential characteristic. Her members are styled with emphasis, "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation." And whatever visible church fails to distinguish itself by this mark, by separation from the pollutions of the world, is thereby known to be not a church that the Lord has planted. Hypocrites are found in the true church. "The Door," is not the only way into the sacred enclosures. But do individual hypocrites give to the church her character? Did the treachery of Judas fix its stigma on the whole brotherhood of the Apostles? Judge of the church from her acknowledged principles—are they not holy?—from her laws—are they not pure?—from her spirit—is it not benevolent and kind? She is not indeed perfect, but perfection is her *aim*: she is not without spot, but her prayers and efforts are directed to entire conformity to God; and though she be black, she is comely, her enemies themselves being judges, and this comeliness is derived from the Lord, her Redeemer. It is the work of his Spirit—a work that declares him to be, "a God of righteousness and without iniquity"—a God "glorious in holiness."

3. The glory of God appears in the *preservation* of the church, in the midst of dangers and difficulties. She has fightings without, and fears within. She is "troubled on every side, yet not distressed; perplexed, but not in despair; persecuted but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed." And her safety arises from the fact, that "the Lord her God in the midst of her is mighty"—that he has sworn to afflict all that afflict her—to save her when she halteth—and to get her praise and fame, wherever she has been put to shame. Instead of breaking the bruised reed, and quenching the smoking flax; he increaseth strength to them that have no might, and feeds the flickering flame of love with the oil of grace. "Fear not thou worm Jacob, I will help thee, saith the Lord. Thou shalt thresh the mountains, and beat them small; thou shalt rejoice in the Lord, and glory in the Holy one of Israel. When the poor and needy seek water, and there is none, and their tongue faileth for thirst, then the Lord opens rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of vallies; he makes the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water," that "they may see,

and know, and consider, and understand, that the Lord hath done all this," to declare his power and truth.

How often and how remarkably have such encouragements been realized! When the enemy hath come in like a flood upon Zion, the Lord hath lifted up a standard against him; when the wicked have said, 'Let us swallow them up alive as the grave, and whole as those that go down into the pit,' the Lord hath made bare his arm for his people, and wrought a great deliverance. At one time, we behold the church in an ark of Gopher wood, riding out a storm that sweeps the world of every living thing; at another, we see her passing dry shod over a sea that, in an hour afterwards, overwhelms all the pride and glory of Egypt. Like the youthful Joseph, she is sometimes immured within the walls of a dungeon for her fidelity, and God unlocks the gates and brings her forth in renovated health and beauty. Like the intrepid Daniel, she sometimes finds herself among lions, but God shuts their mouths and she sustains no injury. Like Paul and Silas, her feet may be made fast in the stocks for a night, but joy cometh in the morning, when an earthquake sets her at liberty. Never has God delivered the soul of his turtle dove unto the multitude of the wicked, nor forgot the congregation of his poor, but has had respect unto his covenant, and broken in pieces the head of whatever Leviathan has sought her ruin.

4. The glory of God appears in the enlargement of the church. The stone cut out of the mountains without hands is waxing greater and greater, as years roll on, and gives no doubtful promise of soon filling the earth.

The beginnings of the church were small. Time was, when the family of Noah embodied all the true religion of the world; and afterwards, beyond the family circle of the "Father of the faithful," where could aught be found, among all the habitations of men, but heaven provoking idolatry! When Christ came, did he find faith on the earth? But after his resurrection and ascension, how rapid was the march of truth, and how extensive its conquests! "The hand of the Lord" was with the Apostles, while they were borne as on eagles' wings from land to land, every where testifying repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Flourishing churches were speedily established in all the principal cities of the then known world; the altars and the temples of idolatry fell down; and whole kingdoms were shaken to their centre, by the invisible and irresistible influence that accompanied the gospel of the Son of God. In later years, the same cause has advanced with a sure though retarded step; and at the present moment is borne onward by that Angel, whose wing will never tire, till he has left the print of his foot on every land, and sounded out the word of the Lord so clearly, that every ear shall hear, and every knee bow, and every tongue confess unto God. And this is

all the work of the Lord. No arm but his can thus humble the lofty looks of man, and bow down the haughtiness of man—tear up the cedars of Lebanon and the oaks of Bashan—utterly abolish the idols, and drive their worshippers into the holes of the rocks, and into the caves of the earth. Thus that mighty power and unspotted holiness, which constitute the essential glory of God, are admirably displayed.

Happy, thrice happy they, who seek first the kingdom of God; for all other things shall be added unto them. Happy, thrice happy they, to whom Zion is a name of joy, and who make her enlargement and glory the subject of their constant prayers and unremitting efforts. They shall share her honors, participate her victories, and swell the song of her triumphs, in that world, where the wicked shall cease from troubling.

But woe to them that hate her, and rise up against her to vex her. They consult shame unto themselves; they sin against their own souls. The stone will cry out of the wall against them, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it; they labor in the very fire, and weary themselves for very vanity. Zion is a troublesome stone to her enemies, and all that burden themselves with it shall be cut in pieces; for the Lord will fill the earth with the knowledge of his glory.

S. S.

## DO THYSELF NO HARM.

'Do thyself no harm' by *believing false doctrines*.—The mental constitution of man is from the same hand that framed his physical structure. God has assigned laws to each, and in neither case can these be transgressed with impunity.

What revelation has declared, experience has illustrated, that *truth* is the aliment divinely appointed to nourish the soul. The Saviour prayed for his disciples, 'Sanctify them through *thy truth*; *thy word is truth*.' Here the truth, divinely revealed, is recognized as the instrument of sanctification. But the truth, to take effect, must at least be believed. It must be received into the understanding. It is not enough that it lies on the table, if it be not stored in the mind. No man is so insane as to hope, because food is prepared and is on his table, that therefore he shall live, eat it or not. Neither should any one be so irrational as to expect spiritual health and growth, mental expansion, heart enlargement, the soul's salvation, without embracing that truth which God hath revealed for this specific purpose. But if it be thus necessary to believe the truth, it is plain to demonstration that we must not embrace errors, which are *fundamentally subversive of this truth*.

You may have flattered yourself that the *nature* of your opinions was of little importance—that *sincerity* in them was enough. But rest assured that sincerity in the belief of error is widely different from believing the truth. Did you never hear of a person's taking poison, sincerely believing it to be a wholesome medicine? And did his sincerity arrest the laws of nature? Did the poison forget its virulence and become harmless and nutritious, because of his sincerity? On the contrary, was not his sincerity the very thing which ruined him? Had he indulged any suspicions, he might have examined with care before he took the poison; or he might have prevented its effects after he had taken it, by timely preventives. But his apprehensions were not awakened. He felt no alarm. He sincerely believed it a wholesome medicine, and his sincerity destroyed him.

Sincerely believing ice to be fire, will not convert it into fire. Sincerely believing stones to be bread will not render them nutritious. Nor will sincerely believing error to be truth alter at all its destructive nature.—Suppose a man should take a quantity of flour, and an equal quantity of arsenic, and comparing them together, should conclude, that one was just as well calculated to preserve life as the other. He might say, 'I can see no great difference between the two; I can feel no difference; I can smell no difference. I can perceive no reason why one should preserve life, and the other destroy it. I am under no obligations to believe what I cannot understand,—nor do I believe it. I am sincerely of the opinion that this arsenic is just as good to preserve life, as that flour.' And having reasoned thus learnedly, he proves his sincerity by swallowing the poison. Yet, notwithstanding his sincerity, he is a dead man. Yea, *in consequence* of his sincerity, he is a dead man. It is just because he really and sincerely believed what he professed, that he took the poison and destroyed his life. Sincerity does not reverse or suspend the laws of nature, either in the physical or moral world. It rather gives efficiency and certainty to those laws.

Suppose (and the case is not wholly without a parallel) that a foreigner, recently landed on our shores from some of the arbitrary governments of Europe, should sincerely believe that, having now reached a land of liberty, he might freely appropriate to his own use whatever he desired; and proceeding on this his sincere belief, suppose he should rob the first man, or steal the first horse, that came in his way. Would the sincerity of his belief snatch him from the arrest of justice? Would the Judge and the jury confirm his sincere belief; or would they confine his person? His sincerity in this case has lodged him in a prison. It was the sincere belief of a dangerous and foolish error that turned him aside from the path of honesty and duty, and led him to commit a crime by which his liberty is forfeited.

Some of the pirates, executed not long since for murder on the high seas, are said to have declared on the gallows, that they believed there was no God, no heaven, no hell, no retribution, no hereafter. That they were *sincere*, it should seem there can be no doubt; for they published the declaration with their dying breath. Were they justifiable or excusable in their belief? Do you say, No? But who are you that undertake to decide what another man ought, or ought not, to believe? They sincerely believed there was no God, and their sincerity was tested at the end of the halter; and why were they not justifiable? You will reply doubtless, as I should, that there is light enough, even from the works of God, to teach any person that he is. Before these men could have become Atheists, they must have closed their eyes to the light of day, and their consciences to the light of heaven. They loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. Their sincere belief of error arose entirely from their love of sin. They wanted no God and they would believe in none. They heartily desired that he should not be, and they sincerely believed that he was not. Their sincerity, therefore, is found, on examination, to be not their excuse, but their fault; not their misfortune, but their crime. Instead of palliating their guilt, it is itself the most portentous mark in the long catalogue of their sins.

And what is true in this case, is true in all analogous cases. Sincerity in the belief of essential error is never any excuse for such error. So far from justifying those who embrace it, it aggravates their condemnation. Take the Deist who, professing to believe in God, rejects his word. Will his sincere rejection of Christ and the gospel save him? How strange it would be, if a sincere rejection of Christ, and a sincere acceptance of him, should lead to the same results—should entitle to the same blissful rewards!

No, reader, we must sincerely reject error, and sincerely believe and embrace the truth. And we must be careful not to mistake human error, for heavenly truth; man's wishes, for God's revelation.

*'Do thyself no harm,' by believing and embracing false doctrines.*  
W. S.

---

ON THE USES AND ABUSES OF THE DOCTRINE OF GOD'S PURPOSES.

[Continued from p. 485.]

1. The doctrine of Divine purposes is of use, in proving the *existence* of the Supreme Being.—The argument from what are called the works of nature to prove the existence of a God, is

founded chiefly on the evidence which they exhibit of *design* or *plan*. A traveller, crossing a desert heath, picks up a watch; and though he never saw one before, he infers conclusively from the evidence it furnishes of design, that it must have had an intelligent designer. So when we look upward to the world above us, or abroad upon this world, or turn our attention to the structure of our own bodies, or of our own minds, we discover so much evidence of design, of a general and universal plan, that we cannot but admit the fact of an intelligent and universal Planner, whom we call God. This is substantially the argument of Paley, and it is conclusive. But suppose the Creator had formed no plan in eternity, and no evidence of plan were discoverable in his works; how could his creatures ever have arrived at the conclusion of his existence? How could they have escaped the direful necessity of living and dying in cold, blank atheism?—It is evident from this consideration, that the doctrine of Divine purposes is *fundamental* in religion, as it lies at the foundation of all the evidence we have, or can have from nature, that there is a God.

2. The doctrine of Divine purposes is of use, to give us just and exalted ideas of God. This doctrine represents God, not only as existing before all creatures, but as exalted to an infinite height above them, and as exercising an universal and uncontrollable sovereignty. ‘I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me; declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, *My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure.*’ In eternity he formed his plan,—a plan extending through all space and time, to all beings and worlds,—a plan needing no alteration or amendment, the accomplishment of which has been carried forward thus far with an unflinching hand, and can never fail. In view of a doctrine such as this, all intelligent creatures must see, that God can be under no apprehensions from the greatest of his enemies—that he is never defeated or disappointed, surprized or grieved—that he is bringing light out of darkness, and good out of evil, and sees all things infallibly taking place, according to the counsels of his eternal will. Surely such a doctrine must be glorious to the Supreme Being, and on this account is precious to all who love him. With the humbled monarch of Babylon, they will ‘praise and honor him who liveth forever and ever, and whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, *who doeth according to his will* in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth, and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?’

3. The doctrine of God’s purposes, especially his purpose respecting the final salvation of his people, is fitted deeply to humble them, and to give them a strong sense of obligation to his distinguishing mercy. It teaches them that their salvation is not of themselves, but that from beginning to end, from eternity to eter-

nity, from the foundation to the top stone, it is all of grace. 'He hath chosen us,' says the Apostle, 'before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love, having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace.' And again, 'Being predestinated according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will, that *we should be to the praise of his glory.*' How does it become the people of God, in view of representations such as these, to inquire, 'Who hath made us to differ? and what have we that we have not received?' And while they are humbled in view of their own unworthiness, they must be penetrated with a sense of obligation to him 'who hath saved them, and called them with a holy calling, *not according to their works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given them in Christ Jesus before the world began.*'

4. The eternal purposes of God furnish strong ground of support, comfort, and confidence to his people, under all their trials. In the belief of this doctrine, they can regard no 'affliction as coming forth of the dust, or trouble as springing out of the ground.' Nor can they trace the stream of their sorrows to any disappointment, mistake, or wrong on the part of the Supreme Disposer. The ills they meet with, of whatever nature, they are led to consider as integral parts of a boundless and perfect plan;—as necessary links in that endless chain, which stretches from eternity to eternity, and which is leading onward, through scenes of present mystery and darkness, to the most glorious results. And with such impressions, how can the people of God repine? How can they but submit and rejoice?

The friends of Christ are often tried, not only with their own personal sorrows, but with those of a more public nature. The cause of the Redeemer seems declining, while that of his enemies prevails and triumphs. Error and sin and misery abound. Roots of bitterness are springing up, and divisions and contentions are multiplied. Often, in such circumstances, the Christian feels that he should have no support, were it not for his belief in the universal and unchangeable purposes of God. But resting on these, he is not dismayed; nor are his spiritual consolations, perhaps, at all diminished. For high above the impending clouds and darkness which thicken around him, and shut out the sun, he sees God upon the throne. Infinite wisdom and goodness, clothed with omnipotence, reign, and nothing takes place but in accordance with the councils of the Eternal Mind. Confiding thus in the stability and perfection of God's government, and in the assured fulfilment of all his purposes, the Christian has consolations under trials which no enemy can interrupt or destroy. For though the earth be removed out of its place, and the mountains be carried into the midst



of the sea, the ground on which he stands is not moved. The foundations of his peace remain unshaken forever.

And as the purposes of God afford support to his people under present trials, so they inspire confidence with regard to what is to come. For come what will, they know that their heavenly Father will keep the throne, and will reign in wisdom and holiness forever. They know that his eternal purposes will be fulfilled, his cause promoted, the greatest good accomplished, and his name glorified. And seeing in this view what is to be the assured and glorious issue of the present system of things—‘the winding up of the grand drama of this world’s history;’ how can they but rejoice and be happy.

5. The purposes of God, especially his revealed purposes, afford the greatest encouragement to his people to labor in his service. It has been observed already, that the doctrine under consideration has sometimes been made a means of discouraging effort. But this surely is a gross perversion of it. Its legitimate tendency is all the other way. When Daniel understood that the set time had come for his captive people to be restored, and the temple of God rebuilt, he ‘set his face the more earnestly unto the Lord, to seek by prayer and supplication, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes.’ He felt that that was the time for prayer, and that then he had peculiar encouragement to pray.

There is no more efficient motive to action than the assurance of success. But the revealed purposes of God assure his people of the entire ultimate success of all their labors for the promotion of his cause and kingdom. Not a prayer can be offered in behalf of this holy kingdom which shall not be heard. Not a hand can be lifted or an effort made, but it shall tend to hasten its predicted triumphs. ‘For behold,’ saith God to his church, ‘I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands; thy walls are continually before me. For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercies will I gather thee. In a little wrath, I hid my face from thee for a moment, but with everlasting kindness will I have mercy upon thee, saith the Lord, thy Redeemer. Kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and queens thy nursing mothers; they shall bow down to thee with their face toward the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet. The nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.’—Who needs any greater encouragement than this, to labor and suffer in the cause of Christ? Indeed what language of assurance can convey greater encouragement?

6. One important use of the doctrine of Divine purposes is to humble the pride of the wicked. This it does by showing them, however bold and daring they may be, that their efforts always fail of their end. They can never defeat or injure the Supreme Being. They can thwart none of his purposes, cross none of his

plans, but are a mere accomplishment (though they mean not so) of what 'his hand and counsel before determined should be done.'—It will be found on examination, that to check in this way the pride of the wicked is one important end for which the doctrine of Divine purposes is introduced in the Scriptures. It is often introduced in connexion with the death of Christ. The enemies of Christ, for a season, triumphed in his death. They had accomplished their malicious purpose, and the hated Nazarene was overthrown. But Christ told them beforehand, that he should 'go as it *had been written* of him ;'—that the Divine purpose, instead of being defeated, would be accomplished in his death. And Peter told them on the day of Pentecost, that the same Jesus whom with wicked hands they had crucified and slain, had been 'delivered *by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God.*' Peter also in another place, speaking of those to whom the Saviour was 'a stone of stumbling and rock of offence, who stumble at the word, being disobedient,' adds, '*whereunto also they were appointed.*' The divine appointments are not defeated by their stumbling and falling; so far from this, they are fulfilled. The Apostle Jude, after describing the 'ungodly men who had crept in unawares, and were turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ,' is careful to observe, that they were before of old *ordained to this condemnation.*' And this he says, not to offer an excuse for their sins, but to show them, and others like them, that, however bold they may be in wickedness, they are not defeating or injuring God, but only bringing ruin upon themselves.

Sinners may also learn, in the doctrine of the Divine purposes as set forth in the Scriptures, not only that they never have defeated God by their sins, but that they never can. His word will 'accomplish that which he pleases, and prosper in the thing whereto he sends it,' though, through their abuse of it, it may prove to them 'a savor of death unto death.' God 'will be glorious, though Israel be not gathered ;' and the mansions above will all be filled, though sinners reject the offered grace, and have no portion there.

7. Still another use of the doctrine of Divine purposes is to try the feelings, of the human heart. There is no truth of revelation more eminently calculated to do this, than that now under consideration. The real friends of God *love* the doctrine of his sovereignty, involving that of his eternal and unchangeable purposes. They love to see God exalted upon the throne, high above all the designs and efforts of his enemies. They love to see his wisdom and power in everything,—to contemplate him, as 'working all things after the counsel of his own will,' and overruling all the sin and misery in the universe, however hateful in itself, for his own brighter glory, and for the deeper disgrace and ruin of his foes.

But this view of God, the hearts of those who are unreconciled to him cannot bear. They invariably rise up against it, and pour forth their feelings in murmurs and complaints. 'Why doth he yet find fault, for who hath resisted his will?' 'I know thee that thou art an hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strowed.'

There is, perhaps, no part of the Bible in which the purposes and sovereignty of God are more fully exhibited, than in the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. And there is no part of the Bible more precious than this to the people of God, or more perplexing and confounding to his enemies. The former receive it in its plain, obvious meaning, and find it congenial to their souls; while the latter cannot endure it, as it stands, but are under a necessity, either of explaining it away, or of rejecting it as no part of divine revelation.

It is of great importance that the doctrine of Divine purposes be used and applied in a proper manner. The objections and the prejudices against it have arisen in no small degree from its abuse. That there are difficulties attending this doctrine, as well as others, and that questions may be raised respecting it which, with our present means of knowledge, do not perhaps admit of a satisfactory answer, need not be denied. But we have no right to use it as a means of puzzling and perplexing ourselves or our fellow men. We have no right to pry into it any farther than it has been plainly revealed. We have no right so to exhibit it as to set it in hostile array against other plain facts and principles of the Gospel. Especially have we no right so to hold or exhibit it, as to make it a means of inducing sloth and discouraging effort on the part either of saints or sinners. The doctrine under consideration was made known to us for other purposes than those here mentioned; and to use it as a means of accomplishing these, is to pervert and abuse it. Let the purposes of God be introduced, when we have occasion to exalt his glorious character; or when we have occasion to humble and affect the hearts of his people, give them support and confidence under trials, and encourage them to labor in his service; or when we wish to check the pride and silence the boastings of the wicked; or with a view to try and bring out the feelings of the human heart;—let this doctrine be introduced in such connexions and for such ends, as it is by the inspired writers; and soon all good people will be of a mind respecting it. All will acknowledge its truth, appreciate its importance, and receive it as the nutriment of their souls.

The importance of this doctrine, indeed, when properly used and applied, can hardly be over-estimated. 'If the *foundations* be destroyed, what shall the righteous do?' The eternal purposes of God are entitled to be considered as among the foundations; and if these should be destroyed or removed, the righteous would be

left without hope or comfort. What support could they have under trials? What ground of submission in adversity? What hope or confidence as to scenes in prospect? Or what encouragement to labor in the service of their Divine Master? Blot out the doctrine of God's eternal purposes, and to the eye of the Christian the world would be a chaos,—a scene of commingled and inextricable confusion, of which no being in the universe could tell the object or the end. The Christian would find himself far out upon a tempestuous sea, without chart or compass, sun or sky. No wonder, then, that this doctrine is precious to the hearts of his people. No wonder that to them it is matter of unspeakable joy, that it never can be blotted out.

Ungodly sinners may object and murmur, but all their murmurs will be in vain. 'He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh, the Lord shall have them in derision.' His throne will stand; his purposes will be accomplished; even 'the wrath of man shall be made to praise him, and the remainder thereof will be restrained.'

---

JAPAN

(Concluded from page 492.)

The Japanese Islands were discovered by the Portuguese, about the year 1542, and a friendly commercial intercourse was almost immediately opened with them. A few years after, a native of these islands, named Anger, after having long sought relief to a troubled conscience from the bonzes of his own country, came to Goa in hope of finding the celebrated Xavier, of whom he had heard by means of some Portuguese merchants. The instructions of Xavier having led him to embrace Christianity, he became solicitous for the conversion of his idolatrous countrymen; and his representations induced that eminent man to embark for Japan to plant the Gospel there, in the year 1549. The prince, in whose dominions he landed, gave him leave to instruct his subjects in the religion of the cross, and he soon met with encouraging success, not only in that, but in several other kingdoms. The bonzes or priests, as may well be supposed, made a vigorous opposition; and when argument failed, had recourse to persecution. Their malice, though it often brought Xavier into danger, did not daunt his spirit. With intrepid zeal, and untiring perseverance, he travelled from city to city on foot, in mean attire, undergoing toil, privation, and reproach, sometimes disputing with the bonzes, sometimes instructing the people. Few preachers of the Gospel since the days of the Apostles, have labored with more diligence, devotedness,

and fortitude; few have been more disinterested, or have had more success. With amazing rapidity, he laid the foundations of a flourishing church in this idolatrous empire; and by the splendid results of his ministry here, and in other parts of the East, acquired the illustrious title of the "Apostle of the Indies." His attachment to the Romish church, and the vigor with which he practised her austerities, are forgotten in the ardor and sincerity of his devotion to his Saviour, in the meekness with which he endured injury and contempt for his sake, and in the undaunted resolution with which he labored to shed the light of salvation on those who were sitting in darkness and the shadow of death.

After spending two years and three months in Japan, he determined to go to China, to convey to the perishing millions of that vast empire the glad tidings of salvation through the cross of Christ; but died on his way thither, in the island of Sancian, on the second of December, 1552, in the 47th year of his age. He was held in high admiration by the Indians and the Japanese; and the Portuguese to this day invoke his name as one of their tutelar saints.

After the departure of Xavier, other Jesuits went to propagate the faith in Japan. They soon spread themselves into almost every part of the empire, unlimited freedom being granted them to travel and preach wherever they pleased. Notwithstanding the opposition of the bonzes, and the tumults frequently excited against them, they met with almost unparalleled success. Vast numbers embraced the Gospel, or rather became members of the church of Rome, among whom were many of the princes and great lords, and some even of the bonzes themselves. The king of Omura—one of the 66 chieftans of Japan—was baptized in 1562, and made Christianity the religion of his principality, absolutely forbidding the exercise of any other. Twenty thousand of his subjects were baptized in 1575, and fifteen thousand one year after. Several other kings followed his example. Three of these kings sent an embassy to Rome in 1582, for the express purpose of paying homage to Gregory XIII., who then filled the papal chair. In the year 1581, there were 150,000 converts in Japan, under the care of 59 Jesuits. In 1587, there were 200,000 converts, and 120 Jesuits. There is reason to fear, however, that most of these were ignorant of the life-giving power of the Gospel, resting their hopes of salvation on the practice of external ceremonies and a blind obedience to their spiritual guides, rather than on the blood of a crucified Saviour. Yet it may be hoped that some among them discovered, even under the rubbish of a corrupt Christianity, something of the excellency of divine truth, and were made by it wise to salvation.

Maclaine, the translator of Mosheim, assigns three causes of the astonishing success of the Jesuits in propagating their faith in Japan.

1. Their humanity and compassion towards the sick and indigent, contrasted with the severity and cruelty of the bonzes. The latter looked upon them not as objects of pity, but as wretches suffering the infliction of divine displeasure; while the former constantly treated them with kindness, and furnished them with food, medicine, and lodging. 2. The resemblance of Christianity, as preached by the Jesuits, to some of the prevailing superstitions of the country. These supple missionaries have never found it difficult to accommodate themselves and their religion to the prejudices of men. Their conquests have been chiefly made by frittering away the requisitions of the Gospel, keeping out of view its offensive features, and endeavoring to make out a resemblance between it and the religion of those whom they wish to proselyte. In the present case, the difficulty of such a representation was comparatively small. the Japanese had a false Messiah, in whose merits they confided. They also, like the Romish church, had a calendar of saints, whose remains they revered, and whose intercession they implored. They used statues, processions, candles, and perfumes in their worship, and even prayers for the dead, and auricular confession; and had great numbers of monasteries for devout persons of both sexes, who lived in celibacy, solitude, and abstinence. Their religion was therefore no bad preparation for Popery. 3. The maritime princes of Japan were so fond of commerce with the Portuguese, that they strove who should oblige them most; and encouraged the missionaries, not more perhaps from a conviction of the truth of their religion, than from motives of interest.

The Portuguese realized incredible profits from their traffic with Japan. They are said to have annually exported from the country 300 tons of gold, and an immense quantity of silver. But becoming intoxicated with their success, their imprudence ruined them. As their riches and their credit with the natives increased, their haughtiness became insupportable. The caution and self-denial which the missionaries had exhibited in their early efforts, were succeeded by rashness and self-indulgence. The mild, meek, disinterested piety of Xavier was exchanged for over-weening pride and arrogance. At length, the zeal of the grandees for the new religion began to cool, especially when they found it would not tolerate polygamy, to which they had been so long accustomed. The bonzes took advantage of this to arouse their opposition, and to kindle their resentment against the missionaries and their converts. The dissolute lives of the Portuguese merchants occasioned great scandal; and it began to be believed that the missionaries, notwithstanding their apparent sanctity, were no better than their countrymen. At length, these foreigners were suspected of playing a deep game for the subjugation of the empire. The arrogance of the Spaniards, who, having conquered Portugal in 1580, had added to their own immense possessions in America the almost

equally extended possessions of the Portuguese in Asia, and seemed disposed to content themselves with nothing short of universal dominion, augmented these suspicions; while the hatred and envy of the Dutch towards their late oppressors blew the jealousy of the Japanese princes into a flame.

In 1587, Taycosama, who had favored the Christians during the preceding five years of his reign, began to grow hostile. Thinking the safety of his throne endangered by the influence of the missionaries, he ordered them all to leave Japan within twenty days; but as no ship would be ready to sail in less than six months, the execution of the decree was respited. The missionaries, to the number of 120, had a general meeting in August 1587, and resolved to keep their posts, and suffer martyrdom rather than abandon their converts. No one daring to speak to the emperor in their behalf, they determined to offer up masses and prayers, and perform penances, that God would touch his heart, and incline him to cease from his hostility. Taycosama did not press the execution of his decree, being apprehensive of revolts among the grantees and tributary kings, who had embraced Christianity. The Jesuits kept themselves extremely quiet, and their number was increased by fresh reinforcements of devoted laborers. Numbers of the Japanese Christians suffered banishment and confiscation of property: and not a few were put to death.

Notwithstanding this persecution, the Jesuits continued to make converts, and in the years 1591 and 1592, when all their churches were shut, 12,000 persons are said to have been baptized. The persecution at length ceased; better prospects opened; and had the Portuguese, including both merchants and missionaries, acted with prudence, and adapted their conduct to the character of a nation so haughty and so decisive in its measures, it seems probable that Japan would have become completely Christianized. But neither their pride nor their avarice seem to have abated. The immense treasures they sent out of the country alarmed the government, and the imprudence and arrogance of the clergy gave umbrage to the great lords. It one day happened that a Portuguese bishop met on the road one of the counsellors of state on his way to court. Instead of stopping to pay him the customary marks of respect, the haughty prelate passed by without taking any notice of him. The great man was highly exasperated, and made such a representation to the emperor of the affront he had received, as went far to raise another persecution. Some Franciscan friars, about this time built a church, and preached openly in the streets of Miaco, in defiance of the imperial commands, which provoked the government to take severe measures. Some of them were maimed, and others crucified. The apprehensions of the Japanese court were strengthened, in consequence of a quantity of arms being found on board a Portuguese vessel; whose captain, being interrogated on the subject

of the extensive conquests of his nation, said that these were made by sending missionaries, who converted a large proportion of the people, after which an armed force was landed, and these being joined by the converts, an entire conquest was made of the country.

Meanwhile, the Dutch were strenuously endeavoring to supplant the Portuguese, and get the lucrative trade of Japan into their own hands. Being at war with Spain and Portugal, they captured a homeward-bound Portuguese vessel, on board of which a letter, containing the particulars of a plot for dethroning the Japanese emperor, was pretended to be found. The Japanese Christians were said to be concerned in the plot, and ships and troops were promised from Portugal. A disclosure of this nature could not fail to rouse to the utmost violence the fury of an emperor who was naturally suspicious and cruel. He at once concluded that he could not sit secure on his throne, while Christianity existed in his dominions; and therefore, in the year 1615, issued against its professors and ministers an edict of utter extermination. All foreigners, who were Christians, were commanded to leave the country; and the natives who had embraced the Gospel were required to renounce their profession, under penalty of death in its most dreadful forms. This edict was executed with a barbarity perhaps unparalleled in history. Vast multitudes of the Japanese Christians, of each sex, and of all ages and ranks, expired, amidst the most fearful torments, rather than apostatize from the faith. The Jesuits and other missionaries, by the agonies they endured, and their unshaken fortitude, seemed to make some expiation for the faults they had committed in the exercise of their ministry. Most of them suffered under the hands of the executioner; not a few with triumph and joy. Some of them, doubtless, were truly good men, who loved the Saviour, amid all the darkness and degeneracy of the corrupt system they professed, and who preferred to shed their life-blood, rather than desert his cause.

Christianity had taken such deep root in Japan, that it was extremely difficult for the utmost violence of persecution to eradicate it. The flame which had been kindled could be extinguished only with the blood of a thousand hecatombs of hapless victims, offered up without mercy on the altars of Paganism. The attachment of the native converts to the Gospel was unconquerable. The struggle continued many years, and was at last brought to a close in the year 1638, when all that remained of Christianity in Japan was exterminated in one day. More than 37,000 Christians, reduced to despair at beholding the insufferable torments inflicted on their brethren, took up arms, and threw themselves into the castle of Simabara, with a firm resolution of defending their lives to the last extremity; but after a siege of three months, the castle was taken, and all who were found alive in it were inhumanly put to the sword.



The Dutch have been strongly suspected of forging the intercepted letter above referred to, and of having by other means inflamed the jealousy of the Japanese princes against the Portuguese; and the conduct of that people in other instances, particularly in the dismal massacre of the English at Amboyna, has served to fix on them the imputation. As the reward of their unchristian conduct, and the assistance they rendered in driving out the Portuguese, they were for a time permitted to enjoy important privileges; but have eventually failed of reaping the golden harvest they expected, their commerce with Japan being inconsiderable, and embarrassed with the most humiliating restrictions.

Both the Portuguese and the Spaniards have made several ineffectual attempts to re-establish an intercourse with Japan. The former sent thither a splendid embassy soon after their exclusion from the empire; but the ambassadors and their whole retinue, to the number of 61 persons, were beheaded by the special command of the emperor, except a few of their meanest servants, who were spared to carry home the sad tidings of this inhuman butchery. Attempts have also been made by the English, and more recently by the Russians, to open a trade with the empire; but it has been uniformly declined.

Christianity is now held in supreme detestation in these islands. "It is not to be named," says one. In order to discover whether any Japanese Christians are concealed in the country, various methods of detection have been devised, particularly that of annually trampling on the cross, and on the image of the virgin Mary and her child. It is not true that the Dutch are obliged to submit to this ceremony; but a compliance with it is exacted of all the natives, at least in the town and neighborhood of Nangasaki, where Christianity once greatly prevailed. Even the feet of children unable to walk are placed on the images, that an abhorrence of Christianity may be one of the first sentiments imbibed by the infant mind.

It may easily be conceived, that during the existence of such a state of things, any attempt to plant the gospel in Japan, must be attended with the utmost danger. And yet such an attempt was made in the year 1709, seventy years after its final extinction there. The fact is remarkable, and far from being extensively known.

"Jean Baptiste Sidoti, a native of Palermo, who had been educated for the church, was seized, whilst a youth, with the desire to preach the gospel in Japan. To qualify himself for such an undertaking, he went to Rome, where he studied the Japanese language, and attained to speak it with facility. He solicited and prevailed with the Pope to appoint him missionary to Japan; and with this appointment departed from Rome in 1702, to travel by land to the East Indies. The difficulties he encountered retarded

his arrival at Manilla, which he did not reach till the year 1707, and he was then unprovided with the means of prosecuting farther his intention. By contributions from charitable persons, he was able, at the end of two years more, to equip a vessel to convey him to Japan. He came in sight of that empire on the 9th of October, 1709; and landed during the obscurity of the night. The captain of the vessel, as had been before settled, to avoid giving alarm, departed from the Japanese coast with all speed, and returned to Manilla.

“Sidoti did not escape almost immediate detection. He was apprehended, and sent to Nangasaki, where he underwent examination, answering the interrogatories readily in the Japanese language, to the astonishment of all present. From Nangasaki, he was sent prisoner to Jeddo, and was kept there some years in confinement, the government being unwilling to take his life. But at length it was discovered, that, during his imprisonment, he had baptized several Japanese people. On this discovery, Sidoti, whose constancy and zeal are worthy to be regarded with admiration, was condemned to death and executed, as were all his converts.”

The unfortunate issue of Sidoti's heroic enterprise shows how dangerous would be any *direct* attempt to introduce Christianity into Japan. A missionary, who should land on its shores, would immediately experience his melancholy fate.—To the question, therefore, what can be done to bring Japan under the influence of the gospel? we are constrained to return answer, The establishment of a mission there, at least for the present, is impossible. Nor can we hope to gain access to Japan, as we do to China, by means of its colonies; for the few colonies which it has, are in the immediate vicinity of the main body of the empire, and bound by the same system of exclusion. We cannot expect to operate on the Japanese who may visit other countries; for no Japanese is allowed to leave his country on pain of death. There is indeed a gleam of hope that individuals, who may be wrecked on the Russian coast, may be brought under the influence of the gospel, and may be prepared, like the Hawaiian youth, found a few years since in America, to become heralds of mercy to their countrymen. Such instances of shipwreck, however, are very rare, as the Japanese seldom venture more than a few miles from their own shores.

Permit me to suggest a few thoughts on the probable means of letting in the light of the gospel upon the benighted millions of Japan. Little can be hoped at present from the Dutch factors at Desima, judging from their past inactivity and indifference to religion, as well as from the sleepless vigilance with which all their proceedings are watched by the Japanese. Yet should that factory be intrusted to men deeply imbued with the spirit of Christ, they could do much to allay the prejudices of the Japanese against the gospel, and to dispose them to receive it. The Japanese have never yet

had an opportunity to see what the gospel is. The grasping ambition of the Portuguese, aiming, as they believed, at their subjection to a foreign power; and the cold hearted avarice of the Dutch, heaping up money at the expense of every generous and noble feeling; might well excite their prejudice against the religion of Christ, and prompt the determination to keep aloof from its pernicious influence. Were the true spirit of Christianity exhibited before them in all its loveliness, they would be compelled to see that, so far from endangering their national security, it would confer on them the most invaluable blessings. The Dutch agents above referred to are permitted, though under many restrictions, to reside in the empire. Some of them have so far conciliated the favor of the Japanese, as to enjoy valuable opportunities for investigating their natural and civil history, geography, and political institutions. Had these men been devoted Christians, what services might they not have rendered to the cause of the Redeemer?

Is it not worth the consideration of the friends of missions, in this and other lands, whether some means may not be used for dispelling the prejudices of the Japanese against the gospel? They are an intelligent, cultivated, noble race; capable of discriminating between truth and error, between beauty and deformity; capable, no doubt, of distinguishing between the pure religion of Christ, and that wretched system which has been palmed upon them under that sacred name. A distinguished friend of missions\* has suggested whether some good might not be hoped from the presentation to the government of Japan of a MEMORIAL, drawn up in behalf of the missionary societies of England and America, setting forth the true nature of Christianity; the views it teaches us to entertain of God, his government, our relations to him, and the means of obtaining his favor; the character and mediation of its Founder; the blessings it confers on man in the present life, and in the life to come; and the consequent interest which the Japanese have, as men and as immortal beings, in obtaining those blessings. The Memorial should dwell particularly on the difference between the Christian faith as professed by Roman Catholics and by Protestants, who obtain it simply from the pure scripture, and should effectually exculpate the latter, as well as their system, from all concern in schemes of Papal or worldly ambition. This suggestion is thrown out with much diffidence; to many it may appear chimerical; but it should be remembered that not a few of the plans which God has blessed to the promotion of his cause have been viewed in the same light. The result of such a Memorial might be eminently happy; at least it will be time enough to pronounce sentence of condemnation on it, when, after having been presented, it has failed of success.

\* Rev. Dr. Jenks, of Boston.

It seems probable that we are to gain access to Japan through China. The "Celestial Empire," indeed, still refuses to receive our missionaries, and having thrown in their way the barriers of legal interdiction, regards herself as safe against their intrusion. But she does not know that vigorous assaults are making upon her outposts, which will soon lay open to the soldiers of the cross the heart of her territory. The circulation of Christian books and tracts among the *extra-mural* Chinese, who out-number some European nations, cannot fail eventually to introduce, through the length and breadth of China itself, the happy influence of our holy religion. The conversion of China, or of any considerable number of the Chinese, would powerfully promote the conversion of Japan. On that nation the Japanese look with less jealousy than on any other, freely admitting its ships into their ports, and receiving from it not a little of their literature. Nothing that comes to them from China is deemed unworthy their regard. This partiality suggests what is probably the best, if not the only method, of introducing the Bible and Christian books into Japan. Give them to the Japanese in the language of China. Dr. Morrison and Mr. Medhurst, missionaries at Canton and Batavia, had long been desirous to get some insight into the language of Japan, in order to ascertain whether the Chinese version of the Scriptures, executed by the former, will do for the Japanese; and if not, what alteration is necessary. In February, 1827, Providence threw in the way of Mr. Medhurst a number of Japanese books, which went a great way towards solving the problem. These, for the most part, were Dictionaries, the very books which were needed. The meaning of the Japanese words was given in Chinese and Dutch; to which Mr. M. added the English. He also obtained the four books of Confucius, in Chinese, interlined with a Japanese translation; which shows the precise method in which the Chinese Scriptures must be written, in order to be intelligible to the great mass of the Japanese. Send Chinese converts to Japan, with the word of God in their hands, and we may expect soon to see the foundation of a Japanese church.

It appears from the survey we have taken, that there is no other nation on the face of the globe so absolutely removed from the influence of the gospel, as the inhabitants of Japan. The "Celestial Empire," notwithstanding the iron wall of interdiction she has thrown around himself, can be approached through the port of Canton, and the thousands of Chinese scattered through the Indian Archipelago. The Mahometan governments, while they forbid us to make converts from Islamism, give us free access to their Christian subjects, and thus open the way for the ultimate (may we not hope, speedy,) conversion of Musselmen to the Christian faith. Even the barbarous tribes of Central Africa, buried in the thick darkness of forty centuries, will soon be visited by missionaries

from Sierra Leone, Liberia, and the Cape of Good Hope. But Japan is as if surrounded by a triple wall of adamant, towering to heaven. Deep rooted prejudice, ever-wakeful jealousy, and severe legal enactments, combine to exclude the Christian missionary from her shores. "Darkness covers the land, and gross darkness the people:"—a darkness more deep and dismal, for the flashes of light that darted across the horizon two centuries ago.

The prospect of the speedy conversion of Japan is small indeed. To the eye of human reason, it appears wholly obscured. We see little or nothing which we can do for her spiritual benefit. There is one thing, however, which we can do. We can *pray*. We ought to pray especially for Japan, for China, and for other countries, whose rulers deny access to the Christian missionaries. We ought to beseech God to throw down the brazen ramparts, to cut in sunder the bars of iron, "to say to the prisoners, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, Shew yourselves." In the midst of the disheartening gloom which rests upon Japan, the promises of the Eternal Jehovah inspire hope. The clanking of the chains, in which Satan has bound her millions, is soon to cease. What says the sure word of prophecy? "The Lord will furnish all the gods of the earth; and men shall worship him, every one from his place, even all the isles of the heathen. The isles shall wait for his law." He has promised to 'give his Son the heathen for his inheritance, and the *utmost parts of the earth* for his possession.' Japan belongs to Christ; it is a part of the purchase of his blood; and he will ere long assert his claims.

## NOTE.

The cautious policy observed by the Japanese renders our information respecting their country less perfect than we could wish. A late writer remarks, "there is probably no part of the world, so little known, and at the same time so worthy of exciting a rational curiosity, as this empire." The copious letters written by the missionaries, while their access was allowed, are better calculated to advance the credit of the Jesuits, than to put us in possession of accurate information. It is probable, however, that their account of the country is more to be relied on than their history of the mission. The most copious and impartial account of Japan has been furnished by Engelbert Kämpfer, a native of Magdeburg, who resided many years among the Japanese. He died in 1716, aged 65. No further opportunity of gaining information occurred till 1775 and 1776, when Dr. Thunberg, a Swede, obtained permission to travel with the Dutch ambassador from Nangasaki to Jeddo, in the quality of physician. His travels are valuable as a supplement to Kämpfer. Varenus and Valentine have communicated the results of their observations, while residing in the empire as Dutch agents. Mr. Tittsingh, who resided long in Japan, and who, while exercising the functions of Dutch Resident, conciliated the esteem and confidence

of the princes of the imperial blood, was not long since preparing a large historical and geographical work on this country; when finished, it will be a valuable present to the world. Golownin's *Adventures* contain the latest information we have. Being sent, in the year 1811, by the Russian government to explore the Kurilian Islands and part of the coast of Tartary, he was detained while on shore at one of the Japanese Kuriles, and kept in confinement two years. The cause of his detention was some acts of hostility committed several years before on one of the Japanese Kuriles, by a Russian officer on his return from an unsuccessful embassy from his court, by way of wreaking his resentment for the lynx-eyed vigilance with which he and his vessel were guarded, while in port. The captivity of Golownin gave him some opportunities of observing the Japanese character, and of becoming acquainted, from the report of those who visited him, with many interesting facts, though he could not add much to our knowledge of the physical features of the empire. "Dr. Siebold, the Dutch Resident in Japan, has recently transmitted to the Asiatic Society of Paris a work containing the result of his researches in that country during the last four years. He also writes that he has collected the largest library that ever was formed in Japan [by foreigners?] consisting of more than 1500 volumes. His zoological museum contains more than 3000 specimens, and his botanical collection about 2000 species, in more than 6000 specimens." From these fruits of Dr. Siebold's labors, and from the Japanese books collected by Mr. Medhurst of Java in 1827, some of which treated of history, poetry, medicine, botany, &c. valuable additions to our knowledge of this singular empire may shortly be expected.

---

## REVIEWS.

**EXEGETICAL ESSAYS** on several words relating to *Future Punishment*. BY MOSES STUART, *Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover*. Andover: Flag & Gould. pp. 156

WHAT does the word of God teach respecting the duration of future punishment? This question, one of the most momentous ever engaging the attention of an immortal mind, is nevertheless, to all who believe in the full inspiration of the Bible, a simple question upon a matter of fact. The inquiry is not, what has reason discovered, or philosophy taught, or selfishness approved; but what inspiration asserts. The holy Scriptures declare the doctrine of eternal punishment, or they do not. How then shall the real fact in the case be ascertained? It is unnecessary to repeat the established and universally admitted position, that every question relating to the doctrines of Scripture is to be settled by an appeal

to the language of Scripture, explained upon the simple and impartial principles of philology.

The Essays of Professor Stuart are an attempt to do this in relation to the doctrine just specified. They contain an examination of all the principal words of the original Scriptures, whose import has been brought into discussion on this subject. The examination is conducted in the only proper and satisfactory method, that is, not in a superficial and popular manner, but upon purely philological and exegetical principles. And we are confident that no candid reader can fail to perceive, or hesitate to acknowledge, that the author has pursued the task of critical investigation with a degree of fairness, patience, and completeness, of which we have few examples. For ourselves, without intending to assert our perfect agreement with Professor Stuart in all his criticisms and remarks, we are prompt to say, that we consider his Essays as presenting the evidence respecting the general meaning of the words in question, and their Scriptural import as to the subject of future punishment, in a manner perfectly convincing and conclusive.

The words examined are αἰών (aion,) αἰώνιος (aionios,) שְׁאוֹל (sheol,) ᾗδης (hades,) τάρταρος (tartaros,) and γέεννα (gehenna.) The portion of the Essays relating to the first two words was originally published in this Journal.\* But although so large a part of the work has appeared on our pages, we wish here to present a brief abstract of the whole, in order to exhibit in closer connexion its important results, and to introduce more conveniently our own remarks.

*First.*—It appears that the word αἰών occurs in the New Testament *ninety-five* times.† In *five* of these it is used in relation to the subject of future punishment. Setting aside the five cases, what is the meaning of the word in the other ninety?

In *thirty* its force may be expressed by the term *world*, in one or another of the shades of signification sometimes attached to that term. The remaining *sixty* have reference to *continuance of time*, fifty-three to future and seven to past. In *forty-nine* of those referring to the future, the word is employed in the sense of *indefinite, unlimited time, ever, always, forever*; and in the other *four*, it is applied to the dominion of Christ, where there can be scarcely a doubt that it has the same *unlimited* sense. Of those referring to past time, in *six* cases the word is employed in the same sense of *indefinite, unlimited time, ever, always, forever*; in *one* its meaning is simply *long ago, yet indefinitely*. In the whole *sixty*, there is not a case, in which the word is used for the purpose of designating a *period limited*, or having *distinct beginning and end*; in every case the purpose is to express the idea of *unlimited, indefinite time or duration*.

\* See Vol. ii. p. 405.

† Excepting cases of doubtful reading.

Now which class of instances, the *sixty* referring to *continuance of time*, or the *thirty* signifying *world* in some shade or other of its meanings,—which class shall we apply, to determine the import of the *five*, that relate to future punishment? It would seem as if no candid inquirer could hesitate a moment to give the answer, and admit the irresistible conclusion which follows, that the word, when applied to the subject of future punishment, is employed to express unlimited duration.

Should it be said that in the thirty cases, where the sense of *world* is admitted, the idea of limited time is involved, (because the world had a beginning and will have an end,) and, therefore, in at least one third of the instances of its use the word means a finite period, let it be remembered, that in *no one* of these thirty cases is the word designed, in itself, to signify *limited* duration. This is shown plainly by the context, as in some of the cases, the world meant is the future world, and the duration, if any duration was intended, is of course *unlimited*; and in the rest, the word is not employed to express duration at all. So that in fact there is not an instance in the New Testament, where the word is used *for the purpose of expressing duration*, where it does not mean *duration unlimited or indefinite*, unless it be in the *five* passages in which it is used in relation to the future punishment of the wicked. In these, the unquestionable purpose of the word is to express duration. Unless this be the very and sole purpose, no rational account can be given why it is used in such a connexion. Is it possible, then, that the inspired penmen here, in order to express *limited* and *finite* duration, would employ the word which, in every other instance expressing duration, they had used in the sense of *unlimited* and *indefinite*?

It is sometimes urged as an argument against the doctrine of endless punishment, that it is taught in so few passages. But the philological statement which we have just given, as the result of Professor Stuart's investigation, presents an argument on the other side of incomparably greater weight. If a doctrine be *actually taught in a single passage* of God's word, that doctrine has the highest evidence possible, both in kind and degree: for God asserts it; and "no demonstration can be stronger than this; God hath said so, therefore it is true." And it is not necessary that God should *repeatedly* assert a truth, and aver it over and over again. The first statement carries with it all the real evidence which can be conveyed by any number of statements reiterated. If the affirmation is made a thousand times, the evidence of its truth is still simply the divine testimony,—God saith it; and this evidence we have in full strength; if there be but a single insulated statement. If, therefore, a doctrine be actually taught in one inspired passage, it is enough; and the fact that it is taught only in a few passages, constitutes not the shadow of a valid objection.



But another kind of demonstration must be employed in determining the *meaning of a word*. God's testimony, in the form of a proposition or declaration, cannot be applied in such a case. The very supposition is an absurdity. God's testimony can be given to man only in man's language; and if that testimony is to be demanded to explain the terms in which it is conveyed, then every successive testimony is to be explained by subsequent testimony without end. If you stop at any testimony in the series, it is because you interpret its language yourself. And how do you do it? Certainly on the general principles of interpreting language. These you apply, to determine the meaning of each word in the testimony. Here then is the striking, irresistible argument in the case under notice. In *five* passages, God employs a certain word to express the duration of future punishment; this same word he employs in the course of his communications *ninety* other times; in all these *ninety* instances, there is *not one* case where the idea of *limited duration* is the thing for the sake of expressing which the word is used; in the only cases where the object of using the word is to express any kind of duration, it evidently means duration *unlimited*, and these only cases are *sixty* in number: the question is, in the *five* passages, does that word mean limited duration, or unlimited? How stands the evidence? Not a single competent witness can be found to testify in favor of the former; all the witnesses that the boldest advocates on that side can bring forward, utterly fail to give any positive testimony; while, on the other hand, *sixty* witnesses, the best possible, explicitly and fully testify in favor of the latter. Could there be a plainer case? No jury, not wholly blinded by passion or prejudice, would wish to leave their seats to decide the question. And what we say, in view of this striking philological statement of the case, is, that it presents a more unquestionable proof that the unlimited duration of future punishment is taught in the New Testament, than we should have, if the *sixty* passages which are now competent witnesses themselves related to the subject of future punishment and were designed to express its duration. For then they must be set aside in the trial, and no one of them could stand as a witness to prove the meaning of the word in dispute.

*Secondly.* The word *αιωνιος*, which is the adjective formed from the noun *αιων*, occurs in the New Testament *seventy-two* times.\* In *seven* instances it refers to future punishment.

What is its meaning in the other *sixty-five* cases? In *five* it is applied to past time, in *two* to God, *six* cases are of a miscellaneous nature, in *one* the word is used adverbially, and *fifty-one*† relate to the happiness of the righteous.

\* Excepting 1 Tim. vi. 19, as doubtful reading.

† We should class here, and not with the miscellaneous, 1 John i. 2, and 2 Cor. v. 1, which with 1 Tim. vi. 19, make fifty-four passages relating to the happiness of the righteous.

Now which class of passages shall be taken to explain the *seven*, which are the subject of special inquiry? Can any candid mind hesitate to take those, in which it is applied to the happiness of the righteous? The bliss of the righteous is often contrasted with the misery of the wicked; and in one most striking passage where this contrast is presented, the very word in question is applied to both. If the word is intended to express the duration of the happiness in the one case, is it not intended in the other to express the duration of the misery? And unless the contrary is asserted somewhere in the Bible, must not the word be intended to express, in both cases, the same duration? Then we must either admit the endless punishment of the wicked, or renounce the endless happiness of the righteous.

But suppose one should choose to look to the other passages in order to illustrate the meaning of the word: if he takes those relating to God; in one, the word expresses the duration of God's existence; in the other, the duration of his glory. If he takes either of the six miscellaneous cases, he will find the word obviously signifying unlimited duration. If he takes the five which have respect to time past, in not one of them does the phrase containing the word mean a limited duration, but in every instance refers, in an indefinite manner, to ages past, and is equivalent to the phrase *in* or *from eternity*. Or if he takes the solitary remaining case of adverbial use, it gives him still the simple idea of *indefinite* duration, expressed perfectly by the words *for ever*. What then must be the conclusion of the unbiased inquirer? He finds not an instance in which the word is employed *for the sake of positively expressing limited duration*: can he then help feeling the utter impropriety of giving the word this sense in the *seven* passages in question? Especially when he calls to mind the other passages, upwards of half a hundred, in which the word is applied to the never ending joys of heaven?

We venture to repeat here, what to some may appear at first view paradoxical: although, in considering the word now under notice, we observe but *seven* passages in which the duration of future punishment is exhibited, yet we have, in the statement of a philological fact which the investigation furnishes, stronger proof of its unlimited duration than we should have, if a larger number of the passages containing the word related to the same subject. God in these *seven* passages speaks of future punishment as everlasting, and in *more than fifty* others teaches us, in the best possible way of teaching, *what he means by everlasting*.

There is no evading the pressure of this argument, but by adopting interpretations of the word *aiwnios*, to the invention of which nothing but the necessities of a theological system could ever have given birth.

A prolific writer, who considers himself attacked by Professor Stuart, and does not take very graciously the honor of having a *learned antagonist* that will not condescend to name him or his books, seems to think it quite an easy matter to annihilate the argument drawn from the application of the word to the happiness of the righteous. With imperturbable assurance he declares, "*Eternal life* designates indeed the happiness of the righteous, but it is their happiness *in this world*." How that which is awarded to the righteous at the day of judgment, not only *after death*, but *after the destruction of the earth*, can be their happiness in this world simply, many will be at a loss to comprehend.

Another writer, with a theory somewhat analogous and equally baseless, proposes to render the word in question *spiritual*. 'These shall go away into *spiritual* punishment, and the righteous into *spiritual* life.' This interpretation Professor Stuart notices, and well replies, that it has no support from the use of the word elsewhere, and does not harmonize with the context. The context shows demonstratively that the misery and happiness intended are each something not entered upon until the day of judgement; whereas spiritual misery is experienced by the wicked in the present life, and spiritual happiness also by the righteous. The latter objection, however, goes for nothing with the author of the interpretation. He does not believe there ever will be any general judgement. "The assembled universe so often spoken of as gathered at once before the throne of God to be reciprocally spectators of each other's trial and judgement is a mere coinage of the human brain. Certainly the Scriptures assert *no such thing*."\*

\* Readers unaccustomed to Unitarian hardihood may be surprised at this bold defiance of truth and fact. "The Scriptures assert no such thing as the assembled universe gathered at once before the throne of God," &c. Yet in the very paragraph (Matt. xxv. 31—46,) upon which this man was writing, *just such a thing is asserted*. If the phrase all the nations (*παντα τα εθνη*) means not "the universe," we beg to know what would! And if Christ does not, by his language here, assert that they are assembled 'at once,' and 'before the throne,' and 'spectators of each other's trial and judgement,' we beseech Mr. E. S. G. to tell us, by what language he could do it! Mr. G. will not attempt an escape by saying that the assembly here spoken of is to be gathered before the throne, not of God, but of Christ, for the subject of his remark and denial is not the person of the judge, but the nature and circumstances of the trial. He says, "Every man, I believe, is judged in himself, and in himself alone, by the spiritual manifestation of God within him;" and "such a judgement of God in and upon man takes place in the present, as truly as in the future world, although not so extensively." How accordant this view of the subject is with the explicit declarations of Christ, let the reader judge. Let it be compared also with the language of Paul (Acts xvii. 31) "HE hath appointed a day, wherein he will judge the world in righteousness, by a man whom he hath ordained."

Mr. G. in some parts of his exceedingly vague and loose remarks seems to mean, by the judgement, a conviction of sin, like that which is indispensable to conversion. We have no objection at all to his calling this a "manifestation of God in the soul;" but it is most superlatively absurd to suppose this to be the judgement meant by Christ or Paul. All the punishment, into which the person thus condemned *departs*, is a *present sense of guilt*. Not to dwell on the unaccountable strangeness of Christ's language, if such simply was his meaning, viz. "the fire that is eternal, that is prepared for (or by) the devil and his angels,"—who does not know, that in the verdict of conscience, enlightened by a 'manifestation of God in the soul,' all are condemned? No son of Adam is acquitted in that trial, and not one escapes the actual punishment, i. e. sense of guilt. But Christ describes a trial, on which the judge will acquit some, and admit them to a "kingdom prepared for

In reference to the former objection, he attempts to show that the word *has* sometimes elsewhere the sense of *spiritual*, and spreads the matter over almost eighty pages. His whole argument from the New Testament is, that in some passages, chiefly two, 1 John v. 11, 12, and iii. 15, the word "cannot well be understood to signify anything else than spiritual." The first passage is a most unfortunate selection for his purpose, and cannot with any plausibility be limited to the sense proposed; for it surely could not be necessary that an inspired Apostle should write (verse 13,) a letter to believers, in order that they might know that they were actually enjoying spiritual happiness at the time; it might be very proper, however, to do it, in order to confirm their hope of eternal happiness in the world to come. The second passage can be understood with the common rendering as perfectly well, as with the strange one proposed. "No murderer hath abiding in him *eternal* life," (i. e. the holy, happy principle that lasts forever,) is just as good sense as, 'no murderer hath abiding in him *spiritual* life;' in our opinion it is better, because it is both more forcible, and more accordant with other passages.

The argument from classic Greek occupies by far the greater part of the fourscore pages. The writer is to show, that *αιωνος* is used in the sense of *spiritual*. Well, what is the argument? Why, *first*, Lennep's Etymologicum Linguæ Græcæ derives *αιων* from *αιω* to *blow* or *breathe*; which might, as all must admit, very naturally give to it the sense of *spirituality*; and *secondly*, two old lexicographers, Hesychius and Phavorinus, give, as one of the meanings of *αιων*, *vita, life*: not *time* of life, but rather *principle* of life; and the principle of life, all must admit, is something very much akin to *spirit*. Yes, but, as all must admit, this proves nothing; *αιων* might mean spirit or spirituality, from whatever root Lennep or any other etymologist had derived it, and whether Hesychius and Phavorinus had or had not noticed a signification lying within telescopic distance from such an idea. How then does the writer complete the argument? *Thirdly*, he examines "line by line" Homer, Hesiod, Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, most of Pindar, and a considerable part of Aristotle. And what does he

do before the foundation of the world." And what a logical and powerful appeal does this 'coinage of the human brain,' which Mr. G. adopts, make of Paul's exhortation to the philosophers of Athens. "God now commandeth all men every where to repent, because he hath appointed a day, wherein he will judge the world in righteousness, by a man whom he hath ordained." The meaning of this is, according to the interpretation of Mr. G., God now commandeth all men every where to repent, because he *judges* the world, not "gathered together," but "every man in himself alone;" not "at once" on an appointed day, but "in the present as truly as in the future world;" not by any ordained external judge, but by "the spiritual manifestation of God within him!"

Were not the subjects before us so awfully momentous, our readers could scarce refrain from smiling to hear Mr. G. describe, after all this, the tenderness of his conscience in relation to the language of inspiration, and to learn what religious anxiety he has not to depart from Scriptural terms. So quick are his sensibilities on this point, that, in giving instruction to "a confiding people" on the subject of future punishment, he "despises," to make use of the "English words *eternal* and *everlasting*, because they may express more than their originals.

find? Not one instance, where *αιων* means *eternity*, several where it signifies *principle of vitality*, and many, much the greatest number, where its sense is expressed by the word *existence*, better than by any other in our language. And what is all this towards proving that *αιωνιος* is used in the sense of *spiritual*? Of the whole amount of discovery gained by this barefoot pilgrimage over so many thousand lines of Epics, Lyrics, Dramatics, and Metaphysics, all that approaches into the vicinity of any bearing upon the question is, that "in several instances *αιων* signifies the *principle of vitality*." Suppose the word be thus used; *principle of vitality* is not necessarily *spirit*, even if it be very much akin to it. But suppose that in all these "several instances," and a great many others, *αιων* actually means *spirit*; is it a just, fair, and unavoidable conclusion that *αιωνιος* is sometimes used to mean *spiritual*? There is an utter failure of the argument; and the writer instead of stating (as, when he began his work he probably expected to do, in a triumphant conclusion,) that he had found *αιωνιος* in a goodly number of sentences meaning *spiritual*, ends by acknowledging, that in his whole careful exploration, he has *not seen the word*, and seeks to console himself and his disappointed reader with the conjecture, that it was *coined* on the banks of the Nile by the translators of the Pentateuch.

But we must return to our main purpose. In treating of the words *αιων* and *αιωνιος*, Prof. Stuart speaks of their use in the Septuagint. In above four hundred instances they occur (one or the other,) as translations of some form of the Hebrew עולם. The proper meaning of this word is *eternity*. "This is its sense," says Professor S. "in an overwhelming predominance of examples." It is, however, sometimes applied to express *any indefinite duration*, as e. g. the *eternal* hills, where the idea is simply long, indefinite duration. But all the instances of the latter taken together amount only to a small proportion of the whole.

We consider the philological argument founded upon the New Testament use of these words as perfectly satisfactory, without reference to the Septuagint. But philological evidence is cumulative, and this statement of Septuagint use brings with it additional weight. If in an overwhelming majority of at least four hundred cases, the words mean *eternity*, how astonishing is it, that any should seize upon the comparatively few instances, where they have a different sense, and thence seek to prove that they signify in the New Testament *only* a *limited* period! Especially, when even in these instances, the sense is merely duration *indefinite* instead of *infinite*, and not duration positively *definite* and *limited*, as it should be, in order to afford any foundation for their reasoning.

*Thirdly*; the word שְׁאוֹל (Sheol) occurs *sixty-five* times in the Hebrew Scriptures, and is often translated *hell* in our version. What is the proper meaning?

Professor S. classes *fifty-six*\* cases, where it has the general meaning of *region of the dead, world of the departed*. Two,† which he does not mention, would undoubtedly be referred to the same class.

The remaining *seven*,‡ he considers as instances, in which the word, besides its general meaning of world of the departed, includes also the idea of *misery*. He enters into an examination of some of these passages, and advances the reasons§ for his views respecting them. Yet in conclusion he speaks with great caution; "The sum of the evidence is, that the Hebrews did, probably, in some cases connect with the use of this word the idea of misery subsequent to the death of the body."

The word *Sheol* is translated in the Septuagint by *adnc* in sixty out of the sixty-five instances in which it occurs. The Septuagint has *adnc* only in a few other cases. The word is used sixteen times in the Apocrypha, in all which instances, according to Professor S., it has the sense of *world of the departed*. The general classical sense of the Greek word is not a matter of doubt. Beyond all dispute, it signified the world of the departed, including both the righteous and the wicked.

Now, comparing the passages in which *Sheol* occurs in the Hebrew, and then taking into account the fact, that *adnc*, (whose signification is so settled in classical and apocryphal use,) is thus uniformly employed in the Septuagint as equivalent to it, we should consider it as perfectly evident, that the proper meaning of the Hebrew *Sheol* is, *the world of the departed, including both the righteous and the wicked*. This is the substantial result of Professor Stuart's investigation; is we believe in accordance with the views of the best modern critics; and has a bearing of great importance.

Some dabblers in criticism, having discovered that the word rendered *hell* in the Bible is sometimes the same that is rendered *grave*, have thence inferred and maintained, that no place of misery after death is named, and of course none exists. But what is the fact? The word, which is thus used, designates the world where are all the departed both good and evil. Suppose, then, that not one of the passages necessarily implies, that the evil *are*

\* Gen. xxxvii. 35; xlii. 38; xlv. 29, 31. Numb. xvi. 30, 33. Deut. xxxii. 22. 1-Sam. ii. 6. 2-Sam. xxii. 6. 1 Kings ii. 6, 9. Job. vii. 9; xi. 8; xiv. 13; xvii. 13, 16; xxiv. 19; xxvi. 6. Ps. vi. 5; xvi. 10; xviii. 5; xxx. 3; xxxi. 17; xlix. 14, 15; lv. 15; lxxvi. 13; lxxviii. 4; lxxxix. 43; cxvi. 3; cxxxix. 8; cxli. 7. Prov. i. 12; xv. 11; xxvii. 20; xxx. 15, 16. Ecc. ix. 10. Cant. viii. 6. Is. v. 14; xiv. 9, 15; xxviii. 15, 18; xxxviii. 18; lvii. 9. Ezek. xxxi. 15, 16, 17; xxxii. 21, 27. Hos. xiii. 14. Amos ix. 2. Jonah ii. 2. Hab. ii. 5.

† Is. xiv. 11, and xxxviii. 10.

‡ Job xxi. 13. Ps. ix. 17. Prov. v. 5; vii. 27; ix. 18; xv. 24; xxiii. 14.

§ In doing this Prof. Stuart offers some admirable remarks on the manner, in which the inspired writers use figurative language in respect to the objects of the future world. See *Essays*, pp. 94—104.

punished in that world; will this word, by its meaning, show that they are not? "The wicked shall be cast into *sheol*." If we grant that this passage does not necessarily imply that they are cast into punishment, because *sheol* does not properly and primarily mean any thing but simply the *world of the departed*; does not the same reason make it plain that the passage neither contains nor suggests any thing in the least degree inconsistent with the idea of punishment,—much less furnishes any proof or evidence that they are not punished? It is truly painful to think that any should, by reasoning so obviously fallacious, confirm themselves in an error, which stands in direct opposition to the general scope of the gospel.

*Fourthly*; the word *adnc* is used in the New Testament *eleven\** times, in ten of which it is, in the common version, rendered *hell*, and in one, *grave*. Prof. S. has arranged the passages in separate classes, distinguished by shades of meaning. But in all of them it has the general sense which belongs to *sheol* in the Hebrew, and this is the fact, which seems to us to be of chief importance in relation to the subject of future punishment. *Hades* means *the world of the departed, including the righteous and the wicked*.

The same sophistry which we have exposed in relation to *sheol*, has been applied to *adnc*. The reasoning of some has been as follows: 'The word translated *hell* ten times in the New Testament is the very word which is, in another instance, rendered *grave*; and therefore, in the former passages, it gives no countenance to the notion of punishment after death.' But what is the fact? Not to mention, what we shall have occasion immediately to notice more fully, that this is not the only word rendered *hell* in the New Testament, we answer, that the word in question means *world of the departed*, and that in one passage, tremendously awful, Christ expressly teaches that it includes a place or state of torments. "The rich man also died, and in *the world of the departed* lifted up his eyes being in torments." The pertinency of the text as a proof of punishment after death is not in the slightest degree affected by dropping from the translation the word *hell*. And suppose it be urged that the word *grave* should be used; who does not see that, absurd as the translation may be, the argument remains untouched? 'In the *grave* he lifted up his eyes being in torments.' Wherever he was, he was in *conscious misery*.

*Fifthly*; the word *ταρταρος* does not occur in the Bible; but a verb derived from it, *ταρταροω* (*tartaroo*) is used in 2 Pet. ii. 4. In classical Greek, it is perfectly well known, *Tartarus* means that *part of Hades*, in which the wicked are supposed to be forever punished. The verb used by Peter means indisputably to *place or fix in Tartarus*.

\* Matt. xi. 23; xvi. 18. Luke x. 15; xvi. 23. Acts ii. 27, 31. 1 Cor. xv. 55. Rev. i. 18; vi. 8; xx. 13, 14.

Professor S., comparing the context, (particularly verses 3, 4, 9, 17,) considers it as incontestably clear, that Peter must have intended to recognize the idea of a place of punishment, in which the apostate angels are reserved for the same day of judgement unto which God reserves all ungodly men. We see not how any careful reader of the context can help agreeing with him, nor how any well informed scholar can admit any other interpretation to be consistent with general classical use.

Ingenuity, however, has been tasked to discover another meaning, and it has been gravely urged, that by the phrase "binding in Tartarus with chains of blackness," Peter simply intended 'fixing in the darkness of the grave.' But to bury in the earth *angels*, approaches too near the regions of absurdity; and therefore, by the interpretation alluded to, it is only some "sinning *messengers*" of human kind that God spared not. That this interpretation may be at all consistent with itself, the conclusion or inference (vs. 9) drawn by the apostle from his premises must also be limited to temporal punishment. Let it be death, which is the greatest. What then is the solemn asseveration of the inspired writer contained in a formal sentence protracted through six verses? 'False teachers will soon come to the grave; for if God brought temporal death upon certain messengers who sinned, and upon the old world, and upon the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, he knows how to bring the wicked to the grave!!' Peter was not surnamed Cephas\* on account of his senseless frigidity. This passage is not a puerile truism decked in swelling bombast. It is heavy with momentous and terrific instruction from the Holy Ghost. 'The final damnation of false teachers is at hand; for if God spared not sinning *angels*, but, fixing them in hell in chains of blackness, gave them over to be kept unto judgement, and spared not the *old world*, nor the *cities of Sodom and Gomorrah*, he will assuredly reserve ungodly *individuals* for a day of judgement to be punished.'

*Sixthly*; the word *ἄγγελοι* is found in the New Testament in twelve passages,† which are exhibited by Professor Stuart.

It is important to notice the origin of this word. "ἄγγελοι is derived, as all agree, from the Hebrew words *בְּנֵי הַיַּבֵּעַ* valley of Hinnom. This is a part (the eastern section) of the pleasant Wadi or valley, which bounds Jerusalem on the south. Josh. xv. 8; xviii. 6. Here, in ancient times, and under some idolatrous kings, the worship of Moloch, the horrid idol-god of the Ammonites, was practised. To this idol children were offered in sacrifice.‡ If we may credit the Rabbins, the head of the idol was like that of an ox, while the rest of its body resembled that of a man. It was

\* A rock or stone.

† Viz. Matt. v. 22, 29, 30; x. 28; xii. 5; xviii. 9; xxiii. 15, 30. Mark ix. 43, 45, 47. James iii. 6.

‡ See 2 Kings xxiii. 10. Ezek. xxiii. 37, 39. 2 Chron. xxviii. 3. Lev. xviii. 21.



hollow within; and being heated by fire, children were laid in its arms, and were there literally roasted alive. We cannot wonder, then, at the severe terms in which the worship of Moloch is every where denounced in the Scriptures. Nor can we wonder that the place itself should have been called Tophet,\* i. e. *abomination, detestation*. After these sacrifices had ceased, the place was desecrated, and made one of loathing and horror. The pious king Josiah caused it to be polluted, i. e. caused to be carried there the filth of the city of Jerusalem." "Following the example of Josiah, the Jews threw into it every species of filth, as well as the carcasses of animals and the dead bodies of malefactors. To prevent the pestilence which such a mass would occasion if left to putrify, constant fires were maintained in the valley, in order to consume the whole. By an easy metaphor, the Jews, who could imagine no severer torment than that of fire, transferred this name to that part of *adnc*, in which they supposed that demons and the souls of wicked men were punished in eternal fire."†

Professor Stuart inquires whether this word is used in the New Testament *literally* for the polluted valley, or *figuratively*, for the place or state of future punishment; and shows the latter to be the fact, beyond all dispute. There is but one passage upon which it seems possible even to force a literal sense, Matt. v. 22. On this passage we will quote from the Essay.

"The Saviour here says, 'Every one who is angry at his brother is obnoxious *την κρισιν*,' i. e., as it were, to a punishment inflicted by a lower court, viz. that of the *Septemviri* among the Hebrews; 'but whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be obnoxious *συνεδριου*,' i. e., to the *Sanhedrim*, or highest council, who could inflict severer punishment than the court of *Septemviri*, q. d. he will deserve severer punishment than he who is merely angry; 'but he who shall say, Fool, shall be obnoxious *εως της Γενναν του πυρος*,' i. e. to the *fire of the valley of Hinnom*, q. d. to a still higher and more severe punishment, such as is inflicted by burning to death in the valley of Hinnom."

"Is all this *literal* or *spiritual*? How can it be *literal*? Our Saviour had just said, that the Jews adjudged him only to be guilty of murder, who *actually killed* a man. (vs. 21.) He then declares, that in the sight of God, this whole matter appears in a very different light. It is not the *external act* only, which he regards. The *spirit* which is cherished and exhibited constitutes an essential part of the crime as it is viewed by him. Accordingly, he who cherishes an angry and revengeful spirit, is exposed to punishment; he who lets this spirit break out into provoking and reproachful language, is more guilty still; but he who gives loose to his passion so as to utter epithets of the highest reproach, should be deemed worthy of the most signal punishment of all."

"It must be very plain, now, that the Saviour (who had just declared that the Jews regarded nothing to be *killing* or *murder* except the *external act*, and of course did not punish any thing else, or take cognizance of it,) could not here mean, that the Jews would punish the various gradations of crime which he marks. This would be to contradict what he had just said. We must suppose, then, that he means to designate the punishment which God, who could judge the heart, would inflict, and which must be *spiritual*. Surely it cannot be meant that God would subject persons, who cherished anger, to a *literal* court of the *Septemviri*, or the *literal Sanhedrim*, or to the *literal fire* in the valley of Hinnom. What is meant must then be, that God would punish in a future world

\* Jer. xxxi. 32. 2 Kings xxiii. 10.

† Wahl's Lexicon.

with different degrees of severity, which were signified or symbolized by the punishment inflicted by the Septemviri, by the Sanhedrim, and by being burned in the valley of Hinnom."

If the reader will consult the other passages which contain the word, he will see, not only how difficult, but how utterly impossible it is, to interpret it as meaning *literally* the valley of Hinnom. If there are but two senses in which the word is to be understood, i. e. either as *literal*, or as signifying the place or condition of *future punishment*, we must regard it as beyond comprehension how any one can fail to adopt the latter, unless his intellect is incapable of perceiving either argument or objection in any thing, or he is wilfully and criminally enslaved to his preconceptions. For example, Matt. xxiii. 15, Christ says to the Pharisees, "Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him two fold more a son of hell (*υιου γεεννης*) than yourselves;" what does this mean? The Pharisees *literally* sons of the valley of Hinnom! And their disciples *literally* two fold more the sons of the valley of Hinnom than themselves! But how obvious and simple is the meaning, when we call to mind other passages analogous in sense; e. g. in John ix. 44, Christ says, "Ye are of your *father*, the Devil," and in Acts xiii. 10, Paul calls Elymas the sorcerer, a "son of the Devil." Son of Gehenna, and son of the Devil, are phrases substantially synonymous, meaning evidently a person that possesses such a character as to be obnoxious to the fire of the spiritual Gehenna prepared for the Devil and his angels.

The manifest absurdity of applying the literal sense to the passages containing the word Gehenna, has always been a stumbling block in the way of those who would deny the future punishment of the wicked. Accordingly an attempt has been made to fabricate a figurative meaning, that should not recognize such a doctrine. Whether Professor Stuart was aware of this attempt and the results, we cannot say; but he does not notice the novel interpretation to which we refer, and on this account has received no little abuse, as if he had been guilty, either of the most unpardonable misrepresentation, or of the sin (accounted it would seem almost or quite as heinous,) of not having read and answered every wild speculation and ridiculous dream of heresy.

We can imagine no figurative sense of the least plausibility that can be resorted to for the purpose of escaping the 'odious doctrine.' As to that, which the learned Professor has been so abundantly censured for not noticing, we can confidently assure a certain writer, who evidently feels towards it something of 'the partiality of an author,' that whatever may be the true explanation of the great mystery of Professor Stuart's silence, he was not made silent by any difficulty, which he could have encountered in refuting it. It will require no extraordinary attainments in philology to demonstrate both the *falseness* and the *absurdity* of the interpretation.

By this interpretation it is maintained, that Gehenna means "the temporal miseries God was to bring on the nation of the Jews for their sins." The sole argument to show that this is the meaning, is the *assertion*, that in the Old Testament, "the prophet sets forth the temporal miseries coming on the Jewish nation under the figure of Gehenna, or valley of Hinnom." The passages quoted to justify the assertion are Jeremiah chap. vii. 29—34, and chap. xix.

Now, in the first place, the *assertion* is not in accordance with *fact*; for in neither of these passages does the prophet set forth "the temporal miseries, &c. under the figure of Gehenna, or valley of Hinnom." The first passage is as follows, vs. 31, 32. "And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire, which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart. Therefore the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter; for they shall bury in Tophet till there be no place." Our vocabulary furnishes us with no epithet by which to characterize the perspicacity of genius, that can discover in this passage the miseries coming on the Jews, set forth *under the figure* of Gehenna. The sin of the Jews, and the temporal retribution for it, are set forth, and the valley of Hinnom is mentioned as the scene of both; but where is the *figure*? The sin, was an abominable idolatrous worship in that valley; the retribution predicted was a terrible destruction of the people, who should be *buried there* in such numbers, that its name might with propriety be changed and called the *valley of slaughter*.

This idea of a 'figure' becomes still more palpably inept, if we give to the latter clause of the passage the rendering which the Hebrew seems to favor and perhaps require, and which is actually given in the Septuagint; "for they shall bury in Tophet, through want of a place" (ἐκ τῆς ἰουδαίας, δια το μὴ ὑπαρξαι τόπος). So many shall perish, by famine, sword, or pestilence, that for want of other places sufficient, you shall be glad to bury the slain in the spot, once the seat of your idolatries, although now desecrated to be the receptacle of the filth of the city, the carcasses of beasts, and the corpses of malefactors.

The other passage is equally incapable of receiving the figurative meaning proposed. Jeremiah, (chap. xix.) is directed to "get a potter's earthen bottle," and "take of the elders of the people, and of the priests, and go forth unto the valley of the son of Hinnom;" there, having first proclaimed the words that God commanded (part of which were as follows, "They have built also the high places of Baal to burn their sons with fire for burnt offering unto Baal, which I commanded not, neither came it into my mind; therefore behold the days come, that this place shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley

of slaughter,") he was to break the bottle in the sight of the men who accompanied him, and further proclaim as follows; "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, even so will I break this people and this city, as one breaketh a potter's vessel, that it cannot be made whole again, and they shall bury in Tophet till there be no place to bury. Thus will I do unto this place and to the inhabitants thereof, and make this city as Tophet." Here again, a tremendous punishment of a temporal nature is set forth; but is it "under the figure of Gehenna?" The passage is in every respect similar to the former, except the additional idea, that the city itself should be defiled, and become desolate like the abominable valley. But there is a circumstance, which seems if possible to augment the absurdity of the notion that the name of the valley is used figuratively; the prophet utters the awful threatening, *standing on the very spot*, with the chief men of the city called to hear and witness: 'Look at this valley, the scene of your former abominations; the vengeance of God shall overtake you; your citizens shall perish in such numbers that this valley shall be filled with their corpses; and your city itself shall be as desolate as this loathsome spot.'

Thus falls to the ground the *sole* argument employed to bolster the conjecture, that Gehenna in the New Testament means "the temporal miseries God was to bring upon the Jews," viz. the *assertion* that the prophet sets forth the temporal miseries coming on them under the figure of Gehenna." The magical interpretation, which has annihilated Hell, and is destined in a few years to banish from the Christian world this bug-bear of weak minds, and which Professor Stuart, for some mysterious reason,—ignorance, fear, or secret treachery to his professed cause,—omitted to attack, proves to be but an airy dream.

But in the next place, if the phrase valley of Hinnom, or any corresponding phrase or term, were in the Old Testament used figuratively in the manner asserted, it would not remove or diminish the *absurdity* of giving Gehenna that sense in the New. In order to perceive what force and wisdom this new exegesis imparts to the passages where the word occurs, take the precept of Christ, Matt. x. 28. "Fear not them who kill the body, but *cannot kill the soul*; but rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in 'the temporal miseries God is to bring upon the nation of the Jews;' or in the parallel text, Luke xii. 4, 5, 'I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and *after that have no more that they can do*; but I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; fear him, who, *after he hath killed*, hath power to cast into 'the temporal miseries God is to bring upon the Jews.'

In the well known passage of James too, (chap. iii. 6,) what admirable significancy is called forth from long slumber, as if by the wand of Mercury or magic. "So is the tongue among our members, that it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the

course of nature ; and it is set on fire of " the temporal miseries which God is to bring upon the nation of the Jews for their sins !"

Comment on such philology really would seem an insult to our readers. None but the commonly received sense can be given to the word *Gehenna*, and meet at all the exigency of these and similar passages.

Here then we find a word which designates, if no other does, a place of future punishment. The *duration* is also indicated, in connexion with this word, by the sentences repeatedly annexed, " where the fire is not quenched and their worm dieth not." In these there seems to us, when we consider the original, literal sense of the word, to be a peculiar and very striking force, which is overlooked in the common mode of viewing the phrases as being applicable to the valley itself, and which confirms in our opinion the Orthodox interpretation of the principal word. The Saviour seems thereby emphatically to say, ' I mean not a *Gehenna* of finite character, like the accursed valley near your city, whose fires are capable of being quenched, and whose worm may die, but a *Gehenna* more dreadful still, where the fire is not quenched and the worm dieth not.'

Our remarks have been much more extended than we at first purposed, and we will leave the subject with mercy requesting the reader to view at a single glance, the sum of the results we have noticed as exhibited in these Essays.

First. *There is a place or state of punishment after death.* We find two words, *Sheol* and *Hades*, which include it, although not often used specifically to designate it ; one word *Gehenna* specifically designates it, and cannot possibly mean anything else ; another word derived from *Tartarus* recognizes it, and in the connexion shows the apostate angels confined in it.

Secondly. *The punishment is endless.* This is proved by the descriptive adjuncts connected with *Gehenna*, and by the manner in which the words *αιων* and *αιωνιος* are applied to the subject.

It will not be forgotten that there is a mass of cumulative evidence on this subject in the Bible, wholly independent of what is here adduced.

But here we have the direct argument from philology. It is an argument of small compass and great simplicity ; but it possesses impregnable strength. Proud reason may rave in mad rebellion against the truth it demonstrates ; false philosophy may seek to wrap the awful secret in her misty obscurities ; and vulgar heresy may pour over it her torrents of abusive rant ; yet the plain, simple argument from philology will remain unalterably fast. Volumes have been written, and volumes without number more may be written, to explain away the clear declarations, of the Bible. Mountain on mountain of sophistry may be heaped up by the sons of error, laboring with the toil of fabled giants. Flood may succeed

to flood of boasting criticism, loose as the rolling wave, hot and wild as the whirling sands of the desert. But this adamant pillar stands, with its broad base unmoved, and its dread inscription un-effaced. The word of the living God is there, and meets the first look of the sinner, blasting his vain hopes, and filling him with despair: **THUS SAITH JEHOVAH, *The soul that sinneth, it shall die. Fear him that can destroy both soul and body in HELL.***

If these lines shall be perused by a single reader, who has not present peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, we earnestly beseech him to make repentance and reconciliation his first, immediate, and grand concern.

**TRICKS OF REVIVALISTS EXPOSED: *The Substance of two Discourses delivered in the first Universalist Church in Boston, on the Morning and Afternoon of Sunday, April 17th, 1831.*** BY WALTER BALFOUR. Boston: G. W. Bazin. pp. 24.

**ON REVIVALS OF RELIGION: *A Sermon delivered in New Bedford, April 17th, 1831.*** BY WILLIAM MORSE. [*Teacher of Universalism.*] New Bedford: B. J. Congdon. pp. 20.

**A COMPARISON OF THE GOOD AND THE EVIL OF REVIVALS.** BY EZRA S. GANNETT. [*Tract No. 50, First Series.*] *Printed for the American Unitarian Association.* Boston: Gray & Bowen. 1831. pp. 28.

**A LETTER TO AN ORTHODOX MINISTER ON REVIVALS OF RELIGION.** BY BERNARD WHITMAN. Boston: Gray & Bowen. 1831. pp. 64.

**ON REVIVALS.** BY JONATHAN FARR. [*Tract No. 10, Second Series.*] *Printed for the American Unitarian Association.* Boston: Gray & Bowen. 1831. pp. 16.

**"THESE FOUR DAYS MEETINGS:" *What are they for? And what will be the Cost and Fruit of them?*** BY JONATHAN FARR. *Minister of Gardner, Mass.* 1831. pp. 18.

The contest of the Jews and Pagans against the spreading and victorious gospel, in the early days of the Christian church, must have been, in many respects, a perplexing and confounding one. They must have been often, as the Psalmist expresses it, "at their wits end," not knowing which way to turn, or what to do. For if they drove the Christians from one place, it was only to scatter them into a thousand other places. If they put them to death, 'the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the church.' And what was most dis-

gressing of all, numbers of their own partizans, and those too who had been the most bold and zealous, were continually dropping off, and joining the hated, persecuted company.—Saul of Tarsus, one of their choicest spirits, was sent away to Damascus, ‘with authority and commission from the chief priests, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem.’ The rulers of the Jews had full confidence in the ability and fidelity of this young man, and were anxiously waiting his return, to report that he had extirpated the Nazarenes in Syria; but lo, the first they hear of him, ‘he is preaching in the synagogues, and proving that Jesus is very Christ !!’

Our minds often revert to these ancient events, in contemplating the present struggle of Unitarians, Universalists, and open Infidels against Revivals of religion, and the spreading triumphs of the Son of God. This is doubtless the most perplexing, confounding struggle in which these men were ever called to engage. When they contend in argument, it matters not so much what the result is; ‘for even though vanquished, they can argue still.’ Or when they contend against the Bible, they can by false criticisms obscure the sense, and puzzle both themselves and their readers. Or when they contend against plain matters of fact, they can give their own explanations of things; and make a bad case appear plausible. But when contending against the Holy Spirit of God, who has all hearts in his hand, and can turn them as the rivers of water are turned, and who is taking numbers, as he pleases, from among themselves, and bringing them down in the dust at his feet;—who is safe in such a contest? And what can those engaged in it say, or do? Here, perhaps, is an individual, on whom they place great reliance. He is learned, able, zealous, and determined. He has been long proved, and no suspicion of his fidelity is entertained. But the first they hear of him, he is on his knees in some assembly of Evangelical Christians, renouncing his errors, confessing his sins, and imploring the forgiveness and prayers of God’s people. He has become the devoted abettor of that cause which once he hated and despised. Were the instances of this kind few or isolated, they might be more easily accounted for, and better endured; but they have been numerous of late, and are almost continually occurring; and in view of them, what shall be said or done?

The case in regard to revivals of religion is briefly this: Here are large bodies of professing Christians, ministers and others, who believe religion to be a concern of immediate and infinite importance. Without it, our institutions cannot be long sustained. Without it, individuals cannot be happy in this life, and must be miserable forever. Still, multitudes to whom religion is of so much importance are, in a great degree, negligent of it. They are intent upon the pursuits of time, and think little of eternity. They ‘cast off fear and restrain prayer, and are living without hope and without God in the world.’ In view of such a state of

things, the minds of Christians are deeply pained. They cannot sleep over the prospect which surrounds them. They cannot rest, without making an effort to rescue those who are ready to perish. They are combining their energies, and doing what they can, to arouse their fellow men to a sense of their danger, impress on them the importance of religion, interest them in it, bring them to possess it, and thus prepare them for everlasting blessings. And the Lord working with them, they are in a high degree successful. Hundreds and thousands are hopefully converted, who are proclaiming with one voice that, whereas they once were blind, now they see;—whereas they were once like the troubled sea which cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt, they now find joy and peace in believing.—Meanwhile, there is another class, some of whom profess to be Christians, who are displeased. Whether it is that they cannot bear to see other denominations so much more engaged and successful than themselves, we pretend not to say; but at any rate they are displeased,—and they give vent to their feelings in objections and complaints. ‘Why all this talk, and parade, and effort? Why these frequent meetings, and earnest supplications, and fervent appeals? Why not conduct things in a cool and rational manner, leave them more to their natural course, let religion spring up of itself, and be of a spontaneous growth?’—To all this we might reply, ‘Alas! dear friends, the soil is unfavorable. It will bear weeds, and tares, and thorns; but a thousand experiments show that wheat will not grow here without much cultivation. All experience shows that, to bring forth the fruits of the gospel in perfection—‘the full corn in the ear’—there must be unwearied and incessant toil.

We have grouped together the pamphlets, whose titles stand at the head of this article, not for the purpose of replying to them separately and in form, but of showing our readers, in one view, the extent and character of the opposition at present arrayed against revivals of religion, and of noticing such topics and making such remarks as the occasion seems to require. These books, though differing in some respects according to the different tempers and characters of the writers, are in most respects remarkably similar. They present, in general, the same views of religion; give the same distorted representations of revivals of religion; and urge the same objections to revivals. They contain statements and stories designed to discredit revivals of religion, some of which have been publicly refuted, and more might be, were the object worth the labor. They abound with predictions, presumptions and surmises, such as men might be supposed to utter, who know little or nothing of the subject in question, and yet hate it with their whole heart. Mr. Whitman, in a special manner, dwells upon the numerous and intolerable evils growing out of revivals; and yet, with characteristic *consistency* and *truth*, affirms, that these excite-



ments "are produced *oftenest and most extensively under Unitarian preaching!*" See pp. 40, 41. He describes the converts in the revivals as 'unhappy in their tempers, fretful, gloomy, uncharitable, censorious, vain and self-righteous, proud and revengeful;' yet he says that, during his visit among the Christians in the Western States (who, he tells us, have been distinguished above all other denominations by the frequency and extent of their revivals,) he "always found them distinguished for their *good morals and practical piety!*" See pp. 30, 10.

It is no part of our object to vindicate revivals of religion against the aspersions cast upon them in these books. Our readers understand the subject too well to render such an effort on our part needful, or even tolerable. They could as well hear us undertake to answer objections to the shining of the sun, or the falling of the showers.

The consequence of revivals most distressing of all to our liberal friends, though they have not thought proper directly to notice it, is doubtless this: These seasons are continually thinning their ranks, and adding new and striking attestations to the power and excellence of evangelical truth. The converts from Unitarianism and Universalism during the late revivals are not only numerous, but of a character, in many instances, to distress and appal those who are determined still to remain in error. Numbers of their principal supporters, their best instructed and most zealous partizans, in different parts of the United States, have experienced an entire change of views, and taken refuge in the hope set before them in the gospel.

We allude to these facts, not at all in the spirit of boasting, but with a view to honor the divine Spirit, show the efficacy of revivals, and the reason why their opposers find so much fault with them. We have often looked on with admiration and wonder, to see how easily and speedily the Holy Spirit could effect that which man had long labored in vain to accomplish. As a liberally educated Unitarian gentleman, recently converted, expresses it, 'as soon as the Spirit of God touched me, my Unitarianism *fell off.*' Instantly it lost all attraction, and like an old, out-grown garment, it '*fell off.*' When the eyes of a person are opened to see his character in its true light—when he becomes acquainted with his sin, guilt, danger, and ruin; he finds at once that he needs a *Saviour*,—not a mere teacher and example, but a *Saviour*. He needs the help of one, 'whose blood cleanseth from all sin,' and who is 'able to save to the uttermost all who come unto God by him.' And with these views, Unitarianism and Universalism are no longer the religion which his soul craves; they are no longer adapted to his situation and wants; they afford him no support or comfort, and he thrusts them from him with loathing and abhorrence. Let but the Spirit of God be poured out upon the world, to convince men of

sin, of righteousness, and of judgement, and it will soon cure them of their errors in regard to the original character of man, and the way of salvation by a Redeemer.

Of one of the writers named at the head of this article, (Mr. Gannett,) we can truly say, that we are sorry to find him in such company. We have read his tract with no other emotions than those of grief. It is written, indeed, with a good degree of seriousness and candor, and although it contains much false doctrine, much censure of evangelical Christians, and many statements respecting the origin, the "management," and results of revivals, which are not true, it is on the whole, perhaps, as unexceptionable a discourse in opposition to them as a man in his circumstances could be expected to write.

But it is affecting to see one, who seems to have a serious regard for religion, making common cause with scoffers, all over the land, in resisting and opposing efforts, the single object of which is to advance religion, and enthrone it in the hearts of a renovated and rejoicing people. It is painful to behold a man of a cultivated and serious mind, who would not intentionally injure any living thing, thus throwing out his speculations before the public, upon a subject of which he evidently has little more correct knowledge than he had at the moment of his birth. We mean not to disparage the gentleman's acquirements, but what can Mr. Gannett know accurately respecting revivals of religion? Did he ever pass through one? Did he ever have part in one? Doubtless, he has heard a great many stories, and read a great many books;—and so one born blind may have heard a great deal about the beauties of the rain-bow; and the deaf-mute may have seen others rejoicing at the sound of music. There are some things which books and instructors cannot teach—which can be learned only by *experience*; and this is pre-eminently true of *vital* religion—the religion of revivals. Let Mr. Gannett enter thoroughly for once into a revival of religion, not as a spectator, but as an interested individual; let him mingle with it enough to feel its influence upon his heart; let him go himself to the inquiry meeting, and pass from seat to seat, and listen to the relations there given; let him become minutely acquainted with the anxieties of awakened souls, and with the views, feelings, and joys of new converts; let him pass through a season such as this;—and we are persuaded he will burn his tract, and lament before God that he ever wrote it. He will acknowledge, as distinguished ministers have done before him, that the revival was the best school he ever entered, and that he learned more in it respecting the human heart, and respecting the method and work of salvation, than he ever learned before.

Our liberal neighbors are displeased, not only at the revivals of religion with which our churches are blessed, but at the means which are used to promote these revivals;—particularly the pro-

tracted meetings. "These four days meetings: What are they for? And what will be the cost and fruit of them?" Mr. Farr is but one among many brethren, who have undertaken to declaim against these meetings.

Unitarians should learn to be cautious how they object to Orthodox measures, as they are so apt, after a while, to adopt the same. Time was, when they were strenuously opposed to Foreign Missions; and then they became the warm advocates of such Missions. They were once opposed to Sabbath Schools; but now they are loud in praise of these schools. Formerly, too, some among them denounced all religious meetings during the week as a violation of the fourth commandment; but now they do not scruple to hold meetings in the week, and in the evening, whenever they find it convenient. The march of mind may be such that, in a few years more, they will think it best to institute three or four days meetings; and they had better be cautious what they say of such meetings now, lest their objections ere long should return upon their own heads.

But seriously, why should Unitarians and Universalists object to the protracted meetings? No one is obliged to attend these meetings. None are unduly urged to attend them. If I am disposed to attend a meeting two or three days in a week, and my neighbor pleases to spend as much or more time in an excursion for pleasure; why have I not as much liberty as he? And why should I be censured more than he?

It has been generally understood that the churches and societies of the different denominations in this country have the right, so long as they are peaceable, to manage their own proper concerns in their own way. If one church is disposed to appoint a lecture, and another a fast, and another a protracted meeting, and another to have no special meetings at all; so long as the peace of society is not disturbed, whose business is it? And how has this espionage of certain sects relative to the affairs of others—this peeping over their shoulders, interfering with their measures, and making them matter of general and sweeping denunciation;—how has it been got up? "What is it for? And what will be the cost and fruit of it?"

Mr. Farr insists, in the first place that there is no need of the protracted meetings, or of any "additional meetings in the week."

"I hold that the ordinary and stated means of grace, and the positive institutions and ordinances of religion, if they are diligently and properly improved, are generally sufficient to bring one to a saving acquaintance with the gospel."

Doubtless persons *may* come to a saving acquaintance with the gospel, by merely attending public worship on the Sabbath—that is, *if they attend where the gospel is preached*. Or they *may* come to this knowledge, by staying at home and reading the Bible. The proper question on this subject is not, what *may* men do? but what *will* they do? What are they *actually doing*? Is it a fact that our citizens generally—the aged, the middle aged, and the young

—with all their privileges, are now, and have been for a course of years, coming to the saving knowledge of the gospel? Do they, in general, manifest that this is the case, in their conversation and their lives? However Mr. F. may answer this question, we are constrained to decide it in the negative; and we feel the necessity of more urgent means, to arouse unthinking men to the importance of religion, lead them to value and improve their privileges, and thus secure the salvation of their souls.

Mr. F. affirms, that the *motives* of the Orthodox in establishing these meetings are corrupt.

"I verily think I have reasons for believing that the real, exciting object of them is to increase the power, influence and numbers of the Orthodox party."

It hardly becomes men, so loud in the praise of their own *charity* as Unitarians generally are, thus to decide upon the motives of others, and without ceremony to ascribe to them motives so different from those by which they profess to be actuated. And we know not what extraordinary power of 'trying the reins' Mr F. may possess, which should give him a pre-eminence in this respect above his neighbors. Perhaps, however, we ought not to think hardly of him. He may be as unable to appreciate the motives of some men, as the counsellors of Hanun were to enter into the feelings of pious David. (2 Sam. x. 3.) He may be sensible that no motive short of a thirst of power could induce him to preach as frequently and labor as diligently as some Orthodox ministers; and why should he regard them as less ambitious, or more disinterested, than himself?

Mr. F. inquires, What if "each sect of any magnitude in our land were to have its four days meetings?"—And what if it were? If the different sects would institute these meetings at suitable intervals, and make due preparation for them, and conduct them properly; we should rejoice at them. We should think them an omen of great good. If Unitarians will establish these meetings, and conduct them in a proper manner, it will be our least objection to them, that they continue three or four days.

Mr. F. thinks it a great objection to these meetings, that they consume so much precious time.

"Say there are 280 towns in the state, and there should be a four days meeting in each of them, and only one person should attend on each of these occasions;" [a singular *meeting* or *assemblage* at which only one person should be present.] "that would make 1120 days. But instead of only one at each of these meetings, say there are four hundred; eleven hundred and twenty multiplied by four hundred would give four hundred and forty-eight thousand. There would be, on an average, a loss of sixteen hundred days to each town."\*

Will Mr. F. inform us, in his next publication, how much time was wasted by the hearers of John the Baptist, when "Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan," followed

\* Dr. Witherspoon somewhere tells us of an Infidel, who undertook to compute the loss of time and money which the Sabbath had occasioned to the world. He forgot, says the shrewd Doctor, to compute how much it had saved.

him out into the desert to be instructed and baptized;—and how much was wasted by the thousands who, in some instances, followed Christ, and attended on his ministry for several successive days (Matt. xv. 32);—and how much was wasted by the Apostles and their associates, when they “continued *daily* with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house?” He will also inform us what he regards as the great object of living, or for what he thinks our time was given us. Was it given us, that we might pursue the world, or take care of the soul? that we might hoard treasure upon earth, or lay it up in heaven? If we are indeed bound to seek, first of all, and above all, the kingdom of God and his righteousness; if it should be the grand object of life to secure the sanctification and salvation of the soul; and if this object can be promoted by occasional protracted meetings; then, what if they do consume a portion of our time? How shall time be better spent? On what days of our lives shall we look back with greater satisfaction, from the bed of death, the scenes of the judgement, and the retributions of the eternal world, than on those which we spent in listening to the calls of mercy, and in giving away ourselves to God?

But there will be an expense, not only of time, but of what many people seem to regard as more than precious time.

“Many poor persons will hire horses and carriages, who can ill afford it; and their Sunday dress will be worn more this year, than it need to have been in several years.”

Why, alas! did not the promoters of the protracted meetings seek an interview with Mr. Farr, and avail themselves of his profound suggestions on some of these topics, before proceeding with their prodigal schemes! How much wear and tear of Sunday dresses might in this way have been prevented! How much more tidily, too, these dresses might have been kept! How much longer they might have been worn! And what is the *soul* to to a new Sunday dress!

But all these things, momentous as they may seem, Mr. F. assures us are of “trifling consideration, compared to others which he shall proceed to mention.” Let us then listen to some of these weightier matters.—“On these occasions, multitudes will hear the voices of strangers, instead of their own shepherds.” That is, the hearers of Unitarian ministers, who attend the meetings, may learn to like other preachers better than their own. And not only so, “many will listen to views of religion, to which they had hitherto been strangers.” They will discover, perchance, that Unitarianism is not the gospel,—that they are themselves sinners, who need an almighty, an atoning Saviour. No wonder Unitarian ministers are alarmed at the possibility of consequences such as these.

Mr. F. believes that the protracted meetings will produce much disturbance in families. Wives and daughters will be induced to

attend them contrary to the wishes of their husbands and fathers; families will no longer be able to worship at the same altar; and husbands will not bear ruin in their own houses.—This is a theme of perpetual declamation to the opposers, not only of protracted meetings, but of revivals of religion. ‘Families will be divided, and domestic peace will be destroyed.’ But what families will be divided and disturbed? Not religious, Orthodox families; for these will rejoice to have religion revived in their houses, and to have the number of renewed souls increased. It is the families of Unitarians and Universalists, of the irreligious and the infidel, which are in danger of being disturbed by revivals of religion. And for fear of disturbing these, evangelical Christians must stay their hands, and use no more means to promote religion even among themselves.

But how is it that religion disturbs the families of the irreligious. We can tell how; for, alas, we too well know the usual course of proceeding to be mistaken on this subject.—Here is an individual in such a family, a wife or a child, who becomes anxious for her soul, and is hopefully converted. She is faithful and affectionate, more so than before, and no fault can be found with her ‘except concerning the law of her God;’ but she soon finds by sad experience, that all ‘who will live godly in Christ Jesus must suffer persecution.’ It is painful to her to think of separating herself from the rest of the family in public worship; but her conscience and the interests of her soul require it, and she asks permission;—but no—she is prohibited. She feels bound by an obligation higher than man can impose, to profess Christ according to her own views, and come to his table; but when this subject is suggested, she is again prohibited. ‘A man must bear rule in his own house, and she shall do no such thing.’ Feeling that religion is a concern in which she must act and answer for herself, and in which she ought to obey God rather than man, she ventures occasionally to assert her rights, and goes where she can worship God according to the dictates of her own conscience; but when she returns, she is reproached, chided, scolded, and it may be *beaten*, by the hands of her husband or her father. A friend gives her a religious tract, but this is torn from her, and thrown into the fire. Another loans her a book suited for her instruction and consolation, but this is taken away, and ordered to be sent home. As her last resource, she retires to her chamber, to pour out her soul to God and pray for her persecutor; but the sanctuary of her devotions is burst open, and she is ordered to depart out of it. And having thus disturbed and distracted his whole house, and set it in a flame, the *liberal* husband or father now sallies forth, to curse protracted meetings and revivals of religion, and to tell how they divide families, and disturb and destroy domestic peace. And, sad to relate, he finds professed ministers of the gospel ready to listen

to his complaints, and give an echo to his denunciations from the pulpit and the press.—We do not mean to say that *all* professedly liberal husbands treat their orthodox wives and children after this manner. Far from it. But that this is the way in which not a few (with the exception, perhaps, of personal violence) are treated, and in which disturbance in families is usually created in consequence of revivals of religion, *we certainly know*. We are ourselves acquainted with instances, in which Unitarians and Universalists—farmers, mechanics, merchants, men who think themselves respectable and would be accounted gentlemen—hold the religious inmates of their houses in a state of bondage and of fear. Their wives and daughters have little more freedom on that great subject which, of all others, lies nearest to their hearts, than though they were the tenants of a Turkish *harem*.

Nor is this treatment so much to be wondered at; for this is the way, it appears, in which liberal gentlemen are taught by their ministers to treat their families. In the tract on which we are remarking, Mr. Farr exhorts his readers, not only to keep away from the protracted meetings themselves, but to keep their families away. “*Keep at home,*” he says, “and *keep those under your authority at home also.*” ‘Don’t go to hear this orthodox preaching. You may be convinced by it, and thus be drawn away from your loving Unitarian teachers.’ Mr. F., it will be recollected, is one of those who have insisted so strenuously, and for so long a time, upon the importance of *free inquiry* in matters of religion. How often has it been said, ‘Be not afraid to hear and think for yourselves, and to examine the subject of religion freely. Prove all things, and then you will be able to distinguish that which is good.’ But no sooner do some of the members of Unitarian congregations begin to assert the right to hear and think freely—begin to drop into orthodox meetings and listen candidly to the preaching of the gospel, than their teachers are alarmed, and cry out to warn them of their danger, and exhort them to keep out of the way.—And not only must they keep at home themselves, they must *keep their families at home also*. True, your wives and children must answer for themselves, but they are not to be permitted to act for themselves,—unless they shall choose to act as you choose to have them. They are not to be permitted to hear such preaching as they please, but such as you please,—not to have the religion which is most agreeable to them, but that which is most agreeable to you. “*Keep those under your authority at home also !*” Mr. F., it will be recollected, is a strong advocate of *religious liberty*, as well as of free inquiry,—and he laments, in the pages before us, that our religious liberties are in so much danger from the Calvinists.

Now Calvinists as we are, and sensible as we are of the *danger* of erroneous teaching on religious subjects, (a feeling of which the

*principles* of the liberalists leave them scarcely susceptible) the advice which we should give to those under our influence in regard to the subject here discussed, would be directly the opposite of that given by Mr. Farr. We would say explicitly to the Evangelical Christian householder, (though we know of no facts which make it necessary to say it) if you have a wife who is conscientiously a Unitarian or a Universalist, and who wishes to worship with either of these denominations; by all means let her go. And not only let her go, but aid her to go; furnish her with a seat; and treat her with the same kindness when she returns, as though she had worshipped at your own meeting. The danger of attending such places of worship is indeed great, but the responsibility in this case is hers, not yours, and forcibly to restrain her would only be to increase the evil. And if you have children of sufficient age and capacity to form an enlightened opinion on religious subjects, who, after all your instructions, are seriously and conscientiously inclined to attend a different place of worship from yourself, we would give the same advice in respect to them. By no means restrain them. And if this is not Christian liberty, then we will consent to take lessons from those who say to their readers, "*Keep at home, and keep those under your authority at home also.*"

Mr. F. thinks it a strong objection to the protracted meetings that they "will occasion a great deal of gossip, talebearing, backbiting, scoffing, railing, ridiculing, mocking, cursing and swearing."—And so Christians must stay all special efforts to advance religion and save the souls of men, for fear that the wicked will curse and swear at them! How long does this writer think we should retain our Sabbaths, or ordinances, or public worship, or religious privileges of any kind, if the profane and ungodly could swear us out of them!

"Others," says our author, "annoyed in their domestic and social peace, or disturbed in various other ways, will treat them [the protracted meetings] with more rudeness and severity." We suppose he means that they will disturb the meetings with drums and guns, with throwing stones and breaking windows, as they have done in some instances already. And will Mr. F. appear as the apologist of such proceedings? Or will he charge the blame of them to the meetings? As well might the Apostles be blamed for the tumults which the wicked excited against them. As well might the Saviour himself be blamed, for the disgraceful scenes attending his crucifixion.

Among the bad consequences of the protracted meetings, Mr. F. mentions their effects on religious societies. "Many more societies will be diminished in numbers and strength." But what societies? Not those of Evangelical Christians. So long as the meetings are properly conducted, we have no fear as to their effects on these. It is the societies of Unitarians and Universalists,



for which Mr. F. feels so much solicitude. And with good reason. For after all his efforts to keep people away from these meetings, they will have their liberty, and will attend them. And here, in many instances, they will learn the difference between truth and error, between the chaff and the wheat; the Spirit of God will enlighten their souls, and they will come to the knowledge of the truth. And then farewell to the liberal meeting. The persons thus affected will have no heart for such a meeting, and will not (unless by compulsion) attend it. Many liberal societies have been already weakened in this way, and if the protracted meetings are continued in a proper spirit and manner, many more undoubtedly will be. And this consideration has more weight, probably, than every other, in inducing the liberal clergy to denounce them.

Mr. F. concludes with bemoaning our religious prospects, and with endeavoring to work upon the sympathies of his readers to persuade them to stand by their Unitarian ministers.

"Our religious prospects are humbling and alarming."—"With my views of religion, I cannot but look on our present circumstances, at times, as very dark and gloomy."

We wonder not at all at this. Had we the same views of religion with Mr. F., instead of rejoicing, as we now do, in the rising glory of the church, we should, with him, regard the present aspect of things as pre-eminently dark and gloomy. Revivals of religion multiplying and extending on every side, and the Son of God riding forth from conquering to conquer—gathering in converts by hundreds and thousands, enlarging and building up his churches, and withering and blasting unfounded hopes;—we wonder not at all that Mr. F. and his brethren are alarmed. We wonder not that, with their views of religion, present circumstances look dark to them, and often fill them with painful apprehensions.

"Think," says he to his readers, who he takes for granted will be inclined, after all, to attend the protracted meetings,—“think of your minister! Think how you multiply his labors, anxieties and troubles! He has feelings, as well as you. Think what joy and confidence you would give him, if he found you bound together, and cleaving to him in this time of danger and delusion. Why will you set fire to your own house, or pull it upon your own heads? Why should you destroy your own society?”

Truly, we are sorry for these distressed ministers, and most devoutly do we wish that they might come to the possession of better views. Then, instead of mourning, they might rejoice. In place of present gloom and fear, their souls might be filled with hope and peace. But standing where they now do, what can be said or done to comfort them? The times are undoubtedly becoming worse and worse for them. The gospel is soon to be preached for a witness to all nations; the Spirit is to be poured out upon all flesh; revivals are to be extended with increasing rapidity and

power; and conversions are to be multiplied a thousand fold. If the opposers of this great work are already afraid; if paleness begins to gather on their faces even now; 'what will they do in the end thereof?' Most unfeignedly do we pity them, and with them all those who, in this day of Divine power and mercy, set themselves in opposition to the rising kingdom of Christ. The issue of a struggle so unequal cannot be doubtful, and to those who persist in it must be dreadful. May all who have an interest at the throne of grace be much in prayer for such persons, that their eyes may be opened and their hearts renewed, that their spirits may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

That the protracted meetings, when properly conducted, are an admirably adapted means of grace, an instrument of prodigious power, and one which the Holy Spirit has delighted greatly to honor, there can be no doubt. Men, in their blindness, may ridicule and oppose them, but the heavens are rejoicing over them; and thousands of ransomed souls are now rejoicing upon earth, and will rejoice in heaven forever, that these meetings were instituted, and were the means of their salvation.

It must not be forgotten, however, that like every thing else entrusted to human hands, the meetings in question are liable to be perverted. And if the enemy of souls cannot crush them by opposition, he will leave no means untried to accomplish their perversion. Let, then, those who engage in them be on their guard; for they are 'not ignorant of his devices.' Let them watch against every thing in the public service of God, which is not accordant with his revealed will, and with the pure and heavenly spirit of the gospel. Let them watch especially their own hearts; be ever humble; feel their *dependence* as well as their obligations; be mighty in *prayer* as well as untiring in effort; and the Spirit of God will not leave them to 'labor in vain, and spend their strength for nought and in vain.'

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### FIRST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN THE UNITED STATES.

The following account of "old Mr. Tennent" (father of Gilbert and William Tennent\*) and of the "school of the prophets" over which he presided, is extracted from the Journals of Rev. Mr. Whitefield. While Whitefield resided at Philadelphia, Nov. 10, 1739, he was first introduced to Mr. Tennent, and speaks of him as follows:

"At my return home, was much comforted by the coming of one

\* Gilbert Tennent was at this time settled in the Ministry at New Brunswick, and William at Freehold, in New Jersey.

Mr. Tennent, an old grey-headed disciple and soldier of Jesus Christ. He keeps an academy about twenty miles off Philadelphia, has been blessed with four gracious sons, three of whom have been, and still continue to be, eminently useful in the church of Christ. He is a great friend to Mr. Erskine of Scotland, and, as far as I can find, both he and his sons are secretly despised by the generality of the Synod, as Mr. Erskine and his brethren are hated by the Judicatories of Edinburgh, and as the Methodist Preachers are by their brethren in England."

"November 22. Set out for Neshamini (twenty miles distant from Trent Town) where old Mr. Tennent lives, and keeps an academy, and where I was to preach to-day, according to appointment. About twelve we came thither, and found above 3000 people gathered together in the meeting-house yard; and Mr. William Tennent, an eminent servant of Jesus Christ, preaching to them, because we had stayed beyond the time appointed. When I came up, he soon stopped, and sung a Psalm, and then I began to speak as the Lord gave me utterance."

"After our exercises were over, we went to old Mr. Tennent, who entertained us like one of the ancient patriarchs. His wife to me seemed like Elizabeth, and he like Zacchary; both, as far as I can find, walk in all the ordinances and commandments of the Lord blameless. It happens very providentially, that Mr. Tennent and his brethren are appointed to be a Presbytery by the Synod, so that they intend breeding up gracious youths, and sending them out from time to time into our Lord's vineyard. The place wherein the young men study now, is in contempt called the college. It is a log-house, about twenty feet long, and near as many broad; and to me it seemed to resemble the schools of the old prophets. From this despised place seven or eight worthy ministers of Jesus have lately been sent forth; more are almost ready to be sent, and a foundation is now laying for the instruction of many others. The Devil will certainly rage against them, but the work, I am persuaded, is of God, and therefore will not come to nought."

#### REMARKABLE CONVERSIONS.

In the recent Revivals of Religion, there have been many remarkable conversions. Hardened sinners, those who had wandered farthest from the ordinary channels of saving mercy, have been apparently humbled, and brought to the knowledge of the truth. Such instances are striking, but not new. They occurred in the primitive church. And they have occurred in all places since, where the gospel has been faithfully preached, and has been accompanied by the power of the Holy Ghost.—The two following cases are mentioned by Mr. Whitefield in his Journal at Philadelphia, under date of Nov. 9, 1740.

"The first is one Mr. Brockden, Recorder of Deeds, a man eminent in his profession, but for many years a notorious Deist. In his younger days, he told me, he had some religious impressions, but coming into business, the cares of the world so choked the good seed, that he not only forgot his God in some degree, but at length

began to doubt of, and to dispute his very being. In this state he continued many years, and has been very zealous to propagate his Deistical, I could almost say Atheistical principles among moral men; but he told me he never endeavored to make proselytes of vicious, debauched people. When I came to Philadelphia this time twelve-month, he told me, he had not so much as a curiosity to hear me. But a brother Deist, his choicest friend, pressing him to come and hear me, to satisfy his curiosity, he at length complied with his request. It was night. I preached at the Court-house stairs, upon the conference which our Lord had with Nicodemus. I had not spoke much before God struck his heart. "For," said he, "I saw your doctrine tended to make people good." His family knew nothing that he had been to hear me. After he came home, his wife, who had been at sermon, came in also, and wished heartily that he had heard me. He said nothing. After this, another of his family came in, repeating the same wish; and, if I mistake not, after that another; till at last, being unable to refrain any longer, with tears in his eyes, Why, says he, I have been hearing him; and then expressed his approbation. Ever since, he has followed on to know the Lord, and I verily believe Jesus Christ has made himself manifest to his soul. Though upwards of three score years old, he is now, I believe, born again of God. He is a little child, and often (as he told me) receives such communications from God, when he retires into the woods, that he thinks he could die a martyr for the truth."

"The next is one Captain H———, formerly as great a reprobate as ever I heard of: almost a scandal and reproach to human nature. He used to swear to ease his stomach, and was so fond of new oaths, that he used to go on board the transport ships, and offer a guinea for a new oath, that he might have the honor of coining it. It would be endless to give instances of his vile profaneness. To the honor of God's grace let it be said, he is now, I believe, a Christian; not only reformed, but renewed. The effectual stroke, he told me, was given, when I preached last spring at Pennypack. Ever since, he has been zealous for the truth; stood like a lamb when he was beaten, and in danger of being murdered some time ago, by many of my opposers; and, in short, shows forth his faith by his works."

"I mention these in particular, because I think they are remarkable proofs of that too much exploded doctrine, I mean, *God's Eternal Election and Everlasting Love*. Whatever men's carnal reasoning may suggest, yet if the children of God fairly examine their own experiences, if they do God justice, they must acknowledge, that they did not choose God, but God chose them. And if he chose them at all, it must be from eternity, and that too without any regard to any thing foreseen in them. But I would be tender in this point, and leave persons to be taught it of God. I am of the martyr Bradford's mind:—'*Let a man go to the grammar school of faith and repentance, before he goes to the University of election and predestination.*'"

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *The Great Encouragement to Ministerial Effort: A Sermon delivered at the Installation of the Rev THOMAS MATHER SMITH, as Pastor of the Presbyterian Church, Catskill, N. Y., June 15, 1831.* By LEONARD WOODS, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Andover: Flagg & Gould. pp. 22.

The principal object of this Discourse is to show, that "*the doctrine of Divine influence presents the only adequate encouragement to the servants of Christ, to labor for the conversion of sinners and the prosperity of the church.*" This is unquestionably true; and it is also true, that the more deeply any person feels his dependence on the Divine Spirit, to accompany his labors and make them successful, the more disposed will he be to labor in the cause of Christ. Because a deep and solemn sense of dependence on God will be attended with deep feeling on all religious subjects;—with engagedness and watchfulness, with earnest desires, and fervent prayers, and consequent vigorous exertions, to extend the borders of the Redeemer's kingdom. At the same time there is danger, that our dependence on God to bless us *in* our labors, may degenerate into a sluggish reliance on him to bless us *without* our labors;—that instead of looking up to him to work with us and by us, we shall come to presume on him to accomplish his own work and ours too;—and that we shall wickedly excuse our sloth, and want of interest, and consequent want of success, by alleging our dependence on his power and pleasure. In this view, the following inference is exceedingly important:

"It is a fair inference from what has been said, that *the best preparation which can be made on our part for the work of divine grace in a revival of religion, is, to become duly sensible, that we are nothing, and that God is all in all.* I say *duly* sensible,—sensible in a *right* manner, and with *right accompanying circumstances.* The feeling I refer to is not like the inability of a sick man to rise up and walk; nor is it like the inability of a man to move and act, when he is overcome with sleep. He who is *duly* sensible of his insufficiency, and his dependence on God, is all alive to the interests of religion. He knows that sinners, whether old or young, are utterly ruined. He knows that their end draws near, and that if they die in impenitence, their souls are lost forever. This view of their depravity and wretchedness moves the pity of his heart. He longs and pants for their salvation. His soul is all on fire to see the glory of God displayed in the conversion of the multitudes who are ready to perish. But with all his pity, and love, and zeal, and all his fervent prayer for the salvation of those who are lost, he is convinced, he knows and feels, that not one of them will ever be converted without special divine influence; that his word will return unto him void, and all his labor accomplish nothing, unless it please God to interpose, and save sinners by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

Connected with this sermon there is a note, in which the author expresses his approbation of *protracted meetings*, and his reasons for this approbation.

"After much reflection, I have become satisfied of the fitness and utility of holding such a meeting occasionally, and under proper regulations, by the following reasons.

1. It was the appointment of God under the former dispensation, that religious observances should, on particular occasions, be continued for several days in succession. And this divine appointment undoubtedly involved a principle adapted to the nature and constitution of man. The history of Christ and the

Apostles, and of the church in its best days, furnishes much evidence in favor of the same principle, and none against it.

"2. The withdrawalment of men, on particular occasions, from common worldly pursuits, and fixing their attention on the concerns of the soul, for a longer time than usual, has a tendency manifestly favorable to the success of the gospel.

"3. God has put upon such meetings a visible mark of his approbation, by making them the means of the hopeful conversion of a great multitude of sinners, and of advancing believers in a holy life.

"4. Evangelical Christians, both in this country and in Great Britain, have in past times frequently had religious exercises substantially like those we are now considering. At the larger meetings of ecclesiastical bodies, and to some extent at communion seasons, they have had religious services in public for several days in succession. It cannot therefore be alleged, that a meeting continued through a part of several days for the purpose of promoting the interests of religion, is an *innovation*, or that it has anything new, except its name, and the particular order or mode of its exercises."

2. *The Scriptural Interpreter*. Vol. I., No. I., July, 1831. Boston : Leonard C. Bowles. pp. 48.

The Editor of this new Monthly is the Rev. E. S. Gannett, Junior Pastor of the Federal Church and Society in Boston. He candidly states in his Prospectus "that he is a Unitarian, and believes that Unitarian Christianity is the *only* system of faith and duty which can be drawn from the New Testament, by a just interpretation of its contents." We admire his frankness, so different from the policy of American Unitarians generally only a few years ago, and from that of not a few of them even now.\*

The principal object of "the Scriptural Interpreter," will doubtless be, to satisfy its readers, especially its young readers, that Unitarianism is the religion of the New Testament, and consequently to initiate them into all the mysteries of Unitarian interpretation. They may here expect to learn the most approved methods of interpreting away a great variety of passages,—particularly those which speak of the Divinity of the Saviour, of his Divine names, attributes, works, and worship,—of the Holy Spirit, of the existence and agency of fallen spirits, of the depravity of man, of regeneration, repentance, and justification, and of future eternal punishment. We have some specimens of this kind of interpretation, even in this first number.

The Greek word commonly rendered *repent*, Mr. Gannett renders *reform*; because, says he, "the word *repent* does not express the force of the original." But does not Mr. Gannett know that this Greek word (*Metanoia*) necessarily denotes a change of *mind*, of *feeling*, an *internal* change,—whereas the word *reform* (as commonly used) imports no more than an *outward* change of conduct? And does he not know that this Greek word is *used*, throughout the Bible, to denote an internal change, *to be followed by reformation*, as the fruit of it? "Repent, and turn from your idols, and turn away your faces from all your abominations." "Repent, and turn from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin." Ezek. xiv. 6, and 18, 30. "That they should repent,

\* Much has been said in our pages respecting the *concealment* formerly practised by Unitarian ministers in this country. We find a striking testimony on the subject in the published proceedings of the last meeting of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. One of the speakers then observed, "A few years ago, there were not above one or two ministers in America that would venture to avow themselves Unitarians!! and he remembered an American clergyman, when in England, demurring as to preaching in a Unitarian pulpit, lest it should come to the ears of his congregation, and raise a prejudice against him!!"

and *turn to God*, and DO WORKS MEET FOR REPENTANCE." Acts xxvi. 20. Will Mr. Gannett hazard his reputation for intelligence and candor, by substituting, in these and the like passages, the word *reform*, in place of the old fashioned word *repent*?

"The Holy Spirit," we are told in "the Scriptural Interpreter," signifies "the spiritual influences of Christianity, including its divine truths, its holy character, and the miraculous gifts which were enjoyed by its first disciples."—We recommend to the Berry Street Conference that, at their next general meeting, they endeavor to settle the meaning of the words, Holy Spirit. This and the like phraseology is certainly of frequent occurrence in the New Testament, and it is no light disgrace to liberal interpreters, and is calculated to bring suspicion upon their whole scheme, that scarcely any two of them explain it alike.

3. *The Christian Ministry*, with an Inquiry into the Causes of its Inefficiency. By the REV. CHARLES BRIDGES, B. A., Vicar of Old Newton, Suffolk, and author of Exposition of Psalm cxix. In two volumes. First American from the second London edition, corrected and enlarged. New York: J. Leavitt. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1831.

"Mr. Bridges," says Dr. Milnor of New York, "is a distinguished Clergyman of the Church of England—a man of sterling piety, of the most decidedly evangelical sentiments, and of a catholic spirit towards Christians of other denominations. The work is, in my opinion, calculated for general usefulness, but will be found eminently adapted to the use of students preparing for the work of the ministry, and of those already engaged in its sacred duties, who, called to their responsible office by the Holy Spirit, desire to "show themselves approved unto God as workmen that need not to be ashamed."

4. *A Grammar of the Hebrew Language*. By MOSES STUART, Associate Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Institution at Andover. Fourth Edition, Corrected and Enlarged. Andover: Flagg & Gould. 1831. pp. 248.

Says Professor Stuart in his Preface, "I have revised the present Edition throughout, and have made a multitude of additions and corrections of a subordinate kind. No page of the third edition has escaped some change; although, for the most part, the alterations are of such a nature as will not attract the notice of readers in general." "The labor which I have bestowed on the present edition will at least be regarded as furnishing some evidence, that my desire is strong to improve the work as much as lies in my power."

5. *Church Psalmody: A Collection of Psalms and Hymns adapted to Public Worship*. Selected from Dr. Watts, and other Authors. Boston: Perkins & Marvin. 1831. pp. 576.

The Compilers of this work are Messrs. Lowell Mason and David Greene, of this city. The number of Psalms and Hymns contained in it is 1185. Of these, 421 are from Dr. Watts, "who has undoubtedly written more good Psalms and Hymns of a highly lyrical character than any other author, and to whom the church is indebted, probably, for nearly half of all the valuable lyric poetry in the language."—No pains have been spared by the Compilers to render this

collection as complete and perfect as the nature of the case admits. They have had access to "nearly all the good lyric poetry in the English language," and have selected and arranged with much taste and judgement. The work is thoroughly Evangelical in doctrine and spirit, and is well worthy the attention of those who desire to improve the Psalmody of our churches.

6. *A Selection of Hymns*, adapted to the Devotions of the Closet, the Family, and the Social Circle, and containing subjects appropriate to the Monthly Concerts of Prayer for the success of Missions and Sunday Schools, and other Special Occasions. By ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER, D. D. New York: J. Leavett. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1831. pp. 624.

This selection of Hymns is "intended for *private*, rather than public use," and has been prepared with the special view of aiding in the devotions of the closet, the family, and the social meeting. "It will be equally suited to all Evangelical denominations," as "all have been made to contribute more or less to the collection." It is not designed to supersede other similar publications, but rather to be supplementary to them; as the Editor assures us that "much the larger part of the hymns in this volume are not contained in any of the collections which have been printed, or widely circulated, in this country."

7. *The Christian Lyre*. By JOSHUA LEAVITT. Fifth Edition Revised. New York: J. Leavitt. Boston: Crocker & Brewster. 1831. pp. 216.

The first volume of this little work, published in monthly numbers, is now complete. It contains a variety of hymns and tunes adapted to the use of families and social meetings, particularly in revivals of religion. "The work is not designed to please scientific musicians, so much as to profit plain Christians." It is highly recommended by respectable ministers and others, and will be introduced, in many places, with interest and profit.

8. *Spiritual Songs for Social Worship. No. 1*. Words and Music arranged by THOMAS HASTINGS of Utica, and LOWELL MASON of Boston. Utica: Hastings, Tracy, & Williams. 1831. pp. 42.

This little work, like that last noticed, is a periodical, designed to consist of twelve numbers. The object of the two publications is the same, and is one, we think, of great importance. "Psalms and hymns of the ordinary character are well adapted to the use of large and dignified assemblies; but for the accommodation of families and private circles, something more simple, chantant, and melodious in its character is more appropriate." Several of the melodies in the number before us "have been composed expressly for the work. None of them, it is believed, have been injured by irrelevant associations. The words have been selected with care, and in all things the compilers have aimed at that species of chaste simplicity, which is so favorable to the promotion of religious feeling."

9. *An Essay on Repentance*. By THOMAS SCOTT, Rector of Aston Sanford, Bucks. Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1831. pp. 116.



THE  
**SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.**

---

---

VOL. IV.

NOVEMBER, 1831.

NO. 11.

---

---

**COMMUNICATIONS.**

THOUGHTS ON SOME OF THE DANGERS OF THE TIMES.

That the present is a season of peculiar interest to the church, every one at all acquainted with events now occurring around us must feel. We refer particularly to those revivals of religion which are pouring their blessings over the land, and preparing, as we trust, the church for her great and decisive conflict with the powers of darkness. Since the days of the apostles, there has been no such copious and universal outpouring of the Spirit, no such evident and cheering precursors of millennial triumph. In this season of gracious visitation and refreshing from the presence of the Lord we rejoice, but not without trembling. The victory is not yet won. The church is receiving rich blessings; but dangers, great as her blessings are precious, thicken around her. There is an enemy aroused and maddened by her successes, who will hurl his poisoned arrows, and spread his secret snares, and concentrate the malice of a world at enmity with God, in order to paralyze the efforts and blast the prospects of the church. To be ignorant of his devices, or to disregard the tokens of impending danger, will but ensure defeat. At such a time, if we manifest some solicitude, lest the reviving power and rising hopes of the church should make her insensible to danger, let it not be ascribed to our pusillanimity. When does the watchful pilot feel the deepest solicitude? Not when he is chiding the slumbering winds, and watching the lazy motion of his vessel upon a sea of glass; but when the waves are curling under the favoring breeze, and the ship under a press of sail is bounding towards its destined port. Then, a concealed rock is fatal.

We cannot now prosecute the general subject which we have started. Our object is to utter a word of caution in relation to *one* of the dangers to which the church is at this season peculiarly exposed, namely, the introduction into its bosom of apparent converts, who know little of the real claims, and nothing of the true spirit of the gospel. It would be remarkable, if we should wholly escape this evil. It attends all revivals of religion, and is enhanced by

their frequency and power. When a divine energy is abroad in the land waking up the souls of men in a thousand places at once, and the most pungent appeals are made to the conscience, and the whole power of a most efficient moral machinery is brought to bear upon the mind with incessant and prolonged activity, and the work of individual conversion is short, and multitudes are escaping with trembling haste from the wrath to come, and the tide of public sentiment is setting in strongly towards the kingdom of God,—then is the time of the greatest danger; for many, awakened suddenly from their unprofitable dreaming, and pressed by convictions which they cannot remove, will rush into the visible church, without any radical change in their affections, or any definite and abiding purpose in regard to their future course. At such a time, it is hard for a man to know himself; and when *true* conversions are multiplied with such unprecedented rapidity, it is difficult for Christians to detect those which are false.

The consequences to the church of an increase of unconverted members, (not to speak of the fearful results to hypocrites and self-deceivers themselves) must be disastrous. Here is the source of those multiform heresies which spring up, and deform the gospel, and deprive it of its power. To the same cause must be ascribed the tardy and feeble movement of the church towards the completion of its great purpose, the conversion of the world. The cold indifference of professed friends often freezes its life-blood; and in times when union and efficient co-operation are indispensable, these are the men whose influence stands ever in the way of success. Encumbered by such hindrances, the church must move like a ship in the polar seas surrounded by huge masses of ice; and unless the hand of the Almighty shall guide it out, or his breath melt the frozen mountains, the fragments of our bark will be scattered upon the waves. From the history of the New England church we may derive an illustration and a warning: an illustration of the danger attending the introduction of unsanctified men to its affections and councils, and a warning to guard with holy and jealous caution the ark of our hopes.

To diminish as much as possible the danger to which we have adverted, it should be the object of every minister of Christ to spread out before the sinner, and to make him understand and feel, the real nature of those claims which the gospel urges, and the whole weight of those obligations which he assumes, when he resolves to be a Christian. In times of religious excitement, there is often but a partial development of the subject concerning which the sinner is required, once for all, to decide. There is a way of representing religion so easy and so delightful, that it is very difficult for a sinner not to be a Christian; and there is sometimes a fear, lest by showing what may be considered the darker shades of the picture, some one who is almost persuaded, may be discour-

aged. There is moreover a tendency to dwell upon the glorious *results* of piety for the purpose of urging an immediate choice, while the practical duties which lead to those results are not brought into full and distinct view. We would not render religion harsh and repulsive. We would portray it in the brightest colors and most attractive forms. But at the same time, we would tell the sinner that the beauty of religion is the serene beauty of holiness; that the happiness of religion results from bearing the yoke and the burden of Christ; and that the glory of the Christian is the glory of a man who denies himself and overcomes the world. We would never show the crown but in connexion with the cross, nor let hope appear except as the anchor of a tossed soul. In no other way can the increase of hollow professions, and the spread of a superficial religion be prevented. While conversion is made to consist in a single mental operation with reference to a complex subject which is but partially understood; while the way to heaven is made broader and more easy to a worldly mind than the way to hell; while the garland of victory is held out to allure the heart without pointing to the conflict of the battle field; what can we expect but that many will flock into the church without having received the mark of Christ upon their foreheads, or the anointing of the Holy Ghost upon their hearts? Let then the preacher, while he tells the sinner nothing but the truth, tell the whole truth. Let him show the length and breadth and height and depth of those responsibilities which a man assumes when he makes a profession of religion; so that when he comes to see all that is involved in his decision, as sooner or later he must, he may not be disappointed, and be induced either to apostatize from the faith, or to attempt the concealment of his irreligion by a studied hypocrisy.

What then is really required of a sinner when he is urged to become a Christian? Obviously, something more than a mere choice of heaven and eternal glory in preference to hell and eternal torments. Every man desires and chooses to go to heaven. Who is insensible to the attractions of a city, the walls of which are jasper, and the pavement of pure gold? But the choice of the path which leads to heaven—the feelings and conduct with which eternal glory is indissolubly connected, is a very different thing. How often do we see men thus divided against themselves. Their imaginations travel up to heaven, while their hearts are rushing with fearful haste along the path that leads down to perdition. They make a simultaneous choice of the rewards of holiness and the ways of sin. They fix their eyes upon the glory that fadeth not away, while their feet stumble upon the dark mountains. Let then the sinner know that the choice of heaven is folly in the extreme, without the choice of the path which leads to it; and that he gains nothing by wishing for the prize placed before him in the gospel, unless he is willing to run the race by which that prize must be won.

Nor is it sufficient to have the conscience awakened and deeply impressed with a conviction of the excellence and importance of religion. This conviction the awakened sinner feels in common with many of the enemies of God in both worlds. Truth and conscience were framed by the same hand, and they harmoniously correspond the one to the other. It is impossible for any man to hear the gospel faithfully preached, without feeling that it is true and excellent. Men may hate religion, but they feel that it is good. They may, like Satan, rebel against the light; but they know that it is light against which they are rebelling. Let the Bible teach its sublime doctrines, blazing with the wisdom of God; let the law be spread before the mind in all its purity and power; let the gospel come, preaching peace by Jesus Christ; and in what part of Jehovah's dominions is the conscience that can regard the whole of this magnificent display as useless or injurious?

Now, under a plain and powerful exhibition of truth, a sinner, whose mind has for a long time been fixed upon worldly things, and whose conscience has slept merely because the truth has been kept away from it, may awake as from a dream, and feel a strange and unwonted approbation of religion. He hears God speak, and bows to the truth; he opens the Bible, and is struck with the holiness which flashes forth from its consecrated pages; he enters the house of God, and feels that it is good to be there; he reflects upon his life, and the immovable conviction fastens upon him, that religion is the one thing needful. He never felt so before; is not this conversion? He begins to hope. Alas! he has mistaken the light of conscience for the influence of grace, and an intellectual approbation of religion for the possession of its spirit. The delusion is fatal; for nothing is more certain than that this approbation of religion—this homage which conscience is compelled to pay to truth, may co-exist with a heart at enmity with God. How often have we seen a conscience and a heart thus working with all their strength in different directions,—a conscience keenly alive to the purity and excellence of the law, and a heart that panted after forbidden gratifications. Such a divorce between conscience and the affections may perhaps be found in some who read these remarks. While they are awakened to see and “approve the things which are excellent,” they may be fast bound in the chains of a degrading worldliness; and while they wonder and admire, may also perish. Let the sinner be fully persuaded of this, that the affections must follow the decisions of conscience. What is the approbation of the intellect, without the quickening influence of love? Would you see a shining illustration of the union of heart and conscience, look at David. “Thy law is exceeding pure, therefore thy servant loveth it.” “The judgements of the Lord are true and righteous altogether; more to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honey comb.”

“O how love I thy law; it is my meditation all the day.” These are the feelings of a sanctified heart; let the reader say whether they exist in his own. The question is of great importance. “With the heart man believeth unto righteousness.” It is vain to bring your sacrifice of intellectual approbation to the altar of God, unless love be there to sanctify it, and present it as an acceptable offering to the searcher of hearts.

Equally plain is it, that regard for religion must extend to all its parts, to every doctrine and to every precept. Many are ready to be Christians while they contemplate religion as a grand and beautiful system at a distance sufficiently great to render the impression general and vague. But when it comes near, and unfolds its real design, and urges one by one its unyielding claims, and brings all its doctrines before the mind; these very persons discover particular parts which they could wish were altered or removed; they would break the system into fragments, and select those portions of it which seem to be most favorable to their prevailing habits of thought and feeling. The young man who came to Christ to ask what he must do to be saved, was satisfied with the Saviour's first general answer to his question; but when he heard the command to part with his wealth, and follow a master who had not where to lay his head, he went away sorrowful. He could not submit to a precept which tore from him his idol. When he fixed his eye upon that part of religion which seemed consistent with his practice, he was pleased; but when he considered its high and exclusive claims, its disinterestedness, and its unbending spirituality, he rejected the whole; and though he might still profess to be a lover of religion, in all probability he died without having drank of its pure spirit. In a season of revival, it is not uncommon for Christians to dwell chiefly upon a few subjects, important indeed, but not constituting the whole of the gospel. The tendency of this is to convert sinners to a part of religion, and not to the whole. There are some things in the gospel which every one likes, as soon as he hears them. Select from the crowd of worldlings about you any one you please, and urge upon him some two or three of the most affecting subjects contained in the Bible; speak to him of the indulgent Father of mankind bending from his throne to take his children to his bosom; show him the cross, not shrouded in sackcloth, but like another sun pouring the beams of love and mercy over a benighted world; read to him God's own magnificent descriptions of the New Jerusalem with its gates of pearl, and its river of life; show him the society of just men made perfect, with their crowns of starry brightness, and their harps of gold; whisper in his ear those precious promises which wake up in the believer's soul hopes full of immortality;—and it would be wonderful if he did not say at once that he would be a Christian;—and you might rejoice in the belief that you had converted a sinner

from the error of his ways, and had saved a soul from death. But when the first emotions have in some measure subsided, seek out this new convert, and explain to him in plain and simple language the whole gospel scheme of salvation, with its practical bearing upon human life; show him that God, while he loves men and desires their salvation, will by no means connive at sin, nor accept of a divided heart; show him that the cross can save only by crucifying the world unto him, and him to the world; show him that no promise can be appropriated until there is an entire conformity of life to the law of God, and that there is no heaven but for the pure in heart; show him the field of labor and of conflict, and tell him how much the Saviour expects him to do and suffer for his sake; and perhaps you will find that these hard sayings eclipse all the glories of the gospel, and throw a chilling influence upon the heart that seemed just ready to mount up to heaven.

We do not mean that a preacher should exclude those affecting views of truth to which we have adverted: this would be to wander to the other extreme. They are in the gospel; let them be brought forth and made to bear upon the heart; but let the whole gospel be preached. While we are careful to add nothing to the system, let nothing be taken from it. And let the sinner see that the gospel must be received and loved just as it is. Let him feel that duty and privilege, threatening and promise, conflict and victory, go together; and when he seems ready to subscribe with his own hand to be the Lord's, let him ask himself, Do I love every thing that Jesus teaches and requires? Is there no part of his gospel that I should be glad to alter or change? Is there no doctrine that I wish to hear explained in a milder form than that in which it appears in the Bible? Is there no duty of self-denial from which I would gladly be excused? Do "I esteem his commandments concerning *all things* to be right, and hate every false way?" This is the feeling of the real Christian; and he would no sooner alter or remove one precept of the gospel, than he would blot out a sun from the system of the universe.

One further remark in relation to this subject, and I have done. The man who chooses religion and professes to be a Christian, must follow up his choice by a life of practical godliness. Love, like faith, must prove its existence by holy deeds. If ye love me, said the Saviour, keep my commandments. If you have resolved that you will be a Christian, let the world see that your decision is a practical one. Religion is but another name for every thing in human character and conduct that is lovely and of good report. There are those whose devotion is chiefly expressed in words. Professions of attachment to the cause of Christ, they intend shall be received as the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen. They have a high standard of feeling, but a low standard of practical obedience. Their affections gleam out

occasionally upon the darkness of an indolent life, like the meteor which may dazzle and astonish, but does not warm and invigorate. This will never do. Piety, without doubt, has its origin in the heart; but there is a fatal inconsistency in substituting mental operations, even love itself, for practical godliness. Religious affections were not designed to be like a volcanic fire, at one time shut up, and at another poured out in streams that blight and consume; they were intended to be like the genial warmth of the spring, which thaws the frozen earth, and forces into vigorous life the plants which refresh and sustain mankind.

Let, then, the sinner remember, that religion hath its duties as well as its doctrines; that it demands the energy of benevolent exertion, as well as the confidence of faith; that it calls for real sacrifices as well as for professions of attachment; that it holds forth a world lying in wickedness, and bids him go work in this vineyard, and do with his might what he there finds to be done. Let him not think to defraud his Maker and the world, by making religion a system of speculations and abstractions; let him not evade the debt of gratitude and obedience which he owes to the compassionate Saviour, who hath called him from darkness into light; let him not profess to receive the doctrines of the gospel, and deny in practice their legitimate influence, which is a holy life. And let him know that whatever be a man's object in professing religion, whether it be present peace or future glory, obedience to the commands of Christ is the only way to secure it. The path of duty is the path of comfort and hope, which shines brighter and brighter unto the perfect day. All other paths, though at first inviting, are ways of darkness and fear, leading down to the chambers of death.

Reader, what are you *doing* to furnish evidence to yourself and to the church that you are born again? Remember that the first question of the new-born soul is, '*Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?*' Its last triumphant exclamation is, '*I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith.*'

---

#### STATE OF MORALS IN ANCIENT GREECE AND ROME.

AN incidental advantage of the labors of modern Missionaries, and one which, were there no other, might compensate for all that these labors have cost, is, they have made us acquainted with the actual moral state of the idolatrous nations. Previous to the commencement of Missionary efforts, we were accustomed to hear much respecting 'the pious heathen,' and the comparative virtue

and happiness of those nations which did, and did not, enjoy the light of the gospel. But the visits of Missionaries to the unevangelized portions of the earth have opened the eyes of people to this subject, and effectually dispelled the previous delusion. They have announced to the Christian world the appalling fact, that 'the pious heathen,' are no where to be found, and that it is as true now as it was eighteen hundred years ago, that among the worshippers of idols, 'there is none that doeth good, *no not one.*'

The labors of the apostles had a similar effect in opening the eyes of Christians in their times, and in all subsequent ages, to the enormous wickedness of the idolatrous nations of antiquity. The admirers of the ancient Greeks and Romans, not content with extolling their genius and eloquence, have often eulogized their virtues. These renowned nations have been represented as distinguished, not only for their success in arts and arms, but for whatever is estimable and ennobling in character and conduct. But Paul, the Missionary, gives us a very different account of them. In a letter to the Romans, written under circumstances which would have led to contradiction had he misrepresented or exaggerated, he describes them, in their heathen state, as "being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful." A dark and doleful picture truly! Can it possibly be just!

My design in the following paper is to justify this representation of the Apostle, in its application particularly to the Greeks and Romans, by an appeal to their own authors, and to such other sources of evidence as have come down to us from heathen antiquity.

And here I would call attention, in the first place, to one of the public amusements of the Romans—the shows of the gladiators.\*

If we may trust the most learned inquirer upon this subject, the horrid waste of mankind in these shows sometimes amounted to twenty or thirty thousand lives in one month.† Their exhibition was continually demanded of those from whom custom had given the people any claim to require it, and was among the most certain means of gaining their favor. They were crowded by all classes of persons, women as well as men. Among the permanent edifices erected in the times of Roman magnificence, the most

\* For much that follows, I am indebted to an Article in the Monthly Anthology for June, 1810.

† Credo, ino scio, nullum bellum tantam cladem vastitatemque generi humano intulisse, quam hos ad voluptatem ludos. Numerum cum animis vestris recensete dierum quos diu hominumque; mentior si non unus aliquis mensis Europae stetit vicenis capitum millibus aut tricenis. Lipsii Sat. 1. 12.



vast, the Colisæum of Vespasian, was one of those buildings, erected to contain the spectators of these shows. They were not confined to the capital, but at last exhibited throughout the extent of the Roman empire, so that we find amphitheatres (*cædium illarum sedes*) everywhere among the remains of antiquity. Nor was this sort of shows exhibited in public only; but they were sometimes introduced to heighten the pleasure of the guests amid the festivity of private entertainments.\* After having contemplated this subject, the observer of antiquity might look, not without curiosity and interest, to find if there were not, at least in the writings of the better men of those times, some traits of moral principle or of human feeling regarding this custom. And it would not be without disappointment and pain, that he would find such a sentence as this in the writings of Cicero, "*Crudele gladiatorum spectaculum et inhumanum nonnullis videri solet, et haud scio an ita sit, ut nunc fit.*"† Cicero. *Tusculan.* II. 17.

From the subject of the gladiators, we may turn to that of the number and treatment of slaves in Greece and Rome. At Athens, in the time of Demetrius Phalereus, the number of Athenian citizens was twenty-one thousand; the number of free men of age to pay the capitation tax, who had not the rights of Athenian citizens, ten thousand; and the number of slaves, including men, women and children, four hundred thousand!! "The disproportion," [of slaves to freemen] "was greater," says Mitford, "at Lacedæmon, and scarcely inferior over Greece." In confirmation of this remark, he quotes Thucydides, who says, "that the proportion of slaves was no where greater than in Chios, except in Laconia."

With regard to the number of slaves in Italy, there is nothing known with so much exactness as in the preceding statement respecting Athens; but the following translation of one of the notes of Lipsius upon Tacitus, may give some information on the subject. "I find," says he, "that the number of slaves among the Romans was such as will hardly be credited in the present state of society. Tacitus ascribes four hundred to Pedanius Costa Secundus. Pliny, five thousand to a certain Cæcilius Isidorus; and these say nothing more than Athenæus, from whom the following is a quotation. 'You know very well, good Masurius, what numbers of domestic slaves the Romans possess. Very many of them have ten thousand, and twenty thousand, or even more; not for the sake of profit, as had Nicias, the richest of the Greeks; but many of the Romans have a great number in constant attendance.' Seneca, in his work concerning peace of mind, has this passage: 'Do you call Demetrius Pompeianus, who was not ashamed to be

\* *Romani rem ipsam cottidie oculis usurpaverint super mensam: nam in lætiori convivio solenne fuit in triclinio paria aliquot gladiatorum exhibere ad pugnam.* Lip. Sat. I. 6.

† The spectacle of gladiators seems to some persons cruel and inhuman, and I do not know but it may be so, as it is at present conducted.

richer than Pompey, happier? An account of slaves was daily brought him, like that of an army to a general, all whose wealth ought to have been long since only what a slave may possess.' So many others belonged to one, that it was not without reason that Pliny complained 'of legions of bondmen and crowds of strangers in men's houses, and the being obliged to use a nomenclator for a person's slaves.'"

The consequences of this vast number of slaves were such as might be expected, frequent disturbances, rebellions and wars. Shortly after Sparta, in union with the rest of Greece, had triumphed over the power of Persia, she was nearly overthrown by an insurrection of the Helots; and in Italy, in the servile war, a body of seventy thousand fugitive slaves maintained themselves for a time against the discipline of the Roman armies, not without some bloody and important victories, and even the hope of surprising and becoming masters of Rome itself.

With regard to the treatment of this wretched class of men, who were, as it respects numbers, the principal population of Italy and Greece, the more the subject is examined, the more we fear will be discovered of general inhumanity, and of particular acts of cruelty. The ordinary mode of putting them to death was by crucifixion; and in Italy, and for the most part in Greece, they were entirely at the disposal of their masters, as to the infliction of this dreadful punishment, or any less severity. As witnesses in criminal causes, they were examined by torture, both at Athens and at Rome, and he who demanded a slave for a witness was in some cases obliged to give bonds to his master to pay his value, if he should expire under examination, or be maimed so as to become useless. The treatment of the Spartan slaves is well known, and that uniform system of insult and cruelty, by which it was attempted to deprive them of the spirit and feelings, as they had before been deprived of the privileges of men. Some of the ablest of the Spartan youths were from time to time sent into the country, armed with daggers, to waylay and murder the Helots, particularly selecting those who were distinguished by superiority in body or mind. Concerning the condition of slaves in Italy, we may likewise recollect that law, by which, if a master was slain in his own house, and the murderer not discovered, all his domestic slaves were to be put to death, and the particular account given by Tacitus of its execution upon four hundred persons at once, the slaves of Pedanius Secundus. We may learn also something from such passages as the following. It is Juvenal, who is describing an imperious woman dictating to her husband:

"Pone crucem servo." "Meruit quo crimine servus  
Supplicium? quis testis adest? quis detulit? audi.  
Nulla unquam de morte hominis cunctatio longa est."

"O domens, ita servus homo est? nil fecerit, esto;  
Hoc volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas."<sup>8</sup>

VI. 218—222.

The following passages from the same author may give us a still further view of some of the domestic scenes in a Roman family.

..... Si nocte maritus  
Aversus jacuit; periit libraria, ponunt  
Cosmetæ tunicas, tarde venisse Liburnus  
Dicitur et pœnas alieni pendere somni  
Cogitur: hic frangit ferulas, rubet ille flagello,  
Hic scutica; sunt quætoribus annua præstant.  
Verberat, atque obiter faciem linit; audit amicas  
Aut latum pictæ vestis considerat aurum;  
Et cædit longi relegit transacta diurni.  
Et cædit, donec lassis cædentibus, Exi  
(Intonet horrendum) jam cognitione peracta.†

VI. 474—484.

.....  
Disponit crinem laceratis ipsa capillis  
Nuda humero Pæcas infelix, nudis mamillis.  
Altior hic quare cincinnus? taurea punit  
Continuo flexi crimen, facinusque capilli.‡

VI. 489—492.

Returning again to the subject of the public spectacles of the Romans, we may notice the impurity of their pantomimes. There is no decent language in which one can explain what was publicly exhibited in the Roman theatres. These spectacles, however, were frequented by women. We will give a translation of a short extract from St. Cyprian, as quoted by Rupert, in his note on a passage in Juvenal relating to this subject. The passage itself is not decent enough to be produced. "They learn adultery," says St. Cyprian, "as they look on; and she, who went to the spectacle perhaps a modest woman, comes back without modesty."|| The people were so much engaged in these shows, that they divided into parties favoring one or the other performer, and sometimes came to battles in the theatre, which terminated in bloodshed and murder. Nor was this interest confined to the common people.

\* "Have a cross fixed for that slave."—"What crime has he committed to deserve it? what witness is there against him? who is his accuser? let him have an hearing. No delay can be too long, where the life of a man is concerned."—"Fool, is a slave then a man? Suppose he has done nothing; let it be so; it is my will, it is my order, let that be for a reason."

† If her husband has neglected her, the housekeeper is undone; the tire women are obliged to strip; her chairman is accused of coming too late, and forced to suffer for another's fault; the ferules are broken on one, one is red with the lash, another with the thong; there are those who pay tortures by the year. The lashing goes on, and she in the mean time daubs her face, listens to her friends, or examines the broad gold of an embroidered garment; the beating continues while she reads over the transactions of a long journal; it continues till those are tired who inflict it; then she thunders out in an horrible voice, "Go, your examination is finished."

‡ Her hair is dressed by an unhappy slave, with her own locks torn, with bare shoulders, and her breasts bare.—"Why is this curl so high?" The lash immediately punishes this abominable crime about a curled lock.

|| Adulterium discitur dum videtur, et quæ pudica fortasse ad spectaculum matrona processerat e spectaculo revertetur impudica.

The actors in these pantomimes, wretches infamous for exhibiting themselves as spectacles of lewdness, were courted and followed after by men in some respects above the vulgar. "Who is there," says Seneca, "who is not a slave?—I will shew you youths of the most noble rank, who are the slaves of pantomime performers."\*

Passing over the naked exercises of the Grecian youths in the *gymnasia*, which Cicero [Tusculan. Quæst. IV. 33] thinks had no very favorable effect upon public morals, we may notice the debauchery which prevailed among the Greeks and Romans, from the time we have any notice of their private manners. The necessary foundation of our regard for those connections which *cheer and soften life*, of all the charities and endearments of domestic intercourse, is chastity; yet this virtue is one, of which Christianity alone seems to have recognized the importance. There is no subject respecting ancient manners that requires less illustration than this. The worst vice of impurity was always prevalent in Greece, and at later times in Rome. Except in married women, and in those of the higher rank, the virtue of chastity in either country was scarcely expected or required.

Until the 520th year from the foundation of the city, it is said there were no divorces at Rome. This is accounted for by Gibbon; according to whom the connection of husband and wife was little other than that of master and slave, from which the one could not get free, and which the other would not dissolve. In later times, Juvenal, in describing the vices of women of the higher rank at Rome, exhausts every thing gross in idea and indecent in language. The accusations of the satirist are however confirmed by many passages in the contemporary historian, Tacitus, of which we shall refer only to one, where, he animadverts on the severity of Augustus toward his daughter and grand-daughter for so common a crime as adultery, "*culpa inter viros ac scæminas vulgata.*" [Ann. III. 20.]

In Greece, in Athens, the women of more decent lives passed their time almost in entire seclusion, and were uncultivated in their minds and manners. The arts of pleasing were left to the courtesans, who were numerous in this, as in the other Grecian cities. Some of these acquired not only the more elegant accomplishments, but even a knowledge of various branches of learning; so that their company was sought by other than those who resorted to them merely for the purpose of animal gratification. The favorite mistress of Pericles was the favorite female friend of Socrates !!

With regard to the general licentiousness of ancient manners, we shall give a single passage from an oration, before a judicial as-

\* *Servus est . . . Ostende quis non sit. Alius libidini servit, alius avaritiæ, alius ambitioni, omnes timori. Dabo consularem ancillæ servientem, dabo ancillulæ divitem. Ostendam nobilissimos juvenes mancipia pantomimorum. Epist. 47.*

sembly, of a Roman senator, and that senator perhaps the first and best man of his country, Cicero.

“ Verum; si quis est, qui etiam meretriciis amoribus interdictum juventuti putet; est ille quidem valde severus: negare non possum: sed abhorret non modo ab hujus seculi licentia, verum etiam a majorum consuetudine, atque concessis. Quando enim hoc non factum est? quando reprehensum? quando non permissum? quando denique fuit ut quod licet non liceret. [Orat. pro Caelio. sect. 20.] In what public assembly at the present day would a similar passage be tolerated from a man of such rank and character? In what public assembly would it not be considered as the language of the lowest and most abandoned impudence?

If we look into the amatory poets of the Greeks and Romans, we may gain a still further knowledge of the manners of the times when they wrote. If we except a very few passages, we shall find nothing in their writings of those sentiments, by which the passion of love is elevated and refined; nothing of those affections which strengthen into permanent friendship; nothing of respectful tenderness or manly delicacy;—they give us only the voluptuous descriptions and the gross and selfish sentiments of mere animal passion. In the work of Ovid, the *Ars amatoria*, he treats throughout only of the lowest and meanest artifices of seduction and allurements; and in talking of love, he describes nothing but a commerce between cheats and prostitutes. Yet the sentiments of Ovid are about as refined as those of the poets, his contemporaries and predecessors;\* and the women whom they celebrate are of the same character with those whom he addresses.

It was customary among the ancients, as it is now among nations uncivilized by Christianity, to expose their new-born infants to perish, when their maintenance might be burdensome, or when from any other cause they were thought not worth preserving. On this subject, we shall give the unimpeachable testimony of one not at all disposed to exaggerate the moral depravity of the times before the prevalence of Christianity. “The exposition of children,” says Gibbon, “was the prevailing and stubborn vice of antiquity. It was sometimes prescribed, often permitted, almost always practised with impunity by the nations who never entertained the Roman ideas of parental power; and the dramatic poets, who appeal to the human heart, represent with indifference a popular custom, which was palliated by motives of economy and compassion. If the father could subdue his own feelings, he might escape, if not the censure, at least the chastisement of the laws; and the Roman empire was stained with the blood of infants, till such murders were included by Valentinian and his colleagues in the letter and spirit of the Cornelian law.” We may add to this, that Tacitus twice

\* Even Virgil could celebrate in a song that base and unnatural passion which the Apostle so pointedly condemns, Rom. i. 27. See Ecloga ii.

mentions it as a national characteristic, once of the Jews, and in another place of the Germans, that it was a crime with them to destroy their children, which circumstance would alone prove that this practice existed as a custom among the nations with which he was most acquainted. In the words of Grotius, "Exponete liberos quotidianum."

There were no charitable institutions, into which any of these wretched outcasts from parental care might be received. There were no hospitals among the ancients, nor was there any kind of public provision established for the relief of poverty and disease.

We will next consider the administration of justice among the ancients. That respect for the sacredness of an oath, which is so powerfully produced by the influence of Christianity, was with the ancients imperfectly supplied by natural religion, and the popular superstitions. From this and from other causes, judicial proceedings, both at Greece and Rome, were in the highest degree irregular, arbitrary and oppressive. Precedents were not regularly preserved or regarded in the decision of judicial causes. The orators on both sides did not think of confining themselves to the examination and exposition of what might be reasonable and just. In addressing the judges, they appealed without reserve to their passions and prejudices, to their pity and their indignation, and even to their interest; and in accusing or defending one brought to trial, instead of confining themselves to the present charge, they ranged over his past life for topics of invective or panegyric. The decisions of the judges were such as might be expected from men who would suffer themselves to be thus addressed. Among the causes which gave such violence to the contests of political parties among the Greeks and Romans, we may reckon this want of any judicial authority to which the weaker party might fly for refuge, and from which it might receive protection.

Long before the time of Cicero, a disregard of oaths had become a national characteristic of the Greeks. In his oration for Flaccus, in discrediting the testimony of some Greek witnesses brought against him, he says—"That nation never regarded the sacredness and obligation of the oaths of witnesses; they are entirely ignorant of their force, their binding power, and their importance. From whence comes that expression; '*Let me have your testimony as a loan*?' is it of the Gauls or the Spaniards? It belongs entirely to the Greeks; so that those who are ignorant of the Greek language, do yet know those words in which this request is made." There was in truth such a general want of good faith and common honesty among the Greeks (if we may trust their countrymen Polybius) as must not a little have embarrassed trade and commerce. "Among the Greeks," says that historian, "if you lend only one talent, and for security have ten bonds, with as many seals, and

double the number of witnesses, yet all these obligations can scarce force them to be honest." At Athens, "twelve for the hundred was the lowest usual interest for money, and the cautious lender commonly required monthly payment. Thirty for the hundred was commonly given by those who borrowed for commercial adventure; and on account of the insecurity of contracts, the lender frequently embarked himself with his money or the goods bought with it, to be ready to take his principal again with the interest, in the first moment that the borrower should have means of repayment." At Rome, in the time of Juvenal, a regard to oaths and fidelity in performing contracts, if we may judge from his thirteenth satire, seem to have been virtues not more common than they had formerly been in Greece.

Nunc si depositum non inficietur amicus,  
Si reddat veterem cum tota ærugine follem,  
Prodigiosa fides et Thuscis digna libellis.\*

He afterwards addresses the person, whose loss of a large sum of money with which he had entrusted another, was the occasion of his writing,

Si nullum in terris tam detestabile factum  
Ostendis, taceo . . . . .  
Sed si cuncta vides simili fora plena querela;  
Tene, O delicias, extra communia censes  
Ponendum.†

If now we look to the internal government of the most civilized ancient nations, Greece and Rome; we shall find with regard to Greece, that its different states were always full of disorder, and trouble, and violence. In their internal contests, as either party alternately prevailed, its principal opponents were either massacred, or obliged to find safety in flight and exile. Greece was at all times swarming with these unfortunate men. Among its little cities were continually exhibiting, in successive revolutions of government, acts of injustice and cruelty, and sometimes scenes of horror and misery, of which we can hardly form a conception.

The internal condition of the Roman republic was not more quiet and settled than what was common among the small states of Greece. After domestic enmities were no longer restrained by the dread of foreign foes, and the expedient of a war with their neighbors could no more be resorted to for preventing internal commotions, there followed a series of acts of sedition and violence, occasioned by the contests of her different parties, which at last broke out into the civil war between Marius and Sylla. From this,

\* Now if a friend should not deny a deposit; if he should restore the old bag with all the rust; such honesty is ominous, and worthy the books of the soothsayers.

† If you will shew me no fact so detestable in all the earth, I will be silent; but if you see every forum filled with similar complaints, do you think that you, sweet sir, are to be excused from the common lot?

to the time when Rome sunk under the government of the emperors, there was nothing stable or secure. There followed a quick succession of civil wars, with short intervals of troubled and dangerous peace. Between the time when Sylla turned Rome into a slaughter house, to that when Cataline formed his conspiracy to massacre the senate and set fire to the city, was a space of only seventeen years. There were twenty-one, from that to the battle of Philippi. The power which this battle gave to Caesar he enjoyed for four years. Three years intervened between his assassination and the commencement of the proscriptions of the triumvirate. The next year, the second battle of Philippi decided, that they were to be masters of the world; and in six years more the two principal of them, having already deprived the third of his share, quarrelled with each other for the possession of their plunder, and Octavius secured the whole to himself in the battle of Actium. All these scenes passed within much less than the common limit of the life of man; and there were, without doubt, many living under the reign of Augustus, who, as witnesses, if not as actors and sufferers, had passed through the whole series of these calamities. We need not proceed further. It will not be pretended that the times of the empire were better than the times of the republic.

It does not seem to us, that these various revolutions, either of Greece or Rome, are much to be attributed to their forms of government; but rather to the materials of which all the ancient states were composed. Considering the little influence of religious principle, and the want of those feelings, views and habits, which this produces; their disregard of domestic life, and their not having that value for its quiet and comforts, which renders men so fearful of civil commotions; we do not think that much political research is necessary to account for the instability of their governments.

With regard to the Roman provinces, their condition is one of the most gloomy subjects, which history presents. We learn their wretchedness, not from their own complaints, but from the testimony of Cicero, and that of the Roman historians. From them we learn the unrestrained license of the provincial governors; the wasteful and improvident rapacity which was exercised; the oppression and injustice of those who collected the taxes; the plunder of individuals; the depopulation of cities; the frequency of seditions; the associations of robbers and murderers, which became frequent from the miserable condition of the inhabitants; the insufficiency of the government for any other purposes than those of rapine and extortion; the little difference there frequently was between the march or residence of a protecting, and the invasion of an hostile army; and in a few words, the general disregard of common justice, both by the state, as well as by individual officers in their conduct toward the provinces. "It is hard to say," are the words of Cicero, "how much we are hated by for-



eign nations, on account of the injustice and vices of those, whom for these some years we have sent among them as governors. For what temple in those places do you think is held sacred by our magistrates ; the privileges of what city inviolable ; what house sufficiently closed up and fortified." These forcible expressions, however, are not the most striking that may be produced from the many passages, in which Cicero speaks on this subject. In his oration against appointing Q. Cæcilius as the accuser of Verres, he says : "The provinces wasted, harrassed, thoroughly ruined, the allies and tributaries of the Roman people afflicted and miserable, have now no hope of being raised from destruction, but only seek some consolation under it."

From the condition of the Roman provinces, we may turn to notice the barbarism and atrocity of ancient warfare. We shall not, however, enlarge on the subject. The invasion of an enemy's country, for the purpose of laying it waste and destroying all the works of nature or art, which could not be carried off as plunder, the general and indiscriminate massacre of its inhabitants in such invasions, the putting to death of prisoners, and the exposure of the whole population of a city for sale as slaves, are facts continually presented to the view of the observer of antiquity. War thus carried on was generally considered as lawful against all those, with whom there existed no express treaty or agreement. "It appears to have been very generally held among the Greeks of that age," says Mitford, speaking of the times of the Peloponnesian war, "that men were bound by no duties to each other, without some express compact. The property of foreigners might be anywhere seized, and themselves reduced to slavery, or even put to death, without the breach of any human law ; and not only without the breach of any divine law, but prayers were addressed to the gods for favor and assistance in the commission of such violences."

Barbarous as was the general mode of warfare among the ancients, it was sometimes exceeded by acts of particular ferocity. More than once, during the Peloponnesian war, the Athenians deliberately passed a decree for putting to death all the adult males of a conquered people, and selling into slavery the women and children. We shall give a passage relating to one of these decrees concerning the Melians. "The Athenians," says Mitford, "had no pretence for any command over the Melians, but that they were stronger. Connected by blood, by habit, and by their form of government with Lacedæmon, these islanders had nevertheless been cautiously inoffensive to Athens, till forced to become her enemies. The punishment for this involuntary crime, even to the lower people supposed to be in some degree friendly, was no less than what the unfortunate Scionæans had undergone for that termed their rebellion. All the adult males were put to death, and the women and children of all ranks were sold for slaves. The island

was divided among five hundred Athenian families. With the most unquestionable testimony to facts, which strike us with horror when perpetrated by a tribe of savages, we are at a loss to conceive how they could take place in the peculiar country and age of the fine arts, where Pericles had spoken and ruled, where Thucydides was then writing, where Socrates was then teaching, where Zeno-phon, Plato and Isocrates were receiving their education, and where the paintings of Parrhasius and Zeuxis, the sculpture of Phidias and Praxiteles, the architecture of Calliocrates and Ictinus, and the sublime and chaste dramas of Sophocles and Euripides, formed the delight of the people."

Among the beneficial effects of Christianity, one not the least important is, the institution of regular public instruction in religion and morals. But with respect to the lower classes of society among the ancients, they were without public teaching, and books were much too scarce for general use. The philosophers had no effect in removing the ignorance or correcting the depravity of the times, when they lived. Their teachings were not addressed to the vulgar, nor were their moral discourses within their reach, or adapted to their comprehension. Indeed the fundamental principles of the better sects were such, that their philosophy was not likely to have much influence upon common minds. They admitted no other sanction of moral conduct than that happiness, which, in the present life, virtue from its own nature confers on its possessor. They maintained that a perfectly virtuous man must be perfectly happy even amid torments, that he was impassible to every thing external, and that his self-enjoyment was not to be affected by the accidents of life, the loss of friends, the suffering of those around him, by men or by the gods. These sentiments, either in their full extent or with some modification, seem in the days of Cicero to have been adopted by almost all the philosophers, who paid much attention to the inculcating of morality.

It is obvious enough that with these sentiments, the philosophers were able to do nothing for the reformation of the times when they lived. Let them have lectured ever so long, not one slave of interest or passion, not one of the corrupted multitude around them, would have been restrained from any excess or injustice, through a regard to the intrinsic enjoyments of virtue.

The religion of the ancients had very little beneficial effect upon their moral conduct. Its temporal sanctions, where they were at all regarded, seem to have been feared much more for the neglect of ceremonies and offerings, and for any direct insult to the gods, such as the profaning a temple, than for a disregard or violation of the duties of man to man. The inefficacy of a religion with such sanctions, and the contempt into which it must at some times fall, are so well explained by Mitford, that we will give the passage entire. It is with reference to the plague at Athens, that he is speaking.

“The moral effects of this extraordinary visitation deserve our notice. Wherever the doctrine of retribution in a life to come for good and evil deeds in this world has taken any hold on the minds of men, a general calamity strongly tends to check the passions, to inspire serious thought, to direct attention toward that future existence, and to make both hope and fear converge to the great Author of nature, the all-powerful, all-wise, and all-just God, who can recompense the suffering of the good with endless blessings, and convert to lasting misery any short lived joys, that can arise from the perpetration of evil. But in Athens, where the Deity was looked to very generally and very anxiously for the dispensation of temporal good and evil only, it was otherwise. The fear of the divine power, says Thucydides, ceased; for it was observed, that to worship the gods; to obey or not to obey those laws of morality, which have been always held most sacred among men, availed nothing. All died alike; or if there was a difference, the virtuous, the charitable, the generous, exposing themselves beyond others, were the first and the surest to suffer. An inordinate and before unknown licentiousness of manners followed. Let us enjoy ourselves; let us, if possible, drown thought in pleasure to-day, for to-morrow we die, was the prevailing maxim. No crime therefore that could give the means of any enjoyment, was scrupled; for such were the ravages of the disease, that for perpetrator, accuser and judges all to survive, so that an offender could be convicted in regular course of law, was supposed against all chance; and the final consummation already impending over equally the criminal, and the innocent, by the decree of fate or of the gods, any punishment, that human laws could decree, was little regarded. How most to enjoy life, while life remained, became the only consideration; and this relaxation, almost to a dissolution of all moral principle, is lamented by Thucydides as a lasting effect of the pestilence at Athens.”

What we have seen is not, however, the most unfavorable view of the religion of the ancients. Some of its direct tendencies were to inflame the passions and to countenance the vices of those, among whom it prevailed. Its rites were some of them cruel, and some of them consisted in the excesses of drunkenness and impurity. In the characters of its gods, the lewd and the ferocious equally found for themselves examples and excuses.\* Nor were these, as is apparent from the dramatic poets and other writers of antiquity, disregarded, or infrequently alleged. What is said by one of the characters of Terence, who asks why he who was but a man might not do what the gods committed, “*hoc ego homuncio non facerem,*” was, we may easily believe, a sentiment often repeated.

\* What were Saturn, and Moloch, and Venus, and Bacchus, but cruelty, and lust, and intemperance personified? And what were their altars, their temples, and their groves, but scenes of the grossest pollution, and often of the most horrid crimes?

Such then (to say nothing of the immense multitude of slaves) was the condition of the great body of the free population among the ancients. They were without moral instruction, not acknowledging some of the most obvious principles of humanity and justice; with no institutions to call to remembrance those principles, whose obligation they might speculatively acknowledge, and to give these that efficacy which they have only when continually enforced upon the mind; without anything in their religion to make virtue venerable or vice odious; and what alone might be almost sufficient to give the character of the times, without any regard to the sanctions of a future life, which had a general influence on men's conduct; and the consequent corruption was dreadful.

---

#### THE IMPASSABLE BRIDGE.

In one of my late excursions into the country to preach the gospel to the poor, I met with a Christian brother in humble life, who had been distinguished for his uniform zeal and faithfulness in the cause of Christ. He had encountered many discouragements—from his minister, from some of his professed brethren, as well as from a scoffing world, but had persevered, not altogether without success, in his endeavors to arouse his neighbors and those around him from their slumbers, and bring them to a saving knowledge of the truth. I had a curiosity to know the history of this man's religious experience;—to learn what it was which originally gave him such an impulse, and had borne him on in such an uniform course of labor and self-denial in the service of the Redeemer. I took an opportunity to state to him my wishes, and found him not unwilling to gratify me in this matter.

He proceeded with much modesty, and with every appearance of sincerity and truth, to give me substantially the following account.

'I was,' said he, 'awakened and I trust brought to repentance in early life. But being alone in my feelings, and living where I had none to encourage me, and where the church was not in altogether a desirable state, I neglected to profess religion; and (after a season of enjoyment) I relapsed into a state of comparative worldliness. In this state I lived several years, performing some religious duties, and finding comfort in them, but neglecting others, and my heart often reproaching me for my unfaithfulness. At length, it pleased God to visit me with protracted sickness. I was not dangerously ill, but my confinement was long and tedious. This trial, however, produced no very perceptible change in my

feelings. If it should please God to take me away, I hoped I was prepared to die. Or if he should restore me, I thought I felt willing to live to his glory. But, alas, I had no adequate conception at that time of what it is to live to God's glory, or of what is implied in such a course of life.

In this state of mind I was gradually recovering, with a prospect of being soon able to resume my wonted labors, when, on a certain night, I had a remarkable dream or vision. I seemed to myself to be standing on an eminence, with a vast plain, steeply inclined towards a broad, dark river, stretched out before me. A wide bridge was constructed part way over the river, the farther end of which was obscured in a thick, impenetrable fog or mist which lay along on the opposite side of the stream. To persons on the plain, the bridge seemed to reach quite across the river, and to promise a safe and pleasant passage; but in my situation, I could distinctly perceive that it reached only till it had entered the mist, and terminated just beyond the middle of the flood. I saw but one way of approach to the plain; but there were two ways leading from it,—the one by the bridge already described, and the other on the opposite side of the plain, up a steep and somewhat difficult bank. The way to the plain was thronged with travellers, and the plain itself seemed covered with people of both sexes, and of all ages, ranks, and conditions in life. Every one of this immense multitude was busy, and many among them seemed as though they might be happy. The steep inclination of the plain gave a constant and strong downward tendency to those who came upon it, so that at every step the multitude in general were insensibly verging towards the bank of the river. The consequence was that while only a few attempted to get from the plain by means of the passage on the upper side of it, thousands were crowding to the bridge, and vainly thinking to pass over it in safety. I saw them enter upon it, and rush gaily along, flattering themselves that there was no danger, and that soon they should be beyond the deep waters, till presently they entered the mist and were hidden from the eyes of those who followed them, when they dropped one after another into the stream, and sunk in its dark flood to rise no more. I continued looking at this shocking spectacle, till my heart was full—ready to burst—and in the effort to cry out to the deluded throng who were just entering on the bridge, or were about to enter, Stop! Stop! Stop! I awoke,—and it was a dream.

But though it was a dream, the impression it made upon my heart was indelible. I have never lost it, and I never shall. The vision, I saw at once, was full of meaning. The plain is the world. The bridge is the broad road spoken of by the Saviour. The path up the bank represents the strait and narrow way which leadeth unto life. And seeing, as I continually do, thousands and thou-

sands of my fellow creatures, jostling down the steep, pressing towards the bridge, crowding upon it, heedlessly thinking it will carry them safely over, and not dreaming of danger, till they make their last plunge and are gone forever ;—seeing all this continually passing before my eyes, how can I hold my peace ! How can I cease to cry in the ears of deluded mortals around me,

Stop, poor sinner, stop and think,  
Before you farther go !

I am blamed, and have been, for saying and doing so much as I have on the subject of religion. But I blame myself for not doing a great deal more. The vision, though years have now passed away since first I saw it, is still before me. The feelings which I then had are fresh upon me. And while these remain, I can never cease to warn the wicked of his way, to tell him of the impassable bridge and the devouring flood, and to point him upward to the path of life.'

I need not say that I listened to the narrative of my aged friend (for he is now advanced in life) with intense interest. His eye kindled, and his soul seemed to glow with heavenly fire, while the words fell from his lips ; and I looked upon him with silent admiration. O, thought I, could a vision such as this open upon the eyes of ministers, and professing Christians ; how differently would they preach, and live, and labor, from what many among them do at present ! And could it open upon a thoughtless world, how great and happy would be the change ! How soon would vice and vanity lose their votaries, and the noise of mirth cease ! How soon would the broad way be deserted, and the narrow way thronged ; 'the kingdom of heaven suffer violence, and the violent take it by force !'

---

## REVIEWS.

**A HELP TO PROFESSING CHRISTIANS, in Judging their Spiritual State, and Growth in Grace.** BY REV. JOHN BARR, Author of the *Scripture Student's Assistant*, &c. &c. Boston : Perkins & Marvin. 1831. pp. 307.

Even heathen philosophy, unguided by any light from heaven, save that which is disclosed in the workings of the soul and the works of nature, could estimate the value of self-knowledge, and adopt the "*Γνωσις σεαυτου*" of the Grecian sage as a maxim of divine original. We regard it as one of those records of natural truth transcribed from the broad page of creation into the word of God, which make his word and works coincident, and together form a strong argument for the Divine origin of Scripture, that this maxim

is inculcated by the precepts of the Bible. But while the pagan teacher could recommend the study of ourselves as useful only in reference to the business of this life,—to the purposes of avarice and ambition, the inspired teacher enforces it as aiding us through time, in the great work of preparing for eternity. And as far as Christian hopes are higher than those of the heathen, or the realities of an eternal state exceed the trifling affairs of time,—so far is the value of this species of knowledge above the estimation of pagan antiquity.

We shall be pardoned for devoting our attention, and calling that of our readers, to the peculiar importance and benefit of this duty, as one of Divine command. And, first, as regards the *sinner*. It is manifest that conversion can never take place, while he remains indifferent to, or ignorant of, his own character and prospects for eternity. You must light up within him the blaze of self-knowledge, before you can warm him into the moral energy of fear or of love. He must see his own state,—his pollution, his helplessness, his enmity to God, his exposure to deserved wrath,—before he is penitent, or humbled, or so much as inquiring. What an illustration of the truth of this doctrine is the fact, that the sinner in his practice acknowledges it to be so; that he turns away from the disagreeable picture which conscience presents of himself; that he shuts up his bosom from the light of truth, and acquires great dexterity in avoiding a personal application of it, by looking, not at his own case, but at that of others.

He who looks down into the secret recesses of his soul, dimly guided at first by the light of God's word, and discovers their hateful tenants and fearful corruptions, their host of foul passions and their accumulated guilt;—while, as he examines more closely, and the blaze of Divine truth illuminates them more strongly, the horrid throng seems to multiply and increase in hideousness, and their abode becomes more and more polluted; he will perceive his guilt in all its blackness, the imminence of his danger, and the necessity of escape from the wrath to come; he will realize the justice of God's anger, and the infinite loveliness of that scheme of salvation through which he can inherit eternal blessedness. Thus, from the study of himself by the light of inspiration, the sinner will be humbled, that he may be exalted; and he will rise at length to a delightful contemplation of God, and to all spiritual knowledge in Christ Jesus.

The importance of this exercise to the *Christian* is sufficiently manifest from the fact, that it forms the burden of a Divine command. His reliance on God is such, that whatever be His commandments, obedience is rendered with perfect confidence in the wisdom and goodness of the Lawgiver. And this is the grand secret of the Christian's happiness,—that under all circumstances, of sorrow and labor, of trial and peril, he looks up with

unshaken reliance to the kindness of his Father in heaven. The apostolic injunction, therefore, "examine yourselves whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves," is enough to send the follower of Christ to his closet, and to the study of his heart, as a positive duty.

The advantages which stand connected with the performance of this duty are numerous and important. A moment's reflection will show that our spiritual peace and joy, our growth in grace, and the elevation of the Christian character, flow out as natural streams from the fountain of self-knowledge.

Our joy and peace in believing can never be full, until we have satisfactorily settled the great question whether we be the children of God. While ignorant of our own character we cannot feel, and while doubtful of it we can but partially feel, the delightful emotions of ransomed sinners. In the first case, we are in perfect darkness; in the second, we have but broken intervals of light and shadow, day and night. If professing Christians complain of spiritual gloom, of their "dark days," it is certain that they have neglected to study themselves,—to measure themselves by the standard of God's word, and to know how far, and where, and when, they come short of the example set before them in Christ. They have turned away from the vision of their own weakness, their need of Divine aid, and from the richness of God's love and mercy, and have forgotten to depend on him, and look up to him, and of course they complain of the hidings of his face. If they desire to meet God and to enjoy his smiles, let them first know and humble themselves. "To this man will I look, even to him that is poor, and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word."

The cunning devices of the adversary of souls render necessary the most keen and faithful scrutiny of our own characters. He attacks us, not alone in the shape of a palpable tempter to evil, seducing by pride, or sloth, or fear, from Christian constancy; but he also comes in the guise of angel ministers, exhibiting in us the semblance of grace and holiness where there is not the substance, and collecting so many artful counterfeits of Christian character, that nothing but vigilant and heaven-guided watchfulness can save us from deception. While, therefore, the professor of the religion of Christ is ever praying to be delivered from temptation, he must resist all the wiles of the devil, scrutinizing even the fruit of the tree of life before he eats of it. It is lamentably true that almost every trait of the true believer has such a counterfeit, that even the honest inquirer, if he be not watchful, is liable to be deceived: so that while the disciple of Christ is tried by the hatred of the world, the persecution of enemies, and open temptations, before which, did not God aid him, he must fall,—he is also exposed to the false reports of his own judgement, blinded as it is by evil passions, and to the



attack of secret foes who come up against him, like Judas with his kiss, in the guise of friends.

Growth in grace depends greatly on the discharge of the duty under consideration. It is obvious that, until we understand our relation to God and our religious state, we cannot, "forgetting those things that are behind, reach forth to those which are before." If we know not what path we are in, we cannot march boldly and rapidly onward. We must know where we are, and be sure of our direction, before we can expect to advance.

That growth in grace results from self-examination will appear from a consideration of some of the peculiar graces of the Christian. The school of *humility* is to be found in a man's own heart. Let him go there and behold his true character,—the sordidness of his principles, and the waywardness of his practice; let him see how he comes short in all things, how necessary the Holy Spirit is to prevent him from stumbling, and how unmerited is this precious gift, and we shall find him bowing at the feet of the Saviour, 'with his hand upon his lips, and his lips in the dust.'—And *love to God* will spring up from this study of ourselves, more certainly than from any other cause. For how much soever the exhibitions of God's kindness in the works of nature, and in the provision made for the happiness of his creatures in general, may affect us with gratitude and love, we never feel so deeply these emotions, as when we behold our own misery prevented, our sins forgiven, our weaknesses supplied, and the Saviour coming over the high mountains and crossing the deep gulf of our offences with messages of life and mercy for us. Oh, if ever the ransomed soul anticipates on earth that warmth of affection which glows in heaven, it is when, after viewing his own blackness of guilt, his just exposure to fiery indignation, and his own impotence, he beholds Christ as his commissioned Deliverer, all holy, and merciful, and powerful to save!—*Faith*, too, will ever be proportioned to the knowledge which the believer has of his own true character,—to the degree in which he feels his guilt and ruin, and his need of the interposition of an almighty Saviour. It is under impressions such as these that he clings to Christ, and nothing can separate him from his love.

Indeed, a general elevation of Christian character must inevitably result from a proper performance of the duty in question. We say inevitably, because we believe that just as surely as God has bound together any cause and effect, so surely has he connected these.

Never does the individual Christian rise so rapidly towards the "stature of a perfect man in Christ Jesus," as when he exercises himself by looking into his own heart and surveying and gauging it by the standard of his master. And as the members of the spiritual body rise nearer and nearer to the image of Jesus, elevating themselves by the assistance of God's Spirit, and others around

them by their example, the whole church collectively is exalted and perfected. While, therefore, we attend to the duty of self-examination from a desire of our individual improvement and happiness, we ought also to remember that we are acting as inhabitants of "that city set on a hill" whose light is to the glory of God and the illumination of the world, and that every improvement made in ourselves is an ornament to the whole church,—every advancement on our part helps forward the whole body of the professed followers of our Lord and Master.

Correct self-examination cannot but be productive of good. But there is danger of using a wrong standard of comparison, or an imperfect measure, in the performance of this duty. The true standard is contained in the Bible, Jesus Christ himself being our great example. We surely and fatally err, when we compare ourselves with other men, and take them as our example. The high calling of God is in Christ Jesus; and there is no other name or pattern under heaven, by which we can be saved. All men have gone out of the way; all come short; and if we look no higher than the imperfect and sinful creatures of the world, we shall never rise above the world.

There is danger of another kind from this comparison with others. The temperaments, dispositions, and circumstances of men are so various and dissimilar, and operate so strongly upon their religious characters, that it would not be safe for one to rely on the practice or opinions of another, unless he were sure (which he can never be) that all the influences by which they both are affected, are identical. We take an illustration from the work before us.

"They whose dispositions and conduct from their early youth have been mild and irreproachable, and who have been accustomed to observe all the duties of religion before they were made the subjects of grace, are often distracted because they cannot trace in themselves a change so great and remarkable, as they conclude they might do, were they truly the children of God. And on the other hand, they whose tempers and practice have been most offensive and hurtful till they had arrived to maturity, after they are renewed by the Spirit of God, are often greatly troubled that the change is not complete, and view the remainders of their former character as incompatible with a gracious state." pp. 46, 47.

Here are two different cases, in both which the Christian is represented as throwing away his comfort in religion, because in the examination of himself he uses a wrong standard of comparison, and is guided by something else than Scripture light. If men will thus burthen themselves with an earthly incumbrance, they must be content to 'fly low.' If they will fetter themselves with fleshly chains, they must remain forever in their earthly prison house.

There is also danger that Christians will measure themselves by the opinion entertained of them by those around them, and rest satisfied with the praise of men. But while our religion is primarily a religion of the inner man; while the eye of God alone reaches

to our most secret thoughts, and searches our hearts; this erroneous principle of self-examination will destroy those who adopt it. The maxim which the Latin poet in flattery applied to his friend, "Tu recte vivis, si curas esse quod audis," is fatal to the spirit of Christianity: for no human admeasurement can reach the springs of action within us—no human opinion concerning us can be trusted; and if we live according to the praise of those who best know us and love us, we shall be 'blind led by the blind.'

Having thus expressed our sentiments as to the importance and advantages of self-examination, which is the subject of the work before us, we will conclude by noticing the work itself. Its general spirit is that of deep, humble, sincere piety. It contains the effusions of a soul warm with the love of God and man, and is written in a simple and easy manner, so that the important truths which it embodies will go home to all hearts with the strongest probability of producing their appropriate effects. Mr. Barr, the author, and James, who is one of fellow-soul, have richly merited public and private gratitude for the efforts they have made to assist their fellow Christians along the path of duty; and many a heart has rendered thanks to 'the Father of lights, from whom cometh down every good and every perfect gift,' for the aid which it has received through the instrumentality of these men.

We may add, that the work before us is neatly executed, and is of a size and price which place it within the reach of every professing Christian.

---

A SERMON ON THE DEATH OF JEREMIAH EVARTS, Esq., *Corresponding Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M., delivered in Andover, July 31, 1831, by appointment of the Prudential Committee.* By LEONARD WOODS, D. D., *Professor of Christian Theology in the Theol. Sem. Andover.* Andover: Flag & Gould. pp. 27.

A TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE JEREMIAH EVARTS, Esq., *Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M., delivered and published at the Request of the Executive Committee of the Auxiliary Foreign Missionary Society of New York and Brooklyn.* By GARDINER SPRING, D. D. *Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church in the city of New York.* New York: Slight & Robinson. pp. 32.

SKETCH OF THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF JEREMIAH EVARTS, Esq., *late Corresponding Secretary of the A. B. C. F. M.* Published in the *Missionary Herald.*

Various thoughts and emotions naturally arise in the mind on the decease of a great and good man. One of the first is, that of

public and private *loss*. And this is a source of pain and grief which a consideration of the virtues and usefulness of the departed tends not to alleviate, but to heighten. For the greater the excellence of his character, and the worth of his example, and the extent of his labors and influence in the cause of Christ, the *greater the loss*,—and the more difficult for survivors to ‘make up the hedge, and stand in the gap.’ How great the loss to the waning kingdom of Judah, when good Josiah died; and to the infant church at Jerusalem, when James the brother of John, was slain with the sword; and to the reformation in England, when Edward the sixth was taken away; and to the cause of modern Missions, when Martyn, and Hall, and Newell, fell upon the high places of the field. The loss to the world was not the less, because these were eminently good and useful men, but the greater: and to dwell upon their various excellencies, however comforting in some points of view, could only aggravate the sense of loss.

But when a great and good man dies, we quickly turn from a consideration of the world’s loss, to that of his unspeakable and eternal gain. We love to follow him to that state on which he has entered, to see him welcomed to the company of ransomed spirits, and to contemplate the fulness and completeness of his joy. He is exalted now above all uncertainty, and suspense, and conflict, and trial—his sorrows and cares are ended, his tears are wiped away, he rests from his labors, and his works do follow him. Who can wish him back, to bear again the load of life, and to endure its pains? What friend, however oppressed with the sense of loss, can desire him to lay aside his harp and his crown, and return to the labors and sorrows of earth?

The death of no individual in this religious community has ever, perhaps, been more extensively deplored, than that of the late Jeremiah Evarts. For in addition to the excellence of his character and his private worth, his very calling, and the ability and success with which he labored in it, seemed to unite and endear him to the American churches, and to the friends of Missions in every part of the earth. All confided in him, all felt an interest in him, regarding him as identified in the same great enterprise with themselves; and when he was removed, all seemed to mourn and lament together. Yet in the midst of their mourning there was joy;—for the holy and useful life of their deceased friend, and his triumphant departure, gave united assurance, that heaven had gained what they had lost, and forbade them to indulge their tears.

Aside from the general interest of the subject, there are peculiar reasons why we should preserve on our pages some memorial of the life of Mr. Evarts. For ten years, he was assiduously engaged in an employment like our own, and did more, as an Editor, to expose and refute disguised heresy, and arouse the American churches to a sense of their dangers and their responsibilities, than

any individual now living. Besides, he was among the original projectors, and from the first, one of the Trustees and Conductors of the Spirit of the Pilgrims. He felt a deep interest in the undertaking and success of this work, aiding it by his counsels, and enriching its pages by his contributions, and we feel bound, from personal as well as public considerations, to diffuse and perpetuate, so far as we are able, some account of his life and labors. In doing this, we shall freely avail ourselves, as occasion may require, of the thoughts and the language of others, particularly of the writer of the very able article in the *Missionary Herald*.

"Mr. Evarts entered upon his career at a most eventful period of the world—a period about to be distinguished by changes in this land, and other lands, in the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of men, and especially in the great movements of Christian benevolence, which eminently indicated that the Redeeming God and Saviour, by a series of dispensations, alternated by success and disaster, confidence and alarm, hope and fear, was about to gather together the nations of the earth, and the kingdoms of the nations, to the last moral conflict which should agonize this guilty, suffering world. Think of the events that have taken place on the earth within the last fifty years. The youth and manhood of Mr. Evarts have occupied nearly the whole of this wonderful period. Just as this new and splendid era was about to be introduced, he was cradled on yonder mountains. The first missionary society was established; the first revival of religion, in a series thus far unbroken, commenced; and the first memorable calamity began to fall on the nations which had given their power and strength to the Beast; while he was a youth, and preparing for the part he was about to act in these moral revolutions. He entered on active life at a period when he was called extensively to influence the opinions of men, and to exert an agency in originating and carrying forward designs that were to elevate the character of the church, and fill the earth with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. Whoever hereafter writes his history, will find it in those developments of light and love which illumine the history of the American churches within the last thirty years."

Mr. Evarts was born at Sunderland, in the state of Vermont, on the 3d of February, 1781. When about ten years old, he removed with his father to Georgia, in the northern part of the same state, where his father was one of the first settlers. Five years after this, he was sent to a school in Burlington, at which place, and in Georgia, he pursued his studies without much interruption for nearly two years. In January, 1798, he went to East Guilford, in the state of Connecticut, and was under the tuition of the late Rev. Dr. Elliot of that place until the October following, when he entered Yale College, being at that time in his eighteenth year. While a member of College, he applied himself to his various studies with great diligence, and gave much promise of his future eminence as a writer, by the facility and correctness with which he communicated his thoughts. He spent four years in college, and graduated in September, 1802.

During his senior year, in the winter of 1801–2, there was a remarkable outpouring of the Divine Spirit upon the college, and many became hopefully the subjects of grace. In the number of these was young Evarts; and what an importance does an instance

like this stamp upon such visits of mercy, especially when bestowed upon the colleges of our country? Had none but this young man been converted in this revival, when and where would its saving consequences cease? Who now would be able to estimate its widening, lengthening, glorious results?—Mr. Evarts connected himself with the college church in April, 1802; and at the time of leaving college, united with those of his classmates who were professors of religion in a mutual covenant, a copy of which has been found among his papers, to promote, by prayer, correspondence, and counsel, the spiritual welfare of each other.

In April, 1803, Mr. Evarts took charge of an academy in the town of Peacham, in his native state, in which employment he continued about a year. He then returned to New Haven, and entered himself as a student at law in the office of the late Judge Chauncy. In the summer of 1806, he was admitted to the bar, and commenced the practice of his profession in New Haven. In May, 1810, he received an invitation to take the editorial charge of the Panoplist, and removed to Charlestown, Mass., with a view to enter on his new employment.

"Few men have possessed a greater assemblage of qualities essential to constitute a good editor, than did Mr. Evarts. His mind was naturally vigorous and active, trained by severe discipline, furnished with extensive knowledge on a great variety of subjects, and entirely at his command. He possessed great critical acumen, and was able to search out and expose the most intricate and plausible sophistry. His power of discrimination and analysis, and his ability to examine a subject till he knew that he had seen the whole of it, and to arrive at conclusions in which himself and the public might confide, were remarkable. He was an example of accuracy, industry, and patience in research. While he possessed a moral courage which enabled him to stand undaunted before any opposition, he was adorned with uncommon candor in controversy, and meekness and self-command under reproaches. His integrity and benevolence, and his feeling of responsibility for the manner in which he exerted his influence, and his high estimate of the power and importance of the press, effectually secured him against rashness, and directed his labors toward the public good. His high standard of religious feeling and action, and especially his enterprise and zeal in behalf of religious and charitable institutions, were just what was needed at that time, in one who was undertaking to correct and guide public sentiment. With these qualifications, and with a fondness for writing, which rendered it his pastime, he commenced his labors as editor."

Under the direction of Mr. Evarts, the Panoplist immediately rose in character; its circulation was extended; and it received for a time the almost undivided support and confidence of evangelical Christians throughout the country. It exerted an important agency, in stemming the tide of error, and in restoring an enlightened, scriptural and active piety to many of the declining churches of New England. It showed what the influence of such a publication may be, when in the hands of an able and judicious editor, who seeks to know, not what public sentiment is, but what it should be; not what will humor it, but what will rectify it; and whose aim is, not to gain popularity and patronage, but to *do good*. The benefits resulting from this publication not only extend to our

own times, but will go down to future and distant generations. If any good is to be derived from the Theological Seminary in Andover; if true religion is promoted by the establishment of evangelical churches in Boston and the vicinity; if the doctrines of the Reformation, as preached in these churches, are to be approved; if the effusions of God's Spirit in revivals of religion are to be desired; if the education of hundreds and thousands of ministers under the fostering care of charitable institutions is to bring down countless blessings upon our land; if the sending of the gospel to the heathen is a good work, upon which the blessing of God may be expected; in fine, if the whole system of religious instruction and charitable exertion, as sustained by evangelical Christians, is a blessing to mankind;—then must the Panoplist be allowed to have discharged an important service, as it promoted and defended all the measures which led to these results, and was the organ of many original suggestions respecting them.

While Mr. Evarts was engaged, as here pointed out, in endeavoring to raise the tone of piety in the churches, and to excite them to new and increased exertions in the cause of Christ, he did not urge a labor upon others in which he was not willing himself to bear a part. He engaged personally, zealously, and perseveringly in various benevolent efforts, at a time when these efforts were comparatively new, and were regarded by many in the light of experiment.

"He was a member and clerk of the original committee, appointed in 1812 by the General Association of Massachusetts, to correspond with other ecclesiastical bodies, collect facts, and devise plans for arresting the progress of intemperance. The report of that committee, made the following year, containing most striking details respecting the quantity of intoxicating liquors consumed, and the ravages of intemperance, bears evident marks of coming from his hand. This led to the formation of the Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance, of which he was an original member, and he took a laborious part on the first committee for managing its concerns."

"He was active in the organization of the Massachusetts Bible Society, and of the Auxiliary of Middlesex County. He was also one of the first managers of the American Bible Society, and ever remained deeply interested in its object. In the Massachusetts Missionary Society, though organized some years before he entered on active life, he felt a deep interest, and was for many years its treasurer, and one of its trustees. He was appointed one of the committee of supplies of the Connecticut Education Society, formed in 1815. Of the American Education Society he was an early and active friend and one of the vice presidents. He was among the founders of the Connecticut Tract Society, and wrote three or four of its publications. The New England and American Tract Societies, the societies for the benefit of seamen, for home missions, and for the establishment of Sabbath Schools, all received his cordial approbation and liberal support. The conductors of them all regarded him as their common and impartial friend, of whose wisdom and experience they could avail themselves in every emergency. He early felt a special interest in measures for preserving the Sabbath from desecration, and on the organization of the General Union for promoting the better observance of that day, he took part in maturing its plan, and did much to aid that institution."

\* At a meeting of gentlemen in Boston, Jan. 10, 1826, Mr. Evarts introduced resolutions which led to the formation of the American Temperance Society. See Fourth Report of the A. T. S. p. 11.

Mr. Evarts became officially connected with the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in 1812, two years after the organization of that venerable body. From this time, he was actively concerned in all the plans and labors of the Board, both for obtaining the necessary funds, and for enlarging and giving vigor to its operations. As this great work increased upon him, and occupied more and more of his time and thoughts, he found himself unable to continue his usual editorial labors, and at the close of the year 1820, the publication of the *Panoplist* was suspended. The *Missionary Herald*, which for several years had been issued in connexion with the *Panoplist*, now took its place, and was conducted for a time entirely by Mr. Evarts.

In the office of Corresponding Secretary of the Board, Mr. Evarts found scope for all his wisdom, enterprize, and industry, and for all his various abilities and acquirements. This was the station for which Divine Providence raised him up, and to which the peculiar structure of his mind was every way suited. He entered upon it and labored in it, not from a sense of duty merely, but because it was his loved, his chosen employment. He studied it as a profession, and devoted to it the remaining energies of his life.\*—On this subject we quote the language of Dr. Woods, who was long associated with him as a member of the Board and of the Prudential Committee.

"After Mr. Evarts entered on the station assigned him, he consecrated his time and influence to the cause of Missions among the heathen. This was his object. Towards this his thoughts, his studies, his exertions directly tended. I need not tell you how much it would have detracted from his usefulness, had he connected other things with this, as favorite objects of pursuit; had he, for example, indulged a literary ambition, a taste for the fine arts, or a fondness for wealth. But he had chosen his object; and, in point of excellence, the world had nothing that could be compared with it. To this he devoted his life. Not that he disregarded any private obligations;—not that he undervalued any other object of Christian benevolence or patriotism, or lost his love for literature and science, or for any thing which could adorn the mind, or promote the comfort of society. But to whatever other objects he occasionally turned his attention, he never lost sight of the cause of Missions. To this he devoted his first thoughts, his warmest affections, and his best labors. He acted on the principle, that if a man would accomplish the highest degree of good, he must have only one great object, and must pursue that object with steady resolution, and zeal, and perseverance. The object to which he thus devoted himself, and the efforts which he made, were of such a nature as to be followed by *durable effects*,—by a *continuity of good*.—It was the appointment of Christ, that his apostles should bear much fruit, and that their fruit should *remain*. What they did, produced *permanent effects*;—it conduced to a good which was *spiritual and everlasting*. Our beloved Secretary labored for the same object. He was of one heart with the apostles, who labored to save those that were lost. His efforts, like theirs, were upon a large scale. Had he promoted the salvation of

\* The following is part of a Record made by the A. B. C. F. M. at their late meeting, to express their sense of the character and services of Mr. Evarts. "This excellent man had, for a number of years, devoted all the powers of his strong, sagacious, and sanctified mind, to the cause of missions among the heathen, with a degree of judgement, zeal, disinterestedness, and indefatigable diligence and perseverance, which has, probably, never been exceeded by any one occupying a similar station, and which commanded the universal confidence of the friends of missions to whom he was known, in every part of the world."



a single individual, he would have done a great and good work. But his efforts were directed to the highest good of communities and nations; to the salvation of the world. And if respect is had to the wisdom of the measures which were adopted, and which were all calculated for permanent effect;—if respect is had to the fact, that the extensive and systematic operations, in which he was so intensely engaged, and which have already been attended with such animating success, are to lead on to other measures, far more extensive, and far more successful—that the missionary zeal, which he helped to kindle up in the church, is to burn with a still purer and brighter flame; and if respect is had to the unquestionable fact, that his labors were, by the gracious appointments of heaven, closely connected with the ultimate overthrow of idolatry, and the establishment of Christ's kingdom in pagan lands; the good resulting from his agency will appear too great for human language to describe, or an angel's mind to comprehend.

In pursuing the object which was so dear to his heart, he was particularly aware, that he needed the cordial assistance of fellow Christians around him, and of the community at large. The influence of a man in any station, especially in one that is public and very difficult, may be increased in a degree above computation by being skilfully united with the influence of others. Mr. Evarts successfully availed himself of this important principle; and he always did it with evident satisfaction. Who was ever more unassuming; or more free from that self-sufficiency and folly, which makes a man reluctant to acknowledge himself indebted in any way to the judgement and foresight of others? Who ever came nearer to a full compliance with the direction of the apostle, that, *in lowliness of mind, each should esteem others better than himself?* His truly modest and humble disposition, joined with his deep solicitude that every thing should be done in the best manner, rendered him very desirous of counsel and aid from his brethren, and heartily willing to own himself under obligation to them, even where it was evident that he was the man who possessed the best information and the highest degree of wisdom, in regard to the subject under consideration."

Mr. Evarts was an ardent lover of his country. He was, in the highest and best sense of the term, a patriot. But his was patriotism on strictly *Christian* principles. His inquiry was not, how this party or that might acquire or retain the ascendancy; or how this or that sectional interest might be promoted; or merely how the nation at large might be enriched, or rise to power and dignity among other nations;—but how this might become a nation of holy men, fearing God, keeping his commandments, and enjoying his favor. It was in no small degree from *love of country*, that he took so lively an interest in all measures to promote the sanctification of the Sabbath. The profanation of the Sabbath he regarded as a great national sin, ruinous to the moral principle and virtue of the community, drawing after it national judgements, and threatening the subversion of our free institutions. Indeed, Mr. Evarts was the friend and promoter of all those means now in operation, tending to enlighten and correct public opinion, and to purify and elevate the character of this nation.

"But all these, he was fully aware, would not accomplish the object unless rendered efficacious by the Spirit of God. Genuine revivals of religion, therefore, more numerous and powerful than any thing hitherto experienced, resulting in the conversion of men from sin to holiness, and in increasing the numbers, the piety, and the zeal of the disciples of Christ, he regarded as the ultimate hope of the country. His anxious desire for their prevalence and purity was conspicuous in his daily prayers and conversation; and accounts of them were received by him with unspeakable joy and thankfulness. This was not

because such revivals strengthened a religious sect, nor merely because they were connected with the final salvation of numerous individuals; but also because of their influence on the character and destiny of this nation. In the body of religious men in the community, not as organized into a political party, or as exerting any authority over the consciences and conduct of men, but as a fountain of moral influence, he supposed the health and safety of the nation to consist; and just in proportion to the amount of vital, operative piety existing in the community, did he suppose the prospect would be fair for continued national freedom and happiness."

The views of Mr. Evarts respecting the future growth and influence of this nation, the dangers to which it is exposed, the means of its preservation, the exalted destiny to which he would have it aspire, and the solemn responsibility resting on the individuals that compose it, may be learned from the eloquent conclusion of the Report of the American Board of Commissioners for 1830. He here makes three suppositions "in regard to the character of the people of North America, who will speak the English language, when the whole continent shall be full of inhabitants. The first is, that the proportion then existing between morality and vice, truth and error, honesty and crime, religion and impiety, will be the same, or nearly the same, as at present;—the second, that infidelity and wickedness will prevail, while the friends of God are reduced to a very small number, and driven into obscurity;—and the third, that religion will pervade the land, in the length and the breadth of it, till opposition shall have ceased, and the whole vast community shall wear the aspect, and exemplify the reality, of a nation, or rather a cluster of nations, consecrated to God." We have not time to follow him in his examination of these several suppositions. Suffice it to say, that he considers the first as the least probable,—and the momentous question whether the second or the third is to be realized as depending very materially, under God, on professing Christians of the present generation. If they do their duty and receive a blessing, and if, after two or three generations, the religion of the gospel shall pervade the land,—

"Then will be a day of glory, such as the world has never yet witnessed. As the sun rises, on a Sabbath morning, and travels westward from Newfoundland to the Oregon, he will behold the countless millions assembling, as if by a common impulse, in the temples with which every valley, mountain, and plain will be adorned. The morning psalm and evening anthem will commence with the multitudes on the Atlantic coast, be sustained by the loud chorus of ten thousand times ten thousand in the valley of the Mississippi, and prolonged by the thousands of thousands on the shores of the Pacific. Throughout this wide expanse, not a dissonant voice will be heard. If, unhappily, there should be here and there an individual, whose heart is not in unison with this divine employment, he will choose to be silent. Then the tabernacle of God will be with men. Then will it be seen and known to the universe, what the religion of the Bible can do, even on this side the grave, for a penitent, restored, and rejoicing world."

The subject to which Mr. Evarts directed more of his thoughts and labors than to any other, during the last two years of his life, was the rights of the Indians. He knew that these Indians had a

natural right to their lands, which they had never forfeited or relinquished. He knew that our government had recognized that right, and had promised in the most explicit terms to protect them in it. He knew that the Indians were devotedly attached to their country, and that nothing but force or oppression could induce them to leave it. He knew that the acquisition of their lands, to a nation possessing a territory so vast as ours, was not worth a thought. He fully believed that a removal of the Indians would be fraught with the most disastrous consequences to them. To think, then, that this free, powerful, enlightened, and professedly Christian nation should, in face of the world, be guilty of such perfidy and injustice, as to wrest from a few weak and dependent Indians the pittance of land left to them, to which they had the double title of inheritance and guarantee, filled him with inexpressible shame and indignation, and with painful forebodings of the righteous judgements of heaven. Mr. Evarts is well known as the author of the essays first published in the *National Intelligencer*, during the summer and autumn of 1829, under the signature of William Penn, in which all the various questions connected with Indian rights are considered and discussed with singular ability and candor. These essays were copied into at least forty other newspapers, and were doubtless read by more than half a million of our countrymen. He also wrote and published many other pieces on the same subject, corresponded with gentlemen in all parts of the country, and exerted much influence in causing petitions to be forwarded to congress. When the bill to effect the removal of the Indians passed the House of Representatives, Mr. Evarts was present, and remarked to a member of congress who sat near him, "My comfort is, that God governs the world; and my hope is, that when the people of the United States come to understand the subject, there will a redeeming spirit arise: for I will not believe that the nation is yet lost to truth and honor."

In delineating the character of Mr. Evarts, time would fail us to speak of his enterprise, his energy, his public spirit, his habitual calmness and cheerfulness, his expansive benevolence, and his untiring industry. He was one of the very few men who will labor as strenuously and perseveringly for the public, as for themselves, and who, in all the associations with which they are connected, are willing that the burthen of labor should be thrown on them.—Mr. Evarts was scrupulously an *honest* man. He regarded with peculiar abhorrence all injustice, meanness, artifice, and intrigue. His very name was associated in the public mind with a feeling of safety in regard to any interests which might be committed to his care.—Nearly all who have spoken of him since his death have made mention of his *boldness*.

"He possessed," says Dr. Spring, "a bold and undaunted decision of character. He was often placed in situations which gave him a noble opportunity of

exercising this spirit, and he did it. Neither flatteries nor frowns could move him.

"Where'er he went,  
This lesson still he taught, to fear no ill  
But sin, no being but Almighty God."

It was not an assumed and fictitious independence that he possessed; it was not founded in caprice and passion; nor put on for the sake of differing from others; but it grew out of a deliberate, steadfast regard to God and duty; and to these he adhered, whatever might be the consequences. He was as much above the opinions and customs of the world, as any man I ever knew. When once he had formed his purposes, he did not stop to ask what others might say and do in relation to them, but vigorously carried them into execution, and left observers to speculate, and opposers to complain afterward. I have known him, especially about the time he began the world, to suffer severely, both in his reputation and property, from his unbending rectitude. But nothing would induce him to make a compromise with conscience. The unexpected pressure of difficulty may have disturbed him for a moment, but it was only to inspirit him with fresh resolution and fortitude. Who that intimately knew him, cannot look back upon a multitude of incidents in his history, in which his conduct seemed to say, "Be bold in the service of God. It is the only thing worth being bold for!" When his mind had once taken a strong view of the great object he was pursuing, it was in vain to embarrass and resist him, unless you meant to stimulate him to growing ardor and activity."

Mr. Evarts was a firm friend and supporter of evangelical truth. On all questions of controversy at the present day, his habit of thinking was at once cautious and decided, and was conformed to the settled orthodoxy of New England. The atonement, and the other doctrines connected with the plan of salvation by grace, were ground which he had satisfactorily examined, and on which he dared to stand and bear his whole weight. Says Dr. Spring, "I distinctly recollect to have heard him express the sentiment, some years since, that he wondered Dr. Priestly, and other modern Unitarians, were not ashamed of their miserable self-righteousness, when such men as Paul, and Edwards, and Fuller, and Martyn, placed their whole trust in the atoning blood of Christ."

The *religious* character of Mr. Evarts was one of remarkable uniformity and symmetry. His piety was not fitful, but equable and enduring; not a feverish heat, but the even pulsation and glow of health. What others might do from sudden excitement, or the spur of the occasion, he did from *principle*,—principle which was strong, uniform and abiding,—which was the same, morning and evening, at noon and in the wakeful hours of night,—the same at the beginning and the end of the year,—the same in prosperity and in adversity. The moral principle which actuated him was as permanent, as the faculties of the soul;—as permanent as that indwelling Spirit of God which caused its existence. When contemplating a character such as this, we feel that it is safe to commend and copy it. We are not pained at the thought, that possibly there may be somewhere a fearful drawback, and that while we admire one side of the picture, the other may be sadly, irremediably disfigured.

But to analyze a character like that of Mr. Evarts, and view it

in its several parts is no easy task. We do not contemplate a well proportioned edifice as consisting of parts, or think of the appearance or separate effect of each stone; but we look at it as a whole, and the impression made by it is that of a whole. So in regard to the character before us. The different parts were so adjusted to each other, so interlocked, that the separate traits were not prominently visible, and by the casual observer might be scarcely noticed.

But it is time that we turn from the character and labors of Mr. Evarts, to contemplate the closing scenes of his life.—Debilitated by disease and worn down with toil, he left his family and home on the 15th of last February, and sailed for Havana, where he arrived on the 2d of March. During the passage, his mind was remarkably tranquil, though solemn. Under date of Feb. 27th, which was Sabbath, he wrote as follows:

“Daily, and many times a day, I have been disposed, I trust, to acknowledge the goodness of God, and to consecrate myself anew to his service. I had thought of making a formal and written consecration of myself to the Lord this forenoon: but my mind is so weighed down by my feeble body, that I can write nothing, except of the simplest kind, and cannot adequately dwell upon the amazing theme of being a servant of God, and of having him for my portion forever.”

“Here, in this sea, I consecrate myself to God as my chief good;—to him as my heavenly Father, infinitely kind and tender of his children;—to him as my kind and merciful Redeemer, by whose blood and merits alone I do hope for salvation;—to him as the beneficent renewer and sanctifier of the saved. I implore the forgiveness of my numerous and aggravated transgressions; and I ask that my remaining time and strength may be employed for the glory of God my portion, and for the good of his creatures.”

“Whether I make my grave on the land, or in the ocean, I submit cheerfully to Him. It will be as he pleases; and so it should be. I pray that the circumstances of my death, be it sooner or later, may be favorable to religion; that I may not deceive myself in the great concerns of my soul; that I may depart in peace, and be received, through infinite mercy, to the everlasting kingdom of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.”

The health of Mr. Evarts was somewhat improved, during his stay in the West Indies. On the 18th of April, he embarked for Savannah, where he arrived on the 24th, much exhausted by the voyage. After remaining one week, his friends most assiduously administering to his comfort, he left this place for Charleston on the 3d of May. He was cordially welcomed at the house of the Rev. Dr. Palmer, where every thing, which friendship or medical skill could suggest, was done, to restore vigor and health to his diseased system,—but without effect. We are now, therefore, to draw around this holy and devoted man, and witness his end. But in the eloquent language of Dr. Spring,

“Rush not rudely, “just on the verge of heaven.” It is an atmosphere beyond the common atmosphere of earth. There is a deep solemnity, an afflictive tenderness here: for death is cold, and inexorable; and yet there is a sweetness, a placidness, which seem reflected from purer skies. There is no alarm—no dismay—no withered hopes—no deep, impenetrable gloom. Recollection rolls not its dark waters by; nor sin its tempest; nor God his thunder;

nor eternity its woes. And yet, the "chamber where the good man meets his fate," is a scene of conflict. The spirit struggles; the immortal spirit struggles for release and victory. She would fain get near the throne. She is striving to break her chains, and range those fields of light. She is restive to be unclothed and clothed upon, with her house which is from heaven."

On Friday, the 6th of May, four days before the decease of Mr. Evarts, a number of ministers, at his request, met in his chamber, when, though exceedingly weak and prostrate, he addressed them, remarking that he knew his case to be exceedingly critical—that he found it pleasant to be in the hands of God, who would do all things well—that he had no painful solicitude as to the result of his sickness, but thought it his duty to use every means for his recovery. He then requested an interest in their special and united prayers:—1st. That if consistent with God's will he might recover; 2dly. That he might have a sweet sense of pardoned sin and an unshaken confidence in the Saviour; 3dly. That if God should spare his life, he might be *wholly and entirely* the Lord's, consecrated to his service; and 4thly. That, if it should please God to remove him by this sickness, he might be able to glorify him on a bed of languishing, and that his precious cause might be promoted by his death. He then expressed a firm and abiding hope in the Lord Jesus, and seemed like a little child, sweetly reclining on the arm of its faithful protector. By this effort he was so much exhausted, that, at his request, the ministers retired to another apartment for special prayer.

Saturday, there was no material change in his symptoms. Still, however, he was more feeble, and his pains returned with violence. Saturday evening, he remarked, "To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath. I may be in eternity before it arrives. My mind is so weak I cannot pursue a train of thought, but I bless God it is tranquil. Not my will, but thine, O God, be done." About nine o'clock he breathed out a short but comprehensive prayer in interrupted and broken petitions, making at its close a full and entire surrender of body and soul into the Redeemer's hands, and said, "O dear Saviour, if this is the last night I have to pray on earth, let my unworthy prayer be exchanged for praise in thy kingdom above. Amen, amen." Speaking of his family, he said, I pity them, but God is a faithful God, he will take care of them—he *will take care of them*—that is enough."

"In the morning his appearance was greatly changed, and during the day he was gradually sinking, yet he conversed considerably. To a young professor of religion who was in attendance, he said, "You have professed religion while young; so did I. I rejoice in it. All I have to say to you is, endeavor to aim at high attainments. The present age demands great things of Christians. Be not satisfied with being half a Christian. Be entirely consecrated to his service." To several young Christians he said, "I feel a great interest in young Christians. I want to exhort you to

*help* each other. Live near to God. Be bold in his service. It is the only thing worth being bold for. Do not be afraid. The Lord be with you."

On the morning of the 10th, when told that death appeared to be near, he said, "The will of the Lord be done. Attend now to what I say, as to the words of a dying man." Then naming the several members of his family, and other relatives, he added, "To all my relations and friends, grace, mercy, and peace in the Lord Jesus Christ, by whom alone they and I can hope to be saved.—And I wish in these dying words, to recognize the great Redeemer as the Saviour from sin and hell; able and willing to save all that come unto God by him. To him I commend my spirit, as to an all-sufficient Saviour. He is the great champion and conqueror of death and hell. And I recognize the great Spirit of God, as the renovator of God's Elect; and herein, if I gather strength, I wish to recognize and acknowledge the church of God, containing all who have truly dedicated themselves to him in a new and everlasting covenant. And here permit me, a poor unworthy worm of the dust, to give thanks to many of the children of God, from whom I have received confidence, kindness, and favor, as a disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ.—And one more duty; if in any respect I have offended the children of God, I ask their forgiveness. If I have grieved them by impatience, or in any other way, I ask their forgiveness."

During the day, he had seasons of pain and very laborious breathing. About nine o'clock in the evening, expecting that his time was come, he requested to be laid in the position suitable for that occasion. But in about a quarter of an hour, he had a short return of violent pain, and when nearly exhausted, he said, "Dear Jesus." It was added—

While on his breast I lean my head,  
And breathe my life out sweetly there.

Immediately he burst forth with expressions of rapture which cannot be described—"Praise him, praise him, praise him in a way which you know not of." It was said, you will soon see Jesus, as he is, and you will then know how to praise him. "Wonderful, wonderful, wonderful glory. We cannot understand—we cannot comprehend—wonderful glory, I will praise him, I will praise him. Who are in the room?" "Call all in—call all—let a great many come—I wish to give directions—wonderful—glory—Jesus reigns." All the members of the family were called, but before they could be assembled, he sank down exhausted, and scarcely spoke again. He continued to breathe free from any further paroxysm of pain until a quarter before eleven o'clock, when he fell asleep in Jesus.\*

\* His funeral service was attended the following afternoon, and addresses were delivered by the Rev. Doctors Palmer and McDowell. On the arrival of his remains at Boston, a funeral discourse was preached (May 25th) by the Rev. Dr. Beecher, from Heb. iv. 11. "And by it he, being dead, yet speaketh."

What, reader, shall we think of such an end? What conclusions shall we form in regard to this dying scene? Was Mr. Evarts, who had been so entirely self-possessed up to this moment, suddenly delirious? Was he imposed upon by false appearances in his departing hour? Was that "wonderful, wonderful, wonderful glory," which now caught his eye, a mere image of the fancy, an overpowering illusion? No, says Dr. Woods,

"This was no vision of enthusiasm;—no feverish excitement of passion;—no delirium of a heated brain. What man was ever better shielded than he, against all mental delusion, and all undue excitement? At that time in particular, a variety of circumstances which might be related, proving beyond any doubt, that he was perfectly rational and self-possessed. That which he experienced was doubtless like what apostles, and martyrs, and eminent saints have often experienced in a dying hour, when through the special influence of the Holy Spirit, they have had clear views of the glory of their Saviour, and of their eternal inheritance, and have earnestly desired to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord."

"And what, think you, must be the enjoyment of such a Christian in heaven, —with a capacity so enlarged,—with the powers of reason so active,—with affections and desires so pure, and so elevated,—what must be his enjoyment in the presence of him whom his soul loveth, in the society of angels and saints, and in the society of no small number, brought to that happy world by means of his faithful labors! Neither eye hath seen, nor ear heard, nor can the heart of man conceive what such a saint enjoys, when he comes to be where Jesus is. Oh! what rest after years of wearisome labor, and toil, and conflict with sin! Oh! what quietness and ease, after so much sickness and pain! Oh! what blessedness, to be free forever from the feeling, and the sight of moral pollution, to be like the Saviour, and to see him as he is, and to drink of the river of pleasure which flows at the right hand of God!"

A variety of reflections crowd upon us in view of the scenes over which we have passed, but we have not time or space to enlarge.

We see in the case of Mr. Evarts what true religion can do for a man. What was there great and worthy and ennobling in his character, for which he would not acknowledge himself indebted to the religion of Christ? It was this which gave him enlargement of views and exalted aims; which furnished him with just principles of action, and gave them predominance over his heart. It was this which opened to him fields of labor, and enabled him to occupy them, to the glory of God, and for the salvation of men. It was this which sustained him under exhausting labors, comforted him in trials, made him humble in prosperity, and joyful in tribulation. It was this which provided him friends in a land of strangers, supported him when heart and flesh failed, gave him the victory over his last enemy, and cheered him with views of heavenly glory when in the cold embrace of death. In short, it was the religion of that Saviour, who 'having loved him while he was in the world loved him unto the end,' which made Mr. Evarts what he was, living and dying, and which now constitutes his high and eternal song in the realms of light. He came to the possession of this religion in early life; he exemplified and adorned it in riper years;



he shared its consolations while he lived; and he has gone, we doubt not, to drink of that unfailing river which flows out forever from the throne of God and the Lamb. Would that his character might be studied and his example copied by thousands and ten thousands of our youth! Then would they know in their own experience the reality and worth and power of the religion of Christ, and the blessedness which results from devotedness to his service. Then would streams flow out from our churches to fertilize the surrounding deserts, and our land would become the glory of all lands, the joy of the whole earth.

The great work of missions, to which Mr. Evarts devoted the energies of his soul, is now committed, under God, to his survivors; and they are bound by every consideration to take it up, and carry it vigorously forward. It must not stop. Our hands must not be weakened, nor our hearts discouraged by the ravages of death. Could those who have fallen in this glorious work now address us from their heavenly place, with what emphasis would they say, 'Remember the injunction of the risen Saviour; remember the nations that know not God. Sectional distinctions, party interests, local enterprizes, wealth, fame, pleasure,—all must be forgotten in the great and common enterprize of converting the world. Tremble not for the missionary cause. God will protect it, though its leaders and standard bearers fall. By his power and grace it has been hitherto sustained, and by the same resistless energy it will be carried on, till the necessity for it ceases, and the uttermost parts of the earth are given to Christ.'

"Let the friends of missions listen to this timely counsel. Though the earth be removed, and the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea, God is a refuge for us, and we need not fear. Evarts may be silent and forgotten in the grave; but the Lord liveth, and blessed be our Rock, and let the God of our salvation be exalted. Changes in men and events there will be; but there is none in God. Be it ours to increase our faith, to enlarge our plans of benevolence, to redouble our efforts,—for the diffusion of the gospel among all nations—for the destruction of every false system of religion—for the conversion of the world;—and the God of heaven will take care of the missionary enterprize. Let not difficulties discourage us, or reproaches provoke us, or disappointments depress us. 'Who is he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good?' 'They that trust in the Lord shall be as Mount Zion, that shall not be removed, but abideth forever. Fear not them which kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do; but *fear him who, after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell: yea, I say unto you, FEAR HIM.*'"

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## THE RIGHTS OF CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES.

In our previous volumes, we have discussed repeatedly and at length the subject of Congregational churches, showing their distinct corporate existence, and their right to hold their own property, elect their pastors, and to manage in general their own proper concerns. That our views on this subject are not novelties, or the peculiarities of a party, is evident from what we have already published; (See Vol. i. p. 498.) and will be further evident from the following article, which appeared in the Christian Register of Sept. 10th. The writer of it, whoever he may be, is entitled to the thanks of all the friends of Congregational churches.

“What are the rights of Congregational churches? These safeguards of religious liberty were erected by the fathers of New England. They are monuments of wisdom deserving the veneration of their children. In answering the proposed inquiry, two points are to be considered.

“1. The origin and principles of churches bearing this name.

“2. The practice of Congregational churches.

“1. The origin and principles of Congregational churches. It is not deemed necessary to bring into view the whole history of churches of this denomination. It may suffice to observe, that the principles of these churches in distinction from others relate, not to *doctrine*, but to their *order* and *government*. Omitting what may be asserted respecting the founding of the *first* Christian churches on earth on the same principles which are the basis of the Congregational churches, I will mention only that the *Independents*, so called in England, may be considered as having revived rather than originated the system of church government, which is the system of Congregational churches in this country.

“A Congregational church is a company of professed Christians, possessing the exclusive right of self-government in matters of religion, and so far independent as to be amenable to no earthly tribunal for the exercise of its rights and prerogatives.

“Its rights are, to form its own terms of agreement; its own conditions of membership; its own constructions of doctrine; its own laws of discipline; accountable only to the great Head of all Christian churches.

“A Congregational church has, most clearly, the exclusive right to determine who may be members of its own body, and to elect its own officers. If others than those contrary to its own consent could become members and influence its elections, its very existence must become a nullity. It has the right of electing, not merely its own teacher of religion, but its own pastor, its own presiding officer, its own minister of holy seals. The imposition of a pastor and presiding officer upon a church, by a body politic not acknowledging its terms of agreement, its obligations and the sanctity of its seals, would seem to me to be the essence of tyranny. A congregation or society of Unitarians might

have it in their power to impose a pastor to break the bread of life and administer government to a Calvinistic or Baptist church, and *vice versa*. Societies who associate for the support of religious teachers do not consider themselves as *professing* to be Christians. Their general object is, not to take upon themselves the *obligations* of Christians, but to be *instructed* upon the general subject of religion. They give no pledge that they ever will receive the seals of membership in the church, or consent to its administration of discipline. I think no enlightened and good citizen would lift up his hand in the election of a teacher to be imposed on the church as its minister of seals—to break to it the sacramental bread. It cannot be reasonably supposed, that what are called religious societies, in electing their teachers, consider themselves as exercising a right of membership in the church. If they supposed this, would not many persons of tender conscience, or influenced by sentiments of most serious regard to Christian institutions, be induced to shrink from measures that confound together civil and religious institutions. Parishes and religious societies are known to our constitution and laws as bodies politic under the protection of the State. If the churches be merged in them, they either lose their ecclesiastical existence, or there is a complete amalgamation of church and state. Or rather, the church loses its existence, and the *body politic* assumes the keys of the kingdom of God and all the attributes of ecclesiastical prerogative. This cannot be reconciled to the principles of religious liberty. Although the puritans of New England, who founded our Congregational churches, carried their religious principles into all their institutions, it cannot be believed that they intended to blend or confound together parishes and churches.

“2. In coming to a result upon this question of rights, we proceed to consider the practice of Congregational churches.

“In all times, I believe, it has been the practice of these churches to exercise independently the right of electing their own pastors, and of determining their own terms of discipline and communion and membership. On Congregational principles, and according to practice, every church has the right to ordain its own minister. In courtesy, and for the sake of promoting good fellowship, churches in the ordination of ministers or pastors invite the aid of pastors and delegates from other churches. But ordination has ever been considered exclusively an ecclesiastical ordinance.

“Of late, the rights of these churches have been called in question, and in my humble opinion seriously invaded. The error, I admit, may be in my own apprehension.

“It is asserted to be a gross assumption for the church to claim the right of a negative against the election of a minister or a teacher of religion by the parish. Whether parishes have been in the practice of yielding too much courtesy or liberality to the church may be a distinct question. Very seldom have serious difficulties arisen in practice, during the whole period since the establishment of the Congregational system by our Puritan ancestors. I speak of disagreement between churches and parishes connected with them. They have generally had a mutual interest, that led them to a course of con-

ciliation. Seldom could the church be so regardless of its own prosperity as not to consult the peace and welfare of the parish. In a few instances, churches and ecclesiastical councils have disregarded the will of parishes. These instances are monitory, but surely cannot furnish a sufficient pretext for annihilating or impairing the rights of Christian professors. If the church has claimed the right to determine exclusively whom the parish shall support as a public teacher of religion, it is equally absurd as for the parish to claim the right of determining who shall break bread to the church. To contribute money to the support of a minister not of our choice surely cannot be a greater grievance, than to receive from him the holy seals of membership and communion in the church. If either the church or parish or society assume unjust prerogative, the practice must be a most fruitful source of division and contention, and of accumulated burthens upon both parties.

The Congregational system of order and discipline appears to me no less admirably formed to secure the rights and privileges of common Christians, than are our political institutions to secure to the common citizens their rights and privileges. These religious and civil institutions were devised with great care and wisdom by our ancestors, and were evidently designed to aid and strengthen each other. Like concentric spheres, they have generally moved harmoniously though distinctly, and although sometimes losing the equability of their motion for a moment, it may probably be asserted with truth, that neither could have continued in existence without the other, and that no institutions of human device have ever so successfully secured to any people their rights and privileges, both civil and religious, as these have done.

“But admit for a moment, that without any seal or explicit profession, a whole parish or religious society be considered as constituting a church. It may be that members of parishes are sometimes destitute of all decency of character, and as members of parishes have power to give a casting vote against the dearest rights of exemplary Christians. Would not Christians be compelled to shun all connexion with *parishes* on such terms? In a question of discipline, for instance, an accused Christian would be exposed to be judged and condemned by those to whom the laws would not allow the common rights of suffrage, and no safeguard or protection could be found against such oppression. In the church-relation, we have a voice in the admission of those who may be our judges. To the church they would be amenable for their oppressive or abusive acts. The church being merged in the parish, the members would be less secure in their rights, than are common citizens. The laws secure to the citizen, on trial involving his property, life, or reputation, an impartial jury of “good men and true” to render judgement. The Christian, in his character as a Christian, would enjoy no such protection. It must then be the unalienable right of members of Congregational churches, whether in their individual or collective capacity, in regard to religious rights and privileges, to enjoy the sympathy, aid and protection of those to whom they are joined by acknowledged obligations of duty.

"For these reasons it is the duty of Congregational churches to protest with firmness against all encroachment upon their rights."

## PROFESSOR LEE.

The following letter from Rev. Samuel Lee, Professor of Arabic and Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, England, to Jonathan Scott, Esq. presents "a very interesting account of genius and industry in humble life, struggling with and surmounting all external obstacles, and at length elevating their possessor to one of the most important and conspicuous stations in the literary and Christian world." We publish it, as we find it, in the last number of the *Biblical Repository*.

"SIR,

"In conformity to your request, I now proceed to give you a detail of my pursuits in languages, with some circumstances of my life connected therewith.

The first rudiments of learning I received at a charity school, at Longnor, in the county of Salop, where I was born, which is a village situated on the Hereford road, about eight miles from Shrewsbury. Here I remained till I attained the age of twelve years, and went through the usual gradations of such institutions, without distinguishing myself in any respect; for as punishment is the only alternative generally held out, I, like others, thought it sufficient to avoid it. At the age above-mentioned, I was put out apprentice to a carpenter and joiner, by Robert Corbett, Esq. in which, I must confess, I underwent hardships seldom acquiesced in by boys of my age; but as my father died when I was very young, and I knew it was not in the power of my mother to provide better for me, as she had two more to support by her own labor, I judged it best to submit.

About the age of seventeen, I formed a determination to learn the Latin language; to which I was instigated by the following circumstances. I had been in the habit of reading such books as happened to be in the house where I lodged; but meeting with Latin quotations, found myself unable to comprehend them. Being employed about this time in the building of a Roman Catholic chapel for Sir Edward Smith of Actonburnel, where I saw many Latin books, and frequently heard that language read, my resolution was confirmed. I immediately bought Ruddiman's Latin Grammar, at a book-stall, and learnt it by heart throughout. I next purchased Corderius' Colloquies, by Loggan, which I found a very great assistance to me, and afterwards obtained Entick's Latin Dictionary; also soon after Beza's Testament, and Clarke's Exercises. There was one circumstance, however, which, as it had some effect on my progress, I shall mention in this place. I one day asked one of the priests, who came frequently to us, to give me some information of which I was then in want; who replied, that "charity began at home." This was very mortifying, but it only served as a stimulus to my endeavors; for, from this time, I resolved, if possible, to excel even him. There was one circumstance, however, more powerful in opposing me, and that was poverty. I had, at that time,

but six shillings per week to subsist on, and to pay the expenses of washing and lodging; out of this, however, I spared something to gratify my desire for learning, which I did, though not without curtailing myself of proper support. My wages were, however, soon after raised one shilling a week, and the next year a shilling more; during which time I read the Latin Bible, Florus, some of Cicero's Orations, Cæsar's Commentaries, Justin, Sallust, Virgil, Horace's Odes, and Ovid's Epistles. It may be asked, how I obtained these books? I never had all at once, but generally read one and sold it, the price of which, with a little added to it, enabled me to buy another, and this being read, was sold to procure the next.

I was now out of my apprenticeship, and determined to learn the Greek. I bought therefore a Westminster Greek Grammar, and soon afterwards procured a Testament, which I found not very difficult with the assistance of Schrevelius' Lexicon. I bought next Huntingford's Greek Exercises, which I wrote throughout, and then, in pursuance to the advice laid down in the Exercises, read Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, and soon after Plato's Dialogues, some part of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of Homer, Pythagoras's Golden Verses, with the Commentary of Hierocles, Lucian's Dialogues of the Dead, and some of the *Poetæ Minores*, with the *Antigone* of Sophocles.

I now thought I might attempt the Hebrew, and accordingly procured Bythner's Grammar, with his *Lyra Prophetica*; and soon after obtained a Psalter, which I read by the help of the *Lyra*. I next purchased Buxtorf's Grammar and Lexicon, with a Hebrew Bible; and now I seemed drawing fast towards the summit of my wishes, but was far from being uninterrupted in these pursuits. A frequent inflammation in my eyes, with every possible discouragement from those about me, were certainly powerful opponents; but habit, and a fixed determination to proceed, had now made study my greatest happiness; and I every day returned to it, rather as a source of rest from manual labor; and though I felt my privations in consequence, it amply repaid me in that solitary satisfaction which none, but a mind actuated as mine was, could feel. But to return; chance had thrown in my way the *Targum of Onkelos*; and I had a Chaldaic Grammar in Bythner's *Lyra*, with the assistance of which and of Schindler's Lexicon, I soon read it. I next proceeded to the Syriac, and read some of Gutbir's Testament, by the help of Otho's Synopsis, and Schindler's Lexicon. I had also occasionally looked over the Samaritan; but as the Samaritan Pentateuch differs little from the Hebrew, except in a change of letters, I found no difficulty in reading it, in quotations, wherever I found it; and with quotations I was obliged to content myself, as books in that language were entirely out of my reach.

By this time I had attained my twenty-fifth year, and had got a good chest of tools, worth I suppose about £25. I was now sent into Worcestershire, to superintend, on the part of my master, Mr. John Lee, the repairing of a large house, belonging to the Rev. Mr. Cookes. I began now to think it necessary to relinquish the study of languages; as I perceived, that however excellent the acquisition may have appeared to me, it was in my situation entirely useless.

I sold my books and made new resolutions. In fact, I married, considering my calling as my only support; and some promises and insinuations had been made to me, which seemed of a favorable nature in my occupation. I was awaked, however, from these views and suggestions by a circumstance, which gave a new and distressing appearance to my affairs; a fire broke out in the house we were repairing, in which my tools, and with them all my views and hopes, were consumed. I was now cast on the world without a friend, a shilling, or even the means of subsistence. This, however, would have been but slightly felt by me, as I had always been the child of misfortune, had not the partner of my life been immersed in the same afflicting circumstances. There was, however, no alternative, and I now began to think of some new course of life, in which my former studies might prove advantageous. I thought that of a country schoolmaster would be the most likely to answer my purpose. I therefore applied myself to the study of Murray's English Exercises, and improved myself in arithmetic.

There was, however, one grand objection to this; I had no money to begin, and I did not know any friend who would be inclined to lend. In the mean time the Rev. Archdeacon Corbett had heard of my attachment to study, and having been informed of my being in Longnor, sent for me in order to inform himself of particulars. To him I communicated my circumstances, and it is to his goodness that I am indebted for the situation I at present fill, and for several other valuable benefits which he thought proper generously to confer. My circumstances since that time are too well known to you to need any further elucidation. It is through your kind assistance I made myself thus far acquainted with the Arabic, Persian, and Hindoostance Languages; of my progress in which you, Sir, are undoubtedly the best judge.

I am, Sir,

With every possible respect,

SAMUEL LEE.

Blue School, Shrewsbury, }  
April 26, 1813. }

#### JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

Extracted from a Sermon of Dr. South.

"No duty or work, within the power or performance of man as such, is able to expiate and take away the guilt of sin. In this matter we must put our hands upon our mouths, and be silent for ever. He that thinks, and attempts by his own goodness to satisfy God's justice, does by this the more incense it; and by endeavoring to remove his guilt, does indeed increase it. His works of satisfaction for sin, are the greatest sins, and stand most in need of the satisfaction of Christ. Those that can imagine the removal of the guilt of the least sin feasible, by the choicest and most religious of their own works, never as yet knew God truly, nor themselves, nor their sins: they never understood the fiery strictness of the Law, nor the spirituality of the Gospel.

“ Now, though this error is most gross and notorious amongst the Papists, yet there is something of the same spirit that leavens and infects the duties of most professors; who in all their works of repentance, sorrow, and humiliation for sin, are too apt secretly to think in their hearts that they *make God some amends* for their sins. And the reason of this is, because it is natural to all men to place a justifying power in themselves, and to conceive a more than ordinary value and excellency in their own works, but especially such works as are religious.

“ But this conception is of all others the most dangerous to the soul, and dishonorable to God, as being absolutely and diametrically opposite to the tenor of the Gospel, and that which evacuates the death and satisfaction of Christ; for it causes us, while we acknowledge a Christ, tacitly to deny the Saviour. And herein is the art and policy of the devil seen, who will keep back the sinner as long as he can from the duties of repentance and humiliation; and when he can do this no longer, he will endeavor to make him *trust and confide in them*. And so he circumvents us by this dilemma. He will either make us neglect our repentance, or adore it; throw away our salvation by *omission of duties*, or place it *in our duties*: but let this persuasion still remain fixed upon our spirits, that repentance was enjoined the sinner as a duty, not as a recompense; and that the most that we can do for God cannot counter-vail the least that we have done against him.

“ That course which alone is able to purify us from the guilt of sin, is by applying the virtue of *the blood of Christ* to the soul, by renewed acts of faith: it is that alone that is able to wash away this deep stain, and to change the hue of the spiritual Ethiopian: nothing can cleanse the soul but that blood that redeemed the soul.

“ The invalidity of whatsoever we can do in order to this thing, is sufficiently demonstrated in many places of Scripture, Job ix. 30, 31. ‘ If I wash myself with snow water, and make my hands never so clean, yet thou shalt plunge me in the ditch, and my own clothes shall abhor me.’ He that has nothing to rinse his polluted soul with, but his own penitential tears, endeavors only to purify himself in muddy water, which does not purge but increase the stain. In Christ alone is *that fountain that is opened for sin and for uncleanness*.

“ Every soul is polluted with the loathsome, defiling leprosy of sin. And now for the purging off of this leprosy, if the Spirit of God bids us go and wash in the blood of Christ, that spiritual Jordan, and assures us that upon such washing, our innocence shall revive and grow anew, and our original lost purity return again upon us, shall we now, in a huff of spiritual pride and self love, run to our own endeavors, our own humiliations, and say as Naaman, ‘ Are not the rivers of Damascus better than all the waters of Israel? May I not wash in them and be clean?’ Are not my tears, my groans, and my penitential sorrows, of more efficacy to cleanse me, than the blood and death of Christ? May I not use these and be clean, and purified from sin? I answer, No; and after we have tried them, we shall experimentally find their utter insufficiency. We may sooner *drown*, than *cleanse* ourselves with our own tears.”



## ILLUSTRATION OF MATTHEW VI. 7.

*“But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do; for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.”*

The following extract, translated from the Chinese, shews in a striking manner the justness of the charge here brought against the Gentile nations.

*“A Canon delivered by Fuh.* [A prayer or charm to be repeated] for the exterminating of all misfortunes, and for the attaining of life in the pure land, To-lo-ne.”

“Nan mo-o-me-to-po-yay, to-ta-keëa to-ya, to-te-yay-ta, o-me-le-too po-k'wan, o-me-le-to, seeh-tan-po-kwan. O-me-le-to, kwan-kean-lan-te, o-me-le-ta, kwan-kea-lan-te, këa-me-ne, këa-këa ua, chëh-to-këa-le, po-po-ho.”

This prayer, or whatever it may be called, is perfectly unintelligible to every Chinese; not one out of a hundred even of the priests of Füh, who daily use it in the temples, understanding the meaning. It contains the bare sounds of Indian words, expressed in Chinese characters. These, however, are supposed to possess a mystical and most wonderful efficacy for the removal of all evil. The editor of the book from which it is taken, adds—

“This prayer is for the use of those who are travelling to life. The god O-me-to [a name of Füh,] rests on the top of the heads of those who repeat this, in order to save them from all their enemies; to render them safe and comfortable in life; and to confer upon them any mode of future existence, which they may, at the hour of death, desire. When a person has repeated it twenty times ten thousand times, then the intelligence of Poo-te begins to bud within: when he has repeated it thirty times ten thousand times over, he is at no distance from a personal vision of the face of the god O-me-to. In the dynasty of Tsin, while Yuen, the celebrated teacher of Loo-shan, was in the act of repeating this prayer, there came to him a divine person from the west, holding in his hand a bright silver throne. He addressed Yuen thus: ‘Celebrated teacher, thy days are ended: ascend this seat, and be carried to yonder region of exquisite delights.’ The people round about all heard the sound of harmonious music in the firmament; and a marvellous fragrance, which ceased not for several days, was diffused all round.”

In the passage which this quotation is intended to illustrate, our Lord condemns the repetitions of the heathen, not merely from their utter fruitlessness in producing any salutary impressions on the heart, or reform of life; but also from the motive and view of the individuals in using them—namely, “that they think they shall be heard,” or derive vast benefit, “for their much speaking.” It is evident from what is above-mentioned, that they expect not only present good, but also future happiness, for the sole merit which is supposed to be attached to their repetitions. This will be still farther evident from the subjoined extract taken out of the same work. The book contains a number of plates, representing various forms of Füh, sitting on a lotus flower. Each form is surrounded by six

dotted lines, springing from the lotus at the bottom, which, after the shape of a pear, terminates in a point at the top. To the last plate the following note is appended.

"On the right are nine plates, representing the lotus. The 5048 dots, which their circling lines contain, are intended for the purpose of being marked with a red pencil,—one dot for every thousand or hundred repetitions of the name of Fúh. After a long time, when the whole is filled up, they are to be again gone over with some other kind of ink. At the time of death, the plates, thus filled up are burned to ashes, that they may pass into the other world, as a testimony in favor of him who used them. Depending on the merit of this virtue, he goes to live in a pure land."

---

#### RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *The Biblical Repository*. No. IV. October, 1831. Conducted by EDWARD ROBINSON, Professor Extraordinary in the Theological Seminary, Andover.

We have noticed the previous numbers of the *Biblical Repository*, as they have appeared, and by the extracts we have given, and the opinion we have expressed, have furnished to such of our readers as do not see the work the means of judging of its merits. The number before us fully sustains the previous high character of the work. It contains six articles. The one in which we feel most deeply interested is "On the meaning of ΚΥΡΙΟΣ in the New Testament;" by Professor Stuart. The plan of the writer is to ascertain, by a simple, philological classification and examination, "the meaning of *κύριος* as employed by the classic heathen writers; its use by the authors of the Septuagint version; its proper meaning, in general, as applied to God or to Christ in the New Testament; and the manner in which Paul actually applies it in his Epistles." His conclusions in regard to these several topics are,

1. That the heathen classic writers use this word in the sense of *lord, master, owner, head of a family, head of a house.*

2. The authors of the Septuagint version use it in the sense of *owner, possessor, master, husband, lord*, and in numberless instances apply it to designate *the only living and true God, the King of kings and Lord of lords.*

3. The writers of the New Testament use the word to designate the *owner, possessor, head, lord, or master* of anything, and also as an appellation of respect and civility. They employ it often to designate *God supreme, God the Father*, but most frequently of all as an appellation given to *Christ*. This word, it is fully shown, is applied to Christ by the writers of the New Testament, because they regarded him as indeed "the Lord of all, the universal Potentate, the King of kings and Lord of lords."

Professor Stuart here shows, that the *κυριότης* (lordship) of Christ is in *one* sense not original, but conferred; and not eternal, but destined, in the consummation of all things, to have an end. In proof of this latter point, he adduces the celebrated passage, 1 Cor. xv. 24—28, where the apostle declares that when 'the

end is come, Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father, that God may be all in all.'

"In other words, when the office of Mediator is fully completed; when there shall be no more sinners to be reconciled to God, or saints to be guided and defended; when all the ends which Infinite Wisdom had in view in the mission of the Son of God to this world of sin shall have been consummated; when the world itself shall come to an end, and there shall no longer be any rational beings placed in a state of probation and capable of being redeemed; in brief, when every end of the mediatorial office is fully accomplished, and nothing more remains to be done; then the office itself, the power with which the Mediator was clothed, the dominion that was conferred in order to render him competent to fulfil the design of his office—all these will of course *cease*, and God will then reign simply as God, and not by the Vicegerent (so to speak) who has so long wielded the sceptre of his kingdom, in consequence of authority conferred upon him.

All this, indeed, we are obliged to express in merely human language; and how easy it is, therefore, to raise questions of difficulty, if one will carry forward, in a literal way, human analogies to divine things, every person must know who has had any experience in the subtleties of disputation. But after all the objections which may be raised, thus much seems to be substantially true, viz. that the *mediatorial* dominion as such, which had been bestowed on Christ as Mediator, will cease at the day of judgement, and God will no more govern by a Vicegerent, but directly and immediately as God.

"A thousand fearful questions start up at once. 'What then is to become of this *complex person*, God-man, no longer occupying the throne of the universe? What is to be the future state or condition of the *human* nature of the Saviour, thus giving over his exaltation to the Divinity, and resigning the authority with which it had been clothed?'

"I answer at once, that I do not know. The apostles have not told us. Jesus has not revealed anything relative to this. The "glory that he had with the Father before the world was," he will doubtless have after the world shall be no more. 'But is none to be given through eternal ages to the *Messiah*?' Paul does not deny this. He only says, that the *xystos* of the Messiah will be resigned, at the final consummation of all things; in other words, that the duties of his office as Mediator being fully consummated, the office as such is no longer retained. But the glory which results to him as the Redeemer of countless millions—the praise of salvation purchased by his blood—are these to cease? So the beloved disciple does not seem to teach us: for he represents the same honors as being paid to the Redeemer, in heaven, which are paid to the Father, and "blessing, and honor, and glory, and power," as being ascribed by worshippers before the throne of God, not only to Him "who sitteth on the throne," but "to the LAMB FOR EVER AND EVER," Rev. 5: 13. When will there be a time in heaven, that the hearts of the redeemed will cease to beat high with gratitude for atoning blood? And when will the time come, in which they will no longer be inclined to express this gratitude?

"But I must stop. Here is a boundless ocean, and I dare not launch any further upon it. It is easy to ask a thousand questions, which none but the redeemed in heaven, or God himself, can answer; but what profit would there be in doing this."

Professor Stuart next proceeds to show, that in *another* sense, the dominion of Christ is strictly *everlasting*. "That dominion which was employed in subjugating enemies, and in guiding and protecting friends, may come to an end, when enemies can make no more struggle, and friends need no more protection;" but the *moral reign* of the Son, simply considered as such, will continue forever and ever. After the judgement, he will no longer be *xystos*, "so far as this appellation is given him in relation to the office which he will then resign; but *xystos* in another sense, as 'God over all blessed forever,' as Lord, Master, Redeemer, and Benefactor of the blessed, he will always be. These relations can never cease, so long as the parties who sustain them shall exist."

"Thus, in my imperfect way, have I touched on these fearful questions, from which the mind almost instinctively shrinks back with awe. I hope that I have not put my own presumptuous assertions or declarations in the place of the divine word, nor attempted to unveil what God has chosen should remain a mystery in our present state. The proper attitude of mind for a solicitous inquirer here, is one which receives implicitly what is revealed, and waits with submission and humility for further disclosures, until the veil that covers all mortal things shall be removed, and the disciple sees his Lord and Master face to face."

"One consideration I cannot help suggesting, before I pass to that part of my investigation which still remains. This may be distinctly brought before the mind, by the following question: If the office of Mediator comes thus to an end, at the day of judgement, and Christ ceases to exercise any more authority in this way from and after that period; how are the impenitent in the world of woe to be reconciled to God? What is the probation or arrangement which is to bring them into the kingdom of God *without a Mediator*? Does the Bible propose any such method of salvation? And if not, who can assure us that such an one exists?"

"These are questions of truly awful import; and it does behoove those who are placing their hopes on being redeemed in a future world, to ask who the Redeemer is to be, after Jesus has resigned his office, and completed in it all the duties which he had to perform."

4. In answer to the fourth general inquiry, viz. 'How does Paul apply the word *κυριος* in his epistles?' Professor Stuart shows, that there are only *three* "legitimate and clear examples, in which Paul, when *using his own language*, applies this word to God, and not to Christ." These, compared with between two and three hundred instances of a different nature, present "overwhelming evidence, that *κυριος* familiarly and habitually, in the mind of Paul, was the chosen designation of the Lord Jesus."

At the close of this laborious investigation, we have the following conclusions:

"1. The Lord Jesus is the Lord *on whom Christians call*, i. e. he to whom they direct their petitions and their praises.

"2. The Lord Jesus is the Lord to whom the primitive Christians looked in a peculiar manner for guidance, for consolation, for illumination, for success in their work, and for victory over their spiritual and temporal enemies. Him they regarded, in a peculiar manner, as "Head over all things to his church;" as "King of kings and Lord of lords," for the express purpose of accomplishing the work of redemption. Hence their frequent supplications for his grace and favor; their desire for his benediction; their deep sense of dependence on his protection and his mercy.

"It is indeed ordained of God, that "every knee shall bow to Jesus, and every tongue confess that he is Lord." He will surely "reign until all enemies are put under his feet." But is it not equally true, when "every knee shall bow to Jesus, and every tongue confess that Jesus is Lord," that this will be to the "glory of God the Father?" So thought Paul, Phil. 2: 11; so then we ought to believe. "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." "Thanks be unto God, then, for his unspeakable gift." Glory and praise be unto him for ever and ever, for his boundless mercy!

"But is glory due to him who said, "Lo, I come, my God, to do thy will?" So thought and said the apostles; so the redeemed in heaven are represented as declaring, Rev. 5: 13. Why should the one exclude the other? Why should the glory which redounds to God the Father, because that every tongue confesses Jesus to be Lord, detract from the glory which is to be given to this same Jesus as Lord?

"But you will say, perhaps, that the glory to be given to Jesus is inferior and secondary praise. Be it so then, so far as that *κυριος* is concerned which is *delegated*, and which will come to an end. But is there not something more than the praise of this *κυριος* due to "Him who was in the beginning with God," and "WHO WAS GOD;" who is "GOD OVER ALL and blessed

for ever ;" who is "OUR GREAT GOD and Saviour," who is "the TRUE GOD and eternal life?" The humble Christian will pause, at least, before he decides against this."

2. *Fourth Report of the American Temperance Society*, presented at the Meeting in Boston, May 1831, Boston : Perkins & Marvin. pp. 110.

If this Report had merely detailed the operations of the American Temperance Society during the last year, it would have been an interesting and valuable publication. But it does much more. It contains a concise history of the temperance reformation ; of the enormous evils which led to it\* ; of the manner in which it was commenced and has prevailed, in this country and in other parts of the earth ; of the formation of the American Temperance Society in the year 1826 ; and of its subsequent operations to the present time. It portrays in strong colors the guilt of continuing the traffic in spirits, and by considerations, which it should seem no man not devoid of conscience and the fear of God can resist, urges all who are engaged in this traffic to desist.

"Of all the obstructions which the friends of temperance now meet with, which stand in the way, and hinder the progress of that mighty movement which God has awakened, and which takes hold on the destinies of unborn millions for eternity, these men,—yes, the men who traffic in ardent spirit,—present the greatest.

"And if this movement is ever to stop, and that deluge of fire again roll, unobstructed, through the length and breadth of this land, scorching and withering, consuming and annihilating, all that is fair, and lovely, and excellent, and glorious in possession and in prospect, these men—the men who continue to traffic in ardent spirit—are to bear a vast and ever-growing portion of the odium, the guilt, and the retribution, of this tremendous ruin. They not only sin themselves, but they tempt others to sin. They stand at the fountain of death, and open streams which may roll onwards, after they are dead, and sweep multitudes to the world of wo."

One of the most cheering results of the measures for promoting temperance is the outpouring of God's Spirit, in the recent powerful revivals of religion. The documents here published show, that the connection between these things is something more than casual—that they have moved onward in rapid and almost uniform succession, in various parts of our land. "The special attention manifested to the great interests of the soul in fourteen colleges and more than five hundred towns, where the effects of the temperance reformation have been most conspicuous, speaks with a voice which will be heard and heeded by the friends of God throughout the earth."

Much as has been done within a few of the last years for the promotion of temperance, more still remains to be done.

"There is a tendency with many to conclude that the work is already accomplished ; or that so much is done, that it will now go forward to its completion of itself ; and that its friends may be excused from further effort. But as well might a man who had undertaken to sail round the globe, and had gone a few miles with a prosperous gale, conclude that the voyage was accomplished, or that so much was accomplished, and he was now going so finely, that wind, and tide, and gravitation would of themselves accomplish the work, and that he might be excused from further effort, as for a man to adopt this opinion with regard to the Temperance Reformation. It is the very opinion which the drunkard, who means to continue such, propagates ; and, so far as it pre-

\* The Hon. William Cranch, Chief Judge of the District of Columbia, estimates the annual loss to the United States from the use of ardent spirits at not less than 94,425,000 dollars,—a sum "more than sufficient to buy up all the houses, lands, and slaves in the United States, once in every 20 years."

vails, *it is fatal*. The work is not accomplished till there is not a drunkard in our land; and not a sober man, much less a Christian, to make his children drunkards."

Our limits do not permit us more than to glance at this very able and satisfactory Report. It embodies a mass of information, a multitude of facts, in relation to the important subject of temperance, which can be found no where else. It ought to have, and must have, an extensive circulation.

3. *A Discourse on the Philosophy of Analogy*, delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa Society of Rhode Island, September 7th, 1831. By FRANCIS WAYLAND, D. D. President of Brown University. Boston: Hilliard, Gray, & Co. pp. 32.

The object of this ingenious and eloquent discourse is to explain the nature of analogy, its practical uses, and the sources of its improvement.

"There is needed a science, which, standing on the confines of what is known, shall point out the direction in which truth probably lies, in the region that is unknown. This, when it has assumed a definite form, will be the *science of analogy*."

"Whenever the laws of such a science shall have been discovered, I think that they will be found to rest upon the two following self-evident principles.

"First. A part of any system which is the work of an intelligent agent is similar, so far as the principles which it involves are concerned, to the whole of that system.

"And, secondly. The work of an intelligent and moral being must bear, in all its lineaments, the traces of the character of its Author. And, hence, *he* will use analogy the most skilfully who is most thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the system, and at the same time most deeply penetrated with a conviction of the attributes of the first Cause of all things.

"To illustrate this by a single remark. Suppose I should present before you one of the paintings of Raphael, and covering by far a greater part of it with a screen, ask you to proceed with the work and designate where the next lines should be drawn. It is evident that no one but a painter need even make the attempt; and of painters, he would be most likely to succeed, who had become best acquainted with the genius of Raphael and had most thoroughly meditated upon the manner in which that genius had displayed itself in the work before him. So, of the system of the universe we see but a part. All the rest is hidden from our view. He will, however, most readily discover *where the lines are drawn*, who is most thoroughly acquainted with the character of the author, and who has observed, with the greatest accuracy, the manner in which that character is displayed, in that portion of the system which he has condescended to reveal to us."

Among the means of improvement in the science of analogy, Dr. Wayland adverts to the study of God's word.

"Besides the works which he has created for our instruction, he has condescended to make himself known to us in a written revelation. Here he has taught us the infinity of his power, the unsearchableness of his wisdom, the boundlessness of his omnipresence, the tenderness of his compassion, and the purity of his holiness. Now, it is evident that the system of things around us must all have been constructed in accordance with the conceptions of so ineffably glorious an intelligence. But to such a being as this we are infinitely dissimilar. Compared with the attributes of the Eternal, our knowledge, and power, and godness are but the shadow of a name. As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are His ways higher than our ways, and his thoughts than our thoughts. So long, then, as we measure his works by our conceptions, is it wonderful if we are lost in inextricable darkness, and weary ourselves in asking of nature questions to which the indignant answer is invariably no! It is only when, in the profoundest humility, we acknowledge our own ignorance and look to the Father of light for wisdom, it is only when, bursting loose from the littleness of our own limited conceptions, we lose ourselves in the vastness of

the Creator's infinity, that we can rise to the height of this great argument and point out the path of discovery to coming generations. While men, measuring the universe by the standard of their own narrow conceptions, and surveying all things through the distempered medium of their own puerile vanity, placed the earth in the centre of the system, and supposed sun, moon and stars to revolve daily around it, the science of astronomy stood still, and age after age groped about in almost rayless darkness. It was only when humility had taught us how small a space we occupied in the boundlessness of creation, and raised us to a conception of the plan of the Eternal, that light broke in like the morning star upon our midnight, and a beauteous universe rose out of void and formless chaos."

4. *Holy Living and Dying ; with Prayers, containing the Complete Duty of a Christian.* By JEREMY TAYLOR. To which is prefixed an Introductory Notice, by an American Clergyman, and a Memoir of the Author. Amherst: J. S. & C. Adams. Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1831. pp. 431.

"The intellectual endowments of Bishop Taylor were of a very high order; but the qualities in which he shone most conspicuous were, an uncommon richness and fertility of invention, an exuberance of fancy, and an unbounded command of harmonious language. No prose writer can be mentioned, with the exception perhaps of Milton, in whom the powers of a splendid imagination are more conspicuous, or whose periods fill the ear with a more delightful harmony. To a mind like his, composition must have been rather a pastime than a labor. Illustrations the most apt and expressive, and imagery which constitutes the very essence of poetry, clustering around his pen, justify the appellation by which he is so familiarly known—"the Shakspeare of Divinity."

"But that which constitutes the principal charm of this favorite author is the strain of deep, simple, unaffected piety, which appears in every page of his devotional works, and which will never cease to recommend them to the Christian reader. The rules of holy living which he proposed to others, he observed himself. He had learned, amid scenes of poverty and oppression, the divine art of suffering with patience; he wrote experimentally, and hence the extensive popularity of his devotional and practical works, and the profit which has attended their perusal."

The treatise before us is that by which Bishop Taylor is best known to the present age. While his polemical works are consulted only by the scholar, and his sermons are less read than they deserve to be, his *Holy Living* still continues to be the closet companion of such as humbly aspire to tread in the footsteps of their Divine Master.

5. *Aids to Devotion, in three parts. Including Watts' Guide to Prayer.* Boston: Lincoln & Edmands. 1831. pp. 288.

This publication "consists of three parts. In the first part is condensed a large portion of Bickersteth's excellent treatise on the nature, duty, and privilege of prayer, with various other topics, which form an appropriate Introduction to a work of this nature.

"The second part consists of the entire treatise of Dr. Watts, entitled a *Guide to Prayer*; in which he most judiciously guards the reader against many errors, and points out most ably and satisfactorily the means for acquiring a holy freedom and pious elevation in the exercise.

"The third part comprises devotional exercises, selected principally from the passages of Scripture arranged by Mr. Henry in his *Method of Prayer*, and

from Mr. Bickersteth's Forms of Prayer." The work is beautifully executed, and adapted to be highly useful.

6. *The Friends. A True Tale of Woe and Joy : From the East.* Boston : Lincoln & Edmands. 1831. pp. 178.

This work is said to "contain the history of events and persons that are real in every respect, with the exception of the names." The design of the narrative is to illustrate Hindoo scenery and manners, the trials and the consolations of missionaries, the traits of character exhibited by the native converts, and the manifold good effects resulting from the Eastern Baptist Missions. The work purports to have been written by an eye witness, and although occasionally marked with the phraseology of a sect, will be read with interest by American Christians generally.

7. *Counsels on Matrimony ; or Friendly Suggestions to Husbands and Wives ; and a Remembrancer for Life. With an Appendix, &c.* By JOHN MORRISON. Newark : William Worts. Boston : Peirce & Parker. 1831. pp. 126.

8. *The Way of Salvation : A Sermon delivered at Morristown, New Jersey, Feb. 8, 1829.* By ALBERT BARNES. Third Edition. Newburyport : Charles Whipple. 1831. pp. 20.

9. *God's Instrument for the Conversion of Men : A Sermon delivered at the Installation of Rev. JOSIAH W. POWERS, over the Evangelical Church in Kingston, Mass. June 15, 1831.* By RICHARD S. STORRS, Pastor of the First Church in Braintree. Boston : Peirce & Parker. pp. 28.

10. *The Glory of the Lord filling the House : A Discourse delivered at the Dedication of the North Meeting House in Braintree, Dec. 29, 1830.* By RICHARD S. STORRS, Pastor of the First Church in Braintree. Boston : Peirce & Parker. pp. 32.

11. *A Sermon preached at the Installation of the Rev. WILLIAM N. CORNELL, as Pastor of the First Congregational Church and Society in Woodstock, Conn. June 15, 1831.* By ERASTUS MALTBY, Pastor of the Trinitarian Congregational Church, Taunton, Mass. Taunton : Edmund Anthony. pp. 24.

12. *The Pious Man Happy in his Sufferings : A Sermon preached in the Chapel of the Theological Seminary, Andover, Sept. 11, 1831.* By WILLIAM G. SCHAUFFLER, M. A. Abbot Resident in the Theological Seminary, Andover. Boston : Peirce & Parker. pp. 22.

Mr. Schaufler is known to many of our readers as a foreigner, who has spent several years at the theological seminary in Andover, in preparation for the gospel ministry. Being about to engage in missionary labors among the Jews in the East, he in the Sermon before us takes an affectionate leave of Christian friends in this country. He will be followed to his scene of labor by the best wishes and prayers of thousands in America.



## SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

VOL. IV.

DECEMBER, 1831.

NO. 12.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

## THIRD ARTICLE IN THE DECLARATION OF RIGHTS.

It was proposed in the Legislature of Massachusetts, at the last session, to amend the constitution of the State, by annulling or essentially modifying the third article in the Declaration of Rights. As this proposition is one of general interest, and will in all probability be renewed in the next legislature, it is important that the people should have the means of forming a correct judgement in regard to it. The following is the Article in question :

"As the happiness of a people, and the good order and preservation of civil government essentially depend upon piety, religion, and morality, and as these cannot be generally diffused through a community, but by the institution of the public worship of God, and of public instructions in piety, religion, and morality;—therefore, to promote their happiness, and to secure the good order and preservation of their government, the people of this Commonwealth have a right to invest their Legislature with power to authorize and require, and the Legislature shall, from time to time, authorize and require the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, and religious societies, to make suitable provision, at their own expense, for the institution of the public worship of God, and for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality, in all cases where such provision shall not be made voluntarily. And the people of this Commonwealth have also a right to, and do, invest their Legislature with authority to enjoin upon all the subjects an attendance upon the instructions of the public teachers aforesaid, at stated times and seasons, if there be any on whose instructions they can conscientiously and conveniently attend:—Provided, notwithstanding, that the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies, shall, at all times, have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance. And all monies, paid by the subject to the support of public worship, and of the public teachers aforesaid, shall, if he require it, be uniformly applied to the support of the public teacher or teachers of his own religious sect or denomination, provided there be any on whose instructions he attends; otherwise, it may be paid towards the support of the teacher or teachers of the parish or precinct in which the said monies are raised. And every denomination of Christians, demeaning themselves peaceably, and as good subjects of the Commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the law; and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law."

According to the provisions of this Article, and of existing laws, every inhabitant of the state is obliged to belong to some religious society; and the legislature are bound to require every such society to support a "public Protestant teacher of piety, religion, and morality." They have authority also to enjoin attendance on his ministrations. In the opinion of the writer, this article needs to be greatly altered, if not to be wholly set aside.—It will be the object of the following paper, first, to assign reasons for the opinion here expressed; secondly, to answer objections; and thirdly, to offer some remarks relative to the alterations that may be requisite.

1. My first objection to the article in question is, that it goes to create a *legal, religious establishment*. It establishes the Protestant religion *by law*, as the religion of the state. This is evident on the face of the article, and was expressly admitted by its advocates in the late Convention for revising the Constitution.\* The objections to such an establishment are various. In the first place, it is altogether unscriptural. Where did Christ or his Apostles ever intimate, that they wished their religion to be incorporated with the state, and to be supported by civil enactments and penalties? Where do we gather a hint from them, that they thought such a connexion desirable, or even possible?—Besides; a legal establishment of the Christian religion is inconsistent with the genius and spirit of this religion, and tends invariably to secularize and corrupt it. The visible kingdom of Christ exists *in* this world, and while its members remain here, they are required to yield obedience to every lawful human ordinance; but we have it on the authority of Christ himself, that his kingdom is not *of* this world. Its interests, its objects, and the entire spirit by which it is actuated, are totally distinct from those of every worldly kingdom. This spiritual, holy kingdom, the seat of which is in heaven, and the design of which is to train up moral beings in a meetness for heaven, does not require to be supported by civil statutes, or admit of becoming a creature of the laws. Accordingly, the pen of history has recorded, that every attempt to establish Christianity by the state, and support it by the force of law, has tended to corrupt it. So it was in the days of Constantine. So it has been in all periods since. The hierarchy of Rome is a standing memorial of the evil of attempting to secularize the religion of Christ, and support it by the civil arm. And the reformed, established churches in Europe afford convincing evidence of the same truth. Religion there has been taken into the arms of the state to be fostered and upheld by the civil power; but in an embrace so unnatural, instead of being sustained and cherished, it is confined, encumbered, and corrupted, till its spirit and life, in many instances, are gone.

\* "He [Dr. Freeman of Boston] agreed that making this provision was *establishing religion*, and that *religious establishments had been mischievous*; but it was because something else had been mixed with religion." *Journal, &c.* p. 168.

When our fathers came to this country, religious establishments were the order of the day every where. They existed in every country of Europe, where Christianity in any form had obtained the ascendancy, and the utility of them had not been questioned. As a matter of course, religion was almost immediately established here. And the evil consequences of the measure were soon manifested. Dissenters were harassed and persecuted, and in the established churches, the power and glory of religion were sensibly diminished. A spirit of coldness and slumber was induced, and a disposition to rely on the civil arm, rather than on the power and protection of Jehovah. It was in this way that the seeds of error were first implanted in many of the Pilgrim churches, and a foundation laid for their consequent defection from the truth and excellence of the gospel.—With such views as to the nature and tendency of religious establishments, I feel constrained to urge that the third article in our declaration of rights, *which goes confessedly to create a religious establishment in Massachusetts*, may be essentially altered or expunged.

2. The spirit of this article, and of the laws which have grown out of it, is *repugnant*, in many ways, to *the rights of conscience*. The article requires, as we have seen, that every inhabitant of the state shall belong to some religious society, shall aid in the support of some Protestant religious teacher, and attend upon his instructions. But how can such a requisition be made to comport with the religious rights of the Catholics, thousands of whom now reside in this commonwealth? And how does it agree with the rights of those, not a few of whom are found among us, whose consciences are not sufficiently enlightened (as they say) to perceive the necessity or propriety of belonging to any Christian society, or of supporting or hearing any public teacher of the Christian religion? Will it be said that such persons *ought* to be Christians? *We* may think so, indeed, but *they* assure us that they think otherwise. And what, in these circumstances, is the most likely method to bring them to think favorably of our religion? Shall we compel them to support and to frequent our worship, contrary to what they declare are the dictates of their consciences? Or shall we treat them in a more forbearing and conciliatory manner?

The whole system of taxation, by which our laws require religion to be supported, is in direct opposition to the consciences of a respectable portion of our citizens. They are willing those should be taxed who consent to be, for in that case the tax is no more than a voluntary contribution; but they assure us that they cannot themselves pay a compulsory religious tax, nor can they do any thing which implies an acquiescence in this mode of supporting the gospel. Accordingly, it was no relief to such persons that, previous to the law of 1811, their teachers could, by a certificate, withdraw their money from the hands of those by whom it was assess-

ed. Their objection was to *the tax*; and this must be assessed and collected, let the money come ultimately into whose hands it might. The act of giving and obtaining a certificate was understood by many as a virtual acquiescence in the propriety of the tax; and consequently they would not obtain certificates, and neither would they pay their taxes, till these were taken from them by force of law.—Within less than a year after the adoption of the Constitution, Mr. Backus informs us that “four Baptists had been imprisoned, and a fifth had had a cow taken from him,” for taxes.\* Between that period and 1811, a multitude of similar cases occurred. It was said of a member of the Convention of 1820, that he “had had his property taken from him to the amount of 300 dollars, for the support of public worship in a form which he did not approve.”†

And where certificates were given, and the dissenting teacher undertook to withdraw his taxes from the parish treasurer, these were not always relinquished without trouble and expense. In the late Convention, Dr. Baldwin mentioned the case of a single town in which “fourteen lawsuits” had been instituted to compel the parish treasurer to pay over the money of dissenters.† Mr. Varnum alluded to another “case, in which a man was taxed four dollars, and it was only after a series of lawsuits, which lasted four years, at an expense of one hundred dollars to him, and as much more to the parish, that he succeeded in having it appropriated to the teacher of his own society.”‡

To be sure, the law of 1811 brought vexations and oppressions of this sort comparatively to an end; but it did it by, in effect, nullifying the provisions of the Constitution;—by opening a way in which these provisions may be so easily evaded, that it is no longer possible they should be strictly enforced. And after all, the law of 1811 is not entirely satisfactory. Still there remains the religious establishment—crippled indeed and inefficient;—but still it exists. There is still the legal tax, which every citizen must pay, unless he makes what has been termed ‘the certificate bow,’ or contrives in some other way to evade it. In short, the evil, in principle, still exists, although so modified as to be less troublesome to the purses and the consciences of dissenters than it was in former years.

I know it will be said, that these scruples about a legal tax, and about certificates, are needless and childish; and perhaps they may be so. But that they exist in the minds of many of our citizens, and of some of our most worthy citizens, there can be no doubt; and the question is, whether a provision shall be retained in our Constitution and incorporated with our laws, which goes (to make the best of it) *needlessly* to violate them; or whether it shall be set aside.

\* Hist. of Baptists, vol. ii. p. 332.

† Journal, &c. pp. 163, 167, 254.

There is another class of persons, whose religious rights are entirely disregarded in the existing establishment;—I refer to minors and wards. Persons in this situation often become intelligently established in religious principles the opposite of those of their legal guardians. And in such cases, they may have the mortification and grief to see their property taxed to aid in the support of a religion which their souls abhor. I would simply inquire whether this is right; and whether such a system of things ought longer to be tolerated.

There is still another provision in the article before us, by which great violence may be done, and often has been, to the consciences of individuals.

“All monies paid by the subject to the support of public worship, and of the public teachers aforesaid, shall, if he require it, be uniformly applied to the support of the public teacher or teachers of his own religious sect or denomination, provided there be any, on whose instructions he attends, otherwise it may be paid towards the support of the teacher or teachers of the parish or precinct in which the said monies are raised.”

That is, if a man is so unfortunate as to be situated where he cannot attend, with his family, on that religious worship and instruction which he believes is right, then is he liable to be compelled to contribute for the support of that which he believes is wrong! A Calvinist so situated that he cannot attend the meeting of his choice may be compelled to pay for the support of Universalism; or a Universalist so situated that he cannot attend the meeting of his choice may be compelled to pay a man for preaching what he considers as the horrible dogma of eternal punishment.

3. The third article in the declaration of rights is *inconsistent with the second*. The second article provides that “no subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshipping God in the manner and seasons most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience; or for his religious profession or sentiments; provided he doth not disturb the public peace, or obstruct others in their religious worship.” This article is so framed as to secure equally the rights of *all religionists*,—the Catholic, the Jew, and the professor of the mere religion of nature, as well as of the Protestant Christian. But how does this agree with the provisions of the third article, which binds every citizen to aid in the support of some *Protestant* religious teacher, and to attend on his ministrations? The inconsistency is gross and irreconcilable, and that it was not discovered by the venerable framers of our Constitution can be accounted for only from the fact, that there were almost none at that time in the state, who were not nominally Protestants.

But the operation of the third article has been such in respect to *Protestants*, as perpetually to violate the provisions of the second. Has no Protestant subject been “hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshipping God in the manner

and seasons most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience; or for his religious profession or sentiments?" The many who have had their property taken from them, or have been imprisoned, for their religious taxes, will best be able to answer this question.

4. The third article in the declaration of rights is *inconsistent with itself*.—It is inconsistent in its *reasoning*. It assumes, *very justly*, that "the happiness of a people, and the good order and preservation of civil government, essentially depend upon piety, religion, and morality," and that "these cannot be generally diffused through a community but by the institution of the public worship of God;"—and then it infers, that *a religious establishment ought to be erected—that public worship should be supported by law!* As though 'piety, religion, and morality could not be generally diffused through a community' without an establishment; and the public worship of God could not be maintained without the aid of compulsory laws! The premises assumed in the article we most cordially admit; but the conclusion does not follow. It is contradicted by the experience of the church in every age. Consequently, the reasoning of the article is inconsistent and deceptive.

The article is inconsistent, also, in its *practical operation*. At the time when it was adopted, the Congregationalists were a majority in nearly every town in the state. They were in possession of the meeting houses, and a very great proportion of the legal parishes were under their control. The article went, therefore, to establish this sect, without naming it, and to confer upon it peculiar legal facilities and privileges. The Congregationalists could support their teachers and meet their other parochial expenses by a legal tax, assessed upon all the rateable polls and property in the several towns; while the other denominations, being a minority, had no such privileges. For more than thirty years, they were taxed with the Congregationalists; and then, by a circuitous, vexatious route (of which many could not in conscience avail themselves, and in which those who did were often obliged to encounter great embarrassments) their money might be drawn back for the benefit of their own teachers. Such was the actual operation of the third article, till its course was interrupted by the law of 1811. And yet this same article provides that "*no subordination of any sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law!*"—The dissenting denominations have always complained of the practical inconsistency of this article; and, as I think, with sufficient reason.

5. The article before us is *unequal* in its operation. It has never been enforced in Boston, and in several of the larger towns in the state. The religious societies in these places are voluntary associations, under the protection of the laws, who meet their vari-

ous expenses and transact their concerns, in that manner which to themselves is most agreeable. Many people in the country feel themselves justly aggrieved, that they cannot have the same liberty which is enjoyed in the city—that they are subject to laws from which other citizens are free. And especially do they feel aggrieved that some of their city brethren should attempt to bind burthens upon them which they will not themselves touch with one of their fingers.\*

6. The subject under consideration is one in which Massachusetts should not be altogether uninfluenced by *the example of her sister states*. Religious establishments formerly existed in several of these states, but in the progress of light and of public opinion, they have gradually and totally disappeared. The religious establishments in Virginia and New York were assailed and undermined during the war of the revolution, and for more than thirty years have been entirely overthrown. In Connecticut, the religious establishment was destroyed by the adoption of the new Constitution, A. D. 1818. In Vermont, the laws for supporting the gospel were similar to those in Massachusetts, till the year 1807, when they were repealed, and religion was left to the voluntary exertions of its friends. In New Hampshire, an act passed, July 3, 1827, providing that “no person shall be compelled to join, or support, or be classed with, or associated to, any congregation, church, or religious society, without his express consent first had or obtained.”

I might proceed to give extracts from the Constitutions of the several states; but this is unnecessary. Suffice it to say, that in retaining her religious establishment and laws, Massachusetts now stands alone. In this respect, she is evidently behind her sister states, and behind the light and spirit of the age. Religion has here been encumbered and fettered by civil legislation long enough. It is high time that she be set at liberty, and be permitted to walk forth in the exercise of that freedom wherewith Christ has made her free.

7. It may be pertinent to adduce the opinions of some of the *greatest and best men of modern times* in favor of a degree of religious freedom which cannot be enjoyed in Massachusetts, while our Constitution remains as it is at present.

After the adoption of the Federal Constitution, and the election of Gen. Washington to the Presidential chair, he was addressed by a committee of the united Baptist churches in Virginia. From his reply to their address, I extract the following, which (considering the known sentiments of these Baptist churches, and the conflict then scarcely terminated in Virginia with a long existing and over-

\* The proposition before the last legislature to amend the third article was opposed by a great majority of the Boston members, and was lost in the Senate, probably, through their influence.

bearing religious establishment) is conclusive as to the views of the Father of his country.

"If I could have entertained the slightest apprehension that the Constitution framed in the Convention where I had the honor to preside *might possibly endanger the religious rights of any ecclesiastical society*, certainly I would never have placed my signature to it; and if I could now conceive that the general government might ever be so administered as to render the *liberty of conscience insecure*, I beg you will be persuaded that no one would be more zealous than myself to establish *effectual barriers* against the horrors of spiritual tyranny, and every species of religious persecution. For you doubtless remember, I have often expressed my sentiments, that every man, conducting himself as a good citizen, and being accountable to God alone for his religious opinions, *ought to be protected in worshipping the Deity according to the dictates of his own conscience.*"

In 1784, a bill was introduced into the legislature of Virginia, the object of which was to bring about a state of things very similar to that now nominally existing in Massachusetts, viz. to compel every person to be classed with some religious society, and to contribute to the support of some religious teacher. While the proposition was under consideration, a number of spirited remonstrances were sent in to oppose it;\* and among them one from the pen of Col. James Madison, afterwards President of the United States. This elegant and forcible appeal cannot well be abridged, and my limits do not admit of publishing it entire. It may be found in Benedict's History of American Baptists, vol. ii. p. 474, and is entirely in point with the present discussion.

In the early settlement of the Southern portion of our country, the celebrated Mr. Locke was applied to to prepare a form of government for the Province of Carolina. This form, as it came from his hands, *contains no provision for the legal support of Christian institutions.* The ninety-sixth Article, as it stands in his Works, "was drawn up and inserted, by some of the Proprietors, *against the judgement of Mr. Locke,*" and is as follows: "It shall belong

\* Among these Remonstrances, was one in verse. As the subject does not seem to admit of much poetical embellishment, my readers may be curious to see some of these lines.

"May a poor bard from bushes sprung,  
Who yet has but to rustics suag,  
Address your honorable House,  
And not your angry passions rouse?  
\* \* \* \* \*  
Tax all things—water, air, and light,  
If need there be;—yea, tax the *night*:  
But let our brave, heroic min-<sup>s</sup>  
Move freely as celestial winds.  
Make vice and folly feel your rod,  
But *leave our consciences to God.*  
Leave each man free to choose his form  
Of piety,—nor at him storm.  
And he who minds the civil law,  
And keeps it whole, without a flaw,  
*Let him, just as he pleases, pray,*  
*And seek for heaven in his own way;*  
And if he miss, we all must own,  
No man is wrong'd, but him alone."



to the [Provincial] Parliament to take care for the building of churches, and the public maintenance of divines to be employed in the exercise of religion, according to the church of England," &c. This provision for a religious establishment, we are expressly told, was "*against the judgement of Mr. Locke.*"

In 1739, Dr. Watts wrote "an Essay on Civil Power in Things Sacred," from which the following sentences are taken :

"Civil government, in its proper aims and designs, hath no direct reach nor authority beyond the benefit of men in this world; nor do the things of religion, nor the affairs of a future state, come within its cognizance, any farther than they have a most evident reference to the natural and civil welfare of men in the present life."—"It does not appear plain to me, that taxes of any kind should be *imposed* on the people, in order to encourage and maintain the peculiar ceremonies or sacrifices, preaching or ministrations, of *any supposed revealed religion.*"—"In the peculiarities of Christianity, I find nothing which can be *required or imposed by civil authority*, without entrenching upon the rights or liberties of mankind. In all our reasonings and writings on this important subject, let us take heed to allow *no such power or dominion to men*, which would have excluded the best of religions—the religion of Christ—out of the world."

"May not every civil government appoint certain persons to offer public prayers and praises unto the great God at certain seasons, and *require* the attendance of the people on this worship? I answer, it is difficult to find how this may be done, *without entrenching upon the liberty of mankind, and imposing upon the consciences of some of the people of the land.*"

I will only add an extract from Messrs. Bouge and Bennett's History of Dissenters, which may be supposed to speak the sentiments of the whole body of our Congregational brethren in England, on this subject.

"The civil magistrate has no authority in the church of Christ. Through the whole New Testament, not a hint is given, that the civil rulers of any country are, in that capacity, *at all to interfere with the church of Christ*, so as to frame regulations for its disciples, and exert an authoritative influence in its affairs."

"For their temporal support, the dissenting ministers depend on the contributions of the congregation. To flesh and blood, this method does not appear so desirable as the salary of the state. But, with all its disadvantages, nothing has yet appeared to alter the opinion, that, as it was the *first*, it is the *best*—best for the minister—best for the people—and best for the cause of religion." Vol. iv. p. 356.

8. The powers conveyed by the third article in the declaration of rights are such as *cannot be well defined, and are exceedingly liable to be perverted.*\* For instance, the legislature is here bound to require the people to support "Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality." But the terms "piety and religion" are differently understood among Protestants, and who is to define their meaning?—Again; the legislature has "authority to enjoin upon all the subjects an attendance upon the instructions of the public teachers aforesaid at stated times and seasons, if there be any one on whose instructions they can conscientiously and conve-

\* This was a principal objection to the Article, when it was under consideration in 1780: "It is not sufficiently explicit;—it is ambiguously expressed;—it is capable of being variously, and of course wrongly interpreted;—an objection which, experience has shown, is too well founded.

niently attend." But who is to fix the "stated times and seasons" when persons shall attend upon the instructions of their religious teachers? And who can tell, aside from the individual himself, whether there is any teacher on whose instructions he can *conscientiously* attend?

The article provides that "the several towns, parishes, precincts, and the other bodies politic, or religious societies, shall, at all times, have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers." But what are we to understand by these "other bodies politic, or religious societies?" It is morally certain that, at the time when the article was framed, these words were understood to include the *churches*, and to secure to them the right of electing their pastors.\* But they have since been interpreted as *excluding* the churches, and taking from them their right of election. And thus understood, they are a *tremendous invasion of the rights of conscience*—one which has never been acquiesced in by the good people of Massachusetts, and never will be.

The phraseology of this article was doubtless intended to be guarded and cautious, and perhaps it is as much so as the nature of the case admits. But these are subjects on which it is not only difficult, but impossible to legislate, without invading rights which lie beyond the sphere of human legislation—which lie exclusively between man and his Maker.

9. The third article has been a source of perpetual *strife* and *litigation*, from its first proposal to the present hour. In the Convention which framed the Constitution, this article was the subject of long and angry debates, and was opposed, to the last, by a large and respectable minority.† In the Convention of 1820, it was the subject of more dispute than any other part of the Constitution, and I believe than *every* other, and was finally retained in opposition to the wishes of more than 160 members. From the time of the adoption of the Constitution until the year 1811, the state was almost continually agitated with dissensions and law-suits between Congregationalists and dissenters, respecting taxes. The harmony of society was interrupted, bad feelings were excited, and much time and money were worse than thrown away. Nor since 1811, has the strife ceased, although the subject of it has been somewhat changed. It is now next to impossible to determine who are qualified voters and the lawful subjects of taxation, in the original, territorial parishes. Persons are off one day, and back the next, just as their caprice or their party feelings dictate. Our courts have

\* For proof of this point, the reader is referred to an article in the *Spirit of the Pilgrims* for July, 1829, and especially to pp. 374—382. This article was the termination of a protracted and warm dispute on the meaning of the *very words* considered above. No reply to it has been attempted, and, it is presumed, will not be.

† "This article," say the Convention in their Address to the people, "Underwent long debate, and took time in proportion to its importance." See an Account of these debates in the *Independent Chronicle* for Feb. 10, 1790.

been perplexed with suits of this nature for several of the last years, and are likely to be for years to come.

Another class of suits, which have long agitated the Commonwealth, and to which (while the third article is retained and interpreted as it is at present) no one can foresee the end, are those relating to the rights of churches. Churches claim the natural, unalienable right of choosing their own officers, holding their own property, and managing their own concerns. This right their enemies are intent upon taking from them; and they claim authority to do it (as hinted already) from a mistaken interpretation of this third article.—There can be no doubt, in short, that this article *has been* a perpetual source of trouble and expense to Massachusetts, and (if retained) is likely to be; and, hence, the sooner it is taken out of the way, the better.

10. The existing order of things in Massachusetts has a most unfavorable bearing on *the morals* of this community. It leads to perpetual *frauds* and *evasions*, in connexion with the sacred subject of religion. All the inhabitants are bound, by the constitution and laws, to support and attend upon religious institutions. Still it is perfectly easy, under the statute of 1811, to evade this obligation, and it is continually and, by many, *fraudulently* evaded. Voluntary societies spring up, for the *professed* purpose of supporting their own religious worship, but for the *real* purpose of making their own taxes, and in fact of making no taxes at all. In the Convention of 1820, Mr. Webster stated, that he knew societies had then “been formed, for the *express* purpose of enabling the members to evade the obligations” of the Constitution.\* Mr. Saltonstall also stated, that “there had been many frauds and abuses under the law of 1811, and that it was not in the power of the most respectable and best intentioned ministers to prevent them.”\* In fact, the present order of things holds out a perpetual lure to evasions of this kind, and has in this way a most unfavorable bearing on the morals of the community.

11. The order of things here referred to is peculiarly oppressive to the *original, territorial parishes* in the state. They are obliged by law to support the public worship of God, and are liable to a heavy fine, if they fail of doing it. But while one law imposes this obligation, another opens a door by which the power of fulfilling it may be completely taken away. Voluntary societies may spring up and be organized, till the original establishment is completely disabled. It cannot retain its minister; or if destitute, cannot settle and support another.—And besides, as the laws now are, what encouragement have first parishes to build or repair meeting houses, and to increase their conveniences for public worship? Suppose a parish to contemplate building a new house of worship; and while the subject is in agitation, half the members,

\* Journal, &c. pp. 204, 207.

or more, fly off and form a voluntary society, to avoid the expense. Suppose, however, that by great personal sacrifices on the part of those who remain, the undertaking is accomplished. What is there now to prevent the voluntary society from disbanding, and its members from dropping back into the first parish, taking possession of the house, and settling a minister, in direct opposition, it may be, to the wishes of those by whom the building has been erected?—As things now are in Massachusetts, unprincipled men may not only ease themselves of all burthens in supporting the public worship of God, but may vastly increase the burthens of others, and embarrass them in the performance of their duty. Not only the rights of conscience, but the rights of property, on the part of those who value the institutions of the gospel, are left at the mercy of men who feel no interest in these things, and only wish to perplex and plunder those who do.

In short, the tables here are completely turned, and the original, territorial parishes, which used to have the pre-eminence, are coming to be trampled under foot. And there is no way to prevent this, but to abolish the third article, and place religious freedom upon a consistent and proper basis. This article, and the law of 1811, can never be made to operate fairly and favorably together. They may not clash directly in words, but they are practically inconsistent, and the one or the other must give place. But there is no part of our statute book more dear to our people generally, than the law of 1811. It cannot and ought not to be repealed. The third article ought, therefore, to be removed, and religious freedom to be established here, as it is in the other states.

12. The third article ought to be essentially modified or abolished, because it is already, to a great extent, *abandoned in practice*, and *cannot longer be enforced*. As I have stated already, it never was enforced in Boston and in some of the larger towns, and never can be. Who would undertake to compel every inhabitant of Boston and Salem, Catholics and all, to support some Protestant religious teacher? Who would advocate the laying of a tax upon all the rateable polls and property in these places, for such a purpose?—But not only is the thing impracticable in the larger towns, it is equally so, though in a different way, in every town. There is not a town in the Commonwealth where the provisions of the article before us are now strictly enforced, or can be. There is, probably, not a town in the Commonwealth, where every individual contributes for the support of public worship. The Constitution, on this point, is evaded every where. Few if any pay their money for religious purposes, unless they choose to do it, nor beyond the amount they choose. We have law enough to embarrass the friends of religion, but not enough, generally speaking, to aid them at all. The third article has lived in our statute book, till it is fairly outgrown and superseded by the spirit of the age; and it

is now high time it should be removed. It is high time that religion was left free and unincumbered in the towns of Massachusetts, as it is in the city, and as it is in every other part of the United States.\*

To the views advanced under the foregoing particulars I am sensible there will be objections; and to these I will now endeavor to give a candid attention.

1. It is said that without the aid of laws *religion cannot be supported*. This objection was urged with great earnestness in the Convention which framed the constitution. "If there is no law to support religion, then farewell meeting-houses, farewell ministers, farewell all religion."† The same was also urged in the Convention of 1820. "Religion," it was said, "will not take care of itself. It requires money;" and this must be collected by force of law.‡

With whatever shadow of plausibility this objection might have been urged fifty or a hundred years ago, it is really too late to propose it now. To every intelligent, candid mind, the bare mention of it suggests its refutation. Religion cannot be supported without the aid of compulsory laws! How was it supported, and carried forward from conquering to conquer, in the primitive church? How is it supported and diffused in the dissenting churches of England? Look at Boston, Salem, Newburyport, and some other of our large towns, and see if religion is not as well supported in these places, as in the country around them. Look at the volun-

\* The following remarks of the Hon. Samuel Lathrop, President of the Senate in 1850-51, on taking leave of the Board at the prorogation of the Legislature, are full of wisdom, and will repay an attentive perusal:

"May I be excused in making a suggestion in reference to another article in our Constitution. Whenever any provision of the Constitution ceases to have any obligatory effect—when public opinion clearly and unequivocally demands of the legislature a disregard of its injunctions—when we are obliged to frame our laws in such a manner as to evade it, or directly to contravene it, and when our judicial tribunals give the sanction of constitutionality to such enactments, the continuance of the article remains not merely useless—it also tends to diminish our veneration for the whole instrument, and necessarily leads to a practice of immoral tendency. Will not these observations apply to the third article in our Bill of Rights? It is now too late to agitate the question whether the enforcement of the provisions of that article would be an infringement of the liberty of conscience. The question is settled both by the legislative and judicial tribunals—and it is settled by a still higher tribunal, by the people themselves. No legislature can enforce its provisions and obey its requirements.

"There is perhaps no subject, on which a free and enlightened people are more jealous of the interference of the government than that of religion—and this extends, and will extend, not merely to the right of choosing the religious sect or denomination to which they will contribute their support, but also to the fact, whether they shall be compelled to contribute to the support of any. Our legislation for a long period has been fruitful in devices, by which we the people, may evade an obligation expressly but unwisely enjoined. Is it not better that the article be wholly expunged, rather than that our statute book should exhibit such glaring inconsistencies between the provisions of the law and the duties enjoined by the constitution? It will scarcely be contended by any one, at the present day, that there will be less of vital piety, of genuine religion, and of practical morality, where they derive their support from voluntary association and free contribution, than from constitutional provisions and legal enactments."

† I quote the very language which was then used. See *Continental Journal*, March 23, 1780.

‡ *Journal*, &c. p. 206.

tary Congregational Societies which have sprung up within a few of the last years, and see if religion is not supported in them. Look also at the churches of some other denominations, and see how they have increased and prospered, not only without laws, but in the face of laws. And is their foundation stronger or better than that of the Congregational churches? When we admit this, we will no longer style ourselves Congregationalists. Look again at the churches in the states around us, which have abolished their establishments and their compulsory laws, and see if religion is not as well supported as it was in former years. Go into Connecticut, Vermont, and New Hampshire, and see if religion is not supported; and see if you can find an individual of any denomination, clergyman or layman, who wishes the former state of things restored. To say that our religion cannot be supported without the aid of establishments and laws is to disgrace it in the eyes of the world, and to cast reproach upon its Author. It is to contradict the truth of his word, which represents his church as built upon a rock, so that the gates of hell cannot prevail against it. It is to contradict the experience of ages, and to deny the plainest facts which are now passing before our eyes.

2. But it will be said, religion has been supported by law in Massachusetts, almost from the first settlement of the country. We have *experienced* the beneficial effects of such laws; and shall we throw away the lessons of experience for any theory, however plausible?—It is admitted that religion has been supported in Massachusetts ever since the settlement of the country; and by the greater part of the Congregational denomination, it has been supported in connexion with the laws. But before any argument can be drawn from this, it must be shown that religion would not have been as well supported without the laws, as it has been with them. I firmly believe it would have been better supported; and I am justified in this belief by the facts to which I have already referred. Religion was supported, and much more than supported, during the first 300 years of the Christian era, not only without laws, but in face of bloody, persecuting laws. It has been triumphantly supported by our dissenting brethren in England, for between two and three hundred years, in spite of every discouragement from the laws. It was supported by the Pilgrim settlers of Massachusetts, and in greater purity than it has ever been since, during all the hardships of their early settlement, chiefly by voluntary contributions.\* It has been supported without laws by the dissenters from our religious establishment, ever since this establishment was formed; and during all this time, these dissenters have been continually multiplying and increasing upon what has been called the *standing*

\* Chief Justice Parker dates the commencement of legal obligation on the part of towns to provide for the support of Ministers, in 1652. Mass. Term Reports, vol. xvi. p. 516.

order. Religion has all along been supported, amply supported, by many Congregational churches in a voluntary way; and the number of those who support the gospel in this way has, within a few of the last years, been greatly increased. In several of the states, where religious establishments formerly existed, they have been overthrown; and yet religion is as well supported as it was before, and with much greater peace and comfort to the people. Such are some of the *facts* in the case; and, in view of them, how shall it be made to appear that religion would not have been as well supported in Massachusetts, from the first, without the aid of compulsory laws, as it has been with them? It is my firm belief, as I said, that it would have been much better supported. I have no doubt that the legal establishment of religion has been a curse to our churches;—not so great a curse as it was to the churches in the days of Constantine, or as it has been to the reformed churches in Europe—but still an incumbrance and a curse. It has certainly been a source of almost continual contention and strife. It has stained the records of our courts and the page of our history with numerous instances of oppression and cruelty, which no tears can wash away. It has palsied the energies of our churches, and brought over them a spirit of coldness, worldly security, and slumber. In short, the result of our *experience* on this subject is, that the gospel can be sustained among us, *a religious establishment to the contrary notwithstanding*. We have every reason to believe that it can be better sustained without such an establishment than with it, and consequently that what remains of our old establishment ought to be taken out of the way.

3. It has been often said that it is the incumbent *duty* of a Christian commonwealth to make laws for the support of religion.—But how does it appear that this is a duty? Not because Christ or his Apostles commanded it; for they did not command it. Neither because religion cannot be supported without such aid; for it has been shown already that religion can be supported without the aid of laws even better than with it.

But it is said that religion is the great prop of government; that without it, civil institutions could hardly exist; and, consequently, that it is as much the duty of governments to support religion, as to support schools, or courts of justice.—It is admitted that religion is an essential aid to civil government, so that without it the forms of government could not well be maintained. Most fully do I accord to all that has been written, or is likely to be, in proof of this point. And if there was no way for religion to be supported, and so to lend its aid to government, except by compulsory laws, then should I be in favor of such laws. I should think it the sacred duty of governments to enact them. But if, as has been fully shown, religion can be better supported, and lend a more efficient aid to government, without laws than with them, then the argument

for them, on the ground here considered, is taken away. If laws and establishments are a real incumbrance to religion, it surely is not the duty of Christian governments to incumber it. From a sense of what they owe to religion, it is not their duty to load it with enactments which do it vastly more hurt than good. If governments are vitally dependant on religion to give them energy and effect, so that they can hardly subsist without it (as is undoubtedly the fact) then, instead of introducing laws to the detriment of religion, let them do that which will be most for its benefit;—*let them simply afford it their protection*. Let them leave it free and unshackled as the spirit of heaven; and thus will it best diffuse itself through every class of society, and impart strength and efficiency to all the valuable institutions of the state.

4. It will be pretended, no doubt, that the sentiments expressed in the foregoing pages are calculated to bring reproach upon the venerable fathers and early settlers of New England. But in answer to this, several things may be said. In the first place, the early settlers of this country commenced supporting the gospel by voluntary contributions. The taxing power was not given to towns until after the colony had been established more than twenty years.—Besides, nobody pretends, at the present day, that we are bound in *all things* to walk in the steps of our worthy ancestors. They were wise and good men—heroic men—men far in advance, in many respects, of the age in which they lived—men to whom we are under an amount of obligation which can hardly be estimated. Still, they thought it necessary to do many things which none at the present day would think of imitating, and which, were they now alive, they would not repeat.

It should be considered, too, that there were many reasons why our fathers commenced a religious establishment, which are not reasons for our continuing it. Most of the people, in their times, were of one denomination; and as a tax was a convenient mode of raising their minister's salaries, they naturally enough fell into it. But now there are various denominations, embracing large and respectable portions of the community; and if a general assessment is attempted, there must be so many facilities for evading it, as to render it more a trouble than a blessing.—Again, religious establishments were common, in the days of our fathers, wherever Christianity, in any form, had obtained the ascendancy. The utility of them had not been questioned; nor had it been seen, as it now is, in the experience of modern times, that religion can be sustained without them in greater purity and vigor than it can be with them.—But especially, our fathers established their own form of religion to forestall and prevent the establishment of another. They had just broken away from under the yoke of the hierarchy of England. They had seen Episcopacy established in Virginia, and had heard the doctrine advocated, that the religious laws of England



extended to the colonies, and provided for the establishment of that form of religion in them all. To prevent this, the religion of the settlers was taken into close connexion with the state, and supported by the civil power.—I do not say that our fathers were fully justified in all the measures which they took in relation to this subject; but I do say, that they were altogether more excusable for commencing their religious establishment, than (in our circumstances, and with our advantages) we can be for continuing it.

5. It has been objected, that without compulsory laws for the support of religion, there would not be sufficient encouragement for young men to devote themselves to the work of the ministry. This consideration was much insisted on in the late Convention for revising the constitution.\* But it is one which deserves very little attention. It is contradicted by the plainest facts. Young men have shown themselves as ready to go into the ministry, and have made as thorough preparation for it, where compulsory laws were not in existence, as where they were. And besides, the objection is contradictory to the very spirit of the gospel. Who wants young men to be lured into the ministry by the bait of an ecclesiastical establishment? And what will ministers be worth, who are drawn by such motives to engage in such a work? They will invariably seek the fleece rather than the flock, and will prove a curse more than a blessing to the church. It is one of the principal objections to laws and establishments, that they hold out inducements to mercenary men to crowd into the sacred office and disgrace it. If our youth cannot be drawn by the love of Christ and of souls to devote themselves to the work of the ministry, then let them engage in other employments. Christ has no call or service for them in the sacred offices of his church.

6. I shall notice but another objection to the abolition or alteration of the third article, and this is that it will *injure some Congregational societies*. And if such should be the result, as perhaps it may be, I trust our brethren have Christian principle and public spirit enough to make a sacrifice of this sort, when so obviously demanded by the general interests of religion and the state. Doubtless there are some societies which may be temporarily affected by the contemplated change. That is, there are individuals here and there who pay something now for the support of the gospel, who will not pay as much, perhaps not anything, if the constitution is altered and the compulsory laws repealed. But the change, if wisely effected, will be felt much less than many anticipate, and not at all after a little time,—while the good effects of it, in the cessation of parochial suits and contentions, in the peace and quietness of the different denominations, and in the increased purity and sta-

\* It was urged by Mr. Flint "that it was necessary to make legal provision for the support of religious instructions, that there might be sufficient inducement to young men to qualify themselves for the office of public instructors." *Journal, &c.* p. 170.

bility of our religious institutions, will soon reconcile all minds in its favor. When a similar change was effected in Connecticut, great fears were entertained by many respectable individuals, that it would result in the ruin of the Congregational churches. But now, no people in the state more unanimously approve the change, or feel more grateful for it, than the Congregationalists. Similar fears were indulged in Vermont and New Hampshire, when the religious laws in those states were repealed. But I have it on good authority, that not a single Congregational minister was dismissed in consequence of their repeal. All found themselves as well supported without the laws, as they had been with them, and soon came to rejoice, that the incumbrance of laws was taken away.

In regard to the alterations in our constitution and laws, which may be requisite, to meet the object which I have in view, my limits do not permit me to enlarge; nor would it be proper, in the present state of the question, to offer more than some general remarks.

The religious societies now in existence should be continued, and a way pointed out in which new ones may be formed, and all should be protected in the exercise of their corporate powers and rights, and in the forms and usages of the several denominations with which they are connected. No person should be compelled to belong to any religious society, or be regarded as belonging to any, unless by his own consent; and those who do belong should have the power of raising money to defray their parochial charges in any manner that shall seem to them most expedient. They should have power to make contracts with their religious teachers, and others, and all contracts formed, or to be formed, should be sacredly binding.—It may not be expedient, perhaps, that all the needful regulations on this subject should be incorporated with the Constitution. Much may be safely left here, as it is in the other states, to legislative provision.

The following substitute for the existing third article was proposed and largely discussed in the Convention of 1820. It is substantially the same as the seventh article of the Constitution of Connecticut, and expresses very nearly my own views.

“As the happiness of a people and the good order and preservation of civil government, essentially depend upon piety, religion, and morality; and as these cannot be generally diffused through a community, but by the public worship of God; and as the public worship of God will be best promoted, by recognising the unalienable right of every man, to render that worship in the mode most consistent with the dictates of his own conscience; Therefore no person shall by law be compelled to join, or support, nor be classed with, or associated to any congregation, or religious society whatever; but every person now belonging to any religious society, whether incorporated or unincorporated, shall be considered a member thereof, until he shall have separated himself therefrom, in the manner hereinafter provided. And each and every society, or denomination of Christians, in this state, shall have and enjoy the same and equal power, rights, and privileges, and shall have power and authority to raise money, for the support and maintenance of religious teachers of their re-

spective denominations, and to build and repair houses of public worship, by a tax on the members of any such society only, to be laid by a major vote of the legal voters assembled at any society meeting, warned and held according to law.

“ Provided nevertheless, that if any person shall choose to separate himself from the society or denomination to which he may belong, and shall leave a written notice thereof, with the Clerk of such society, he shall thereupon be no longer liable for any future expenses, which may be incurred by said society.

“ And every denomination of Christians demeaning themselves peaceably and as good citizens of the Commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the law, and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law.”

The following amendment or substitute was proposed in the Legislature, June last, and was carried in the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority :

“ As the happiness of the people and the good order and preservation of civil government, essentially depend upon piety, religion and morality, and as these cannot be generally diffused through a community but by the institution of the public worship of God, and of public instructions in piety, religion and morality, therefore, to promote their happiness and secure the good order and preservation of their government, the people of this Commonwealth have a right to make suitable provision at their own expense for the institution of the public worship of God, and for the support and maintenance thereof. *Provided*, that all religious societies shall, at all times, have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance, and, provided also that the obligations of no existing contract shall be hereby impaired.

“ And all Religious sects and denominations, demeaning themselves peaceably and as good citizens of the Commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the law ; and no subordination of any sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law.”

There would be no great objection to this, were it not for the *proviso*, borrowed from the existing third article, that “ all religious societies shall, at all times, have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers,” &c. Nor would this be objectionable, if we could be sure that the words, “ religious societies,” are to be understood as they were by the people generally at the time when the original article was adopted. It is beyond dispute (as has been observed already) that these words were then understood to include the churches, and to secure to them the right of electing their pastors. But they have since been interpreted, on high legal authority, as excluding the churches, and depriving them of the natural and immemorial right of election. And to the *proviso*, thus interpreted, a vast proportion of the religious part of our citizens have never given their assent, and they never will. They ask nothing for the churches, but the enjoyment of their own natural, inherent rights. They ask not that they may be permitted to impose religious teachers upon their associated parishes, but simply that they may be protected in the choice of their own *pastors*—in the choice of those who are to preside in their meetings, direct their discipline, and administer to them the seals of the covenant of life. The right here insisted on is claimed by the *churches* of every denomination, in which the distinction between church and parish is known, and will be relinquished by them only with their existence.

It may be proper, before closing, to exhibit the manner in which religious freedom is secured in the Constitutions of several of our sister states.

The following is the 18th article of the Constitution of New Jersey. The same, for substance, is in the Constitution of Georgia.

"No person shall ever, within this colony, be deprived of the inestimable privilege of worshipping Almighty God, in a manner agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience: nor, under any pretence whatever, be compelled to attend any place of worship, contrary to his own faith and judgement; nor shall any person within this colony ever be obliged to pay tythes, taxes, or any other rates, for the purpose of building or repairing any other church or churches, place or places of worship, or for the maintenance of any minister or ministry, contrary to what he believes to be right, or has deliberately and voluntarily engaged himself to perform."

The article which follows will be found, in nearly the same words, in the Constitutions of Connecticut, New York, South Carolina, and Mississippi.

"The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall, forever hereafter, be allowed within this state to all mankind: Provided, that the liberty of conscience thereby declared, shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this state."

The following article is from the Constitution of Pennsylvania, and has also been adopted into the Constitutions of Kentucky, Tennessee, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois.

"All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences: and no man can, of right, be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent; that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience: and that no preference shall ever be given, by law, to any religious establishments or modes of worship."

---

#### THE STATE OF THE HEATHEN.

The present age is distinguished by efforts to give the gospel to the heathen. Into the treasuries which have been opened, are poured the offerings of the great mass of Protestant christendom. Bibles, tracts, and living teachers, have been sent out to almost every heathen nation. Yet even *now*, the character and prospects of the heathen are ambiguous in the minds of multitudes, and expressions of uncertainty are every where in circulation, which cramp our energies and limit our success. No subject can be more important than this to the interests of mankind. A great majority of the human race are concerned in our perception of the truth, respecting it, and in the deepness of impression which it makes upon our minds. Those who overlook, or extenuate, or excuse, the sinfulness

of the heathen, will not fulfil the work which, in the fulness of times, has devolved upon the present generation. Each of us is called to the work of blessing the heathen. Let us, then, endeavor to become acquainted with their character and prospects.

From the New Testament, we learn what were the character and the prospects of the heathen at the time of the promulgation of the gospel. In the language of the apostle to the Gentiles, they were '*children of disobedience*;' and in that character, exposed to '*the wrath of God.*' Even their idolatry had no apology of ignorance to excuse it; because 'though they knew God (as discovered in his works) they glorified him not as God, and did not like to retain him in their knowledge; but changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature, instead of the Creator.' Neither was their idolatry a single offence. Because they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, they were given over to a reprobate mind, and to the most abominable vices. The catalogue recorded Rom. i. 29, 30, 41, and Eph. v. 5. is abundantly confirmed by cotemporary history, and there remains no question, that idolatry and vice united in forming the general character of the ancient heathen.\*

Their *prospects* resulted from their character. As children of disobedience, they were children of wrath. To the exposition of their character just referred to in the Epistle to the Romans, the Apostle prefixes the declaration; "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against *all* ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness;" and he follows it by the assurance that God will render "tribulation and anguish to every soul of man that *doeth evil*, of the Jew first, and also *of the Gentile.*" Of course, the heathen were accountable on the same principles, to the same authority, and under the same sanctions, as either Jews or Christians, and were subject with them to the wrath of God.

These declarations are confirmed and explained by other forms of expression. Thus it is said that idolators '*have no inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God.*' Eph. v. 5. Are they not left then as outcasts, with those who have sinned against the instructions of the Old and New Testament? Thus also the Saviour, when commissioning the apostle to the Gentiles, declares in the most explicit terms their sinful, guilty, lost condition. "Unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive *forgiveness of sins* and inheritance among them which are sanctified, through faith that is in me." Of course, before the gospel reached them, they were, as idolatrous children of disobedience, guilty, unforgiven, un sanctified, and without any prospect of inher-

\* For an illustration of this remark, see an article in our last number, on "the State of Morals in Ancient Greece and Rome."

itance in the kingdom of Christ and of God. The general commission given to all the apostles, and indeed the design of sending the gospel to the heathen at all, in like manner shews, that they were children of disobedience—as such unforgiven—without the inheritance of the kingdom of Christ—and children of wrath—alike with those who have sinned against greater light.

The principles here established are sufficient to guide us to a decision upon the case of the modern heathen. Their *character* is a question of fact;—their *prospects* depend upon their character. If they live and die ‘*children of disobedience*,’ they are, of course, ‘*children of wrath*.’ The question is, therefore, simply this, Are modern heathen, in the same sense as the ancient, ‘*children of disobedience*.’

As a general fact, it may be safely affirmed, that modern heathen are exceedingly base in their character, and bear a striking resemblance to the descriptions which are furnished in the New Testament. In their case, also, idolatry is no sin of ignorance,—no solitary sin, clustered round with all the moral virtues. It is a sin against the God, whose power and Godhead they read upon the page of nature, with all the vices clustering around it—sustained by it and sustaining it. If the facts be so, then are they also *children of wrath*,—accountable on the same principles, at the same tribunal, and under the same sanctions, as we are, who enjoy the light of the gospel, with no other difference in their favor than what obtains among ourselves,—that the righteous God will judge every individual according to his opportunities and his deeds.

I know these facts have been disputed, and we have heard much of the innocence and virtues of the heathen. But the more the heathen of all countries have become known, the more convinced has the world become of the baseness of their general character. Even in that ancient and applauded seat of civilization, Hindoostan, eye witnesses without number tell us that idolaters, almost without an exception, are dishonest, incontinent, cruel, liars.\* Or if we will seek for a specimen among those who are less removed from the simplicity of nature, we have the report of one of the missionaries at the Sandwich Islands: † “With great ingenuousness they (the natives) confess themselves to have been murderers, adulterers, sorcerers, thieves, liars, drunkards;” “nor has there been an exception to the character here described, where the person has arrived at mature age,—so universally prevalent was the state of

\* After a twenty years residence in India, Mr. Ward observes, “I have never seen one man (in his heathen state) who appeared to fear God and work righteousness. On the contrary, the language of the Apostle seems most strikingly applicable to them all, ‘There is none righteous, no not one. There is none that understandeth; there is none that seeketh after God.’” Another Missionary observes, “As my acquaintance with the natives enlarges, I am increasingly convinced that there is scarcely one who has the least pretension to any religious concern.” See Ward on the Hindoos, Vol. i. pp. 286—362, including the testimony of the Hon. Charles Grant.

† See Mr. Bishop’s letter, June 3, 1823.

depraved morals among them."—We may say, then, without danger of mistake, that the heathen at large are '*children of disobedience*;' and must of course conclude that they are '*children of wrath*.'

This doctrine, so plainly revealed, and so painful to the heart, requires to be relieved from some objections, which have embarrassed many minds, and checked the compassion of the Christian world. It has been often asked, 'How can the heathen be condemned, since they sin in ignorance of the law and of the Gospel?' Or, if justice must condemn them, 'How can we explain the delay of divine Providence in making known to perishing millions the good news of salvation?' It becomes him who would plead the cause of the heathen, to attempt a solution of these questions. May the Spirit of wisdom direct the attempt.

I. How can the heathen be condemned, since they sin in ignorance of the law and of the gospel?

I answer, they will be condemned, because they have *not* sinned in ignorance,—because they have sinned *against light and knowledge*. Let no one imagine that the heathen are ignorant of those great moral duties which they universally and flagrantly violate; that they sin in ignorance, when they lie, cheat, and steal; commit adultery, incest, and murder; or cherish inwardly the feelings which originate these crimes;—or that they worship stocks and stones, birds, beasts, and creeping things, in utter ignorance of the **GREAT SUPREME**. If they are ignorant of his claims, amidst the glories of his works around them, they must be guilty for their voluntary blindness; as those always are, who put darkness for light, and light for darkness. But, in general, the heathen have not this ignorance, whether it be for their excuse or condemnation. The Apostle's assertion holds true to this day: "Though they *know* God, they glorify him not as God;" and even in their idolatry, they sin not in ignorance, but against light and knowledge.\*

But we say more,—the heathen have not sinned in ignorance of the general truth, that *God is merciful*. It has been assumed by the objector, and sometimes unwarily admitted by those who believe in the guilt and ruin of the heathen, that the gospel *only* speaks to mankind in the accents of mercy. The gospel undoubtedly is more full and explicit on this subject than the voice of nature, and above all, it displays the mode in which divine mercy is conveyed. But neither our Saviour nor his Apostles gave the least intimation,

\* It would be interesting to see this Apostolic doctrine illustrated by records of the common feeling in the principal heathen nations. For the case of 100,000,000 of Hindoos, take Mr. Ward's testimony. Ward on the Hindoos, Vol. iii. p. 1. " '*One Brumhu without a second*' is a phrase very commonly used by them, when conversing on the nature of God." Yet in the same page, he says, "Not a single temple dedicated to the **ONE GOD**, is to be found in all Hindoostan, nor is any act of worship, in any form, addressed by this people to God." The same testimony is borne by Mr. Nott, another eye witness, in his "Sermon on the idolatry of the Hindoos," in which a full and satisfactory record is made of the testimony of the people to their knowledge of the *True God*.

that the gospel was to convey to the heathen the first information of the mercy of God to sinners. It is from a revelation which overspreads the globe, that our Saviour illustrates the love of God to his enemies. 'Your Father in heaven maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth his rain on the just and on the unjust.' This display of kindness to sinners is recognized by the Apostle in his address to the idolaters of Lystra: "Nevertheless, he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness." His exhortation to the Athenians announces more distinctly the merciful design of the displays of Providential kindness: "Neither is he worshipped of men's hands as though he needed anything, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation: *That they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him and find him, though he be not far from any one of us.*" Surely then, the heathen sin, not only against the law of duty written in their hearts, but against the knowledge of divine kindness and mercy to sinners, fitted and designed to lead them to seek his saving favor. They are not already in the same state as the devils and the damned, to whom no tokens of mercy can be shewn; nor does God meet them only to frown them from his presence; but in the kindness of his daily Providence, he invites them to seek and to find him. If they are children of disobedience, and therefore children of wrath, it is not because they have no light of divine mercy; but their characters are formed, and their doom settled, by abusing the light which shines around them. If their light be fainter than our own; if it be not all radiant from the Sun of righteousness, as risen on us; it is bright and glorious still; and it will deepen their condemnation, if they do not seek after, and find, the God who is *near to every one of them*, with daily earnestness of unbounded blessings which he is ready to bestow. Never man gave such encouragement to man to seek his aid, as God gives daily and hourly to all the nations of the earth. Their indifference and neglect are no more a proof against this assertion, than the indifference and neglect of the great proportion of christendom are, that God's love does not shine in the gospel with the brightness of the sun. This is the condemnation, alike of Christian and heathen lands, though in different degrees,—that 'light has come into the world, and men have chosen darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.'

II. This acknowledgement of the sinful, perishing state of the heathen at large, requires our attention to the second question, viz.

*How can we explain the delay of divine Providence in sending the gospel to the heathen; i. e. so as to avoid the dilemma, that they must be saved, or perish unjustly by their own misfortune?—*



It ought, by every believer, to be considered a sufficient answer to this objection, that if the heathen cannot be *justly* condemned, the gospel is absurd. It is certainly absurd to provide a remedy, where there is no disease; atonement, where there is no guilt; salvation, where there is no condemnation. It is absurd to preach the gospel to any creature, who, at the moment of hearing it, is not already justly exposed to the ruin from which it proclaims deliverance. But the gospel is not absurd; nor need he be ashamed, who goes forth to proclaim it to the heathen; for it is the "power of God unto salvation" from a ruin in which they lie in common with sinners against the light of revelation.

I cannot but think, however, that the objection takes for granted, without sufficient reason, and against evidence, that divine Providence has, *of its own accord*, delayed, for these thousands of years, to give the gospel to the heathen. Before we conclude thus against the equity of Providence, or deny the plain declarations of Scripture, it becomes us to reflect well upon what God has done, to persuade the world to seek his favor, and to extend and establish his revealed will throughout the earth.

The condition of mankind, as voluntary sinners, is a moral condition, which is to be remedied by no simple application of omnipotence, but by omnipotence co-working with the faculties of man, both in the reception and propagation of the scheme of salvation. I know it may be presumptuously claimed, that God should have revealed the means of recovery in such a manner, that nothing could have hindered their universal spread, and their uninterrupted descent through all nations and to all ages; just as some contend, that he must and will, at last, make an absolute and final restoration of all the wicked. But not to pause to show how this interferes with the principles of a moral world, every student of the Scriptures will perceive, that even divine omnipotence could not come to the task of saving sinners, with its strong hand and outstretched arm *alone*. It was needful that the Almighty, as a moral governor, and as a Saviour of moral beings, should come with applications suited to their faculties;—with a plan, and a process of execution, which were fitted to alarm and persuade the souls he designed to save—which, as a means of moral reformation, needed to be submitted to the acceptance or rejection of men, and to their hindrance or co-operation, in preserving and extending it in the earth, not the less, because "the excellency of the power is of God, and not of man." Hence it behooved him who undertook our reconciliation to God, to be made in all things like unto his brethren, that he might be qualified to win and hold their confidence, as a faithful high Priest. Hence, also, that gradual communication to mankind of the light of salvation, which at length increased to the perfect day of Christianity; because the facts and events on which the principles revealed were grounded could only take place in the gradual

progress of human history ; and because the human mind might not be able to bear them, until those principles were developed by facts and events.

If we examine the ancient and modern Mythology—that of civilized nations and savage tribes—we are met with the traces of that revelation, which the objection before us assumes has been given and confined to a small portion of mankind. Heathenism itself, in every land, bears witness to the universality and energy of the effort which has been made, to extend this revelation unto all. When the fountains of heavenly truth were opened, they had a fulness and a pressure, which have conducted them through all ages and nations. The streams have become corrupted and polluted in their flow through “vain imaginations” and “foolish hearts ;” but they have flowed, and flow still, with a fulness and strength, which shew the pressure at the fountain head.

The information which we gain from the Scriptures and other authentic history explains this admixture of revelation and heathenism which all Mythology displays, and illustrates the methods which God has taken to give to all nations his revealed truth. Without adverting at all to the case of the old world, I ask, if the facts and promises, which were to be the foundation of man’s salvation, were not the universal property of the new world, and had not the fairest opportunity, after the deluge, and under the sign of the bow of promise, of being handed down to all future ages. If a hindrance occurred at Babel, in the division of tongues, which, even to this day, has retarded the transmission of either an oral or written revelation, it was a hindrance interposed in lieu of the greater hindrance to divine knowledge which successful union among the wicked would have produced. A separation occurred, which was indispensable to preserving the world in a condition susceptible of saving knowledge, and at a period so early, as to afford to each subdivision of mankind the tradition of their intercourse with God, and give them, after all their wanderings in the labyrinth of sin, a clue of return to the Author of salvation.

When Abraham was called alone out of Ur of the Chaldees, and the blessing of heaven rested peculiarly upon his family, God did not make a circle of exclusion in respect to all the other families of the earth. On the contrary, the promise to him was, “In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.” This promise indeed looked forward to future ages ; but it included opportunities and blessings even from the time of its announcement to the patriarch. The light of salvation was not then put under a bushel, but on a candlestick, that all might see it. Amidst the darkness which in a few centuries had nearly overspread the earth, it pleased God to concentrate the light of salvation upon the tent of Abraham, and to keep it burning in successive ages over the tabernacles of Israel, and the temple of Solomon, that all surrounding nations might be-

hold its glory. What wonders did he perform in behalf of the Jews! What wonders did he show to Egypt—to Nineveh—to Babylon—to Tyre; that he might attract all nations to the light of salvation! Let the objector tell us if God did not do enough in sight of the ancient heathen, to demand the attention of the near, and through them the attention of the distant nations;—enough to demand from every heart the feeling of Ruth, when she came to put her trust under the wings of the Lord God of Israel, and from every tongue her memorable declaration, “Thy people, shall be my people, and thy God, my God.”

When the gospel took the place of Judaism, its deeds were not done, its doctrines were not proclaimed, in a corner. Its apostles were commanded to “go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.” At their first proclamation of a risen Saviour, men of different and distant nations heard them speak, each in their own language, the wonderful works of God. In a single day, the message of salvation was delivered at Jerusalem, and despatched to the various regions of Asia, to Africa, and to Europe, confirmed by the gift of tongues. As the gospel continued to be published, it awoke attention and commanded faith by the miracles which accompanied it, and which ceased, it may be, only at the point, when their commonness would have rendered them inoperative, or their perversion might have made them hindrances to the progress of the truth.

Let us then, as we look abroad upon the heathen world, ask no more, ‘How can they be guilty?’ or charge their guilt to the delinquency of Providence. Rather let us awake to the malignity of that moral plague, which has so long withstood the plan and process of salvation, and to a higher admiration of the patience and perseverance, which for six thousand years have been striving to bless an opposing world; and lay our bosoms open to the influence of the motives which the history of all ages presents to our minds, at once to restore and save us by the gospel, and make us the proper agents to apply it to the salvation of others. In that array of means which the course of ages has collected, nothing seems now to be wanting, under God, to bring the gospel to its universal triumph but deeper piety throughout the ranks of hopeful believers. A more kind compassion—a more fervent charity—a more lowly humility—a more decided choice of heaven—and a more single trust upon the arm of the Almighty, would presently furnish laborers, as numerous as the wide harvest requires, and would send them forth, sustained by the alms, the prayers, and the example of the Christian world, to the great work of turning the Gentiles from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God.

D. C.

## THE PROBATIONERS' CLASS.

To the Editor of the Spirit of the Pilgrims.

SIR,

The first article in the last number of your periodical would be entitled to the consideration of pastors and churches at any time. At the present time it deserves *peculiar* attention, and the writer, in furnishing it, has shown marks of wisdom, and not of "pusillanimity."

There are many ministers who, in these days of God's merciful visitation, are standing amid scenes of the deepest interest. The people of their respective charges, moved as by a simultaneous impulse, are rising up and pressing into the kingdom of heaven. As always, so now especially, if they would be faithful watchmen, they must "be sober, *be vigilant.*" They must not be ignorant of the devices of Satan; nor must they, through a carelessness induced by prosperity, commit the sacred interests of the church into the hands, either of those who are themselves deceived, or of those who would hypocritically advantage themselves under the mask of religion. Times of the greatest prosperity are often times of the greatest danger. Then originate the embryo causes which subsequently break out in ruin.

Under present circumstances, what course shall the churches pursue, in examining and receiving persons to their communion? This is a question of great practical importance. When, in a community that is comparatively slumbering over its religious concerns, an individual wakes up to the duty of consecrating himself to God and joining himself to the church, he is in far less danger of self-deception, than though that community were in a state of high religious excitement. And the danger of the individual, in every case, is the danger also of the church. How then shall these common dangers be met, and the spiritual interests, both of candidates for membership and of the churches, be best secured?

A pastor—one of those favored pastors, whose people are now hopefully turning to the Lord—would with deference propose the following method of procedure, which it is believed has been already introduced in some congregations. Let there be a class formed of such as have become hopefully pious, to be denominated *the Probationers' Class*; and as fast as others begin to give evidence of piety, let them be induced to join it. This should be considered as *the first step* towards a public profession of religion. And having taken this step, individuals may be expected to rest here for a little season. The interval will be longer or shorter, according as age and other circumstances seem to render it expedient.

The members of this class should be regarded as *on probation for the church*—as under the inspection of the church—and should be

the subjects of much prayer and of continual and appropriate religious instruction. For the purpose of instruction, they should be accustomed to meet with the Pastor at stated seasons, and should be visited, individually, by the Pastor, and the other officers and members of the church. The object should be, to give them clear and correct views respecting the nature and evidences of piety, that they may not be deceived respecting their own characters; to watch the progress of their minds and the exercises of their hearts, that a correct judgement may be formed respecting them; and to acquaint them fully with the duties and responsibilities connected with a public profession of religion, that they may be able to count the cost, and to come forward with right apprehensions to the work of the Lord.

One advantage arising from this course is, the young converts will not be left exposed to temptation, with nothing thrown around them for their security. The interval between conversion and a public profession of religion is one of great interest and moment—on the right improvement of which the future character of individuals in no small degree depends. It is of the last importance that persons, during this period, be favored with every security, and with all the helps and privileges that can possibly be given them.

Another advantage of the course proposed is, it will afford opportunity to lengthen the period of probation, especially in those cases that seem most to require it. Owing to the exposed situation of persons during this trying interval, ministers are under strong temptations to curtail and shorten it. But the safety of the church forbids that it be unduly shortened. Persons cannot decide satisfactorily upon their own characters, or make due preparation for the ordinances of the church, in one week, or two, after their supposed conversion. They must have time for instruction and self-examination. Nor yet ought the duty of a public profession of religion to be suffered at all to pass out of mind. Measures should be taken to make it a subject of continual thought and care, and to prepare candidates for it in the best possible manner.

An obvious advantage of the measure under consideration is, persons will be likely to come into the church with better views. Having been instructed, in meetings and conversation with the officers of the church, in the nature and evidences of piety, in the doctrines and precepts of religion, and in the more important parts of Christian character and duty, they will be likely to come into the church more truly evangelical Christians than could otherwise be expected.—Many are now becoming pious, in families where they have not been taught the first principles of religion. To such, this period of probation must be highly beneficial.

As another advantage, the method proposed will be likely to prevent admitting to the church persons who do not belong there, and whose influence will be only to unnerve its arm and paralyze its energies. It is a great injury to unconverted persons themselves

to admit them to the church; and it is a source of constant hazard and trouble to the church to have them received within its sacred enclosures. The probationers' class will be like the fan spoken of by the forerunner of Christ, to separate between the chaff and the wheat. A principal object of it will be to try the characters of its members, that those who are found wanting may be set aside, and those who are approved may be made manifest.

Another good effect of the measure proposed will be, to bring all those in a congregation, who are properly entitled to the privileges of the church, within its borders. In years past, there has usually been a class of persons in every congregation, who were indulging a hope in the mercy of God, and giving some evidence of piety, but who were not prepared (as they thought) nor were they in a way to be, to profess Christ before men. Such persons should be induced, and in most instances would be pleased, to join the probationers' class; and here, under a course of appropriate instruction, their minds would probably soon come to be decided, one way or the other.

It may be hoped, too, that the plan here recommended may be a means of raising the prevailing standard of piety. There is no period more favorable to permanent religious impression, than that immediately subsequent to conversion. This is the day of a person's espousals—the season of his first love. The mind and heart are now susceptible and open. The views as to practical religion are forming. The opportunity, therefore, is one highly favorable, in which to raise the standard high, and lead persons up to the elevation of the gospel.

As a part of the above plan, it may be expedient, in some places, to have a distinct class, consisting of those in childhood and early youth. Happily, many of this age are now hopefully converted, and the question is beginning to be agitated, What shall be done with them? As they may need a course of instruction and discipline peculiar to their age, I would suggest, where several are found in the same congregation, that they be formed into a class by themselves, to meet the pastor and other officers of the church at stated seasons, for the purpose of being instructed and examined, by question and answer, like the catechumens of the primitive age. And whether older or younger, as soon as their cases come to be *satisfactory*, they ought to be admitted to the communion of the church. The decisive question as to their admission ought not to be one of *years* at all, but one of *character*. If they give *satisfactory evidence*, however young, that they belong to the number of God's spiritual children, who shall debar them from their Father's table?

TENET.

## REVIEWS.

THE CHRISTIAN STUDENT, *Designed to assist Christians in general in acquiring Religious Knowledge. With a List of Books suitable for a Minister's Library.* BY THE REV. E. BICKERSTETH, *Minister of Sir George Wheler's Chapel, Spital Square. From the second London Edition.* Boston: Perkins & Marvin. 1830.

Few books would be more valuable, in the present state of theological learning and Christian society, than a guide "in acquiring religious knowledge." The press is prolific in Theology. And the taste for theological reading, in part the cause and in part the effect of this increased productiveness of the press, has been singularly extended within these few years. But a short time since, religious newspapers and other religious periodicals were almost unknown to the great body of the community in this country. The Recorder, the Panoplist, and the Christian Observer were, till recently, all that occurred to us, when a religious periodical was alluded to. Now every state is pervaded by weekly and quarterly Journals and Reviews, more or less devoted to the interests of Christianity.

The range thus given to minds engaged in the cause of Christ is truly grand—almost universal. A writer of eminent success in any department of theology, on any branch of benevolent enterprise, or any topic of Christian duty, is limited by no bounds but those of the Christian world. Not an occasional discourse or essay of peculiar merit escapes, from a Christian pen, but it circulates, through these channels, every where. It addresses all who use the language, and in many cases is translated into other languages, spoken by evangelical Christians. When a few of the distinguished names of our own time occur to us, we can think of nothing but that day, which St. John saw in vision, where the influence of sanctified genius, is beautifully described, in the glowing language of the east, under the image of an angel in the midst of heaven: "And I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgement is come: and worship him, that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters."

It would be extravagant to represent this increase of our periodical religious literature as owing to the late increase of publications in other departments. There is, at present, however, a surprising rapidity of production, in Sacred Philology, Polemic Theology, Ecclesiastical History, Practical Divinity, and Christian Eloquence

and Biography, as well as an unexampled republication, in whole or in part, of the earlier English Divines.

This fact supposes an extended and active curiosity after religious knowledge. The press is not thus laboring to no purpose; it is to supply an actual demand. Men publish, because the community read. The press is the pulse of the reading public. The change in this respect is wonderful and cheering. But wonderful as it is, another twenty years will probably disclose a state of things vastly more so. Sabbath Schools and Bible Classes have already excited a general demand for juvenile religious books. The sale of such books is an important branch of the trade. Yet Sabbath Schools and Bible Classes are in their infancy. The habits thus formed, the taste thus created in childhood, will continue in the youth and the man, and will call for successive supplies of similar works, and others of a kindred character, through the different periods of life. The amount of publication which another generation may demand, is past conjecture.

But the work before us has to do with what is, not what may be; and our intention was to speak of the utility of such a work, in relation to the multifarious religious authors from whom we, of the present generation, have to select, for our instruction and edification.

It is not now enough, in the estimation of any respectable denomination of Christians, that a divine, in addition to a tolerable acquaintance with the English Bible, has pored over some approved body of divinity, and learned, with due facility, and a professional assurance, to construct an argument upon every controverted point in his theological system. The public mind requires, in the minister of the gospel, not only a Christian spirit, and a command of the common places and technicalities of the old school of divines, but various and contemporary learning; a familiarity with the original languages of the Bible, with its antiquities, its history; with the history of the Jewish people, and of the Christian Church; the history of religious opinions, and of the connexion of the gospel with the changes in civil society and social life. To sustain the dignity of his office, the preacher must, in some good degree, enter into the spirit of his time, maintain a frequent intercourse with the current literature, and especially with the models of clear reasoning and persuasive eloquence, that he may be able, not only to inculcate the elements of truth upon rude minds, and address the Christian consolations to hearts already affected by the gospel, but, also, to give attraction and power to religion by bringing to view its noble features, as they are fitted to excite a cultivated and reflecting mind; the beauty, grandeur, and authority of its truth; its solemn history; its awakening prophecy; its affecting pictures of minds under the conscious bondage of iniquity, and struggling to be free, agonizing to enter into the kingdom of God.



We speak, of course, not of all who preach the gospel. There are spheres of action for men of worth, who make no pretensions to literature, whose only sources of knowledge have been, for years, the English Bible and their own hearts. Instances of such might be named, whose praise is in all the churches; instances of thrilling eloquence, of a practical good sense, and a self-denying devotedness to duty, which have sometimes almost inclined us to doubt, whether any other qualifications need be sought for the sacred office. Still, as a general thing, it will be found true, that men of such resources only maintain a feeble hold upon a very important class in the community. And this is not true, in towns alone, where the most distinguished man becomes necessarily the standard by which others are judged. It is very much so, also, throughout our villages. The intercourse of professional men, of merchants, and even of mechanics and farmers with the large cities has become so frequent, that it materially affects the prevalent ideas of preaching in the country. Intelligent men, with opportunities for comparison, soon discover the contrast between an instructive and interesting preacher, and one who travels for ever in the same circle of common places; and, unless held by real love of truth, will, by and by, be found dissatisfied with an indifferent ministry, however pious. The history of many New England parishes will disclose precisely this course of things, resulting in the prostration of once flourishing churches and religious societies.

A guide to religious knowledge of the kind we have mentioned is yet a desideratum. We know not where to look for it. There is a vast amount of materials, of excellent discussion, lucid reasoning, touching eloquence, rare and rich information, scattered through the works of our moral and theological writers;—but who shall point out these passages to the student? An author, somewhat voluminous, is often valuable only upon a single subject, or in a single passage. And it is, perhaps, generally true of those, who have written much, that their chief merit lies in a very few productions. It is not difficult to write books; books, too, in which, as Lessing says, “there is much that is true, and much that is new;” but “the true, not new, and the new, not true.” No man is inexhaustible; and, in general, a writer soon says his best things. What Directory has the Christian student, to save him the thankless labor of searching out these choice productions, these best things, for himself?

There are catalogues of books, many of them judiciously selected and arranged—very complete and useful. But no one, so far as we know, exactly answers the purpose. What is wanted is an arrangement of subjects, upon some simple plan, with minute and definite references to authors who throw light

upon it; references to volume and page, indicating, as nearly as possible, the precise object and character of the passage referred to. Thus aided, the student, with tolerable qualifications for investigation, would see his way open, would waste no time in finding where things are to be found, and would have the satisfaction of knowing when he had consulted the principal sources of knowledge upon the subject of his inquiry. The Lectures of Doddridge have appeared to us to be quite as valuable for the authorities to which he refers, as for the outline which they furnish of a system of morals and divinity. The course of study by Dr. Woods, intended for the direction of the class in theology at Andover, is also of great value. Neither of these, however, is sufficiently comprehensive in the plan, nor sufficiently full and precise in the references. To be perfect, a work of this kind should include allusions to all the valuable sources of information on every subject introduced; and, at the same time, indicate the best. The references should be numerous, that students, in every situation, might avail themselves of some, at least, of the authors recommended. Yet the very best should be distinguished; because there is no department, in which so much has been written, with so little real addition to the stock of truth. Writers have copied one another with a humiliating and surprising servility. What mere echoes of older authors are half our commentators and systematic divines. It may almost be said, that, when one has mastered a truly original and luminous writer on any particular subject, he has possessed himself of all that follow. Or, it might be nearer the truth to say, that, when one such author is understood, all others may be read with great rapidity, and yet with sufficient care to detect any additional thought, or happy illustration, which they happen to contain. The mind passes over them, as the eye of the painter passes over specimens of his own art, or scenes in nature, which he may not have looked upon before. The great features common to all similar objects are so familiar, that a glance discovers to him the slightest peculiarities; and what might cost an unpractised observer hours of laborious examination and comparison, seems to be seen by him intuitively.

Here, doubtless, is revealed the secret of much of that apparently miraculous power, which individuals are known to possess, of reading comparatively little, and yet understanding every thing that has been written;—of seizing upon the contents of an entire treatise, while an ordinary reader is poring over the introduction. It is a well defined and comprehensive view of the subject, derived, in many instances, from previous careful study of a masterly writer, that prepares a man thus to dispose of volumes, while others are wading through chapters.

It is on most subjects of less importance, that the works first

read and chiefly studied be minutely accurate, than that they exhibit the workings of original and profound minds. The judgement of the student itself will often be able to correct slight faults in the productions of the most gifted intellects. And even should he incur the risk of imbibing occasional errors, it is altogether better for him to soar in the track of a great mind than to creep after a little one—better at some hazard to mount with the eagle into the upper air, than to crawl forever upon the earth. “*Errare mehercule malo cum Platone, quàm cum istis vera sentire.*”

We hope some person of sufficient leisure and judgement may be induced to undertake a work so much to be desired by reading men, especially among the clergy. It would save to the profession time enough to compensate him for the labor of his life, and would tend greatly to give direction, and compass, and fullness to many minds, that would otherwise accomplish comparatively little.

The work of Mr. Bickersteth makes no pretensions to the character we have described. It contains, it is true, a valuable and copious list of books for a minister's library, some brief but judicious remarks on the history of divinity, including many useful criticisms on the fathers, the schoolmen, and later writers. But the leading object of the writer is to inspire into the Christian community at large a more eager curiosity for religious knowledge, to exhibit the motives to it, the means of it, the dangers of its pursuit, and its true application. The work is executed with care and judgement. The opinions expressed are never extravagant; the principal topics are enriched by free and pertinent quotations from a great variety of standard authors; the style is unpretending and perspicuous; and the whole is thoroughly imbued with a catholic and devotional spirit. We recommend the volume, as supplying a vacancy in the Christian's library; and particularly valuable to intelligent persons, who incline to enrich their minds with the best of all knowledge.

Its publication in this country is timely. It becomes Christians here to be armed for a conflict with error, and with real and woful ignorance under the garb of wisdom. False views of religion never stalked with prouder step over the land. Heresy never betrayed, with so insidious art. A Christian man must not only contend earnestly for the faith against the unbelief of others, but must watch and pray, lest he himself fall, while thinking to stand. It is vain to hope that the churches can be kept undisturbed, by being kept in ignorance. The very air is impregnated with delusion. It must be met and exposed, or its triumph is inevitable. The time is at hand, when Christians must be intelligent, “increasing in the knowledge of God,” or they cannot be Christians at all.

Indeed, at all times, and in all places, we “do the gospel mighty wrong,” by separating, even in imagination, (we can hardly do it in fact,) eminent devotion from eminent intelligence on the subject

of religion. The separation of feeling from truth is unnatural, absurd. The darkness and sorrow of half the afflicted and bowed down among the people of God is owing to the inactivity of their understandings, more than the coldness of their hearts. We ought rather to say, perhaps, that this very coldness of their hearts is owing to the absence of truth from their minds. They neglect the contemplation of affecting truths, and then complain that they are not affected. They shut their eyes, and mourn that the delightful sensations of vision are unfelt. They close their ears, and lament the loss of that sweet harmony, which once soothed their souls. They afflict themselves, because they cannot feel, and yet are thinking of nothing that can possibly be felt.

Protestants set out with the principle, that men are capable of knowledge as well as faith—of understanding as well as feeling. They saw that ignorance is not the mother of devotion. Hence their zeal for the diffusion of the Bible. Hence their stress on the use of reason, and on the right of every man to judge for himself. And hence, in no small degree, the sudden elevation of true piety, where the doctrines of the reformation extended. Knowledge is to the heart, what light is to the vegetable world, the source of health, beauty, and vigor. The *Sun* of righteousness shines in upon the mind, and its affections receive new life and energy—the wastes of the heart become green, and fragrant, and beautiful.

It was natural that this great principle, on which the reformation was founded, should be carried to excess. It was so in fact. Men began to substitute intelligence for devotion—to make thinking right synonymous with being right. And one extreme, of course, served to give rise to the opposite. Exclusive regard for knowledge, in a part of the community, was followed by too high regard for feeling in another part. It might be difficult to say, which party errs most grossly, or most certainly prevents the true influence of the gospel. The evil affections cherished by both errors are kindred. Both cherish pride; one, the pride of knowledge, the other, the pride of devotion; one, the pride of reason, the other, the pride of divine influence; one, the pride of self-importance, the other, the pride of self-abasement. Both defeat, as far as they prevail, the design of the gospel; the one by leading us to rely too much on the efficacy of truth, the other, by leading us to look too directly, we might say presumptuously, to the divine agency.

The truth is, religious knowledge can be, by no means, separated from divine influence. God sanctifies by the truth. Nor is this connexion between his agency and knowledge arbitrary. It is essential, by the constitution of the mind. Without truth, it is impossible to move the human heart. It is impossible to conceive of an emotion without an object. We cannot even define a feeling, but as a state of mind in view of some object of the thoughts.

Love, in the abstract, does not exist. We might as well talk of the sensation of sight without seeing any thing, and of sound without hearing any thing, as talk of love without loving any thing. No affection of the heart can, by any possibility, exist, but in connexion with its appropriate object, with truth, with knowledge.

And it is as certain that right thoughts, habitually in the mind, will be attended with religious feeling, as it is that any other thoughts will be attended by the feelings which they are fitted to produce. There is reason to think that the man, whose thoughts are on God's truth, will ultimately feel as that truth is fitted to make him feel; just as the man, whose thoughts are on any other subjects, will be ultimately characterized by correspondent feelings. The influence of climate, of natural scenery, of particular professions, is not more certain, than that of religious truths. "He that walketh with wise men shall be wise; but the companion of fools shall be destroyed;"—not because the mere contiguity of evil or good companions has any influence; but because the society we keep determines the objects of our thoughts, the course of our reflections, the kind of truth, the kind of knowledge, which we habitually cherish. We see the same sights, hear the same sounds, imagine the same scenes—have, in short, the same thoughts as those whom we accompany, and therefore come to possess, in general, the same characters.

It may be replied, that the same truths are sometimes received and meditated upon by different minds, with very different results. But we deny, that unless in a very loose sense, the truths, in the case supposed, are the same. When the great English painter went into a gallery of paintings in Italy, he was surprised and disappointed not to find the wonders which he had anticipated. But, by and by, by daily visits and careful study, he began to appreciate those great models. The things, however, were not altered. They hung there untouched as they had long done. But to him they were not the same. He had not, when he gazed at them, the same thoughts, the same knowledge, any more than he had the same feelings. He saw things which he had not seen before; and could tell what it was he had overlooked.

The plough boy, as he turns his vacant eye towards the sun, going down amidst the vying glories of a thousand clouds—and the poet gazing in mute extacy on the same scene—may, loosely, be said to look at the same things. But, in truth, they see things as differently, as are their education and intellectual habits. So it is in respect to religious truths. Though, in some sense, the same to all, they really exist in different minds in forms as unlike as possible. The same truths were probably listened to by Simon Magus, and many of his converted neighbors. But, when the first agitations of his mind had subsided, and his real views began to appear with some distinctness, we discover, that he had not at all

seen, in those truths, provision for a distressed and burdened heart, for relief from sin. They had quite another aspect to him, and were held by him in entire consistency with supreme attachment still to applause and gain.

Peter and Judas had both sinned. Both felt condemned and miserable. Thus far they saw the same truths, and felt the same emotions. A preacher might have addressed them in the same general terms. Peter saw moreover, in his offence, unfaithfulness to his best friend; and a cowardly, unworthy, unkind renunciation of his Saviour. The look which that Saviour gave him revived all the tender relations he had held to him; and he "went out, and wept bitterly." Judas, with as real conviction of guilt and anguish of spirit, had none of these tender associations, saw no reproving yet compassionate look, and in distrust and despair, "went and hanged himself." So different were their feelings and their conduct, because so different were their *views* of the wrong they had done. The picture which came before the imagination of Peter, when the cock crew, was melting, subduing. Had he detailed the process of his mind, at that memorable hour, he would have told us, not only how he *felt*, but how that denial of his master, those oaths and curses that grieved the yet sweet and gracious countenance of his injured Lord, then *looked* to him. And Judas, had he left a similar description of his last hour, would have painted, not only the agony of remorse and despair, which made life loathsome, but that scene of reckless avarice and treachery, that insulted and exhausted mercy, which haunted his imagination, withering every hope, and putting him in hell before the time.

In general, if we mistake not, the experience of Christians, in perfect accordance with the word of God, evinces the presence of some new truth, some clearer *views*, whenever they are conscious of new emotions of joy or grief, of love or penitence. They "*think* on their ways, and turn their feet into the testimonies of God." "While they  *muse*, the fire burns." They are "renewed in (by) knowledge." Knowledge then, truth, not that "knowledge" which "puffeth up," a "philosophy falsely so called," but "Christian knowledge," must be regarded, as under God, the fountain of pious affection. Ignorance, instead of being the mother of devotion, is its grave.

In this view of the connexion of truth with Christian feeling, with its commencement and its progress in the heart, we by no means lose sight of THE DIVINE INFLUENCE. But in whatever mode this influence is exerted, it is evidently, always, in connexion with the truth. The Spirit convinces men; but He convinces them *of sin, of righteousness and judgement*. He sanctifies; but he sanctifies *through the truth*. He produces no emotion, except in immediate view of the appropriate object of that emotion. It is certainly the doctrine of Scripture, that no right affection is ever produced

*without the agency of God. We are his workmanship, his husbandry. But it is not less certain, that this agency is exerted upon us, only through the truth.*

---

FEMALE SCRIPTURE BIOGRAPHY: *including an Essay on what Christianity has done for Women.* BY FRANCIS AUGUSTUS COX, A. M. Boston: Lincoln & Edmands. 1831. 2 vols. 12mo.

The Bible should be the great centre in the universe of human learning, about which, and in subservience to which, all the sciences should revolve. It is not precisely like the sun in the celestial system, shedding radiance on all around it: for it also receives a light from all things in return. It is rather the centre jewel, giving brilliancy to, and receiving splendors from, the surrounding gems in the glorious circle of God's creation. To speak without figure, the Scriptures, containing the revelation of God's moral purposes towards men, and unfolding their eternal destiny, are infinitely more important than any other writings ever put into the possession of man; and an acquaintance with them is infinitely more desirable and valuable than all other knowledge put together. In this light, not only is all human science vastly inferior to Scriptural knowledge, but the different sciences rise, in value, according to the aid they furnish, in becoming acquainted with the truths of revelation. It is a glorious truth, that God has so formed the universe—has so adapted us to the things about us, and his system of moral government to us and them, that the great end and object of our being is, or may be, the more clearly seen, his all-wise government more strongly manifested, and the truth of his blessed word more certainly evinced, by every new fact we learn, every new rule we discover;—that all the mysteries of knowledge are, or may be, the agents of moral illumination. We rejoice that our bountiful Creator hath made it so;—that having given us capacities for learning, and a thirst for knowledge which can never be satiated, he has also made an acquaintance with his material and immaterial wonders not only safe but healthful to our moral natures—not only innocent but beneficial, by the consequences which result from it; by the new sources of admiration, love, and worship which it opens; by the light it diffuses along the path of duty, and the helps it furnishes in the way to heaven. We rejoice that it is so; and surveying the vast field of knowledge before us, with the reflection that when we engage in the acquisition of it, we are laboring as God would have us labor, and are accumulating treasures which “moth and rust cannot corrupt”—which may assist us along the road to glory, and which,

when we are there, shall not desert us, but be that around which the accumulating knowledge of heaven shall collect and cluster, with the increased rapidity and certainty resulting from our elevation in intellectual powers, the absence of earthly incumbrances, and the removal of obstructing passions,—with what delight should we labor to increase our stores of useful knowledge! With what joy should we yield ourselves, in this respect, to the impulse and the invitations of nature!

There are two respects in which human science sheds light on the statute book of the Almighty; viz. first, on its facts: and secondly, on its precepts.

1. The *facts* of the Bible are confirmed by testimony derived from many concurrent sources of human information. Thus, all antiquity lifts up its voice in favor of the authenticity of Scripture. And whether we hear that voice in written history, or in the monumental records which the “tomb-searcher,” time, has spared to tell their tale: whether it relates the occurrence of facts, or the fulfilment of prophecy;—howsoever or whensoever heard,—whether in the treasured relics of literature, or on the mouldering stone, disturbed in its earthly resting place by the curiosity of some modern traveller; from the eloquence of poet, historian, or philosopher, or from the vaulted catacombs of Egypt;—it still declares the truth of “the everlasting gospel.” And the authenticity of the Bible history once established, its system of moral government cannot be set aside. It must come home to the heart with resistless energy, as the result of God’s own wisdom and benevolence. But,

2. Human science sheds light on the *precepts* of the Bible; and by exhibiting their immutable tendency to make men wiser, happier, and better, proves at once the excellence of their nature, and the divinity of their origin. There is not, perhaps, a single science, which does not thus illustrate the laws of God’s revelation. And it is not enthusiasm but reason—reason supported by the laws of analogy—to infer, from that which the history of the past has told us, that when science has reached its full height of perfection, and shines unclouded upon the human intellect, its rays will blaze on the book of inspiration with an effulgence like that of a present Deity, and drive back scepticism forever to the shadows of ignorance. Oh, that some master spirit might now arise, and write the history of knowledge, with single reference to the effect it has had in evincing the glorious truths of the Bible: might survey the universe of intellectual acquisition, and exhibit the result of each successive step in the process of improvement on the plainness of those moral precepts, which are revealed in the Scriptures to guide us to heaven!

These remarks, on a subject of delightful contemplation, have been drawn forth by a perusal of the work whose title stands at the head of this article, and which, we have no doubt, from the subject



and the manner of its execution, will become popular in the Christian community. It throws light on the word of God in each of the methods above named, thus enlisting profane knowledge, as it is termed, under the banner of the Captain of our salvation, and making it, what it ever should be, the help-meet of divine truth.

In telling the story of the lives of those females who are most conspicuous on the inspired page, it interweaves a great amount of interesting collateral information, illustrating ancient manners and customs, exhibiting the purposes of Deity in his operations, and shewing the fulfilment of prophecy, in a manner so simple and a style so plain, that the understanding and heart alike conspire to deepen the impression of the narrative on the memory. There are other works on Scripture biography more voluminous, and as well written. But we have seen no other exclusively devoted to the lives of women. This peculiarity of these volumes will give them a high degree of interest, and will make them worthy to stand by the side of the lectures of Hunter, and the work of Robinson.

At the beginning of the second volume, there is an essay on the benefits which Christianity has conferred upon woman, that will cause every female reader to bless God, that it was her lot to be born under the gospel. This is a subject of surpassing interest to Christian mothers and daughters. It is one, a consideration of which should stimulate to renewed zeal in the missionary enterprise, by which the blessings of the gospel are diffused.

How few there are, who are fully acquainted with the thousand evils from which the religion of Jesus Christ has redeemed the female sex;—with the situation of woman before Christianity was published, and in those countries where it is not now known. Those nations of antiquity which we call polished, in very few cases, regarded woman in any other light than as the slave of man, or as the minister to his worst appetites. Or if, in any case, they renounced these views, and a course of treatment growing out of them, they usually fell into an extreme of adulation, equally removed from that sober regard and feeling of equality which are the results of Christianity. Sometimes, when of royal birth or uncommon beauty, the female was, like the Grecian Helen, the cause of national quarrel and profusion of blood-shed. Sometimes, by a combination of talent, beauty, and depravity, as in the case of Cleopatra, she became the mistress of kings and of kingdoms. But seldom was she renowned, like Penelope, for domestic virtue and conjugal fidelity; or distinguished, like Cornelia, for the wise education of her sons. In most cases, if destitute of personal attractions, she was the laborious drudge; or if beautiful, the heroine of lascivious song or convivial praise. In modern countries, where the Bible is unknown, her condition is more deplorable than it was in the nations of classic antiquity. The caged mistress and the slave of man, but never his equal companion and help-meet, woman is robbed of

her rights, treated as a soul-less and mind-less being, and what is far worse, is debarred from the exertion of any influence in society, save an influence for evil. As wife, as mother, or as sister, she can never rise to noble deeds, guide the growing mind in the path of wisdom, or be received as an instructive associate.

The Bible reforms all this evil. It places woman just where God meant she should be placed—in the domestic sphere, clothed with an almost resistless influence, and exerting that influence in the purest and holiest manner. The influence of woman on the moral condition of the world is too little estimated. Almost the entire amount of early education, in civilized and Christian lands, depends on her, and of course her power for good or evil is to be measured by the power of such education. But in heathen lands, the mother has little to do with education;—and were she allowed to teach, she is not competent to the task, so that the children learn from her very little, and what they do acquire is valueless.—Reflections like these should rouse the hearts of female Christians, and excite them to benevolent deeds, while they cause them to raise continual thanks to God for the blessed allotments of his hand.

Works like the one before us are calculated to enlighten the public with regard to the true state of the world; and they should find their way to every fire-side, around which the disciples of Jesus gather to think or speak of what they owe to his unmerited kindness. They are the most entertaining species of reading, and while they secure the interest of the reader, pour lessons of wisdom into the heart. As calculated to kindle that missionary flame which is now bursting out around us, and which we hope will soon set on fire the universal church of God, and spread its light and warmth over the world, we wish these little volumes a wide spread circulation.\*

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### ON A SELF-DETERMINING POWER OF WILL.

The following extract of a Letter from the first President Edwards to the Rev. Mr. Erskine of Edinburg, dated Stockbridge, August 3, 1757, shows in what estimation he held the views he had previously advocated respecting the "Freedom of the Will."

"I think that the notion of Liberty, consisting in a *Contingent self-determination of the Will*, as necessary to the morality of men's

\* Our only regret in regard to these volumes is, that they should bear, on a single page, the image and superscription of a sect. Why could not the author write the history of Lydia, without seeming to take for granted that immersion is *essential* to baptism, and that her household were all *converted*, because it is said they were baptized?

dispositions and actions, is almost inconceivably pernicious, and that the contrary truth is one of the most important truths of moral philosophy, that ever was discussed, and most necessary to be known; and that for want of it, those schemes of morality and religion, which are a kind of infidel schemes, entirely diverse from the virtue and religion of the Bible, and wholly inconsistent with, and subversive of, the main things belonging to the gospel scheme, have so vastly and so long prevailed, and have stood in such strength. And I think, whoever imagines that he, or any body else, shall ever see the doctrines of grace effectually maintained against these adversaries, till the truth in this matter be settled, imagines a vain thing. For, allow these adversaries what they maintain in this point, and I think they have strict demonstration against us. And not only have these errors a most pernicious influence, in the public religious controversies that are maintained in the world; but such sort of notions have a more fatal influence many ways, on the minds of all ranks, in all transactions between God and their souls. The longer I live, and the more I have to do with the souls of men, in the work of the ministry, the more I see of this. Notions of this sort are one of the main hindrances of the success of the preaching of the word, and other means of grace, in the conversion of sinners. This especially appears, when the minds of sinners are affected with some concern for their souls, and they are stirred up to seek their salvation."

"The doctrine of a Self-determining Will, as the ground of all moral good and evil, tends to prevent any proper exercises of faith in God and Christ, in the affair of our salvation, as it tends to prevent all dependence upon them. For, instead of this, it teaches a kind of absolute independence on all those things, that are of chief importance in this affair; our righteousness depending originally on our own acts, as self-determined. Thus our own holiness is from ourselves, as its determining cause, and its original and highest source. And as for imputed righteousness that should have any merit at all in it, to be sure, there can be no such thing. For self-determination is necessary to praise and merit. But what is imputed from another is not from our self-determination or action. And truly, in this scheme, man is not dependent on God; but God is rather dependent on man in this affair: for he only operates consequentially in acts, in which he depends on what he sees we determine, and do first.

"The nature of true faith implies a disposition, to give all the glory of our salvation to God and Christ. But this notion is inconsistent with it, for it in effect gives the glory wholly to man. For that is the very doctrine that is taught, that the merit and praise is his, whose is the original and effectual determination of the praiseworthy deed. So that on the whole, I think it must be a miracle, if ever men are converted, that have imbibed such notions as these, and are under their influence in their religious concerns.

"With respect to self-flattery and presumption, as to what is future, nothing can possibly be conceived more directly tending to it, than a notion of a liberty, at all times possessed, consisting in a power to

determine one's own will to good or evil; which implies a power men have, at all times, to determine them to repent and turn to God. And what can more effectually encourage the sinner, in present delays and neglects, and embolden him to go on in sin, in a presumption of having his own salvation at all times at his command? And this notion of self-determination and self-dependence tends to prevent, or enervate, all prayer to God for converting grace; for why should men earnestly cry to God for his grace, to determine their hearts to that, which they must be determined to of themselves. And indeed it destroys the very notion of conversion itself. There can properly be no such thing, or anything akin to what the scripture speaks of conversion, renovation of the heart, regeneration, etc. if growing good, by a number of self-determined acts, are all that is required, or to be expected.

"Excuse me, Sir, for troubling you with so much on this head. I speak from the fulness of my heart. What I have long seen of the dreadful consequences of these prevalent notions everywhere, and what I am convinced will still be their consequences so long as they continue to prevail, fills me with concern. I therefore wish that the affair were more thoroughly looked into, and searched to the very bottom."

#### MEIKLE'S HINTS TO MINISTERS OF THE GOSPEL.

The amiable author of "the Traveller," "Solitude Sweetened," &c. though not himself a Minister, had his thoughts often turned to the work of the ministry, and long and fondly indulged the hope that God would, at some time, accept his offers of service in the Gospel. "As I feel a constant opposition in me to all that is holy and divine, I desire," says he, "to be chained, as it were, by *office* to religion; and by a close exercise therein, and breathing after communion with God, to get, through his grace, the antipathy in my heart against what is good dispelled, as far as my militant state can allow of." The following "Hints to Ministers of the Gospel" are extracted from the Memoirs of Meikle.

"Contract not much carnal acquaintance.

"Learn to be abused without becoming angry.

"Meddle not much with the affairs of this life.

"Argue coolly, and from conscience, not for victory.

"Affect not a show of sanctimony before men.

"Be not ashamed of piety in any company.

"Whatever else thou readest, read a double portion of the Scriptures of Truth.

"Shun familiarity with the men of the world, else celestial truth, as uttered by thee, will be contemned.

"Care not much about thy own reputation, so Truth and the Gospel suffer not.

"Learn daily more of Christ, and more of thyself, else thy other studies will profit little.

"Seek not great things for thyself; seek not great approbation, great applause, great conveniences, or a great income: but seek great things for Christ; seek to him great glory, many converts, and much fruits of righteousness.

“Consider the preciousness of souls, the value of salvation, the weight of the sacred charge, the terrors of the Almighty, the awful day of account, and thine own utter inability:—then shalt thou have no vain confidence, but depend on God alone.

“Please all men in the truth, but wound not the truth to please any.

“Set thy affections on things above; so shall spiritual things be thy delight, and not thy burden.

“In company, always study to drop something for edification; and so in a manner preach occasionally, as well as stately.

“Be much with God in secret; so shall God be with thee in public.

“See that the carriage of every one in thy family be a pattern to all observers, and not matter of reproach, to the joy of enemies.

“Let thy charge be continually on thy mind; and not only pray with them in public, and from house to house, but carry them to the closet, and pray for them in private.

“Neglect not to visit them at all proper times, but especially embrace those golden opportunities, sickness and affliction.

“Have a fellow-feeling with the sufferings of all thy flock.

“Let thy conversation be uniform; and what thou preachest on the Sabbath, practise through the week.

“Not only press charity on the wealthy, but let thy example, according to thy power, show the way.

“Rather lend thine ear to reproaches than applauses: the first may let us see some foible or failing with which we are chargeable; but the last is very apt to kindle self-conceit, of which every one has enough.

“Act the Christian even in eating and drinking; and be not, when at a feast, though temperate at other times, a glutton or a wine-bibber.

“With respect to thy charge, consider that thou art made the steward of a family, and therefore must, seeing the great Master allows it, provide food for all; flesh for the strong, and milk for the weak. See that the worship of God be set up in all families, and performed twice a day; and that parents instruct their children in private prayer, to say grace at meat, and to keep the Sabbath. See that the rising generation under thy care grow in knowledge, and be well acquainted with the Scriptures. Be well acquainted with the knowledge and conversation of every one that is admitted to the Lord's table.

“Keep an exact list, or catalogue, of thy charge; who is pious or profligate, knowing or ignorant, in affluence or exigence, in health or sickness; and read it often.

“Give a pleasant ear to the commendations of others, but always frown away the friend that would commend thee to thy face.

“Be sparing in producing specimens of thy learning, or criticisms on the words in the original, especially before the unlearned; for a nice grammarian may be but a novice in the Gospel.

“In preaching, aim at God's glory and the good of souls; and then, without deviating from that rule, please all men as much as possible.

"Let thy sermons be always the fruit of much study and application; and never dare to serve God with that which cost thee nought.

"Never be bigoted to thine own opinions, or interpretations of particular texts, lest, in establishing them, thou be seeking after thine own fame; but if the thoughts of others be as orthodox and consonant to the analogy of faith, if it be necessary for peace's sake, acquiesce in them.

"Never show a fondness for new doctrines, which, among Christians, are little better than new god's among the Israelites; but contend earnestly for the faith once (and but once, because sufficiently) delivered to the saints in the Scriptures of Truth; and still walk in that way, which, though very old, is very good."

---

#### RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

1. *Fastidious Hearers of the Gospel Admonished: A Sermon preached at Park Street Meeting House, Oct. 16, 1831.* By WILLIAM G. SCHAUFFLER, A. M. Boston: Peirce & Parker. pp. 20.

This truly original and valuable discourse is founded on Numbers xxi. 5, "*Our soul loatheth this light bread.*" From these words, the author takes occasion to administer a severe but seasonable reproof to those hearers of Divine truth, who do not scruple to 'criticise and judge, acquit or condemn it, just as though they were called together, not to hear the word of God, in order to do it, but to hear and witness a performance in the departments of composition and eloquence, and then to exercise and exhibit their critical acumen, by analyzing the performance, and passing a verdict on its comparative merits.' Such hearers—who Mr. S. thinks more likely to be found in cities than in the country, but who, we have reason to know, are not unfrequent visitors in the churches of both city and country—he describes, as "guilty of despising the word of God;"—they "are guilty of ingratitude to God, and provoke his anger;" they "unfit themselves for the reception of any benefit from the word of God;" they "discourage and grieve faithful ministers, and encourage and tempt temporizing men;" they "are the chief instruments in dividing churches and congregations, and of directing the minds of their neighbors and friends from the great object of preaching;" they "show by their conduct the pride of their hearts, and the sinfulness of their motives in coming to the house of God; and they "wholly mistake the relation in which the preacher of the gospel stands to them," regarding him as *their* servant, or the servant of the congregation, rather than as the servant of Christ.

In showing to this class of hearers how much they despise the word of God, Mr. S. uses the following comparison:

"Suppose there is a prisoner in the state prison who has forfeited his life. He is convicted, and his sentence is pronounced. The day of his execution comes, and he expects at every moment to see the door of his cell opened, and himself called to the place of execution. The door opens, and in comes a deputy from the governor, to offer him pardon and liberty. The prisoner professes to be exceedingly delighted with the message, but he very much objects to the

bearer of the message. He is a man of no consequence, or he is hardly able to deliver his message in a becoming manner. Instead of rising up and getting out from his dungeon, the prisoner is all the time dwelling on the disqualification of the deputy, and wonders why a man of more talent and higher standing has not been sent to him. He is reminded of the preciousness of the message, and his obligation to esteem and value it, and to overlook those unimportant matters. O yes, he replies, I know the message is valuable indeed, and I have it in all honor;—but why is the pardon not printed on parchment, &c. And so he goes on, never leaving his prison, but quarrelling without cessation about the minor and unessential circumstances of the case. Another committee is sent to him, and another still, and every thing possible is done to suit his taste; but in vain. He complains, and will not be satisfied. And now, my hearers, who of you will say, that man had any realizing sense of the value of the pardon offered to him?"

In showing those whom he addresses that their conduct is the result of pride, and that their motives in coming to the house of God are sinful, the preacher proceeds in the following artless but impressive manner:

"They do not want to hear this man, and that man, and another. And if you ask them, why, do you think this man is unfit for the ministry? Do you think this man had better be about some other business? O no, they reply, we think that he may be made very useful. He will do very well in a small town, or in a village. Send him out to the West, or to the Indians. But he will not answer for us. We must have quite another man. And then, we can pay for good preaching; we are able to pay a decent salary; and we are willing, if we can only get a man who will suit us. Such language you may hear among people, and if they do not say it in so many words, it is plainly implied in what they do say, and it speaks loudly in their conduct. But I ask, whether this frame of mind has your approbation, and whether you think that it has the approbation of God, and will be attended with a blessing from above?"

"Such hearers show by their conduct the sinfulness of their motives in going to the house of God. From their disappointment, you can safely reason upon the particular and ruling want or wants with which they entered the sanctuary, and which they chiefly expected to satisfy there. They go away disappointed and dissatisfied; and why? Was the subject not profitable and practical, or was it not gospel truth, or was it not well established and faithfully applied? O yes, all this it was, no doubt. But it was not so powerful, or so beautiful, as a composition; it was not as able as it might have been; it was not delivered with the sweetness and grace, or with the rolling, commanding eloquence of this or that great man. Now I will not make my charge too heavy. I will not say that such hearers are entirely uninfluenced by the motive of hearing divine truth. I will grant that this is one of their motives. But it is certainly an inferior one. Their grand motive is to be *pleased*, to be *entertained* by an exhibition of learning and taste, and by a rhetorical exercise. My hearers, let me tell it plainly, their grand motive is the identical one from which those men, whom the world calls decent men, visit the theatre, or any other public exercise of a similar kind."

In reply to some of his expostulations, Mr. S. represents his hearers as averring,

"We do not wish a man to depart from the purity of the gospel; we wish to hear it; and surely the gospel cannot be preached in too fine and graceful a style.—To this I reply, Yes, it can. I have heard a sermon to which I had no other objection except this, (and a mighty one it was) that it was too beautifully written and too gracefully delivered. Every body talked about the beauties of the sermon, whilst the important subject of it was forgotten. The fault was, that the proportion of beauty to truth was vastly too great; the effects of the medium were wholly prevented by the immense quantity of sugar mixed with it. The gospel must be preached with a certain degree of simplicity and plainness, if it is to do any good."

The discourse concludes with the following excellent practical rules, by

which to prepare for a profitable attendance on the public services of the Sabbath.

1. "Cultivate day by day simplicity of heart and humility, and a proper regard for the precious Word of God.
2. Compose your mind on Saturday evening or night, for the solemn exercises of the Holy Sabbath.
3. On Sabbath morning rise early. Let secret prayer and meditation be your first exercise.
4. Keep in a still and uniform frame all the Sabbath. Read little except the Bible; relish and digest what you read. But
5. Take care that this is all done in a sweet and easy way; make no toil or task out of the service of God. Do all freely and cheerfully, without violent effort.
6. Keep your heart with all diligence, as you go to the house of God; look not hither and thither unnecessarily, lest your mind be distracted and your devotion lost. Much less look about in the sanctuary; for this is a mark of disregard.
7. Ask, either at home or in the sanctuary, for God's blessing upon yourself, the preacher, and all the hearers.
8. When you retire after services, remember your obligations to God for having heard his word, and your responsibility for its improvement. Remember the perishing heathen, and ask that the gospel may speedily be preached unto every creature.
9. During the Sabbath, refrain from remarks of any kind on the preaching, and from censorious remarks refrain always, except when and where duty may call for them.
10. Digest what you hear, and *do it*, which will be the best preparation for the next Sabbath, if you should live to see it.

Thus shall your Sabbaths fit you for an everlasting rest in heaven; and the manna on which you feed in the wilderness of this world shall sustain you until you are permitted "to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God,"—which may God, in his infinite mercy, grant through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom be glory in the church forever. Amen."

2. *The Way to Bless and Save our Country: A Sermon preached in Philadelphia, at the request of the American Sunday School Union, May 23, 1831.* BY HEMAN HUMPHREY, D. D. *President of Amherst College.* Philadelphia: A. S. S. Union. pp. 24.

Dr. Humphrey proposes "to bless and save our country," by the religious education of our youth. He commences with the following inquiries: "What is it to train up a child in the way he should go? How is it that such training forms a permanently virtuous and pious character? And how may the whole youthful population of our country be thus piously educated?"—The first of these inquiries he answers as follows:

"A child is trained up in the way he should go, when he receives a pious education, commencing with the dawn of intellect, and continued till his character is formed and settled;—when his wayward propensities are watched and checked in their earliest manifestations;—when his opening mind is carefully imbued with moral and religious truth;—when his conscience is exercised to a quick discernment of right and wrong;—when his heart is made habitually to feel the presence of high and holy motives;—when the budding of every kindly affection is cherished by the breath of prayer; and when, in fine, virtuous habits of thought, of feeling, and of action, are gradually consolidated into great and abiding moral principles."

In showing how it is that such training forms a permanently virtuous and pious character, Dr. H. remarks upon the power of habit, and upon the mightier power of the renewing Spirit, which may be expected to accompany and



bless the faithful labors of those who endeavor to train up their children for God.

In answer to the third general inquiry, Dr. H. observes that, in the present state of things, the universal religious education of the youth of our country cannot be expected from the unassisted efforts of parents; since there is such a dreadful "dearth of piety at the head of more than a million and a half of American families." But much may be reasonably hoped from Sabbath Schools, and especially from the efforts of the National Union.

"Here, in this blessed Union of hearts and hands, of counsels and prayers—in this flowing together of the waters of life from so many different sanctuaries, I see a pledge that every child in the city and the country, on the sea-board and by the great rivers of the west, shall be sought out, and have the opportunity of being instructed "in the right way of the Lord."

The Discourse concludes with earnest and appropriate addresses to parents, to teachers, to ministers of the gospel, and to all lovers of their country, to patronize and promote, by every mean in their power, the noble cause of Sabbath schools. As teachers are literally "the working men" in the Sabbath school system, we extract, for their encouragement, a part of the address to them.

"Suppose, for a moment, that you could summon around you, every Lord's day, some of the most prosperous and influential men of business—some of the most devoted and useful preachers of the gospel—some of the ablest advocates and judges, and some of the most distinguished legislators of our country? Suppose you could do this as easily as you can now call your classes together, and could open the Bible before them, and impress its great truths upon their hearts and consciences, and give a permanent shape to their whole character? Would you not esteem it an honor and a privilege? And could you possibly exert so mighty an influence in any other way?"

"Well then, what are the facts in the case? Have you not actually before you, every Sabbath, some of the future ministers of the church, and rulers of the country? Some of the great merchants and bankers, jurists, legislators, and physicians of the next forty years? That little boy, who now listens to you with so much interest, and whose heart and intellect you are helping to fashion, will one day preach the everlasting gospel to the Hindoos, or the Chinese. And that other lad whom you found in a cellar, and allured to your school-room, will in your own lifetime, be at the head of business in your city. Among those whose characters you are forming, on the eternal basis of Scriptural truth, one may be a Howard, another a Martyn; one a Whitfield, and another a Robert Hall, or Jonathan Edwards. That little child, now at the head of his class, may become another Franklin, or he may hereafter sit upon the bench of the Supreme Court, or he may one day be President of the United States! What an influence! What an advantage, to have the first training of the young idea, and to direct the moral power of a great nation! The thought is prodigious."

### 3. *The Christian Offering*, for MDCCCXXXII. Boston: Lincoln & Edmands. pp. 231.

No small part of the periodical literature of our country has, for several years, been contained in the *Annals*; and it is justly matter of regret, that so few of these ornamented and captivating volumes have hitherto been of a religious character. How few of them have been such, that the Christian father could, without misgiving, introduce them to the notice of his family; or one Christian friend put them into the hands of another. In general, they have been of a character to dispel seriousness, not to promote it—and to please the imagination at the expense of the heart. Verily, these things ought not so to be, and we rejoice that the Editor of the work before us\* has been able to furnish so satisfactory proof "that literary elegance and Christian instruction may happily coalesce."

\* Rev. J. O. Choules, of Newport, R. I.

"The Christian Offering" is executed throughout in a style of uncommon elegance; is embellished with several beautiful engravings; contains a great variety of entertaining and instructive articles, in prose and in verse; and, better than all, is characterized by a decidedly evangelical spirit. We do not say that the selections are the *best* which could have been made, but, in general, they are highly respectable and judicious, and the work is well worthy the attention of those, whose circumstances allow them to gladden the hearts of their families and friends by a Christmas or a New Year's present.

The following extract from the "Biography of Lady Huntingdon" will be interesting, both as a specimen of the work, and as furnishing some account of this most extraordinary woman.

"Lady Huntingdon's person, endowments, and spirit, were all uncommon. She was rather above the middle size; her presence noble, and commanding respect; her address singularly engaging; her mind acute, and formed for business; her diligence indefatigable; and the constant labors of her correspondence is hardly to be conceived. During forty-five years of widowhood, she devoted her time, talents, and property, to the support and diffusion of the gospel. To the age of fourscore and upwards, she maintained all the vigor of youth; and though, in her latter years, a contraction of her throat reduced her almost wholly to a liquid diet, her spirits never seemed to fail. To the very last days of her life, her active mind was planning extensive schemes of usefulness for the spread of the gospel of Christ. Her most distinguished excellence was, the fervent zeal which always burned in her breast, to make known the glad tidings to all the dwellers upon earth. This no disappointments quenched, no labors slackened, no opposition discouraged, no progress of years abated: it flamed strongest in her latest moments. The world has seldom seen such a character."

4. *A Guide for Emigrants*, containing Sketches of Illinois, Missouri, and the adjacent states. By J. M. PECK, of Rock Spring, Illinois. Boston: Lincoln & Edmands. 1831. pp. 336.

The design of this book is sufficiently indicated by its title. "Within a few months past," the author informs us, "he has received more than a hundred letters, calling for information, in detail, on all those subjects about which a man wishes to inform himself, before he decides upon a removal, or which may aid him in his journey, and which may enable him successfully to surmount the difficulties of an untried land. To answer these was impossible. The only feasible method to afford general satisfaction, was to write a book." The book before us, originating in such a motive, contains not only an amount of information, but precisely that kind of information which, in prospect of emigration, a considerate person would most desire. Its appearance will be welcomed by not a few of our citizens, and its statements may be the more relied on, as its author, "having no connexion with town-sites and land speculations," may be supposed to give a plain and unvarnished detail of facts.

5. *Memoir of John Mooney Mead*, who died at East Hartford, April 8, 1831, aged four years, eleven months, and four days. Boston: Peirce & Parker. 1831. pp. 94.

The public are here furnished with another instance of probable conversion in the case of an interesting little child. John M. Mead was born at Brunswick, Maine, May 4th, 1826, and died April 8th, 1831, being not quite five years old. Yet he lived long enough to learn that he was a sinner, in need of a Saviour; that Christ came into the world to save sinners; and that there was no happiness but in loving and following Christ. He lived in the world long enough to be weaned from it, and to be willing (so far as appears on Christian principles) to leave it.

"Within a few months of his death, he repeatedly called his mother to his bed after he had retired at night, and requested her to tell him all she knew about the children in heaven, referring to the Saviour's words: "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." While sick, he again desired her to tell him all she knew about them, and particularly what they did in heaven. When she had finished, he said:

"I wish to join that company of children around God's throne." His mother asked: "Are you willing to die, and leave your dear father and mother, and to go and join them?"

"He replied with perfect calmness: "Ycs."

"Other things were said, daily manifesting the same feelings, while he was every hour shewing the liveliest attachment to his parents, and seemed unwilling to have them out of his sight for any long time.

"One day his father was sitting on the bed, holding him up, as he often requested, when he said: "My son, we hope you will get well, but it may be God's will, that you shall die. Are you willing?"

J. "Yes."

F. "Where will you be, my son, if you die?"

J. "Where God pleases to put me."

F. "Are you willing he shall do with you as he may please?"

J. "Yes."

F. "Do you often pray to God in your heart?"

J. "Yes."

"His father could at the time discover no reason to doubt, that he understood fully what he said, and felt as he expressed himself. Neither on mature reflection has he discovered the least evidence to the contrary, or any reason to doubt, that this was the habitual state of his mind during his sickness."

The volume before us contains a beautiful portrait of little John. It is replete with instruction as to the religious education of children, and on this account deserves the attention, not only of those in early youth, but also of parents. It is hoped it may contribute to deepen the impression that young children may give satisfactory evidence of piety, and may encourage parents and teachers to labor more for the early conversion of those committed to their care.

#### 6. *Christian Examiner and General Review, for November, 1831.*

It is not our intention to give a general account of the contents of this number of the Examiner, but merely to glance at several things which seem to require a passing notice.

1. We have here a more distinct expression than is commonly given of the views of the Conductors, as to the *person of Christ*. Miss Joanna Baillie, an Arian, had said of Socinianism, 'It seems at variance with so many plain passages of Scripture, that it cannot be considered as standing upon any solid foundation.'

"Here," say the conductors of the Examiner, "we differ considerably from Miss Baillie. In the simplest way possible of reading the Scriptures, there are so many places in which our Saviour is expressly called a man, and so few in which he seems to be called anything else, that it appears to us rather a hasty saying, to assert that the doctrine of his humanity is destitute of 'any solid foundation.' And the knowledge of a little criticism—admitted on *all* hands to be correct and fair!! would inform that lady, or any one else, that the creation of the world which is ascribed to Christ in the Scriptures, is not so decidedly the creation of the material and natural world, as she has assumed it to be."

2. The same views of inspiration, on which we have formerly commented, continue to be urged in the pages of the Examiner.

"The inspiration of the writers of the New Testament began and ended in a supernatural communication to their minds of a clear, abiding, and infallible perception of the vital and essential principles of the new dispensation. These they were afterwards left to state, illustrate, and recommend, as they were able,

*in their own language, and by their natural faculties.* Unitarians do not think it necessary to maintain, that the sacred writers were inspired as natural philosophers, metaphysicians, or critics, nor even as logicians, chronologers, or historians. They distinguish, moreover, between the Christian revelation, which existed, and had been extensively diffused many years before a line of the Christian Scriptures was written, and these Scriptures themselves, which are but a record of the revelation."

"On subjects not connected with the Christian doctrine, or merely collateral and unessential, discrepancies and contradictions occur in the sacred writings which never have been reconciled by a fair and legitimate construction, and never can be. It is necessary, therefore, either to adopt views of inspiration which are consistent with such discrepancies and contradictions, or give up inspiration altogether.

It is remarkable that these sentences are part of an article designed to 'vindicate Unitarianism against the charge of sceptical tendencies!'

3. The views here exhibited respecting the nature of *faith* are entitled to some consideration.

"Faith is not a simple act of the will; nor can it be strengthened, or weakened, or changed, or in any way modified, by a simple act of the will. It is the *involuntary yielding* of the mind to a preponderance of evidence, as it strikes us at the time. True, in some states of mind we are much more likely to believe, than in others; but it is because in different states of mind the same evidence strikes us differently, being viewed under different aspects; and not because the will, simply considered, has any control over our convictions. *In all cases without exception*, let our state of mind be what it may, belief is the *involuntary assent* of the understanding to a preponderance of evidence, as it strikes us at the time."

Strange, that our Saviour should enjoin faith, as a *duty*, and represent the neglect of it as incurring his eternal displeasure! "He that *believeth not, shall be damned!*"

4. Unitarians find great difficulty in persuading their people to come to the Lord's table. To induce them to do this, it was formerly urged, that 'the Christian rites are not holier than the other parts of public worship; and that we have no more occasion for preparatory lectures, or preparatory meditations;—we have no more business to slum them up to a peculiar and chosen few, than we have to treat in a similar manner any of the public services of the sanctuary.' See *Chris. Ex.* vol. iii. pp. 9, 10. The inference from all this was, as might have been expected, 'If the Lord's supper is a thing of so little importance, it may be safely neglected. Why should we trouble ourselves about it?' And the consequence was that, in most Unitarian congregations, the ordinance continued to be neglected more and more. To check, if possible, the growing evil, an opposite course of representation is now adopted. The Lord's supper is magnified, and an attendance upon it is declared to be "the *only public recognition which we can make of our religious obligations.*"

"Attendance at church is not any express avowal of religious feeling. It does not amount, in fact, to a declaration of belief in Christianity. The only public, formal, and authorized expression, now understood as such, of belief in Christianity, and that connected with a serious purpose to obey its precepts, is to be found in the sacramental vows of the communion table. Is it not desirable that there should be such an expression,—public, formal, and unquestionable? Is it not proper and expedient that the great interests of life and of being should be thus openly and solemnly recognized, thus acknowledged in the presence of each other, thus avowed before heaven and earth?"

5. There are some valuable remarks in the number before us on the importance of *free inquiry* in matters of religion.

"The days of mystery and concealment are passing away; for men have learned, from the Scriptures themselves, to prove all things and hold fast that only which is good. There are those who are alarmed at this; but the man who fears that inquiry will make him a skeptic, shows himself a skeptic already. All interferences to repress freedom of thought, all attempts to deter men from *hearing and reading on both sides*, all appeals to the fears and prejudices of the people to prevent a free and open discussion of novel opinions, originate in that very skepticism, which they are vainly thought to preclude. It is the policy of men, whatever they may say to the contrary, *who have no confidence in their own cause, and therefore dread, above all things, the inquisitive and searching spirit which is trying the systems and institutions of the world, as by fire.*"

To these remarks we subscribe our full assent; and we recommend them to the consideration of those Unitarian ministers, who are so much afraid that their people will wander into our protracted meetings, and occasionally hear an Orthodox sermon,—and to those liberal husbands and fathers who have prohibited "those under their authority" from worshipping God according to the dictates of their own consciences.

# INDEX.

American Education Society vindicated,	148	Hints to Christian Ministers	672
Amherst College,	395	Iceland account of	215
Apostolical Churches, Errors in	238	Illustrations of Matt. iii. 7.	621
Arius, Life of	422	Impassable Bridge	592
Arian Persecutions,	427	Inept Interpretation	451
Arianism,	426	Interpretation of the Scriptures	67
Arminius, Account of	258	Introduction	5
Arminians called Remonstrants,	261	Japan account of	485
Austin Dr. Samuel Memoir of	293	Japan Missions in	529
Beard's Collection of Sermons Remarks on	289	Jews ancient believed in a Future State	108
Belgie Confession of Faith	257	Kent Chancellor opinion of	501
Calvin Note on the Character of	54	Letter to a Young Christian	51
Calvin defended	133	Locke not a Unitarian	401
Champollion's Illustrations of Sacred History,	197	Lord's Table Excuse for forsaking	75
Champollion's Replies to Infidel Objections,	207	Ministerial Sobriety	9
Channing Dr. his Charges,	120	Missionaries Persecuted	508
Charges against the Orthodox examined,	122	Motives of Good Men not understood by others	299
Cherokees Case of against Georgia	492	New Creature	415
Christian Examiner remarks on	451, 679	Obituary Notice of Mrs. Martha Ropes	48
Churches cautioned	64	Obituary Notice of Jeremiah Evarts, Esq.	347
Churches Communion of	245	Orthodox how understood by Hollis	376
Church Officers	136	Orthodox Church oppression of	116
Congregational Churches not Independent	136	Orthodox charges against	118
Congregational Churches Rights of	614	Paine Thomas life of	338
Contingent Prospects of our Country	181	Payson Dr. Memoirs of	22
Creeeds defence of	125, 129	Payson Dr. Remarks on	29
Dangers of Awakened Sinners	227	Persevering Puritan	442
Dangers of the Times thoughts on	573	Probationers' Class	656
Declaration of Rights third Article in	629	Professor Lee	617
Diaries on keeping	428	Professor Stuart on the xvith Psalm	107
Do thyself no Harm	520	Professor Stuart on the meaning of <i>Kurios</i>	622
Edwards on a Self Determining Power	670	Protracted Meetings Vindicated	559
Egypt ancient account of	99	Purposes of God Uses and Abuses of	479, 422
Election Week	344	Questions	516
Evarts Jeremiah Memoir of	601	Recent Publications 60, 107, 235, 290, 344, 397, 457, 513, 569, 622, 674	744
Examination of 1 Tim. iii. 16.	112	Reformation Doctrines of	132
Figurative character of the Sacred Writings	15	Religious Retirement on	230
Future State revealed in Old Testament	305	Religious Differences in Mass. Thoughts on	358
Genevese Persecutions	153	Remarkable Conversions	567
German Universities	109	Revivals of Religion	404
German Rationalists Infidels	111	Revival in Yale College in 1807	290
German Theological Students	445	Revivals in Foreign Countries	405
German Clergy	447	Revivals formerly in America	406
German Rationalism	451	Revivals recent	408
Glory of God manifested by the Church	517	Revivals Necessity of	467
Gospel Ministry Hall on	228	Romans ix. 5. remarks on	49
Gospel Truth—do.	230	Salter's Hall Controversy	379
Greece and Rome State of Morals in	579	Slavery in Greece and Rome	581
Greece Modern account of	311	Socinus advocated persecution	280
Greek Church	321	South on Justification	619
Hall Robert Selections from	223	Stiles Dr. Ezra Life of	349
Harvard College Property of the State	373	Synod of Dort misrepresented	135
Harvard College monopolized by a Sect	383	Synod of Dort account of	263
Heathen State of	648	Synod of Dort defended	266
Hieroglyphic System of Champollion	98	Theological Seminary of Tenent	566
		Unitarianism State of in England	80
		Unitarianism in N. England. Letter ix.	61
		Unitarianism not favorable to Missions	87

Unitarianism and Infidelity	283
Unitarians English, their Perversions	36
Unitarian Theological School	390
Washington on Religious Liberty	636
Watts Dr. on Religious Liberty	637
Whitman Mr. his Misrepresentations	129—175, 335
Whitman Mr. his ignorance	129—139
Whitman Mr. his Inconsistencies	154—159
Whitman Mr. his Letters characterized	58, 175
Woodd Rev. Basil Memoir of	461
Xavier in Japan	528
Young Christian Letter to	51
Zwingli Religious Sentiments of	233

## INDEX OF REVIEWS.

Review of Memoir of Rev. Edward Payson, D. D.	21
Works on the State of Unitarianism in England	31, 80
An Essay on the Hieroglyphic System of M. Champollion	98—197
Letters to Rev. Moses Stuart. By Bernard Whitman	117
Henderson's Iceland	212
Scott's History and Articles of the Synod of Dort	256
Letters to Rev. Joel Hawes, D. D. By Samuel J. May	272
Anderson's Tour in Greece	311
Whitman's Reply to the Review of his Letters	326
Harvey on the Visible Church	365
Publications relating to Harvard College	373
Memoirs of Rev. Henry Martyn	428
the Cherokee Case against Georgia	492
Stuart's Exegetical Essays	538
Pamphlets in opposition to Revivals	554
Barr's Help to Professing Christians	594
Publications on the Death of Jeremiah Evarts, Esq.	599
Bickersteth's Christian Student	659
Cox's Female Scripture Biography	667

## INDEX TO THE PRINCIPAL CRITICAL NOTICES.

Notice of Professor Stuart's Prize Essay on Distilled Liquors	55
Memoir of Nathan W. Dickerman	56
Huntington's Poems	57
Whitman's Letters to Professor Stuart	58
Biblical Repository, No. 1.	107

Henderson's Examination of 1 Tim. iii. 16.	112
Dr. Wood's Discourse on the Province of Reason in Matters of Religion	115
Orme's Life and Times of Richard Baxter	116
Dr. Wisner's Discourse on the Landing of the Pilgrims	236
Life of President Dwight	290
Cooke's Remonstrance against an Established Religion	292
Fairechild's Sermon on the Deity of Christ	292
Lectures before the American Institute in 1830	344
Wilson's Sermons on the Sabbath	345
Dr. Codman's Convention Sermon	397
Withington's Election Sermon	400
Dr. Beaseley's Reply to Dr. Channing	401
Dr. Porter's Fast Sermons	403
Memoir of Mrs. Huntington	404
Ware on the Formation of Christian Character	457
Dr. Payson's Sermons	460
Memoirs of Rev. John Townsend	460
Child's Book on the Soul	460
Parkhurst's Moral Philosophy	513
Sullivan's Moral Class Book	513
Pearson's Letter	514
Appeal in behalf of Illinois College	515
Daily Scripture Expositor	516
Dr. Woods' Installation Sermon at Catskill	569
The Scriptural Interpreter	570
Bridge's Christian Ministry	571
Stuart's Hebrew Grammar (Fourth Edition)	571
Church Psalmody	571
Dr. Alexander's Collection of Hymns	572
The Christian Lyre	572
Spiritual Songs for Social Worship	572
Biblical Repository, No. 4.	622
Fourth Report of American Temperance Society	625
Dr. Wayland's Discourse on the Philosophy of Analogy	626
Taylor's Holy Living and Dying	627
Aids to Devotion	627
The Friends	628
Schauffler's Sermon on Fاسidious Hearers	674
Dr. Humphrey's Sermon on Sabbath Schools	676
The Christian Offering	677
Peck's Guide for Emigrants	678
Memoir of John M. Mead	678
Christian Examiner for Nov. 1831	679

